



Security Council

UN LIBRARY
OCT 18 1989
UN/SA COLLECTION

PROVIS IONAL

S/PV.2860
26 April 1989

ENGLISH

PROVIS IONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO THOUSAND EIGHT HUNDRED AND SIXTIETH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Wednesday, 26 April 1989, at 3.30 p.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. NOGUEIRA-BATISTA
Mr. FORTIER
Mr. YU Mengjia
Mr. PEÑALOSA
Mr. GEBREMEDHIN
Mr. TORNUDD
Mr. BLANC
Mr. HASMY
Mr. RANA
Mrs. DIALLO

Mr. BIRCH
Miss BYRNE
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 3.55 p.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 representatives of Afghanistan and Pakistan to take places at the Council table; I invite the representatives of Angola, Bangladesh, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Comoros, the Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, India, Iraq, Japan, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, 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. Umer (Pakistan) took places at the Council table; Mr. Diakenga Serao (Angola), Mr. Mohiuddin (Bangladesh), Mr. Stresov (Bulgaria), Mr. Dah (Burkina Faso), Mr. Maksimov (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic), 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. Treiki (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), 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): The Security Council will now resume its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The first speaker is the representative of Afghanistan, upon whom I now call.

Mr. ROSHAN-RAWAAN (Afghanistan): The debate on the Pakistani aggression and its intervention and interference in the internal affairs of Afghanistan is now in its third week. We express our thanks and appreciation to the Council and to all those who have participated in these meetings, raising their voices in support of the cause of peace and stability in our region and the cause of peace in Afghanistan and putting an end to this tragedy, which has been continuing for a decade because of the Pakistani intervention and interference in the internal affairs of our country.

The statements that have been made in the Council during this debate show very clearly that a very grave situation prevails in our region. A great number of the speakers in this Council in the last three weeks have stated the cause, the root-cause, of this grave situation. That cause is nothing but the continued interference and intervention on the part of our neighbour Pakistan in the internal affairs of our country.

Those speakers have also stated the complete lack of implementation of the Geneva Agreements by the Government of Pakistan. Pakistan has so far failed to implement even a single provision of the Geneva Agreements.

(Mr. Roshan-Rawaan, Afghanistan)

We presented a great number of facts and arguments which have left no doubt that the present tense situation is the result of this continued Pakistani intervention and interference. We were told that all these facts were categorically rejected by Pakistan. Of course, nobody expects the aggressor to come here and confess and repent. What is important is that these are real facts: there is interference, there is intervention in our internal affairs, and this has caused a great tragedy for our people, the people of Afghanistan.

(Mr. Roshan-Rawaan, Afghanistan)

The rejection by the Pakistani Government of the very long and revealing report from Islamabad, dated 16 April this year, by The New York Times correspondent Henry Kamm must be seen in that light. It was rejected by Pakistan, but the facts are there. The facts revealed in that report are there; they are there on the ground. Nobody can hide them or deny them.

We were accused on the one hand of being "selective" in quoting from various newspapers and other mass media, and on the other we were accused of quoting all of that article during a Security Council meeting. It is very difficult for me to understand which exactly was the position of the representative of Pakistan in that regard.

The Security Council was told that the Republic of Afghanistan had not produced evidence of direct participation by the Pakistani military and militia in the fighting in eastern Afghanistan, particularly around the city of Jalalabad - except for two Pakistani agents who were caught around the city of Kandahar and who, in Kabul a few weeks ago, confessed to being Pakistani agents. We were told that those two agents were not speaking Dari or Pushtu, the languages of Afghanistan, and it was implied they were speaking only Urdu. We all know the people of Afghanistan do not speak Urdu, so the agents must have come from Pakistan. We cannot be held accountable for the fact that such incompetent agents were sent into Afghanistan by the Inter-Services Intelligence (ISI) of Pakistan; we cannot be held accountable for the inefficiency of the ISI.

It is very important to note that the representative of Pakistan spoke on the one hand of the need for a broad-based Government in Afghanistan while on the other hand Pakistan is imposing this war on us. It is very obvious that the intra-Afghan dialogue which is necessary for the establishment of such a broad-based Government can come only after we put an end to this war - or at least after the war subsides

(Mr. Roshan-Rawaan, Afghanistan)

to the extent that would make it possible for all Afghans to gather together, solve their differences and determine their future.

We are all Afghans. There is no doubt that we can solve our differences. We can determine the shape, the form, the policies of our Government. We can start hand in hand to rebuild our country, a poor, least developed country, which has been destroyed by this undeclared war imposed on us for the past 10 years. But for that to become a reality it is necessary that interference and intervention in the internal affairs of my country be stopped.

We are told that the Government of Pakistan supports the idea of a broad-based Government and, in fact, that it believes it to be perhaps the only solution. But on the other hand, those who are now harboured in Pakistan are prevented by the Government of Pakistan from entering an intra-Afghan dialogue, which we trust is the only way out of this tragedy. They are being armed, they are being equipped, they are being encouraged, they are being sent into Afghanistan to fight their brothers, they are being provided logistical support by the Pakistani military. Their attack on the city of Jalalabad is being supported with the direct participation of Pakistani army officers.

How can we believe the Government of Pakistan is serious in its position that it is in favour of peace in Afghanistan and in favour of a broad-based Government in Afghanistan if it continuously fans the war in Afghanistan?

It is also very important that so much was said on the need for self-determination for the people of Afghanistan. We are the people of Afghanistan; we are in favour of our own self-determination. We have a saying in our beautiful Dari language, that no midwife can be kinder to her child than the child's own mother. We do not need the Government of Pakistan to support our right of self-determination. The valorous Afghan people have always fought for their

(Mr. Roshan-Rawaan, Afghanistan)

self-determination. They will always uphold that right. No matter how long the conspiracies of the Government of Pakistan and its Inter-Services Intelligence agency continue, no matter how long Pakistani aggression and interference and intervention in our internal affairs continues, the people of Afghanistan will fight for their self-determination.

What is important is who the people of Afghanistan are. Is it correct, as the representative of Pakistan tries to portray it, that those who are inside Afghanistan are not Afghans, and that Afghans are represented only by a government made in Rawalpindi? Are not those valorous soldiers who are now defending the city of Jalalabad Afghans? They are. They are defending their country; they are defending their honour, their traditions, their sacred religion of Islam in the face of Pakistan's aggression, intervention and interference in our internal affairs. Are not the people living inside Afghanistan, in the cities of Afghanistan, Afghans? How can it be possible in the twentieth century for the Inter-Services Intelligence agency of Pakistan to create a puppet government and then portray it as representing all the people of Afghanistan?

