



Security Council

UN LIRDA DV

MAY 1 1989

UN/SA COLLECTION

PROVISIONAL

S/PV.2859

26 April 1989

ENGLISH

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO THOUSAND EIGHT HUNDRED AND FIFTY-NINTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Wednesday, 26 April 1989, at 10.30 a.m.

President: Mr. BELONOGOV

(Union of Soviet Socialist
Republics)

Members: Algeria
Brazil
Canada
China
Colombia
Ethiopia
Finland
France
Malaysia
Nepal
Senegal
United Kingdom of Great Britain and
Northern Ireland
United States of America
Yugoslavia

Mr. DJOUDI
Mr. ALENCAR
Mr. FORTIER
Mr. YU Mengjia
Mr. PEÑALOSA
Mr. TADESSE
Mr. TORNUDD
Mr. BLANC
Mr. HASMY
Mr. RANA
Mrs. DIALLO

Mr. BIRCH
Mr. OKUN
Mr. PEJIC

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the Official Records of the Security Council.

Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, within one week, to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

The meeting was called to order at 10.55 a.m.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was adopted.

THE SITUATION RELATING TO AFGHANISTAN

LETTER DATED 3 APRIL 1989 FROM THE CHARGE D'AFFAIRES OF THE PERMANENT MISSION OF AFGHANISTAN TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL (S/20561)

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): In accordance with decisions taken at the previous meetings on this item, I invite the representative of Afghanistan and the representative of Pakistan to take places at the Council table; I invite the representatives of Angola, Bangladesh, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, the Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, India, Iraq, Japan, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Madagascar, Mongolia, Nicaragua, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, the Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the United Republic of Tanzania and Viet Nam to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Roshan-Rawaan (Afghanistan) and Mr. Shah Nawaz (Pakistan) took places at the Council table; Mr. Diakenga Seroo (Angola), Mr. Mohiuddin (Bangladesh), Mr. Stresov (Bulgaria), Mr. Dah (Burkina Faso), Mr. Moumin (Comoros), Mr. Adouki (Congo), Mr. Oramas Oliva (Cuba), Mr. Zapotocky (Czechoslovakia), Mr. Al-Ashtal (Democratic Yemen), Mr. Zachmann (German Democratic Republic), Mr. Esztergalyos (Hungary), Mr. Gharekhan (India), Mr. Sumaida (Iraq), Mr. Kagami (Japan), Mr. Kittikhoun (Lao People's Democratic Republic), Mr. Rabetafika (Madagascar), Mr. Dugersuren (Mongolia), Mr. Serrano Caldera (Nicaragua), Mr. Gorajewski (Poland), Mr. Shihabi (Saudi Arabia), Mr. Osman (Somalia), Mr. Al-Masri (Syrian Arab Republic), Mr. Aksin (Turkey), Mr. Oudovenko (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic), Mr. Chagula (United

Republic of Tanzania), and Mr. Nguyen Duc Hung (Viet Nam) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): I should like to inform the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity 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 accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Treiki (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) and Mr. Maksimov (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

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

The first speaker is the representative of Burkina Faso. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. DAH (Burkina Faso) (interpretation from French): I should like on behalf of the Burkina Faso delegation to extend warm congratulations to the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on his country's assumption of the presidency. My delegation is pleased to see the Council being presided over by such an outstanding diplomat as you, Sir. We are convinced that you will be able successfully to conduct the proceedings of the Council for the month of April.

(Mr. Dah, Burkina Faso)

I also take this opportunity to congratulate our sister Mrs. Abda Claude Diallo, the Ambassador of Senegal, on the competent manner in which she conducted the work of the Council last month.

My delegation has listened with great interest to the statements made before the Council by previous speakers. My delegation has questions that it considers it its militant duty to raise for the cause of peace. It believes it should take an active part in this debate and make its modest contribution to this exchange of ideas.

We are all the more touched by the tragedy taking place in Afghanistan since that country, like ours, belongs to the Non-Aligned Movement. Certainly it is important to know whether the events occurring in Afghanistan involve questions that are exclusively internal matters relating to the Afghan people. Certainly it is appropriate to ask whether the existing Government still retains or has lost the confidence of the Afghan people. But is not the crux of the issue elsewhere? Is not the basic issue the reconciliation of that country's children? Is not the most important thing the cessation of the provision of military matériel? My delegation believes that it is thanks to the arsenal that exists to the ill-concealed delight of the gun merchants that the civil war, on the one hand, and the external aggression, on the other, are continuing and being stepped up day by day - to such an extent that they threaten peace and stability in Asia.

For more than 10 years international public opinion was polarized with regard to the situation of Afghanistan, which was due to the presence of Soviet troops. There can be no doubt that that foreign occupation of the past violated the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the country.

(Mr. Dah, Burkina Faso)

To fight against that foreign presence, resistance forces were organized, and they benefited from an outpouring of international solidarity. Resolutions adopted in the United Nations since 1979 testify to that. And yet the suffering of that heroic people did not come to an end.

(Mr. Dah, Burkina Faso)

It took two statesmen of exceptional political stature, President Reagan of the United States and President Gorbachev of the Soviet Union, to show goodwill and wisdom in relations between their countries, enabling détente to prevail and regional tension to subside.

Burkina Faso welcomed with great hope the 14 April 1988 signing of the Geneva Agreements as the basis for a final settlement of the conflict in Afghanistan. As a party to and guarantor of those Agreements, the Soviet Union set an example by keeping its promise to withdraw its forces from Afghanistan. The completion of that withdrawal early this year confirmed the Soviet Union's good intentions and was an important step towards peace.

If it were only a question of the Soviet military presence in Afghanistan, the sound of weapons would have ceased and the situation would have become normal once more, for no Soviet soldier remains in that country. Two months have already passed since the withdrawal of the foreign troops, but unfortunately dialogue gives way to intense and increasingly deadly armed confrontation.

The situation on the ground can be summed up in a few words borrowed from a celebrated literary figure:

"It is most surprising that I have not yet abandoned all hope, for hope seems absurd and unattainable. Yet I cling to it regardless. ... It is absolutely impossible for me to build everything on foundations of death, misery and confusion".

Peace is essential to rally the energy to fight our developing countries' common enemy: poverty. Peace is also a prerequisite for a people to exercise democracy: to achieve the institutions of its choice. My delegation feels this is not the time to anathematize one or other of the factions bitterly vying for power, as though they were not integral parts of the Afghan people.

(Mr. Dah, Burkina Faso)

The role of the international community, the cornerstone of the Geneva conference that led to the conclusion of the April 1988 Agreements, must continue without flagging. In that connection, Burkina Faso, like all other Members of the United Nations, must support and encourage the tireless efforts of the Secretary-General and his colleagues to achieve proper implementation of the Geneva Agreements. For that purpose, and as is customary, all the parties concerned must demonstrate political good will and comply in good faith with all provisions of the Agreements, which, as we know, establish appropriate machinery and procedures to settle disputes.

Burkina Faso believes that the heart of the problem lies in the proper implementation of the Geneva Agreements: a purely military solution has not worked, and will not work now or in the future. We consider that an effective solution involves, along with on-site action by the United Nations, a halt to all supply of weapons to all parties. Perhaps the war would end for lack of ammunition. Clearly, the Afghan people - the silent majority - is tired of war.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): I thank the representative of Burkina Faso for the kind words he addressed to me.

Mr. DJOUDI (Algeria) (interpretation from French): It is a great pleasure, Sir, for the Algerian delegation to see you presiding over the work of the Security Council this month. You represent a great country with which Algeria enjoys close relations of friendship and co-operation. We are convinced too that your great experience, ability and know-how will enable you to discharge your particularly difficult duties.

I am pleased also to congratulate your predecessor, Mrs. Absa Claude Diallo, Permanent Representative of Senegal, to whom we are indebted for the outstanding sensitivity and great effectiveness of her presidency, which did honour to all of Africa.

(Mr. Djoudi, Algeria)

I wish also to take this opportunity to convey a welcome to Ambassador Pickering of the United States. We are sure his reputation as an experienced diplomat will prove a valuable contribution to the work of the Security Council.

The Afghan conflict is among the crises that have been of great concern to the international community. It has been widely felt that the improvement of the international situation we all wish to see would benefit greatly from a peaceful and final settlement of that conflict. In fact, it was the prospect of a negotiated solution, like that reached for other conflicts, that enabled us last year to predict optimistically a new era in international relations, thanks especially - and it would be unjust not to repeat this - to the tireless efforts of the Secretary-General.

Unfortunately, today, a year after the conclusion of the Geneva Agreements, which provided for machinery to settle the conflict and related problems, the war continues. We cannot assume there will be a peaceful settlement in the foreseeable future. Yet one major aspect - decisive for the implementation of the Agreements - has been carried out: the withdrawal of Soviet troops. The Soviet Union withdrew all its troops by the date on which it had agreed to do so. That was as expected, and the international community warmly welcomed the withdrawal. But the international community remains concerned at the continuation, two months later, of bloody, devastating battles, even though 10 years of war showed tragically that no military solution was possible.

