



Security Council

UN TIRADAV

APR 25 1989

UN/SA COLLECTION

PROVIS IONAL

S/PV.2857

24 April 1989

ENGLISH

PROVIS IONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO THOUSAND
EIGHT HUNDRED AND FIFTY-SEVENTH MEETINGHeld at Headquarters, New York,
on Monday, 24 April 1989, at 10.30 a.m.President: Mr. BEJONOGOV(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. DJUDI
Mr. ALENCAR
Mr. FORTIER
Mr. WANG Guangya
Mr. PEÑALOSA
Mr. TADESSE
Mr. TORNUDD
Mr. BLANC
Mr. HASMY
Mr. RANA
Mrs. DIALLO

Mr. BIRCH
Mr. OKUN
Mr. PEJIC

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

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

The meeting was called to order at 10.55 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 Minister for Foreign Affairs of Afghanistan and the representative of Pakistan to take places at the Council table; I invite the representatives of Angola, Bulgaria, the Comoros, Cuba, Democratic Yemen, the German Democratic Republic, India, Iraq, Japan, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Madagascar, Mongolia, Nicaragua, Saudi Arabia, the Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey, 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. Wakil (Afghanistan) and Mr. Umer (Pakistan) took places at the Council table; Mr. Diakenga Serao (Angola), Mr. Stresov (Bulgaria), Mr. Moumin (Comoros), Mr. Oramas Oliva (Cuba), Mr. Al-Ashtal (Democratic Yemen), Mr. Zachmann (German Democratic Republic), Mr. Gharekhan (India), Mr. Sumaida (Iraq), Mr. Kagami (Japan), Mr. Kittikhoun (Lao People's Democratic Republic), Mr. Rabetafika (Madagascar), Mr. Dugersuren (Mongolia), Mr. Serrano Caldera (Nicaragua), Mr. Shihabi (Saudi Arabia), Mr. Al-Masri (Syrian Arab Republic), Mr. Aksin (Turkey), Mr. Chagula (United Republic of Tanzania) and Mr. Nguyen Duc Hung (Viet Nam) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): I should like to inform the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Bangladesh, Burkina Faso, the Congo, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Somalia and the Ukrainian

(The President)

Soviet Socialist Republic, in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Mohiuddin (Bangladesh), Mr. Dah (Burkina Faso), Mr. Adouki (Congo), Mr. Zapotocky, (Czechoslovakia), Mr. Esztergalyos (Hungary), Mr. Gorajewski (Poland), Mr. Osman (Somalia) and Mr. Oudovenko (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

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

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

Mr. ZAPOTOCKY (Czechoslovakia): I should like first of all, Sir, to express my pleasure at your presidency of the Security Council during this month and to wish you much success in this responsible post. I am confident that, thanks to your capabilities, skills and statesmanship, the work of the Council will result in significant achievements. I should also like to thank your predecessor, the Permanent Representative of Senegal, for the constructive manner in which she conducted the Council's duties last month.

(Mr. Zapotocky, Czechoslovakia)

The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic is gravely concerned about the dangerous development of the situation along the Afghan-Pakistani border in which the growing intervention against Afghanistan is escalating more and more frequently into acts of open aggression. The facts disclosed by Mr. Wakil, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Afghanistan, in his statement before the Security Council on 11 April 1989, are alarming. The continuing deployment of Pakistani armed forces and the intensification of military actions against Afghanistan indicate the existence of further dangerous plans of stepping up the conflict leading to a further escalation of tension in this part of the world. Of no less concern are also the facts revealing the direct participation of high-ranking Pakistani commanders in armed struggles conducted directly in the Afghan territory, such as the fight for control over Jalalabad being held under the direct command of Pakistani generals and having already claimed a toll of thousands of lives.

The figures on the extent of combat equipment used in intervention raids, including often most up-to-date and highly sophisticated weaponry, are convincing evidence of the continuing intensive foreign military assistance supplied to the anti-Government forces motivated by an effort to topple the Afghan Government and to force a change of the political system of the country.

It is a year ago today that the world welcomed the conclusion of the Geneva Agreements on Afghanistan that have paved the path towards an end to the long, drawn-out 10-year-old undeclared war that has brought so much suffering to the Afghan people to date. The Geneva Agreements have created a realistic and honest basis for the solution of the problem. They were expected to provide guarantees for the Afghan people to be able to resolve ultimately their problems by themselves, without any external interference. Part and parcel of the Geneva Agreements is also the bilateral agreement between Afghanistan and Pakistan on the

(Mr. Zapotocky, Czechoslovakia)

principles of their mutual relations, in particular on non-interference and non-intervention. In Article II, the agreement clearly stipulates, inter alia, that the Contracting Parties will respect each other's sovereign and inalienable right freely to decide on their respective political, economic, cultural and social systems; that they will refrain from the threat or use of force in any form and will not violate each other's frontiers; that they will make provision for their respective territories not ever to be used in any manner resulting in encroachments on the sovereignty, political independence, territorial integrity and national unity of the other Contracting Party. They have undertaken to refrain mutually from armed intervention and from any actions aimed at destabilizing the other Contracting Party, and expressly also to avoid direct and indirect support for rebel or secessionist movements directed against the other Contracting Party. They have obliged themselves not to permit in their respective territories the presence, of camps or bases, the organizing, training, financing or arming of individuals and political, ethnic or other groups engaged in subversive or insurrectionary activities in the territory of the other Contracting Party.

Does the present situation perhaps bring any proof that these obligations are being complied with? The contrary is true. After the Soviet Union has fully lived up to its obligations under the Geneva Agreements, the unwillingness of Pakistan to let some other foreign forces to leave the solution of Afghan matters conclusively in the hands of the Afghans is beyond any doubt.

The considerate course of action of the Afghan leadership, which is aimed at putting an end to the bloodshed and at opening up a dialogue, is in sharp contrast with this policy.

This is manifested by concrete deeds. The President of the Republic of Afghanistan and General Secretary of the Central Committee of the People's

(Mr. Zapotocky, Czechoslovakia)

Democratic Party of Afghanistan, Mr. Najibullah, has emphasized that the Party and its allies do not insist on having a monopoly of power and are, quite conversely, interested in creating a government comprising representatives of all strata of Afghan society.

The efforts of the country's leadership in the search for ways of political reconciliation and expansion of the social and economic platform for democratic transformations of the country are important. The supreme organs of the country, as well as the bodies of State administration, are being reinforced by representatives and influential officials of the most varied strata and social groups of Afghan society. The leadership of the Republic of Afghanistan has adopted measures to involve also those political forces in the management of State affairs that have found themselves outside Afghan territory yet wish to participate in the national process of building a new Afghanistan.

However, the endeavours of the broad masses of the population are being impeded by the subversive actions of armed opposition groups. Equipped with the most sophisticated weapons, they perpetrate terrorist attacks against economic enterprises, and during such raids about 2,000 schools, many medical facilities and a large part of the electric energy distribution system have been destroyed. They have ruined almost 200 mosques and killed and tortured to death tens of Muslim religious persons.

The terrorist activity, which those groups launch mostly from Pakistani territory, would not be possible without the all-round and generous support of the armed rebels from abroad amounting to tens of millions of dollars.

The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic has always been convinced that a political situation relating to Afghanistan is possible. Therefore, we have always supported all initiatives leading to this aim that respect the sovereign rights of the

(Mr. Zapotocky, Czechoslovakia)

participating States. Above all, a political settlement must put an end to armed and other external interference with the internal matters of Afghanistan. It must create conditions under which such intervention would be excluded in future. This would help resolve also the question of the free return of refugees, for whom the leadership of Afghanistan is creating adequate political conditions. The recent proposals of the Soviet Union, aimed at bringing about a cease-fire and an end to the supply of weapons to the warring groups and at convening an international conference, deserve urgent attention and a clear response from all parties concerned.

The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic expects that in carrying out its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security the Security Council will, in order to prevent an exacerbation of the situation, consider all necessary steps which could lead without any further delay to the end of foreign intervention against Afghanistan and to a political solution of the conflict, which now constitutes a serious threat to peace and security in the region. We believe that an urgent invitation to bring about a cease-fire and strict compliance with the Geneva Agreements would be the first necessary step in this direction.

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

The next speaker is the representative of Bangladesh.

I now invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. MOHIUDDIN (Bangladesh): Mr. President, your performance as President of the Security Council for the current month has been truly praiseworthy. We find this all the more gratifying because of the excellent bilateral relations that traditionally exist between your great country, the Soviet Union, and mine.

At the same time, felicitations are also due to your predecessor, Ambassador Absa Claude Diallo of Senegal, for her capable leadership of the Council during the month of March.

My delegation would have been happy if the Security Council did not have to deliberate on this issue now, and consequently if we were not constrained to make this intervention.

Afghanistan has been debated upon at length in this forum. The Council and the United Nations have taken commendable measures towards the resolution of the dispute. The Geneva accords of 14 April 1988 are a significant milestone along the path of peace. Your own country, Sir, the Soviet Union, has displayed a truly remarkable commitment to its pledges by completing withdrawal of troops by 15 February 1989. A mechanism has been painstakingly set up to address relevant disputes. To invoke Articles 34 and 35 (1) of the United Nations Charter at this point and reactivate the Security Council may compound recriminations rather than advance our goal.

We have heard a litany of complaints against Pakistan. It would indeed be a grave matter were they substantiated. However, that has not happened. The

(Mr. Mohiuddin, Bangladesh)

evidence of the United Nations Good Offices Mission in Afghanistan and Pakistan (UNGOMAP) to date does not lend credence to these claims.

We urge restraint. We plead for calm. The parties must concentrate on the return of the 5 million displaced Afghans to their homes in honour and dignity.

Bangladesh would like nothing better than to see our Afghan brethren take their rightful place in the comity of nations.

It is not for the world to tell the Afghans how to organize their polity. History bears ample testimony to the fact that the Afghans can never be hectored into compliance or frightened into submission. A million martyrs prove this point. Further sacrifice is totally unnecessary.

If the international community has a duty now, it is to enable the Afghans to live in peace under a government of their own choice. They must also be helped to rebuild their country. Bangladesh pledges to join you all in this call and beyond in these endeavours.

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

Mr. RANA (Nepal): Please allow me at the outset to extend my warmest congratulations to you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of April. You represent a great country, with which Nepal has friendly relations. For me personally, it has always been a pleasure to have the opportunity of working closely with you. My delegation is confident that under your wise and able guidance, the Council will have a fruitful and memorable month.

I wish also to place on record our deep appreciation to the Permanent Representative of Senegal, Her Excellency Mrs. Absa Claude Diallo, who displayed a unique combination of charm, ability and skill during her tenure as President of the Council last month.

(Mr. Rana, Nepal)

The search for a peaceful and comprehensive settlement of the Afghan problem has been a priority concern of the United Nations during the past nine years. It was therefore natural for the international community to feel a surge of hope and happiness when the peace accords were signed in Geneva last year under United Nations auspices. The successful conclusion of the intricate and protracted negotiations is a tribute to the diplomatic efforts and skill of the Secretary-General and his Special Representative as to the sense of reason and realism displayed by the parties concerned.

