



# Security Council

PROVIS IONAL

S/PV.2855  
19 April 1989

ENGLISH

## PROVIS IONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO THOUSAND EIGHT HUNDRED AND FIFTY-FIFTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,  
on Wednesday, 19 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. NOGUEIRA-BATISTA  
Mr. FORTIER  
Mr. LI Luye  
Mr. PEÑALOSA  
Mr. TADESSE  
Ms. RASI  
Mr. BLANC  
Mr. HASMY  
Mr. RANA  
Mr. BA  
  
Sir Crispin TICKELL  
Mr. PICKERING  
Mr. KOTEVSKI

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 11 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 the decisions taken at the previous meetings on this item, I invite the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Afghanistan and the representative of Pakistan to take places at the Council table; I invite the representatives of Cuba, Democratic Yemen, the German Democratic Republic, Japan, Mongolia, Saudi Arabia, the Syrian Arab Republic and Turkey to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Wakil (Afghanistan) and Mr. Shah Nawaz (Pakistan) took places at the Council table; Mr. Oramas Oliva (Cuba), Mr. Al-Ashtal (Democratic Yemen), Mr. Zachmann (German Democratic Republic), Mr. Kagami (Japan), Mr. Dugersuren (Mongolia), Mr. Shihabi (Saudi Arabia), Mr. Al-Masri (Syrian Arab Republic) and Mr. Aksin (Turkey) 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 India, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Madagascar, Nicaragua, the United Republic of Tanzania and Viet Nam, 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.

(The President)

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Gharekhan (India), Mr. Kittikhoun (Lao People's Democratic Republic), Mr. Rabetafika (Madagascar), Mr. Serrano Caldera (Nicaragua), Mr. Chagula (United Republic of Tanzania) and Mr. Trinh Xuan Lang (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.

I should like to draw the attention of members of the Council to the following documents: S/20588, letter dated 10 April 1989 from the Permanent Representative of Bulgaria to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General; and S/20594, letter dated 14 April 1989 from the Permanent Representative of Czechoslovakia to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General.

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

Mr. GHAREKHAN (India): Mr. President, it gives my delegation particular pleasure to see you presiding over the deliberations of the Security Council this month. Our two countries have very close and cordial relations. You bring rich experience and outstanding diplomatic skills to your job. There is no doubt that you will conduct the Council's business with your customary flair and distinction.

I should like also to express my appreciation to Her Excellency the Ambassador of Senegal, Madam Claude Diallo, for the outstanding manner in which she handled the complicated agenda of the Council during the month of March. Senegal and India have a tradition of working together, not only in the United Nations but also in the non-aligned movement and other international forums.

(Mr. Gharekhan, India)

Last week marked the first anniversary of the signing of the historic Geneva Agreements on Afghanistan. When they were concluded, we had all hoped that a particularly difficult and painful period for Afghanistan and its people would soon come to an end. We had been further encouraged by the spirit of compromise shown by the parties concerned during the forty-third session of the General Assembly, when the draft resolution on Afghanistan was adopted without a vote. That resolution welcomed the conclusion of the Geneva Agreements as constituting "an important step towards a comprehensive political solution of the Afghanistan problem"

and 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".

(General Assembly resolution 43/20, paras. 1 and 6)

India, therefore, is deeply distressed that peace has not returned to Afghanistan. Instead, its people are passing through yet another horrendous period of death and destruction. Two weeks ago several dozen people were killed while praying at a place of worship. India hopes that religious places will not come under attack in the future.

Being a country in the region, and in the context of our age-old links with the people of Afghanistan, we in India cannot remain unconcerned over these distressing developments. As a gesture of our feelings, we have sent humanitarian assistance to Kabul.

(Mr. Gharekhan, India)

The Geneva Agreements were concluded after intense negotiations and with the active involvement of the United Nations. Last September the Foreign Ministers of non-aligned countries, meeting in Cyprus, expressed the view that

"effective and strict implementation and non-violation of the provisions of the Agreements would have a positive impact on the process of peace aiming at a comprehensive settlement of all the issues involved to the benefit of the Afghan people as a whole". (S/20212, annex, final document, political part, para. 122)

(Mr. Gharekhan, India)

That remains the crux of the matter. In our view strict implementation of the Geneva Agreements by all concerned is of the utmost importance for the resolution of the Afghan problem. Though all Soviet troops have withdrawn from Afghanistan in strict compliance with the Geneva Agreements, interference still continues by other foreign elements. It is imperative that all concerned desist from such activities. As the Secretary-General said in his statement of 14 April,

"Inasmuch as the withdrawal of foreign troops was an important aspect of the Geneva accords, I have stressed on several occasions that all the provisions of the accords should be implemented in an integrated manner. It is therefore incumbent upon the parties and the guarantors to ensure the scrupulous and faithful implementation of all their obligations under the Geneva accords." There also appears to be a need to give a bigger role to the United Nations with a view to the strict implementation of the Agreements.

India would like a peaceful negotiated settlement of the Afghan problem which would ensure a sovereign, independent and non-aligned Afghanistan. We feel this can best be achieved through a broad-based government which takes into account the existing realities and the legitimate concerns of all the parties and which is evolved by the Afghans themselves without outside interference or intervention.

In the past year and more, we have seen a gradual improvement in the climate of international relations. There is general expectation that these positive developments will continue. An essential element that has contributed to these expectations is the definitive steps taken towards the resolution of a number of regional conflicts. One of the most significant of these is the Agreements on Afghanistan. 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.

(Mr. Gharekhan, India)

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.

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.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): I thank the representative of India for his kind words about my country and myself.

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

Mr. CHAGULA (United Republic of Tanzania): I should first like to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of April. My delegation is further delighted to see presiding over the Council a distinguished diplomat from the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, a country with which Tanzania enjoys friendly relations and which has proved to be an active champion of international peace and security. My delegation is confident that, given your diplomatic skills and experience, you will successfully guide the work of the Council.

My delegation would also like to extend its felicitations to your predecessor, Ambassador Absa Claude Diallo of Senegal, for having successfully presided over the Council last month.

The Security Council has once again been called upon to deal with the situation in Afghanistan. My delegation has been following the various initiatives for peace in Afghanistan since the early 1980s, when our Secretary-General, Mr. Javier Perez de Cuellar, visited Kabul, and the subsequent negotiations that

(Mr. Chagula, United Republic  
of Tanzania)

culminated in the signing of the Geneva accords, which came into force on 15 May 1988, for which the Secretary-General and the parties to the accords, as well as the guarantors of the accords, are to be heartily congratulated.

This whole process that led to the signing of the Geneva accords was a very difficult one. In addition it testifies to the good intentions of all the parties concerned to realize a lasting peace in the region. With the signing of the Geneva accords, the parties involved in the peace process and the international community as a whole saw the beginning of the long awaited peace in the region, which had been interrupted by nine years of bloody war in which thousands of people died - not to mention the hundreds of thousands who fled as refugees.

The withdrawal of troops from Afghanistan in accordance with the Geneva accords was one of the crowning events in the peace process in Afghanistan. However, as the withdrawal of foreign troops from Afghanistan was just the first step in that peace process, my delegation takes this opportunity to appeal to all the parties involved in the final implementation of the Geneva accords to exercise restraint and tolerance towards each other so as to give a chance to peace in the area. Such efforts for restraint on the part of all concerned would not be new, and the demands on them would not be overwhelming if each one would take some time to look back on the rough and very difficult road that has already been travelled.

