



General Assembly

PROVISIONAL

A/40/PV.73
13 November 1985

ENGLISH

Fortieth session

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE SEVENTY-THIRD MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Tuesday, 12 November 1985, at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. DE PINIÉS (Spain)
later: Mr. MOSELEY (Vice-President) (Barbados)

- The situation in Afghanistan and its implications for international peace and security: [28] (continued)

- (a) Report of the Secretary-General
- (b) Draft resolution
- (c) Report of the Fifth Committee

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 General Assembly.

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

The meeting was called to order at 3.25 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 28 (continued)

THE SITUATION IN AFGHANISTAN AND ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND SECURITY

- (a) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/40/709-S/17527);
- (b) DRAFT RESOLUTION (A/40/L.11);
- (c) REPORT OF THE FIFTH COMMITTEE (A/40/867)

Mr. SHELDON (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): At every session of the General Assembly, and especially at this fortieth session, much is said in this world forum about devotion to the lofty ideals and the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter. In practice, however, there are still cases in which, to that accompaniment, imperialist circles and their assistants ruthlessly strike at the fundamental principles of the United Nations Charter and treacherously undermine its key provisions.

The continuing provocative fuss surrounding the so-called Afghan question constitutes inadmissible interference in the internal affairs of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan and represents a blatant violation of the United Nations Charter. The malicious imposition of discussion of this question against the just and determined protests of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, which is resolutely supported by the delegation of the Byelorussian SSR, is extremely dangerous and harmful to the cause of peace, because it distracts us from the search for a political solution to a situation that has been created by the forces of imperialism and reaction in South West Asia and only plays into the hands of those who are blinded by imperial pretensions to the right to declare governments legitimate or illegitimate and accordingly to reach verdicts and mete out punishment on the basis of their own political ambitions.

(Mr. Sheldov, Byelorussian SSR)

Look at what is being said this time by those who whip up passions against this question. Anyone can see even with the naked eye the meaning of these provocative acts which are aimed at covering up their real objectives: regaining their lost positions and abolishing the gains of the April 1978 revolution in Afghanistan.

In their statements at this session of the General Assembly, the representatives of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan have rightly rebutted all this. They clearly and convincingly showed that the revolutionary process in Afghanistan cannot be reversed. Born free and independent, the people of Afghanistan, heroically defending their revolution, have shown that no forces on Earth will be able to force them from the path they have chosen for their happiness and happiness of future generations of the Afghan nation.

As the facts show, it is the foreign and domestic policy, reflecting the interests of the people, of a peace-loving non-aligned State, a Member of the United Nations, the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, and the path of progress and social equality chosen by the Afghan people, which infuriates their enemies. Here we have the heart of the problem. Here we have the driving force behind the complicated and motley anti-Afghan provocative campaigns and actions. In the chorus of the enemies of Afghanistan, the tone is set by the United States of America; and this is done persistently on an ever-expanding basis. As early as the second month of his first term in his present office, the Head of the Washington Administration stated his intention to give military assistance to the Afghan counter-revolutionaries. That policy was reaffirmed in the statement of the United States President at the anniversary session of the General Assembly. These promises are not idle. They are being carried out in concrete acts.

Waging an undeclared war against the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan and its people, it is the United States and some of its allies who are financing,

(Mr. Sheldov, Byelorussian SSR)

arming and training Afghan counter-revolution scum. They have already spent more than one billion dollars on committing anti-Afghan provocations, subversion, acts of sabotage and murder of peaceful citizens.

At the beginning of this year, \$280 million were allocated from the United States treasury, and another \$200 million has been provided by other people who are supposedly concerned for the freedom of Afghanistan. Recently, the United States Senate allocated additional sums to the tune of \$200 million for the same purpose. According to the American press, the Central Intelligence Agency is waging the largest United States secret operation since the Viet Nam war against Afghanistan. Consequently, the United States on a permanent basis has been allocating funds to create, train and equip counter-revolutionary gangs, with the most sophisticated weapons, including missiles, to carry out military operations against the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan.

In this way terrorism is elevated to the rank of a State policy. All of this is accompanied by specially timed propaganda salvos on various pretexts and massive anti-Afghan propaganda, also generously funded by United States sources.

No clever propaganda ploys or outright slander can hide the truth about the ever-increasing atrocities and crimes of the counter-revolutionary bands who are outrageously called freedom fighters. These bandits are spilling the blood of children, women, old men, teachers, clergymen, hundreds of completely innocent people. For their so-to-speak great deeds, they are paid under the blood-curdling rates of the criminal price list. Five to seven thousand Afghanis are paid for the killing of an Afghan soldier, 10 to 15 thousand for the killing of a party activist, etc. Specific data on the damage done by the counter-revolutionaries, destroyed and burned schools, hospitals, health centres and peasant co-operatives were presented yesterday by the representative of the Democratic Republic of

(Mr. Sheldov, Byelorussian SSR)

Afghanistan, Ambassador Zarif. On the whole, according to official data of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan for the beginning of 1985, the damage caused by the bandits to the country's economy was more than 35 billion Afghanis.

This is the scale of the dirty work of the so-called defenders of the freedom of the Afghan people who in carrying out their criminal actions are using various kinds of weapons, often with the brand name effaced. But this cannot hide the fact which is well known, that is, where this weaponry is produced and how it gets into the hands of the bandits, paid in dollars, Pakistani rupees, Yuans, et cetera.

As a major springboard and shelter of the counter-revolutionary gangs, Pakistan is used. More than 120 camps are located there where the Afghan Dushman are trained with the help of 300 American advisers. To finance this activity, American channels are used as well as military assistance of the United States to Islamabad, which at present is more than \$3 billion. Moreover, Pakistan received the most sophisticated kinds of weapons including new surface-to-surface missiles, "Stinger" portable anti-aircraft rockets, stingers, planes, helicopters, tanks, artillery; and part of this weaponry is transferred to the Dushmans who have entrenched themselves in that country.

The major military injections which Islamabad receives can be justly considered as eloquent testimony to the fact that the undeclared war against the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, carried out from Pakistani territory, is only part of Washington's large-scale plan to destabilize the situation throughout the region, from southern Asia to the Persian Gulf, threatening the countries of that part of the world.

In this context we should emphasize that in Pakistan a central command of the United States, a so-called CENTCOM has been established. Nineteen States of Asia and Africa are included in the area of action, including Afghanistan. CENTCOM also

(Mr. Sheldov, Byelorussian SSR)

has responsibility for the rapid deployment forces. Themselves ever more deeply involved in the undeclared war against the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, Pakistani authorities with determination worthy of a better application, are trying to accuse the peace-loving Afghan State of increasing tensions in the region. But this is a vain attempt using unworthy means.

