

UNITED NATIONS



# SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-FIFTH YEAR

**2187<sup>th</sup>** MEETING: 6 JANUARY 1980

NEW YORK

---

## CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2187) .....	1
Adoption of the agenda .....	1
Letter dated 3 January 1980 addressed to the President of the Security Council by the representatives of Australia, the Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Fiji, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Indonesia, Italy, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malaysia, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, the Philippines, Portugal, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, Uganda, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, Uruguay and Venezuela (S/13724 and Add.1 and 2) .....	1

UN LIBRARY  
MAY 27 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.

RESOLUTION  
S/RES/1982  
1982

## 2187th MEETING

Held in New York on Sunday, 6 January 1980, at 11 a.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/2187)

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 11.45 a.m.*

### Adoption of the agenda

*The agenda was adopted.*

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

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): In accordance with decisions taken at the 2185th and 2186th meetings, I invite the representatives of Afghanistan, Australia, Bulgaria, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Democratic Kampuchea, Egypt, Japan, Liberia, Malaysia, Mongolia, New Zealand, Pakistan, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Somalia and Turkey to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. Sahak (Afghanistan), Mr. Anderson (Australia), Mr. Yankov (Bulgaria), Mr. Kinsman (Canada), Mr. Liévano (Colombia), Mr. Piza Escalante (Costa Rica), Mr. Thiounn Prasith (Democratic Kampuchea), Mr. Abdel Meguid (Egypt), Mr. Nisibori (Japan), Mr. Tubman (Liberia), Mr. Zaiton (Malaysia), Mr. Dashtseren (Mongolia), Mr. Francis (New Zealand), Mr. Naik (Pakistan), Mr. Jaroszek (Poland), Mr. Allagany (Saudi Arabia), Mr. Koh (Singapore), Mr. Sharif (Somalia) and Mr. Eralp (Turkey) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.*

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

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. Hulinský (Czechoslovakia), Mr. Hollai (Hungary), Mr. La Rocca (Italy) and Mr. Piniés (Spain) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.*

3. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The Security Council will now resume its consideration of the item on its agenda.

4. Mr. McHENRY (United States of America): Mr. President, I should like at the outset to express our appreciation and admiration for the manner in which the representative of China exercised his responsibilities as President of the Security Council last month. I should like also to express our confidence that you, Mr. President, will carry on in the same

manner during your term of office. I am sure that our two delegations will continue to enjoy the very warm working relations they have had over a period of years.

5. Since this is the first time I have had the opportunity to address the Council this year, I should also like to welcome the new members of the Council. I wish to assure them that the delegation of the United States looks forward to working very closely with them in the spirit of co-operation that has always characterized our membership on the Council.

6. The Security Council meets today at the request of more than 50 Members of the United Nations from all parts of the world and of all political persuasions. We meet to consider a matter of fundamental importance to world peace and to the principles on the basis of which the United Nations was founded.

7. A Member State of the world Organization has been invaded by massive contingents of troops from another State. Its Government has been overthrown. Its leaders have been killed. Its people have been silenced. Its territory has been occupied.

8. The United States has joined in the call for an urgent meeting of the Security Council to consider the Soviet Union's blatant act of aggression against the territory and the people of Afghanistan. We have done so because the action of the Soviet Union not only breaches the peace and violates international law but also threatens the viability of the fundamental principles that underlie the Charter of the United Nations.

9. The representative of the Soviet Union has offered us a wide and confusing range of rationales for the so-called limited but surely deadly assistance foisted on the people of Afghanistan. Let us look at the chilling sequence of events connected with the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan.

10. During the first weeks of December 1979, the Soviet Union secured Bagram airfield, north of the Afghan capital of Kabul, by sending the equivalent of an airborne regiment there. It also landed troops and equipment at the Kabul airport and at the same time mobilized enormous forces in areas bordering Afghanistan.

11. On 25 and 26 December, a massive Soviet airlift into Kabul took place. In over 200 flights, roughly 10,000 Soviet troops were transported into Afghanistan.

12. On the evening of 27 December, a special Soviet assault unit surrounded the presidential palace in Kabul. Afghan soldiers defending the palace were attacked and overcome, and President Amin was summarily executed. Simultaneously, Soviet troops attacked Afghan forces guarding Radio Afghanistan and other key installations and took them under control.

13. The first announcement of the Soviet-engineered *coup d'état*, and the replacement of President Amin by Babrak Karmal, who had been in exile in eastern Europe, was made using frequencies purporting to be Radio Kabul. In fact, the transmitters from which those announcements were made were located in the Soviet Union. We know this because the real Radio Kabul continued normal transmissions for at least one and a half hours after those announcements were first heard. Nothing in these broadcasts from Radio Kabul confirmed the content of the Soviet broadcast disseminated in Afghanistan's name.

14. Subsequently, Soviet troops captured all key civilian and military installations in the Kabul area and established a defence perimeter around Kabul. Afghan military forces have been disarmed.

15. Immediately after the *coup*, two Soviet motorized rifle divisions entered Afghanistan by land, one at Kushka and the other at Termez. Elements of the western division arrived at Herat, where fighting between Soviet and Afghan forces was reported. Much of the Termez division proceeded to the Kabul area.

16. The Soviet Union now has up to 50,000 troops in Afghanistan. There are indications that other Soviet divisions are moving into the Soviet-Afghanistan border. Soviet forces have moved out to secure other key towns.

17. The Soviet Union has claimed that the leadership of Afghanistan requested Soviet military assistance. Which leadership? It is beyond doubt that President Amin was still in his office when the Soviet troops attacked the presidential palace and when he was executed. Are we to believe that President Amin invited Soviet troops to come into Afghanistan in order to oversee his own downfall and his own execution? Or was it the leadership of Babrak Karmal, President Amin's Soviet-appointed successor, a man who was not even in Afghanistan at the time of the Soviet intervention but was, rather, in the Soviet Union?

18. The Afghan people and the Afghan army units have resisted this Soviet aggression despite the overwhelming military superiority of the invader. Fighting continues in several areas of the country.

19. The facts of the situation are clear. Over a period of months, the Soviet Union carefully planned and prepared to invade Afghanistan because it was dissatisfied with the degree of subservience of the Amin Government and, undoubtedly, with its performance against Moslem insurgents in Afghanistan, who long have been struggling for their rights. The Soviet Union then carried out its military operation, quickly and brutally. It offered no recourse whatsoever to the authorities then in power in Afghanistan. The Soviet Union overthrew the Amin Government, which it had previously supported, and replaced it with a puppet régime.

20. The armed intervention of the Soviet Union in Afghanistan and the presence of an uninvited occupation force in that country is a gross and blatant violation of the most important principles of international law and of the Charter of the United Nations. What are those principles? That one State must not use force against the territorial integrity and political independence of another State; that a State must not intervene by force in the internal affairs of another State; that all States must respect the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples; that fundamental principles of human rights must be respected by all Governments; that States must settle international disputes by peaceful means.