The Afghanistan conflict threatens regional peace and security, but its persistence may also spoil the ongoing process of peaceful settlement of crises, a process the international community has called for and encouraged, inter alia, through renewed confidence in and support for the United Nations.

(Mr. Djoudi, Algeria)

It remains true that none of the parties can win a military victory. A negotiated solution alone remains fully valid and timely; all the parties must work without delay towards such a solution. To that end the Geneva Agreements, strengthened by the consensus adoption of General Assembly resolution 43/20, are the appropriate framework for assuring a settlement of the conflict in its national and international aspects.

The only possible position on the Afghan conflict is in favour of peace, which Algeria wishes to see established for the benefit of the entire brotherly Afghan people, which has endured long years of suffering. A negotiated solution including formation of a broad-based government would meet the aspirations of the Afghan people, which desire national reconciliation. It should make possible the return of refugees. It should guarantee a sovereign and non-aligned Afghanistan assured of territorial integrity and protected from foreign interference and intervention. A hard, lengthy and costly task lies before Afghanistan in rebuilding its economy and pursuing its development.

(Mr. Djoudi, Algeria)

Here, the international community must encourage such a solution by all possible means and hasten the advent of a negotiated peace. In that context the United Nations itself has a role that must be supported, particularly through a strengthening of the ways and means to enable the United Nations Good Offices Mission in Afghanistan and Pakistan (UNGOMAP) to carry out its mission. In particular, the Secretary-General must be able to count on the support of all in his efforts to reach a comprehensive political settlement. It is that support that the ongoing discussions in the Council must demonstrate today.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): I thank the representative of Algeria for his kind words addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Hungary. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. ESZTERGALYOS (Hungary): Allow me at the outset to express to you, Sir, our congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month. It gives us special pleasure to see you, a representative of a fraternal socialist country, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, presiding over our deliberations. We are confident that with your well-known diplomatic abilities and skill you will conduct the business of the Council successfully. I would also like to congratulate your predecessor, Her Excellency Ambassador Absa Claude Diallo, Permanent Representative of Senegal, for the excellent manner in which she performed her duties during last month.

When the Agreements on the Settlement of the Situation relating to Afghanistan were signed a year ago - on 14 April 1988 - the whole world sighed with relief. There was the expectation that through scrupulous adherence to the provisions of those Agreements by all the parties concerned the Afghan people would also be able to enjoy peace.

(Mr. Esztergalyos, Hungary)

If we look back on the events of the past year in the context of the Agreements, we can note that the provision contained in paragraph 5 of the Agreement on Interrelationships for the Settlement of the Situation relating to Afghanistan - namely, the withdrawal of foreign troops within the specified time-frame - has been fulfilled. Although this was an important part of the Agreements, it must be clear to all of us that there is a careful balance between all the other provisions in the Agreements, and only the scrupulous adherence to them by all the parties will result in the restoration of peaceful conditions in and around Afghanistan.

The Government of the Republic of Afghanistan has made every effort to keep its side of the bargain. There have been repeated offers aimed at national reconciliation and renewed offers to achieve, at the least, a cease-fire. Unfortunately, those offers, although made with the best of intentions, have been rejected.

The overt and covert interference in the internal affairs of the Republic of Afghanistan is continuing and even increasing. The likelihood of wider hostilities poses a danger to peace and security in the region. The Security Council must therefore act to stop that untenable situation.

The preservation of the sovereignty, territorial integrity, political independence and non-aligned character of Afghanistan is essential for a peaceful solution of the problem. Therefore, scrupulous respect for and faithful implementation of the Geneva Agreements by all parties is an absolute necessity.

We hope that a call to that effect by the Security Council will defuse the present dangerous situation and create conditions in which the Afghan people will be able to live peacefully without any outside intervention and interference.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): I thank the representative of Hungary for the kind words he addressed to my country, the Soviet Union, and to me personally.

The next speaker is the representative of Somalia. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. OSMAN (Somalia): Allow me at the outset to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of April. We wish you every success in the fulfilment of your responsibilities and feel confident that the Council will be able to conduct its business effectively under your able guidance.

Let me also take this opportunity to express the profound appreciation of my delegation for the exemplary manner in which Ambassador Absa Claude Diallo of Senegal guided the deliberations of the Security Council last month.

Since this is the first time I have addressed the Security Council this year, I would like to convey my delegation's warm congratulations to the new members who have taken their seats on the Council and to wish them every success in carrying out the important responsibilities they have assumed.

This series of meetings of the Security Council coincides with the first anniversary of the signing of the historic Geneva accords on Afghanistan. Following the conclusion of those accords we had all hoped that a climate of peace and stability would prevail in that country. In fact, at this crucial phase of its history Afghanistan needs peace more than ever. For almost 10 years the tragic loss of human life and suffering has been a matter of serious concern to the international community. The large scale of the human tragedy has created a refugee situation of major catastrophic proportions owing to the flight of thousands of Afghans from tyranny and war. The international community has also

(Mr. Osman, Somalia)

been deeply concerned by the destabilizing effects of that grave situation on regional and international peace and security.

All those aspects of the Afghan situation have repeatedly been addressed by the United Nations. The intensive pressure of the international community has been reflected time and again by the numerous resolutions adopted by the General Assembly, the Non-Aligned Movement, the Organization of the Islamic Conference and other international organizations.

(Mr. Osman, Somalia)

Somalia has always been a firm and consistent supporter of the legitimate cause of the Afghan people for freedom, justice and human dignity.

The Geneva accords, to which I have referred earlier, mark the culmination of the persistent efforts of the United Nations to eliminate tension and conflict in Afghanistan and restore the much needed peace for the people of that country. The accords were the outcome of intensive and arduous negotiations, for which the parties concerned and the Secretary-General are to be warmly congratulated.

With the conclusion of these accords and the completion of the Soviet troop withdrawal, the external aspects of the Afghan situation have, in our opinion, been successfully addressed. Accordingly, my delegation believes that the current situation in Afghanistan does not involve foreign intervention, nor does it relate to a dispute between Afghanistan and Pakistan or, for that matter, any other country. In essence, it is a purely internal situation in which the Afghan people are engaged in a historic process in the search for a political settlement and the establishment of a widely representative government reflecting the true wishes and aspirations of the Afghan people. The continuing struggle of the Afghan people for the restoration of their national and human rights is essentially an internal matter which does not, in our opinion, come within the ambit of Articles 34 and 35 (1) of the United Nations Charter. My delegation shares the view expressed by a number of preceding delegations that no useful purpose will be served by this debate in the Council on what is essentially a "domestic matter".

On numerous occasions since the coming into force of the Geneva accords we have heard allegations by Afghanistan that Pakistan has been violating the provisions of the accords. The delegation of Afghanistan, in its extensive statement before the Council, repeated those charges. We have also heard the detailed statement by the representative of Pakistan, who categorically rejected

(Mr. Osman, Somalia)

the validity of these accusations. It should also be noted that such allegations have even been brought to the attention of the United Nations Good Offices Mission in Afghanistan and Pakistan (UNGOMAP). We are given to understand, however, that none of the allegations has been substantiated by UNGOMAP findings.

No training camps, bases or ammunition were found in any of the places cited in the complaint. In fact, most of these places were identified as refugee camps where old men, women and children were living. The United Nations agencies dealing with the refugees in Pakistan have repeatedly found no evidence that Pakistan has prevented any refugee from returning home.

The tragic continuation of the conflict in Afghanistan is a consequence of the continuing denial to the people of Afghanistan of their right to self-determination. With the total withdrawal of interventionist forces from Afghanistan, the time has now come for the Afghan people to resolve their own problems through the process of dialogue and national reconciliation. We believe that peace and stability can be restored to Afghanistan only with the establishment of a broad-based government acceptable to the Afghan people as a whole. The establishment of such a government, which is the exclusive prerogative of the Afghans themselves, was acknowledged in the Geneva Agreements and the United Nations General Assembly consensus resolution 43/20 of 3 November 1988, which, inter alia, mandated the Secretary-General to facilitate the establishment of such a broad-based government. The resolution reaffirmed:

"... the right of the Afghan people to determine their own form of government and to choose their economic, political and social system free from outside intervention, subversion, coercion or constraint of any kind ..." (General Assembly resolution 43/20, para. 6)

(Mr. Osman, Somalia)

The international community has a duty at this crucial stage in Afghan history to exert all possible efforts to heal the grievous wounds inflicted on Afghanistan. The Afghan people, who for nearly 10 years have borne incalculable sufferings, cannot afford to have more violence, bloodshed and destruction. The situation in Afghanistan can be resolved only when a comprehensive political settlement, in accordance with the wishes of the Afghan nation, has been achieved and a broad-based government fully representative of the Afghan people has been established in their country. The efforts of the international community, and particularly the parties to the Geneva accords, should be directed to the attainment of this paramount objective, so that a conducive climate is established for the people of this great country to devote their resources and energies towards national reconstruction, social progress and economic development.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): I thank the representative of Somalia for his kind words addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Poland. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. GORAJEWSKI (Poland): Allow me first of all to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of April. It is gratifying to see as President of the Security Council the representative of the Soviet Union, a neighbouring socialist country with which Poland shares common values and enjoys the most fruitful co-operation. I am sure that your outstanding experience and high professional and human qualifications constitute valuable assets which will help the Council in dealing with the complex matters on its agenda in the month of April.