(Mr. Sheldov, Byelorussian SSR)

The Afghan people is having to carry out the tasks of the April Revolution in a difficult and tense military and political situation, during an undeclared war waged by aggressive imperialist circles and their helpers against the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan. The successes of the democratic, young, free Afghan State, which rejects the schemes of imperialism and reaction against the revolution are being achieved in an attempt to create a new life. That is stated in particular in the message of the Loya Jirgah (Grand Assembly) of Afghanistan to the Secretary-General (A/40/273). The facts show that during a very short historical period, as a result of the consistent implementation of land and water reforms, 320,000 families have received land. The state sector of the national economy has increased by 20 per cent. A literacy campaign has taught more than a million people to read and write. The education system has been expanded, and the network of institutions giving free medical care has been broadened.

The creation of the Loya Jirgah, with representatives from the villages, provinces and urban regions, was an important political event in the country's history. It showed the concern of the political vanguard of the toiling masses of Afghanistan and the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan, which has celebrated its twentieth anniversary, about further broadening the participation of the population in the role of the State.

We should dwell on the holding of the Grand Assembly, where all nationalities and social levels of Afghan society were represented. Sixty per cent of its members consisted of workers, artisans and peasants, and the rest were representatives of the clergy, the intelligentsia, merchants and major political and social figures. About 2,000 representatives from all parts of the country spoke in their message to the Secretary-General of the peace-loving character of the foreign policy of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan. Following that

(Mr. Sheldov, Byelorussian SSR)

policy, the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan has been making efforts to achieve a political solution of the Afghan situation. The basis of that settlement is contained in proposals of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan of 14 May 1980 and 24 August 1981. They are multifaceted, dealing with all aspects of the situation in Afghanistan. Those initiatives are flexible and realistic, taking into account the protection of national sovereignty and the interests of all the States of the region.

Supporting that constructive approach, the delegation of the Byelorussian SSR once again states unambiguously that it continues strongly to support a complete, unconditional, guaranteed end to armed and all other interference from outside in the internal affairs of Afghanistan, and we favour creating conditions in which such interference would be impossible in the future. We support the normalization of relations between Pakistan and Iran and the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan. That is the way to solve the problem - not by whipping up a propaganda campaign at the United Nations.

It is time to end all attempts to use the United Nations to interfere in the internal affairs of States and peoples. We must strongly insist that there be full compliance with the provisions of the Charter and the resolution adopted at the thirty-ninth session entitled "Inadmissibility of the policy of State terrorism and any actions by States aimed at undermining the socio-political system in other sovereign States" (resolution 39/159).

As is emphasized in the statement of the States Parties to the Warsaw Treaty at the summit conference of the Political Consultative Committee at the end of October this year, held in Sofia, "Nobody should encroach on the sovereign right of every nation to live and work under the socio-political system that it has itself freely chosen" (A/C.1/40/7, p. 4).

(Mr. Sheldov, Byelorussian SSR)

The Democratic Republic of Afghanistan has participated honestly, sincerely and constructively in the Geneva talks, through the Secretary-General's Personal Representative, to promote the achievement of a political solution. As is noted in the Secretary-General's report:

"There is also a growing conviction on both sides that a negotiated settlement is the only possible way to achieve peace in Afghanistan" (A/40/709, para. 2).

The Afghan position in favour of negotiations has been clearly and unambiguously reaffirmed at this session. In particular, speaking of a political settlement of the Afghan situation, the Foreign Minister of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, Shah Mohammad Dost, emphasized in his speech to the Assembly on 22 October:

"The best way in which such a settlement could be achieved is certainly through direct talks.

"From this rostrum we should like to make the following appeal to our neighbours: let us compete in constructive work, in building our countries and in raising the living standards of our people. We invite them to face up to that challenge and abandon the path of confrontation, which brings nothing but misery and waste of precious resources. Let us test this approach and taste its fruits." (A/40/PV.44, p. 91)

Is not that a responsible approach, to the future not only of his own country and people but also of the peoples and States of the whole region? Is it not an appeal to take the path set forth in the Charter:

"to practise tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbours"?

It is high time to understand that, if we are to be realistic, there is no alternative to a political settlement of the problem.

(Mr. Sheldov, Byelorussian SSR)

I hope that some countries that vote for anti-Afghan draft resolutions will finally adopt a realistic approach and remember their responsibilities under the Charter - not to interfere in the internal affairs of other States - and that they will, whether they like it or not, stop pouring grist into the mill of imperialism and reaction, of those forces which are undermining the basis of peace and security, opposing economic and social progress and preventing peoples living as they choose.

That is the attitude of the Byelorussian delegation to draft resolution A/40/L.11. We strongly oppose it and will vote against it, because merely repeating previous drafts is not politically realistic, distorts and ignores objective factors and in no way takes account of the legitimate interests of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan or its constructive initiatives.

Mr. FERM (Sweden): A few weeks ago we celebrated in this very Assembly Hall the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations. Speaker after speaker used that occasion to reaffirm the need for all Member States to adhere scrupulously to the principles laid down in the United Nations Charter.

In today's world few steps would be more conducive to the attainment of those high goals than a decision by the Soviet Union to withdraw its troops from Afghanistan. Such a move on the part of the Soviet Union would also, in my Government's view, contribute substantially to a lessening of the tension in the world. It would not only affect the relations between the two major Powers, but relieve fears and apprehensions in many smaller countries, which regard the universal application of international law as an important safeguard for their own sovereignty and territorial integrity.

The Soviet armed intervention in Afghanistan has now been going on for six years. During these six years it has been rightfully and clearly condemned by the overwhelming majority of Member States. It constitutes a grave violation of the fundamental rules of international relations.

The provisions contained in the United Nations Charter must guide all nations in their relations with other countries. But the situation becomes particularly grave when a permanent member of the Security Council, instead of setting a good example, so flagrantly displays its military might in an attempt to subdue a poor people in a small neighbouring State. There is only one way for the Soviet Union to live up to its legal and moral obligations, and that is by the prompt withdrawal of its troops from Afghanistan. Such an action would also instil a greatly needed respect for the rule of law in international affairs.

The Soviet invasion of Afghanistan has resulted in one of the worst human tragedies in our time. According to the report by the Special Rapporteur on Human

(Mr. Ferm, Sweden)

Rights in Afghanistan, the situation has resulted in "one of the biggest movements of refugees history has ever known" (E/CN.4/1985/21, para. 53). Perhaps as much as one third of the Afghan population have been forced to flee their homes and country and take refuge in the neighbouring States. Pakistan and Iran have had to deal with a refugee problem of gigantic proportions. The two countries have shown great generosity in admitting and assisting these refugees.

In the case of Pakistan, the conflict in Afghanistan and the refugee situation have caused yet another hardship. During the last few years the territorial integrity of that country has been repeatedly and seriously violated, causing many casualties.