My delegation would like to reaffirm that the Geneva accords of 14 April 1988 do form the basis for a lasting solution to the conflict in Afghanistan. The bilateral Agreement between the Republic of Afghanistan and the Islamic Republic of Pakistan on the principles of mutual relations, in particular on non-interference and non-intervention each other's internal affairs, provides in very clear terms for the peaceful coexistence of the parties concerned in the conflict. That



(Mr. Chagula, United Republic  
of Tanzania)

Agreement is the central pillar in the whole process wherein is enshrined the Charter of our Organization and the principles of international law governing friendly relations and co-operation among States. It is the sincere hope of my delegation that that Agreement will now be translated into reality.

(Mr. Chagula, United Republic  
of Tanzania)

Before concluding, my delegation would like to reaffirm the thrust of General Assembly resolution 43/20, in which the Assembly, inter alia, reiterated that the preservation of the sovereignty, territorial integrity, political independence and non-aligned character of Afghanistan was essential for a peaceful solution of the Afghanistan problem, 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, called upon all parties concerned to work for the urgent achievement of a comprehensive political solution and the creation of the necessary conditions of peace and normalcy that would enable the Afghan refugees to return voluntarily to their homeland in safety and honour, and emphasized the need for an intra-Afghan dialogue for the establishment of a broad-based government to ensure the broadest support and immediate participation of all segments of the Afghan people.

Thus, the Geneva accords of April 1988 and General Assembly resolution 43/20 are complementary, and it is the sincere hope that the parties to the Geneva accords and both the guarantors of the implementation of the accords will scrupulously honour them, in addition to facilitating the implementation of General Assembly resolution 43/20. If that were done, the problem of Afghanistan would be behind us in a very short time from now.

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

Mr. LI Luye (China) (interpretation from Chinese): Please allow me first to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of April. I am convinced that with your outstanding diplomatic talent you will perform that important duty with distinction.

I should also like to thank your predecessor, Her Excellency Ambassador Diallo of Senegal, whose wisdom and dedication to the work of the Council commanded the respect of us all.

The Chinese Government and people are deeply concerned over the present situation in Afghanistan. That situation reveals that, Soviet troop withdrawals notwithstanding, the serious aftermath of a prolonged military occupation by Soviet forces is far from being removed, and the peace longed for by the Afghan people has yet to become reality. In view of that, we hold that the parties concerned should implement in earnest the agreements already in effect and let the various political forces in Afghanistan form a broad-based coalition government through consultation free from outside interference so as to ensure the safe return of Afghan refugees to their homeland and an early restoration of Afghanistan's status as an independent, sovereign, neutral and non-aligned country.

With protracted mediation by the United Nations, the parties concerned signed the Geneva accords on 14 April 1988, after arduous negotiations. As we all know, in order to prevent violations of the agreements, the accords laid down proper mechanisms and procedures to handle accusations. The United Nations Good Offices Mission in Afghanistan and Pakistan (UNGOMAP) also works hard to fulfil its mandate.

(Mr. Li Luye, China)

Moreover, 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 accords so as to support the Secretary-General's efforts towards an Afghan settlement with their own concrete actions.

The Chinese delegation does not see that any positive purpose will be served by a Security Council debate on Afghanistan's current domestic situation. In fact, the Geneva accords have already provided appropriate mechanisms and procedures for handling such disputes. In our view, a Council debate on this question right now will not help the prospect of a comprehensive political settlement of the Afghan question.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): I thank the representative of the People's Republic of China for the kind words he addressed to me.

Sir Crispin TICKELL (United Kingdom): Mr. President, it is a pleasure to see you in the Chair. You have all our good wishes in your exacting task. I remember that last year your presidency seemed almost to attract crises - and then mine did too, so I hope very much that history will not repeat itself.

Our thanks go likewise to your predecessor, who brought special charm as well as skill to her management of Security Council affairs.

My delegation has some doubts about the value of this debate. We have no evidence to support the allegations made in the letter addressed to you, Sir, by the Foreign Minister of Afghanistan. The Council should be careful about involving itself in what is now essentially the internal affair of the Afghan people. I am not sure that the statements that have been made during the debate will serve to help bring an end to the fighting and bring peace to Afghanistan.

(Sir Crispin Tickell,  
United Kingdom)

The international community is at one in wanting the sufferings of the Afghan people to be brought to an end and Afghanistan itself to achieve stability within and outside its borders. That can only be brought about, as previous speakers have said, by the restoration of peace and the establishment in Kabul of the kind of representative government with which the rest of the world can deal. That government would need to recognize the legitimate security, political and economic interests of neighbouring countries and would have every right to expect those countries to reciprocate.

The common interest of the international community was well set out in the consensus resolution adopted by the General Assembly last November calling for the restoration of Afghanistan's independence and non-aligned status and for the return of refugees in safety and honour. In particular, that 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 whatsoever".

(General Assembly resolution 43/20, para. 6)

(Sir Crispin Tickell,  
United Kingdom)

The Soviet Union has faithfully carried out its promise to withdraw from Afghanistan, and the completion of the withdrawal earlier this year constituted an essential - and welcome - step towards the achievement of these aims. The priority now must be that the Afghans themselves can exercise their right to self-determination.

The present régime has failed to win back politically through its national reconciliation policy what it lost militarily on the battlefield. There is no prospect of its winning over the hearts and minds of the Afghan people.. Nor can it evolve into a representative government. It has already been rejected by the Afghan people. The decision by over five million Afghans to leave their country since the Soviet occupation is a telling indication of how the Afghan people view the régime.

Sadly the Afghan people lack an easy route to a comprehensive settlement. A decade of revolution and war has virtually destroyed the mechanisms by which political, religious and tribal groups resolved their differences in the past. The process of self-determination will be painful. Peace will be restored only if the Afghans can establish a government whose authority is accepted by the overwhelming majority of the population.

In the meantime the international community has not been idle. For example, since 1980 the British Government has provided over \$100 million in aid to help the victims of war in Afghanistan, including nearly \$80 million in the 1988-89 financial year. For its part the United Nations has an important role through the United Nations Good Offices Mission in Afghanistan and Pakistan (UNGOMAP) and such relief agencies as the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF). Many voluntary agencies are also involved. Here I wish to pay tribute to their work as well as to the efforts of the

(Sir Crispin Tickell,  
United Kingdom)

Co-ordinator for United Nations Humanitarian and Economic Assistance, Prince Sadruddin Aga Khan. Once a settlement has been reached there will be a further role for the United Nations and the international community in helping to rebuild Afghanistan's shattered infrastructure and economy.

Mine clearance will be a problem of particular complexity. Little information is available on the location of many of the minefields, particularly in areas no longer controlled by the régime. Indiscriminate sowing of mines will damage generations to come. We urge the Soviet Union and the Kabul régime to make available to the United Nations all the details they have and to offer full co-operation in ridding Afghanistan of this bitter harvest.

The future of UNGOMAP is primarily a matter for the parties to the Geneva Agreements. More active forms of political assistance such as United Nations supervised elections, the dispatch of a United Nations peace-keeping force or the holding of an international conference would be appropriate only if they were wanted by a broad majority of Afghans. Even then the provision of such help by the United Nations would be subject to important practical considerations.

Respect for the principle of self-determination is at the heart of the United Nations and its Charter. Lack of it is at the heart of the problems of Afghanistan. The international community cannot impose a solution on the Afghan people. The only peace proposals which will work are those which have the support of those involved on all sides in this unhappy struggle.