At the same time, I should like to express my appreciation for the exemplary manner in which your predecessor, Ambassador Absa Diallo of Senegal, conducted the Council's work during the month of March.

(Mr. Gorajewski, Poland)

On 14 April one year had passed since the signature of the Geneva Agreements on Afghanistan. The signature of the Agreements on the Settlement of the Situation relating to Afghanistan was a momentuous development as it opened prospects for the peaceful solution of the protracted Afghan conflict. The Geneva Agreements constituted a balanced set of commitments which took into account the interests of the Afghans themselves and those of the other parties involved in the conflict. Under those Agreements all the provisions were to be implemented in an integrated manner. Specifically the settlement included, under paragraph 7 of the Agreement on the Interrelationships for the Settlement of the Situation relating to Afghanistan and the Memorandum of Understanding annexed to that Agreement, specific arrangements to ensure the faithful and complete implementation of all its provisions.

The world-wide implications of the Agreements were immediately recognized by the international community. The President of the forty-third session of the General Assembly captured the general mood when he said on 3 November 1988 that

"they confirm and inspire an encouraging trend toward seeking negotiated solutions to international disputes. In that connection, the Agreements of 14 April 1988 initiated a positive process which now embraces other important regional disputes and which has significantly altered and improved an overall situation in which discord and conflict had traditionally predominated".

(A/43/PV.45, pp. 2 and 3)

The Soviet Union has withdrawn its forces from Afghanistan in accordance with the timeframe provided for in the Geneva Agreements - as has been confirmed by the United Nations Good Offices Mission in Afghanistan and Pakistan (UNGOMAP) in paragraph 22 of document S/20465 - thus completing the implementation of one of the important aspects of the Geneva Agreements. This has not been the case so far as

(Mr. Gorajewski, Poland)

other obligations under those Agreements are concerned. As UNGOMAP notes in paragraph 24 of the report to which I have just referred,

"During the initial period of its operation, UNGOMAP encountered a number of difficulties in connection with the arrangements for monitoring the implementation of the non-interference and non-intervention obligations set out in the first instrument of the Geneva Accords". (S/20465, para. 24)

Unfortunately, that regrettable situation continues, and indeed is being exacerbated, which led the Government of Afghanistan to put before the Security Council the question of non-compliance by some parties to those Agreements with the non-interference and non-intervention obligations.

We consider this request entirely legitimate in terms of Security Council resolution 622 (1988), by which the Council confirmed its agreement to the temporary dispatch to Afghanistan and Pakistan of military officers to assist in its mission of good offices and requested to be informed of further developments in accordance with the Geneva Agreements.

We are concerned at the deterioration of the situation in Afghanistan and especially at the lack of an intra-Afghan dialogue for the establishment of a broad-based government, as called for by General Assembly resolution 43/20, and at the continuation of foreign interference in Afghan affairs, since these factors threaten to undermine the Geneva Agreements and can influence in a negative way the political processes in other parts of the world.

We are convinced that peace in Afghanistan can be achieved only through scrupulous compliance with the Geneva Agreements and initiation of an intra-Afghan dialogue with a view to the creation of a broad-based government which enjoys the support of the Afghan people and in which all segments of that people participate.

We appreciate the policy of national reconciliation promoted by the Government of the Republic of Afghanistan and its efforts to establish Afghanistan's permanent

(Mr. Gorajewski, Poland)

neutrality and demilitarization through the convening of an international conference.

The present disturbing situation in Afghanistan requires that full use be made of the control mechanism provided for in the Geneva Agreements. Of practical importance would be deployment of UNGOMAP personnel in areas adjacent to the Afghanistan-Pakistan frontier. That measure could play an important role in the reduction of tension and in the implementation of the Geneva Agreements.

We take note of the consent by Pakistan to the opening of three observer posts on the Pakistan-Afghanistan border.

As a country contributing military observers to UNGOMAP we commend the Secretary-General of the United Nations for his efforts aimed at the implementation of the Geneva Agreements fully and in an integrated manner. We welcome also his assurance, reiterated in his statement of 14 April 1989, that he will continue to provide all assistance required by the Afghan people for the early realization of a comprehensive, political solution in Afghanistan, as called for by General Assembly resolution 43/20.

We support, Mr. President, the proposals of your country on a cease-fire among the opposing Afghan groups and on the simultaneous cessation of arms supplies to all belligerents.

In view of the escalation in recent months, it is urgent that vigorous measures be adopted to end the conflict.

Of special importance is the proposal for the convening of an international conference on the neutrality and demilitarization of Afghanistan. We support the convening of such a conference, whose successful conclusion would contribute to stability in the region and to international peace and security.

(Mr. Gorajewski, Poland)

In conclusion, we express the hope that the Security Council, aware of its overall responsibility for international peace and security and in view of the specific responsibilities it has assumed by virtue of its resolution 622 (1988), will take the decisions that would uphold the Geneva Agreements and contribute to the early realization of a comprehensive, political solution in Afghanistan.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): I thank the representative of Poland for his kind words addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Saudi Arabia. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. SHIHABI (Saudi Arabia) (interpretation from Arabic): It had been my hope that I would not have to take up the time of the Council unduly in answering the statement made the day before yesterday by the Chairman of the delegation of the Kabul régime. In that statement he referred to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and to the sympathy that the Saudi Arabian people have for the Afghan rights that have been forfeited by the Kabul régime in which and did not hesitate to dwell upon religious questions in which he is not versed and with which the Muslim Afghan people are very familiar.

I do not need to reiterate how strong is the Islamic brotherly bond between the Saudi people and the Afghan people. Every Afghan in Afghanistan is aware of this; every Afghan who has visited the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia has felt it and has experienced it.

(Mr. Shihabi, Saudi Arabia)

It is absurd to add to this tie the elements of weaponry and explosives. It is even more absurd to explain these feelings as arising from anything other than generosity, love for sound support and concern for the stability of the country of Afghanistan and its people. That has been our approach towards Afghanistan and towards every Islamic country, as well as towards every friendly country, since the Kingdom was established by its founder, King Abdul Aziz, and until the trust was undertaken by the Custodian of the Two Holy Mosques, King Fahd bin Abdul Aziz, who gave the Kingdom the capabilities for a strong drive and an unflinching commitment on the path of the true Islamic spirit, locally, regionally and internationally, which all members know, and which only an individual who does not any better would deny.

I say this in the hope that the representatives of the Kabul régime sitting among us, looking for newspaper articles and narratives to which the imaginings of people having certain designs have accumulatively been added, will tell us who brought to Afghanistan the catastrophes that have taken place during the last nine years and which still continue. Who brought in the foreign occupation? Would it have been possible for an irregular force supported from the outside, as they claim, however it may be, to force the withdrawal of the regular foreign armies that we have witnessed?

The régime in Kabul is, as we all know, the one that brought to the country of Afghanistan and its people the catastrophe whose effects the world is at present trying to alleviate - brought it to a country that was living peacefully in tranquillity and prosperity. A free people like the Afghan people would never in its history have accepted what the present ruling circle in Kabul wants for it. The Afghan know themselves. No political theorizing can change the sense of pride, the dignity or the high spirits of the Afghani people so as to make them lose their independence. That fact defies all that the representatives of the régime in

(Mr. Shihabi, Saudi Arabia)

Kabul mentioned in their statement the day before yesterday concerning the Kingdom and other countries.

Levelling accusations at other States and peoples that have not and never would have any objective except the security and independence of Afghanistan can do nothing to change the real status of the régime in Kabul today. It is the status of the accused party responsible for the great catastrophe that has befallen the country.

In my statement last week I said that the Islamic people had pronounced themselves recently at the Islamic Foreign Ministers' Conference, which nullified any international qualification of the régime in Kabul that might still linger. Representing the Islamic nation of which the Afghani people is a part, it recognized the interim Afghani Government. The régime in Kabul has no legitimate standing - there or here.

As for Islam, it is innocent of what they say, or what they claim. The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and its leadership know very well how to accomplish their Islamic duties - something the régime in Kabul is ignorant about, both in religious matters and in worldly matters.

Finally, we earnestly hope that peace will prevail in Afghanistan in the very near future.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): The next speaker is the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. TREIKI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (interpretation from Arabic): At the outset I should like on behalf of my delegation to say how happy we are to see a representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, a country with which mine enjoys close relations of friendship and co-operation, presiding over the

(Mr. Treiki, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

Security Council. Mr. President, your personal skill and experience, as well as your comprehensive knowledge of international relations, convince us that the Council's deliberations this month will be crowned with success.

My delegation could not fail to express its appreciation and thanks to Mrs. Absa Claude Diallo, representative of Senegal, for the skill with which presided over the Security Council last month.