Withdrawal of foreign forces demanded by successive General Assembly resolutions and set out in paragraphs 5 and 6 of the instrument on the interrelationships has rightly been considered as central to the entire settlement. In this context, my delegation wishes to recall the statement issued by His Majesty's Government of Nepal in mid-February welcoming the withdrawal of Soviet forces from Afghanistan in strict compliance with the terms of the Geneva accords.

It is our hope that in the interest of the peace process other aspects of the Geneva Agreements are also implemented. The Good Offices Mission of the Secretary-General, established to verify implementation of the instruments, enjoys the support of the international community and the concurrence of the parties concerned. It would therefore be logical to make full use of UNGOMAP in case of complaints as the Mission is in the area and is in a better position to make factual and impartial assessment. As a participating country, we take pride in reporting that UNGOMAP, despite the difficult situation on the ground, is carrying out its mandate faithfully. Nepal stands ready to extend all support to the Secretary-General should he deem it necessary to expand the good offices functions now in place.

(Mr. Rana, Nepal)

The Afghan people have put up a heroic struggle for the preservation of their national independence and sovereignty. But in the process they have undergone great suffering. The situation has also created social and economic problems of enormous magnitude to neighbouring countries, which have readily given shelter and support to millions of Afghan refugees. I wish to place on record our deep appreciation to the friendly Government and people of Pakistan not only for the great sacrifices they have been making to meet this humanitarian obligation but also for their efforts to find a political and peaceful solution to this tragic conflict. My delegation shares the view that continuation of the conflict in Afghanistan is neither in the interest of the Afghan people nor in the interest of peace and security in our own region of South Asia, a region that has been subjected to many conflicts in the past and lives in an atmosphere of tension at present.

It is for these considerations, and in keeping with our deep commitment to the cause of peace and principles of the United Nations, that Nepal has always favoured an early and enduring settlement of the Afghanistan conflict. We remain convinced that the peace process cannot achieve the desired results without the involvement in and acceptance of the Afghan people. The international community must encourage all efforts for the creation of a broad-based government representing all segments of the Afghan people, thereby ensuring the preservation of the sovereignty, territorial integrity, political independence and non-aligned character of Afghanistan.

The Geneva accords on Afghanistan have implications far beyond the comprehensive political settlement of the Afghan problem. As General Assembly

(Mr. Rana, Nepal)

resolution 43/20 puts it, the settlement of the problem would have a favourable impact on the international situation and provide an impetus for the resolution of other acute regional conflicts. Implementation of the provisions of the Geneva accords in a constructive manner will verify the credibility and desirability of similar mechanisms, which the United Nations can offer for the peaceful settlement of conflicts and the maintenance of international peace and security.

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

Mr. PEJIC (Yugoslavia): I should like first of all to congratulate you most sincerely, Sir, on your assumption of the responsible duty of President of the Security Council. Your vast diplomatic experience, wisdom and skill demonstrated on many past occasions are a guarantee that you will discharge the tasks before you successfully. In that endeavour you can count on the full support of the Yugoslav delegation.

My appreciation also goes to Her Excellency Mrs. Absa Claude Diallo, Ambassador of Senegal, who conducted the deliberations of the Security Council very effectively and successfully during the month of March.

A year ago the international public welcomed the signing of the Geneva Accords on Afghanistan with undivided relief and satisfaction. The signing of the Accords was perceived as providing a genuine opportunity for achieving a lasting and comprehensive solution of the problem of Afghanistan which, as a result of foreign intervention, has been one of the most dangerous sources of international tension and conflict. The broad support rendered to these Accords in the general debate at last year's session of the General Assembly, as well as the adoption of the General Assembly resolution on this question by consensus, increased the general expectation that necessary pre-conditions had at last been created for the final withdrawal of foreign troops and for enabling the people of Afghanistan to decide on its own fate freely and without foreign interference. These Accords were supported also by the non-aligned countries at their Ministerial Conference in Nicosia last September, when a call was made for their strict observance.

There is no doubt that the decision of the Soviet Union to withdraw its troops from that country in accordance with the Geneva Agreements was of particular importance for the solution of the problem of Afghanistan.

(Mr. Pejic, Yugoslavia)

To our utmost concern and regret, however, it appears that the long, painstaking and delicate work of international agreement-making goes unmatched by actual events: two months after the withdrawal of Soviet troops, the situation related to Afghanistan continues to be fraught with serious consequences for the country and the stability of the region as a whole. Fighting and bloodshedding continue with no prospect for a speedy political solution of the problem, despite the fact that the 10-year tragic developments have shown that the question of Afghanistan cannot be resolved by military means.

Ever since the beginning of this grave international problem, Yugoslavia has firmly opposed foreign interference and intervention, and this continues to be our position in the present situation concerning developments in Afghanistan. We have always pointed out the need for a political solution based on the restoration of the full national sovereignty, territorial integrity and truly non-aligned and neutral status of Afghanistan and on full respect for the right of the Afghan people to decide on its own internal development, one that would enjoy the support and confidence of all strata of the population. Only such a solution can create the necessary conditions for the cessation of bloodletting, the reconstruction of the country and the return of more than 5 million Afghan refugees from neighbouring countries, thus alleviating one of the gravest humanitarian problems of the present-day world.

My country also calls for the consistent and full implementation of the Geneva Accords by all interested parties. Along these lines, we fully support the mediation efforts of the Secretary-General aimed at defusing the situation and at facilitating the formation of a broad-based government. In this context, we consider that the mechanisms envisaged by the Geneva Accords constitute appropriate instruments for overcoming the present difficulties that stand in the way of

(Mr. Pejic, Yugoslavia)

achieving the final solution of the problem of Afghanistan that would correspond to the interests of all the people of that country. A significant role in bringing this about should be played by the United Nations Good Offices Mission in Afghanistan and Pakistan (UNGOMAP) by ensuring consistent implementation of the Geneva Accords.

It is our earnest hope that the political conditions will be created for a peaceful solution of the problem of Afghanistan in accordance with the aspirations of its people.

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

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

Mr. OUDOVENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): Comrade President, I should like first to welcome you to the post of President of the Security Council and to wish you every success in conducting the business of the Council for this month. We are all familiar with your great diplomatic experience and profound knowledge, which has stood you in such good stead in working in a wide variety of United Nations bodies. Your lofty authority and the respect you command among delegations in the United Nations will doubtless enable you properly to discharge the duties of President of the Council in this difficult and intense period of work in this body. I should also like to pay a tribute to your predecessor, the Permanent Representative of Senegal, Mrs. Absa Claude Diallo, who successfully conducted the work of the Council last month.

(Mr. Oudovenko, Ukrainian SSR)

Today is the start of the third week of the Council's consideration of the item entitled, "The situation relating to Afghanistan", in response to the request of the representative of Afghanistan. The delegation of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic has been closely following the discussion taking place in the Council, for we are certainly not indifferent to developments in Afghanistan and to the possible consequences of the further escalation of tension on the question of Afghanistan. We sympathize with the concerns of Afghanistan for another reason, that is, within the limited contingent of Soviet troops that was withdrawn from that country two months ago were also sons of the Ukraine, many of whom gave their lives in discharging their international duty.

The Ukrainian people have decisively supported efforts for a political solution to the Afghan question and welcomed the conclusion of the Geneva Accords, as a result of which the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan became possible.

These meetings of the Security Council, as has been noted by many previous speakers, have coincided with the first anniversary of the signing of these Accords, which opened the way to promoting a comprehensive solution of the Afghan question. The main contents and thrust of the Accords was to eliminate the external conditions which were not conducive to overcoming the inter-Afghan disagreements and fragmentation and to bring the Afghans to the inescapable conclusion on the need for a constructive search for ways to overcome their disagreements.

(Mr. Oudovenko, Ukrainian SSR)

As a result of the signing of those Agreements, there was military détente in the Afghanistan situation, which made possible strict respect for the plan for the withdrawal of Soviet troops in accordance with the established time-frame.

For its part, the Government of Afghanistan put forward a constructive programme of national reconciliation and put into effect a number of legislative and other measures relating to the solution of the refugee problem and created all the necessary conditions for the functioning of the United Nations good-offices mission on its territory.

It would have seemed, therefore, that all the conditions existed for a peaceful solution to the Afghanistan issue. But tension in the situation in Afghanistan not only has not been reduced but is in fact escalating.

A particular role is played by Pakistan in stepping up the activities of groups in Afghanistan that are hostile to the Government. Large-scale military action unleashed by the opposition near Jalalabad and other regions of Afghanistan have led to enormous human and material losses. That is borne out by information provided in the statement made by the Foreign Minister of Afghanistan. In that connection, I would refer to an article published yesterday, 23 April, in The New York Times. That article states that the decision regarding the assault by the Afghan opposition on Jalalabad was taken by the Government of Pakistan

"at a meeting of civilian and military leaders in Pakistan, and in the presence of the American Ambassador". (The New York Times, 23 April 1989, p. 1)

The attack against Jalalabad has revealed another side of the problem, too - namely, that now the Republic of Afghanistan is being subjected not only to attacks by the rebels but direct armed aggression from Pakistan. According to a great deal of testimony in this respect, the Pakistan armed forces have already entered

(Mr. Oudovenko, Ukrainian SSR)

Afghanistan and carried out an attack on it. That only exacerbates the situation even further. As has been pointed out quite rightly by many speakers, these activities threaten not only stability in the region but international peace and security as well.

There are some who attempt to portray matters as though the current developments in Afghanistan are a purely internal problem of the Afghan people. They say that trying to internationalize the matter and discussing it in the Security Council cannot promote a comprehensive settlement of the situation in Afghanistan. Allow me to disagree with that notion. What internal nature of the conflict can we be talking about when it is clear - and many facts have been adduced to prove this - that there is direct interference by Pakistan in the internal affairs of a neighbouring, sovereign State? The New York Times article to which I have just referred, which was published yesterday, states quite clearly that

"The Jalalabad decision illustrates how the war ... is managed. Major decisions are made by Pakistan, in the absence of the Afghans but with an American presence". (ibid., p. 16)

Naturally, the anonymous refutation issued by Islamabad merely highlights the factual situation described in The New York Times article.

We cannot agree with the view expressed by some that the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan removed all the external aspects of the Afghan problem and that it therefore became an exclusively internal matter with which the Security Council should not be dealing. The present military activities in Afghanistan prove that we are witnessing one of the major regional conflicts in the world now and that the Security Council cannot remain on the sidelines in regard to this issue.

Whatever monitoring machinery may have been worked out in the Geneva Agreements, it does not deprive the Government of any side - in this case,

(Mr. Oudovenko, Ukrainian SSR)

Afghanistan - of the right to come to the Security Council. We feel that discussion in the Council should help it to do its duties under the Charter - that is, to promote the cessation of hostilities and the restoration of peace in Afghanistan, through the adoption of practical measures, in particular those provided for in Article 36 of the Charter. We have in mind the fact that the Security Council is authorized at any stage of a dispute to recommend appropriate procedures or methods of adjustment.

We believe that there would have been much more progress towards a settlement of the Afghanistan problem if not only the Soviet Union and the Republic of Afghanistan but other parties to the Geneva Agreements, and Pakistan in particular, had responsibly and strictly fulfilled the entire set of obligations laid down in the Agreements.