There has been talk in this debate about alleged violations of the Geneva Agreements. The British Government is not a party to those Agreements and it is not for us to make a judgement. But we have listened with great care to the points made by the representative of Pakistan in his statement to the Council on 11 April. There is nothing to support the régime's claims that Pakistani troops have

(Sir Crispin Tickell,  
United Kingdom)

been involved in the current fighting around Jelalabad. Many journalists have, for example, visited the front line. Not one has seen Pakistani troops inside Afghanistan. Who could believe that the Afghans who have so fiercely defended their independence would now surrender it to a foreign Power?

We are deeply concerned at the indiscriminate use by the régime of weapons supplied by the Soviet Union such as Scud missiles which have struck on both sides of the Afghan-Pakistan border and caused large numbers of civilian casualties. The international community should work to mitigate the effects of the war on civilians, for example, through the provision of humanitarian aid.

In conclusion, those who have fought for nine cruel years to liberate their country are not now disposed to look for compromises. They do not want anything to do with a régime which with the help of a foreign army so misconducted the affairs of their country. There is no reason why they should give up a struggle in which they enjoy the overwhelming support of the Afghan people. We would do ill in this Council to suggest that they should.

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

I sincerely hope that the already very heavy agenda in April will not be burdened by the addition of items due to crisis situations in the world.

Mr. BLANC (France) (interpretation from French): On behalf of my delegation and on my own behalf I should like at the outset to congratulate the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on his country's assumption of the presidency of the Security Council. I take this opportunity to express to our colleague, Mrs. Absa Claude Diallo, the Ambassador of Senegal, our gratitude for the way in which she carried out the duties of the presidency of the Council during the month of March.



(Mr. Blanc, France)

France warmly welcomed the signing a year ago of the Geneva Agreements, which marked an important step towards the settlement of the Afghan conflict. It was indeed an important step but only a step, for in our view the absence of agreement among the Afghans themselves had from the beginning constituted a serious flaw and ran the risk of compromising prospects for a solution.

Unfortunately, our misgivings were well-founded since civil war ensued following the intervention of foreign troops, resulting in an equally heavy price in human lives and in the suffering of the Afghan people which had already been sorely tried by 10 years of conflict.

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.

(Mr. Blanc, France)

Only such a dialogue will it possible for all Afghans to exercise their right to self-determination, the necessity of which has recently been recalled by the Secretary-General.

France, for its part, will always stand ready, as soon as conditions appear propitious, to promote such a dialogue and the implementation of an overall solution.

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

Mr. FORTIER (Canada) (interpretation from French): On the occasion of our first debate in the Security Council during the month of April, may I take this opportunity to congratulate you, Sir, on having assumed the presidency of this body during what has become an active period. I should also like to pay a tribute to your predecessor, Madame Absa Claude Diallo of Senegal, who directed our work in the month of March with great diligence and ability.

The sufferings of the people of Afghanistan, in a war they did not initiate, have been a burden they have carried far too long. More than a million have been killed, and an even greater number wounded. A third of the population has been displaced. Millions have fled the country. The problem of Afghanistan has confronted the international community and the United Nations for more years than we care to remember.

Developments in the last year, however, have offered some hope for a solution to the conflict in Afghanistan. Through the good offices of the Secretary-General and his Special Representative, the Geneva Accords were signed just over a year ago. We commend the dedication and hard work that resulted in their signature and are pleased to note that the Soviet forces have withdrawn from Afghanistan as scheduled.

(Mr. Fortier, Canada)

With the Soviet withdrawal completed, my Government believes that it is for the Afghan people to determine their common future without outside interference. Canada supports the early establishment of a representative government in Afghanistan. Only in this way can there be a lasting solution to the conflict and an end to the continuing loss of life. The Afghans themselves must be permitted to establish the conditions which will allow the millions of refugees in Pakistan and Iran to return to their homes and their country to be rebuilt.

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. We recognize the important contribution made by the United Nations Good Offices Mission in Afghanistan and Pakistan (UNGOMAP), in which Canada participates, in overseeing the implementation of the Geneva Accords. We urge the international community to continue its support for the United Nations appeal for humanitarian assistance to the displaced and dispossessed victims of the war, particularly through the United Nations Co-ordinator for Afghanistan, for whose programme Canada has pledged its full support.

Canada accords highest priority to the clearance of mines, which is essential for the safe return of the refugees and the reconstruction of their country. We ask again that all those who can assist in this important endeavour to co-operate fully with the efforts of the United Nations.

(Mr. Fortier, Canada)

There will be no solution in Afghanistan until the Afghan people can freely choose its own form of government. United Nations efforts must be directed towards this end. Only then will the people of Afghanistan be able to rebuild their shattered country and to lay the foundations for a secure future for themselves and their children.

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

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

Mr. RABETAFIKA (Madagascar) (interpretation from French): On behalf of the delegation of the Democratic Republic of Madagascar, I should like to convey to you, Sir, and through you to members of the Council, our sincere thanks for permitting us to participate in these debates.

Recent tradition has it that a guest may also convey congratulations to the current President and thank the retiring President. I avail myself most willingly of this opportunity, since I have had the pleasure and privilege of working closely with you, Mr. President, in your capacity as representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in the Council and with the Permanent Representative of Senegal, whose devotion and many merits we all recognize.

The signing at Geneva on 14 April 1988 of the Geneva accords on Afghanistan was welcomed with satisfaction, since, concluded under the auspices of the United Nations, it constitutes the results of several years of arduous negotiations. Hence it is only proper for us to pay a tribute to all the interested parties and to the Secretary-General and his Special Representative for the imagination, spirit of compromise and political vision they have shown.

(Mr. Rabetafika, Madagascar)

A key element in the negotiated solution put to us for approval, the withdrawal of foreign troops, has taken place according to the schedule stipulated in article IV of the Geneva accords. Having followed the vicissitudes of this withdrawal, we now grasp the complexity and difficulties of the operation. All this gives us reason to recognize the will of the Soviet Union to fulfil its contractual obligations in good faith. It is thus not in vain that the General Assembly, in its resolution 43/20, adopted by consensus on 3 November 1988, called 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.

The Secretary-General, in reporting the total withdrawal of foreign troops, emphasized that it was now a matter of necessity to take advantage of the impetus provided by the implementation of that element of the accords, and move forward, ensuring full and faithful implementation of all commitments entered into under those accords.

(Mr. Rabetafika, Madagascar)

One year after the conclusion of the accords and two months after the withdrawal of the Soviet troops we would have preferred to learn that their implementation was proceeding normally. On the contrary, fighting has intensified around population centres, the number of dead and wounded is growing, the exodus is swelling the ranks of the refugees and the destruction of the economic and social infrastructure is continuing.

Moreover, tension remains unacceptably high throughout the region. Mutual accusations of violations are proliferating. The United Nations Good Offices Mission cannot cope with all the requests for investigation, hindered as it is by the lack of information, the broken terrain, the time that has elapsed since the alleged incidents and the situation with regard to security in the given sector.

However, it is encouraging to note that the two parties have clearly reaffirmed to UNGOMAP their determination fully to implement the accords and to ensure that all the obligations flowing therefrom are met faithfully. If that is indeed the case, we must ensure, by means of appropriate and effective machinery, that there is genuine adherence to article I on non-interference and non-intervention. For it is on this adherence that the exercise by the Afghan people of its right to self-determination depends - and this exercise remains, at the political level, the basic goal of the accords.