The international community has made substantial efforts to relieve the sufferings of the Afghan people and assist the neighbouring countries in this respect. I should like to reiterate my Government's appreciation of the humanitarian activities carried out by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and non-governmental organizations.

The Swedish Government has been a firm supporter of these programmes and has made substantial contributions to the various humanitarian efforts. It is important that further international humanitarian assistance be given to the victims of the conflict, in particular the most vulnerable groups of the Afghan people.

My country has a long tradition of strong support for respect for human rights and humanitarian law in armed conflicts. I would therefore like to put on record my Government's condemnation of the gross violations of human rights, as well as other violations of international law, being reported from Afghanistan. Some of these violations have been described in the report on human rights in Afghanistan to which I referred earlier. That report presents clear evidence that the people

(Mr. Fern, Sweden)

of Afghanistan has been subjected to untold sufferings and hardship. The Special Rapporteur has reported on the wilful destruction of crops, the use of anti-personnel mines and so-called toy bombs, ill-treatment, torture and other forms of victimization of the civilian population, among them many women and children.

A year ago, in the debate on this item, I pointed out that customary international law as well as international conventions contain principles designed to prevent certain forms of indiscriminate warfare, such as area bombardment and the use of certain particularly inhuman weapons in civilian surroundings. I would like to remind this Assembly that the Soviet Union is a signatory to the treaties in question and is in fact committing serious violations of the same international law as it has actively participated in creating and codifying.

My delegation will vote for the draft resolution that is before us. It contains the necessary elements for a just solution: that all foreign forces must be withdrawn from Afghanistan; that the right of the Afghan people to determine their own form of government must be respected; that the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Afghanistan must be upheld; and that the millions of Afghan refugees must be able to return to their homes in safety and honour.

The Secretary-General has undertaken efforts to achieve a peaceful solution to the conflict on the basis of these principles. He has the full support of my Government in these endeavours.

It seems to my Government that the situation in Afghanistan is deteriorating further. Diplomatic attempts to solve the problem will not succeed as long as the Soviet Union pursues its aggression against the people of Afghanistan. The withdrawal of the Soviet forces from Afghanistan is therefore urgent. This would

(Mr. Fern, Sweden)

lead to less tension and more confidence in world affairs and, above all, it would at last give the people of Afghanistan a chance to live in peace.

Mr. TSVETKOV (Bulgaria) (interpretation from French): This year again the General Assembly has been led to indulge in a fruitless polemic on the item known as "the situation in Afghanistan". The People's Republic of Bulgaria sees in this one more attempt at interference in the internal affairs of a sovereign Member State of the United Nations and a way of distracting the attention of the Organization from the problems that are truly generating danger to international peace and security.

(Mr. Tsvetkov, Bulgaria)

One of those problems, which we should call by its true name, is precisely the pursuit of an undeclared war against that State, a war that is being conducted remorselessly and without compromise by the allied forces of imperialism, regional reaction and the Afghan counter-revolution, which is the only source of the dangerous situation in that region at the moment. It is natural, therefore, not to expect that we can achieve a much-needed, just and peaceful settlement of this problem by encouraging the aggressor and attacking the victim of the aggression.

The background of this question is well known. In April 1978 the Afghan people realized their inalienable right to determine their own destiny. Under the guidance of the Democratic People's Party of Afghanistan, the democratic national revolution dealt a death blow to the old feudal system and set in motion a far-reaching process of socio-economic transformation. The Afghans are laying the foundations of a modern national industry; they are successfully carrying out agrarian reform and developing their water resources; 250 modern industrial units have been commissioned; more than 312,000 rural families have received free land. Illiteracy is rapidly being eradicated and the country has been provided with an extensive public health system. These positive changes in the life of the country are becoming more and more typical of the Republic as a whole and are being welcomed by the broad masses of the people.

The working masses are participating ever more actively in the social and political affairs of the country. The most eloquent example of this trend was supplied by the first democratic municipal elections ever to be held in Afghanistan. Those elected to the councils of people's power are workers, peasants, intellectuals and representatives of all ethnic groups. This immense achievement of the April revolution is a historic achievement of the Afghan people as a whole.

(Mr. Tsvetkov, Bulgaria)

The People's Republic of Bulgaria, which is linked with the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan by relations of friendship and mutual assistance, is deeply gratified by these successes and we are confident that with every year of freedom they will be strengthened.

However, enormous difficulties have arisen in the path of this process. As the successes of the Afghan people in building their new society and in the economic and cultural spheres become more impressive, the actions of the enemies of the Republic become ever more sweeping, treacherous and pitiless. Groups of bandits, armed with the most sophisticated weapons - rocket-launchers, bazookas, heavy machine-guns, mines, toxic substances, ground-to-air rockets, anti-tank rockets, as well as the most modern kinds of light weapons - are constantly being brought into the country and taken into the interior. They are used to attack villages, towns, roads and mountain passes. Terrorist acts are being committed against schools, hospitals, mosques, etc. and are accompanied by massacres of civilians: doctors, teachers, skilled workers and technicians. There is nothing surprising about the fact that the victims should be the very ones who bring science, progress and hope to the masses, who were held for centuries in ignorance without any rights. To the irreparable losses in human lives caused by the bandits, we must add the material damage, which so far totals 35 billion Afghans, that is, more than \$800 million.

The criminal acts of the armed counter-revolutionaries, who have been trained in more than 150 special camps located for the most part in Pakistan territory, are being orchestrated and financed by well-known Western countries. At the head of the list is the United States, whose assistance to the "dushmans" - that is how the people call the bandits - has totalled \$625 million in six years. This year alone the arms and munitions supplied total more than \$500 million. Considerable amounts

(Mr. Tsvetkov, Bulgaria)

are also earmarked for terrorist acts by other countries with conservative régimes. In all, this assistance is comparable to the annual military budget of a medium-sized European Power. Such is the picture of the "poor and abandoned" Afghan rebels with which the Western press is so concerned.

It is a classic picture that we are watching. There has not been a single country that has committed itself to the way of national independence and social progress which has not immediately fallen victim to attempts to restore the old order and colonial dependence. Many States of Asia, Africa and Latin America can confirm this from their own experience of civil wars provoked by their former masters. It is a tactic as old as is the world. But it has not served anyone to roll back the tide of history.

The undeclared war against people's Afghanistan is being conducted hand-in-hand with a campaign of disinformation directed at world public opinion. Its purpose is to misrepresent the progressive changes that are taking place and to tarnish the picture of the aid provided by socialist countries and democratic forces to this young Republic. This process is not new either. Let us recall for a moment how capitalist propaganda used to hurl invective against the freedom fighters of countries which, today independent, are proudly occupying their well-deserved places in this forum, the most important in the world. They used to be called "foreign agents"; they used to be labelled terrorists and barbarians. This same propaganda was also used to slander the socialist countries because they unreservedly supported national liberation movements; they were accused of "stirring up international trouble", "intervention" and "expansion". The vocabulary remains the same today, as emerges clearly in this artificially inspired debate. But nobody can conceal the truth: only the mercenaries of imperialism and

(Mr. Tsvetkov, Bulgaria)

their instigators are the terrorists and interventionists, who are ready to shed any amount of blood to recover their lost privileges and their strategic positions.