Unfortunately, that has not happened. In fact, there is virtually no article of the Bilateral Agreement between Afghanistan and Pakistan signed in Geneva that has not been violated by Pakistan. I do not wish to take up too much of the Council's time by citing all the violations; I shall refer only to a few of those articles. Under the Agreement, each contracting party undertakes, for instance, to refrain from armed intervention, subversion, military occupation or any other form of intervention and interference, overt or covert, directed at the other contracting party; to refrain from the promotion, encouragement or support, direct or indirect, of rebellious or secessionist activities against the other contracting party, under any pretext whatsoever, or from any other action which seeks to disrupt the unity or to undermine or subvert the political order of the other contracting party; to prevent within its territory the training, equipping, financing and recruitment of mercenaries from whatever origin for the purpose of

(Mr. Oudovenko, Ukrainian SSR)

hostile activities against the other contracting party, or the sending of such mercenaries into the territory of the other contracting party. How wise and prophetic the Geneva Agreements were.

Concrete proof of the violation of those and other articles of the Agreements has been cogently advanced in statements by the representatives of the parties directly concerned in the Agreements - the Republic of Afghanistan and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics - and no one has refuted that evidence here in Council.

We think that the Security Council in its decisions on this question should require Pakistan to comply strictly with the obligations it has assumed.

As you know, Comrade President, the United States and the Soviet Union signed the Declaration on International Guarantees in Geneva. That Declaration states, inter alia, that the parties undertake to refrain invariably from any form of interference and intervention in the internal affairs of the Republic of Afghanistan and to respect the commitments contained in the Bilateral Agreement between Afghanistan and Pakistan. How can one compare those provisions with the attempts to challenge the legality of the existing Government in Afghanistan and the intention to break diplomatic relations? Indeed, it is the United States which is a guarantor of an agreement concluded with that very Government.

Some previous speakers have said that the existing Government in Kabul does not represent anyone and does not enjoy the support of the Afghan people. But developments in Afghanistan since 15 February 1989 show a very different picture. What has happened near Jalalabad shows that the forecasts that the Afghan army could not defend its own country were untenable. The leaders of the opposition were predicting that the Kabul régime would liquidate itself. But that has not happened.

(Mr. Oudovenko, Ukrainian SSR)

The activities of the Government of the Republic in these new conditions, which are much more complicated militarily than before, have shown how vital that régime is and its ability to resolve political and military problems in the interest of the stabilization of the situation in the country. Furthermore, the continuation of the so-called alliance-of-seven policy in this armed struggle has fully unmasked the thesis that the struggle of the Mujahidin is a struggle for liberation. Following the withdrawal of Soviet troops, they have been fighting against their own people.

In these conditions, foreign assistance for the opposition and direct participation by Pakistan in the hostilities in Afghanistan territory are nothing but gross interference in a sovereign State's internal affairs.

Some have expressed great alarm at the emergence of SCUD-type missiles in Afghanistan. Why are they not bothered by the opposition's possession of very sophisticated weaponry - missiles, artillery and so on? Those are the weapons that are literally destroying Jalalabad - and I am not talking about the Stinger-type or the Blow-pipe missiles. Those are the weapons used against the USSR Embassy in Kabul.

In order finally to bring peace to Afghanistan so that the Geneva accords can really be implemented and set an example for the resolution of other regional problems, efforts by the Security Council and the entire international community are necessary. As Mr. Gorbachev said in his statement at the National Assembly of the Republic of Cuba on 5 April this year,

"The international community should and must take responsible attitudes towards these events. International co-operation in the cause of the peaceful settlement of the conflict on the basis of the Agreements between the parties directly concerned is becoming ever more urgent. Solution of the Afghan conflict is the touchstone for the entire international community."

(Mr. Oudovenko, Ukrainian SSR)

The United Nations, which made such a great contribution to the achievement of the Geneva Agreements, must continue to play an important constructive role in their implementation. In the present conditions, UNGOMAP's peace-keeping role is becoming increasingly important. Its functions and its length of stay in Afghanistan and Pakistan are set forth in the Geneva Agreements. It could deal with the careful checking of facts regarding the violations referred to in the statement of the Foreign Minister of Afghanistan and listed in document S/20585.

To that end, we support the setting up of permanent control points on the Afghan-Pakistan border. In establishing UNGOMAP, everyone believed the Geneva accord would be scrupulously complied with, but in a situation in which Pakistan is grossly violating the Agreements, there logically arises the question of the need to increase that machinery's effectiveness.

The number of UNGOMAP posts is at a lower level than that set forth in the Geneva accords. An important role can be played by the Secretary-General in promoting the process of the speedy attainment of a comprehensive political settlement in Afghanistan in accordance with General Assembly resolution 43/20. The Ukrainian SSR shares the concern he has expressed regarding the escalation of hostilities in Afghanistan and believes his appeal to the parties to the Geneva Agreements to ensure that all obligations are scrupulously observed was timely.

The General Assembly resolution, adopted unanimously, calls upon all members of the international community to promote a political solution to the Afghan problem and emphasizes the need for an intra-Afghan dialogue for the establishment of a broad-based government. In our view, the Council should define its attitude towards that resolution and find ways to promote its effective implementation. A realistic programme for the achievement of a comprehensive settlement for Afghanistan was set forth by Mr. Gorbachev in his statement before the General

(Mr. Oudovenko, Ukrainian SSR)

Assembly on 7 December last. His proposals, among them an international conference on Afghanistan, are still on the agenda.

Sincere implementation of the Geneva accords is the only test of the peaceful intentions of the parties. Any action aimed at belittling or ignoring them harms their implementation and threatens peace, security and stability in the region. We rely on the Security Council to make its contribution to the process of the implementation of the Geneva Agreements and to take urgent steps to terminate the external interference in the affairs of Afghanistan and thus promote a peaceful settlement in that country.

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

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

Mr. ADOUKI (Congo) (interpretation from French): It is my pleasure, Sir, to congratulate you most warmly on behalf of my delegation on the assumption of the presidency of the Security Council by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, a great country, a friend and partner of the Congo. I am convinced that, thanks to your remarkable qualities as a diplomat, you will successfully discharge your important functions as the President of the Council for the month of April.

I wish also to thank Mrs. Absa Claude Diallo, Permanent Representative of Senegal, who presided over the Security Council in March. With her combination of competence and charm, Mrs. Diallo conducted the proceedings of the Council outstandingly during her term of office.

Whether one likes it or not, the present meetings of the Security Council have at least one immense advantage: they make us all brutally aware that the situation relating to Afghanistan remains one of profound crisis. Witness, for example, the

(Mr. Adouki, Congo)

plight of the many Afghan refugees who see their lives crumbling before them, and the terrible echoes of battle that persist in Afghan territory, around the cities, around Jalalabad, and even in Kabul, which just this morning was under rocket fire. This has produced a situation that could destroy the Geneva accords on the settlement of the situation relating to Afghanistan.

From the comments of many speakers we have heard in this debate, and from the words of impartial observers - in The New York Times of Sunday, 23 April 1989, for example - it appears this fighting is being strongly encouraged from outside and is aimed at nothing less than toppling the Government of the Republic of Afghanistan.

(Mr. Adouki, Congo)

In the view of my delegation, the military option is not inevitable. Since 14 April 1988 the parties concerned have had the various mechanisms provided by the Geneva accords, which were guaranteed by the United States of America and the Soviet Union. It is thus disturbing that parties to the accords have given themselves over to comfortable dreams rather than to respecting the freely negotiated provisions that would lead to a comprehensive peaceful settlement.

The Congo is all the more concerned at the situation in Afghanistan because the withdrawal of the Soviet contingent that had been stationed there, long held as a key prerequisite for the return of peace and stability in the region, has been completed. Still, we welcome the Soviet Union's withdrawal of those troops in conformity with the timetable and other commitments it undertook.

It is hard to understand how the international community can remain passive at this time of extreme tension for the Afghan people, when the settlement envisioned by the Geneva accords is on shaky ground and when we hear harsh accusations from both Afghanistan and Pakistan of acts of interference and aggression.

The improvement in the overall climate in international relations made possible the conclusion of the Geneva Agreements, reached under the patient mediation of the United Nations. On 14 April 1988 the Secretary-General stressed that it was important for the parties and the guarantors to abide strictly and faithfully by their commitments. Today, that statement by the Secretary-General is more timely than ever.

Given the general hope prevailing in the international situation, we were much encouraged by the consensus achieved by the General Assembly at its forty-third session during consideration of the situation relating to Afghanistan and the adoption of a resolution on that item. The international community must continue to work with determination for the return of Afghan refugees to their country and

(Mr. Adouki, Congo)

for the self-determination of the Afghan people. An urgent appeal for strict respect for commitments undertaken in the Geneva Agreements, which can form a reliable basis for an overall settlement, as well as renewed support for the efforts of the Secretary-General and for the United Nations good-offices mission, will guarantee the attainment of those objectives and the achievement of a just and lasting peace in the region.

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

The next speaker is the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Afghanistan, on whom I call.

Mr. WAKIL (Afghanistan) (spoke in Dari; English text furnished by the delegation): For the past two weeks the Security Council has been discussing the question of Pakistani aggression and interference in the internal affairs of Afghanistan, which has been posing a grave threat to peace and security in our region. This discussion, which is taking place at the request of the Republic of Afghanistan, a Member of the United Nations, is fully in accord with Articles 34 and 35 (1) of the United Nations Charter.

In my statement of 11 April 1989 before the Security Council I presented undeniable facts and figures which demonstrated Pakistani aggression and interference in the internal affairs of Afghanistan and Pakistan's constant violation of the spirit and letter of the Geneva Agreements. Now I should like to state the opinion of my Government concerning the reasons for this complicated situation and the ways and means by which it can be resolved.

First of all, it is noteworthy that the statements made by the representatives of various countries, including a number of members of the Security Council, have

(Mr. Wakil, Afghanistan)

demonstrated the presence of a regional conflict in our part of the world. That conflict has continued for 10 years and has further intensified since the completion of the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan. The very tone and content of the statement made on 11 April by the representative of Pakistan were in themselves indicative of the existence of such a conflict.

The slanderous and irresponsible utterances by the representative of Pakistan against Afghanistan, its Government and its people were not surprising. Such statements are old worn-out clichés which have been repeated over the past 10 years in various international forums. What is important is the fact that, in spite of the signing of the Geneva Agreements, the completion of the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan and the creation of a completely new situation for putting an end to war and bloodshed in Afghanistan, Pakistan is still clinging to its old policies based on interference and intervention in the internal affairs of Afghanistan, and thereby preventing termination of the fratricide among Afghans and the realization of national reconciliation in Afghanistan.

The hostile statements of the representative of Pakistan, containing slogans calling for toppling the legal Government of Afghanistan - uttered under the roof of the Security Council, which is responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security and for upholding respect for the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter, and in the presence of the representatives of two States guarantors of the Geneva Agreements, the Soviet Union and the United States - require serious attention. Those statements, which reveal the hidden intentions of Pakistan vis-à-vis Afghanistan, are in fact a reflection of the strategic policy of Pakistan in the region, a policy which has been pursued by the military rulers of Pakistan to weaken their neighbour, Afghanistan.