I wish also, through you, Mr. President, to thank the members of the Security Council for allowing us to address the Council on the item now under discussion.

My country has most attentively followed the different stages of the Afghan problem. Like other countries of the world, we expressed satisfaction at the signing of the Geneva accords on 14 April 1988 by Pakistan, Afghanistan and the two guarantors, under the auspices of the Secretary-General. The Agreements met with the satisfaction of the entire international community. We had hoped that those accords would mean an end to the suffering and plight of the fraternal people of Afghanistan. We continue to hope that those accords will be implemented in letter and in spirit, as a sure guarantee of the solution of the Afghan problem.

The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, which has close ties of friendship, co-operation and brotherhood with both Afghanistan and Pakistan, sincerely hopes that their differences will be peacefully resolved in accordance with the Geneva accords on the Afghan problem. We hope that neutrality and stability will be guaranteed for the Afghan people and that their internecine struggle will come to an end.

(Mr. Treiki, Libyan Arab
Jamahiriya)

The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya reaffirms the validity of General Assembly resolution 43/20, adopted by consensus on 3 November 1988, which calls for full respect for the Geneva Agreements. The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya pays a tribute to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics for its full commitment to the provisions of the Agreements and for the total withdrawal of its forces from Afghanistan in conformity with the agreed timetable. My country supports the independence, Islamic character, neutrality and non-aligned status of Afghanistan. We support a solution of the Afghan problem by peaceful means, the non-use or threat of use of force in attempts to solve that problem, on the basis of the Charter of the United Nations.

It is time for the blood-letting in Afghanistan to end. It is time for Afghans to agree on the future of their country, on the basis of respect for the Geneva Agreements and the relevant provisions of the Charter of the United Nations.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): I thank the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya for the kind words he addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. MAKSIMOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): Let me begin by congratulating you, Sir, on your assumption of the high post of President of the Security Council. We are confident that under your skilled and experienced leadership the Council will deal successfully with the tasks before it.

We should like also to thank the Permanent Representative of Senegal to the United Nations, Her Excellency Mrs. Absa Claude Diallo, for her skilled guidance of the Security Council as President in March.

(Mr. Maksimov, Byelorussian SSR)

More than 40 speakers have already taken part in the debate on the item before the Security Council. That alone attests to the great concern of United Nations Member States about the question of an Afghan settlement, and refutes the assertion of certain representatives who have tried to cast doubt on the usefulness of the Security Council's discussion of the appeal by the Government of the Republic of Afghanistan concerning the threat to Afghanistan's territorial integrity, independence and national sovereignty.

First and foremost, we cannot forget that military action in Afghanistan constitutes the largest existing military conflict. We are speaking of external interference posing a threat to Afghanistan's sovereignty and independence, and peace and stability in south-western Asia.

We cannot agree with the assertion that the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan eliminated all foreign-policy aspects of the problem, and that everything now taking place in Afghanistan is merely the internal affair of the Afghan people. Such assertions deliberately distort the situation and ignore the basic reason for the bloody events in the country, which is unquestionably crude external interference in the internal affairs of Afghanistan.

A year ago, when the Geneva Agreements on Afghanistan were signed, there was hope that this critical hotbed of tension - which poisons not only the regional, but also the international atmosphere - could be quenched. But a year after agreement in Geneva on a process for political settlement, the flames of war continue to burn in Afghanistan. The great peace-making potential of the Geneva Agreements can be used to the full only with strict and scrupulous implementation of their spirit and letter by all parties, without any exceptions whatsoever.

(Mr. Maksimov, Byelorussian SSR)

While the Soviet Union and the Republic of Afghanistan are unswervingly implementing their commitments, Pakistan is flagrantly trampling upon the provisions of the Geneva Agreements. The actions of the United States with respect to its obligations as a guarantor are by no means above reproach.

At the basis of the Geneva Agreements was a balance taking account of the interests of the Afghans themselves and of the parties involved in the conflict. Only scrupulous implementation of their commitments by all the parties can ensure realizing the objectives set out in the Agreements. The primary reason the Afghan situation continues to be a source of alarm and concern is that the Agreements have yet to be implemented in full.

The Soviet and Afghan sides agreed on the withdrawal of Soviet troops in the belief that external interference in Afghan affairs, carried out primarily from Pakistani territory, would come to a total end in accordance with the Geneva Agreements, and that there would thus be no further need for a Soviet military presence to counteract such interference.

Now, after the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan, it is obvious that the reasons for the bloodshed were and continue to be unceasing interference in Afghanistan's internal affairs, which has sharply increased since the withdrawal of Soviet troops.

Many facts concerning the scale of interference in Afghan affairs were set out, inter alia, in the letter of the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Afghanistan, Mr. Wakil, and in the Minister's statements to the Security Council on 11 and 24 April, as well as in statements by the representatives of a number of other countries. The Security Council has before it document S/20585, which contains an impressive list of cases of aggression and interference in the internal affairs of the Republic of Afghanistan carried out by Pakistan. That document

(Mr. Maksimov, Byelorussian SSR)

cites the locations of 162 military training centres of armed opposition forces. But under the Geneva accords, when Soviet troops left their military bases, the opposition's military training centres and supply bases in Pakistan would be dismantled.

Opposition headquarters, camps and training centres for fighters and terrorists and staging points continue to operate in Pakistani territory. There is not merely a flow, but an open transfer of weapons, ammunition and armed forces from Pakistan into Afghanistan. Moreover, Pakistani troops play an active part in military operations on the side of the Afghan opposition. A particularly active direct Pakistani military presence may be seen in the area of Jalalabad, whose capture the Afghan opposition links to far-ranging plans for installing its "transitional government", which does not represent all the opposition forces, let alone the majority of the Afghan people.

(Mr. Maksimov, Byelorussian SSR)

The representative of Pakistan and some of his protectors try to deny the facts that attest to their interference in the internal affairs of Afghanistan. Facts, however, are stubborn things, and they cannot be refuted by verbal acrobatics. In this connection we would once again refer to Henry Kamm's article in The New York Times of 23 April 1989 - as several previous speakers have already done - which states, inter alia, that the principal decisions in the war being waged by the rebels against the Government of Afghanistan are being made by Pakistan, in the absence of the Afghans but with the Americans. The article states that the rebels are under the control of the Government in Islamabad. In other words, the Pakistan Government is directly violating the Geneva Agreements and encouraging and guiding rebel military actions inside Afghanistan. I should like once again to draw attention to the fact that the article in The New York Times was written by a respected American newspaperman.

At a time when the situation in Afghanistan is continuing to give rise to serious concern, the United Nations has a special responsibility to keep the military action in Afghanistan from growing into a chronic regional conflict fraught with unforeseeable consequences.

We believe that the United Nations must give practical assistance in organizing regular meetings between representatives of Afghanistan and Pakistan, as provided in the Agreements signed at Geneva. At the same time, we should like to draw serious attention to the need to enhance the effectiveness and efficiency of the United Nations Good Offices Mission in Afghanistan and Pakistan (UNGOMAP) and the establishment of continuous control points along the Afghan-Pakistani border for that purpose. UNGOMAP's activity has so far been substantively limited by the Pakistani side. When UNGOMAP was established it was assumed that the Geneva Agreements would be implemented unswervingly by all parties. However, since those

(Mr. Maksimov, Byelorussian SSR)

Agreements are being flagrantly violated by Pakistan, we may rightfully ask whether UNGOMAP, in its present form, is able to cope with the responsible duties entrusted to it. The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR believes that UNGOMAP must expand and step up its activities. In that connection, we are fully in agreement with the views that have been expressed in the present debate with regard to the need to expand the numbers of UNGOMAP.

Here, a significant role falls to the United Nations Secretary-General, under whose aegis the Geneva Agreements were concluded. We therefore support the appeal to the Secretary-General to adopt the most urgent and effective measures to put an end to foreign intervention in Afghanistan and, in so doing, to implement the Geneva Agreements in full.

In this connection it is appropriate to recall that General Assembly resolution 43/20, which was adopted by consensus,

"Calls for the scrupulous respect for and faithful implementation of the Geneva Agreements by all parties concerned who should fully abide by their letter and spirit". (para. 3)

The General Assembly also expressed itself in favour of the establishment of a broad-based coalition government in Afghanistan.

One important step towards achieving that objective would be a cease-fire between the groups in conflict in Afghanistan, and this has already been mentioned in many of the statements we have heard here in the Security Council. The Byelorussian SSR supports the proposal for holding an international conference on the neutrality and demilitarization of Afghanistan, and we share the views expressed here that a first step to the convening of such a conference could be a meeting of experts or a working group for an exchange of views on an Afghan settlement. Participants in such meetings could be representatives of the major

(Mr. Maksimov, Byelorussian SSR)

Afghan forces, Afghanistan's immediate neighbours and the guarantors of the Geneva Agreements.