(Mr. Roshan-Rawaan, Afghanistan)

That government has not even been supported by all the members who participate in the so-called Shura. That government has not been supported by the segments of Afghan resistance. That government has not been supported by the refugees. There were demonstrations in Pakistan in the refugee camps against the imposition of such a government on the people, and what is important is that those demonstrations were crushed by Pakistani police in Pakistan.

All the Afghans who are living inside and outside Afghanistan are Afghans, and they, together, as a nation, have the right to self-determination. They as a whole, as one nation, have the right to choose their future, to choose their government, to choose their way of life. They will never accept a government imposed on them from Islamabad. We were told that we should take into consideration stubborn facts. Those are stubborn facts.

The representative of Pakistan also tried to name the elements that comprise the bases for a comprehensive settlement for Afghanistan; he did so in an upside-down manner. The representative of Pakistan must remember that in 1982, when we first started negotiations at Geneva, they were insisting that we must start with the question of the withdrawal of the limited military contingent of the Soviet Union from Afghanistan. But their position was illogical, and they knew it. They therefore agreed that we should start from the root cause, namely, intervention and interference. We all remember that that was the question that was discussed at Geneva for years. The document on non-interference and non-intervention was the very first document that was completed at Geneva. Then came the document on international guarantees and on the return of Afghan refugees and then - and only then - on interrelationship with non-interference and non-intervention, the question of the withdrawal of the limited military contingent of the Soviet Union from Afghanistan was discussed and agreed upon and was to be

(Mr. Roshan-Rawaan, Afghanistan)

implemented simultaneously - at the same time - with all the other provisions in other instruments of the Geneva Agreements.

That shows that the root cause of this tragedy, for the solving of which we have now appealed to the members of the Security Council for assistance, lies in the interference and intervention of Pakistan in our internal affairs. That interference started long before 1978. Some of the leaders of those groups that are now fighting around Jalalabad City were in Pakistan and in the service of the ISI well before 1978. During the presidency of Muhammad Daoud rebellions were fanned by Pakistan through the use of the same so-called leaders who are now in Peshawar in the eastern part of Afghanistan, the same part of Afghanistan where we are now facing aggression, intervention and interference by Pakistan.

After the completion of the withdrawal of the limited military contingent of the Soviet Union, we find ourselves once again in the same situation in which we were before we invited the limited military contingent of the Soviet Union. Let me remind the representative of our neighbour Pakistan that in July 1979, before we requested assistance from the Soviet Union, we sent a high-ranking delegation from the Foreign Ministry to Islamabad. Our delegation held talks in the Foreign Ministry of Pakistan at Islamabad and also with President Zia-Ul-Haq. We must remember that on that occasion they told us - indeed, they invited us, they challenged us - to take whatever measures we deemed necessary to put an end to the crossing of armed persons from Pakistan into Afghanistan. They told us that it was not their responsibility to safeguard the borders of Afghanistan. They invited us to take whatever measures we deemed necessary. We took that measure because, like every other nation, we have the right to self-determination and the right to self-defence.

(Mr. Roshan-Rawaan, Afghanistan)

In this connection there is one other important matter that should be addressed: Why this aggression and interference on the part of Pakistan in the internal affairs of my country? What is the goal beyond this adventure on the part of Pakistan? That could be surmised from the statement made by President Zia-Ul-Haq to Selig Harrison, as we quoted it in our statement the day before yesterday here in the Council. He stated that Pakistan had

"earned the right to have a very friendly régime in Kabul. We won't permit it to be like it was before ...". (S/PV. 2857, p. 43)

There is no such "right". No matter how long a country interferes and intervenes in the internal affairs of its neighbour, it cannot be entitled to such a right. Afghanistan is the country of the Afghans. Afghans have very fraternal feelings towards other people and towards the people of Pakistan, with whom they share such a great Islamic and historic heritage. They want to be friendly with Pakistan. But Pakistan has no "right", as they put it, to have a government to its liking in Kabul.

(Mr. Roshan-Rawaan, Afghanistan)

The fact that this Pakistani intention is being continued by the present leadership in Pakistan was revealed in none other than the Pakistan Times of 7 February 1989. This newspaper quotes the current President of Pakistan, Mr. Ghulam Ishaq Khan. With your permission, Mr. President, I shall read out a small portion of what has been carried in that issue:

"Mr. Ghulam Ishaq Khan expressed his firm confidence that the people of Afghanistan would certainly continue to recognize the role which Pakistan played during their struggle after the restoration of their independence also, as" - and this is quoted by the paper directly from Mr. Ghulam Ishaq Khan - "they are not ungrateful people'."

When asked whether the proposal for the formation of an Islamic Afghanistan and Pakistan confederation was still on the table, the President said:

"Let Afghanistan become an independent and non-aligned State once again and other things could be considered later on."

I believe the intention, the altruistic aim Pakistan is pursuing in Afghanistan, is very clear to everybody. But let me remind the representative of Pakistan that at the end of the twentieth century our world is becoming smaller and smaller. It is very, very difficult to commit aggression, to disregard commitments solemnly assumed when signing international agreements, and get away with it.

This morning we also heard another slanderous barrage from the representative of Saudi Arabia. This barrage was evidently triggered by a number of quotations which we cited in our statement the day before yesterday. If these reports by the international mass media had been incorrect, as they were claimed to be, I believe that they should have simply been dismissed as irrelevant, that they would not have caused yet another barrage of slander against my delegation and against Afghanistan. That in itself shows that perhaps a very sensitive nerve was touched by the revelation of these reports.

(Mr. Roshan-Rawaan, Afghanistan)

Today I read in the news a very interesting report in this regard. With your permission, Mr. President, I shall read out a few lines:

"Sheikh Sadiq Munfiaty, Ambassador of Saudi Arabia in Delhi, had admitted in an interview with the correspondent of United News of India that since April 19 a number of nationals of his country were fighting against the Government forces in the Republic of Afghanistan. According to the Ambassador, 11 Saudi Arabians were killed in the recent fighting between the so-called Mujahidin and the Afghan Government forces."

I do not believe I have to add anything further to what has been said in this regard by the Ambassador of Saudi Arabia to New Delhi himself, but I should like to add one point. I should like to say that in the history of nations sometimes troubled times come and difficulties can arise. There is a duty for brotherly countries - and in the case of an Islamic country like Afghanistan, it is the duty of Islamic countries, including both the Saudi Arabians and the Pakistanis - to help their Islamic brethren in solving their difficulties and not to pursue altruistic, political goals in the camouflage of defending Islam. I believe that playing a constructive role in bringing the Afghans together to assist in beginning an intra-Afghan dialogue will serve to bring to Saudi Arabia the prestige in the Islamic world that it is now seeking through helping, assisting and directly participating in the Pakistani aggression, intervention and interference in the internal affairs of Afghanistan.