This right to self-determination is subject to respect for the sovereignty, territorial integrity, political independence and non-alignment of Afghanistan. Above all, it is the acknowledged right of the Afghan people itself to determine their own form of government and to choose their own economic, political and social system free from outside interference, subversion, coercion or constraint of any kind whatsoever.

(Mr. Rabetafika, Madagascar)

In emphasizing this in its resolution adopted on 3 November 1988 the General Assembly has merely reaffirmed the principles of the Charter specifically set forth in the 24 October 1970 Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and the 21 December 1965 and 9 December 1981 Declarations on the Inadmissibility of Intervention and Interference in the Internal Affairs of States. The specific obligations set forth in article II of the first instrument of the Geneva accords merely reiterate them by adapting them to the situation in Afghanistan.

Any difficulty that may arise in implementing the accords must, in our view, be ironed out in keeping with the letter and spirit of these accords as well as with the Charter and the principles of international law, such as those mentioned in the Manila Declaration on the Peaceful Settlement of International Disputes.

Afghanistan and Pakistan are members of the Non-Aligned Movement. They know that the Movement is deeply committed to respect for the principles of non-interference and non-intervention. At the Movement's Conference of Ministers of Foreign Affairs held in Nicosia in September 1988 the Ministers reaffirmed the right of the Afghan people to pursue its political, social and economic goals without foreign hindrance, pressure or interference. They also expressed their confidence that strict and genuine implementation and non-violation of the provisions of the accords would have a positive impact on the peace process, with a view to achieving a comprehensive settlement of all the questions, to the benefit of the Afghan people.

Of course, the Geneva accords only deal with the problems relating to the external aspects of the situation in Afghanistan. But the establishment of

(Mr. Rabetafika, Madagascar)

conditions capable of restoring peace and stability in the region and allowing the Afghan people to determine their own future depends upon their implementation in good faith.

Failure to implement the accords would undermine the confidence of States in the United Nations to settle disputes peacefully, make uncertain the settlement of other regional conflicts, rekindle international tension and threaten international peace and security.

I cannot conclude without adding my delegation's voice to the Secretary-General's repeated appeals to the Afghan people "to resolve their differences and seize this historic opportunity which will enable them to settle the problem peacefully, to their benefit and in their territory's interest, by creating a national dialogue to lead to the establishment of a government of national reconciliation. Only a comprehensive political settlement will make it possible to create the necessary conditions for the voluntary return, in full security and with dignity, of millions of refugees to their homeland."

With regard to the interested parties, to the extent that they have always been aware of their responsibilities, we would only remind them of the still-valid principle of reciprocity in the implementation of obligations that arise from arrangements made or agreements, contracts and treaties entered into.

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

Ms. RASI (Finland): I should like to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for April. My delegation is convinced that your well-known diplomatic skills will prove to be of great help to us this month. I also wish to express my delegation's warmest thanks to your predecessor, Ambassador Diallo of Senegal, for the efficient way in which she guided us through the month of March.



(Ms. Rasi, Finland)

In our opinion, the debate on the situation relating to Afghanistan in the Security Council did not have a promising beginning. The statements we have heard indicate that the realities of the situation are perceived and interpreted in a very different manner by Afghanistan and Pakistan, the two principal parties to the Agreements that were signed in Geneva almost precisely one year ago. The subsequent debate in the Council has shown only minimal signs of convergence of views. Nevertheless, since the debate has continued we wish to emphasize some salient points.

First of all, it is incumbent on the whole international community to be concerned with the suffering of the people of Afghanistan. The response of the international community has been positive, but we are all still only at the beginning of the task of relief, rehabilitation and reconstruction. The first political pre-condition for improving the situation was, of course, the conclusion of the Geneva Agreements last year, after painstaking negotiations under United Nations auspices. Of decisive importance was the withdrawal of the Soviet troops, which was completed on 15 February this year. What is needed now is an internal settlement putting an end to the bloodshed and making it possible for the humanitarian efforts of the United Nations to be carried out with full effectiveness.

The people of Afghanistan is very resilient, but everybody knows that it is tired of war. The need for a political settlement is universally recognized. Thus every effort must be made to put an end to the suffering of the Afghan people and to work for the establishment of an intra-Afghan dialogue.

(Ms. Rasi, Finland)

However, for the time being there does not seem to be sufficiently broad agreement as to who should negotiate with whom and under what conditions. In any case, we are of the opinion that the re-organization of the country's political structures should be effected by the Afghans themselves through peaceful means. We know that the Secretary-General is engaged in efforts to promote negotiations towards a political settlement. Those efforts have our full support

The situation relating to Afghanistan has now been brought to the attention of the Security Council in the form of a complaint against a neighbouring country, Pakistan. We are all aware of the obligations undertaken by the Governments of Afghanistan and Pakistan in the Geneva Agreements concerning non-interference, non-intervention and the voluntary return of refugees. If it appears to be the case that some complaints cannot be settled even after the services of the United Nations Good Offices Mission in Afghanistan and Pakistan (UNGOMAP) have been fully utilized, it is up to the parties to the Agreements to clarify the procedures of the Agreements on dealing with complaints. If the parties recognize that UNGOMAP is not able to carry out that task effectively to their satisfaction, further steps may be needed within the context of the already existing Agreements.

As regards the question now before us, my delegation is ready to support any decision by the Security Council that could effectively contribute to strengthening respect for the Geneva Agreements, make their implementation more effective and promote the achievement of a peaceful political settlement in Afghanistan.

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

I should now like to make a statement in my capacity as representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. This does not mean, of course, that we have concluded discussion of the item on the agenda. But in view of the item's particular significance, and since the Soviet Union is a party to and guarantor of the Geneva Agreements, we believe it entirely appropriate and timely at precisely this stage of the Security Council's discussion for us to express our views on the item under discussion.

The Soviet Union wholeheartedly supports the recourse undertaken by the Government of the Republic of Afghanistan to the Security Council in connection with the threat to that country's territorial integrity, independence and national sovereignty stemming from Pakistan's escalation of its aggressive activities and acts of intervention in Afghanistan's internal affairs.

Afghanistan's recourse to the Security Council is entirely right, proper and timely. Current events in Afghanistan are by no means the strictly internal affair of the Afghan people, as has been so strenuously argued by certain speakers here in the Council, the representative of Pakistan in particular. A great deal of evidence, including evidence presented in the statement of the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Afghanistan, Mr. Wakil, demonstrates that this is a matter of outside activities posing an ever-greater threat to the sovereignty and independence of Afghanistan, thus creating a threat to peace and stability in South-West Asia.

More than two months have gone by since Soviet troops were withdrawn from Afghanistan. Strict compliance by the Soviet Union and the Republic of Afghanistan with their obligations under the Geneva Agreements, endorsed by the United Nations

(The President)

and so warmly commended in the official statements of the leaders of many countries, was welcomed by the international community. Not a single Soviet soldier remains in Afghanistan.

If the issue were merely that of the Soviet military presence in Afghanistan, as some have tried so hard to represent, it would appear that all conditions now exist for moving the Afghan settlement onto a peaceful track in order to devise mutually acceptable compromises and political solutions with which to reconcile intra-Afghan differences.

However, the tension of the situation in Afghanistan not only is not subsiding but is actually growing. The senseless fratricidal war, pitting Afghan against Afghan, is becoming ever more bitter and is assuming ever more tragic forms and wider scale. As was pointed out in the Soviet Government's statement of 11 March, that largely explains why "the armed Afghan opposition, instigated and encouraged by certain political and military circles in Pakistan, the United States of America, Saudi Arabia and other countries, in disregard of all sensible appeals for national reconciliation issued by the Government of the Republic, has adopted a policy of exclusively military solutions and the violent seizure of power".