(Mr. Wakil, Afghanistan)

In the contemporary civilized world - where relations between States are based on the principle of mutual respect, the right of States to equal sovereignty and the principles of non-intervention and non-interference in the internal affairs of other States - uttering slogans for toppling the Government of a neighbouring country is contrary to the norms of international law, the Charter of the United Nations and the principles of non-alignment, and, last but not least, constitutes a flagrant violation of the Geneva Agreements.

The very first article in the first instrument of the Geneva Agreements, 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, which Pakistan has signed with Afghanistan, stipulates that

"Relations between the High Contracting Parties shall be conducted in strict compliance with the principle of non-interference and non-intervention by States in the affairs of other States". (S/19835, annex I, p. 3)

It should be noted that in the Security Council the representative of Pakistan is uttering slogans for toppling the very Government in whose internal affairs it pledged a year ago not to interfere, by signing the Geneva Agreements in the presence of the Secretary-General and the Foreign Ministers of the Soviet Union and the United States. The lack of good will on the part of Pakistan concerning the Geneva Agreements - which has resulted in total disregard for all 13 paragraphs of Article II of the instrument on non-interference and non-intervention - is very clear from that aggressive and interventionist stand.

Paragraph 6 of Article II of the same document stipulates that each Party undertakes

"to refrain from any action or attempt in whatever form or under whatever pretext to destabilize or to undermine the stability of the other High Contracting party or any of its institutions". (p. 4)

(Mr. Wakil, Afghanistan)

Paragraph 8 of the same article provides that they undertake

"to prevent within its territory the training, equipping, financing and recruitment of mercenaries from whatever origin for the purpose of hostile activities against the other High Contracting Party, or the sending of such mercenaries into the territory of the other High Contracting Party and accordingly to deny facilities, including financing for the training, equipping and transit of such mercenaries". (pp. 4-5)

(Mr. Wakil, Afghanistan)

Paragraph 12 of article II reads:

"to prevent within its territory the presence, harbouring, in camps and bases or otherwise, organizing, training, financing, equipping and arming of individuals and political, ethnic and any other groups for the purpose of creating subversion, disorder or unrest in the territory of the other High Contracting Party and accordingly also to prevent the use of mass media and the transportation of arms, ammunition and equipment by such individuals and groups." (S/19835, p. 5)

Paragraph 13 of that article obliges Pakistan, as a High Contracting Party, "not to resort to or to allow any other action that could be considered as interference or intervention." (ibid.)

How is it possible to reconcile those concrete and clear principles, the implementation of which the Government of Pakistan has solemnly assumed, with the situation that is going on in our border provinces with Pakistan? In his statement the representative of Pakistan said that foreign journalists had visited the war front around the city of Jalalabad. One wonders through which country and under the authorization of the authorities of which country did those journalists visit Nengarhar Province bordering Pakistan? Those journalists were not issued entry visas by the consulates of the Republic of Afghanistan.

What is more important to ask is the question: Whence come the thousands of rockets and artillery and mortar shells that are rained on the civilian population of the city of Jalalabad? Which country is used as a conduit for the transfer of those weapons to the territory of Afghanistan? The fact is that Pakistan has not only ignored all its obligations deriving from the Geneva Agreements, but, by dispatching its militia and military officers into Afghanistan and by providing logistical support for the operations of the armed extremists, it has resorted to

(Mr. Wakil, Afghanistan)

actual aggression against the independence, national sovereignty and territorial integrity of Afghanistan.

No logic can convince world public opinion that a vast military operation in all the border provinces of Afghanistan, particularly around the city of Jalalabad, where various heavy and light weapons are used and thousands and thousands of rockets, artillery and mortars are being fired, would be possible without Pakistani violations of the provisions of the Geneva accords. The escalation of military operations after the withdrawal of Soviet troops solely in those provinces bordering on Pakistan and not in any other province is in itself a clear indication of the fact that the military operations of the armed extremists in those provinces are backed by hundreds of military depots, military-training centres and other infrastructure located in the territory of Pakistan that were supposed to be removed after the signing of the Geneva accords.

In the light of all those undeniable facts, how would it be possible to take seriously the claim made by Pakistan that the present situation in Afghanistan is an internal question and does not fall within the purview of the authority of the Security Council? There are no signs in the world mass media that would indicate one single step taken by Pakistan during the past year to comply with the provisions of the Geneva Agreements. We did not hear even a single word in the statement by the representative of Pakistan to indicate the compliance of Pakistan with a single provision of the Geneva accords.

Pakistan is making every effort to portray to the world that the whole situation around Afghanistan was the result of the presence of Soviet troops in the country and that the Geneva accords were signed only and solely for the purpose of their withdrawal. If such were the case, what was the need for the two sides to spend years negotiating on the terms of non-interference and non-intervention and

(Mr. Wakil, Afghanistan)

to prepare a document for that purpose? Why did Pakistan agree to discuss the question of non-interference and non-intervention and sign an agreement in that regard? The reason for that was the fact that there existed interference and intervention on the part of Pakistan in the internal affairs of Afghanistan for the termination of which it was necessary to sign an agreement. The Pakistani side must remember that at its request a period of one month was provided between the date of the signing of the Agreements and the date of their entry into force precisely to give Pakistan the time to create the necessary conditions for compliance with the provisions of the Agreements on non-interference and non-intervention by dismantling the offices, arms depots, training centres and propaganda means of the armed extremist opposition. However, is it possible for Pakistan to say which of those provisions it has implemented - not in the course of one month, but in a period of the one year that has elapsed since the signing of the Geneva accords?

A correspondent of BBC Radio, in an interview on 18 March 1989 at Kabul with General Rauli Helminen, Deputy Representative of the Secretary-General, asked the following questions:

"Well, journalists who have gone to the border have given what seems to be rather convincing proof of Pakistani involvement along the border. And I am wondering whether you have got that same kind of access to the details of special kinds of events going on there?"

The same correspondent also asked:

"General Helminen, there is one article in the Geneva Agreements which talks specifically about the fact that Pakistan should not allow the existence on its soil of things like radio stations, offices, different kinds of establishments which support the Mujahidin. But if one goes to Peshawar, it

(Mr. Wakil, Afghanistan)

is plainly obvious that that those offices exist, the radio stations exist, which are in violation of the Geneva accords. Those things do not seem to be difficult to find out, they are clear and open. Do you ever mention this? It is an ongoing violation of the Geneva accords. What has been done about this?" General Helminen's answer to that question was the following:

"We have already months ago received complaints from the Afghan Government about these matters. We have submitted those reports to the Pakistani Government and received some responses. All of those materials and some of our own ideas as well have been sent to the United Nations Secretary-General."

In the same interview the BBC correspondent expresses the view that the facts concerning Pakistani intervention in the war are in themselves a violation of the Geneva accords.

Such is the opinion of journalists who have visited the area and who are familiar with the situation in our border provinces. What response could Pakistan possibly provide to those facts, which journalists have observed and reported?

The role played by the Inter-Service Intelligence (ISI) in the organization of military operations in Afghanistan is so obvious that nobody can hide it from world public opinion. The Financial Times, in its issue of 24 February 1989, writes:

"What has also been expressed beyond doubt is the degree of manipulation by Pakistan's military intelligence, known as ISI (Inter-Service Intelligence), through whom these arms are distributed and whose senior officials have admitted that the main task is to keep the alliance together."

The Washington Post, in its issue of 6 March 1989, quoting diplomatic sources, writes:

(Mr. Wakil, Afghanistan)

"The ISI is apparently attempting to dictate to the guerrilla group how to conduct specific military operations, designing them to maximize Hekmatyar's role and credit for any victories, rebel and diplomatic sources say. In one case, Afghan guerrillas near the eastern provincial capital of Jalalabad described the dispute among rebel leaders over an ISI plan for an assault of the city that would have given a leading role to a commander who had few forces in the area but who was a political ally of Hekmatyar."

The daily newspaper Le Monde, in its issue of 29 March 1989, under the headline "Pakistani army is continuing its interference in the affairs of various Afghan resistance groups", writes:

"Zia is dead; however, the military intelligence of Pakistan follows a policy which is not in line with the new and evolving democracy in Pakistan. The bloodshed resulting from the war in Jalalabad that was launched by the Pakistani military intelligence is another form of the outmoded activities of Pakistan."

(Mr. Wakil, Afghanistan)

With all these reports in the international mass media, is it possible to accept the statement of the representative of Pakistan claiming that foreign journalists have not reported Pakistani participation in the military operations in the Afghan provinces bordering Pakistan? These reports are not only indicative of a deep cleavage in the Alliance of Seven but also show that the ISI stands behind all decisions taken by the leadership of the Alliance of Seven only in appearance. The existence of such a situation has caused indignation on the part of numerous commanders inside the country. The Washington Times, in its issue of 1 April 1989, quoting Abdul Haq, writes:

"The ISI has pushed us every day for two months to start the battle. We told them, no, the time is not right. Finally, they found someone who would do it for them."

What response can Pakistan possibly provide to this statement by Commander Abdul Haq? His statement not only gives the lie to Pakistan, which is trying to adopt an innocent profile, but is also important from other standpoints. It reveals the ISI's full participation in military operations against Jalalabad, and at the same time demonstrates that this interference is so deep and flagrant that it has disturbed Commander Abdul Haq, as an Afghan, who has for years co-operated with the ISI. This proves the saying that it is impossible to buy Afghans forever because Afghans could not live under foreign domination for long.

Pakistani aggression and interference in the internal affairs of Afghanistan have also caused the protests of the forces of peace in Pakistan itself. Kuwaiti agencies quoting Abdul Wali Khan, leader of the Pakistan National Awami Party, in early April this year reported that Pakistan was dispatching enormous quantities of weapons through Pakistan to Afghanistan and in return bringing in to Pakistan numerous dead bodies. He has added that, while Pakistan is sending weapons to the

(Mr. Wakil, Afghanistan)

other side of the border, it must not expect that flowers should be sent to this side of the border in return.

As a neighbouring Islamic country with numerous deep religious, historical and cultural relations with the fraternal people of Pakistan, we are seriously in favour of sending bouquets of flowers to the other side, but in return it is also the Islamic duty of the Government of Pakistan that if they are not sending flowers at least they should stop the dispatching of weapons into Afghanistan which has continued for the past 10 years.

The daily Jang, published in Pakistan, quoting Wali Khan, reported in early April that Pakistan is treating Afghanistan as its fifth province and is trying to install in Kabul a Government created by Pakistan.

The fact is that Afghanistan is not the fifth province of Pakistan. Pakistan has no right to impose on Afghanistan a government of its creation. Afghanistan is a country of free Afghans who have a 5,000-year-old history and a tradition of patriotism and love of freedom. Afghans are a poor nation but they are proud and full of love of freedom. During their whole history they have lived in freedom and they will continue to live in freedom in the future. The valorous people of Afghanistan and its heroic armed forces will not allow any country, to the last drop of their blood, to turn the majestic peaks of Hendo Kosh into its sphere of influence. The history of Afghanistan is witness to the fact that, when in the past great empires have nurtured such designs for Afghanistan, they have always been forced to abandon them in the face of fierce Afghan resistance.

It seems that Pakistan is still continuing General Zia-ul-Haq's plans for Afghanistan. The New York Times, in an editorial in its issue of 3 April 1989, quoting Selig Harrison, an American scholar, writes that in an interview General Zia-ul-Haq had said:

(Mr. Wakil, Afghanistan)

"We have earned the right to have a very friendly régime in Kabul. We won't permit it to be like it was before ...".