Everything that is happening around Afghanistan in practice and everything that is being said and heard in this room, points to a simple and unequivocal conclusion. The Afghan people is going through a crucial period of its national development. Its situation should be understood by all of those who are inspired by the ideas of freedom, equality and cultural and economic development. The Democratic Republic of Afghanistan is an independent, non-aligned State which is seeking to promote its relations with all countries, and with its neighbours in particular, on the basis of mutual respect and non-intervention in internal affairs. This country has been the target of an imperialist plot. It is the target of aggression. In conformity with Article 51 of the Charter, it exercised its legitimate right of self-defence. It is not the People's Republic of Afghanistan which is at the origin of the critical situation, but all those who are struggling to train, arm and maintain the counter-revolutionary bands who are infringing the liberty and territorial integrity of this State and using every means available to prevent the achievement of a peaceful political solution.

The People's Republic of Bulgaria, which has tirelessly advocated such a solution, remains convinced that there is no international or regional problem that cannot be settled in that way. To do so, we must ensure that realism, a sense of responsibility and sound political will on the part of all the parties concerned will prevail. The Afghan Government is showing this sound political will. Specific examples are Kabul's foreign policy initiatives of May 1980 and of August 1981 which formulated the basic principles for a peaceful settlement of the conflict in the region.

(Mr. Tsvetkov, Bulgaria)

The People's Republic of Bulgaria is following closely the efforts of the Secretary-General and his Personal Representative, Mr. Cordovez. Those efforts are praiseworthy, and they should be encouraged. The Bulgarian delegation views those efforts as reflecting the positive role the Organization could play in restoring security and peace in the region. Moreover, we hope that these endeavours will lead to direct talks between Afghanistan and Pakistan, without which it will not be possible to reach the desired just and lasting settlement in conformity with the interests of the Afghan people and its neighbours. We are encouraged by the fact that the majority of speakers in the general debate and many representatives who have addressed this item have appealed for a peaceful settlement of the problem. It is very important for such a settlement that the parties directly concerned show political goodwill, as noted in the report of the Secretary-General in document A/40/709.

Those are my delegation's thoughts on the agenda item known as "The situation in Afghanistan". The draft resolution submitted on this item, unfortunately, reflects a false interpretation of the realities. It ignores the legitimate prerogatives of the Afghan Government, infringes inadmissibly upon the international status of Afghanistan, and legalizes enemy intervention in the internal affairs of that country. In no way can the text in question serve the interests of international law, much less those of the Afghan people or the cause of peace and security in that part of Asia and in the world in general. That is why my delegation will vote against the draft resolution.

As in the past, the People's Republic of Bulgaria will spare no effort to assist the search for a just, effective and lasting solution. Such a solution could not fail to have a positive impact upon the situation in that region and on the international climate as a whole.

Mr. KURODA (Japan): Almost six years after the Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan, it continues to maintain a large number of troops there. The Soviet Union alleges that interference from other countries has prolonged the fighting, but the international community knows that, in fact, it is the Afghan people themselves who are fiercely opposing the Soviet military occupation and interference in the affairs of their country. Although the fighting has taken a heavy toll, the Afghan people remain steadfast in their resistance and continue to wage an effective armed struggle throughout the country. The will of the Afghan people cannot be crushed by military means.

The situation in Afghanistan has increased tension throughout the region. During the past year numerous attacks have been mounted against the territory of Pakistan, violating the sovereignty of that country and claiming many innocent lives. On several occasions, Japan has reiterated its call for the immediate cessation of these attacks on Pakistani territory.

In deliberations on the Afghanistan problem at international forums such as the United Nations, the Non-Aligned Movement and the Organization of the Islamic Conference, the international community has clearly and unequivocally expressed its outrage at Soviet policies and actions in Afghanistan. The voting on General Assembly resolutions demonstrates that criticism of the Soviet Union is increasing year by year.

The Soviet Union should not remain intransigent. It should reverse its aggressive military policies and heed the international community's appeals for a peaceful settlement.

The Government of Japan is resolute in its insistence that the Soviet Union end at once its intervention in Afghanistan, which contravenes international law and justice, and withdraw its troops immediately. The situation must be resolved in accordance with the principles of non-interference and respect for the right of

(Mr. Kuroda, Japan)

self-determination. It is for the Afghan people themselves to determine their own political, economic and social system, free from outside coercion.

Thus, Japan strongly supports the draft resolution contained in document A/40/L.11, which reaffirms basic principles for the peaceful settlement of the problem. It is our hope that the draft resolution will be adopted by an overwhelming majority, as were previous resolutions on this question.

The Secretary-General, with the strong support of the international community, has continued his valuable efforts to bring about a political solution to the Afghan problem. We are heartened by his report that there is a growing conviction on both sides that a negotiated settlement is the only hope for achieving peace in Afghanistan. It is particularly encouraging that, as mentioned in paragraph 13 of the Secretary-General's report (A/40/709), the Governments of both the United States and the Soviet Union have reiterated their support for a negotiated settlement and for the continuation of the Secretary-General's efforts. Those efforts have included a May visit to the area by the Personal Representative of the Secretary-General, Mr. Diego Cordovez, and mediation efforts through proximity talks held in Geneva in June and August, with further talks scheduled for December.

My Government has been following closely all these developments, and sincerely hopes they will bear fruit. It regards the coming summit meeting of the leaders of the United States and of the Soviet Union as an opportunity to impart added momentum to the December proximity talks. Japan believes that all these endeavours must be consonant with the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly. Of primary importance, of course, is the complete withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan.

Afghans continue to flee to neighbouring countries. It is reported that at least 2.5 million people are already registered as having taken refuge in Pakistan. That represents 15 per cent of the entire Afghan population. In addition there are reportedly 1.8 million Afghan refugees in Iran. Because the fierce fighting continues unabated, there is no prospect of their repatriation.

(Mr. Kuroda, Japan)

Afghan refugees in Pakistan represent the largest concentration of refugees in the world. That situation imposes not only an enormous burden on Pakistan but is also a gravely destabilizing element in the region. My country sympathizes with Pakistan, which is experiencing manifold difficulties in accommodating such large numbers of refugees, and we pay high tribute to the humanitarian efforts that the Pakistani Government has made to cope with the situation. For its part, Japan has actively extended co-operation to Afghan refugee relief activities in Pakistan through the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and the World Food Programme, as well as other organizations. It is Japan's intention to continue to extend such co-operation out of humanitarian concern and for considerations of regional peace and stability. Japan is also extending assistance to Afghan refugees residing in Iran.

