

UNITED NATIONS



# SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-FIFTH YEAR

**2190<sup>th</sup>** MEETING: 7 AND 9 JANUARY 1980

NEW YORK

---

CONTENTS

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2190) .....	1
Statement by the President .....	
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.

## 2190th MEETING

Held in New York on Monday, 7 January 1980,  
at 3 p.m. and on Wednesday, 9 January 1980, at 7 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/2190)

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 3.40 p.m.*

### Statement by the President

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): It is a pleasure for me, on behalf of the Council, to bid the warmest possible welcome to our colleague Mr. Muñoz Ledo, the representative of Mexico, a country which the General Assembly has, in accordance with Article 23 of the Charter of the United Nations, just elected a non-permanent member of the Council. Mr. Muñoz Ledo requires no introduction from me. In a very short time he has earned the esteem and admiration of everyone at the United Nations. As a statesman, diplomat and author, he will bring to our work the fruits of a considerable and varied experience. He represents a country whose contribution to the ideals of the United Nations is well known. I hope he will accept my best wishes for total success in his mission here among us.

2. Mr. MUÑOZ LEDO (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Mr. President, I thank you for your words of welcome. They are particularly pleasing to hear because they come from a diplomat of such great qualities, one who represents France, with which Mexico shares essential values.

3. I thank all members for the warm welcome they have given me personally, and I am sure that my country's delegation and they will work well together. We have come here today to occupy one of the two seats reserved for Latin America in this forum, a responsibility that has been most ably discharged by Bolivia during the past two years.

4. Returning to the Council after 34 years, Mexico wishes to say that it is unswervingly devoted to the ideals and principles of the Charter and that it will offer this principal body of the United Nations its forthright and complete co-operation.

### 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)

5. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): In accordance with decisions taken at the 2185th to 2189th meetings, I invite the representatives of Afghanistan, Australia, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Egypt, the Federal Republic of Germany, Hungary, Italy, Japan, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Liberia, Malaysia, Mongolia, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Pakistan, Panama, Poland, Saudi

Arabia, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Turkey, Venezuela, Viet Nam and Yugoslavia 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. Barton (Canada), Mr. Canales (Chile), Mr. Liévano (Colombia), Mr. Piza Escalante (Costa Rica), Mr. Hulinský (Czechoslovakia), Mr. Thiounn Prasith (Democratic Kampuchea), Mr. Abdel Meguid (Egypt), Baron von Wechmar (Germany, Federal Republic of), Mr. Hollai (Hungary), Mr. La Rocca (Italy), Mr. Nisibori (Japan), Mr. Southichak (Lao People's Democratic Republic), Mr. Tubman (Liberia), Mr. Zaiton (Malaysia), Mr. Dashtseren (Mongolia), Mr. Boddens-Hosang (Netherlands), Mr. Francis (New Zealand), Mr. Naik (Pakistan), Mr. Illueca (Panama), Mr. Jaroszek (Poland), Mr. Allagany (Saudi Arabia), Mr. Koh (Singapore), Mr. Sharif (Somalia), Mr. Piniés (Spain), Mr. Eralp (Turkey), Mr. Nava Carrillo (Venezuela), Mr. Ha Van Lau (Viet Nam) and Mr. Komatina (Yugoslavia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.*

6. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The first speaker is the representative of Panama. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

7. Mr. ILLUECA (Panama) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Mr. President, at the outset I should like to thank you and the other members of the Council for giving my delegation this opportunity to participate in the debate. For the past two years, it has been my singular honour to work with you in the Council, and I wish to join in the expressions of admiration and respect that have been offered to you by the international community. I should add that France and Panama have deep-rooted historical, spiritual and cultural ties. In congratulating you upon your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council, I wish to pledge to you our co-operation and to express our best wishes for success in your work. We wish to pay a tribute to Mr. Chen Chu of China, for his outstanding work as President of the Council for the month of December. We also wish to commend the Secretary-General, whose co-operation with the Council is well known. Only recently, his very life was endangered in the performance of his duties.

8. It is with pleasure that I congratulate the representatives of the German Democratic Republic, the Philippines, the Niger and Tunisia, which have this year joined the Council as new members, together with Mexico, which this morning the General Assembly elected by an overwhelming majority to fill one of the two Latin American seats in the Council.

9. In addition, we express our appreciation to the representatives of Bolivia, Czechoslovakia, Gabon, Kuwait and Nigeria for their important work as members of the Council. Their mandate ended on 31 December 1979.

10. Panama was one of the 57 countries, including all the Latin American countries, which promoted the adoption by the General Assembly, on 21 December 1965, of the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of their Independence and Sovereignty [*General Assembly resolution 2131 (XX)*]. Understandably enough, my country signed the letter that on 3 January 1980 was sent to the President of the Security Council by 52 Member States calling for an urgent meeting of the Council to consider the situation that had arisen in Afghanistan and its consequences for international peace and security.

11. Not only my country, but the entire Latin American continent was deeply saddened to learn that the people of Afghanistan had been invaded by huge contingents of troops from the Soviet Union, whose offensive capacity exceeds the limits of the territory occupied. Grave concern has been aroused. We were particularly dismayed to learn that with the help of the very troops which had come to its aid, the Government of Afghanistan had been overthrown, the Head of State executed, the territorial integrity of the country wholly violated and the army disarmed and that, at the very time when the Council was meeting, Soviet forces of occupation were carrying out combat operations and firing on dissident segments of the population of Afghanistan, causing a deplorable loss of human life, actions that the human conscience can only repudiate and condemn.

12. In the course of the debate, it has been asserted that the overwhelming Soviet presence in Afghanistan has a certain legitimacy by virtue of provisions of the Treaty of Friendship, Good Neighbourliness and Co-operation between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan signed in Moscow on 5 December 1978.<sup>1</sup> In that regard, it has been claimed that Soviet military assistance was requested under that Treaty by the Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, headed by Hafizullah Amin, who, as is well known, was executed during the Soviet occupation of Afghanistan.

13. That flimsy excuse is entirely unacceptable, not only because it is irrational and illogical, but also because the international community has not conferred—nor can it confer—any legal validity on interventionist provisions or provisions authorizing the arbitrary use of armed forces in the territory of another State that may be inserted or may have been inserted in treaties or international agreements by any Members of the United Nations after the entry into force of the Charter.

14. Article 103 of the Charter of the United Nations leaves no room for doubt in that regard. That Article states:

“In the event of a conflict between the obligations of the Members of the United Nations under the

present Charter and their obligations under any other international agreement, their obligations under the present Charter shall prevail.”

15. It should be pointed out in this connection that the International Law Commission, in drafting the text which later became article 53 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties,<sup>2</sup> took into consideration that a number of countries from various regions and with different legal systems referred to Article 103 of the Charter as a formal norm of *jus cogens*. Article 53 of the Vienna Convention certainly puts into perspective the so-called Treaty of Friendship signed by the Soviet Union and Afghanistan. Article 53 states:

“A treaty is void if, at the time of its conclusion, it conflicts with a peremptory norm of general international law. For the purposes of the present Convention, a peremptory norm of general international law is a norm accepted and recognized by the international community of States as a whole as a norm from which no derogation is permitted and which can be modified only by a subsequent norm of general international law having the same character.”

16. No one is unaware of the fact that, as the most distinguished contemporary jurists have agreed, most of the Articles of the Charter of the United Nations in fact contain typical provisions of constitutional law and that in those Articles there may be found many provisions which are noteworthy because they do not refer solely to matters of procedure, but also create rights and obligations.

17. That is the case—so frequently mentioned as an example by contemporary jurists—with Article 2, paragraphs 3 and 4, of the Charter, which refer to the peaceful settlement of disputes and to the obligation to refrain from the threat or the use of force.

18. The Charter, as we all know, is a treaty which has been accepted now by 152 States and the legislative value which this instrument has in the international arena must be recognized, for its provisions have been ratified at the highest level among the community of States of the world.

19. My country upholds the legal conclusion that States Members of the United Nations are prevented under the Charter from giving legal validity to the Treaty of Friendship, Good Neighbourliness and Co-operation signed by the Soviet Union and Afghanistan, because that Treaty is in conflict with the Charter. To accept the validity of that Treaty would be tantamount to applauding the unlawful use of force in contravention of Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter, which provides that:

“All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any

State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations.”

20. The Soviet invasion of Afghanistan has aroused consternation and concern in today's world. The political cost of this wayward action by the Soviet Union to the Government and the people of that great country is, in our opinion, incalculable, nor will mankind derive any benefit from that action.

21. The Soviet action violates not only the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States but also the Charter of the United Nations. That action is also in open contradiction of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples contained in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960. It is only fair to recall that both documents originated in Soviet proposals, although they were subsequently redrafted by countries of the third world. The Soviet action also contravenes the principle of non-intervention proclaimed in the charter of the Organization of American States, the charter of the League of Arab States and the charter of the Organization of African Unity and accepted in the conferences of Montevideo, Buenos Aires, Chapultepec and Bogota, in the decisions of the Asian-African Conference held at Bandung in 1955, those of the First Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries held at Belgrade in 1961, in the Programme for Peace and International Co-operation adopted at the conclusion of the Second Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries held at Cairo in 1964 and in the Declaration on the Problem of Subversion adopted at Accra in 1965 by the second ordinary session of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African unity.