21. The Soviet claim that it was acting in furtherance of collective self-defence under Article 51 of the Charter is a perversion of the Charter and an insult to the intelligence of the members of the Council. Article 51 can be invoked only "if an armed attack occurs against a Member of the United Nations". Whence came the armed attack on Afghanistan? The only armed attack on Afghanistan was the one launched by the Soviet Union and from the Soviet Union. No one can believe the claim that the Soviet Union was requested by the Afghan Government to intervene in Afghanistan in the fashion in which it did, unless one also believes that President Amin invited the Soviet Union in to overthrow him. Article 51 of the Charter requires that measures taken by Members in exercise of their right of self-defence "shall be immediately reported to the Security Council and shall not in any way affect the authority and responsibility of the Security Council under the . . . Charter to take at any time such action as it deems necessary in order to maintain or restore international peace and security". That neither the Soviet Union nor the puppet régime it has installed in Afghanistan has given the required notice to the Security Council under Article 51 is itself evidence of the hollowness of the Soviet Union's refuge in the Charter.

22. Nor can one believe that the Soviet Union was requested by the Afghan Government to intervene in Afghanistan pursuant to the terms of the so-called Treaty of Friendship, Good Neighbourliness and Co-operation between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan<sup>1</sup> of 1978. For the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan violates the Soviet Union's obligation, under the terms of that Treaty, to respect Afghanistan's national sovereignty and to refrain from interfering in its internal affairs.

23. The Charter of the United Nations does not give the Soviet Union, or any nation, the right to take military action in another country or to replace its Government because it disagrees with the policies or performance of the existing Government. The fact is that the Soviet Union has flouted international law and has violated regional and international peace and stability. That the Soviet Union has done so with cold

calculation and advance planning, in an area of the world which is now experiencing particular instability and tension, makes its act even more egregious and irresponsible. That the Soviet Union is taking military action against a deeply religious and fiercely independent people, who are struggling for human and religious rights, underscores the brutality and illegality of its action. Accordingly, it remains for the Council to take action under the Charter to restore international peace and security.

24. A terrible miscalculation has been made by the Soviet authorities. The ramifications of the Soviet intervention in Afghanistan are enormous. For no State will be safe against a larger and more powerful neighbour if the international community appears to condone the Soviet Union's armed intervention. This must be of particular concern to the States whose territory lies near the Soviet borders.

25. It is, therefore, incumbent upon the Council and upon every nation that believes in the rule of law and opposes the use of force in international affairs to denounce this dangerous breach of peace and security. It is incumbent upon the Council to make the weight of world opinion felt.

26. We note that the Soviet Union has stated that it intends to withdraw its troops from Afghanistan at some point. We urge it to do so immediately, and to allow the people of Afghanistan to conduct their own affairs, to choose their own system of government, to choose their own national leaders without outside pressure and interference. Only in that way can the grave threat to international peace and security created by the Soviet Union be diminished and this most serious challenge to the basic principles of the United Nations be removed.

27. No State, not even a great Power, can be allowed to ignore with impunity the responsibilities, obligations and commitments it assumed when it became a Member of the United Nations. The United States therefore calls on all members of the Council to act vigorously in the discharge of their Charter obligations.

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

29. Mr. ANDERSON (Australia): In thanking you, Mr. President, for giving me this opportunity to address the Security Council today, I should like to offer my warm congratulations on your accession to the presidency. We are fortunate that at this time of international tension, the Council will have the benefit of your sound judgement, experience and diplomatic skills. I should like also to pay a tribute to your predecessor, the representative of China, for his wise and effective leadership of the Council during December. Finally, I should like to congratulate the new

members of the Council and to wish them, on behalf of my Government, every success in their endeavours.

30. Australia has supported the holding of, and asked to participate in, this debate because of the seriousness with which it views the current situation in Afghanistan. What we have witnessed over the past 10 days has been an intolerable and continuing act of interference by military force on the part of the Soviet Union in the internal affairs of Afghanistan. That action has greatly increased the already serious instability of the general region. It constitutes a dramatic and undisguised threat to international peace and security. It is entirely appropriate and necessary, therefore, for the Council to be meeting promptly to consider the situation. The United Nations generally, and the Security Council in particular, must address as a matter of urgency such a callous disregard for the principles embodied in the Charter of the United Nations and for international security. The people of Australia, and indeed world opinion at large, have been outraged by these events and look to the Council to take appropriate action.

31. Our first concern is for the rights and welfare of the people of Afghanistan. They have experienced a succession of Governments since 1978. Australia has watched with increasing concern the growing instability in Afghanistan itself and in the region. The present situation is, however, significantly different. We are now faced with a situation where substantial Soviet forces have moved into Afghanistan to install and to maintain a régime in Kabul subservient to Soviet purposes.

32. Afghanistan occupies a strategic position between Asia and the Middle East. That fact can in no way justify or excuse the outside interference that is now occurring. The people of Afghanistan are entitled to work out their future for themselves without fear of interference from outside forces, large or small.

33. On well-documented occasions in the past, the Soviet Union has stood condemned for its military interference in Warsaw Pact countries. We are now witnesses to a large-scale military intervention in the affairs of a member country of the non-aligned movement. It is intervention, moreover, for which—as previous speakers in this debate have demonstrated conclusively—the Soviet Union has offered no reasonable or acceptable justification. It is understandable that in the circumstances the Members of the United Nations, aligned and non-aligned alike, are watching the situation in Afghanistan with great apprehension.

34. Today more than ever, major questions of world security and economics call for international co-operation on the broadest scale. We had found encouragement in the degree of co-operation that had come into being between the two major nuclear Powers on matters relating to the control of arms. We had hoped

that the Treaty between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms (SALT II)<sup>2</sup> would come into effect as soon as possible and would in turn open the way to new measures of disarmament and arms control. All of that is now in jeopardy and we face the spectre of dangerous confrontation. That would be a tragedy. Surely the precarious gains in Afghanistan are not worth that for the Soviet Union. But for the rest of the world, even more is at stake than Afghanistan itself, because armed invasion and aggression in breach of the Charter threaten the independence and security of every country. We want an end to the invasion of Afghanistan because of that basic concern and because of our concern for the independence and integrity of Afghanistan and its people. But we also want an end to the invasion because we want a resumption and intensification of international co-operation in the great tasks of the world today.

35. Australia joins with all like-minded speakers in this debate in calling for the immediate withdrawal of all foreign troops from Afghanistan so as to allow the people of that troubled country to choose their own future in the full and independent freedom which they have traditionally enjoyed.

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

37. Mr. KOH (Singapore): Mr. President, as in December, the Security Council is again fortunate to have as its President this month a man of enormous ability and vast experience. My delegation is confident that you will be able to provide the Council with the wise and strong leadership which it so clearly needs during this month of January.

38. At the very outset of my statement, I wish to recall that ever since my country became independent, my Government has consistently pursued a foreign policy of non-alignment. We are not aligned with any of the great Powers. We are not a party to their competing military alliances and political blocs. We have studiously avoided involvement in the rivalries between the great Powers. The position which my Government takes on specific issues such as the situation in Afghanistan is based upon the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, the generally accepted principles of international law, the principles of non-alignment and our judgement of the merits of each case.

39. Relations between small nations and great Powers are at the best of times difficult. But when a great Power defies the basic principles of the Charter by openly invading and occupying weaker and smaller nations, then association between it and smaller nations carries obvious dangers. The Soviet action in Afghani-

stan will certainly be viewed in that light by many small nations.