To conclude, may I say a few words about my Government's position with regard to the very tense situation we have been discussing for these three weeks. We are for the full implementation of the Geneva Agreements by all the sides concerned. In this connection, we are for the effective investigation of all violations of the Geneva Agreements by the United Nations Good Offices Missions in Afghanistan and

(Mr. Roshan-Rawaan, Afghanistan)

Pakistan (UNGOMAP), in strict observance of the method envisaged in the Geneva Agreements themselves. To this end, we believe that the establishment of the seven outposts, as proposed by my Government, will help to a great extent. The three outposts the Government of Pakistan has so far accepted to co-operate in establishing are not enough. We hope that the Government of Pakistan, in keeping with its duty, as set out in the Geneva Agreements, will provide the means of transportation and communications to UNGOMAP, will provide UNGOMAP, as requested by General Helminen, with helicopters to investigate violations in time. In a recent interview in Kabul General Helminen stated that so much time was wasted before they were able to investigate a violation. I hope that General Helminen will be provided with the helicopters he needs.

(Mr. Roshan-Rawaan,
Afghanistan)

We are also for the full and strict implementation of the consensus resolution adopted by the General Assembly at its forty-third session. As will be recalled, that resolution set forth, inter alia, the need for the establishment of a broad-based government with the participation of all the segments of Afghan society and without foreign intervention, interference or coercion. To that end, we are for an intra-Afghan dialogue - a dialogue with all the other political groups and influential Afghan figures. To that end, also, we are for an immediate cease-fire, which will certainly facilitate the beginning of an intra-Afghan dialogue.

We invite our brothers to start talking with their Afghan brothers, not from the barrel of a gun - as they are being pushed to do by the Government of Pakistan - but with logic and argumentation.

The time has come for all concerned, including our neighbours - and particularly Pakistan - to realize that the dream of a weak, poor and backward Afghanistan is not attainable. Afghans will fight, as they have proved in Jalalabad, for their dignity, for their honour, for peace and for development and progress in their country.

In the context of the necessity to implement the Geneva Agreements, we are for meetings between the two sides 48 hours after a complaint is lodged with the United Nations Good Offices Mission in Afghanistan and Pakistan (UNGOMAP), in order to resolve the question of violations of the Geneva Agreements.

We all know why, under what circumstances - to be precise, after three weeks of debate in this prestigious organ, and, as the representative of Pakistan put it, "at the end of a prayer" - Pakistan finally agreed to another meeting. Under the Geneva Agreements, such meetings should have taken place more than 400 times, because more than 400 notes were sent to UNGOMAP concerning thousands of Pakistan

(Mr. Roshan-Rawaan,
Afghanistan)

violations of the Geneva Agreements. We want these meetings to take place as provided for in the Geneva Agreements.

Concerning the return of Afghan refugees, it has now become a habit with the representative of Pakistan to arrogate to Pakistan the right to speak on behalf of the Afghan refugees. But we proposed that, in accordance with the Geneva Agreements, mixed commissions for the orderly return of Afghan refugees should be established immediately. The present Pakistani position against the establishment of these mixed commissions is in itself an obstacle to the return of the Afghan refugees.

Let me once again assure the Council that the Republic of Afghanistan stands ready to implement strictly all its obligations deriving from the Geneva Agreements. We shall co-operate with the Secretary-General. We shall co-operate with you, Mr. President, and the other Members of the Security Council. For, as Afghans, we are concerned for the fate of our country. We want peace in our country. We want the senseless fratricidal war in Afghanistan to end. We want to rebuild our country.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): I hope that no member of the Security Council will reproach me with not being impartial if I congratulate the Muslim world on having provided, in the person of Mr. Roshan-Rawaan, another excellent speaker - who is fluent in English - in addition to Mr. Maksoud.

However, I am sure that our outstanding interpreters prefer to have written texts before them rather than having to deal with even the most brilliant improvisations. Therefore, I shall try not to disappoint them and shall depart as little as possible from the text I have already provided to them.

(The President)

I wish now to make a statement as representative of the Soviet Union.

For three weeks now the Security Council has been considering the request made to the Council by Afghanistan in connection with the intensification of Pakistan's aggressive actions and its acts of interference in the internal affairs of Afghanistan.

At the meetings of the Council we have twice heard the Foreign Minister of the Republic of Afghanistan, Mr. Abdul Wakil, and we have heard Mr. Akhund, the Adviser to the Prime Minister of Pakistan. During the discussion, more than 40 representatives of Member States have also spoken.

Today we can definitely say that the discussion of this question in the Security Council has shown the grave disquiet felt by the world community at the situation developing in Afghanistan and the continuing bloodshed there, and at the emergence of new obstacles to progress towards a settlement of the Afghan problem. It is obvious that events have not borne out the intentions of those who stated that the consideration of the question in the Security Council would not serve any positive ends. Quite the opposite is true. The meetings of the Council have provided an opportunity to all those who sincerely seek a political settlement of the Afghan problem to speak up in support of the prompt cessation of the bloodshed and the establishment of conditions for a peaceful settlement by the Afghan people in regard to their future.

Are those not positive ends? Have the concepts of good and evil been reversed? No. Fortunately, human morality has preserved its essential values. That is why we cannot at all agree with those who have been claiming that the consideration in the Security Council of what needs to be done in order to bring peace to the land of Afghanistan as soon as possible does not serve a positive purpose.

(The President)

The representative of Bangladesh, Ambassador Mohiuddin, in his statement to the Council, said that his delegation would have been happy if the Council had not been obliged to discuss this question at the present time. A number of other representatives said more or less the same thing.

We wish to emphasize that the Soviet delegation would be no less happy than any other delegation if events in Afghanistan had not posed a threat to the independence and sovereignty of that country and also a threat to peace and security in the whole region.

However, the Security Council does not have the right to disregard this danger - that is, of course, if it intends to meet its obligations under the Charter. Bearing in mind the threat to the territorial integrity, independence and national sovereignty of Afghanistan, which has come about as a result of Pakistan's intensification of its aggressive actions and acts of direct interference in the internal affairs of Afghanistan, the Soviet Union, as has already been stated, regards Afghanistan's appeal to the Council as well justified, perfectly proper and timely.

It is true that some have recently tried to cast doubt on the statement of Minister Wakil and have baselessly been calling the facts contained in that statement groundless. However, those attempts to spare Pakistan criticism and depict it as being uninvolved in the events in Afghanistan cannot be considered serious or convincing.

The devices used for this purpose have not been noteworthy for their variety. They have really amounted to one thing - statements to the effect that Pakistan denies its interference in Afghanistan, as if the Pakistan side is an impartial arbiter that has been called upon to judge the true state of affairs. Of course

(The President)

this is understandable, because no one is able to refute something that has long been well known to the whole world.

The armed struggle of the implacable opposition against the legitimate Afghan Government is being organized, guided and supplied by Pakistan's military leadership using funds supplied from abroad. Everyone knows from which countries those resources are reaching Pakistan.