There is no such "right" in international law. No country can earn the right to determine the form of government of a neighbouring country, even if it has continued interference and intervention in its internal affairs, under the cover of friendship, for 10 long years. Interference and intervention in the internal affairs of neighbours is not a right. It is a violation of international law.

The Republic of Afghanistan is ready to establish with Pakistan, as with other neighbours, close relations of good-neighbourliness, friendship and co-operation. Such relations, however, should be based on equal rights, mutual respect and non-interference in the internal affairs of each other, and not through exertion of influence by one country on the other. The Afghans, the Government of the Republic of Afghanistan, and the present leadership of the country, are following the policy which insures that Afghanistan remains a free, independent, non-aligned and neutral country which intends to be friendly with all the countries of the world, particularly neighbouring countries, but which will not be under the influence of any country. Such a free and independent Afghanistan bases its policy on the will of the Afghan people, the high national interest of the country, the tenets of the sacred religion of Islam and on deep-rooted traditions and customs of the people of Afghanistan, and, at the same time, it takes into consideration the legitimate interests of its neighbours, other countries of the world and those particularly involved in the questions of the region.

The continuation of the aggressive and interventionist policy of the former President of Pakistan, which is now pursued by Pakistani militarists vis-à-vis Afghanistan, is not supported by the people of Pakistan, who have deep religious and fraternal sentiments for the people of Afghanistan.

(Mr. Wakil, Afghanistan)

Asghar Khan, leader of Tahrik-e-Esteqlal of Pakistan, in a statement to foreign and domestic journalists on 3 April 1989 warned that the continuation of the erroneous policies of the past vis-à-vis Afghanistan would be disastrous for the security of Pakistan itself, and added:

"Instead of a peaceful solution, for the question of Afghanistan, based on the Geneva Agreements, a military solution is being pursued and efforts are being made to conquer Afghanistan."

Rozy Khan, a member of the Central Committee of Pakistan's Mahazi Azadi - Liberty Front - stated that the territory of Pakistan must not be used for bloodshed among Afghans. Pakistan must not dispatch military personnel and militia, along with armed extremists, to fight the Afghans.

What proof could be stronger than such statements by Pakistani politicians on its aggression and interference in the internal affairs of Afghanistan? Is it possible to state, in spite of these statements, that the suffering of the people of Afghanistan, resulting from a senseless war of fratricide in which Pakistani military personnel and militia are directly involved, is not caused by aggression? Article 3 of the Definition of Aggression adopted by the General Assembly on 14 December 1974 says:

"Any of the following acts, regardless of a declaration of war shall ... qualify as an act of aggression ...

"(g) The sending by or on behalf of a State of armed bands, groups, irregulars or mercenaries, which carry out acts of armed force against another State ...". (General Assembly resolution 3314 (XXIX), Art. 3, para. (g))

According to this definition the arming, equipping and dispatch of armed extremist groups from the territory of Pakistan into Afghanistan, and particularly the direct participation of Pakistani military personnel and militia in the

(Mr. Wakil, Afghanistan)

military operations around the city of Jalalabad, could be nothing but aggression. Our request for the convening of the Security Council to consider this aggression is fully in accord with Articles 34 and 35 (1) of the United Nations Charter. We hope that this great and prestigious organ of the United Nations will not ignore the tense situation which has been created as a result of Pakistani aggression against Afghanistan and, therefore, will not encourage the aggressor.

The scenario designed by the ISI of Pakistan to commit this aggression on Afghanistan immediately before and after the Soviet troop withdrawal from Afghanistan has brought about great suffering for the people of Afghanistan, particularly the civilian population.

(Mr. Wakil, Afghanistan)

This scenario consisted of a number of most inhuman measures against the people of Afghanistan through which it was planned to export a Pakistani puppet government into Afghanistan which would actually turn Afghanistan into the fifth province of Pakistan through the creation of a confederation with that country.

The implementation of this scenario was started with intense rocket barrages on Afghan cities and towns. A great number of cities and towns in east and south Afghanistan, including Kabul, came under fire of hundreds of rockets every day for a long period. Numerous innocent civilian people, including women, children and the elderly, fall victims to this blind terrorism. In the course of one year after the signing of the Geneva accords, a total of 432,730 rounds of rocket fire and artillery and mortar shells, as well as other types of heavy weapons, have been fired into heavily populated cities and towns of Afghanistan. As a result of this barbaric act, 2,222 people have been murdered and 13,775, including 1,505 children, have been wounded. The material damage resulting from these terrorist acts amounts to billions of dollars, which is something truly painful for a least developed country such as Afghanistan.

The goal behind these blind attacks on cities was to terrorize the civilian populations and to weaken the resistance of the people against armed extremists. At the same time, immediately before 15 February, a number of Western countries, under the pretext of security considerations, closed their embassies in Kabul, an act the propaganda and psychological goal of which was fully evident.

The establishment of the so-called Consultative Shura of the Alliance of Seven in Rawalpindi was another part of the pre-planned ISI scenario, which was convened in haste under direct pressure from the ISI and with the money that was provided by Saudi Arabia, although deep differences among the Alliance members were hard to hide. The Shura was forced to agree upon a so-called interim government. Using

(Mr. Wakil, Afghanistan)

Saudi Arabian petro-dollars to buy the participants of the so-called Shura was in line with the policy of Pakistani militarists, who have always tried to ensure secure financial sources for the training and equipping of extremist forces. However, this policy has increased the influence of countries outside the region in the affairs of our region and has complicated the questions in and around Afghanistan.

On the role played by Saudi Arabia, the Daily Independence, on 29 March 1989, writes:

"Of most recent concern, though, have been the activities of the Saudi-backed Wahhabi guerrilla groups, whose numbers have been expanded by Arab volunteers previously kept away from the war but allowed now by the Pakistanis to boost the standing of the most extremist Islamic Afghan groups. They are under oath not to take prisoners."

Thus, in collusion with Pakistani militarists, Saudi Arabia is making every effort to implement its plan for the universalization of a particular religious sect, Wahhabism, which is alien to Afghan Muslims, both Sunni and Shia. This is designed to increase the influence of Saudi Arabia in the establishment of the future government in Afghanistan.

Saudi Arabia is continuing this policy under the cover of supporting Islam, while the fact remains that on the basis of Islamic tenets, Saudi Arabia is expected to play its role in putting an end to war and fratricide and in the ensuring of peace and tranquillity in the Islamic country of Afghanistan and the establishment of brotherhood between sections of Islamic Afghan society.

The joint Saudi Arabian and Pakistani conspiracy against the Republic of Afghanistan, through which they tried to impose their altruistic aims on the Islamic conference, was another part of the scenario designed by the ISI. This was

(Mr. Wakil, Afghanistan)

an act which is not in line with the interests of the unity of the Islamic world. The direct Pakistani military aggression on Afghanistan to support the operation of armed extremists for capturing the city of Jalalabad, immediately before and after the completion of the withdrawal of the Soviet troops from Afghanistan, was perhaps the most dramatic aspect of the ISI scenario for exporting the government made in Rawalpindi to the city of Jalalabad. Such a government was to be installed there to implement Pakistan's strategy for creating a weak, backward Afghanistan which would have to rely on Pakistan.

However, the most inhuman part of this scenario was the economic blockade of cities in the east and south of Afghanistan, including Kabul, which, under orders from the ISI, the armed extremist groups made every effort to implement. In the bitter cold of winter in Kabul, which was a record low in the past 20 years, they tried for several consecutive weeks to deprive the people of Kabul and a number of other cities of flour, bread, tea, oil, sugar, meat and fuel, imposing a very tragic situation on them. While more than 2 million inhabitants of Kabul, including innocent children, old men and women and the sick, were suffering from cold and hunger, the armed extremists, under order from the Pakistani ISI, used sacks of flour and sugar, stolen from transport vehicles on the Salang Highway, to build trenches and fortifications.

The goal behind this inhuman and anti-Islamic deed was to try to force the people into rebellion against the Government and then to make a hue and cry of propaganda to the effect that the Government is not supported by the people and has been isolated.

However, thanks to the patriotic resistance of the people and the Government of Afghanistan this ISI scenario failed and has no chance for the future either. Defensive measures were adopted against rocket fire. The defenders of Jalalabad valorously defended their city, creating epics. The overwhelming majority of

(Mr. Wakil, Afghanistan)

Islamic countries refused to recognize the government made in Pakistan. The highways were opened and, thanks to the resilience and steadfastness of the people of Kabul, the harshness of the blockade against the city was borne by the people heroically and in unity as long as it lasted. Years will go by, new generations will come, but history will never forget this period of sacrifice and the steadfastness of the people of Afghanistan on the one hand, and the aggression and interference of Pakistan and the crimes of the armed extremists on the other.

Events during the past two months have clearly shown that the ISI was fully mistaken in its calculations towards reaching a goal which can never be in its reach. All that it accomplished was the intensification of the senseless fratricidal war in Afghanistan and the shedding of the blood of hundreds more Afghans. It is as a result of these ambitious miscalculations that Pakistan has opted of a military solution which has no future. It will only bring more bloodshed for the Afghans and the further destruction of their country. It is because of the choice of a military solution that Pakistan does everything in its power to prevent national reconciliation and the establishment of a broad-based government in Afghanistan.

However, Pakistan must understand that drowning Afghans in their own blood will have a bearing on the situation in Pakistan and the region and will negatively affect relations between the two neighbouring Muslim countries of Afghanistan and Pakistan in the future. Historic evidence clearly shows that from its very creation, whenever the Pakistani army has committed acts of aggression against its neighbours, it has faced shameful defeat. It would be possible for Pakistan for some time to use Afghans themselves in the first line of battle for the continuation of its aggression against Afghanistan. However, the Afghan people will soon fully realize the real intent of the Pakistani militarists.

(Mr. Wakil, Afghanistan)

The representative of Pakistan stated that the so-called government made in Pakistan for Afghanistan was elected through secret ballot by a Consultative Shura, held in Rawalpindi in February, which is an independent organ representing a vast spectrum of Afghans. However, journalists who have covered the process of the establishment of this Shura have seen it differently.

The United States daily, The Washington Post, in its issue of 6 March 1989, writes:

"The ISI also played a prominent role in last month's rebel council meeting, or shura, called by the seven parties to form a provisional Afghan government ...".

The Financial Times, in its issue of 24 February 1989, writes:

"Senior ISI officials were sitting inside the shura, 'advising' on proceedings.

"Delegates report being offered as much as PRs 400,000 (\$25,430)."

The French daily, Le Monde, in its issue of 29 March 1989, writes:

"A great number of the leaders of the Afghan resistance complained that they were under constant pressure from the Pakistani military intelligence during the convention of the shura ... simply, a great number of the members of the shura had been bought."