22. That action by the Soviet Union also contravenes many decisions by the summit conferences of non-aligned countries, and in particular the decisions of the Conferences of Colombo and Havana. The Soviet Union, in acting unilaterally and by-passing the United Nations, has come into conflict with the Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, who said at the Colombo Conference in 1976 that an end must be put to any attempt or effort to avoid or limit participation by the United Nations in the settlement of international problems which are of concern to all countries.

23. Moreover, the Soviet action is in open violation of the statement on the interference or intervention in the internal affairs of States by the Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries at the Havana Conference in 1979. On that occasion,

“The Conference reaffirmed the adherence of non-aligned countries to the principle of non-intervention and non-interference in the internal and external affairs of States, which has been one

of the basic principles of non-alignment. It insisted that violation of this principle was totally unacceptable, unjustifiable under any circumstances and incompatible with the obligations assumed by the United Nations Members under the Charter of the United Nations.”<sup>3</sup>

24. The ill-advised Soviet decision to invade Afghanistan is, in my Government’s opinion, more than a breach of the legal order: it has disrupted international relations. The Soviet action has traumatized the process of international détente in which the world had, in recent times, placed so much hope.

25. We ask: What has happened to the Helsinki Final Act of 1975 and the Declaration on Principles Guiding Relations between Participating States, adopted by the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe—and, in particular, the seventh principle, on non-intervention in internal affairs?

26. The Soviet action not only has dealt a mortal blow to détente but has unnecessarily created a warlike mood in the world—a mood at variance with the ideals of peace of the Soviet Revolution, which we all respect. The visible consequences of that warlike action have been the great intensification of the arms race, with the consequent frustration for all the peace-loving States that wish to promote efforts to bring about disarmament, efforts which now seem to be lost somewhere on the distant horizon.

27. The Soviet action has, moreover, seriously disrupted international economic relations and has cast a pall over the possibilities of fulfilling the hopes of the third world for more equitable economic relations between the developing countries and the industrialized countries. Indeed, it has cast a pall over the already dark world economic picture.

28. Since Afghanistan is a non-aligned country which has been unjustly occupied by a super-Power, the Soviet action has brought about a serious crisis in the non-aligned movement. This crisis will cause a confrontation within the non-aligned system between traditionally friendly countries that now must reach decisions in accordance with the principles and purposes of non-alignment or cause considerable disruption within that movement, with most unpleasant consequences.

29. In general, a crisis of confidence has been created in the United Nations system and in the entire ambit of international relations. As for the countries which are not super-Powers, are they or are they not entitled to expect respect for the right of peoples to self-determination, for the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of States, for the principle of the non-use of force in international relations, for the principle of the inadmissibility of hegemonism, for the principle of territorial integrity?

30. This crisis of confidence, which is not merely spiritual but finds concrete form in the suffering of the people of Afghanistan and the disruption of world peace, cannot be resolved by lukewarm, ambiguous or imprecise resolutions. It demands determined action by the States members of the Security Council, as representatives of the community of the United Nations, and, in particular, by the permanent members of the Council.

31. In our opinion, the States that have the major responsibility to abide by the Charter must agree among themselves on a solution to the crisis. That need not necessarily be contained in a draft resolution; it could be contained in a consensus decision read out by the President, in accordance with the usual practice—a decision that would clearly state the elements of a solution to the crisis, including the immediate withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghan territory and a commitment by all States, both within and outside the region, not to interfere directly or indirectly with the right of the people of Afghanistan freely to decide their future and the form of their political, economic and social life and to maintain their independence and territorial integrity and their status as a non-aligned country.

32. Furthermore, we would remind the Council that article 3 (e) of the Definition of Aggression [*General Assembly resolution 3314 (XXIX), annex*] qualifies as an act of aggression:

“The use of armed forces of one State which are within the territory of another State with the agreement of the receiving State, in contravention of the conditions provided for in the agreement for any extension of their presence in such territory beyond the termination of the agreement.”

33. It is obvious that the measures taken by the Soviet troops against the people and Government of Afghanistan during the occupation constitute a violation of the very Treaty of Friendship on which the measures are alleged to be based. This is a clear case of aggression.

34. In conclusion, I should like with all due respect to make a friendly appeal to the Soviet Union to restore to the world the climate of peace for which we all yearn. To that end there must be agreement, without delay, on the immediate withdrawal of the Soviet troops now in Afghanistan. The admiration of the world for the “Red Army” is much clearer when viewed against the background of its glorious actions against nazism and fascism—as in the battle of Stalingrad—than when viewed against the background of the infamous invasion of Afghanistan.

35. 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 Zaire in which he requests to be invited to participate

in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In accordance with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite the representative of Zaire 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. Kamanda wa Kamanda (Zaire) took the place reserved for him at the side of the Council chamber.*

36. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I invite the representative of Zaire to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

37. Mr. KAMANDA wa KAMANDA (Zaire) (*interpretation from French*): I should like at the outset, Mr. President, to extend my warm congratulations to you on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of January. The Republic of Zaire takes particular pleasure in seeing you presiding over the Security Council at this difficult time, not only because you are the representative of a friendly country, France, but also because you are a man of quality who combines vast experience with distinguished qualifications as a diplomat.

38. I should like also to pay a well-deserved tribute to Mr. Chen Chu, the outgoing President of the Security Council, who conducted the Council's proceedings with skill, efficiency and assurance in particularly delicate circumstances. I would also extend my warm congratulations to all the newly elected members of the Security Council.

39. We are speaking in this debate, first, for reasons of principle and also as a member of the non-aligned movement. There can be no shadow of doubt that the situation created in Afghanistan by the armed foreign invasion constitutes a serious threat to international peace and security. This is a very serious matter in view of the violation of the principles of the Charter and in view of the nature of those concerned. There can be no responsible leader or any Government of good faith in the world that could be persuaded to believe that the régime of President Hafizullah Amin, relying on the Treaty of Friendship and Co-operation<sup>1</sup> linking his country with its powerful neighbour, would have invited the troops of that country to come and overthrow him and then to execute him summarily. Among civilized people there are some things which are understood, and I do not think it is at all appropriate to treat people as if they were wild animals.

40. The primary mission or the essence of law in the human community is to set useful limits to the free course of the instincts, to organize relations among its members on a rational basis in such a way as to avert conflicts, to permit all to enjoy rights and freedoms and to promote not only the progress of the community, but also that of each of its members.

41. Robinson Crusoe on his isolated island could do anything he wanted, since he was alone. But from the moment he ceased to be alone, his conduct had to change and undergo a series of liberating constraints, not to prevent him from enjoying total freedom but precisely to permit him to enjoy it in the knowledge that others also had to enjoy it at the same time and on the same island.

42. The same goes for relations among peoples and States; otherwise there would be a free-for-all in the jungle. We would all be at the mercy of predators and wild beasts, at the mercy of the unknown; it would be a return to medieval times when the strong imposed their will on the weak.

43. In modern times we have substituted the rule of law for might in relations among men and societies, and it is for this reason that there exists a *jus gentium*, a Charter of the United Nations, international treaties and conventions—in a word, international legal instruments which govern all the aspects of relations among States.

44. It has been established, first, according to the elements we have at our disposal and in an irrefutable manner, that the invasion of Afghanistan by regular troops of a great Power is a flagrant violation of Article 2, paragraphs 1 to 4, of the Charter, which stipulate that:

"1. The Organization is based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all its Members.

"2. All Members, in order to ensure to all of them the rights and benefits resulting from membership, shall fulfil in good faith the obligations assumed by them in accordance with the present Charter.

"3. All Members shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice, are not endangered.

"4. All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations."

45. The invasion of Afghanistan by regular troops of a great Power, a member of the Security Council, is also a flagrant violation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security [*General Assembly resolution 2734 (XXV)*]; the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of their Independence and Sovereignty [*resolution 2131 (XX)*]; the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations [*resolution 2625 (XXV)*, annex]; the resolution con-

cerning measures aimed at the implementation and promotion of peaceful and neighbourly relations among States [*resolution 1301 (XIII)*], which calls upon Member States to live together within the letter and spirit of the Charter of the United Nations and recognizes that in the observance of the purposes and principles of the United Nations lies the best basis of ensuring the conditions essential for the nations and peoples of the world to live and to assist each other in mutual tolerance and understanding for the benefit of all. The invasion is also a flagrant violation of the resolution on the inadmissibility of the policy of hegemonism in international relations [*resolution 34/103*] and the resolution relating to the development and strengthening of norms of good neighbourliness between States [*resolution 34/99*], which states in paragraphs 1 and 2:

“1. *Calls upon* all States, in the interest of the maintenance of international peace and security, to promote good neighbourliness in their relations with other States;

“2. *Affirms* that good neighbourliness conforms with the purposes of the United Nations and is founded upon the strict observance of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the Declaration of Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, as well as the rejection of any acts seeking to establish zones of influence and domination;”.