The representative of Pakistan, contrary to well known facts, today asserted that Islamabad has absolutely nothing to do with what has been going on inside Afghanistan, nothing to do with the unceasing military operations being conducted on the territory of that country.

In that case, why can he not simply answer an elementary question: where are those who are conducting military operations on the territory of Afghanistan against its Government getting their Blow-pipe missiles, their Stinger missiles, artillery weapons, grenade launchers, machine-guns and hundreds of thousands of shells, mines and cartridges, which each passing day are being used to lay down a barrage on Afghan towns and populated areas? These weapons of death are not sprouting up out of the ground in the fields around Jalalabad.

I would ask the representative of Pakistan: from where are all these weapons, these means of warfare and armed struggle against the Government of Afghanistan coming to Afghanistan territory? Where are they coming from? I should like to have from you a direct and frank answer to that question, Sir.

The world is well informed as to who is supplying those weapons. Which corporations produce such weapons? Which routes are being used so that they can reach Afghanistan territory? Everyone knows specifically who decides which weapons, in what amounts, are to be supplied, and to which specific forces in Afghanistan

(The President)

they are to be transferred. And who moves this equipment across the Pakistan-Afghan frontier? Who owns the trucks and the helicopters used to transfer it to Afghanistan territory? Everyone knows who owns these things. The world knows. Modern technology provides excellent opportunities for remote observation of all that is occurring there. The Pakistan representative's unfounded assertions to the effect that his Government has nothing at all to do with the supply of weapons into Afghanistan cannot be upheld or confirmed here or anywhere else by any serious evidence. If you have proof, Sir, we should be interested to hear from you to that effect.

It has also been asserted that Islamabad's innocence has been confirmed by the lack of confirmation of violations of the Geneva Agreements in the reports of the UNGOMAP Observers. However, we wish to point out that such justifications of Pakistan have sounded rather facile and shame-faced, because everybody has clearly realized that the Pakistan authorities have fully isolated UNGOMAP from the real situation and have shown the UNGOMAP Observers nothing that might cast any aspersions on the conduct of the Pakistan Government.

In his statement today, the representative of Pakistan gave his own interpretation of the history of the Afghan question. In order not to engage in lengthy polemics, I shall refer him and those who heard him to an article in The New York Times of 23 April 1989 to which frequent reference has been made here, according to which such people as Hekmatyar and Rabbani, leaders of the insurgents, have found refuge in Pakistan after participating in anti-Government rioting in Kabul in 1974.

(The President)

I want to call attention to that date - 1974. That date and many other facts show how long Pakistan has been supplying the intransigent opposition and how long it has been promoting a civil war which would not have grown to its present dimensions had it not been for Pakistan's blatant interference in the internal affairs of a neighbouring country. The December 1979 introduction of a limited contingent of Soviet troops at the request of the legitimate Government of Afghanistan was but a response to the situation, and primarily to Pakistan's interference.

In that connection, it is interesting to note that in his statement today the representative of Pakistan concentrated so much on the earlier phases of the development of the Afghanistan problem. He was clearly trying to steer clear of the situation as it is today and avoid discussing the precise charges laid against Pakistan in connection with the current phase of Pakistani interference in the internal affairs of Afghanistan. I am not at all surprised at the irritated tone so evident throughout this morning's statement by the representative of Pakistan: He is clearly involved in an ignoble cause and is trying to divert attention from Pakistan's violation of the Geneva Agreements and from its direct participation and involvement in the civil war in Afghanistan.

In my country we have a saying about taking someone by the ear and dragging him out into the light of day. The current debate has clearly been very unpleasant for the representative of Pakistan precisely because he has had to hear the truth about the ignoble policy pursued by Pakistan vis-à-vis its neighbour, which has been placed before the Council in all its unseemliness.

The annoyance displayed by the Pakistani delegation is understandable also because it is not very nice for anyone to hear himself saying things that, obviously, no one in the Chamber is going to believe. In fact, practically no one

(The President)

was willing to speak in the Council to support Pakistan's present policy. Quite the contrary, during the Council's meetings the representatives of a number of countries made direct reference to acts of flagrant interference by Pakistan in the internal affairs of a neighbouring country, including the direct participation of the Pakistani military in planning and carrying out military operations on the territory of Afghanistan, in particular around Jalalabad.

Over the past two months, media material - some of it cited in the Council - has repeatedly confirmed involvement and interference by Pakistan in Afghanistan's internal affairs. Thus, all here, even those who in recent days have been trying to defend Pakistan, could once again see for themselves something the whole world knows: that Pakistan has committed blatant violations of the Geneva Agreements, violations that constitute aggression against Afghanistan. In those circumstances, even the closest friends of Islamabad find it difficult to justify Pakistan's actions, for that would be tantamount to endorsing war in Afghanistan. It would mean sacrificing many lives to the ambitious plans of the Afghan extremists and Pakistani military circles and bringing much suffering to the Afghan people.

At our meeting this morning, the Permanent Representative of Pakistan - who, I am sorry to see, is not here this afternoon at our second meeting of the day - was complaining that he had to participate in the work of the Council during Ramadan, a sacred month for Muslims. He should rather complain to the leaders of the intransigent opposition, who rejected the proposal of Najibullah, the President of the Republic of Afghanistan, that there be a cease-fire for that month, and who instead continued their fratricidal struggle against their own people, disregarding both religion and compassion.

We cannot agree with the representative of Pakistan that it is inappropriate for the Security Council to be considering Afghanistan's complaint against Pakistan during the month of Ramadan for another reason as well: During this month,

(The President)

Islamabad has in no way decreased its direct military interference in the affairs of Afghanistan. Had it done the opposite, we would have hailed the wisdom of the Pakistani leadership. We regret that we are unable to do this, for there is no reason to do so. Unfortunately, during the month of Ramadan the world press has daily supplied material testifying to Pakistan's massive interference in the affairs of Afghanistan. So I ask the representative of Pakistan what the month of Ramadan has to do with this, and why the Council should not consider his Government's unlawful actions during that month?

One of the main conclusions to be drawn from the present debate in the Security Council is that the world community is calling very emphatically for full and strict observance of the Geneva Agreements on Afghanistan and for the prompt cessation of the bloodshed and warfare in that country, together with the establishment of conditions for a peaceful solution to all issues dividing Afghans themselves.

Practically all speakers have expressed their satisfaction that the provisions of the Geneva Agreements concerning the withdrawal of foreign troops from Afghanistan were fulfilled by the Soviet Union completely and on schedule.