Leaving aside the purely internal aspects of the civil war in Afghanistan - because those are not the issue now before us in the Council - we cannot deny, if we take the standpoint of objectivity and honesty, that the exacerbation of the situation in Afghanistan has occurred and continues largely, and even predominantly, because of the constant outside intervention in Afghanistan's internal affairs, in defiance of international law, the United Nations Charter and the Geneva Agreements. The scale of that intervention rose sharply after the withdrawal of Soviet troops.

(The President)

In March of this year, the President of the Republic of Afghanistan, Najibullah, twice sent messages to the Secretary-General of the United Nations in which he drew attention to the fact that, as a result of the policy of intervention in Afghan internal affairs pursued by Islamabad, the dangerous development of events and the serious situation in the Afghan provinces bordering on Pakistan have become ever more pronounced and clear cut.

As was pointed out by President Najibullah in his message of 22 March 1989, the situation

"has been aggravated unprecedentedly as a result of the direct intervention of Pakistani army and military intelligence through supporting, encouraging and equipping the extremist armed opposition and providing logistical support for them in the territory of the Republic of Afghanistan" (A/44/189, p. 3).

(The President)

That was a message from President Najibullah, circulated in document A/44/189.

Pakistan's intervention in Afghan affairs goes back many years. The evidence of this is well known. It was referred to, and in some detail, in the negotiations that led to the signing of the Geneva Agreements, one of the goals of which was the cessation of this kind of intervention by Pakistan.

Therefore, in order to understand why the Security Council now finds itself compelled to take up the Afghan problem from the standpoint of Pakistan's policy towards Afghanistan, we must first analyse the situation with regard to compliance with the Geneva Agreements.

As will be recalled, underlying these Agreements was the idea of taking into account in a balanced way the interests of the Afghans themselves and the interests of the parties involved in the conflict. That made possible, ultimately, the signing of the Agreements, after lengthy and meticulous efforts, to which a major contribution was made by the United Nations Secretary-General, Mr. Perez de Cuellar, and his Personal Representative, Mr. Diego Cordovez. Is there anyone among the members of the Council who would not agree that only mutual - and I stress "mutual" - compliance by all parties with their obligations under the Geneva Agreements can achieve the goal set when these Agreements were signed in Geneva one year ago? I wish to draw attention once again to the following words in the statement made on 23 March this year by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Mr. Eduard Shevardnadze:

"The main reason why the Afghan situation continues to give rise to concern and anxiety lies not in any weaknesses inherent in the Geneva Agreements, but in the fact that they have not yet been fully implemented". (S/20549, p. 3)

(The President)

In deciding, with the agreement of the Afghan leadership, to withdraw Soviet troops from Afghanistan, the Soviet side naturally based itself on the understanding that outside intervention in Afghan affairs from Pakistani territory would be completely stopped. The Soviet Union's obligation in regard to the withdrawal of troops was balanced in the Geneva Agreements by a clear-cut obligation on the part of Pakistan concerning what would be Pakistan's policy henceforth in respect of its Afghan neighbour.

That obligation on the part of Pakistan, I should like to point out, by the way, is not something specific which imposes any special conditions on Pakistan. It represents merely a confirmation, as applicable to the situation of Afghan-Pakistani relations, of universally acknowledged principles of international law enshrined in the United Nations Charter and in the definition of aggression adopted by the United Nations and other international documents. When we refer to the Geneva Agreements and talk about violations of them by Pakistan, we do so exclusively for purposes of convenience - in order to highlight and make clear these violations by Pakistan of the principles of international law and provisions of the United Nations Charter, which are precisely what has made it so necessary, indeed urgent, for the Security Council to consider the present item.

Let us now revert to the Geneva Agreements - for example, one of the key documents making up the package of the Agreements. Its title - and I am deliberately giving the official title of the document verbatim - is "Bilateral Agreement between the Republic of Afghanistan and the Islamic Republic of Pakistan on the Principles of Mutual Relations, in particular on Non-Interference and Non-Intervention". Let us compare what is stated in this Agreement with what is actually happening.

(The President)

We find that it is laid down in black on white in the Agreement - and I am referring in particular to article II, paragraph (8) - that each party undertakes to prevent within its territory recruitment for the purpose of carrying out hostile activities against the other party. Now, what do we see happening in actual fact?

Reports are coming in constantly from refugee camps that Afghan citizens are being forced - indeed, often by violent means - to join combat units of the opposition. The scale of this recruitment increases from day to day. Among the refugees this is arousing growing discontent and resistance. There has been a particular rise in the scale of the recruitment on the territory of Pakistan in the past few weeks in connection with the major reverses sustained by the armed opposition at Jalalabad. This kind of activity is strictly prohibited under the Agreement - an agreement that bears the signature of the representatives of Pakistan. One may ask: is this something that the Government of Pakistan does not know?

The same article of the Agreement to which I have just referred states that there is a prohibition on the training in the territory of Pakistan of persons recruited in this way. But we know that to this very day there are operating on the territory of Pakistan more than 100 military training schools, for the purpose of training Afghan rebels. Incidentally, this training is being carried out even on facilities of the Pakistan army. There, training is being given to artillerymen, saboteurs, and launchers of Stinger and Blowpipe missiles. Officers are also being trained to command units of the irreconcilable opposition.

Furthermore, the Bilateral Agreement prohibits the equipping of rebels - that is, a strict prohibition on supplying them with weapons. But does anyone really



(The President)

believe that the units of mujahidin being trained on Pakistani territory are being sent from there into Afghanistan with bare hands and blank cartridges? Actually, these units are crossing the Afghan-Pakistan border with full combat equipment. They are armed not only with rifles but also with artillery, guided and attack missiles and other sophisticated military materiel. And they get all of this on Pakistani territory. In other words, the Pakistan side, in violation of the Geneva Agreements, is permitting active use, in a wide variety of ways, of its territory for openly hostile purposes, against a neighbouring country.

(The President)

This conduct is markedly aggressive in tone and in no way consistent with any of the canons of international law.

So should the Government of Pakistan bear, or should it not bear, responsibility for what is happening on the territory of its own country, where the structure of systematic military and political intervention in the affairs of Afghanistan is not only being maintained but actually increased in flagrant violation of the Geneva accords and universally acknowledged norms of international law?

The answer can only be in the affirmative - if one approaches the question from the standpoint of respect for the obligations assumed by Pakistan under the United Nations Charter and the Geneva accords.

I should like now to draw the Council's attention to the illegal and aggressive nature of the actions in which the Pakistan side has been involved not just on its own territory but actually on the territory of Afghanistan itself. Here Pakistan's intervention into Afghan affairs is becoming something of an entirely different order, posing an even greater threat and danger and involving the direct participation of Pakistani troops in combat on Afghanistan territory.

All this becomes exceedingly clear if we use the example of the situation outside Jalalabad. Now, how is direct Pakistan involvement in the siege of this city manifested?

It takes many different forms. First of all, it has repeatedly been reported in the Western mass media that Pakistan soldiers and instructors are planning practically all the Mujahidin operations, including supplying them with intelligence. At the army headquarters of Pakistan in Rawalpindi, and also in a number of other places, there are courses for the training of Pakistan soldiers so

(The President)

that they can subsequently be sent as advisers to opposition units operating inside Afghanistan. Many organs of the world press, including some that cannot possibly be suspected of sympathy for the Afghan revolution, have no hesitation in calling things by their proper names - and, incidentally, their reports are written not in Moscow or Kabul.