40. Let me review briefly the salient facts as reported in the press concerning recent events in Afghanistan.

41. On 25 and 26 December 1979, a massive Soviet airlift into Kabul, the capital of Afghanistan, took place. In over 200 flights approximately 10,000 Soviet troops were transported into Afghanistan. On the evening of 27 December, Soviet troops were involved in a *coup* against President Hafizullah Amin, who was killed. Immediately after the *coup*, two Soviet motorized rifle divisions entered Afghanistan by land. The Soviet Union is now said to have about 50,000 combat troops in Afghanistan.

42. The Soviet Union has argued that its troops are in Afghanistan at the invitation of the Afghan Government. The Soviet Union claims that the massive Soviet airlift which occurred on 25 and 26 December had similarly taken place at the invitation of the Government of Afghanistan. Unless we assume that the late President Amin had suicidal tendencies, it is reasonable to infer that he would not have invited Soviet troops to enter Afghanistan in order to depose and kill him.

43. After the *coup* against President Amin, the Soviet Union brought an Afghan, Babrak Karmal, from exile in Eastern Europe and made him the new President of Afghanistan. The important fact is that at the time of the Soviet intervention, Babrak Karmal was not part of the Government of Afghanistan and therefore had no authority to request the intervention by Soviet troops.

44. Have the actions of the Soviet Union in Afghanistan violated any of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the generally accepted principles of international law? The answer is yes. In the first place, the use of Soviet troops to depose one ruler and substitute another is clearly in violation of the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of other States and of the principle of non-use of force against the political independence of other States. The actions of the Soviet Union also violate some of the principles contained in the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, unanimously adopted by the General Assembly at its twenty-fifth session [see *resolution 2625 (XXV)*]. One of the principles violated is the principle that "Every State has the duty to refrain from any forcible action which deprives peoples . . . of their right to self-determination and freedom and independence". Another principle which has been violated is that "No State . . . has the right to intervene, directly or indirectly, for any reason whatever, in the internal or external affairs of any other State." Finally, the Soviet actions also violate the principle that "no State shall organize . . . armed activities directed towards the violent overthrow of the régime of another State . . .".

45. The actions of the Soviet Union in Afghanistan have certain grave implications for countries in Asia and for small and non-aligned countries. The fact that this occurred barely a month after the General Assembly adopted a resolution based upon a Soviet initiative condemning all forms of hegemonism [*General Assembly resolution 34/103*], indicates clearly that the Soviet Union has a credibility gap. How can we reconcile Soviet deeds with Soviet words? Henceforth, it will be extremely difficult for us to give any credence to declarations by the Soviet Union that it will respect the territorial integrity, sovereignty and political independence of other States and that it will strictly abide by the principle of non-interference in another State's internal affairs.

46. In the past the Soviet Union has encouraged small nations to pursue a foreign policy of non-alignment as a means of securing their political integrity and independence. Some 90 nations, including Afghanistan, have joined the movement of non-aligned countries. The fact that the Government of Afghanistan, which was overthrown by Soviet troops, was a member of the non-aligned movement and was friendly to the Soviet Union is therefore doubly disconcerting. It makes some of us wonder whether a foreign policy of non-alignment provides one with any security against external interference and aggression in the world today.

47. The great Powers have a special responsibility by virtue of their strength and prestige to adhere loyally to the basic purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations. They should set an example for smaller nations on the rational and peaceful conduct of relations between States. They should be the enforcers of the purposes and principles of the United Nations. That is why five of the members of the Council have been accorded the special status of permanent members with veto powers. They have been accorded this privileged position because they have a special responsibility. But when those in this privileged position to enforce the purposes and principles of the Organization breach them at the expense of a small nation, then we are well on the way to a world without law and without principles.

48. In conclusion, my delegation joins others in demanding, first, the withdrawal of Soviet forces from Afghanistan; secondly, the cessation of Soviet interference in the internal affairs of Afghanistan; and, thirdly, respect by the Soviet Union and all other States for the territorial integrity, sovereignty and political independence of Afghanistan.

49. Mr. ÅLGÅRD (Norway): I should like to congratulate you, Mr. President, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for this month. The Security Council will once again be able to draw on your long experience and well-known diplomatic skill in the best French tradition at a most critical time for the Council and the world at large.

50. At the same time, I should also like to pay a tribute to the outgoing President, Mr. Chen Chu, of China, whose wise and able handling of the duties of that office enabled the Council to arrive at important decisions pertaining to international peace and security during the last month of 1979.
51. It is also a pleasure to welcome the new members of the Council. We look forward to working closely with all of them and pledge our full co-operation in the year ahead. I should also like to express my appreciation to the departing members of the Council. It was a privilege to have worked with them in the discharge of our common duties during the last year.
52. The Norwegian Government is deeply concerned at the situation in Afghanistan and its implications for international peace and security. The Soviet armed intervention in that country represents a violation of Afghanistan's sovereignty and increases tension in the region and beyond. It is a clear interference in the internal affairs of another country and constitutes a potential danger to international peace and security. In view of this serious situation, Norway joined a large number of other countries in requesting an urgent meeting of the Council.
53. The Norwegian Government must once again reiterate its firmly held principle that the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State in contravention of the Charter of the United Nations cannot be accepted on any pretext whatever.
54. The developments in Afghanistan have added in a dramatic way to the sense of instability and strife which, regrettably, has come to characterize various parts of that area of the world over the last year.
55. In a broader international context all countries, big and small, must view the recent developments with great apprehension. At a time when it was hoped that nations could make progress in terms of bridging gaps and lessening tension between them, recent events have regrettably brought this process into question. Whereas there is no alternative to a process aimed at lessening international tension and conflict in the long run, no one can accept that the very principles on which such a process must be built can be violated, as they have been in the case of Afghanistan.
56. In the view of the Norwegian Government, it is of the utmost importance that peace and stability be restored in Afghanistan and that the threat of a wider conflict be removed. The right of the people of Afghanistan to choose their own Government without outside interference must be respected. That requires an immediate withdrawal of all Soviet forces from Afghanistan and the strict observance of the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of another country.
57. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker is the representative of Spain, whom I invite to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.
58. Mr. PINIES (Spain) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I am sure, Mr. President, that you will understand how pleased I am to see the Security Council presided over by a personal friend of mine who, furthermore, is the representative of a country closely related to my own in so many ways.
59. I wish, through you, Mr. President, to thank the Council for the opportunity that I have been given to speak on the question of Afghanistan. The fact that 51 States Members—in other words, one third of the membership of the United Nations—have sought the urgent convening of this main organ, responsible for maintaining international peace and security, is clear proof of the concern of the international community at the recent events in Afghanistan which resulted from Soviet Military intervention in that country, thereby jeopardizing international peace and security.
60. My country and Government deplore this violent act in breach of the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations. As we have learned from the news media, as early as 21 December 1979, there were Soviet troop movements on the Afghan border; since that date, a gradual penetration by forces numbering up to 50,000 troops has been observed.
61. As a result of this intervention, the President of Afghanistan was executed. If anyone actually called for Soviet intervention, the request must have come from the Government of Hafizullah Amin himself, who led the Afghan Government until the Soviet troops reached Kabul. It is scarcely logical for a Government to call in foreign troops to be annihilated by them. As a consequence of the invasion, not only have the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations been violated, but a Member of the Organization—Afghanistan—has seen its sovereignty and political independence encroached upon. This military intervention is quite paradoxical when we recall that at the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly, the Soviet delegation submitted an item entitled "Inadmissibility of the policy of hegemonism in international relations".
62. The non-use of force, the inviolability of frontiers, the territorial integrity of States and the self-determination of peoples: all these principles have been brutally flouted. If there had been any conflict it would have been logical to seek a peaceful settlement of disputes, as established in the Charter.
63. While the events in Afghanistan are extremely serious, my delegation wishes to draw attention to the alarming consequences which those events may have for the international situation at a time when the international community is endeavouring to go beyond