The Byelorussian SSR has consistently supported the achievement of an intra-Afghan settlement through political negotiations. It firmly condemns the actions of Pakistan and the Alliance of Seven linked to it, which are aimed at exacerbating the armed conflict in Afghanistan, and we demand their immediate cessation. We believe that the international community must take steps to secure the sovereignty and independence of Afghanistan from external encroachments.

The Security Council cannot stand idly by when the sovereignty and independence of Afghanistan and the peace and stability of south-western Asia are at stake. The Council must promote an end to foreign interference and bloodshed in Afghanistan. Specific proposals to that end have been made here and can be found in the statements of the delegations of Afghanistan, the Soviet Union and a number of other countries. We hope that the Security Council will take effective measures to stop the bloodshed in Afghanistan and to end interference in that country's internal affairs. In so doing, it will make a concrete contribution to fulfilling its major task, namely, the maintenance of international peace and security.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): I thank the representative of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic for the kind words he addressed to me.

Mr. OKUN (United States of America): The United States had not intended to speak again in this debate. We believe the debate itself was unnecessary to begin with and that it has been needlessly prolonged. We do not see how this debate has furthered either the cause of peace or self-determination for the Afghan people, both of which goals are widely supported here and closely intertwined.

In all the heated rhetoric over the tragic situation in Afghanistan, one central point has been continually overlooked and obscured by the defenders of the

(Mr. Okun, United States)

illegal régime in Kabul. The Geneva accords do not mandate external and artificial support to save the Kabul régime. That cannot be done, because the régime does not have the support of the Afghan people. Rather, the Geneva accords provide that it is the people of Afghanistan who will decide their own political future.

Has any participant in this debate denied that the Afghan people themselves have the indisputable right to self-determination? I do not believe so. This is a right enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations.

The tragedy of Afghanistan stems from the fact that the people of Afghanistan have been denied that right under nine long, cruel years of foreign military occupation. They are still denied that right today by a régime which is desperately clinging to power by force of arms - through extensive and ongoing imports of foreign arms - against the will of the vast majority of its own people. As others here have correctly pointed out, the exodus of over five million Afghans since the beginning of the Soviet occupation shows how the people of Afghanistan view the régime imposed upon them. Denied the right to vote in free and fair elections for a representative government, the people of Afghanistan have voted with their feet.

The aim of those who called for this debate appears to be an effort to persuade the Afghan people that the international community somehow hopes that they will acknowledge the leadership of Najibullah. It is ridiculous to expect the Afghan people to accept as their freely chosen leader a former secret-police chief who was installed by a foreign Power. It is out of touch with reality to ask the world to accord legitimacy to a régime which was created by, and maintains its existence solely because of, a foreign Power. The overwhelming force of foreign intervention failed to suppress the spirit of freedom in Afghanistan. The Kabul régime, even with outside help, will inevitably fail in its campaign to do the

(Mr. Okun, United States)

same. The international community will continue to insist that the people of Afghanistan be provided with the opportunity to choose their own government. It should not and it will not give its seal of approval to an illegally installed régime.

(Mr. Okun, United States)

It was suggested here in a lengthy statement on 19 April that outside forces are somehow critical to ensuring the continued struggle of the Afghan people and the Afghan resistance. No one can seriously believe that the same people who have bled and died in their nine-year fight for independence would tolerate foreign control from yet another source. Nine years of foreign occupation have strengthened the determination of the Afghan people to make their own choices. We all owe them the opportunity to do so.

The United States agrees with the many speakers who have correctly pointed out that Afghanistan has been the victim of foreign aggression. But let us set the record straight. Pakistan is not and has never been the aggressor. As Pakistan has made clear here in the Security Council it has supported, and continues to support, the terms and objectives of the Geneva accords. Those accords are in place. They are functioning. They provide a clear answer to Mr. Wakil's accusations. Despite the numerous press reports, no one has come forward to verify these allegations. On the other hand, not a single one of Mr. Wakil's countless allegations has been verified by the teams sent out by the United Nations to do so, and I understand that Pakistan has recently agreed to an expansion of their activities.

The United States wants peace for Afghanistan, and I know that Pakistan does so also. Does anyone here really believe that Pakistan wants to feed and care for more than three million refugees indefinitely in camps in its country? The refugees have cost Pakistan huge sums. Compare the treatment Afghan citizens receive from their neighbour Pakistan with what they have suffered at the hands of others. The reception received by the refugees to Pakistan has been an act of humanity and moral decency which all nations should admire and support.

(Mr. Okun, United States)

We have also heard the unsupported allegation that Pakistanis are crossing Afghanistan's border. But again let us look at the facts - those stubborn facts, as we have recently heard. In reality, just the opposite is true. Afghans have been fleeing to Pakistan. They go there because they know that Pakistan will grant them shelter from the bombardments and military recklessness of the Kabul régime.

Achieving peace in Afghanistan and the right of the Afghan people to choose their own government are, indeed, urgent goals on which we should all be able to agree. The extensive debate and discussion of the various allegations introduced here by Mr. Wakil have not furthered that process or the prospects for its early conclusion. We are fully prepared to support actions designed to achieve those objectives, but we honestly fail to see any way in which the present debate has done so. We hope the Security Council may now move on to more constructive tasks.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): The next speaker is the representative of Pakistan, on whom I now call.

Mr. SHAH NAWAZ (Pakistan): When the present debate on the agenda item "The situation relating to Afghanistan" began on Tuesday, 11 April, we had occasion to inform the members of the Security Council that there was no valid ground for the request for the holding of such a debate. The circumstances on the basis of which the request had been made were entirely internal to Afghanistan. There was no threat to regional or international peace and security, as alleged in the Kabul Foreign Minister's letter of 3 April and his statement made before the Security Council on 11 April.

Indeed, the developments in Afghanistan are a continuation of a situation of conflict which has existed for nearly a decade. An unrepresentative régime, which was imposed as a result of foreign military intervention, survives only because of the continuation of military assistance, backing and sustenance from the same source.

(Mr. Shah Nawaz, Pakistan)

The imposed régime in Kabul finds itself in dire straits. Its writ does not extend beyond the walls of a few cities. The entire countryside and the overwhelming majority of the Afghan people are bitterly opposed to the régime which has been responsible for inflicting death and destruction on the Afghan people on a scale unparalleled in Afghan history.

The reality of this stark tragedy has been recognized even by fellow travellers of the Kabul régime. In an interview given to Moscow Television Service on 3 February, Mr. Farid Qayyumi said that for 10 years, the régime has not given the Afghan people anything but hunger, destruction, disease and infection. The resistance is successful simply because it has not given aliens, that is, Soviet troops, the opportunity of coming to their country.

Following the signing of the Geneva Agreements, this régime, which is the enemy of its own people, was deprived of the protecting hand of the foreign troops which had installed it. Despite the military hardware and backing which the régime continues to receive from its protectors, it faces the prospects of an inglorious end to its borrowed time.

As the day of reckoning approaches and the régime fears being overwhelmed by the forces of freedom, poised at its gates to terminate its reign of terror and subservience to foreign masters, the régime is making desperate efforts to delay its inevitable end.

The recourse to the Security Council, in these circumstances, represents one such effort. The purely propagandist nature of the request for this Security Council meeting is reflected in the timing of this debate to coincide with the first anniversary of the Geneva Agreements and the fanciful contents of the statement made before the Security Council by the Kabul representative on

(Mr. Shah Nawaz, Pakistan)

11 April. Was it Disraeli or Mark Twain who said "there are lies, damned lies and statistics"? Certainly the Kabul statement contained enough statistics for anybody's stupefaction. The figures in the statement have no relation whatsoever to reality.

In view of the turn this debate has taken, I find it necessary to place it in its proper perspective, by briefly describing the genesis of the Afghanistan problem and its bearing on the present situation in the country.

A period of nearly 10 years separates the Geneva Agreements, signed on 14 April 1988, from the arrival of Soviet troops in Afghanistan, in December 1979, which opened a chapter of invasion, aggression and suffering unparalleled in recent Afghan history.

The advent of the Soviet troops, which installed Mr. Babrak Karmal at Kabul, also opened a chapter of ever-growing resistance from the Afghan people, which forced a change of régime at Kabul in the course of the year 1986.

Mr. Babrak Karmal was removed from his seat of authority and returned to his seat of exile. He was replaced by Mr. Najibullah, Head of the Kabul régime's Secret Police. It might be recalled that Mr. Najibullah, along with Mr. Babrak Karmal, and the present Foreign Minister of the Kabul régime, belonged to an inner circle of six who were brought back to Kabul when the Soviet troops entered Afghanistan.

By the time Mr. Najibullah was placed in power, the strength of the Soviet troops in Afghanistan had grown from 50,000 to nearly 150,000. In true Afghan tradition, the greater and more obtrusive the foreign presence, the more widely spread and visible became the resistance. The experience of those performing an "internationalist duty" turned into a nightmare.

It was only after the assumption of power by Mr. Gorbachev that the Soviet Union recognized a blunder and adopted measures to stanch a "bleeding wound". It

(Mr. Shah Nawaz, Pakistan)

was this recognition of the realities which accelerated the process of negotiations for a peaceful settlement of the Afghanistan problem, under United Nations auspices, and facilitated the signing of the Geneva Agreements.