The New York Times of 22 March, referring to information from Islamabad, reported the approval by representatives of the intelligence services of the United States and Pakistan of the plan for blockading Jalalabad.

One can hardly suspect the correspondent of The Christian Science Monitor of any intention to invent unfounded charges against the Pakistan side when, in its issue of 23 March, referring to information coming from the Mujahidin, he wrote that the attack on Jalalabad was master-minded by the Pakistan inter-agency intelligence.

It is worth asking how this is consistent with Pakistan's obligation under the Geneva accords to respect Afghanistan's sovereignty and to take no action designed to undermine the system existing there.

But this is not the end of the matter. Arms supplies from Pakistan to the rebels, as well as long-range artillery and even helicopters, are often serviced and operated by Pakistan soldiers and officers, who give fire support to opposition units.

The Washington correspondent of The New York Times on 26 February, for example, reported that senior officials in the United States Administration acknowledged that Pakistan military advisers and technicians were giving the opposition assistance in the operation - I stress "operation" - and repair of equipment on the territory of Afghanistan itself, but that the American Administration was reluctant to protest.

(The President)

Participating in combat on the territory of Afghanistan we also find units from Pakistan tribal detachments - the so-called militia; at present, their number on the territory of Afghanistan amounts to more than 6,000. It is impossible to imagine that the militias, who are Pakistan citizens, are acting in this instance without the approval of the Pakistan authorities. For participation in the Jalalabad sector, on the territory of Pakistan there are being trained and prepared for deployment - and for all we know they are being deployed right now on Afghanistan territory - another three mixed regiments of militias totalling 15,000. Nor is it a secret that on Afghanistan territory other foreign advisers are active. From what countries do they come? That information can be found in the American and Western European press.

In this regard, I should like to remind the Pakistan side of the keystone provision of the Geneva accords about the renunciation of intervention against the other party - the very point that was actually included in the title of the Afghan-Pakistan Agreement on the principles of their mutual relations.

We get the impression that in Islamabad they have deliberately forgotten that. Or perhaps they never intended to observe it when they signed the Geneva accords. But that would be verging on dishonesty and would lead us to a conclusion at which we should not like to arrive.

In the last few weeks, every day a tremendous quantity of rockets and artillery shells and mines have been aimed at Jalalabad. Sometimes in a single day they amount to 20,000 units. Not only positions of governmental troops but also residential parts of Jalalabad are subjected to bombardment, as a result of which its residents are being killed and wounded. Who is providing those missiles and heavy artillery pieces to the extremists? How are they getting into their hands?

(The President)

We have only to imagine the scale of ammunition supplies needed to ensure this bombardment of Jalalabad - a vast amount of shells are fired almost every day - to understand that it is practically a conveyor-belt system. And this assembly line, this military machine for the transportation of armaments, is operating from day to day, from week to week and from month to month.

(The President)

Weapons are introduced into Afghan territory in various ways. Of late, these have included military helicopters with Pakistani markings, which have been landing at rebel positions and unloading arms, ammunition and equipment for the rebels. Military cargoes are also delivered by Pakistani land transport.

None of this is a secret to anyone, least of all to the Pakistanis themselves. Some Pakistanis are raising their voices against the dangerous game Pakistani military circles are playing. For example, the Chairman of the People's National Party of Pakistan, Abdul Wali Khan, has said publicly that, week after week, many of his compatriots have themselves seen weapons and other cargoes being shipped in military trucks from Pakistan to Afghanistan. He recently appealed to the leaders of the armed opposition to call a halt to the fratricidal war.

Recently, more than 30 members of the Lahore, Pakistan, supreme court recently issued a statement on events in Afghanistan. They noted, inter alia, that Pakistani authorities, taking their cue from the United States, were endangering their own people.

There could be some who think that we should not base our assessment of the policy of Pakistan's military circles too heavily on the aforementioned Pakistani sources. Let us look at other sources. The New York Times of 13 April 1989 reported that the Pakistani Directorate General of Inter-Services Intelligence

"since 1979 has provided co-ordination and technical guidance to the guerrilla forces and channeled the arms and equipment provided by the United States and Saudi Arabia to their commanders". (The New York Times, 13 April 1989, p. A5)

Earlier, on 26 February, the same newspaper stated that

"the United States will continue to use Pakistan's intelligence services as the conduit for military aid to the Afghan rebels". (The New York Times,

26 February 1989, p. 15)

(The President)

To complete the picture, I should like to cite one more reputable United States newspaper. On 16 April 1989 the Washington Post noted that the United States Administration

"has been providing the rebels with weapons to the tune of hundreds of millions of dollars; they have been supplied through Pakistan".

Perhaps the newspaper was understating the case.

Earlier, on 9 March 1989, the Washington Post stated, equally categorically, that

"Arms deliveries in a constant stream, principally from the United States, are controlled by Pakistan through its special services, specifically its Inter-Services Intelligence service".

The intransigent Afghan opposition knows full well who its Pakistani protectors are and what it is getting from them. Indeed the "President" of the so-called transitional government, Mr. Mojaddidi, in an interview with the Swiss newspaper Le journal de Genève of 14 April 1989, stated that links between the armed opposition and Pakistani military circles had for years been friendly thanks to the fact that "all the equipment for the units goes through them and is shipped from Pakistani territory".

How can all those facts and admissions be reconciled with Article II (12) of the Geneva Bilateral Agreement between Afghanistan and Pakistan on non-intervention, which refers to the obligation to prevent the transportation of arms, ammunition and equipment by individuals and groups creating subversion, disorder or unrest in the territory of the other High Contracting Party.

The Government of Afghanistan has rightly described the actions of Pakistan as aggression against the Republic of Afghanistan and as a flagrant violation by Islamabad of the universally-acknowledged norms of international law, the United Nations Charter and the Geneva accords.

(The President)

In his statement to the Security Council, the representative of Pakistan described the evidence of Pakistani intervention put forward by the Foreign Minister of Afghanistan, Mr. Wakil, as unfounded charges and unjustified assertions. The quotations I have cited clearly show the real worth of those bald denials by Pakistan of the clear-cut truth. No matter how hard some parties try to convince the Council that black is white, we are sure that all those in this Chamber - even those who have recently been publicly defending Pakistan - understand deep in their hearts what the whole world understands: that what is taking place is a broad-based, flagrant violation of the Geneva accords by Pakistan, which in essence represents aggression against Afghanistan. Because of Pakistani intervention in the internal conflict in Afghanistan, a new dangerous dimension has been added: military confrontation between Pakistan and the Republic of Afghanistan.

In essence, what is now taking place with Pakistan's support is the systematic destruction of Afghanistan's industry, agriculture and entire economic structure. Thousands upon thousands of wholly innocent people are being sacrificed. The ruthless annihilation of Jalalabad and other Afghan cities is under way through bombardment with tens of thousands of shells and heavy projectiles supplied by Pakistan.

Under the circumstances, it is no surprise that, as pointed out in Mr. Wakil's statement, the mounting aggression by Pakistan should have aroused an upsurge of patriotic feeling among Afghans. For instance, in the western province of Herat thousands of citizens have stated their willingness to volunteer to go to Jalalabad and help defend the city against the attacking rebel units. At the same time, a number of field commanders of armed units operating in Paktia and Herat provinces have responded to President Najibullah's appeal for a cease-fire and begun negotiations with Afghan authorities.