46. Secondly, the reason invoked or the argumentation chosen to explain, if not to justify, the armed intervention in Afghanistan is particularly disturbing, if one recalls that Rome in ancient times, in the folly of its imperialist adventure, absorbed, swallowed up and systematically subjected peoples which appealed to it for help. As everyone knows, that empire was unable to digest them all and, harassed everywhere within the confines of its empire, it ran out of breath and died of natural causes. The only merit of that lesson of history is that it exists and is available to those who are interested in history.

47. Even supposing that, in contravention of the normal rules of reason, we accept the hypothesis that the Government of Hafizullah Amin indeed appealed to a great Power within the framework of a Treaty of Friendship and Co-operation to help it resist an external enemy, as yet unidentified, the overthrow of the régime of Amin and his summary execution by the troops to which he had appealed for help is an act of such appalling treachery that many States throughout the world would quite rightly in future be justifiably reluctant and hesitant to sign treaties and agreements of friendship and co-operation not only with the Soviet Union, but in general with more powerful neighbours.

48. It can be imagined that such a situation would seriously affect the mutual confidence and good faith

which are the very foundations of international relations and of the implementation of international commitments. The use of treaties of friendship and co-operation for purposes of destabilization would have the effect of casting a chilling pall of total insecurity over international relations. We refuse to believe that this is the message wished to be conveyed to the international community.

49. Thirdly, it is troubling to note that these flagrant violations of the principles of international law, the Charter and the relevant resolutions of the United Nations have been committed by a great Power, a great country, to which the Charter has entrusted special responsibilities, by charging it and four others—on a permanent basis, furthermore—with the maintenance of international peace and security within the Security Council.

50. All of us some day, I hope, will come to sit on this Council and later we will leave. But it seems that five States will remain permanently in the Council, because they are the very heart and soul of this organ which has the task of maintaining international peace and security.

51. Therefore, if those very members which, above all others, are entrusted with the task of maintaining international peace and security and with the role of arbiter in international disputes—not only, I believe, because of their immense economic and military might, but also because of the high moral values of their peoples and their experience of the horrors of war—should today become the causes of breach of the peace, threats to international peace and security and fomenters of troubles which appear to afford no protection to present and succeeding generations from the scourge of war which, twice in our lifetime, has brought untold sorrow to mankind, I ask you, where are we headed?

52. Fourthly, every honest man should find it repugnant to see a great country, one which is overdeveloped, overindustrialized, overpopulated and overarmed with nuclear weapons and other ever more sophisticated weapons invade a small defenceless country which is underpopulated, underdeveloped, underindustrialized and without weapons and which believed that it had found in international law, non-alignment and the Charter of the United Nations the only defence for its political institutions and its desire to live free within recognized frontiers, to pursue a policy of independence and to work for the progress of its people, free from pressure and threats.

53. The future of the world, at the dawn of the 1980s, seems full of dark foreboding. If we cease to dream of the distant future, peace in the short term and medium term, that peace towards which those of us alive today can contribute something, will not be ensured by the voluntary renunciation by States of the use of force in international relations or of big-Power rivalry.



Although we sometimes wonder if peace is compatible with human nature, we think it is preferable, and the time has come, to think about ways to prevail upon States to conduct themselves reasonably, that is, to stop playing with monstrous weapons.

54. The Soviet Union, intelligent and lucid in its power and generous in its principles, has accustomed us to brilliant statements that are clear, precise and straight to the point. That in this particular case, the difficult search for justification of its unwarranted presence in Afghanistan should have taken it along winding and difficult paths, from one explanation to another, each less convincing than the last, more than proves the disarray and real embarrassment in which this sad invasion of Afghanistan places the whole world.

55. We think that no State and no great Power should contribute to extending the list of the unjust invasions and aggressions of this turbulent century or associate its name with this inglorious page of world history.

56. In our statement in the First Committee, on 17 October 1979, in the debate on the inadmissibility of the policy of hegemony in international relations, we stated:

“If in adhering to the spirit and the letter of the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Union—itself one of the great Powers of the world—all the other Powers intend effectively to give us the formal and solemn assurance that henceforth an end will be put to that phenomenon in relations between peoples and nations, to open up an era of peace and harmonious co-operation based on confidence, justice, equality and freedom, then this thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations will write in letters of gold an illustrious page in the history of mankind, one of which future generations will be justly proud. Believe me, we shall give those who deserve it, and especially the great Powers, the credit for writing that unforgettable page in the history of mankind.”<sup>4</sup>

57. We thought therefore that, after the adoption of General Assembly resolution 34/103 on the inadmissibility of the policy of hegemonism in international relations, we were going to enter a new era of relations among States. But now this invasion of Afghanistan has brought us a bitter surprise. Beyond that invasion and all other invasions, there is the spirit of domination and the desire for power and dominance, the very foundations of the policy of hegemonism, which disturb, bother, embarrass and render insecure many States in the world, and that is what we should stigmatize and denounce when it is the work of the great Powers of the world.

58. As a non-aligned country that has shared with the Soviet Union the same principles during our national liberation struggle and that is grateful to it

for the support it gave to our struggle, we are flabbergasted and do not understand and we ask it to be good enough to withdraw its troops from Afghanistan without further ado.

59. None of the reasons invoked could justify this invasion. In any case, whether it is the torture, human rights violations and genocide of the Amin régime, or the treaties of friendship and co-operation or Afghanistan's right to legitimate collective defence, when everyone knows that it was not threatened from outside, that are invoked, I tell you that the States represented here are becoming increasingly sceptical, if not insensitive, to the reasons which are habitually put forward in order to justify that kind of aggression.

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

61. Mr. BARTON (Canada): Mr. President, I should like to thank the Council for giving me the opportunity to participate in this debate. I should also like to extend congratulations and good wishes to you on assuming the office of the President of the Security Council for the month of January. The Council is fortunate to have you guiding its affairs in these difficult times.

62. It is a matter of deep regret to Canada that we enter a new year and a new decade under the sombre shadows of crises, one of which has necessitated the convocation of this urgent meeting.

63. Let no one try to minimize the gravity of the situation. More than 50 nations, by requesting that the Security Council be called into session, have manifested their profound concern at the violation we have been witnessing in Afghanistan of one of the fundamental principles of the Charter of the United Nations. The Soviet invasion of an independent nation is a gross violation of international law and—equally serious in this day and age—a clear reversal of the process of decolonization begun more than a quarter of a century ago. Respect for the principles and obligations of international law is a cornerstone of the United Nations and all Members are committed to it. There cannot be one law for the Soviet Union and one for the rest of the world. Canada has had no option therefore but to associate itself with all those—and there are very many of them—who have condemned the Soviet action in Afghanistan as the blatant use of force against the territorial integrity and political independence of a smaller neighbouring State.

64. We are being asked to believe that Afghanistan was threatened by outside aggression and that the military might of a great Power—the Soviet Union—was necessary to rescue Afghanistan from its plight. Surely no one believes it—and it disappoints my Government to think either that the Soviet leaders

have talked themselves into believing it or that they are seriously asking others to believe such a contention. The view of the Canadian Government is that, before the Soviet invasion, the situation in Afghanistan was—and indeed it is now—one of civil war rooted in the resistance of a substantial part of the Afghan population, which has been increasingly alienated by the policies of a régime which came to power by undemocratic means. All the evidence suggests that the Soviet Union is deeply implicated in the *coup d'état* of December 1979, and indeed, one of the reasons for the Soviet military intervention was to place in power a wholly subservient régime. As we have seen, it is easy enough to parachute an alien régime into a country, to call it revolutionary and then to call all anti-Government activity anti-revolutionary. Given what has happened in Afghanistan, intervention would be an inadequate word to describe what the Soviet Union has done. It has quite literally moved in. In such circumstances, the Canadian Government has already announced that it will not accord recognition to the régime which has assumed power in Afghanistan with the aid of Soviet arms.

65. But the consequences of this military action reach beyond the fate of the Afghan people to threaten the very fabric of the international community. Half a century ago, it was a Soviet Foreign Minister who wisely warned the world that peace was indivisible. To our sorrow, we have learnt that his warning was well founded. Has the world changed? Indeed, it has become much smaller, to the extent that it is even less possible today than before for any responsible nation to act according to one set of standards in one situation and a different set of standards when it seems expedient.

66. The building of confidence is a continuous process; it permits no interruptions. And détente is indivisible; it cannot be made to flourish in one area of the globe while it is being flouted in another.

67. It is with profound regret that we must acknowledge that the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan has contributed to an erosion of a sense of international confidence and to calling into question the whole concept of détente, which depends on confidence for its effective pursuit.