(Mr. Wakil, Afghanistan)

That is the true profile of the so-called council and interim government the ISI is trying to impose on the people of Afghanistan through military means. However, it must be noted that Pakistani pressure on the Alliance of Seven will only deepen the discord among the Alliance, which will in turn complicate intra-Afghan dialogue among the various sectors of Afghan society and the establishment of a broad-based government. What is more important is the fact that any country, if it so wills, can create such a government on its territory for its close neighbour. The Consultative Shura which was created in a non-democratic manner, not in Afghanistan but on alien soil, cannot possibly represent the people of Afghanistan. Such a Shura does not have the authority to create a government for the people of Afghanistan. The Shura which, at the outset, met only for a few minutes and immediately faced turmoil, created a government selected by the ISI, under extreme pressure from the latter and was then immediately dismissed. If the claim of having control over the greater part of the territory of Afghanistan were correct, this Shura should have been established inside Afghanistan and not on alien territory. The truth is that this so-called interim government created by the Shura was able to sneak into bordering areas of Afghanistan only for a few hours and then had to rush back to Pakistan and into the folds of the ISI.

The government created in Pakistan, lacking any legal basis whatsoever, which is yet to agree with the ISI on the composition of the members of its cabinet, has been rejected by sectors of the opposition, a great number of commanders, the majority of the refugees in neighbouring countries, as well as in Europe and in the United States, political groups and the people of Afghanistan. The Financial Times, in its issue of 24 February 1989, reports:

(Mr. Wakil, Afghanistan)

"Meanwhile, large demonstrations were held against the shura in Peshawar and Queta, where most of the 3.5 million Afghan refugees in Pakistan are located, claiming it was unrepresentative and manipulative by Pakistan and the fundamentalists to legitimize a government of their choice."

It should be also mentioned that the world mass media has reported the crushing of such demonstrations in the hands of Pakistani militarists and armed fundamentalists based in Pakistan.

The truth is that this puppet government of Pakistan, which takes its instructions from General Hamid Gul, chief of the ISI, lacks a civilized political order and is completely incapable of establishing an effective administrative system, ensuring security, creating normal conditions for life and work, keeping discipline among its armed members and honouring international obligations.

The war around the city of Jalalabad, which has been continuing for several weeks, is a Pakistani conspiracy and is aggression. The personnel of the armed forces of the Republic of Afghanistan, from an ordinary soldier to a general, welcomed the martyrdom but refused to surrender or to accept defeat. With remarkable valour and heroism they defeated the Pakistani conspiracy. Henry Kamm, a New York Times correspondent, in a report sent from Islamabad on 16 April, which was published in the Sunday issue of yesterday, 23 April, exposed the whole Pakistani conspiracy for aggression and intervention against Afghanistan, revealing details of the decision of the Government of Pakistan to attack Jalalabad city. In the light of such facts it is no longer possible to cover the truth or to deceive world public opinion. Following is the full text of the report:

(Mr. Wakil, Afghanistan)

"Pakistanis Report Ordering Attacks by Afghan Rebels - U.S. Envoy in on Decision - Move made by Bhutto Team with no Afghans Present - Drive has Stalled:

"ISLAMABAD, Pakistan, April 16 - The frontal assault by the Afghan guerrilla forces on the key eastern town of Jalalabad was ordered by Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto's Government at a meeting of the top civilian and military leadership of Pakistan, in the presence of the American Ambassador, according to a Pakistani participant and other Pakistani officials.

"No Afghan was present at the meeting on March 5, and the decision to attack was made against the advice of the director of Pakistani military intelligence. The attack has bogged down into a costly siege and has brought into question the ability of the guerrillas to achieve an early victory, or any victory, over the Soviet-backed Government in Kabul.

"Belief of Pakistan:

"Pakistan had believed that an impressive military victory would further these chances. Moreover, the Bhutto Government had for many months been told by its intelligence directorate, as well as its American ally, that the two easternmost Afghan towns, Jalalabad and Kandahar, could not but fall to the rebels within weeks of the Soviet military withdrawal, paving the way for the capture of Kabul, the capital, shortly thereafter.

"Since the pullout of the Soviet Army became a certainty with the signing a year ago of the Geneva accords between Pakistan and the Kabul Government, seconded by the United States and the Soviet Union, the scenario of a rapid overthrow of President Najibullah had been the virtual doctrine of the Pakistani and American intelligence services.

(Mr. Wakil, Afghanistan)

"A Branch of the Military:

"A high Pakistani official said no Afghans were present at the March meeting because 'I.S.I. is responsible for them'.

"He was referring to the Pakistani Directorate General for Inter Services Intelligence, a branch of the military. Since the Soviet intervention in December 1979, the directorate has shaped the Afghan rebel leadership, formed the seven-party guerrilla alliance based in the Pakistani city of Peshawar that nominally conducts the struggle and in effect commanded and coordinated its military and political actions.

"Since the United States, under the Presidency of Jimmy Carter, threw its full military support behind the rebels, the Central Intelligence Agency has been the Pakistani directorate's main partner. It channels American-provided arms, equipment and money through the directorate to the rebels.

"A Transition - Ordering Attack on Jalalabad:

"Political and military considerations prompted Ms. Bhutto's decision to instruct her intelligence branch to order the attack on Jalalabad, according to the Pakistani officials.

"The meeting on March 5 came shortly after the transformation of the seven-party alliance into an interim Afghan government and just before a meeting in Saudi Arabia of the Foreign Ministers of the Islamic Conference organization. Pakistan and Saudi Arabia, the second principal source of funding for the rebels, wanted the conference to seat the new government, hoping to enhance its chances of gaining international acceptance.

(Mr. Wakil, Afghanistan)

"According to a participant, Lieut. Gen. Hamid Gul, director general of I.S.I., counseled the March meeting against an assault. He was reported to have explained that the directorate believed the mutually antagonistic guerrilla groups to be incapable of conducting such a large-scale act of conventional warfare as seizing a major city by storm.

"Moreover, the directorate is known to believe that the United States has not equipped the rebels with the heavy weapons necessary for such an attack.

"Instead, the general proposed a somewhat lengthier campaign of attrition against the city's links to Kabul, accompanied by stepped-up talks between Government and guerrilla officers to bring about the surrender of the city.

"This was opposed, according to a participant, by a close aide to Ms. Bhutto, a man in whom she places particular trust in military and Afghan matters. He is a retired major general, Nasirullah Babar, who had been a confident of her father, the late Prime Minister Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, and a senior commander on the Afghan frontier at a time when the Pakistani links to some of today's guerrilla leaders were first forged.

"General Babar told the meeting, according to the participant, that too much time had elapsed since the Soviet withdrawal was completed Feb. 15 without a significant rebel victory. He said such a lag would help memories of the Soviet intervention to fade and would lead to Pakistan's being blamed for continuing a war the Soviets had given up.

"This view prevailed, and Ms. Bhutto's Government ordered the intelligence directorate to set in motion the attack against which it had counseled. It could not be learned whether Ambassador Robert B. Oakley participated in the discussion or decision-making.

(Mr. Wakil, Afghanistan)

"The assault began in earnest two days later. Intelligence estimates of a quick success were belied, both by the attackers' military ineffectiveness and the defenders' combat morale and use of air power. The siege is in its seventh week, with no immediate end in sight.

"A senior Pakistani official familiar with the military said that the intelligence directorate had been cast into its war role under the rule of President Mohammad Zia ul-Haq, a general who was killed in a mysterious plane crash last August. Under General Zia, who ruled Pakistan from 1977, the military and Government were virtually one, and he enthusiastically supported the Afghan rebels and his intelligence service's management of them.

"Despite last December's return of elected civilian government, the first since General Zia overthrew Ms. Bhutto's father in 1977 and had him hanged in 1979, the directorate continues to dominate the conduct of the war. General Babar said in an interview that Ms. Bhutto had a strong inclination to support the military's Afghan policy because it evolved under her father's rule.

"He recalled that such guerrilla leaders as Gulbuddin Hekmatyar and Burhanuddin Rabbani sought refuge in Pakistan after participating in anti-Government rioting in Kabul in 1974.

"'We took them under our cover because we knew that some day there would be trouble in Afghanistan,' the former Inspector General of the Frontier Corps and Governor of Northwest Frontier province, said. 'We wanted to build up a leadership to influence events'.

"He said that the United States had also been financing such potential leaders since 1973 and had taken Mr. Hekmatyar 'under its umbrella' months before the Soviet intervention.

(Mr. Wakil, Afghanistan)

"Unfortunately the problem of Afghanistan is not resolved," said Ms. Bhutto in an interview in her office in this new capital's older sister city of Rawalpindi. She cited the problem of Afghan refugees in Pakistan, whose number she put at 3.6 million.

"We would like all these refugees to return to their homeland," the Prime Minister continued. 'But unfortunately there is a civil war going on'.

"The Pakistani and American intelligence services consistently predicted that there would be no major civil war after the Soviet pullout because the Najibullah Government would fall of its unpopularity as a foreign-imposed régime.

"An official close to the Prime Minister said her Government had for the first time brought Pakistan's role in the war 'under some kind of political influence and persuasion.' The official called the civilian role 'partial political control'.

"As a political reality we do recognize the influence of the military, no doubt," the official explained. 'However, we don't want to push it beyond a certain point. If it is a point of two different premises, of differing hypotheses, then I don't think the political wing would like to interfere that much.

"It's so late in the day. If we do and it doesn't work out, if what is wanted is not achieved, then we would be blamed. So it's better therefore to give a free hand to those who have been handling it'.

"Running the War - Pakistan Decides, With U.S. at Its Side:

"The Jalalabad decision illustrates how the war of the mujahidin, or Islamic Holy Warriors, as the guerrillas call themselves, is managed. Major decisions are made by Pakistan, in the absence of the Afghans but with an American presence.

(Mr. Wakil, Afghanistan)

"Although the intelligence directorate's role in the war is public knowledge though not publicly acknowledged, the part played by the American agency is less transparent and a subject of much speculation here. Many Pakistanis believe that the United States, as a super-Power, calls the shots, but senior Pakistani officials and European diplomats said this was not the case. But the Soviet Union and the Kabul Government have maintained for years that the guerrillas are under the direct control of the Islamabad Government.

"A well-informed Westerner said the intelligence directorate distributes not only arms but also humanitarian relief supplies furnished by the United States according to its formula. Political officials in the moderate Afghan groups said that until the formation of the interim government, the directorate's officers directed alliance meetings. They do so when the new government, consisting of the same leaders, meet, an Afghan reported.

"Countries backing the guerrillas criticize the interim government for slowness in acting like a régime and moving into their country. Some of its officials attributed this to continuing suspicion among the leaders. Although Prime Minister Abdul Rasul Sayyaf, a fundamentalist close to Saudi Arabia, was said to have assured President Sibghatullah Mojaddid of his loyalty, a foreign official in contact with both said there was no way of telling whether President or Prime Minister would emerge as the leader of the régime.

"Moderate Afghans and Westerners who sympathize with them fear that once the interim government has moved inside its country, the more zealously Islamic leaders favoured by the Pakistani military would use their arms superiority to seize power. They said such a move would be favoured by Pakistan's military and the Central Intelligence Agency, whose attitude was described by a knowledgeable official as, 'Those who fought to win the war should run the country'.

(Mr. Wakil, Afghanistan)

"A Western diplomat disagreed. He said that might have been President Zia's design, but Ms. Bhutto knew a Pakistani puppet régime could not last in Kabul. Yet many Afghan moderates believe the military has greater might than the civilian Prime Minister, and General Zia's ideas have survived in the military.

"The dead man's dream is our nightmare,' one said.