(The President)

As we all know, the ferocity of the fighting around Jalalabad can be explained by the fact that taking that city is part of an ambitious plan to locate there a "government" formed by the Alliance of the Seven. The emergence of such a narrow, unrepresentative "government" - whose goal is to seize power in the country - by no means constitutes a step towards forming a broad-based coalition government that could bring peace to the Afghan people. It is, in fact, a step away from that goal. The first few weeks of the functioning of the "transitional government" has shown absolutely clearly that its appearance is only exacerbating confrontation and leading to an escalation of bloodshed.

(The President)

Also, it is no accident that the forming of this government, which is practically in the pocket of the Pakistani military circles, coincided with the revival of the idea of creating a Pakistan-Afghan confederation.

The question arises: How can we reconcile the obligation signed by the Pakistan side in Geneva to respect the sovereignty, political independence, territorial integrity and national unity of Afghanistan with appeals of this kind? Of course, we could disregard statements on this score if they were coming only from extremist-minded politicians at a low level. But we cannot fail to be alarmed at the fact that the possibility of reverting to this idea is not being denied by the President of Pakistan.

Thus, even this brief comparison of what the parties should be doing under international law and the Geneva Agreements and what is actually happening makes it abundantly clear how international norms are being trampled underfoot by Pakistan. Practically every one of the 13 articles of the bilateral agreement between Afghanistan and Pakistan, which are an extremely important part of the whole Geneva package, has been violated by Islamabad.

The taking of hostile, military and other actions by Pakistan against the Republic of Afghanistan makes it entirely justified and gives every moral ground to raise in the Council the question of curbing aggression and intervention by Pakistan against the internal affairs of Afghanistan.

Today the international community has on its agenda the high priority task of preventing the Geneva Agreements, designed to bring a halt to the fratricidal war in Afghanistan, from being flouted. We cannot permit events in Afghanistan to spill over into an even more serious regional conflict with its incalculable consequences.

(The President)

It is becoming ever clearer that the calculations of those who cherished illusions to the effect that the withdrawal of Soviet troops would on the very next day lead to the fall of the Government of the Republic of Afghanistan have proved to be unfounded. The Republic of Afghanistan is alive and fighting in difficult conditions against the subversive actions of the opposition. But in Afghanistan it is becoming more widely understood that the Government of the Republic and its army and those components of the population that support it are in a position to resist the forces of opposition and external aggression. Is it not time now to draw the necessary conclusions from that? Surely, it is time to give some thought to what the protracted war in Afghanistan may lead and to what additional suffering such a prospect is dooming the Afghan people.

A clear idea of this is given by the accumulated experience of the activities of the "intransigent" faction of the Afghan armed opposition, which intends at any price to seize power and to that end is using the most barbaric methods. Its tactics include blockade, hunger, massive bombardment of inhabited quarters of towns with heavy artillery and mortars and terrorist bombings of schools, hospitals, cinemas and even mosques. All these activities are first and foremost designed to hit the peaceful population - women, children and the elderly. The scale and scope of the destruction is growing every day, causing ever greater damage to the economy of the country and bringing fresh suffering to its people.

The continuation of the war in particular is complicating the problem of the return of refugees to Afghanistan. For it is a fact that the attack developed by the opposition forces on Jelalabad has led to a new outflow of refugees from the scene of military activities. In so far as concerns the plans for restoring, rehabilitating and developing Afghanistan provided in the Geneva Agreements, the implementation of these plans will, it is understandable, be postponed for a very long time unless a beginning is made on putting a brake on the machine of war.

(The President)

There can be no doubt that the further build-up of supplies and deliveries of arms to the "intransigent opposition" means a deliberate policy of attempting a military solution to the Afghan problem, although the untenability of this idea is clear to many.

So far I have been talking about the situation in Afghanistan and in Afghan-Pakistani relations. Nevertheless, I should like for the members of the Security Council to give some thought to another point: how what is happening in Afghanistan can influence processes in other regions. We must see that cynical violations of the Geneva Agreements are undermining the key element in any agreement: credibility. For, as we know, the achievement of the Geneva Agreements was not something easy to accomplish and required tremendous efforts and lengthy and complicated negotiations, and underlying them was the natural assumption that the Agreements would be honoured and strictly complied with.

So the legitimate question inevitably arises: What will be the situation in other parts of the world where the efforts of so many countries, with the active participation of the United Nations, are helping us to move towards agreements that still remain to be finalized and then carried out? Surely the refusal of certain parties to the Geneva Agreements on Afghanistan to comply with their obligations will undermine the faith and credence of parties to other conflicts in the effectiveness of possible settlements by means of agreements and faith in the United Nations by those peoples which continue in so many hot spots around the world, including the Middle East, Africa and South-East Asia, to seek relief from internecine strife and regional conflict.

(The President)

Undermining faith in international agreements - and we must say this frankly - is having a bad effect on the whole international climate, darkening the prospects of settling conflicts in other parts of the world. It is calling into question confidence in guarantees for possible agreements, and even in those guarantor countries which are turning their backs on their obligations and undertakings. Does the international community really stand to gain, does any of its individual members stand to gain, if doubt is cast on the fundamental principle of international life: pacta sunt servanda? We are convinced that the answer is no.

There are other aspects of the events under discussion which are of concern to the Security Council. International terrorism, as everyone acknowledges, is an exceedingly important problem the severity of which is not going to leave us. It would be totally short-sighted and irresponsible to give to the "intransigent" Afghan opposition, in the ranks of which we quite often find operating out-and-out terrorists, the more sophisticated forms of weaponry, particularly Stinger and Blowpipe missiles, anti-tank missiles and other armaments, which can be used not only in the battlefield in Afghanistan.

(The President)

Experience has shown that controlled use of these weapons is practically impossible. This poses a very real threat of their being used in acts of international terrorism.

The international community is confronted also with a rapid and turbulent growth in the production of opium in the territory controlled by the Afghan opposition. As was pointed out in The New York Times on 26 March this year, the same means of transport that supplied American military equipment to the rebels carried back to Pakistan some 700 to 800 tons of narcotics in 1988. That gives us food for thought: how can those who have declared war on narcotics and are trying to bring a halt to the illegal trafficking in narcotics extricate themselves from this situation? The only sensible way is a return to compliance with the Geneva accords and implementation of those procedures set forth in the resolution on Afghanistan adopted by consensus at the forty-third session of the General Assembly, which, inter alia:

"Emphasizes the need for an intra-Afghan dialogue for the establishment of a broad-based government to ensure the broadest support and immediate participation of all segments of the Afghan people;". (resolution 43/20, para. 8)

The Security Council's consideration of the Afghan question should produce an effect on those who are disregarding these Accords and creating further obstacles to an Afghan settlement; what is most important, it must promote a cessation of outside intervention designed to encourage the fratricidal war in Afghanistan.

I would remind the Council that the Government of the Republic of Afghanistan, in pursuance of the policy of national reconciliation, has repeatedly declared its willingness to make compromises; it claims no monopoly of power. However, the

(The President)

adventurism of the rebels and their refusal to enter into any dialogue with Kabul - due in part, of course, to the position of their protectors - inhibits the initiation of any process of peaceful settlement. As a result, the goal of the General Assembly's consensus resolution remains unachieved. An important step towards its achievement would be a cease-fire between the opposing groups in Afghanistan.