(The President)

In that connection, particular emphasis was laid on the need for all parties to the Geneva Agreements fully to carry out their obligations assumed under those Agreements, particularly with regard to non-interference in the internal affairs of Afghanistan. We understand and fully share the disquiet felt by a number of delegations at the fact that the undermining of the Geneva Agreements could well generate doubts as to the possibility of achieving any progress in the settlement of other regional crisis situations with United Nations participation and assistance. Equally well justified, we feel, is the alarm expressed by those countries, which fear that the consequences of the fratricidal war in Afghanistan, against the background of uninterrupted outside interference in Afghan affairs, may go beyond the present framework of the conflict and significantly aggravate the situation in south-west Asia.

As the Permanent Representative of India, Ambassador Garekhan, stated here in the Council, one of most significant steps taken towards a resolution of regional conflicts is the Agreements on Afghanistan. He said:

"They must not be allowed to be unravelled. The consequences of that would not only mean the continuation of the conflagration in Afghanistan but would also pose a threat to the stability of the region as a whole and to international peace and security." (S/PV.2855, p. 6)

He went on to emphasize:

"The encouragement of interference can only endanger several welcome processes that have taken place in the region and fuel ambitions that are both unrealistic and dangerous. Their effects will impinge beyond the current parameters of the conflict and extend beyond the termination of the conflict. That would be unfortunate.

(The President)

"There must be a reintensification of the search for peace, a recommitment to the provisions of the Geneva Agreements. The entire international community has a stake in bringing a quick end to the present situation in Afghanistan." (Ibid., p. 7)

War continues in Afghanistan. Afghans are dying by the thousands, including civilians - old people, women and children. Cities are crumbling under artillery and rocket barrages. The military operations being carried out have greatly increased the number of refugees obliged to flee their homes. As Ambassador Blanc rightly observed:

"The continuation of this war is delaying the comprehensive political solution of the problem of Afghanistan that France quite naturally seeks."

(S/PV.2855, p. 19-20)

We fully agree with that. The need for an end to the bloodshed was referred to by practically all the speakers who have made statements here. However, it is essential that those appeals be backed up by concrete actions and practical efforts. There is no need for any more victims, as the representative of Bangladesh so rightly observed. The fact that the Afghan people need help to achieve reconciliation and to settle their conflict by peaceful means was emphasized by the representatives of Iraq, Nicaragua, Angola, the United Republic of Tanzania, Libya, Cuba and a number of other countries.

In his statement Ambassador Tadesse, Permanent Representative of Ethiopia, expressed the conviction that nobody in his right mind will condone the situation, involving as it does massive destruction and loss of lives, as politically expedient or morally justifiable. However, we see that there are some whose policy is to endorse a continuation of the bloodshed by supporting and encouraging the implacable opposition and preventing national reconciliation while fanning the flames of conflict and war.

(The President)

It was strange to hear, in a meeting of the Security Council, the appeal made by one representative to the Afghans "not to abandon the struggle". It is our conviction that the primary thing the Afghans now need is a cease-fire and peaceful conditions that can enable them to resolve their own affairs themselves. Yes, the Afghan people have the right to self-determination, and that point was made in the consensus resolution adopted at the forty-third session of the General Assembly, which 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 whatsoever. That is precisely what the people of Afghanistan need. That is what every Afghan needs, whether he supports the Government of the Republic or the opposition.

The representatives of a number of countries have noted that in the implementation of the Geneva Agreements grave responsibility is borne by the guarantor countries, who also signed the Declaration on International Guarantees at Geneva. That includes undertakings to "invariably refrain" from any form of interference and intervention in the internal affairs of Afghanistan and Pakistan and to respect the commitments contained in the bilateral Afghan-Pakistan Agreement on the Principles of Mutual Relations.

As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, it is well known that ever since the completion of the withdrawal of its troops from Afghanistan it has been engaged in active political efforts to secure the fulfilment of the provisions of the Geneva Agreements by all sides. We would also note that the Government of the Republic of Afghanistan, with which the Soviet Union closely co-operates on matters pertaining to the implementation of the Geneva Agreements, has been doing everything in its power to implement those Agreements and to achieve a political settlement in Afghanistan.

(The President)

The leadership of the Republic of Afghanistan, as confirmed here again by he Foreign Minister Abdul Wakil in his statement in the Security Council on 24 April, has renounced a monopoly on political power and proposed a programme for national reconciliation and the establishment of a broad-based Government with the participation of all political parties and forces within Afghan society. The Government of the Republic of Afghanistan has frequently confirmed its readiness to agree to cease receiving Soviet weapons provided there is symmetry with respect to the opposition.

But what is the other side doing? While Pakistan is openly and blatantly violating the provisions of the Geneva Agreements, the United States Administration has - to put it mildly - been taking an extremely peculiar approach to its role as a guarantor of the Geneva Agreements.

(The President)

The obligations of the guarantors stipulate not only that the United States should itself not allow interference in the internal affairs of Afghanistan and Pakistan but they include that the guarantors must call on others to refrain from such interference. But let us be quite frank about this; they have not set the best example in this respect. By supplying the Afghan opposition with weapons on Pakistan territory, the United States has thereby been pushing Pakistan towards a violation of the bilateral Afghan-Pakistan agreement on non-interference and the renunciation of intervention.

Who will take it upon himself to try to explain to the ordinary Afghan why there is a need for more and more new supplies of foreign weapons to the opposition - weapons which can only prolong the suffering of the civilian population and postpone a political development.

The representative of Pakistan appealed for members not to make selective quotes from the newspapers. It is difficult to say why he made this appeal, because the representative of Afghanistan produced full quotes from The New York Times of 23 April this year, without any cuts at all. So I was all the more surprised by that utterance of the Pakistan representative, since he immediately thereafter proceeded to make a selective quote from another article in that same newspaper.

Let us now fill in the gap left by the statement of the Pakistan representative and refer to the report of the correspondent of The New York Times from Afghanistan, who went on to say in that same article that among Afghans:

"... even in the bazaar, there was perplexity about the United States decision to continue arming the guerrillas." (The New York Times, 25 April 1989, p. A10)

(Mr. President)

That these words are quoted by the correspondent of that same newspaper may sound very naive, but how sincere they are. Just listen: he quoted the words of an Afghan tailor addressing the President of the United States:

"Please tell him to stop this war. All Afghans are brothers, and we have no reason to fight each other anymore'." (ibid.)

How can one remain deaf or indifferent to an appeal of this sort?

The Soviet side urges Pakistan and the United States, whose signatures are to be found under those Agreements, to comply strictly with the letter and spirit of those Agreements. Unfortunately, our constructive policy has not met with an equivalent reaction either in Islamabad or in Washington.

The attempts of the United States, which is a guarantor of the political settlement in Afghanistan, to avoid a constructive discussion of the Afghan question within the walls of the United Nations, can be considered only as an acknowledgement of the impossibility of coming here and defending its real role in Afghan affairs before the international community.