the cold war and avoid an outbreak of war, with irreparable consequences. These efforts are not enough, however: we must prevent this kind of military intervention against small, defenceless countries that are at the mercy of the mighty, which, using conventional means, can deprive them of their political independence. I do not think it necessary to exaggerate these facts; the simple reality of what has occurred speaks for itself.

64. The talks which led to the SALT II Treaty<sup>2</sup> have been seriously jeopardized since the ratification of that Treaty has been frozen by one of the signatories. In other words, at a time when we are striving to achieve détente and promote international co-operation, and when everything was leading us to believe that the world was embarking upon a period of peace in which the cold war would be a thing of the past, this new act of violence takes place: interference in the internal affairs of a State Member of the United Nations.

65. The year 1980 should have marked the beginning of a decade in which, on the basis of the SALT II Treaty and the understanding among the great Powers, we would achieve the necessary harmony in order to make progress in the field of world-wide co-operation and the struggle for development. The world situation today gives no grounds for optimism, however: in the past 12 months, the Council has met repeatedly to deal with a long succession of acts of aggression and violence. We are thus eroding the world political structure which had been built up with such devotion and endeavour.

66. Bearing in mind the matters to which I have referred, the Spanish Government, at the meeting of the Council of Ministers held on 29 December last, emphasized the following points: first, any threat to international peace and security constitutes a source of serious concern to the Spanish Government; secondly, every country is free to look after its own security; but the Spanish Government opposes any military intervention and interference in the internal affairs of other countries, particularly when it is liable to promote tension in an already extraordinarily tense area.

67. My Government hopes that the Security Council will take prompt and effective action to prevent a worsening of the situation in that area and to see that peace and security are rapidly re-established there.

68. My Government deplors this Soviet military intervention in Afghanistan and hopes that the troops of that country will be immediately withdrawn, thus creating conditions that will allow the Afghan people to decide its own political future by democratic means.

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

70. Mr. SHARIF (Somalia): Mr. President, I thank the Council for giving me the opportunity to participate in this debate. I should like first of all to extend congratulations to you on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council. I have confidence in your ability to guide the Council wisely during these troubled times when international peace and security are seriously endangered.

71. We express our appreciation also for the able and efficient manner in which your predecessor, Mr. Chen Chu, of China, conducted the affairs of the Council last month. We likewise convey our felicitations to the newly elected members of the Security Council—namely, the representatives of Tunisia, the Niger, the Philippines and the German Democratic Republic.

72. We have come here to add our voice to the many which have been raised in condemnation of the Soviet Union's military intervention in Afghanistan—an action which constitutes aggression against a non-aligned Moslem State and against a proud and independent people with which we share common civilization, culture and values.

73. The Soviet action is a dangerously explosive one that may bring about incalculable consequences. This intervention of a super-Power in the affairs of a small country in order to further its own ends sets back the clock of international progress, assaulting as it does the rule of international law and the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, and threatening the precarious balance of world peace and security.

74. Instruments such as the Declaration of Principles Governing Friendly Relations and Co-operation between States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations [*General Assembly resolution 2625 (XXV)*] and the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security [*General Assembly resolution 2734 (XXV)*] validate and extend the principles of the Charter when they emphasize the importance of non-interference in the internal affairs of States—a principle equalled in importance only by that of the right of peoples to self-determination and independence. Non-interference, respect for national sovereignty, and the inadmissibility of the use of force in international relations are cardinal principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations, by which all Member States are committed to abide.

75. The group of non-aligned States, of which Afghanistan is a founding member and which constitutes the largest group within the United Nations, can only view the Soviet action with angered dismay.

76. Afghanistan has a long and illustrious history of cultural and political independence. It has preserved its national identity because of the unconquerable will of its people, and it must continue to enjoy the rights and privileges of membership in the community

of nations. The massive armed aggression against its territorial integrity and national sovereignty cannot be countenanced in our world today, however larger and powerful the attacking State may be. Indeed, the super-Powers have a special responsibility towards the rules of international law, a special responsibility to observe the principles of the Charter and to preserve world peace. When the Soviet Union is seen instead to use its power to install or demolish Governments in a neighbouring State, it must be said to have abandoned these responsibilities.

77. Of course, Afghanistan does not provide the only example in recent times of the exercise of imperialist policies and action by the Soviet Union carried out through armed intervention. The same kind of opportunist and large-scale aggression we are witnessing in Afghanistan has already been perpetrated in many parts of the world, including Africa, where it has been directed against peoples struggling to achieve their inalienable right to self-determination and independence.

78. The excuse given for the Soviet intervention in Afghanistan is inept and lacking in credibility. It is evident that the real motive for the Soviet Union's aggression was the furtherance of its hegemonistic policies.

79. The Soviet action in Afghanistan must be clearly and severely condemned by the Security Council and by the international community. It violates international law, and it has been carried out at a time when world tensions are already high and when a lesser incident could trigger a chain reaction of events leading to super-Power confrontation and even nuclear war. This is a time for restraint and statesmanship for the sober and responsible conduct of international affairs.

80. We urge the Soviet Union to withdraw its troops from Afghanistan so that its people can exercise in freedom their inalienable national and political rights and so that a dangerous threat to world peace and security can be removed.

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

82. Mr. ZAITON (Malaysia): Mr. President, I should like first of all to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month. I am confident that, with your wide experience and acknowledged diplomatic skill, you will be able successfully to guide the Council in its deliberations.

83. At the same time, I should also like to express our appreciation to Mr. Chen Chu, of China, for having ably and skilfully conducted the affairs of the Council last month.

84. I join previous speakers in congratulating the new members on their election to the Council—namely, the Philippines, the Niger, Tunisia and the German Democratic Republic. Malaysia is especially happy to see the Philippines, a fellow member of the Association of South-East Asian Nations, take a seat on the Council.

85. I wish also to thank you, Mr. President, and members of the Council for giving me the opportunity to participate in today's meeting. Malaysia is one of the more than 50 countries that have joined in the call for the convening of the Council to consider a serious issue confronting the international community, that is, the external armed intervention in the internal affairs of Afghanistan, a State Member of the United Nations.