By that time over one million Afghans had been killed, more than five million driven out of the country to seek refuge in Pakistan and Iran, and the political, social, cultural and economic infrastructure of the country had been destroyed.

The process of thwarted conquest and ultimate withdrawal of foreign troops created deep rifts in Afghan society, making the achievement of national reconciliation a difficult and time-consuming task.

Who can forget the horrors of Pul-e-Charkhi, in the dungeons of which countless Afghan citizens perished, including such prominent leaders as the late Noor Ahmed Etemadi, a distinguished former Prime Minister and Foreign Minister of Afghanistan and yet another Prime Minister, Musa Shafiq? Who can forget the murder of the revered Mujaddadi family and the burning of their library, which was a national treasure?

(Mr. Shah Nawaz, Pakistan)

Hardly two months have passed since the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan on 15 February. Surely, no one could expect that the legacy of dislocation, destruction, bitterness and hatred bequeathed by the foreign forces after nearly 10 years of intervention and occupation would disappear overnight, or that the antagonisms bred in that period would give way to national reconciliation and a broad-based Government in the twinkling of an eye.

The process of national reconciliation would indeed have been smoother if the Soviet withdrawal from Afghanistan had been complete in all respects. The present régime in Kabul - a creation of the foreign military intervention - continues to receive unlimited military and other necessary assistance, which is its lifeline. It is this assistance which prolongs its precarious life and with it the agony of the people inside and outside the beleaguered cities.

As the members of the Security Council know, an interim Government representing all the parties - barring the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan (PDPA) - has already been established by the Afghan resistance. Indeed, seats have been reserved for acceptable representatives from Kabul also. This interim Government has been admitted into Organization of the Islamic Conference and recognized by four Member States.

The resistance, which not only has survived the foreign military intervention but has become the true voice of the people of Afghanistan, derives its power not from foreign assistance but from deep reservoirs of patriotism and spiritual and moral strength embodied in the Afghan ethos.

The extraordinary feature of the present Security Council debate is that those speakers who made statements in support of the Soviet representative, and indeed he himself, were so bent on accusing Pakistan of alleged violations of the Geneva

(Mr. Shah Nawaz, Pakistan)

Agreements that they ignored the two most important elements in the continuing conflict in Afghanistan. The first element is that it is the Soviet Union and the successive subservient régimes of its creation in Kabul which must take full responsibility for the tragedy enacted in Afghanistan and the continuation of the conflict, with the Soviet Union's involvement. The second element is the size and power of the Afghan resistance movement, which has increased in strength with every infusion of additional forces of occupation and by now has become a formidable fighting force. It is dominant in the countryside and knocking at the very gates of the cities which the Kabul régime tenuously holds, with the help of massive armed supplies over an air-bridge from Moscow.

Pakistan has nothing to do with the situation facing the Kabul régime, which is anything but the legitimate Government of Afghanistan. Pakistan has made no threats against the Kabul régime. Pakistan does not seek intervention or interference of any kind in the internal affairs of Afghanistan. The Afghan war of liberation has had its inevitable impact on Pakistan because of the imperatives of geography and history. Our overriding interest is in a political settlement to be reached by the Afghans themselves, free from outside intervention or interference, which would permit the millions of refugees on our soil to return to their homes.

Pakistan will do nothing to destroy the credit it has with the Afghan people. The main ingredients of that credit are our historic, religious and cultural ties, from which our sympathy for the resistance naturally flows and in harmony with which our soil becomes the natural refuge of millions of Afghan families driven out of their hearths and homes by foreign military intervention.

If Pakistan's principled support for the restoration of the right of self-determination to the Afghan people is seen as a threat by the Kabul régime, that only testifies to the character of the régime.

(Mr. Shah Nawaz, Pakistan)

The Security Council and the Secretary-General are fully aware of the situation in Afghanistan and have placed on the ground a machinery, in the form of the United Nations Good Offices Mission in Afghanistan and Pakistan (UNGOMAP), to keep the Secretary-General continuously informed of the developments there, in accordance with the mandate of UNGOMAP, if there are violations of the Geneva Agreements to be investigated. Pakistan has faithfully used this machinery. It has never contemplated circumventing UNGOMAP and invoking the Security Council when it is not necessary to do so.

The complaints lodged by the Kabul side were thoroughly investigated by UNGOMAP and were found to be baseless. None of them could be substantiated. As pointed out by us in our statement of 11 April, no serious evidence has ever been produced to substantiate any charge of violation of the Geneva Agreements by Pakistan. Pakistan, we stated, is the real aggrieved party, and the violations of the Geneva Agreements by the Kabul side stand proved by the violations of Pakistan airspace and territory. Kabul's planes have been shot down on Pakistan's territory and their Soviet and Afghan pilots captured. At the same time, as a result of the bloody confrontation between the régime and the people of Afghanistan, there has been a fresh influx of Afghan refugees to augment the number of more than 3 million Afghan refugees already on Pakistan's soil.

During the debate on 17 April one representative said that the Geneva Agreements did not lead to an ideal result. Indeed they did not. The Geneva Agreements dealt only with the external aspects of the Afghanistan problem - that is, withdrawal of foreign troops, return of refugees, agreement on non-interference and non-intervention, and international guarantees. At no stage did the Geneva talks address the internal matters of Afghanistan, which are the sole concern of the Afghan people.

(Mr. Shah Nawaz, Pakistan)

Taking their cue from the Kabul representative, some speakers argued for an immediate cease-fire. Pakistan is not a party to the internal conflict in Afghanistan and cannot, therefore, speak on a matter which is entirely within the competence of the Afghan people.

The Permanent Representative of Cuba spoke of the need to make full use of the United Nations moral reserves and energy to ensure peace in Afghanistan and to preserve its independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity. No country has advocated this course of action more strongly or persistently than Pakistan. Pakistan continues to place its total faith in the capacity of the United Nations to make the major contribution towards the restoration of the independence and sovereignty of the people of Afghanistan, who have waged a heroic freedom struggle for the past 10 years to regain their right of self-determination, which no power on earth can deny to them. It is to the achievement of this sublime objective that the moral reserves and energy of the United Nations should be devoted.

We were surprised by the charges against us in the statement you made, Mr. President, in your capacity as Permanent Representative of the Soviet Union, on Wednesday, 19 April, which supported and supplemented the crude allegations contained in the Kabul statement of 11 April before the Security Council. We have already replied to these charges in our statement of 11 April before the Security Council and, once again, reject these allegations categorically.

A transparent attempt has been made in the Soviet statement to absolve the Soviet Union of its responsibility for the colossal tragedy visited upon the Afghan people and to find new scapegoats. It would be naive to accept that the international community, before whose full gaze the Afghan tragedy has unfolded, would be hoodwinked by such an attempt.

(Mr. Shah Nawaz, Pakistan)

Access to the moral high ground, which the Soviet Union now seeks to occupy, is barred by more than a million Afghan martyrs and the rubble of the hearths and homes in thousands of destroyed villages and towns, razed to the ground.

No amount of sophistry or "new thinking" can hide the truth that the Soviet policy of propping up the brutal and savage Kabul régime has resulted in the death, maiming, uprooting and exodus of nearly two thirds of the entire population. It has resulted in the total or partial destruction of two thirds of Afghan villages and pulverization of Afghanistan's entire rural infrastructure. It has caused the conversion of the Afghan countryside into a mass minefield that will maim and kill Afghan men, women and children for decades to come.

Having withdrawn its forces from Afghanistan, the Soviet Union now insists that the Afghan people must continue to accept the murderous Kabul régime in one form or another. It openly threatens to continue supplying the régime with whatever military assistance it may require, including "weapons never before seen in Afghanistan" so as to enable it to survive in defiance of the wishes of the Afghan people.

Instead of using its undoubted influence to facilitate a settlement, in accordance with the rights and wishes of the Afghan people and in keeping with the United Nations General Assembly resolutions, adopted by overwhelming majorities, the Soviet Union insists on conditions unacceptable to every segment of Afghan opinion, as the price of peace. No amount of skilful propaganda against my country and against the Mujahidin can keep the truth from the international community.

(Mr. Shah Nawaz, Pakistan)

Let us put these questions to the bar of world opinion: Who is responsible for the continuing bloodshed in Afghanistan? Who is standing in the way of the restoration of the Afghan people's right to self-determination? Who is violating the letter and spirit of the Geneva Agreements, which were meant to pave the way for an early and peaceful comprehensive settlement, in accordance with the wishes of the Afghan people?

Is it those who have turned over a massive arsenal of modern weaponry to a hated régime that has killed a million of its own people and is prepared to continue to use Afghanistan as a killing field in order to cling to power? Or is it those who demand that there should be an immediate and peaceful transfer of power from the hated illegitimate régime in Kabul, which was imposed by external military intervention, to a broad-based government acceptable to the Afghan people?