"What is important to the United States is the future of U.S.-Pakistani relations,' an interim government official said, discussing the American attitude toward who should run a post-Communist Afghanistan.

"The Inside Stand - Pakistan Holds Off On Recognition:

"Conceding Pakistan's present dominance over the guerrillas, Pakistani and Western officials asserted that only when the interim government governs from inside Afghanistan will this dominance wane.

"For that reason, a high Pakistani official said, Pakistan will not recognize the régime it largely created. 'We have not recognized it because we would like respect paid to the Geneva Accords,' said Ms. Bhutto, offering the official reason. Under the Accords, Pakistan and Afghanistan undertook not to interfere in each other's affairs.

"The official close to the Prime Minister explained that, to be recognized, Pakistan expected the government to 'behave like a government and not as an alliance' and to control and defend some territory in Afghanistan rather than be based here.

"The official also said that Pakistan did not want 'to be left on a limb' and would withhold recognition until the United States and China extended it.

"A senior Pakistani official said the intelligence directorate disagreed with the Government. He said it believed prompt recognition would have avoided the costly siege of Jalalabad by encouraging defections.

(Mr. Wakil, Afghanistan)

"The lack of eagerness to recognize the interim government is evidence of the general change from the earlier American and Pakistani optimism based on overly promising intelligence. Trying to appear optimistic, a senior Foreign Ministry official said, 'Our information that the Kabul régime cannot last more than six to eight months has not yet been proven wrong'.

"But high-level officials are beginning to find more acceptable the notion, rejected by the guerrillas, that the Najibullah Government might have to be granted a role in a political solution.

"The Foreign Ministry aide said Ms. Bhutto had told Foreign Minister Eduard A. Shevardnadze of the Soviet Union that the guerrilla leaders would not negotiate with the Kabul régime and believed it could not survive. The Soviet Minister called this an inaccurate perception.

"The Prime Minister replied it's a matter of perceptions,' the official said. 'If the mujahidin perception proves wrong, a review is called for'."

(The New York Times, 23 April 1989, pp. 1 and 16)

The following article also appears in The New York Times:

"For U.S., a Determining Afghan Role:

"Islamabad, Pakistan, 16 April - The Pakistani military dependence on American arms and money for the Afghan rebels gives the United States a determining role, even if the tactical decisions and co-ordination are Pakistan's province.

"A knowledgeable Pakistani journalist with good access to officials said that, through long and friendly co-operation, the Pakistani and American intelligence services and military tend to see eye to eye.

(Mr. Wakil, Afghanistan)

"Both are believed by Afghan guerrilla figures critical of the predominance of Islamic militants within the seven-party guerrilla alliance, as well as by some Pakistani and Western officials, to favour the most religiously zealous of the parties when it comes to the distribution in arms and money.

"A senior Pakistani official said this was true, but only because the more religiously motivated groups had better fighting records, greater discipline, did not divert supplies for private gain and were better organized to assimilate and use the arms they received. He said the intelligence directorate had established 'a scientific system' for measuring performance on those principles.

"Sharing the arms:

"Under the system, the official said, the most radical Islamic militant, Gulbuddin Hekmatyar, did not receive the greatest share. He said his part was 19 per cent of the total, 'a little less' than that the group headed by Burhanuddin Rabbani, also a militantly Islamic party and the one that receives the most.

"The official indicated that although the United States had urged Pakistani intelligence to rein in Mr. Hekmatyar, whom he conceded to have been 'ruthless' in internecine struggles, his share of arms had not been reduced. 'With Hekmatyar there is never a discipline problem,' he said. 'His ability is optimal. He is intellectually sharp and maintains good discipline. I don't deny he is also ruthless.

"But he said his ruthlessness did not take place in Pakistan and was therefore none of the Pakistani military's business.

(Mr. Wakil, Afghanistan)

"The military guidance:

"'The single thread of command is ISI,' said a high Pakistani official. He said the intelligence directorate had to give military guidance and sometimes do so sternly.

"He said it also withheld arms shipments as punishment for indiscipline. He said arms had been cut off for three months recently from forces controlled by the party of Yunis Khalis because of a massacre of prisoners of war committed by a unit last November.

"With the formation of the interim government, the United States and Pakistan are eager for it to take greater charge of the war and to do so from inside Afghanistan, where the guerrillas claim to control 90 per cent of the territory. But Pakistanis and Westerners complain that the rebel leaders are slow to do this.

"General Yahya Nauroz was named Deputy Defense Minister and Chief of Staff of all forces and urged by the United States and Pakistan to take over from the intelligence directorate control of the distribution of arms. He has not yet done so, a high Pakistani official said.

"On distribution system:

"He reported that the directorate had urged that the interim government's president, Sibghatullah Mojadidi, set up its own distribution system. He said the president had undertaken to do so by March 1. Asked again on March 10, Mr. Mojadidi promised to present his plan by April 1. He has not yet done so, said the official.

"Other Pakistani officials, Afghans and Western diplomats said that the most Islamic parties, receiving the lion's share, presumably saw no benefit to entrusting distribution to Mr. Mojadidi and his Defense Minister Mohammad Nabi Mohammadi. Both head what are known as moderate parties.

(Mr. Wakil, Afghanistan)

"It won't happen overnight," a Western diplomat said."

In the present complicated situation created as a result of Pakistani non-compliance with the Geneva Agreements and aggression and intervention in the internal affairs of Afghanistan, the role of the United Nations Good Offices Mission in Afghanistan and Pakistan (UNGOMAP) has become very prominent. On behalf of the Government and people of Afghanistan, I should like to express sincere appreciation to all the countries that have provided personnel for UNGOMAP.

However, in spite of irresponsible statements by the representative of Pakistan on the activities of UNGOMAP, I should like to emphasize that, regrettably, as a result of the obstacles raised by Pakistan UNGOMAP has not been able so far to investigate Pakistani violations in line with paragraph 3 of the procedures envisaged in the Memorandum of Understanding. Between 14 May 1988 and 18 April 1989, in a total of 417 notes, the Government of Afghanistan notified UNGOMAP of 3,442 specific cases of Pakistani violations. As a result of Pakistan's lack of co-operation with UNGOMAP, none of those cases has been fully investigated as stipulated in the Geneva Agreements.

In this connection I should like to draw the Council's attention to a number of questions foreign and domestic journalists put to General Rauli Helminen, Deputy Representative of the Secretary-General, at the above-mentioned press conference in Kabul.

A BBC correspondent put the following question: "There seems to be some ambiguity in your exact mandate here in Afghanistan, particularly after the withdrawal of Soviet troops. You have a mandate to help the return of refugees. Could you please tell us what your exact mandate is?"

The following was the response provided by General Helminen:

(Mr. Wakil, Afghanistan)

"As is said in the Geneva Agreements, the mandate is divided into three tasks. One of the tasks has already been passed - that is, confirmation of the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan. And two tasks are still remaining. The first is based on the first instrument concerning non-interference and non-intervention in each other's affairs between Afghanistan and Pakistan. The second remaining task is confirmation of the voluntary return of refugees. We are constantly working with our first mentioned task, making inspections on the complaints made by the parties. But the refugees confirmation has not started so far. And everybody knows that refugees are still in their camps and they are not moving so far."

Yes, the two important components of the comprehensive settlement envisaged in the Geneva Agreements - that is, non-interference and non-intervention and the voluntary return of refugees - are still unaccomplished. Pakistan refuses to honour its responsibility in this regard.

A Reuters correspondent asked, "What sort of hurdles have been created by the Pakistani side to you in monitoring the implementation of the Geneva Agreements?"

The answer:

"I think you know quite well the circumstances in the tribal areas and Baluchistan. They are not very easy; the distances are very long. In the summertime the weather is very terrible for our officers. I mentioned already that our biggest problem is the lapse of time. When we receive the complaints from the side, it is some five to ten days after the incident happened. After that we start our planning and discussing with the Pakistani authorities. We cannot go to the border areas if it is not very serious, like downing aircraft. That is a different thing. But just to go to see one shell, in fact, or some alleged sabotage incident, we will have to travel some six hours

(Mr. Wakil, Afghanistan)

over there, and six hours back. We have to collect them together in certain areas, as many incidents as possible, when we go. So very normally more than a month has passed when we are over there. This is the difficulty, more or less."

A correspondent of Afghan television asked the following question: "Do the Pakistani authorities provide UNGOMAP with the same facilities as the Afghan authorities provide?" The answer:

"Yes. Initially we had some problems with the establishment because it took some time. But for the time being we have very good facilities. I have put a request to my liaison officer in Pakistan to provide us with helicopter transportation, because, as I said, we are losing time sitting in land vehicles hour after hour. We have a short time for inspection. If they could provide us with some helicopters we could save much time and be more in time in places. But I have not received an answer so far. That is something I am hoping for very much. Because it has been mentioned in the Geneva Agreements, it is the task of the Government to provide the necessary transportation."

It is important to note that because of the lack of co-operation on the part of Pakistan UNGOMAP is using only land vehicles to accomplish its duty.

A BBC correspondent asked, "Have you, in all the time you have been working as senior officer in UNGOMAP, received a satisfactory response to these complaints? It seems the complaints continue. Have you only sent confidential reports to the Secretary-General, and the files are secretly kept in the UN for some actions that are destined to be taken?" The answer: "Yes, it has been so." Question: "Can you give some examples?" Answer: "No."

(Mr. Wakil, Afghanistan)

It is not surprising that the representative of Pakistan is satisfied with the activities of UNGOMAP, given the outlined Pakistani violations of the Geneva Agreements. Due to hurdles raised by Pakistan the UNGOMAP teams have not been able to investigate even a single violation in accordance with the procedure agreed upon. Because of the fact that UNGOMAP has not been able fully to investigate Pakistani violations, Pakistani militarists, in complicity with armed extremist elements, have committed inhuman crimes against the people of Afghanistan.

A shocking example of those crimes was the capture by Pakistani militia and commandos of customs officials of the Republic of Afghanistan in Torkham in November 1988; those officials were then surrendered to armed extremist groups. Those groups cut into pieces the bodies of 70 of those prisoners and sent them into Afghanistan in sacks. Fourteen of those Afghan customs officers are still languishing in Pakistani prisons in Peshawar. A note in this regard has been sent to UNGOMAP, to which we have not received any reply so far.

Paragraph (a) (iii) of section IV of the Memorandum of Understanding, on the procedure for investigations, reads in part:

"In accordance with paragraph 7 a report on an investigation should be considered in a meeting of the Parties not later than 48 hours after it has been submitted. The Deputy Representative of the Secretary-General will, in the absence of the Representative, lend his good offices to the Parties and in that context he will assist in the organization of the meetings and participate in them. In the context of those meetings the Deputy Representative of the Secretary-General may submit to the Parties for their consideration and approval suggestions and recommendations for the prompt, faithful and complete observance of the provisions of the instruments".

(S/19835, annex, p. 14)

(Mr. Wakil, Afghanistan)

No complaint has so far been fully investigated in accordance with the above provision, due to a lack of co-operation on the part of Pakistan. During the course of about a year as a result of the insistence of the Government of Afghanistan only a single meeting of the two sides has taken place. However, that meeting took place at the level of Chargés d'Affaires and not at the level of the two sides' Liaison Officers with UNGOMAP.