86. As was widely reported, a massive introduction of troops of the Soviet Union into Afghanistan took place around Christmas, about a fortnight ago. On 27 December 1979, the legal Government of Afghanistan, under President Hafizullah Amin, was toppled and the President himself was executed along with members of his family. A new Government closely backed by the Soviet Union has been installed in its place. Today it is reported that there are in Afghanistan about 50,000 Soviet troops with the latest equipment, including tanks and aeroplanes, helping to prop up the new régime and maintaining absolute control over the country. My delegation views this development as a clear case of external interference and intervention in the internal affairs of another country. It contravenes the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and violates the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Afghanistan. In addition, it constitutes a serious threat to international peace and security.

87. It has been claimed that the Soviet troops had been invited into Afghanistan to assist the Government and the people of that country to face alleged interference and provocation by external enemies and that they came there in response to treaty obligations binding the two countries. My delegation finds it difficult to accept such a claim, in the light of available evidence to the contrary, in that the request was made only after the armed intervention, the murder of President Amin and the setting up of a Soviet-backed Government took place.

88. As a small country interested in peace and stability in which to pursue the goals of nation-building and economic development, Malaysia views the events in Afghanistan with grave concern and anxiety. That is a view which must be shared by all, especially the small and developing countries of the world. For how could we live in peace, security and harmony and how could our independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity be ensured if countries, and more especially, major Powers, openly violate the basic principles of peaceful relations between nations as enshrined in our Charter? In such a world we would

only live in fear and dread as to who would be the next victim of subjugation and domination.

89. We see no other way of achieving international peace and security except through strict adherence to the principles enshrined in the Charter. As a Member of the United Nations, Malaysia fully realizes its obligations and will not hesitate to speak out against such violations wherever and whenever they occur, and by whomever they are carried out. We have consistently done so in the past, and, as will be recalled, we did so recently in the General Assembly, during the consideration of the situation in Kampuchea. We shall continue to do so in the future, whenever we see such a case occurring. Furthermore, as a member of the Organization of the Islamic Conference and the non-aligned movement, to which Afghanistan also belongs, Malaysia could not but speak up on behalf of the people of Afghanistan on what we firmly believe to be a clear violation of their integrity and sovereignty.

90. In conclusion, I should like strongly to urge the Security Council to call for cessation of the armed intervention in Afghanistan and for immediate withdrawal of the foreign forces from that country, and thus prevent the situation from deteriorating and escalating into a wider conflict. The people of Afghanistan must be allowed to decide their own future and destiny by themselves, free from foreign interference or influence, for only on that basis can peace and stability in that country be restored.

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

92. Mr. PIZA ESCALANTE (Costa Rica) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Costa Rica has joined a large number of other Members of the Organization in requesting this urgent meeting of the Security Council to ascertain what is the situation in Afghanistan and to consider that events which have occurred in that country, despite ever-present pretexts and subterfuges, constitute a serious violation of the fundamental principles of international law, openly perpetrated by the Soviet Union, and furthermore, a grave threat to international peace and security.

93. It is always the case with any aggression or with any violation of a nation's sovereignty and independence, especially if the nation is small and the aggressor great, that arguments are concocted to justify the aggression.

94. In the case of Afghanistan, these arguments are based on an alleged request by the Government of Afghanistan to the Soviet Union, under the Treaty of Friendship, Co-operation and Good Neighbourliness of 1978,<sup>1</sup> to send in troops to counter a conspiracy that had originated outside the country. The truth is that

the Soviet troops, which had been stationed on the border of Afghanistan since before 21 December 1979, invaded the country on Christmas Eve. This means that, if the request for assistance alleged by the Soviet Union were genuine, that request would have had to have come from the Government of Hafizullah Amin, who was deposed and executed on 27 December, precisely by those responsible for the *coup d'état* supported by the Soviet Union, and whose Foreign Minister came here yesterday to justify the invasion [2185th meeting].

95. Things are so clear that no one can have any doubt as to their reality. In this respect, it can all be summed up in the statement made yesterday by the representative of Pakistan when he said: "It does not stand to logic that a Government should have invited foreign troops to liquidate itself." [*Ibid.*, para. 76.]

96. My country, like most of the third world and non-aligned countries, relies on the rule of law for its external security, and is free from any suspicion of wishing to intervene in the internal affairs of either its neighbours or any other State. For that reason, we cannot accept the argument that such a request was a planned attempt to check revolutionary change in Afghanistan. What concerns us is that treaties of friendship, co-operation and good neighbourliness overnight can become arms of aggression, invasion and intervention in the affairs of a sovereign State. We are rightly concerned when it happens in our own region, but we are also concerned when it occurs in any other part of the world, especially when good faith and friendly intentions, the genesis of international law, are violated. We hope that we are not witnessing a new escalation of aggression which could become the norm for all the great Powers throughout the world, if there was the least suspicion that a friend, ally, satellite or simply a nation which was considered to be in the backyard of one of the Powers, were deviating from the submission which its supposed friends had imposed or had tried to impose.

97. We are hurt, above all, that such clear acts of aggression have been perpetrated by those who, in the current General Assembly session, have proposed resolutions against hegemonism and proclaimed themselves champions of decolonization, self-determination of peoples and the non-use of force in international relations. Their acts rub out their words.

98. The great Powers, precisely because they are responsible for maintaining international peace and order, as is always the argument put forward to justify their right to the veto in the Security Council, must be moderate and generous and recognize their errors in time. The greatness of a Power must not depend on its military might but on its ability to maintain the balance of forces in the world, letting each country decide its own internal affairs without interference. Greatness must reside in the rational action of States and not in superiority or in the ability to trample on

the rights of other peoples. History has shown that arbitrary peoples, using law as a weapon to impose their own will, fall victims to their own excesses and mistakes.

99. My country, because it is sovereign and takes orders from no Power, condemned, through its Government, the sneaky invasion from the time the international wires were announcing it and once it became clear that it was not simply a *coup d'état*, or an internal revolution or an attempt against President Amin, but an invasion in the most refined Fascist style. In fact, my Government, in San José on 2 January of this year, issued the following statement:

"The Government of the Republic of Costa Rica, always anxious to see absolute respect for the fundamental principles which govern relations among all peoples, is deeply concerned at the current intervention of Soviet military forces in Afghanistan.

"That offensive is a clear imperialist move directly affecting the principle of self-determination of peoples enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations and clearly endangering world peace.

"For the sake of world peace, Costa Rica calls for the effective observation of the principle of non-intervention which is the basis and cornerstone of all international law."

100. We all know beforehand that the rules for voting and the veto in the Security Council will make it impossible to adopt a resolution firmly condemning the acts of aggression which have made a victim of the people of Afghanistan even more than its Government. In this respect, all that we can do is to let the whole world know of the unanimous condemnation by free peoples and the truly non-aligned. For this reason I am grateful for the honour of addressing the Council.

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

102. Mr. LA ROCCA (Italy): May I thank you, Mr. President, and through you, the members of the Security Council for inviting my delegation to participate in the debate on the most serious matter before it.

103. I should like first of all to convey to you, Mr. President, my warmest congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month. We are particularly gratified at seeing the work of the Council presided over by the representative of a country with which Italy has in common centuries of civilization, links of alliance, and membership in the European Community, and we express confidence that your most able guidance will greatly facilitate the work of the Council in dealing with the

important questions which are at present on its agenda. May I also express our gratitude to your predecessor, the representative of China, for the skilful way in which he conducted the difficult proceedings of the Council in the course of the past month, and extend our congratulations to the new members of the Council, with all of which Italy entertains friendly relations.