Soviet officials themselves have had an opportunity to talk to Afghan Mujahidin representatives in Taif, Tehran and Islamabad. Nowhere have they found any segment of Afghan opinion willing to talk, let alone enter into a coalition arrangement, with the PDPA. The Secretary-General's representative has similarly consulted various Afghan parties and reported his findings to the Soviet Union. Yet, ignoring this fundamental political reality of the state of Afghan opinion towards the PDPA, the Soviet Union continues to insist that if the Afghan people are to know any peace they will have to come to terms with the rejected unrepresentative régime in Kabul.

This is nothing but a prescription for a military solution of the Afghanistan problem. Pakistan rejects such a solution and from the very beginning has pressed for a political settlement of the problem under the auspices of the United Nations. It was the Soviet Union that sought and failed to obtain a military solution and, most unfortunately, it continues its military policy by proxy.

(Mr. Shah Nawaz, Pakistan)

Soviet military intervention has, indeed, continued after the formal completion of Soviet withdrawal. It has now taken the form of open and massive military support for the régime that has no support among the Afghan people.

All that the Afghan people see of the "new thinking" in Soviet policy is that the Soviet Union has reintroduced Scud missiles, which are nothing but terror weapons, into Afghanistan since the withdrawal of its troops. Those missiles have little effect on the Mujahidin but certainly sow terror among the civilian population. The handing over of such weapons of mass destruction to an irresponsible and sinking régime, which has already fired one of them at my country, is nothing less than a blatant violation of the Geneva Agreements. In addition the Soviet Union is supplying cluster bombs and other state-of-the-art weapons of destruction to the Kabul régime on a virtual conveyor-belt. The military convoys and the military air-bridges to Kabul, which the Soviet Union has established, amount to a continuation of its military intervention in Afghanistan in open defiance of the Geneva Agreements.

Accordingly, the Government of Pakistan is formally requesting the Secretary-General to establish additional UNGOMAP posts in the towns of Hairatan and Torghundi and in the airports of Kabul, Bagram, Shindad and Kandahar, to monitor Soviet compliance with its obligations under the Geneva Agreements.

The allegation that the Pakistan army and intelligence personnel participate in the continued fighting in Afghanistan is entirely baseless. If, as Kabul has alleged, one quarter of the Mujahidin around Kabul are Pakistanis in disguise and Pakistan is providing artillery support, 90 kilometres inside Afghanistan, surely the régime should have been able to produce some evidence by now. All it could do was to stage a farcical press conference in Kabul. None of the several independent

(Mr. Shah Nawaz, Pakistan)

foreign journalists on the spot have found evidence to support Kabul's fantasies. UNGOMAP reports, which are the only reports to be relied upon, have not substantiated any of these wild allegations.

The accusation that Pakistan has been dishonestly overlooking its obligations is itself less than honest as it is designed to divert attention from the real obstacle to a peaceful settlement. It is the Soviet military support for the Kabul régime which prevents an early and peaceful transfer of power to a broadly acceptable interim government.

The battle of Jalalabad has demonstrated that the Kabul régime forces are prepared to use the civilian population as an unwilling shield against the Mujahadin. The residents of Jalalabad are confined to their homes by a strictly enforced curfew and prevented from leaving the city. Helicopters resupplying the régime forces now land in the city centres, since the Mujahidin are reluctant to fire at them for fear of causing civilian casualties.

In a democracy it is natural for a variety of views to find expression. Every political leader is perfectly free to express his views and, whether appropriate or not, he is also free to address his views to whomsoever he wishes. Mr. Wali Khan has done so. The fact, however, is that the vast majority of the people of Pakistan do not share the views expressed by him. To cite his view in support of the argument that the people of Pakistan are divided or did not support the Government's policy towards an Afghan settlement is a distortion intended to mislead the international community.

The charge that Pakistan wishes to impose a confederation on Afghanistan is as wild as it is preposterous. The charge has been denied on several occasions, most recently on 15 February by an official spokesman who said that President Ghulam Ishaq Khan had made no statement proposing a confederation between Pakistan and

(Mr. Shah Nawaz, Pakistan)

Afghanistan. One may rather wonder what the Soviet intentions are, with more than 400 agreements and treaties imposed on Afghanistan during the past eight years.

As regards a halt to arms supplies, the record shows that such an offer was made to the Soviet Union only to be rejected by it. Now, after having turned over several years' worth of supplies to Kabul, it has suddenly reverted to the proposal. The question arises: does the Soviet Union really desire a halt to the fighting, or does it wish to provide a critical military advantage to its clients in Kabul?

The proposal for an international conference for the neutrality and demilitarization of Afghanistan is not germane to the issue of facilitating a comprehensive settlement. It is something for a representative and legitimate government to consider, if it so wishes, after a comprehensive settlement has been achieved.

Similarly, the idea of a United Nations peace-keeping force, which is contingent upon a cease-fire, could be considered only if all the parties concerned agreed. That is not the case at present.

The United Nations is already involved in promoting an Afghan settlement. The Secretary-General's representative has been sounding various Afghan parties, and it is for the Secretary-General to decide upon a feasible approach in the light of his findings. To insist that the Secretary-General take initiatives unacceptable to the Afghan people would be to undermine his prestige and authority without doing anything to promote a settlement.

The UNGOMAP report on the implementation of the Geneva accords provides no basis for the allegation that Pakistan has obstructed its working. General Helminen's statement has been distorted to imply criticism of Pakistan. The statement that UNGOMAP has failed to investigate even a single violation in

(Mr. Shah Nawaz, Pakistan)

accordance with agreed procedures is false and not borne out by its report.

According to UNGOMAP, the vast majority of Kabul's complaints have been of a kind that are impossible to verify. The fact is that, within its resources, Pakistan has provided facilities beyond the arrangements envisaged in the Geneva accords in order to co-operate with UNGOMAP.

Contrary to the allegations made by the Kabul representative, Pakistan has participated in meetings to consider UNGOMAP reports. In fact there have been three such meetings already, and the fourth is scheduled for 27 April.

We have also responded positively to the Secretary-General's request for additional posts for UNGOMAP observers at Chaman, Parachinar and Torkham, in addition to Peshawar and Quetta.

Pakistan is not responsible for the continuing fighting in Afghanistan, where a handful of ideological fanatics sustained by uninterrupted supplies from the Soviet Union is shoring up the doomed cities about to be overwhelmed by the resistance wave. The resistance movement, which is poised for victory, is not a signatory to the Geneva Agreements and therefore is not bound by any provisions of those Agreements. May I remind the Security Council that the resistance leadership was kept out of Geneva by the Soviet Union despite our sincere advice that it must be allowed to participate in the negotiations.

(Mr. Shah Nawaz, Pakistan)

The second statement by the Kabul representative, delivered at the Security Council meeting of 24 April, had a familiar ring. It repeated some of the baseless accusations against Pakistan, giving them a new twist for good measure. I do not think it necessary to deal once again with those allegations, which were simply variations on old themes.

The current struggle in Afghanistan and the battles around the cities in that country are internal developments following the withdrawal of Soviet troops. Pakistan is in no way involved in those developments, except in the sense that they seriously affect the peace and stability of its own frontier regions and have a deep impact on the Afghan refugees on Pakistan's soil. Indeed, fresh infusions of refugees into Pakistan have followed the fighting around Jalalabad, and the great tribes on both sides of the border are agitated and stirred by the fighting, in which their kith and kin are involved.

We reject categorically the baseless charges that Pakistan has in any way violated the Geneva Agreements. The allegation that Pakistan's armed forces are involved in the fighting around Jalalabad is totally irresponsible and does not bear scrutiny. The enormity of that charge - its palpable falsity - clearly shows that the string of irresponsible allegations against Pakistan in the Kabul statement and other statements of that kind are devoid of substance, are propagandist in essence and are totally unworthy of serious attention.

If the Kabul representative is an avid reader of newspapers he should have known that even before he made his statement The New York Times of 24 April had printed the Government of Pakistan's denial of the allegations contained in Henry Kamm's report dated 16 April. The denial issued by the spokesman of the Government of Pakistan was as follows:

(Mr. Shah Nawaz, Pakistan)

"The attention of the Foreign Office spokesman was drawn to a report by Henry Kamm in The New York Times of 23 April 1989 in which it was alleged that, at a meeting in Islamabad at which no Afghan was present and which was attended by top Pakistan civilian and military officers, a decision was taken to set in motion the attack against Jalalabad by the Afghan Mujahidin.

"The spokesman described this report as incorrect. He said that the struggle of the Mujahidin was completely indigenous and that such decisions could only be taken by the Afghans themselves. He explained that the Mujahidin, who for the last nine years had successfully fought for their freedom and independence against a super-Power, would certainly not need any help or advice in their struggle against the illegal puppet régime.

"The spokesman categorically denied that there was any difference of opinion between various Government agencies on the Afghanistan issue. No country in the world, he said, had been affected more by the turmoil in Afghanistan than Pakistan, which continued to host more than three million Afghan refugees. An early peaceful and comprehensive settlement which would enable these refugees to return to their homes was an objective over which there could be no difference of opinion.