Any impartial observer realizes clearly that at the meetings of the Security Council facts have been adduced which disclose the true political conduct of the United States in Pakistan at the present time which is not at all in keeping with their obligations under the Geneva Agreements.

I wish most forcefully to emphasize again that on the question of the implementation of the Geneva Agreements there cannot and must not be dual standards whereby one side strictly and unswervingly fulfils all the Agreements while the other openly disregards them.

It is quite clear that violation of these Agreements casts a shadow over prospects for the settlement of other regional conflicts and undermines a most important component of any agreement, that is credibility, a point to which we have drawn the attention of the international community repeatedly.

(Mr. President)

Much reference is made these days in Washington to their commitment to the political settlement of the Afghan problem. In actual fact, however, the United States, together with the hawks in Islamabad, never allow the fire of internecine strife to go out. They have been slowing down the intra-Afghan dialogue, working hard to overthrow the legitimate Government of the country and trying to prevent the United Nations from bringing a constructive influence to bear on the situation in and around Afghanistan.

None of the concrete and realistic proposals aimed at a cease-fire and the cessation of the supply of weapons to fighting groups, or proposals aimed at the organization of an intra-Afghan dialogue, which would make it possible to establish a representative broad-based Government, or to convene an international conference, or other contacts between the two sides - none of these proposals has so far received a positive response from the American leadership.

Indeed, recently the American Congress had before it a draft resolution containing an appeal for the overthrow of the Government of the Republic of Afghanistan, with a build-up in aid to the Afghan opposition. It would appear that the failure of the opposition's expectation of an easy military victory after the withdrawal of Soviet troops should have induced the American politicians to reassess their clearly unrealistic and unconstructive Afghan policy. However, so far there is no sign at all of that happening.

The international community has vested considerable hopes in the Geneva Agreements after their signing, considering them an example of how other regional conflicts can and should be resolved. But the actions of the United States serve to undermine trust in their statements about their readiness to implement their obligations under the Geneva Agreements.

(Mr. President)

The sooner the American side revises its present approach to Afghan affairs, which serves to destabilize the regional and the international situations, and the sooner it brings that policy into line with the new promising trends prevailing in world affairs, then the better it will be for Afghanistan and for the cause of peace. Indeed, we are convinced that it will be the better also for the lawful national interests of the United States itself.

We wish to recall again that the leadership of the Republic of Afghanistan has again declared its readiness to dispense with Soviet military assistance, provided that supplies of armaments from outside to the opposition forces are halted. In our opinion, this would be a step in the right direction which would help extinguish the flames of war in Afghanistan. The Soviet side is prepared to halt its supplies of military assistance to the Republic of Afghanistan, but where is the United States readiness to show similar restraint, which was referred to in the United States statement on the occasion of the signing of the Geneva Agreements on 14 April last year?

(The President)

Referring today to international guarantees for the Geneva Agreements, we believe that the manner in which they are implemented and the extent to which they are effective will do much to determine the drawing up of future international agreements requiring guarantees from the great Powers. We are entitled to expect fulfilment by the United States side of all its obligations as a guarantor country.

As has been rightly pointed out in the discussion in the Council, what is at stake in the implementation of the Geneva Agreements is the authority and interests not only of the countries directly involved in the conflict but also of the entire international community. For this is a test of the will of States to seek peaceful ways to resolve conflicts. It is a test also of the political will of two permanent members of the Security Council.

During the discussion representatives of many countries - Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Mongolia, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Viet Nam, Bulgaria and others - have stressed the need for the adoption of urgent measures to forestall a further dangerous development of events in Afghanistan, which would make the situation in the region even worse. They have pointed out that the Security Council is expected to take decisions that could make a tangible contribution to the strengthening of the Geneva Agreements, so as to put them more fully into effect, thereby promoting a prompt, peaceful and comprehensive political settlement in Afghanistan.

The annoyance shown by the representative of Pakistan, to which I have already referred, manifested itself today also in his very free interpretation of the substance of the consultations which took place between him and the President of the Security Council. The President of the Council gave serious consideration to the possibility that, after the statements of the representatives of Afghanistan and Pakistan in the Council, the work of the Council should be steered towards the

(The President)

preparation of a presidential statement on the substance of the problem. In that respect, we took into account the views that had been expressed to the President of the Security Council by various members of the Council on this matter.

As President I made that point to the representatives of Afghanistan and Pakistan. The representative of Afghanistan gave an unreserved and positive response. But what about the reaction of the representative of Pakistan? He agreed only that the President of the Security Council should state to the press that the Council had listened to the statements by the sides and had completed its consideration of the question. Was it that kind of presidential statement - one that would never even be included in any document - that we discussed in our conversation with the representative of Pakistan? Not at all. Why, then, needlessly stir up confusion among members of the Council by distorting the picture of what actually happened?

I was sincerely surprised at the bad faith of the representative of Pakistan even in regard to a very elementary question having to do with the events of the past few days. In view of this, what can one say about the distorted picture which the representative of Pakistan gave in his statement of events that have occurred over the past decade?

As was emphasized by the representative of the Soviet Foreign Ministry on 19 April this year in connection with the statement by the Secretary-General on the occasion of the first anniversary of the signing of the Geneva Agreements on Afghanistan,

"The Soviet Union shares the serious disquiet expressed by Mr. Perez de Cuellar at the escalation of military operations in Afghanistan and feels that he has made a very timely appeal to all the parties to the Geneva Agreements, as well as to the guarantor countries, to ensure the precise and faithful implementation of all obligations flowing from those instruments".

(The President)

Clearly, as the representative of our Foreign Ministry went on to state,

"the United Nations has an important role to play in the Afghan settlement, thereby showing a humanitarian spirit and sympathy for the fate of the people of Afghanistan".

It is worth noting that support for the Secretary-General's efforts to assist in the achievement of an Afghan settlement has been voiced in the statements here by the representatives of Finland, Madagascar, Canada, Congo, Yugoslavia, the German Democratic Republic, Burkina Faso, Hungary, Poland and a number of other countries.

The Permanent Representative of China, Ambassador Li Luye, said the following in his statement before the Council:

"... the General Assembly adopted a resolution last November requesting that the Secretary-General promote efforts towards an early comprehensive political settlement of the Afghan question. What is important now, in our opinion, is that the parties concerned should set about implementing in earnest the Geneva Agreements so as to support the Secretary-General's efforts towards an Afghan settlement with their own concrete actions". (S/PV.2855, p. 12)

The Soviet delegation fully agrees with that. We agree fully, also, with the following said by the representative of India, Ambassador Gharekhan:

"There ... appears to be a need to give a bigger role to the United Nations with a view to the strict implementation of the [Geneva] Agreements".