104. In requesting, together with 50 other delegations of different geographical regions, this urgent series of meetings of the Security Council, my Government wished to give concrete expression to the deep concern we feel over the recent developments in Afghanistan. We considered that, whatever the outcome of the meetings, the international community should be allowed to voice publicly its views about the events which are currently occurring in that country.

105. The Council dealt at length in January and March 1979 [2108th to 2112th, 2114th to 2118th and 2129th meetings], with the armed invasion of Kampuchea and the most dangerous sequel of events it generated. At that time the international community, with few exceptions, expressed its condemnation of the use of armed intervention in the internal affairs of other States and strongly reasserted the right of the Kampuchean people to self-determination and to decide freely their own destiny. Similar feelings were recently reiterated by the General Assembly at its thirty-fourth session through the adoption of resolution 34/22 on the situation in Kampuchea, and even more firmly in resolution 34/103 on the inadmissibility of the policy of hegemonism in international relations.

106. Yet only a year has elapsed since the invasion of Kampuchea and we are now witnessing the development of a practically identical pattern of events, this time in Afghanistan. Once more the Government of a State Member of the United Nations has been overthrown through external armed intervention, and the presence of foreign armed forces on the territory of Afghanistan has been belatedly endorsed by a régime set up by those same forces.

107. The Government and public opinion in Italy has been following with grave concern the developments taking place in Afghanistan in the last few months. Our concern has found ample justification in the growing intensity of the armed struggle waged by insurgent movements against the Government of that country, the massive and overt violations of the human rights of the Afghan people, and the increasingly widespread and ubiquitous presence in the country of foreign advisers.

108. The Italian Government cannot accept the position that the military intervention of the Soviet Union in Afghanistan can be justified on the basis of the right to self-defence, either individual or collective, enshrined in Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations. The analysis made by the Italian Government, with all objectivity, of the situation

prevailing in Afghanistan before the recent military intervention by the Soviet Union does not point to the existence of acts of subversion of the affairs of Afghanistan on the part of third countries. The Soviet military intervention, therefore, represents open interference in a situation characterized by an internal conflict but not by foreign aggression.

109. Italian public opinion and political forces have unanimously condemned the Soviet intervention in Afghanistan and my Government fully shares that position. We are convinced that those involved in the situation in Afghanistan must promptly abide by the norms and principles of the Charter, thus allowing the people of that country freely and autonomously to decide their own destiny without external interference and in full respect for the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of Afghanistan.

110. Italy attaches particular importance to the urgent fulfilment of those conditions, which are the prerequisites of the re-establishment of normal international coexistence and of the pursuit of the policy of détente. In our opinion the policy of détente has no alternatives and we are committed to continuing to work for its successful achievement. However, we cannot forget that détente has a global dimension and requires particular restraint by the Governments entrusted by the Charter of the United Nations with specific responsibilities for the maintenance of international peace and security. In the case of Afghanistan, we therefore call for strict observance of the principle of non-intervention in the domestic affairs of other States and for the immediate withdrawal of all foreign armed forces from the territory of that country. We sincerely hope that the proceedings of the Council will effectively contribute to the achievement of those objectives.

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

112. Mr. TUBMAN (Liberia): At this moment international tensions and frustrations are high, because of uncertainties in the Middle East. Crises in the world economy deepen with each passing day. At such a time the rumble of foreign tanks, the menacing sounds of invading military aircraft and the presence of some 50,000 foreign troops in Afghanistan have shattered the peace of that small, defenceless non-aligned nation.

113. The international scene today, with détente apparently crumbling, bears a frightful resemblance to the situation in Europe just 40 years ago, when hopes for peace in that time faded. The lights went out and the horrors of a most devastating war were unleashed upon the world for the second time in this century. Of the many countries that were severely scarred by that war, none is more qualified to preside over this

crucial debate which is now going on, Mr. President, than your noble country France, whose humanitarian attributes, including an abiding love of peace, made it an early victim of aggression in those dark days. But while we are confident that France will be wise and fair in the conduct of this debate, and grateful as we are to members of the Council for the opportunity of addressing them today, my delegation is deeply troubled because we are keenly aware that a situation of threatening and dangerous confrontation between two great Power alignments in the world cannot be divorced from the issues in this debate.

114. In Liberia we say: "when elephants fight, it is the grass which dies". Therefore when, as now, events are shaping up for a serious clash between the great Power blocs, we small nations, especially if we are non-aligned, can make a real contribution to peace, not by remaining silent nor by taking sides, but by calling for strict adherence to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and by insisting upon a role for the United Nations, whose indispensable relevance in safeguarding international peace and security has been demonstrated in recent weeks and will be a vital factor in international relations during the complex and dangerous era which the world has entered. The days when the big Powers used the Organization as an instrument for selfish power play and manipulation are gone. While that unhealthy situation lasted, the effectiveness of the Organization was impaired, because its objectivity and even-handedness were held in suspicion. Such a view of the United Nations, regrettably, but in the view of my delegation unjustifiably, still persists in many quarters.

115. How often in times past have we small States not bemoaned the contemptuous manner in which the United Nations has been prevented by the powerful States from considering grave matters that were of concern not only to the big Powers, but to the whole international community? In the event of a nuclear war, which country would be spared the most devastating direct or indirect effect? Which countries, even now, do not suffer adverse effects caused by the worsening international economic situation that has come about, at least in part, because of happenings in regions far away from their shores? The interdependence of our world today is an inescapable fact. A breach of the peace therefore, whenever it occurs, and particularly, where it involves or threatens to involve the major Powers, poses a dire threat to the whole world. If the Security Council cannot rightfully be seized of such an issue, the prospects for peace and stability in the world are very bleak indeed.

116. The Security Council therefore, by consenting to hold this debate, has risen to its responsibilities under the Charter and deserves the appreciation of all States, particularly small ones and those that belong to the non-aligned movement.

117. There are efforts currently under way—which our brave Secretary-General, at peril even to his life,

has recently sought to advance—designed to resolve the crisis of the American hostages in Iran. Those efforts and now this debate concerning the situation in Afghanistan are aimed at solving the problems through the United Nations. That cannot but be welcomed by all small and medium-sized countries because, quite frankly, when we small countries are in trouble, when we have been the victims of aggression or of racist or colonial domination, we come here to the United Nations because we have no better place to turn to. More often than not, the results we obtain here are far from satisfactory. Let me give one example; for more than 30 years we have been trying to solve the problem of Namibia through the United Nations, but we have not succeeded yet. In the view of my delegation, had greater weight and relevance been attached to the United Nations over these many years by the powerful States, and had all States really tried to develop the marvelous machinery provided in the Charter for the preservation of peace and the fostering of international co-operation, the Organization today would have been better equipped to respond speedily and effectively to issues such as those posed by the troubles in Iran and Afghanistan, issues which only the United Nations can solve if they are to be solved peacefully.