68. As long as present circumstances exist, the Canadian Government cannot but be deeply concerned about the way in which the international climate is being affected. Our concerns exist on a number of levels.

69. In the first place, the Soviet invasion has had a deeply corrosive effect on the interests of the entire international community. Prospects for the early implementation of important measures of arms limitation, which all Members of the United Nations were eagerly awaiting, have dimmed. The invasion has also put in

doubt the Soviet commitment to manifestations of détente as a meaningful policy rather than a high-sounding word.

70. Secondly, the Soviet invasion has exacerbated an already complex and difficult regional security situation and, apart from doing a grave disservice to the interests of world peace, this surely constitutes a major threat to the nations and the people of the region. Tensions have mounted, uncertainties have multiplied and the potential for further instability has increased. Above all, the path of economic development will be interrupted, and the human consequences of this are hard to measure. It is not so difficult, however, to forecast the tragedy that is being played out and undoubtedly will continue in terms of the refugee outflow. Again, as in Viet Nam and Kampuchea, it is a story of lives lost, families separated and hardship endured. We can only ask: in whose interests?

71. Finally, and all things considered, the whole system of relations between the Soviet Union and other nations will inevitably be strained and diminished.

72. The Canadian Government will be keeping the situation in Afghanistan and its consequences for the international community under close review. As a first response to the present situation, we urge that the Council condemn the Soviet Union's role in Afghanistan and demand the withdrawal of all Soviet forces now in Afghanistan, so that the people of that country can determine their own future without the interference of any foreign Power. The achievement of this objective, we believe, is in the supreme interest of all concerned with our world's peace and security and with the observance of generally accepted norms of civilized international conduct.

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

74. Mr. CANALES (Chile) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Mr. President, first of all, I should like to thank you and the other members of the Council for giving the delegation of Chile an opportunity to participate in this debate. I should also like to extend our warmest congratulations to you on your assumption of the functions of President of the Security Council for the month of January. We are confident that your recognized experience and skill will be brought to bear in the work of the Council at a time of such concern for the international community. We should also commend the representative of the People's Republic of China, Mr. Chen Chu, for the wise manner in which he conducted the proceedings of the Council during the month of December.

75. Together with many other Member States of the Organization, the Government of Chile signed the letter requesting an urgent meeting of the Council

to consider the situation in Afghanistan and the consequences for international peace and security as a result of the Soviet military aggression in that country.

76. As is stated in the official statement of the Government of Chile of 3 January 1980, the armed attack on Afghanistan, an Islamic and non-aligned country, has made it perfectly clear that the Soviet Union is once again pursuing its interventionist and expansionist policy. Unassailable proof of this has been provided in the Council in statements of various representatives who have referred in detail and contributed irrefutable background information concerning the chronology of events there.

77. Whatever may be the pretexts that are put forward to justify it, the Soviet military intervention in Afghan territory constitutes a flagrant violation of the most elementary principles of international law, which are embodied in the Charter of the United Nations and repeated in General Assembly resolution 2625 (XXV). Among them are the principle of non-intervention in the internal affairs of other countries and the principle of non-use of force against the political independence of other States.

78. What has happened in Afghanistan shows that the Soviet Union, notwithstanding the leadership it claims in defence of the principle of the non-use of force and in combating hegemonism and other similar principles, does not hesitate to violate those principles, disregarding the most elementary rules of international life, whenever it suits its totalitarian interests.

79. Who can now give any credence to the Soviet Union's lofty rhetoric regarding these principles? Who can now believe the fine words and intentions so often unfulfilled? Who can now feel safe in a world in which the precarious balance of peace has been dangerously threatened by one of the super-Powers?

80. The tragedy in Afghanistan is a clear warning to the developing nations regarding the fragility of détente, now that one of the super-Powers has utilized its immense military might to impose its designs on smaller countries, of which it claims to be the natural ally.

81. My country, which has experienced intervention by that super-Power and by Castroism, has the undeniable moral authority to denounce this hypocritical attitude. During that sombre period in our history, the people of Chile, although the majority strongly supported freedom, was forced to undergo pressure and all kinds of intervention and interference directed by Moscow. The fact that we freed ourselves from that sinister intervention has forced my country to have to deal with a campaign of lies, slander and distortions akin to what is now associated with the brazen Soviet intervention in Afghanistan.

82. The situation we are witnessing today, which threatens a non-aligned country, should cause us to

ponder the dangers which exist for small countries such as ours that wish to maintain an independent position within the system of the balance of power, countries whose sole defence is the law, the Charter of the United Nations and the principles of non-alignment. We are indeed greatly surprised, incidentally, that the Chairman of the movement of non-aligned countries, in the face of this grave situation, has chosen to observe a significant silence, which only reveals the partiality of its position.

83. We believe that the action of the Kremlin, as has been proved in the Council, in keeping with its political and ideological objectives, is aimed at extending its power to an embattled area of the world whose strategic importance has now been heightened by the state of the world economy. For this reason, the Government of Moscow has no hesitation in using totalitarian methods which we had thought belonged to the distant past.

84. In the light of the foregoing, it is my Government's conviction that the United Nations—and primarily the Security Council—must convey the international community's unanimous condemnation of the Soviet Union's immoral action in Afghanistan. For that reason, we join those who have called vigorously for the immediate and total withdrawal of the forces of the Soviet Union, for the cessation of Soviet interference in Afghanistan's internal affairs, and for respect by the Soviet Union and other States for the territorial integrity, sovereignty and political independence of Afghanistan.

85. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker is Mr. Shah Mohammad Dost, the Foreign Minister of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, whom I invite to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

86. Mr. DOST (Afghanistan): At the outset, I should like to express my delegation's profound appreciation and gratitude to those representatives who have expressed their support for and solidarity with the Government and people of Afghanistan by denouncing and rejecting the measures taken by certain countries for the undue convening of the Security Council.

87. I have listened carefully to almost all the speeches given in this connection by other representatives. The speech of the United States representative, and of some others which followed the logic of the United States representative, contained no truth, but merely baseless slanders against my country, my Government and my people, and deserves outright rejection. So I will be brief and will not take much of the Council's time.

88. The representative of the United States of America [2187th meeting] dwelt at length on the arrival of Soviet contingents in Kabul on different occasions and was trying to sow confusion regarding the purpose

for which they were invited after the new Government took power in Afghanistan on 27 December 1979.

89. As I have already made amply clear, my Government does not deny the fact of the arrival in Afghanistan of some Soviet Union army contingents. What we say is that, first, those limited contingents came to Afghanistan upon numerous requests from Afghanistan during the last two years; secondly, the new Government, upon taking power on 27 December 1979, promptly reaffirmed those requests; thirdly, the sole purpose of the limited presence of the Soviet military contingents in Afghanistan is to assist Afghanistan in removing the threats posed from abroad to the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Afghanistan and to repel foreign armed attacks and aggression against our country; fourthly, the Soviet armed forces contingents were not involved at all in the internal events of 27 December; fifthly, those contingents will not stay in Afghanistan for even one day after the reasons for calling them in cease to exist (of course, in the realization of such a step, the aims and acts of hostile foreign Powers play an important role: the sooner they give up their armed interference in Afghanistan's affairs, the closer will be the time of their departure from Afghanistan); sixthly, the request for the dispatch to Afghanistan of the Soviet Army is entirely a bilateral issue concerning only Afghanistan and the Soviet Union within the scope of the Treaty of Friendship, Good Neighbourliness and Co-operation, signed on 5 December 1978 between the two countries,<sup>1</sup> and in full accord with Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations. It is in line with the interests and aspirations of the Afghan people. Afghanistan has on various occasions benefited from such assistance from the brotherly Soviet Union during its long history of relations with that country, every time with the support of the Afghan people.

90. Once, such assistance came in the first days of Afghanistan's independence, during which the Soviet Union assisted Afghanistan with, among other things, aircraft and pilots for the defence of our country. At that time, we were facing the menace of British colonialists, and today we are facing imperialists and reaction.

91. As for the events of 27 December 1979, they were planned and carried out by the gallant Afghan army having full support of the people, under guidance from the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan. Long before the start of the national uprising against the Fascist régime of Hafizullah Amin, Babrak Karmal was present in Afghanistan and directing the whole operation.

92. The threat to Afghanistan's independence, national sovereignty and territorial integrity was imminent. Pakistani soil was and continues to be used as a base for such attacks against Afghanistan. Nobody can deny that fact; it is evident from reports and eyewitness accounts of foreign correspondents visiting

those bases, the statements of Pakistan's progressive public figures and the evidence at our own disposal. I shall not take the time of the Council to mention all those reports, since a number of representatives have already cited some. That is a fact; denying it would mean denying the existence of the sun.

93. As to the point why it was not brought before the Security Council, it is all too clear that Amin, himself involved in all those plots and conspiracies and primarily responsible for all the criminal acts against the defenceless people of Afghanistan and the country, would of course not have brought the case to the Council. Amin—the Pol Pot of Afghanistan—had transformed the whole country into a prison; he had his own mass graves and was saying that he would not care even if millions of Afghans were murdered or put in gaol. He wanted only himself and his bands of criminals to be in power and cared for nothing else.