The Government of Japan reiterates its strong appeal to the Soviet Union to heed the calls which the international community has been making during the past six years to withdraw its troops without delay.

It is Japan's firm conviction that only a settlement which is endorsed by the Afghan people and fully respects their right to self-determination will bring lasting peace and stability to Afghanistan. Together with the majority of the countries of the world which share that conviction, Japan intends to work for a prompt and complete withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan, restoration of its independent and non-aligned status, restoration of the right of the Afghan people to determine their own destiny, and creation of the necessary conditions to enable the Afghan refugees to return to their homeland in safety and honour.

Mr. MOUMIN (Comoros): Six years have passed, six times we have debated, and six resolutions demanding the withdrawal of foreign forces from Afghanistan have been adopted by this Assembly. Yet the plight of the Afghan people has not improved; if anything their human rights condition has drastically deteriorated, with no hope of immediate improvement.

We were informed at the end of December 1979, when Soviet forces invaded the territory of its neighbour Afghanistan, that the forces had been called in by Amin, the then President of Afghanistan, in accordance with the 1978 Treaty of Friendship. A few days after the forces' arrival in Afghanistan, the key witness, Amin, was killed, and there was no one from whom we could verify the story told us.

Why were the forces called in? We were told "to defend the territorial integrity and independence of Afghanistan, which was threatened by its neighbours". For six years we have waited to be told the names of those countries which were threatening Afghanistan's sovereignty and territorial integrity. Six years have gone by and no invasion from outside has taken place. The only invasion we have witnessed is that of over 120,000 Soviet troops. At the beginning of the invasion some of us had naïvely believed the story then given that the forces went in to defend that country. But to everyone's indignation we came to realize later that, instead of defending and trying to unite the people of that once peaceful country, they perpetrated aggression and heinous crimes against the struggling masses and the poor civilians of that unfortunate country, incapacitating their young ones with booby-trapped toys.

In 1980, during the early days of the invasion, the Afghan freedom fighters were killed in hundreds by the invading forces; now they are killed not only in thousands but they are also forced to flee in millions.

(Mr. Moumin, Comoros)

We of the delegation of the Comoros humbly submit that that is a very unusual way of befriending a people. To help them kill each other is understandable, because it is part of the game in the world in which we live where arms must be sold to the poor to impoverish them further and where the motto of the game for those wishing to dominate others is "divide and rule". But it is beyond imagination and utterly disheartening for us to see a super-Power which has moral obligations and responsibilities for maintaining world peace use its military might to destroy a people with which history and geography have united it for eternity.

Why destroy what one cannot construct? Why create everlasting animosity when one can create everlasting love, friendship and understanding? Why use force and energy to create hatred when the same force and energy could better be used to create conditions for uniting and promoting better understanding of a people?

Does the Soviet Union believe that it can win the unholy war it has been waging against the Afghan people? At what price? Can it afford to be hated for ever by the same people with which nature has forced it to co-exist? Has the Great Bolshevik Revolution not taught us one great lesson - that a struggling people cannot but always emerge victorious? The case of Afghanistan will not prove different. Would it not be better for future generations of Soviets to have the Afghans as friends rather than enemies?

If our natural allies believe that the best way to make friends is to kill half of a people, then we must admit that they have a very peculiar way of doing things.

(Mr. Moumin, Comoros)

This is the seventh debate held on the question of Afghanistan and six times my delegation and many others have condemned the Soviet aggression, but the situation has only deteriorated. Consequently, we of the delegation of the Comoros believe that a change in tactics is necessary and might bear fruit.

Instead of only condemning, we should appeal to the Soviet people's sense of fair play. If they have decided to maintain their forces in Afghanistan for ever and have no intention of allowing the Afghan people to determine their own course, then the least they should do is stop killing the Afghans and use their forces of occupation and all the persuasion that they can muster to reconcile the fighting brothers in Afghanistan. If they do that they will surely be the winners in the end.

(Mr. Moumin, Comoros)

The retaliatory bombing of villages and the killing of innocent Afghans by the Soviet air force is unacceptable and should stop immediately.

The Soviet peoples are great peoples and have a long history of being great. The noblest virtue of greatness is magnanimity, so it is time that magnanimity was demonstrated for the benefit of the Afghan people.

What are the political repercussions of the Soviet military intervention in Afghanistan? It has undoubtedly had adverse consequences for international peace and security. It has adversely affected détente and the building of trust in East-West relations. The main social consequence is the humanitarian problem it has created.

As a result of the 1979 Soviet military intervention, almost one third of the Afghan population has been forced to flee their country and to seek refuge in neighbouring Pakistan and Iran. Iran has 2 million refugees, and the fraternal State of Pakistan has over 3 million Afghan refugees. In spite of its meagre resources the Pakistan Government has to spend about \$400 million annually to maintain those refugees in Pakistan. That has created a great burden for the people of Pakistan in their efforts to achieve economic development. We thank those countries which are assisting Pakistan, and urge them to increase their humanitarian assistance to the Afghan refugees.

It is clear from what I have said that there has been very little progress in finding a permanent solution to the problem of Afghanistan. However we ought not to lose hope; we should encourage the interested parties to arrive at a definitive solution.

The efforts of the Secretary-General of the United Nations to find an agreed solution are highly commendable, and the Assembly should encourage and mandate him to continue his efforts to find a comprehensive political settlement based on the following principles: first, the immediate withdrawal of the foreign troops from

(Mr. Moumin, Comoros)

Afghanistan; secondly, respect for the right of the Afghan people to determine their own form of Government and to choose their economic, political and social system free from outside intervention, subversion, coercion or constraint of any kind whatsoever; thirdly, respect for the sovereignty, territorial integrity, independence, and non-aligned status of Afghanistan; fourthly, the creation of the necessary conditions for the voluntary return of the Afghan refugees to their homes in safety and honour.

We believe that the major objective of the Geneva talks should be to facilitate the termination of the Soviet military intervention, which is a sine qua non for the restoration of peace in Afghanistan. As the Secretary-General states in his report,

"... a negotiated settlement is the only possible way to achieve peace in Afghanistan. Peace, and the degree of national reconciliation that it should entail to allow the Afghan people to decide their own future, cannot be attained by military means". (A/40/709, para. 2)

In conclusion, on the occasion of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations, it is the ardent hope of my delegation that a permanent solution of this problem will be found and that this will be the last time we shall have to debate this question.