118. But it is better late than never; therefore we can all hope that henceforth all States, not just the small ones, will make the United Nations a cardinal point of focus of their international relations and policy. Because this debate can only help to foster a wholesome development of that kind, my delegation for that reason and for that reason only did not hesitate to sign the letter in response to which the Security Council is now meeting.

119. The entry by and the deployment of foreign military forces in Afghanistan and their engagement in a shooting war there, without any other qualifying elements, is in the view of my delegation a violation of the Charter of the United Nations. The representative of the Soviet Union, in his statement yesterday [2185th meeting], conceded that point by clear implication, because he saw the need to explain the presence of his country's military forces in Afghanistan, a presence which according to him was in response to a request from the Government of that country. That request, we were told, was made and responded to on the basis of a treaty between the two countries.

120. A treaty of that kind and, more particularly, the despatching of armed forces under its provisions into the territory of another State must, in our view, in order not to constitute a violation of the Charter of the United Nations, comply with the provisions dealing with the concept of self-defence as laid down in the Charter. Considerable legal learning and opinions surround the dimensions of that concept in international law, but their thrust can be briefly summarized. Before endeavouring to do so I would quote

the relevant provisions which are contained in Article 51 of the Charter:

“Nothing in the present Charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defence if an armed attack occurs against a Member of the United Nations, until the Security Council has taken measures necessary to maintain international peace and security. Measures taken by Members in the exercise of this right of self-defence shall be immediately reported to the Security Council and shall not in any way affect the authority and responsibility of the Security Council under the present Charter to take at any time such action as it deems necessary in order to maintain or restore international peace and security.”

121. Against the clear stipulations of Article 51 certain questions may be asked. Was there an armed attack within the meaning of Article 51 in this case? Against which State was the attack made? As we listened to the Soviet representative speaking on this point yesterday, we were left in some confusion. For reasons of this kind, in other words, in order to enable clear and authoritative explanations to be given regarding events which have alarmed the whole international community, these meetings of the Security Council are more than justified—but let me continue.

122. At one point in his statement yesterday, the Soviet representative seemed to be saying that the territory of Afghanistan was being used as a beach-head from which attacks against the Soviet Union could be launched. If such a factual situation indeed existed, then the sending of Soviet troops into Afghanistan was, the Soviet statement seems to suggest, an act of self-defence, not necessarily by Afghanistan, but by the Soviet Union. And if, indeed, that was the reason for the entry of Soviet troops into Afghanistan, given the Treaty of Friendship, Good Neighbourliness and Co-operation between the Soviet Union and Afghanistan,<sup>1</sup> which was apparently invoked, it is no wonder that Pakistan has felt threatened by those developments, since the Soviet representative also stated that Pakistan's territory was being used as a beach-head for attacks against Afghanistan.

123. If the Soviet arguments justifying the use of armed forces in Afghanistan are allowed to stand, the concerns felt by Pakistan and other States in the region are fully warranted, and unless they can be allayed by the Council's handling of the matter, grave tensions and insecurity must persist in the region.

124. As regards both the Soviet Union and Afghanistan, no evidence has been adduced of anything that would qualify as an armed attack for the purpose of invoking Article 51 of the Charter. Reference was made by the Soviet representative to reports in certain Western news organs [2186th meeting] concerning sites in Pakistan that were allegedly being used as training grounds for subversives to carry out attacks

against Afghanistan. But the Government of Pakistan has denied those charges and dismissed them as baseless. In any event, one is left to wonder why the Soviet Union, which has a treaty of friendship and co-operation, as well as common borders with Afghanistan, could not assist its neighbour to the south to wipe out bands of infiltrators without having to dispatch 50,000 troops to Afghanistan.

125. Against whom are those troops now fighting? Are they killing the foreign subversives, or is it not the defenceless Afghan people in all parts of that country who are being attacked and slaughtered? In any event, had this matter of a threat to the Soviet Union or to Afghanistan ever been brought to the Security Council's attention by either country? Even now, has it been done? The international community has simply been told that 50,000 Soviet troops are in Afghanistan to counteract infiltration from outside. That pretext is not tenable, and, as an argument to justify the use of armed forces in a supposed act of self-defence, it disappears altogether because the régime supposedly being defended was immediately liquidated by its would-be defenders.

126. The doctrine of self-defence in international law cannot be invoked in those circumstances. Foreign armed intervention cannot be justified when used to crush the free political expression of a sovereign people. Such an action is not self-defence at all; it is interference of the worst kind in the domestic affairs of another State and it is clearly proscribed by Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter of the United Nations.

127. The second sentence of Article 51 states: "Measures taken by Member States in exercise of this right of self-defence shall be immediately reported to the Security Council . . .". Far from having had a report of these supposed acts of self-defence to the Security Council, we have heard both the Soviet representative and the Foreign Minister of Afghanistan declare that the Security Council has no competence to discuss this issue. Accordingly, even in the view of those Governments, Article 51 does not apply in this case. If Article 51 does not apply, then it seems to us that the Charter has been violated.

128. Even if Article 51 had rightly been invoked, the authority of the Security Council and its responsibility to take, at any time, such actions as it deems necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security are clearly provided for in that Article. What more has to be shown for the situation in Afghanistan to be considered as having serious implications for international peace? The 52 States at whose request the Council now deliberates have declared that, in their view, such implications do exist. Many other States have issued strong statements expressing grave disquiet at the presence of foreign troops in Afghanistan. In addition to all that, the momentum towards disarmament between the great Powers has already been adversely affected, and the feeling of security

and trust between the United States and the Soviet Union in particular has been greatly disturbed.

129. Those developments have raised the level of international insecurity and already they are giving rise to new momentum in the wasteful and dangerous arms race. The gravity of such a situation is inescapable and its implications for world peace are plain. The Security Council is therefore called upon to act clearly and decisively to protect the principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

130. The immediate withdrawal of all foreign forces, including subversive elements—if any are there—from the country must be insisted upon, so that the people of Afghanistan can be left alone to conduct their affairs without outside interference. The Council should call for full respect by all States of the basic principles of the Charter according to which all disputes are to be settled peacefully and armed force shall not be used save in the common interest.

131. But, beyond the actions which the Council should take in response to the situation in Afghanistan, it is incumbent upon all States—particularly the great Powers—at this time of tension and aggravation of international relations to do everything within their power so that the gains of many years of peaceful coexistence and détente laboriously pursued may not be thrown away. Let there be no return to the dangerous days of the cold war nor, worse still, to war itself.

132. We, the States of the developing world—and this includes all members of the Organization of African Unity—have looked forward to 1980 as the year for the commencement of new, more effective ways and means by which to improve the economic well-being of our people. To do this we need a climate of security and peace in the world. If tensions and strife are allowed to rise between the great Powers, their resources will again be diverted in ever-growing measure to armaments, and neither the will nor the means will be forthcoming for addressing the pressing problems of international economic and social development.

133. It is my delegation's earnest hope that its sincere efforts to contribute positively to this debate will not be misconstrued by anyone—not least by the representative of the Soviet Union, whose great country's unmatched support of the struggles against colonialism and racist domination has won for it gratitude, respect and friendship throughout the third world. If that friendship is to grow—and its growth will serve immeasurably the cause of world peace—it must be based on candour, and not on fear. Otherwise, it will lead to the same ugly subservience and domination which, coming from others, the Soviet Union has helped the developing world to attack. Subservience and domination, from whatever source, can have no place in the new world order which, even now, is struggling to be born.