94. One representative showed concern for Islam in Afghanistan. In this connection, I should like to say that the overwhelming majority of the Afghan people are devout and real Moslems, and they will remain so. Islam in our country is genuine and, in accordance with what Allah Jala Ala Shanohu (God Almighty) and his holy prophet, Hazrat Mohammed Savallalah Alahu va Alihi Wassalam (Hazrat Mohammed, on whom God's prayers are bestowed), order the Moslems to do. Our Islam is not that preached by imperialists and colonialists. After all, it was Afghanistan that disseminated Islamic teachings to the land of these so-called champions of Islam, and we taught them Islam. A delegation from another country spoke highly about Islam. That was the representative of that same country whose ruler, hobnobbing with Zionism and imperialism, betrayed Islam and the rights of the brotherly Palestinian people. Because of the anti-Islamic policy of the ruler of that same country, the whole land of Jerusalem lies under the rule of Zionism.

95. My Government has welcomed the Islamic revolution of the brotherly Iranian people against the despotic Shah's régime supported by imperialism. The peoples of Afghanistan and Iran share a common concern at imperialistic intrigues.

96. Some representatives expressed concern that the presence of limited military contingents of the Soviet Union in Afghanistan would pose a threat to peace and stability in the region. I cannot understand the logic of such an assertion. The representative of the United States of America here said much about relations between Afghanistan and the Soviet Union. I should like to remind the Council that it is the United States which has sent its warships, aircraft carriers and troops thousands of kilometres away from its territory, in complete disregard of the threat it poses to the national sovereignty of small States; it is the United States which has thousands of military bases on the soil of other countries, in some cases maintained against the will of their peoples; and it is the

United States which has stationed its armed forces in other countries. And yet the representative of that country has tried to raise a hue and cry about an issue which is entirely within the jurisdiction of the Governments of two friendly countries. What is that all about? Is it hypocrisy or a covert operation, or both?

97. It is evident that the United States wants to expedite arms shipments to Pakistan on the pretext that Pakistan is being allegedly threatened. There is, of course, no justification for arms shipments to Pakistan. If Pakistan continues to arm itself to the teeth, then there is no course left open to Afghanistan except to think seriously about its defence and, naturally, to act accordingly. The peoples of Afghanistan and Pakistan have many things in common. The new Government in Afghanistan has extended the hand of friendship to Pakistan but, unfortunately, instead of responding positively to that call of ours, the Government of Pakistan seems to have opted for another course.

98. The Government and the new leadership in Afghanistan enjoy the full support of the Afghan people and, of course, there are many reasons for that. Babrak Karmal, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan, President of the Revolutionary Council and Prime Minister, is not only well known to the Afghan people, but also known outside Afghanistan. He has dedicated himself to serving the people. In the course of his struggle to liberate the Afghan people from the clutches of despotic and hated rulers, he has on various occasions languished in gaol. Twice he has been elected to Parliament by the people of Afghanistan, where he has done much to raise the political consciousness of the people and to give them the necessary education. He was Vice-President of the Revolutionary Council and Vice-Premier during the late Nour M. Taraki's leadership. By toppling Amin's usurped power, Babrak Karmal has put the Party, which had for a while been derailed by Amin from its principled course, back in the right direction.

99. The new Government has released all the political prisoners and announced the formation of a Front comprising people of all walks of life. It will adopt a new progressive and democratic constitution and arrange elections for the provincial and national assemblies in the near future. It will work hard to realize the lofty goals of the Saur revolution and to build a society free from exploitation of man by man. Afghanistan will follow its positive non-aligned policy; it will work, along with other non-aligned countries, for the fulfilment of the goals and objectives of the movement. We stand against and condemn imperialism, colonialism, neo-colonialism, racism, including Zionism, and *apartheid*. We support the national liberation movements. We shall continue to be active participants in the Organization of the Islamic Conference.

100. Afghanistan's policy is one of peace and friendship with all countries. We believe in the policy of peaceful coexistence. We strongly believe that every people has the inherent right to choose its own socio-economic system without any interference from anywhere.

101. The people of Afghanistan have a long and proud history of love for their freedom and independence. We shall never compromise that, and we would not allow anyone to encroach on our independence, national sovereignty and territorial integrity.

102. The present series of meetings of the Security Council cannot serve any purpose but those of propaganda and the revival of the cold war. The draft resolution [S/13729] which has been circulated on this issue would, if approved, be direct interference in the internal affairs of my country, and my Government will resolutely reject it.

103. Mr. ESSAAFI (Tunisia) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, first of all may I extend to you my heartfelt congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month. You represent a country with which Tunisia has long had the best relations of friendship and co-operation. The Tunisian delegation is therefore particularly pleased to see you conducting the proceedings in the Council for this period.

104. I should also like to extend my best wishes to all the other members of the Council, those which have been serving on the Council and those which, like my country, are newly elected. I wish to thank all representatives who have been kind enough to welcome my delegation and my country. Tunisia will spare no effort in making its contribution to the quest for peace and security in the world in keeping with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

105. The Council has before it a question of special seriousness, one that threatens peace and security in central Asia. Deeply concerned over recent developments in Afghanistan, on 31 December 1979 my Government made the following statement:

"Tunisia, a non-aligned country, has always worked for the right of peoples and countries to choose the government and régime that suits them, for otherwise the independence and sovereignty of States would be a dead letter and the Charter of the United Nations would be without value.

"Deeply concerned over the situation in Afghanistan, the Tunisian Government cannot remain indifferent to the armed intervention contrary to international law of which Afghanistan has been a victim.

"Therefore Tunisia, albeit desirous of maintaining relations of friendship and co-operation with the

Government of the Soviet Union, cannot confer legitimacy on any form of interference, whatever the motive may be, in the internal affairs of States."

106. Tunisia has always worked for the right of peoples and countries to choose the form of government and régime that suits them and to create for themselves the social, economic and political system they desire. Therefore we believe that no social or political considerations can justify the intervention of foreign troops in the territory of a sovereign State.

107. Nothing can excuse such intervention. The principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of States is one of the most important pillars of international relations. In signing the Charter, States assumed an obligation to respect that principle and to settle their differences by peaceful means.

108. Tunisia hopes that the Council will speedily reach an appropriate decision that will remove the threats that hang over Afghanistan and indeed all of central Asia, a decision that will allow the people of Afghanistan to decide on their own future in complete freedom.

109. Mr. TROYANOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): Before turning to the substance of the matter, the Soviet delegation would like to welcome the representative of Mexico, a country that today has taken its seat at the Security Council table. We wish the representative of Mexico success in his work in the Council.

110. The present discussion in the Security Council has shown that none of those who initiated the raising of the "Afghanistan question" has been able to refute the clear facts of armed intervention in the internal affairs of Afghanistan by international imperialism and reaction. Nor has anyone been able to refute the fact that the intervention created a genuine danger of undermining the gains of the April revolution in Afghanistan. It was precisely that danger that compelled the Afghanistan Government to appeal for help from the Soviet Union on the basis of the Treaty of Friendship, Good Neighbourliness and Co-operation of 1978.<sup>1</sup> Therefore the attacks against Soviet military assistance to Afghanistan and the calls for it to be halted are really aimed at depriving the Afghan people of the right to determine themselves the ways and means of ensuring their own security. In practice, that would mean giving a free hand to those forces that are striving to overthrow the new order in Afghanistan. It is obvious that there are some people who, to that end, would like to use the Security Council to legitimize the carrying out of subversive activities against the Afghan Government. Of course, plans such as these should be most categorically rejected.

111. In the Council we have heard assertions to the effect that the decision of the Soviet Union to grant the request of the Government of Afghanistan for the

dispatch to that country of a limited military contingent is not in keeping with the right of States to individual and collective self-defence as laid down in Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations nor with natural law. Such assertions are entirely unfounded. Article 51 of the Charter does not create the right of States to individual or collective self-defence. It merely confirms that right and particularly stresses that it is an inalienable right of States and that the Charter in no way whatsoever impairs it. In so far as concerns the provision for reporting to the Council measures taken by Members of the Organization in exercise of that right, obviously, the dispatch of a military contingent by one State to the territory of another State at its request and in accordance with existing international treaties does not belong to that category of measures; otherwise, the Council would already have been overwhelmed by that kind of report, bearing in mind the number of countries on whose territories foreign troops are stationed, and above all, United States troops. The actions taken in this matter by the Governments of Afghanistan and the Soviet Union are exclusively their internal affair and are not subject to intervention by the Security Council.

112. In the statements of a number of delegations, attempts have been made to link the introduction into Afghanistan of a limited Soviet military contingent with certain internal events which occurred in that country at the end of December. In the statement of the Foreign Minister of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, Mr. Shah Mohammad Dost [2185th meeting], it was demonstrated that the removal from power of Hafizullah Amin was carried out by patriotic and genuinely revolutionary elements within the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan. It was the legitimate consequence of the further development and consolidation of the April revolution, that is to say, an exclusively internal affair of the Afghan people.