Mr. SAIGNAVONGS (Lao People's Democratic Republic) (interpretation from French): Once again the Assembly has before it the question of the "situation in Afghanistan". That is, more or less, the phrase or the idea that one manages to grasp from the statements of most delegations on the item under consideration. However, in this chorus there are some discordant notes. Indeed some - especially those who are accustomed to staging sensational shows or those who are prompted by anti-revolutionary feelings - believe that the Assembly should continue examining this question, because they are thus provided with an opportunity to single

(Mr. Saignavongs, Lao People's
Democratic Republic)

somebody out for public opprobrium. Others, impressed by the big-stick policy of imperialism, or moved by shallow thoughts of protecting themselves against an imaginary communist menace, have allowed themselves to be dragged along by this evil current. Still others, tired of the futility of this debate, which over the past years has made no contribution to the solution of the problem, would like us to bring it to an end because it constitutes an inadmissible interference in the internal affairs of a Member State. In any case, what no one can deny is that this exercise has on each occasion engendered polemics and partisan discussions.

If we wish truly and sincerely to contribute constructively to the solution of this problem, we must examine it objectively in all its relationships of causality and not, as is often the tendency in this kind of debate, simply consider its effects without seeking out the causes.

So far my delegation has had the impression that we have been debating the equivalent of the sex of angels. But from the debate of the last two days and draft resolution A/40/L.11, a number of ideas and themes have emerged that do call for some comment. My delegation would like to single out two of these that we believe are crucial.

In the first place there is a pretence of claiming for the Afghan people the right to decide for itself its form of government and to choose its own economic, political and social system without interference, subversion, coercion or constraint from the outside. Generally speaking, all the Members of the Organization agree on that principle. But the point of divergence is how "the Afghan people" are defined.

We all know that in the 1970s there was a long revolutionary process in Afghanistan through which the working people of that country rose up against social injustice, obscurantism, the tyranny and oppression of the corrupt old régime and

(Mr. Saignavongs, Lao People's
Democratic Republic)

the exploitation of the people by the owners of large estates, usurious merchants and other feudal sectors in order to rescue the country from its state of underdevelopment. That process was crowned with a brilliant victory in April 1978, which was followed by the establishment of a popular democratic régime that received the support of all social strata. Since then, under the guidance of the People's Democratic Party and the Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, the working people of the country have resolutely turned to their task of building up their country to improve the living conditions of the whole population.

(Mr. Saignavongs, Lao People's
Democratic Republic)

An agrarian reform and irrigation programme has been established to help the landless peasants, a free education and health care system has been established in the schools and hospitals in the State, complete equality between men and women in all areas of social activity has been guaranteed, and the campaign against illiteracy is being tirelessly pursued, not to mention the Government's efforts to develop the economic infrastructure and industry of the country.

Of course, when there is such a radical transformation of society there are inevitably some malcontents, or indeed opponents, especially among those who have lost their rights and privileges, as is the case here.

Thus, on the one hand we have the working people of Afghanistan, 16 million strong, who, under the guidance of the Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan is in the course of carrying out its tasks of nation-building and national defence to build a new society, and on the other hand we have a disparate array of people - particularly the feudal large landowners, the leaders of the old régime and reactionary religious leaders - who have found refuge and support in some neighbouring countries and who, yearning for their former privileges, are attempting through terror and destruction to restore the old order. In short, on the one hand we have an overwhelming majority working for the common good and the general interest and on the other, a small minority fighting to restore their privileges and selfish interests.

So the question that arises is who, in view of that reality, is best qualified to represent the Afghan people. If that question is answered correctly, the right of self-determination of the Afghan people and the preservation of the sovereignty, territorial integrity, political independence and non-aligned character of Afghanistan, about which so much concern is felt - or is claimed to be felt - will also find an appropriate and consistent response.

(Mr. Saignavongs, Lao People's
Democratic Republic)

The Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, the embodiment of the revolutionary Afghan people, is a full Member of the United Nations, with all the rights and obligations, without exception, conferred upon it by the Charter, including the right to defend itself with the assistance of its friends. Therefore, its sovereignty and political independence are not in question. Similarly, the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan is a full member of the Non-Aligned Movement of Countries, within which it plays a very active role in maintaining the fundamental principles and purposes of that Movement. Its character as a non-aligned country thus remains intact.

Consequently, the insinuations in draft resolution A/40/L.11 are tendentious, and even slanderous with regard to that country.

There is also an appeal for a political settlement of the situation in Afghanistan. To be more exact, it should have referred to the situation around Afghanistan.

Of all the ideas put forward by various delegations, this is the most interesting. This is indeed the Gordian knot of this problem. In principle, everyone is in favour of a political settlement; only the degree of sincerity of this profession of faith varies from one delegation to another. Some are truly moved by a sincere desire to achieve this, while others are only saying it to impress international public opinion. When it comes to sitting round the negotiating table, they are missing. They have already adopted the same attitude as regards the settlement of the situation in Central America, southern Africa, the Middle East and other regions of the world. In any event, the key question that arises here, we believe, is on what basis to negotiate and in what conditions.

(Mr. Saignavongs, Lao People's
Democratic Republic)

The sponsors of draft resolution A/40/L.11 have put forward a number of proposals most of which, because of their lack of realism and superficial and unilateral perception of the situation around Afghanistan, are very negative.

For its part, the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan has announced a number of measures concerning the repatriation of refugees and put forward a number of proposals for normalizing its relations with its neighbours.

With regard to the return of refugees, the Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan has declared that under the general amnesty announced by it on 1 January 1980 those Afghans who for one reason or another are temporarily in neighbouring countries may return to their country, that their freedom and immunity will be fully guaranteed, that they will be able freely to choose their place of residence and employment, and that the Government will supply them with all the necessary facilities to that end. It is therefore clear that the return of Afghan refugees to their homes should not, in principle, raise any difficulty, provided that they return in peace. The Afghan Government has even addressed an appeal to the authorities of Pakistan and other neighbouring countries to facilitate the voluntary return of those persons. Consequently, the best that can be done to assist those people is for the authorities in question to respond sincerely and positively to the appeal of the Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan.

As regards the political settlement of the situation in May 1980 and August 1981, the Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan proposed to the Governments of the Islamic Republic of Iran and of Pakistan negotiations on the normalization and development of their mutual relations.

It is, of course, on the borders between Afghanistan and some of its neighbours, in particular Pakistan, that tension reigns because of the hostile

(Mr. Saignavongs, Lao People's
Democratic Republic)

activities of Afghan counter-revolutionaries who have found refuge in those countries. Pakistan is concerned about its security, and that is understandable. We also understand Afghanistan's fear for its security. The proposals of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan are constructive and realistic. They take into account the legitimate interests of each party. The important thing for the moment is to dispel the mistrust that each side feels with regard to the other, and the best way to do this is by direct dialogue between the parties. Only direct, frank and sincere dialogue can enable the parties concerned to arrive at a better mutual understanding and, thereafter, to reach together a mutually acceptable settlement of the situation.