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

135. Mr. HOLLAI (Hungary): Mr. President, before turning to the question appearing on the Council's agenda, I wish to present our warm congratulations on your assumption of the highly important functions of President of the Security Council. We are particularly happy to see you in the presidency of the Security Council, since you represent a country with which friendly and co-operative relations with Hungary have recently been developing at an impressive rate, and our bilateral relations hold further possibilities for the benefit of both our countries. You are taking up your activities at a crucial moment in the history of the Security Council and the whole of the United Nations. We all know the circumstances in which we have found ourselves for the past weeks, and also the reasons why the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly was not able to finish its work on time. We are also aware of the tasks lying ahead for the Security Council. At this rather complex juncture, I should like to voice our conviction that, under your wise guidance and with your long experience and well-known competence, the Council will be able to remain faithful to the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and to discharge its duties constitutionally and successfully.

136. My intervention in this debate derives from the well-known policy of principle of the Government of the Hungarian People's Republic. Hungarian public opinion and the Hungarian Government have followed with the greatest attention the developments that have taken place in Afghanistan since the revolution in April 1978. The toiling Afghan people successfully began uprooting feudalism in their country, liberating themselves from their dependence on big landowners, abolishing the outdated socio-economic structures of the country, ensuring equality of rights for all citizens, regardless of nationality, religion and sex, distributing vast lands previously owned by feudal lords to masses of landless farmers, eliminating illiteracy among the population, carrying out the first national population census and starting a new Five-Year Economic Development Plan.

137. Those are some of the most outstanding and truly spectacular changes of historic importance in the life of Afghanistan, among many other transformations designed to place that country on the path of democratic development and social justice. And we in Hungary all applauded these events.

138. We have also been witnessing the internal convulsions taking place in that country—part of any difficult and painful revolutionary process. The subversive activities of the enemies of the Afghan revolution, clinging to their past privileges, and their desperate attempts to divert the attention of the leader-

ship of the country from the constructive tasks of development to the defence of the conquests of the April revolution came, in fact, as no surprise.

139. In their attack on the Government in Kabul, these enemies of the revolution were joined by extremists of all tints and were encouraged and backed by regional and global forces opposed to the ineluctable processes of history and hostile to the cause of the social emancipation of the peoples of the world and to the principle of self-determination. These conspiracies, resorting to all kinds of pretexts and "arguments" against the right of peoples freely to determine their destinies and to take a step forward to progress, have recently been seen in the cases of Viet Nam, Kampuchea and Iran. Now it is the people of Afghanistan who decided to take a bold step forward but were immediately challenged by the same imperialist forces and their new-fangled allies which try to impede progressive evolution throughout the world, overtly and covertly, through open interference or indirect or disguised involvement.

140. In the course of the history of the United Nations, more than once have we heard denials of such involvements and behind-the-scenes activities by obscure forces specializing in this type of action, in co-operation with fugitive elements nostalgic for their past positions. Later, however, when the passions triggered by these actions abated, there came confessions and acknowledgements from authoritative people and institutions admitting their role and involvement in those actions. Should we wait again for a couple of years until someone publishes his memoirs or publicly speaks out on these issues? The concealment of such questions constitutes at present the pillar of the pretext for convening the Security Council, and their disclosure would help to demonstrate what the real situation is in Afghanistan. In this regard, I welcome the presence during the debate in the Council of Mr. Shah Mohammad Dost, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Democratic People's Republic of Afghanistan, and his highly revealing statement [*ibid.*] on the actual state of affairs in his country.

141. Yes, since the revolution of April 1978 there has been continuous foreign intervention in the domestic affairs of Afghanistan. The Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan has not so far been given the chance to dedicate itself solely to the peaceful development of the country. The defence of the new régime and the practical measures taken to this end have always stood in the forefront of the preoccupations of the leaders of that country. As is clear from recently published public sources, the Afghan leaders have asked several times for military aid from their neighbour, the Soviet Union, in order to repulse the assaults of external and internal enemies on the gains of the Afghan revolution—assaults aimed at the overthrow of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan.

142. We share the view expressed by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Afghanistan that the assistance



given by the Soviet Government in response to the numerous appeals of the Afghan leaders is in full conformity with the Charter of the United Nations and the Treaty<sup>1</sup> concluded between the two countries in December 1978. It is a matter which falls completely within the scope of the domestic affairs of Afghanistan and does not concern anyone but the two countries involved, that is, Afghanistan and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. In our view, this limited and temporary Soviet move undertaken at the specific request of the Afghan authorities does not in any way represent a threat either to other countries in the region or, least of all, to international peace and security.

143. Those who try to depict it in that way only seek to divert attention from the really burning questions pertaining to that region and from overt attempts to bring the countries and seas of the area under direct imperialist control. The major war buildup that had already been taking shape for weeks in the immediate vicinity of those countries has apparently found another excuse in the alleged Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. Those who are at present raising a hue and cry about Soviet assistance are simply trying to cover up their aggressive activities in that part of the world.

144. Incidentally, none other than the United States maintains 429 permanent military bases abroad and 3,000 supplementary military installations in 30 countries; and none other than the United States has undertaken since the Second World War 215 military actions and threatened or used actual force against other countries a total of 215 times.

145. I wish to assure the people and the Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan of the support and solidarity of the people and the Government of Hungary in their struggle for social progress and the advancement of their country and for the strengthening of a sovereign, democratic and non-aligned Afghanistan.

146. The matter which has been invoked as the reason for convening the Security Council is obviously one of bilateral relations between the Afghan and Soviet Governments, and, therefore, we believe that the Council should not deal with this problem. While we understand those Governments which closely follow the events and are not indifferent to what has been going on in Afghanistan recently, we cannot understand those among them which, voluntarily or not, contribute to the campaign of hysteria launched in the non-official and official circles of certain countries. We wish to state very firmly that the creation of such an atmosphere is not at all conducive to a rational assessment of the situation and does not contribute to helping to understand all its elements. Those voices, which are reminiscent of the infamous era of the cold war, threaten to undo all the positive achievements of recent times.

147. It is incumbent upon all the States Members of the United Nations, and particularly those that are members of the Security Council, immediately to halt this perilous trend and the malicious propaganda and address a stern warning to those who want to use the Organization again in their selfish political interests as they did during the cold-war years. Let us hope that the international community will be in a position to achieve its genuine major tasks and to act accordingly, instead of letting itself be dragged into a futile exercise of accusations and tendentious statements, thereby considerably worsening the chances of a peaceful future for all of us.

*The meeting rose at 1.45 p.m.*

---

#### NOTES

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

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

---

### كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

يمكن الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة من المكتبات و دور التوزيع في جميع أنحاء العالم . استلم منها من المكتبة التي تتصل بها أو اكتب الى : الأمم المتحدة ، قسم البيع في نيويورك أو في جنيف .

#### 如何获取联合国出版物

联合国出版物在全世界各地的书店和经销处均有发售。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.

---