113. In so far as concerns the introduction of a limited contingent of Soviet troops into Afghanistan, that was in no way linked with changes in the Afghan leadership and was carried out in response to repeated appeals from the Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan for help to repel instances of armed intervention from outside, some of which occurred also in the period when Amin was in power.

114. We cannot fail to condemn most vigorously the aim of certain representatives in the Security Council to sully the new Government of Afghanistan. At the present time that Government has embarked upon major democratic reforms which were mentioned here by the Foreign Minister of Afghanistan. In his statement, a thorough explanation was given of the significance of the measures taken by the Government of Afghanistan in the interests of the broadest masses of the population. One of the most important of those was the freeing of political prisoners. Two days ago local television showed crowds of prisoners leaving

prisons. Obviously, many here saw those broadcasts and were able to observe that the new Government of Afghanistan was actually implementing that decision.

115. In the programme which the Government has proclaimed, provision is also made for the repeal of all anti-democratic laws; respect for the principles of Islam; freedom of conscience, freedom of religion and freedom of worship; the observance of the principles of lawful ownership of property; and the ensuring of normal conditions for the exercise of democratic freedoms. The Government of Afghanistan intends to carry out further phases of the democratic agrarian reform to ensure the development of the cultures of all peoples and tribes in Afghanistan and other progressive measures. The carrying out of this programme will undoubtedly lead to a stabilization of the situation in the country and will ensure the vital interests of all strata of the Afghan people.

116. In circumstances of such radical reforms in the society of Afghanistan, it would appear to be the task of the United Nations to promote the creation of propitious circumstances for the implementation of this progressive policy which has been adopted by the new Government of Afghanistan and not to take any steps which might hinder that process.

117. However, the uproar—initiated primarily by the United States—in the United Nations over the “question of Afghanistan”, has been used as a pretext to justify the policy of certain circles in the West which are attempting to take the world back to the times of the cold war. It is precisely under cover of references to the Afghan question that the Government of the United States is now procrastinating over ratification of 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>5</sup> That dangerous trend was manifested in a decision recently imposed by the United States on Western European members of NATO to deploy on their territories new American nuclear missiles in an attempt thus to disrupt the approximate balance of forces which had been established in the world.

118. At the same time the United States is systematically pursuing a course of increasing its military expenditures and stepping up its military preparations in various parts of the world, particularly in the Near and Middle East and in the Indian Ocean. According to data published in the United States, at the beginning of 1980, out of a total of 2.1 million American military personnel, 480,700 men were stationed outside the territory of the United States itself in more than 30 countries of the world.

119. The Chinese hegemonists, who also do not find the climate of détente to their taste, are playing an active role in the exacerbation of the situation around Afghanistan. They have more than once demonstrated their attachment to the policy of expansionism.

Suffice it to recall the support rendered by Beijing to the anti-Government “movements” in India, Indonesia, Burma, Thailand, Malaysia, and the Philippines; the Chinese-Indian conflict in 1962; pressure on the Mongolian People’s Republic; and the seizure of the Paracel Islands. We have heard references more than once to the heavy responsibility borne by the Chinese leadership before mankind and the world for the tragedy of the Kampuchean people and the aggression against Viet Nam. Participation in subversive action against Afghanistan was just a logical extension of this expansionist policy.

120. Here in the Security Council a number of delegations, apparently in view of the statement made by the President of the United States on 4 January, have expressed their concern at the fact that the future development of the international situation might move in the direction of further exacerbation of tension and the stepping up of the arms race. These appeals are entirely appropriate and they should be heeded by the United States and China, whose policies are moving in precisely that direction, a direction so dangerous for the cause of peace.

121. The Soviet Union, like other socialist countries, firmly supports the view that, in the present circumstances, every effort must be made to prevent a slipping back to the times of the cold war. International co-operation and the easing of tension between States should remain the prevailing trend in world affairs. It is precisely for this reason that we shall strive within the United Nations and elsewhere for the adoption of decisions which will consolidate that trend rather than undermine it.

122. The Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, on whose behalf the Foreign Minister, Mr. Dost, spoke here, has clearly stated that the presence of Soviet troops on Afghan territory is vitally necessary to ensure the sovereignty and the independence of the country and to protect the gains of the people’s revolution. One can only regret that the countries which sponsored the draft resolution [S/13729] did not heed the voice of the people of Afghanistan but followed in the wake of those who do not find the present course of the Government of Afghanistan to their liking. The provision of the draft resolution on the withdrawal of foreign troops from Afghanistan is, in essence, aimed at undermining the security of the Afghan State and at opening the way for the restoration in that country of the old régime which has been overthrown by the people. Another provision in the draft resolution which is inadmissible is that relating to the determination of the form of government and the choice of political and social systems in Afghanistan, which in essence is tantamount to an appeal for a change of the existing order in that country.

123. On the whole, the draft resolution should be viewed as a flagrant intervention in the internal affairs

of a sovereign State and as being contrary to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations. Obviously, the Soviet Union cannot and will not vote in any other way but against this draft resolution.

124. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I shall now make a statement as representative of FRANCE.

125. The events that gave rise to this series of meetings of the Security Council have aroused strong feelings throughout the world. The climate of international relations has been altered by those events, and for the first time in a long time, the peoples and their Governments are wondering about the future of peace.

126. France shares the keen concern caused by the events that have been unfolding in Afghanistan, including Kabul, since 24 December 1979. We expressed that concern publicly on 28 December, and we regret to say that nothing that has happened since has dispelled it. The desired explanations and clarifications are still lacking; the Soviet military intervention in Afghanistan has only expanded. In those circumstances, France shares the feelings of the many delegations that felt that the Council should be seized of the question. The only reason why France did not add its signature to the signatures of those delegations was that, at the present time, my delegation has special responsibilities as President of the Security Council.

127. What is really at stake in this matter are the fundamental principles which are proclaimed by all the States signatories of the Charter of the United Nations, and without respect for which there can be neither security nor development—principles which are also at the very heart of détente, and therefore of peace. I am of course speaking of the right of every State to have its sovereignty and independence respected, the right of every State to make its political and social choices free from all foreign intervention, and, finally, the right of the people of every State to have its special identity and legitimate aspirations fully recognized. But the information available to us indicates that those principles have not been respected in Afghanistan.

128. To justify what has happened in Kabul, an appeal made by the Afghan authorities has been invoked. But the chronology of events leaves no doubt about the fact that the Government that allegedly made that appeal had been set up on 27 December at the earliest, and the Soviet military intervention began on 24 December.

129. Again, to justify the intervention of Soviet armed forces, Article 51 of the Charter has been invoked. But that Article, we must not forget, establishes an obligatory link between the exercise of the right of self-defence and the existence of an armed attack against the State involved. That link does not seem to exist in the case of Afghanistan. Even if

we assume that there had been contacts with neighbouring peoples belonging to the same ethnic groups, that would not constitute the "armed attack" referred to in Article 51. On the contrary, it appears that the facts of the situation were and remain facts relating to internal affairs. What we are witnessing is a movement that is unquestionably the expression of the aspiration of a people that cherishes its Moslem faith and its national traditions. We are aware, of course, that there has been some political violence associated with that movement for a few months now. But that cannot justify the armed intervention and the deployment of troops that we have been witnessing for some 10 days.

130. That intervention, like any other designed to impose on a country the will of another Power, is unacceptable—both in itself and also because it prejudices something for which my Government has been working tirelessly for 20 years—indeed, it was among the first Governments to do so. I am referring to détente: a policy which, to have its full effect, cannot but be global—that is, it must apply to the regions of the world as a whole; a policy which, above and beyond the texts that set forth its principal elements, is based essentially on trust. It is precisely because France is deeply, but not unconditionally, attached to détente that we believe it our duty to state today, with all gravity, that this trust would be seriously shaken if the blow that has just been dealt to it were not speedily corrected.

131. That is why my delegation is prepared to vote in favour of the draft resolution [*ibid.*] before the Council, calling for the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Soviet troops. That is why my delegation solemnly appeals for respect for the independence of one of the first Members of the Organization, a country which has for a long time been a member of the non-aligned movement and which should be allowed to pursue its development and stability in freedom and peace, with the co-operation of everyone. That is why my delegation calls for the restoration of the trust for which each of us, in our foreign relations, feels the most urgent need.

132. I now resume my capacity as PRESIDENT. I understand that the Council is now ready to proceed to the vote on the draft resolution in document S/13729. I shall now call on those representatives who wish to speak before the vote.

133. Mr. CHEN Chu (China) (*translation from Chinese*): In the view of the Chinese delegation, draft resolution S/13729 is inadequate in that it has failed to condemn squarely Soviet armed aggression and intervention against Afghanistan. However, in view of the fact that the wording of the text is clearly directed against Soviet armed intervention in Afghanistan, the Chinese delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution and maintains that the Soviet authorities must withdraw all their invading forces



from Afghanistan immediately and unconditionally as called for in that draft resolution.