(ibid., p. 6)

In the past few days a great deal has been said in the Security Council about the need to provide proper conditions for the effective operation of the United Nations Good Offices Mission in Afghanistan and Pakistan (UNGOMAP). How can the observers of UNGOMAP be expected to act quickly and effectively in checking

(The President)

complaints they receive when the appropriate conditions have not been created for them? They are not there on an excursion of some kind; they are there to check allegations of violations. Frequently, however, it looks as though they are on an excursion when one considers the "tutelage" which the Pakistan authorities provide for UNGOMAP. In fact, this "tutelage" impedes the implementation of the very functions for which UNGOMAP was set up, in accordance with Security Council decisions.

Once again we wish to inquire of the Pakistan side why it refuses to allow UNGOMAP into regions on the territory of Pakistan where, as everyone knows, military training of Afghan extremists is going on and from which foreign weapons are shipped into Pakistan to contingents of the opposition. Why, one wishes to know, is Islamabad so reluctant to agree to opening several additional observation points for UNGOMAP on the Pakistan-Afghanistan border.

(The President)

Pakistan's representatives have been claiming here that Pakistan has nothing to hide. But the fact that Pakistan has agreed to only three of the seven observation posts proposed by the Afghan side may well give rise to further doubts about their sincerity.

The Secretary-General should particularly address the need for the comprehensive enhancement of UNGOMAP's role and increased effectiveness for its verification of compliance with the Geneva Agreements. That point has been made by many speakers in the Council.

We share the opinion expressed here that steps should be taken to implement procedures for the handling of complaints from the sides, as provided for in the Agreements. This would be promoted by regular contacts between the representatives of Afghanistan and Pakistan within the framework of UNGOMAP's operations.

We welcome the readiness of countries represented in UNGOMAP to continue to send their observers to the United Nations Good Offices Mission and also to provide the Secretary-General with support in the event of expansion of UNGOMAP'S functions.

The Permanent Representative of Nepal, Ambassador Rana, has emphasized the need to make maximum use of UNGOMAP in the event of the receipt of complaints. He stated that Nepal was prepared to provide all possible assistance to the Secretary-General should he find it necessary to expand the provision of good offices in the field. The representative of Finland, Ambassador Rasi, made the same observation. These considerations must be borne in mind, along with the remarks of Ambassador Djoudi of Algeria.

The concern expressed here in the Council over the expansion of Pakistan's interference in the affairs of Afghanistan, which is leading to a worsening of the conflict, reflects the feelings and thoughts of decent people in all countries who want peace restored to the long-suffering land of Afghanistan.

(The President)

A fervent appeal for the halting of the senseless fratricidal war in Afghanistan was contained in the letter a prominent Pakistani political figure, Abdul Wali Khan, addressed to Mr. Gorbachev, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet. In his reply, dated 15 April 1989, Mikhail Sergeevich Gorbachev pointed out that

"the dimensions of the support for the Afghan opposition provided by certain Pakistan circles and their own involvement in military operations in the territory of Afghanistan are growing with each passing day. But this is a road that leads nowhere. There is no military solution to the Afghan problem, and there cannot be one. Therefore why should blood be shed and death and destruction sown everywhere?"

President Gorbachev went on to say that President Najibullah proposed another path:

"a dialogue with the opposition, and an urgent call for a political settlement on the basis of power-sharing and the establishment of a broad coalition. The Soviet Union firmly supports this sensible and very justified policy. We have done, and will continue to do, everything possible to ensure that the Afghan people will have a chance to decide its own fate for itself in conditions of peace at the negotiating table, as agreed in an international consensus. That is the purpose of the specific initiatives we have made at the United Nations, and which we have repeatedly addressed to Pakistan and the United States and the whole world community. They are well known. We believe that common sense and a sense of responsibility will eventually prevail over narrow selfish interests, and we are convinced that peace and good-neighbourliness will be realized in our region."

(The President)

On that optimistic note I wish to conclude, emphasizing once again that the Security Council must discharge its responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. The Council must do its utmost to ensure a prompt settlement of the Afghan problem in accordance with the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter. We also hope that all those concerned will draw the right conclusions from the discussion that has been taking place in the Security Council.

I thank the members of the Council for their attention and now resume my functions as President of the Security Council.

Mr. BLANC (France) (interpretation from French): Mr. President, I am addressing you in your capacity as Permanent Representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

In your statement you quoted a sentence from my statement of 19 April. In order to dissipate any possible misunderstanding, I shall read out the paragraph that began with the sentence you have quoted:

"The continuation of this war is delaying the comprehensive political solution of the problem of Afghanistan that France quite naturally seeks. Obviously, such a solution depends on efforts at reconciliation, but in our view such reconciliation will not be possible unless those who in the eyes of the overwhelming majority of the Afghan people represent a painful past stand aside in order to allow for the start of a genuine dialogue between all the components of that people." (S/PV.2855, p. 19-20)

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): As representative of the Soviet Union, I wish to emphasize that what the representative of France has said in no way changes the attitude of the Soviet Union to the statement of the delegation of France. We are entirely in agreement with what he just said.

Miss BYRNE (United States of America): We have spoken twice in this debate and have set forth our position clearly and in the necessary detail.

It is the height, or should I say the depth, of hypocrisy for the representative of the Soviet Union to claim that the régime in Kabul and the USSR are fulfilling their obligations under the Geneva accords of 14 April 1988 and that the United States and Pakistan have failed to do so.

(Miss Byrne, United States)

The truth is precisely the opposite. Further, the whole world knows full well who created this dreadful situation by its invasion of Afghanistan on 27 December 1979. The Soviet Union has at last withdrawn its troops, but it is now seeking to lay the blame for the chaos and continued suffering, and the entire responsibility for remedial action, at the feet of others. But distortion and falsehood will not work.

When the Soviet representative spoke of the "constructive policy" of the Soviet Union and its "strict adherence" to the Geneva accords, was he referring to the continuing massive supply of Soviet armaments to the desperate Afghan régime, the huge build-up of weapons - as much as a two-year stockpile, the introduction of new weapons not seen before in Afghanistan, weapons which are being used against the Afghan resistance as well as Pakistan? These obvious distortions by the Soviet representative make no contribution whatsoever to the peace and reconstruction he claims to seek.

The United States for its part is entirely committed to that peace and will continue to work towards that end.

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

Mr. UMER (Pakistan): As expected, this afternoon's proceedings have added a great deal of heat, but little light, to a debate that should never have been scheduled in the first place. I shall not now seek to answer the various allegations that have been made this afternoon; they represent nothing new, and only serve to reinforce our belief that the debate was requested to provide a propaganda forum and a means to divert attention from the true causes of the Afghan tragedy and the current internal struggle in that country.