Undoubtedly, at the moment it is still difficult for some of the parties to agree to direct meetings. That is why my delegation appreciates the efforts of the Personal Representative of the Secretary-General as an intermediary in the separate contacts between the Foreign Ministers of Pakistan and Afghanistan. Those efforts have been extremely useful and should be tirelessly pursued. In fulfilling his difficult task the Secretary-General will need the co-operation and goodwill of the two parties, and in this respect my delegation welcomes the positive attitude and goodwill shown by the Government of Afghanistan.

(Mr. Saignavongs, Lao People's
Democratic Republic)

We venture to believe that the Secretary-General's mediation is not an end in itself, but simply a means to achieve the end, which must inevitably be direct negotiations. We know that the peoples of the region ardently desire peace. Therefore, those entrusted with governing them should not disappoint their yearning or arouse their anger.

My delegation has already expressed its views on certain aspects of draft resolution A/40/L.11. For the reasons given, it will vote against the draft resolution, as it has done in previous years.

Mr. McDOWELL (New Zealand): It is nearly six years since Soviet troops marched over the border into the territory of the Soviet Union's small neighbour, Afghanistan. Up to that moment Afghanistan had been sovereign and truly non-aligned. The Soviet invaders installed their preferred Government. It is a classic case of a resort to force by a large country against a small neighbour.

In the succeeding six years the Soviet Union has given no timetable for withdrawal. Indeed, its occupying forces are more entrenched than ever before. As the Afghan people continues to resist the occupation and fight for its sovereign rights, its suffering multiplies. Millions have had to seek refuge in neighbouring countries. Millions more have been made homeless or have suffered injury or death. New Zealand continues to be shocked by the indifference of the Soviet Union to the human suffering it is causing by its domination of a valiant and unwilling people.

Every year since that invasion in 1979 the General Assembly has called unequivocally for the foreign occupation to end. It has not. As time goes on, it seems to us that there is a danger of this annual debate acquiring something of a ritualistic character. It should not, and it must not. For the war-weary people

(Mr. McDowell, New Zealand)

of Afghanistan, self-determination and freedom from outside interference are more urgent now than ever. For its sake we cannot allow the situation in which it finds itself to be accepted as the status quo. We must show the people of Afghanistan that we have not forgotten. We must demonstrate to the Soviet occupiers that, six years after they imposed their will on that hapless nation, we have no intention of forgetting the plight of the Afghan people.

For it is clear after these six long years that the Afghan people will not be subjugated. They will not be told what Government is best for them. They want to shape their future themselves, free from foreign interference. And that cannot happen without the withdrawal of Soviet troops. The New Zealand Government has taken every opportunity to reiterate to the Government of the Soviet Union the importance we attach to the withdrawal of Soviet troops as a precondition to an end to the conflict in Afghanistan. Again today we urge the Soviet Union to withdraw its troops without delay.

The fierce resistance which the small country has put up against its powerful occupier demonstrates that there can be no military solution to the problem of Afghanistan. The only route to peace is through negotiation.

Therefore, the New Zealand Government read with considerable interest the Secretary-General's report on the situation in Afghanistan. We warmly commend his efforts to promote a negotiated settlement. We share his frustration that an impasse on the procedure for the negotiations has stalled the diplomatic process - particularly at a time when, as he notes, both sides have re-emphasized their conviction that a political settlement is possible. We urge both sides to demonstrate the political will to overcome the hurdles in the way of a negotiated settlement - and soon.

(Mr. McDowell, New Zealand)

The armed occupation is leading only to increased hardship and suffering for all, including the refugees and their host countries. The influx of refugees into Pakistan and Iran is compounding the economic problems faced by those countries. More widely, the armed occupation diminishes the security of the region and the world as a whole. It damages international confidence. It is of special concern to the small and the vulnerable, to countries which depend for their survival on the willingness of the United Nations membership to adhere to the spirit and to the letter of the Charter - in short, to abide by the rules.

The rules could not be simpler or clearer. They are spelled out in Article 2.4 of the Charter. This calls on all Members, and I emphasise "all", to:

"refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State".

It was to those principles that the Prime Minister of New Zealand referred from this rostrum two weeks ago, when he asserted the rights of small countries to the maximum possible protection, under the Charter, against the force of pressure by larger, more powerful States. The Rt. Hon. David Lange said:

"the central problem is to stop the use of force by States, and especially by big Powers against small ones ... here it is the General Assembly that plays the key part." (A/40/PV.48, p. 52)

The Assembly must bring what pressure it can to bear. The draft resolution before us outlines the essential ingredients for a negotiated settlement of the Afghanistan tragedy, emphasizing: first, the obligations on all States to refrain from the use of force against the sovereignty of any State; secondly, the right of peoples to determine their own Government, free from outside intervention; thirdly, the need for foreign troops to withdraw from Afghanistan; and, fourthly, the urgent need for a peaceful settlement.

(Mr. McDowell, New Zealand)

Adoption of the draft resolution by an overwhelming majority would again demonstrate the strength of the international community's feelings on this issue. We will not collectively tolerate the continued Soviet armed occupation of Afghanistan, against the will of the people of that country. It must be permitted to run its own affairs. Each year the number of countries which support this draft resolution increases. That is a message the Soviet Union must not ignore. New Zealand strongly supports the resolution. We urge all Members to do likewise.

Mr. MAXEY (United Kingdom): In my statement today I shall concentrate on two facets only of the question, one humanitarian and one political. My delegation's views on the broader aspects of the Soviet Union's war against the people of Afghanistan have been expressed many times, and were eloquently represented by the Permanent Representative of Luxembourg in his statement yesterday. But I should like to underscore the tribute paid in that statement to Pakistan and to other countries and international agencies for the way in which they have continued to cope with the huge number of refugees from Afghanistan.

I turn first to humanitarian matters. On 20 May this year the surrogate régime of Mr. Babrak Karmal issued a statement about the 1985 session of the Economic and Social Council. It claimed that:

"No violation of human rights takes place in Afghanistan that would warrant any form of investigation and reporting".

Now, given that - as the statement also asserted -

"revolutionary measures have ensured for people the rights to life, health, education, work, legal protection, participation in civic affairs etc", one might wonder why the Karmal régime was not keen for that splendid state of affairs to be reported. Indeed, one might go further and wonder why in the same

(Mr. Maxey, United Kingdom)

statement the régime presumed to decree that decisions taken by the United Nations Commission on Human Rights and its Economic and Social Council were illegal. And one would certainly wonder why Afghanistan refused to admit a highly qualified and eminent expert appointed by the United Nations.

(Mr. Maxey, United Kingdom)

The interim report to the General Assembly by the Special Rapporteur of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights, Mr. Felix Ermacora, is soon to be issued and considered in detail by the Third Committee. However, if the Assembly is to justice to the people of Afghanistan, we must also pay attention in this plenary debate to the shocking picture which emerges from the judicious account given by Mr. Ermacora in his report to the Human Rights Commission earlier this year, as it has from a host of other reports.