134. Mr. FLORIN (German Democratic Republic) (*interpretation from Russian*): I should like first to congratulate Mexico on its election as a non-permanent member of the Security Council and to welcome its delegation to the Council.

135. The delegation of the German Democratic Republic has thoroughly set forth its views on the question on the Council's agenda. We see no reason for changing our position, but we believe it necessary, before the vote on draft resolution S/13729, to draw attention to the following points.

136. The German Democratic Republic recognizes and respects the right of all peoples to solve freely and without outside interference the questions affecting their future and the form of their Government. This applies also to the obligation of all States to refrain in their international relations from the threat or the use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of States. Although the draft resolution refers to those principles, the delegation of the German Democratic Republic must reject it. It does not take into account the fact that the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan and the Soviet Union acted precisely in the spirit of those principles in carrying out their joint measures to defend the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan.

137. Since the draft resolution deals with internal developments in Afghanistan—which itself is inadmissible—there is a danger that such a resolution might be used as an instrument for further direct intervention by imperialist circles in the affairs of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan. The fact that operative paragraph 6 provides that the Security Council should remain seized of the question, in other words, that it should in the future deal with Afghanistan's affairs, only confirms the apprehension that I have expressed.

138. The draft resolution fails to take into account the Treaty of Friendship, Good Neighbourliness and Co-operation between the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan and the Soviet Union, dated 5 December 1978.<sup>1</sup> The indiscriminate implementation of the demands in operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution would lead to a situation in which the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan would be disarmed in the face of the forces of imperialist and hegemonistic circles. This is, of course, unacceptable to the Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, and we have heard that from the mouth of the Foreign Minister of that country himself.

139. The delegation of the German Democratic Republic, in accordance with the wishes of the Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, rejects this draft resolution.

140. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I shall now put to the vote the draft resolution submitted by Bangladesh, Jamaica, the Niger, the Philippines, Tunisia and Zambia [S/13729].

*A vote was taken by show of hands.*

*In favour:* Bangladesh, China, France, Jamaica, Mexico, Niger, Norway, Philippines, Portugal, Tunisia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zambia

*Against:* German Democratic Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

*The result of the vote was 13 in favour, 2 against.*

*The draft resolution was not adopted, one of the negative votes being that of a permanent member of the Council.*

141. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): It has been suggested that the meeting should be suspended. Is there any objection? The meeting is suspended. It will be reconvened after consultations.

*The meeting was suspended at 5.35 p.m. on Monday, 7 January 1980 and resumed at 7.30 p.m. on Wednesday, 9 January 1980.*

142. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I wish to acknowledge the presence at the Council table of the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of Mexico, Mr. Jorge Castañeda, to whom I extend a warm welcome.

143. Members have before them document S/13731, which contains the text of a draft resolution sponsored by Mexico and the Philippines.

144. Mr. YANGO (Philippines): I should like to take this opportunity to congratulate Mexico on its election to the Security Council, which completes the Council membership by bringing it to 15, and to extend to the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of Mexico, Mr. Jorge Castañeda, and his delegation our full co-operation.

145. We have heard the statements of the delegations of many countries on the situation in Afghanistan, in response to the letter to the President of the Security Council of 3 January 1980 and its addenda, which my country signed along with more than 50 other concerned nations.

146. Subsequent to the sending of that letter, and in furtherance of the concern expressed in the discussions on this matter in the Council, a draft resolution was submitted [S/13729], sponsored by Bangladesh, Jamaica, the Niger, the Philippines, Tunisia and Zambia, which we believed expressed the will and desire not only of the non-aligned group of nations

but of all peace-loving peoples as well for an early peaceful resolution of the situation in Afghanistan.

147. Not only do we have ample proof of an overwhelming sentiment on this matter in numerical terms, but we are also convinced of the depth and intensity of feelings aroused by that situation among countries neighbouring on Afghanistan as well as among the countries of the third world, in particular the non-aligned nations.

148. In our earlier statement on this question [2185th meeting], we stated our preference for the discussion of what is admittedly a complex issue and for a thorough airing of all the pertinent facts, in view of the gravity of the issue. That discussion has taken place. A vote has been taken—13 votes in favour to 2 against—but the draft resolution was not adopted for lack of unanimity among the permanent members of the Council. In view of this lack of unanimity, it is my delegation's view that the Council is unable to discharge its primary responsibility under the Charter for the maintenance of international peace and security.

149. The blame must be shared by the whole Council, for we are a collective body operating under rules set forth in the Charter. In the view of my delegation, the vote in the Council on the draft resolution reflects the majority sentiment of the international community, and we therefore feel that that sentiment has been frustrated by the application of the unanimity rule.

150. Because of the gravity of the issue, which is fraught with potential danger for the peoples of the world, we feel that the rest of the international community should be accorded an opportunity to affirm its concern in a larger forum, unencumbered by regulatory constraints.

151. In seeking to refer the matter to the full assemblage of nations, my delegation is acting in the spirit of the peaceful mission of the Council and is in no way desirous of widening the means of resolution of the problem beyond the peaceful means provided under the Charter of the United Nations.

152. In my delegation's view there are three crucial elements essentially at stake in the present instance: first, the inalienable right of a people to determine its own form of government and its social, economic and political system free from any external imposition by any form of coercion, including armed intervention; secondly, respect for the sacrosanct principles of international law as enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations and in the decisions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, with special reference to the principles of non-interference in the internal affairs of any country, respect for the sovereignty and political independence, sovereign equality and territorial integrity of nations and the principle of the non-use of force in the settlement of

disputes between Member States; thirdly—and this must be considered of special relevance—the principles of non-alignment, which are the basis of the non-aligned movement, of which the country that is directly affected is a founding member.

153. We should not lose hope for a peaceful settlement. We believe that we should exhaust all peaceful means available to us within the United Nations system. In order to avert the possibility that the present situation might get out of hand and escalate into a dreaded armed confrontation among the major Powers, we must immediately activate the only peaceful recourse still open to us, by referring the matter to the General Assembly.

154. It is in the light of these considerations that my delegation has decided to submit to the Security Council the draft resolution contained in document S/13731 dated 9 January 1980, sponsored by Mexico and the Philippines, which is now before the Council. The draft resolution is simple, direct and to the point. The Council would decide to refer the question of the situation in Afghanistan to the General Assembly for consideration, owing to the lack of unanimity in the Council on the question.

155. It is the hope of my delegation and of our co-sponsor that this simple and direct draft resolution will immediately be approved and adopted by the Security Council, for we have no time to lose.

156. It is with deep regret that my delegation has decided to take this initiative. Only recently we had forged close and friendly relations with the Soviet Union and we have every intention of maintaining and promoting those relations. As we all know, close relations amongst nations must be founded on mutual trust and confidence. It is precisely to strengthen those foundations and thus further to develop the relations between us—and with no desire to alienate Afghanistan, with which we have a traditional friendship and close ties—that we felt it necessary to bring the consensus of the Council to the larger forum of the General Assembly. In so doing, we want to make it perfectly clear that it is not our desire to criticize a fellow State Member of the United Nations but to dispel the atmosphere of fear and violence that now agitates mankind and to restore a climate of peace and goodwill among all of us.

157. Mr. CASTAÑEDA (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): First of all, I should like to thank you, Mr. President, for your most amiable words of welcome to me. It is an honour for Mexico to take part in the work of the Council, and I feel it an honour to represent my country in the Security Council on this occasion.

158. Mexico is returning to membership in the Security Council after an absence almost as long as the life of the Organization itself. We are aware that

participation in the work of the Council involves serious risks for a medium-sized and rather weak country. It can seriously affect its bilateral relations with other countries. We have taken the decision to assume this responsibility in full awareness of these risks. For Mexico, membership in the Council is only meaningful if the decision has been taken—as it has been by us—to act in an independent and constructive manner. We do not take part in the work of the Council as the allies, friends or enemies of anyone. We do not intend to support countries but to support just causes and just principles.

159. It is our intention to act, as far as possible, in a constructive and positive way; in other words, by advocating, proposing or supporting ideas and solutions compatible with the principles that we hold and that will tend to reconcile conflicting positions and lead to the resolution of tension.

160. Mexico has sponsored jointly with the delegation of the Philippines the draft resolution contained in document S/13731. By that draft resolution, the Security Council would decide to convene an emergency special session of the General Assembly to examine the question of Afghanistan. The representative of the Philippines has already explained the substance and purport of the draft resolution and therefore I need not dwell on the text. I simply wanted to say that Mexico voted in favour of the draft resolution that was not adopted due to the lack of unanimity among the permanent members of the Security Council, but we did not have an opportunity to explain our vote. We shall do so in the General Assembly, if this second draft resolution is adopted, and if the General Assembly deals with the subject in question. For the time being, I should like to say that to our mind there is no doubt at all that we are faced with an invasion—an armed intervention—and that it is the duty of the Security Council to call for the withdrawal of foreign troops now in Afghanistan. We therefore support the present draft resolution, for it seems to us logical, as a consequence of our vote in favour of the earlier draft resolution, that, since effective action was not possible in the Council because of the lack of unanimity among its permanent members, we should now ask the Assembly to take up this matter.