(Mr. Umer, Pakistan)

In your capacity as representative of the Soviet Union, Mr. President, you referred to the concept of good and evil. The concept of good and evil will remain unchanged, but such references cannot blind us to the fact that the evil that afflicts Afghanistan today is rooted in the 10-year-long tragedy that continues because of the massive assistance provided by the Soviet Union. It is not the concept of good and evil but the attempt to divert attention from that root cause that constitutes a misuse of this lofty forum.

The representative of the Soviet Union gave a certain interpretation to the outcome of the debate in the Security Council on this issue; he is welcome to that interpretation. And he quoted, selectively this time, from statements made by various delegations during the debate. I was going to refer to the quotation he read out from the statement made by the representative of France, but that representative himself corrected it before I had the chance to do so. References were made by the representative of the Soviet Union to quotations from many other speakers - again, highly selective in approach.

May I invite his attention to some statements and quote from some of the speeches also made in the Security Council during the discussion. For example the Ambassador of Malaysia said,

"It is not realistic to expect that withdrawal should ipso facto mean peace and reconstruction. At least for Afghanistan, it cannot automatically apply. The mistake perpetrated over 10 years ago, backed by a foreign army, to transform Afghanistan, uprooting its traditional and religious foundations, does not just disappear upon withdrawal." (S/PV.2853, pp. 17-18)

Similarly, the Ambassador of Canada said in his statement,

(Mr. Umer, Pakistan)

"To this process, the Security Council cannot contribute in any direct or meaningful way in the absence of a request from the entire Afghan people. What the United Nations can do it is doing. We support the efforts of the Secretary-General to promote a political solution to the Afghan dispute."

(S/PV. 2855, p. 22)

While speaking in your capacity as representative of the Soviet Union, you referred, Sir, to what was said this morning by the delegation of Pakistan regarding a statement by the President of the Security Council. We maintain what we said in the morning. Our delegation was approached by the presidency regarding the possibility of a presidential statement in lieu of holding a debate after the first day. We referred the matter to our authorities, and we came back to the presidency saying that we were agreeable to a statement by the President. We did not say what the contents of that statement would be. Our understanding was that the contents of that statement were subject to negotiation among the members of the Security Council and the parties concerned. But after that we heard nothing from the presidency, and learned from other quarters, to our great surprise, that a debate in the Security Council had been scheduled for 17 April.

The Ambassador of the Soviet Union also referred to the statement made by us this morning, and said that the Pakistan delegation kept going to the past. Of course we did, because the past is what produced the present situation. The civil war in Afghanistan did not arise by itself. It happened because of a massive foreign intervention in that country. That is where the genesis of the present problems bedevilling Afghanistan lies.

(Mr. Umer, Pakistan)

In a statement this afternoon, the representative of the Kabul régime made a very interesting observation. He posed a question: he asked how it was possible in the twentieth century to impose a puppet government on any country. Sadly, such an unfortunate event did happen in Afghanistan. Had the Kabul representative sincerely pondered for a while the genesis of the régime he represents, he would have found the answer to the question he posed.

(Mr. Umer, Pakistan)

The representative of the Soviet Union also referred to the fact that this debate was extremely unpleasant for Pakistan. We do not happen to share that view. We believe that the debate was certainly more unpleasant for others than it was for us.

Let me repeat that Pakistan has no role to play in the current conflict in Afghanistan. It does, however, have a deep interest in the peaceful resolution of the problem and the establishment of a broad-based Government acceptable to the Afghan people, because that is the essential prerequisite for relieving Pakistan of the onerous burden of looking after more than three million refugees who are at present on its soil.

The Geneva accords have been and will be faithfully implemented by Pakistan. False allegations about the violation of the Agreements, for which no evidence can be offered, cannot detract from the fact that the Geneva accords dealt with the external aspects of the problem, while the problem in Afghanistan is internal - the desperate efforts of an unrepresentative régime to cling to power. The only external aspect is the massive arms supplies that that régime is receiving and the indiscriminate manner in which it is using them.

Pakistan itself had proposed the stationing of United Nations observers to monitor the implementation of the Geneva accords. It is natural, therefore, that we should have accorded them our full co-operation in the discharge of their responsibilities. A long compendium of unsubstantiated complaints in a vain effort to gain a propaganda advantage cannot be taken seriously by the international community. Without making an odious comparison, I would suggest that those who believe that repeating a statement ad nauseam will make it believable should also remember that there is such a thing as crying "Wolf!" too often.

(Mr. Umer, Pakistan)

For us, it has been a matter of great regret that our views about the inadvisability of this debate were not heeded. Despite our efforts, the exchanges have been acrimonious and have contributed nothing to a comprehensive solution of the Afghanistan problem, which the international community so fervently desires and which the people of that war-torn land so urgently require.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): In my capacity as representative of the Soviet Union, I would like to make a few remarks in reply to the statement of the representative of Pakistan.

Unfortunately, in the statement of the representative of Pakistan we still did not hear where the implacable opposition is getting the weapons of American and other foreign origin. How are those weapons getting into the territory of Afghanistan? We are living in the twentieth century. We are accustomed to thinking pragmatically. We no longer believe that babies are brought by storks or that they grow in cabbage patches. How do the weapons that come into Afghan territory from outside in such great numbers get there? Do they fall out of the sky? Or are they, rather, brought there by some other means? We therefore remain dissatisfied with the fact that we have failed to receive a clear and precise answer to that question from the representative of Pakistan.

As for the unparliamentary references to lies and hypocrisy made by the representative of the United States, it seems to me that the world community and the representatives who have been following the course of the Security Council's debate have formed a very clear idea as to who is being hypocritical and who has been lying in their statements in this Chamber.

I believe that the discussion that has taken place here has been interesting and fruitful, and it will, I trust, serve as a severe warning to the Government of Pakistan. We would hope that the Government of that country and its military

(The President)

leaders will draw some sober conclusions from what has been said here. We would also hope that in coming weeks we will not find ourselves witnessing an expansion of Pakistan's direct military intervention in Afghan affairs. We hope that we will not witness an expansion of supplies of weapons from the territory of Pakistan to foreign territory - in this case Afghan territory.

The time has now come to give serious thought to ways to bring peace to the land of Afghanistan. Now that Soviet troops have withdrawn from Afghanistan and now that the whole world has seen for itself that the Government of the Republic of Afghanistan is supported by a significant part of the population and that it does express the interests of that population and that it is successfully defending it, we would hope that Governments that have been actively interfering in Afghan affairs will alter their policies. That has been the significance of these debates.

As for the possibility of a statement by the President of the Security Council, naturally we deeply regret that we are completing our debates without adopting any statement. However, a sound explanation of why we are not issuing such a statement will be forthcoming from me when the Council meets in consultations following the adjournment of this formal meeting, for we have another urgent matter to take up.

I now resume my function as President of the Security Council.

There are no further speakers inscribed on my list. The next meeting of the Security Council to continue consideration of the item on the agenda will be fixed in consultation with members of the Council.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.