"The spokesman described as mischievous the observation that the leaders of the interim Afghan Government were not being taken into confidence about decisions pertaining to Afghanistan. The Pakistan Government did not take decisions as to what the Afghans should or should not do. This was exclusively their right and responsibility. However, Pakistan had consistently supported and would continue to support all endeavours aimed at achieving a peaceful comprehensive settlement of the Afghanistan problem. It would encourage and co-operate with the interim Afghan Government towards this end."

(Mr. Shah Nawaz, Pakistan)

Similarly, the Afghan resistance leaders also issued a statement saying they were not aware of any meeting on 5 March at which decisions were alleged to have been taken, without their participation, to attack Jalalabad, and scoffed at the idea that Pakistan was in a position to issue orders.

In his statement, the Kabul representative also threatened Pakistan with rocket attacks if, as he said, a planned and systematic shooting war against Afghanistan continued. Nobody should be impressed by such evocative phrases as "planned, systematic and gradual" (S/PV.2857, p. 74) shooting war, used in the Kabul representative's statement. We have denied any role in the fighting inside Afghanistan, and it bears repetition that Pakistan is not involved in any way whatsoever in the internal struggle which goes on in Afghanistan. The fact is that the régime is being equipped with Soviet arms to fight its last battle with its own people.

There should be no doubt in anyone's mind that Pakistan is fully capable of teaching a suitable lesson to any would-be aggressor. In that connection, I should like to inform the Security Council that, replying to a question regarding the possible spill-over of war into Pakistan, the Prime Minister of Pakistan said that Pakistan had no intention of becoming a party to the Afghan conflict. However, if the Kabul régime resorted to committing an act of aggression against Pakistan we would respond accordingly.

The Prime Minister welcomed the completion of Soviet troop withdrawal from Afghanistan and said that the reason for the continuation of the conflict in Afghanistan was that the puppet régime installed by the Soviets continued to cling to power. The Afghan Mujahidin were not prepared to negotiate with the illegal Kabul régime, the Prime Minister said.

(Mr. Shah Nawaz, Pakistan)

The Prime Minister said Pakistan wanted a political settlement of the problem and did not want to impose its point of view on anyone.

Much of the Security Council's time on 24 April was wasted by the Kabul representative quoting verbatim Henry Kamm's entire dispatch printed in The New York Times of 23 April, which spread over 13 pages of that representative's statement.

Now, this is a dangerous game. Selective quotations from tendentious press reports to suit one's own convenience is a game at which more than one can play. For instance, in yesterday's The New York Times there was a report by John Burns which said, among other things, that tens of thousands of Afghans in the Herat area had lost their homes and, many, their lives in the saturation bombing and artillery fire used by the withdrawing Soviet forces in February. He wrote that

"Like Genghis Khan and Tamerlane, who subdued Herat at earlier stages of its 2,300-year-old history, the Soviet forces that occupied this city for nine years reduced wide reaches of it to rubble." (The New York Times, 25 April 1989, p. A1)

He speaks of the Kabul régime as "a government bonded to Moscow" (ibid.) and of the cities as being among the Government's last redoubts, outside which the Kabul régime holds virtually nothing.

John Burns's dispatch contains a hair-raising description of the destruction of Darwaza-i-Mashad,

"a sprawling area on the western approaches to the city that was obliterated by Soviet forces after the guerrillas occupied the district in 1979. Almost to the horizon, all that remains now are jagged walls and twisted beams. The ruins of once-spacious homes are overgrown with grass and weeds. Cuckoos call across the silence. On the few rooftops still standing, Government soldiers stand vigil with machine-guns.

(Mr. Shah Nawaz, Pakistan)

"Like a similar scene along the eastern approaches to Kandahar, the destruction is a monument to the suffering brought on the country by the Marxist coup of 1978, the Muslim uprising it provoked and the Soviet military intervention. In Herat, even Government officers are half-hearted in their attempts to attribute the destruction to the guerrillas, who abandoned the area after a final bombardment by the Soviet Air Force in February 1986."

(ibid., p. A10)

He quotes a Russian telling a companion with tears in his eyes that the destruction had been caused mainly by Soviet bombing after guerrillas had ambushed Soviet tanks in the narrow streets during an assault in 1982. He also quotes the Russian as having said, "All that we touched here turned to dust". (ibid.)

At the very beginning of our statement before the Security Council on the first day of the current debate, and again in my statement today, I said that no valid ground existed for the request for the holding of the present debate on the situation relating to Afghanistan. I would remind the members of the Security Council that the Soviet Union and the Kabul régime held a diametrically opposed view on the need for a meeting of the Security Council in January 1980, when such a meeting was absolutely necessary in view of the presence of more than 50,000 foreign troops in Afghanistan. The meeting had been requested by nearly one third of the entire membership of the General Assembly.

On that occasion, at the 2185th meeting of the Security Council, held on 5 January 1980, the Permanent Representative of the Soviet Union made the following statement:

(Mr. Shah Nawaz, Pakistan)

"The delegation of the Soviet Union most vigorously objects to the consideration in the Security Council of the so-called question of the situation in Afghanistan.... The proposal to involve the Security Council in the consideration of the events occurring in Afghanistan is entirely unfounded and inadmissible, inasmuch as it would be tantamount to intervention on the part of the United Nations in questions relating exclusively to the domestic competence of the people and Government of that country." (S/PV.2185, p. 4)

At the same meeting the representative of the Kabul régime made a statement, in which he said:

"We are here to record our protest and disquiet at the convening of the Security Council ...

"The recent developments in Afghanistan are...not of the nature covered by Article 34 of the Charter and not to be brought up for consideration of the Security Council.

"To allow such consideration would be to accept the diversion of world public opinion from the real threats to world peace and security ...

"The convening of this meeting of the Security Council therefore in our view constitutes open interference in the internal affairs of Afghanistan, contrary to the provisions of paragraph 7 of Article 2 of the United Nations Charter." (Ibid., p. 37)

He concluded:

"We shall not allow the Security Council to be used for propaganda purposes under the pretext of imaginary threats to world peace and security." (Ibid., p. 48)

The present régime's request for an emergency meeting of the Security Council now represents a 180-degree turn from the position taken in January 1980,

(Mr. Shah Nawaz, Pakistan)

demonstrating a remarkable degree of insensitivity to the consequences of the inherent self-contradiction. The request obviously stems from the Kabul régime's desire to externalize its domestic problems, which are on the point of overwhelming it.

The debate began four days after the commencement of Ramadan, and it has already continued for more than two weeks. Indeed, our patience is sorely tried, as the debate has been used for distortion of facts and the martyrdom of truth, day after day, in this Holy Month. If the debate had to be inflicted on the Security Council we might at least have been spared its slow and agonizing pace. One day should have sufficed to exhaust its steam.

It is our hope that from this futile debate we shall emerge with the lesson that the Security Council must not be allowed to be used in a manner that reduces its stature and adversely affects its capability to address the real issues of international peace and security around the world.

Indeed, following the statements made in the Security Council on 11 April the futility of the debate became apparent, and on 12 April you, Mr. President, suggested to us that, if Pakistan were agreeable, the debate could be abandoned in favour of a statement by the President. As a gesture of goodwill, we responded positively. The continuation of the debate, which has yielded nothing but further opportunities for indulging in contemptible propaganda against Pakistan, came as a surprise to us and has effectively foreclosed the option of a statement by the President.

May I say in conclusion that, regardless of the incongruity of the Security Council's meeting in these circumstances, it should be our endeavour to give a positive turn to our discussions.

Afghanistan has already suffered grievously as a result of the Soviet military intervention during the past 10 years. The present situation cannot be resolved by

(Mr. Shah Nawaz, Pakistan)

wishful thinking or the presentation of unrealistic proposals that seek to divert attention from the real issue.

The real issue is respect for the principles of self-determination embodied in the Charter of the United Nations, which lies at the heart of the Afghan struggle for freedom. The international community must recognize the fact that the Kabul régime lacks legitimacy and has no place in a truly representative, broad-based Government, which the resistance leadership and all the well-wishers of Afghanistan wish to see in Kabul.

The situation in Afghanistan will not be improved by propagandist attacks on Pakistan and the concoction of baseless charges and false allegations such as those heard during this debate. Since the very beginning of the conflict in Afghanistan Pakistan has maintained that there can be no military solution to the Afghanistan problem and that the only path to peace and stability in the country, after 10 years of senseless bloodshed and abortive foreign military intervention, is through a political solution based on objectivity and honesty of perception in coming to grips with the realities that have powerfully emerged and that cannot be overlooked with impunity.

The situation in Afghanistan can be resolved only when a comprehensive political settlement, in accordance with the wishes of the Afghan nation, has been achieved and a broad-based Government fully representative of the Afghan people has been established in the country.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): The list of speakers for today's meeting has not been exhausted, but, owing to the lateness of the hour, I propose to adjourn the meeting now. The next meeting of the Security Council to continue consideration of the item on the agenda will take place this afternoon, Wednesday, 26 April 1989, at 3.30 p.m.

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.