161. Having said that, I should like to add in closing that I would not be entirely frank if I did not say how deeply we are concerned at the evolution of the subject we are considering today, as also of the other matter of the hostages being held in Tehran.

162. We have slipped back or are in danger of slipping back into the cold war. The conflict between the great Powers has re-emerged to such an extent that we are faced with a continual escalation of measures and countermeasures of pressure and reprisals. A medium-sized developing country cannot view what is happening without real apprehension. Those who lose most in the cold war are the third-world countries.

We are in danger of slipping back and losing many valuable advances made gradually in the last 20 years. We cannot say that there has been a real peace; that would be too much to say. But there has been a climate of relative détente, accompanied by the conviction that the threat of a world war had been to some extent removed, and thus permitting some important progress for the international community and particularly for the weak countries.

163. Suddenly, decolonization, the negotiation of certain agreements on disarmament such as the SALT II Treaty,<sup>5</sup> regional and partial denuclearization, the acceptance of certain basic principles of a new international economic order, the negotiation of certain globally accepted rules for the law of the sea, and so forth—now all seem jeopardized. Furthermore, the possibility that a treaty like SALT II, which benefits not only the two signatories but the entire international community, will not be ratified is of concern to and should alarm the entire world.

164. The great Powers have a new and very serious responsibility. In spite of the specific problems which now separate them, they must deal with those problems in such a way as not to exacerbate their conflicts and by reacting with moderation and prudence. We, as small countries, call upon them to fulfil their responsibility to make further progress on the road towards disarmament. We cannot accept that there should be any delay in economic co-operation in favour of the weaker countries simply because of this new international tyranny.

165. To sum up, we feel that, today more than ever, the great Powers have the duty to carry out their primary responsibility *vis-à-vis* the United Nations.

166. Mr. TROYANOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): The delegation of the Soviet Union objects categorically to the proposal for the convening of an emergency session of the General Assembly to discuss the so-called question of the situation in Afghanistan. As members will recall, the Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan issued a vigorous protest against any consideration in the United Nations of this petty American-Chinese complaint and called for an end to be put to this inadmissible intervention in the internal affairs of Afghanistan. This scheme, which is hostile to the people of Afghanistan, failed in the Security Council. However, its initiators have not given up and they now want to drag this non-existent question before the General Assembly. By so doing, they are attempting to embroil the Assembly in the execution of their imperialistic and hegemonistic plans regarding Afghanistan and to impose on that international body a confrontation in the spirit of the cold war.

167. What we are witnessing here, in essence, are attempts by the United States and China to exploit

events in Afghanistan, using them as a pretext to justify their course of further exacerbating tension in the Middle East and beyond that area. Such plans cannot fail to alarm all States which have a genuine interest in the preservation of international peace and security.

168. Attempts to embroil the United Nations even further in the discussion of the so-called question of the situation in Afghanistan are contrary to the clearly expressed will of the people and Government of Afghanistan and constitute a violation of the sovereignty of that country. These attempts are contrary to the aims and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, in particular the provisions of Article 2, paragraph 7. It is clear that, if a discussion such as the one proposed is foisted upon the General Assembly, it will not promote the strengthening of the authority and prestige of the United Nations.

169. On the basis of what I have said, the delegation of the Soviet Union will vote against the proposal contained in document S/13731.

170. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I take it that the Council is now ready to vote on the draft resolution presented by Mexico and the Philippines [S/13731].

171. I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes before the vote.

172. Mr. RAHMAN (Bangladesh): My delegation at the outset would like to extend its congratulations to Mexico on its election to membership in the Security Council. We warmly welcome the presence of the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of Mexico and the members of his delegation. We look forward to working in the closest concert and co-operation.

173. Bangladesh's position on the substantive aspects of the situation in Afghanistan has been explained at length in the Council on more than one occasion [2185th and 2189th meetings]. We were a sponsor of the six-Power draft resolution [S/13729] which was defeated because of the negative vote of a permanent member. We believe that, in the face of this situation and the consequent inability of the Security Council to exercise its primary responsibility for maintaining international peace and security, a residuary responsibility does accrue to the General Assembly to take up this question on an emergency basis. Accordingly, my delegation intends to vote in favour of the draft resolution sponsored by Mexico and the Philippines, which is now before the Council [S/13731].

174. Mr. FLORIN (German Democratic Republic) (*interpretation from Russian*): The delegation of the German Democratic Republic has already had an opportunity to congratulate Mexico upon its election as a non-permanent member of the Security Council. Today, the delegation of the German Democratic

Republic would like to associate itself with the words of welcome extended by you, Mr. President, to the Secretary for Foreign Affairs of Mexico.

175. The delegation of the German Democratic Republic considers any discussion in the United Nations of the so-called situation in Afghanistan as intervention in the internal affairs of a Member State. For the same reasons for which my delegation opposed the inclusion of this item in the agenda of the Security Council, we oppose its discussion in the General Assembly.

176. We recall that the Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan categorically protested against the intervention in its internal affairs. Without the consent of the Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, no one has the right to discuss the situation in that country in organs of the United Nations, since the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan poses no danger to any other State. The demand for discussion of the situation in the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan is one further attempt in certain circles to continue the campaign of slander against the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan and against the Soviet Union.

177. The delegation of the German Democratic Republic would like to express the hope that members of the Council will duly take into account the danger of intensifying a confrontation that does nothing to promote the cause of peace.

178. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I shall now put to the vote the draft resolution submitted by Mexico and the Philippines in document S/13731.

*A vote was taken by show of hands.*

*In favour:* Bangladesh, China, France, Jamaica, Mexico, Niger, Norway, Philippines, Portugal, Tunisia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

*Against:* German Democratic Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

*Abstaining:* Zambia

*The draft resolution was adopted by 12 votes to 2, with 1 abstention.<sup>6</sup>*

179. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I call on the representative of Jamaica.

180. Mr. MILLS (Jamaica): As the representative of the other Latin American country on the Security Council, I would not wish to let this opportunity pass without expressing, on behalf of my delegation, our very warm welcome to the delegation of Mexico. My delegation is aware of the circumstances sur-

rounding the effort to fill this Latin American seat on the Council, and we wish to congratulate the group of Latin American States for finding a means of overcoming the problems which faced it, and of ensuring that the Group can make its customary full and significant contribution to the work of the Council. Mexico's willingness to accept the proposal to enter its candidature at this time is a tribute to that great country's respect for the United Nations, the Security Council and the Latin American region.

181. Jamaica enjoys the very closest and most friendly relations with Mexico. We are aware of the great contribution that Mexico has made to the international community and to the Caribbean and Latin American regions—in very many directions. My delegation feels that Mexico's presence on the Council will strengthen this body and will help to maintain its prestige and authority, especially in these very troubled times.

182. We are particularly happy to have with us the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of Mexico, Mr. Castañeda, whose deep interest in international affairs and whose considerable wisdom and influence have already been evident, once again, in the past two days.

183. The fact that Mexico will be represented on the Council by Mr. Muñoz Ledo is in itself a matter for considerable gratification. He is a diplomat of great distinction and a man of wide interests and of many accomplishments. I extend on behalf of my delegation and on my own behalf a warm welcome to him and to the other members of the delegation of Mexico.

184. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I shall now make a statement in my capacity as representative of FRANCE.

185. France voted in favour of the motion that a special emergency session of the General Assembly

should be convened, in the light of the relevant provisions of the rules of procedure governing the procedure for convening the Assembly in case of an emergency.

186. France feels, in fact, that the serious nature of the situation justifies a debate in the General Assembly, within the framework of the powers conferred on it in the Charter. Pursuant to Article 12, paragraph 1, of the Charter, the Security Council can request the General Assembly to make a recommendation on any dispute or situation, in observance of its powers as set forth in the text of the Charter.

187. Consequently, my delegation, while it voted in favour of the motion just adopted, naturally expresses the relevant reservations concerning the wording of the second paragraph of the preamble to this motion.

188. I now resume my capacity as PRESIDENT. There are no further speakers. The Security Council has thus concluded this stage of its consideration of the item on the agenda.

*The meeting rose at 8.05 p.m.*

---

#### NOTES

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

<sup>2</sup> *Official Records of the United Nations Conference on the Law of Treaties, First and Second Sessions, Vienna* (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.70.V.5), p. 296.

<sup>3</sup> A/34/542, annex, para. 245.

<sup>4</sup> *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-fourth Session, First Committee, 7th meeting.*

<sup>5</sup> See CD/53/Appendix III/Vol.I, document CD/28.

<sup>6</sup> See resolution 462 (1980).

---

### كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

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

#### 如何购买联合国出版物

联合国出版物在全世界各地的书店和经销处均有发售。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.

---