Since reconciliation is bound to remain elusive as long as cannons and missiles are being fired, as long as explosions prevent people from listening to one another and the passions of war are as inflamed as they are, it is essential that we ensure that no fresh consignments of weapons be allowed to fan the fires of military confrontation in the region.

The Government of the Republic of Afghanistan has repeatedly confirmed its readiness to refrain from acquiring additional weapons from the Soviet Union on condition that the other party reciprocate accordingly. Understandably, however, it cannot in the present situation act unilaterally.

As far back as December last year, speaking at the forty-third session of the General Assembly, Mr. Gorbachev proposed to the parties to the conflict:

"A complete cease-fire, effective everywhere as of 1 January 1989, and the cessation of all offensive operations of shelling, with the opposing Afghan groups retaining, for the duration of negotiations, all territories under their control; linked to that, stopping as of the same date any supplies of arms to all belligerent;". (A/43/PV.72, p. 21)

The reasonableness of this appeal has become ever-more apparent. Let us now, however, preclude the possibility, at a given stage, of dispatching United Nations peace-keeping forces to strategic centres in Afghanistan, or of otherwise acting to

(The President)

broaden the stabilizing effect of a United Nations presence there. Meanwhile, the proposal for the holding of an international conference on the neutrality and demilitarization of Afghanistan remains in force.

A first step towards such a conference would be the establishment, under United Nations auspices, of a working group of experts for the exchange of views on an Afghan settlement. Representatives of the major Afghan groups could participate in such meetings, together with Afghanistan's direct neighbours and the guarantors of the Geneva Agreements. Strictly internal Afghan affairs must, of course, be settled by the Afghans themselves, but to do this there must be intra-Afghan dialogue, as called for by the world community in the consensus resolution adopted at last year's session of the General Assembly, with which the intransigent opposition has stubbornly and categorically refused to comply. War has been its choice. We would hope, however, that that is not its final word on the subject: it is not too late to revise one's opinion. The responsibility for this, which lies with those outside forces which finance, arm and politically mastermind the intransigent opposition, is exceedingly great.

What the people of Afghanistan desperately need is not weapons but economic and medical assistance; they need food. Yet, to our deep regret, to this very day in some quarters economic and humanitarian aid programmes to benefit Afghanistan are being deliberately and openly politicized, burdened with all kinds of provisos about where and to whom to make the deliveries, and to whom not to make them, thus distorting the very humanitarian nature of the assistance.

An important element of United Nations co-operation for an Afghan settlement is the sanctioning by the Security Council of the presence in Afghanistan and Pakistan of groups of military observers. It is no secret that the activities of



(The President)

the United Nations Good Offices Mission in Afghanistan and Pakistan (UNGOMAP) have thus far been severely limited by the Pakistan side, which has rendered it unable to function effectively.

The Pakistan side, referring to the difficulties of ensuring the personal safety of observers, has at times simply prevented them from entering those places where rebel camps and bases are located and where units of the armed opposition are deployed and redeployed and sent to Afghanistan; or the granting of permission for inspection by the Pakistan authorities has been so bureaucratically delayed by red tape that there has been no opportunity to visit the site of the violation, thereby rendering the entire operation ineffective. It is precisely for this reason that the representative of Pakistan, in his statement here, relied heavily, as he put it, on the fact that inspections by UNGOMAP have not confirmed any violations by Islamabad of the Geneva accords. But let us not forget that there are just 20 United Nations observers in Pakistan, and that the conditions created for them have prevented their seeing or hearing anything.

(The President)

Nevertheless, by its very presence, UNGOMAP - at least to some extent - is placing a limitation on Pakistani military circles, and that is the usefulness of UNGOMAP. A few days ago the Pakistan side gave its consent to the opening of three observer points on the Pakistan-Afghanistan border. In itself that is a positive step, but if the Pakistan side really wants to demonstrate that it has decided to put an end to its intervention in Afghan affairs, why not give permission for at least four of the observer points mentioned in the message from Afghanistan so that the flow of weapons and military personnel would not proceed along roads and paths where there were no United Nations observer posts?

In the circumstances, UNGOMAP must considerably enhance its effectiveness and capacity to function in response to the dangerous development of the situation. In particular, this control machinery must be enabled to investigate the participation of Pakistani military personnel in military actions in Afghanistan and the whole system of logistic support funneled through Pakistan for military operations conducted by the intransigent opposition.

The question remains on the agenda whether to increase the personnel of UNGOMAP, enhancing its responsibilities for controlling and monitoring compliance with the Geneva accords. If Pakistan really has nothing to hide from the international community it should do nothing to hinder such measures. On 14 April one year had passed since the signature of the Geneva accords. We wish to highlight the efforts of the United Nations Secretary-General in promoting implementation of the Geneva accords, which as he has stressed in his statement in connection with this anniversary must be scrupulously and consciously complied with by all parties. We hope that the Secretary-General will continue to offer his assistance and co-operation in promoting the speedy implementation of a political settlement in Afghanistan and, in accordance with the mandate entrusted to him by General Assembly resolution 43/20 duly report on his efforts.

(The President)

The Security Council must deal earnestly with this matter, bringing its authority to bear in order to extinguish the military conflagration in Afghanistan. In this connection the Soviet Union supports the specific proposals put forward here in the statement by the Foreign Minister of Afghanistan. For his part, the representative of Pakistan recalled the positive experience of Soviet-Pakistani co-operation, in the preparation of last year's consensus resolution on bilateral negotiations, on our contacts with representatives of the Afghan opposition. Certainly, we do not want to ostracize or turn our backs on anyone. Here at the United Nations or anywhere else, we are open to contacts and negotiations aimed at compromise, at mutually acceptable solutions for the sake of peace on Afghan soil. This applies as well to the goals that we have set ourselves here in the Security Council. We very much hope that we can have normal, well-developed and even friendly relations with Pakistan, as indeed we have with other countries. When, in the course of the visit of the Soviet Foreign Minister to Islamabad, there was agreement that there could be no military solution to the Afghan problem and that Pakistan would strictly comply with the Geneva accords, we naturally made that position part of the joint declaration.

We have no doubt that there are in Pakistan political leaders who understand the seriousness of the obligations undertaken by their country in Geneva. But there are also influential circles there - and, unfortunately, it is those circles that have set the tone as far as Pakistan is concerned - that are unwilling to renounce their expansionist, chauvinistic policy and, in fact, are pursuing a policy of flagrant, cynical disregard of international obligations undertaken by Pakistan.

(The President)

As was emphasized by the Foreign Minister of the USSR, Mr. Shevardnadze when he recently received the special representative of Pakistan's Prime Minister, we cannot and will not accept this gap between words and deeds on the part of official circles in Pakistan. Aggressive actions by Pakistan against Afghanistan are becoming a matter of serious concern to the Soviet Union and are fraught with unforeseeable consequences for the fate of peace and security in South-West Asia. The time has now come when the true goals and policies of States Members of the United Nations are being put to the test with regard to one of the most dangerous hotbeds of international tension. It is the duty of the Security Council to make a genuine effort to put an end to foreign intervention and bloodshed in Afghanistan and to work for a cease-fire, the holding of an intra-Afghan dialogue and the creation of a broad-based coalition Government.

The time has come to make it possible for the Afghan people to find peace, to return to constructive labour and to live in accordance with their traditions and customs in peace and friendship with their neighbours.

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

There being no further speakers for this morning's meeting, the next meeting to continue consideration of this item will take place Friday morning.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.