In that connection, I should like to state that the establishment of three outposts in border areas to which Pakistan has so far agreed is not enough for effective activities by UNGOMAP. We ask the Secretary-General to establish seven outposts in the areas proposed by the Afghan side. Considering the fact that there exist 90 paths in border areas in the east and south which are used by armed extremists and Pakistani militia, seven outposts are the minimum required; this has been proposed with due consideration of the limited number of officers serving in UNGOMAP. We stand ready to co-operate in any and every way with the Secretary-General in this regard.

We welcome with appreciation the observation made by the Permanent Representative of Finland when he stated in the Security Council that

"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". (S/PV.2855, p. 31)

(Mr. Wakil, Afghanistan)

I should like to request Pakistan, here in the Security Council, not only to agree on meetings between the two sides within 48 hours after a complaint is made, as stipulated in the Memorandum of Understanding, but also to start consultations with Afghanistan on UNCOMAP as proposed by Finland. Given good will for the implementation of the provisions of the Geneva Agreements, it will not prove difficult in co-operation with each other to find more effective ways and means for the activities of UNCOMAP.

The question of the presence of a great number of Afghan refugees in neighbouring countries is of great concern to us. We express our gratitude to all those countries, specialized agencies, particularly the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), and non-governmental organizations that have helped our refugee brothers for so many years. Unfortunately, however, in spite of all that assistance Afghan refugees are living under very harsh conditions, and there is no doubt that they are nurturing the hope that they will be able to return to their homeland as soon as possible.

We are fully aware that Afghan refugees have gone to neighbouring countries for different reasons, including the continuation of the bloody war. It is regrettable that Pakistan is imposing the war on us on the one hand and obstructing the return of refugees on the other.

We are aware that the existence of so many Afghan refugees has exerted a lot of pressure on UNHCR and governmental and non-governmental organizations. Pakistan, however, has reaped huge financial benefits from the existence of Afghan refugees. Pakistan knows that the return of Afghan refugees will further assure the Afghan people of the possibility of peace and the solution of internal problems, will result in the strengthening of the political and social pillars of

(Mr. Wakil, Afghanistan)

the Government of Afghanistan, and will provide further support for the humane policies of the Government. Such developments, however, run counter to the wishes and plans for Afghanistan of the Pakistani Directorate General for Inter-Services Intelligence (ISI).

Article IV of the Bilateral Agreement between the Republic of Afghanistan and the Islamic Republic of Pakistan on the Voluntary Return of Refugees provides that

"For the purpose of organizing, co-ordinating and supervising the operations which should effect the voluntary, orderly and peaceful repatriation of Afghan refugees, there shall be set up mixed commissions in accordance with the established international practice". (S/19835, annex, p. 8)

Similarly, article V stipulates that

"the commissions shall determine frontier crossing points and establish necessary transit centres". (p. 8)

According to article VII of the same instrument, the mixed commissions should have been established immediately after the entry into force of the Geneva Agreements. Almost a year has passed, and Pakistan has yet to agree to the establishment of those commissions. We are convinced that the establishment of the commissions will play an important role in the voluntary and honourable return of Afghan refugees to their homeland. We demand of Pakistan that it be faithful to its commitments and establish with us these mixed commissions, because the present position of Pakistan is in itself a hurdle for the return of refugees.

Not only is the statement of the representative of Pakistan to the effect that the Government of the Republic of Afghanistan is an illegitimate Government imposed on the people of Afghanistan by foreign troops a denial of truth and reality, but hidden behind that statement is the Pakistani design to install in Kabul a puppet

(Mr. Wakil, Afghanistan)

government. The present Government of Afghanistan has diplomatic relations with more than 80 countries and is an active Member of the United Nations, the Non-Aligned Movement, and a great number of specialized agencies and other prestigious world bodies. That Government has proved in practice its full capability for full allegiance to the principles of the Charter and of non-alignment, and for carrying out its bilateral and multilateral obligations. If that Government had really been installed by foreign troops, then after the withdrawal of Soviet troops it should have fallen or at least surrendered to the extremists supported by Pakistan. If the present Government was an illegitimate puppet government it would certainly have preferred its party and group interests over the high national interests of the Afghan people. If it was an imposed and illegitimate government it would have neglected national traditions, the sacred religion of Islam and the customs, history and culture of its people and would not be able today to face its own people or the peoples represented around this table.

The truth is that the present Government of Afghanistan is a national, patriotic and peace-loving Government which enjoys great political trust in Afghan society and among sectors of the refugees and the armed opposition. That trust is the result of courageous steps taken by the present leadership led during the past three years by His Excellency President Najibullah.

(Mr. Wakil, Afghanistan)

That leadership, which took the responsibility for leading the country at the height of war and tragedy, has critically analysed the events of the past decade in Afghanistan, adopting new policies for saving the country from war and destruction and for realizing national accord. It has implemented and is implementing those policies with courage and perseverance under very difficult and complicated circumstances. It is that leadership which, demonstrating good will and flexibility, expedited the process of the Geneva negotiations and signed the Geneva Agreements, although it had justified doubts about the real intentions of Pakistan. The present leadership organized in a relatively short time an independent defence of the country, creating the conditions for the return of Soviet troops from Afghanistan.

The present leadership prepared the grounds for the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan to abandon its monopoly on political power and put forward the programme for national reconciliation and the establishment of a broad-based Government with the participation of all political parties and forces of Afghan society. During the past three years basic changes have been introduced into the rules and the programme of action of the party, which was not an easy task given the complicated situation. I would like clearly to announce that the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan was not and is not a communist party. The Government of the Republic of Afghanistan is not following the path of socialism. We have not chosen that path for our country out of due consideration for national tradition and the social, economic and historical conditions of Afghanistan because we believe that the socio-economic system of the country should be chosen by the people of Afghanistan themselves, and not by this or that political party. No party has the right to impose its views and beliefs on the people and the society.

(Mr. Wakil, Afghanistan)

The present Government in Afghanistan is a national Government that strives for a democratic, multiparty system and a free national economy. The Government is fully attached to the tenets of the sacred religion of Islam, the traditions and customs of the people and the history and culture of Afghanistan. It is opposed to any right or left fundamentalism. We are fully aware that our people do not like any kind of extremist system and cherish their freedom, culture, traditions and customs.

In foreign policy we are against joining any military or political bloc and for full observance of the principles of non-alignment and active and positive neutrality. We wish to have friendly relations with all the countries of the world, particularly with neighbours and big countries, and we welcome their economic, financial and technical assistance in the reconstruction of our country, the development of Afghanistan and the improvement of the life of our people. To us, nothing - no belief, no goal - is more valuable than peace, than putting an end to fratricide, than the reconstruction of Afghanistan, the development of the country, the establishment of freedom, equality and fraternity among all the citizens of the country and safeguarding the independence, national sovereignty and territorial integrity of the common country of all Afghans, Afghanistan. In our view the means for reaching that noble and patriotic goal lie in national accord and drawing up a common platform, through dialogue, that would be supported by all political parties and forces and influential figures of Afghan society.

We hope that all the friends of Afghanistan and the friends of all Afghans will lend a hand to us in ending the war, ensuring peace and realizing national accord. It is the dictate of friendship that the murder of Afghans by Afghans should be stopped. During the past two months we have proved that in spite of the

(Mr. Wakil, Afghanistan)

aggression and intervention of Pakistan we have the power to ensure the defence of our country, but we are not proud of killing our own Afghan brothers. After 10 years of war, destruction and suffering, we sincerely strive for peace, reconciliation and brotherly feelings among all Afghans.

During the past two years the leadership, party and Government of the Republic of Afghanistan have witnessed profound evolution and changes. If there are still those who are not ready to change their perception of the Government of the Republic of Afghanistan, they have not scrutinized the events and developments in Afghanistan. We are not for holding power and government positions no matter what the price. His Excellency President Najibullah has stated on various occasions that we are not only thinking about our own position but are even ready to give our life in the cause of peace and tranquillity in Afghanistan. At the same time it must be noted that the present leadership of the Republic of Afghanistan considers it its national and patriotic duty to stand for intra-Afghan dialogue and the establishment of a government of national unity, because we clearly understand that in the case of complete negation of the present Government in power, the only State and political system that exists in Afghanistan will also perish, social order will be undermined, and Afghanistan, the common home of all Afghans, will face the abyss of disintegration and a long, bloody civil war. To accept such a destiny for our country is in our opinion treason to our homeland and high national interests. In that connection I would like to declare once again that, provided the ceasefire is observed by all sides to the conflict, the Government of the Republic of Afghanistan is ready to hold a national election in a democratic manner all over the country.

In conclusion, I should like on behalf of the Government of the Republic of Afghanistan to pledge once again that, as in the past, the Government of

(Mr. Wakil, Afghanistan)

Afghanistan will remain loyal to the Geneva Agreements and will honestly implement all its obligations. At the same time we will not spare any patriotic efforts to ensure the intra-Afghan dialogue, national reconciliation, country-wide peace and the re-establishment of secure conditions of life and work for the war-weary people of our country, the Republic of Afghanistan.

However, if the United Nations Security Council fails to adopt necessary measures for defusing the present tense situation and Pakistani aggression and intervention against our country continue, we will have no choice but firm and patriotic defence of our country. The Republic of Afghanistan, using its legitimate right for self-defence, will take all necessary steps to defend the independence, national sovereignty and territorial integrity of Afghanistan and to give the kind of response to aggression that it deems necessary.

The Pakistani side must understand that its territory is as vulnerable to rocket attacks as is the territory of the Republic of Afghanistan. Pakistan should immediately put an end to the shooting war it is continuing to wage in a planned, systematic and gradual form against Afghanistan. Otherwise, the responsibility for all the grave consequences of that aggression, which has endangered international peace and security in our region, will fall squarely on the shoulders of Pakistan.

Similarly, if effective measures are not adopted by the Security Council to defuse the present dangerous situation and aggression is continued, we will have no choice in the future but to come once again to the Council. Our appeal to the Security Council is not and will not be a propaganda act and a misuse of this forum but will take place solely to seek an end to foreign aggression and intervention in the internal affairs of our country and to ensure peace and security in our country and region. We hope that the United Nations - and particularly the Security Council, which is responsible for safeguarding international peace and

(Mr. Wakil, Afghanistan)

security - will take all measures towards the realization of this just cause and the wish of all the people of Afghanistan for peace and tranquillity and ending war and fratricide.

There can be no doubt that the patriotic people of Afghanistan and their heroic armed forces have the necessary power to ensure the repelling of any aggression and intervention in the internal affairs of their country and the resolute and independent defence of the independence, national security and territorial integrity of Afghanistan. If the continuation of war is imposed on us, we will give a telling response to the aggressor. However, we are certain that the international community and the Security Council will not allow the innocent people of Afghanistan to continue to fall victim to an imposed and senseless war and to witness the further destruction of their country. The path of peace, negotiation and solving of differences is the only alternative to the present tense situation.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): There are still a number of speakers on the list. However, owing to the lateness of the hour, I intend to adjourn the meeting now.

The time of the next meeting of the Security Council to continue consideration of the item on the agenda will be fixed in consultations with members of the Council to be held at 4 p.m. this afternoon, when we shall also consider a number of other items, familiar to Council members.

The meeting rose at 1.20 p.m.