In his report of 19 February the Special Rapporteur reviews the evolution of civil and political rights in Afghanistan prior to 1979. He does not pretend that human rights were perfectly observed before the Soviet invasion or that life in Afghanistan was other than hard. But the abuses and the extreme hardship which have been inflicted on the Afghan population since the Soviet invasion, which continue to this day, are of a different order. In scale and in nature, they can only be described as horrifying. Let me summarize just a few points from that report.

Paragraphs 78 to 83 of the report describe the selective suppression of opposition elements, the disruption of the administration of justice and the major role of the secret police in the "negative human rights situation". The Special Rapporteur received information that the Khad - the secret police - organized and "was responsible for the systematic arrest and interrogation, including torture, of persons suspected of opposing the régime." (E/CN.4/1985/21, para. 83)

Paragraph 85 of the report describes how former members of the Government were imprisoned and some executed, how unarmed schoolgirls were shot during student demonstrations in 1980 and how there are reported to be over 50,000 political prisoners.

Paragraph 86 lists eight types of torture of which evidence was given. The details are not of a nature which I can repeat from this rostrum. Such obscene,

(Mr. Maxey, United Kingdom)

degrading, cruel, inhumane behaviour has no place in our world. The report gives extensive details of the bombardment and massacre of civilians. Does this cause shame to the régime? Let me quote from an interview given by General Nabi Azimi, First Deputy Minister of National Defence, broadcast on 16 February this year. Azimi claimed with pride to have "bombed to a pulp," to have "erased from the face of the earth" counter-revolutionaries in the Panshir Valley, and to have launched operations on a similar scale in the southern and south-eastern districts of the country.

Paragraph 118 of the report gives evidence of the use of poisonous gases.

Section D of the report describes the virtual paralysis of agriculture, the devastation of villages and fields, the destruction of the irrigation system in Kandahar Province, the threat of famine and the catastrophic malnutrition of children.

One of the most hideous practices described in the report is the technique of dropping booby-trap toys, which are shaped inoffensively like pens or small animals and which explode on the slightest contact. The Special Rapporteur reviewed evidence of children who had lost hands or legs from handling such toys or from stepping on mines.,

I have quoted selectively, but I have not quoted the worst. Mr. Ermacora's report to the Commission deserves to be read in full by every member of this Organization. His interim report to the Assembly will no doubt merit equally close attention. Those responsible for the situation within Afghanistan should feel the deepest shame. The Soviet Union had no justification in going to war with the people of that country. Still less can there be any justification for the way in which the Geneva Conventions and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights are being systematically and grossly violated. We must call for such abuses to end at

(Mr. Maxey, United Kingdom)

once. They also underline the desperate need for a settlement through the withdrawal of Soviet forces, to which I now turn.

After five rounds at Geneva the indirect negotiations conducted with outstanding skill by the Secretary-General and his Personal Representative, and with the full support of my Government and our partners, have reached an impasse. The reason for this is clear from the Secretary-General's report of 7 October. The negotiators have virtually completed the formulation of three of the draft instruments, those on the principles of mutual relations, the arrangements for the voluntary return of the refugees and the declaration on international guarantees. What is lacking, as the report says, is:

"an instrument that would set out the interrelationships between the aforementioned instruments and the solution of the question of the withdrawal of foreign troops in accordance with an agreement to be concluded between Afghanistan and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics." (A/40/709, para. 9)

Why is this lacking? The Government of the Soviet Union would have us believe that it will not agree to the withdrawal of its troops because the Government of Pakistan will not engage in direct talks with the Soviet Union's proxy representative in Kabul. Let me quote, for example, from an interview given by Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Kapitsa on 10 October. He said:

"Only after Afghanistan and Pakistan discuss the issue directly will the Afghan side and ourselves sit down to decide the question of withdrawal. This is no problem. If today there is an agreement, we can start withdrawing in weeks.... But we will not give a time frame for withdrawal of our forces from Afghanistan. That is a bilateral matter between us and Afghanistan."

Does it not strain our credibility a little far to suggest that the Soviet Union will continue keeping 120,000 troops in Afghanistan simply because Pakistani representatives will not sit across a table from Mr. Karmal or Mr. Dost? If the

(Mr. Maxey, United Kingdom)

Soviet Union were really willing to withdraw its army, rectify the atrocious mistake of 1979, avoid further unpopular casualties among its own people and allow the people of Afghanistan to return home, would it really permit that detail to stand in the way?

Through the existing format of negotiations agreement has been reached on three instruments. Why not on the fourth? What could be achieved directly that cannot be achieved through trusted and skilled intermediaries? It is in any case the contention of the Soviet Union, as I have already said, that the missing piece of the jigsaw - that is to say the withdrawal of Soviet forces - is not for discussion with Pakistan, but is "a bilateral matter between us and Afghanistan". Why, then, this ploy about direct talks? Is this not a transparent device to buy time while trying to secure recognition for a spurious régime?

The almost unlimited patience and flexibility shown by the Government of Pakistan has allowed three quarters of an agreement to be concluded. For its part, the Soviet Union has given no sign, shown no evidence, of willingness to supply the missing quarter. The key element, all that is required for a settlement, is a Soviet commitment to withdraw on a firm and credible timetable. Pending such a decision, any attempt to sidetrack the negotiations into procedural questions or the elaboration of modalities must be seen for what it is - an evasion of the real issue.

As the Secretary-General says, we are talking about a question of political will. The United Kingdom joins the overwhelming majority of members of this Assembly in urging the Soviet Union to allow the negotiations to proceed to a successful conclusion by exercising that will and by agreeing to withdraw its army of illegal occupation and to restore the non-aligned and independent status of Afghanistan.

Mr. LAUTENSCHLAGER (Federal Republic of Germany): In his statement, the representative of Luxembourg has already set forth the stance of the 10 States members of the European Community on the situation in Afghanistan and its repercussions on world peace and international security. The Federal Republic of Germany fully endorses this statement.

Six years have now passed since the Soviet armed intervention in Afghanistan began. Unflaggingly the Afghan people still resist occupation by foreign troops. Not only is its resistance unbroken, but the growing duration and intensity of the Soviet occupation régime further increases its resistance. The Afghan people carries on its fight against invasion and suppression although the consequences of armed struggle have become nearly unbearable for them. Hundreds of thousands have suffered loss of life or bodily harm. Millions have been forced to leave their home country.

Human rights are being violated in Afghanistan in many different ways, as has been stated in a special report of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights.

In view of this human suffering, the Federal Government calls once more on the Soviet Union to withdraw its troops, to restore the independence of Afghanistan and to enable the refugees to return honourably to their home country.

The Federal Government condemns these violations of sovereignty and the right to self-determination and of the ban on the use of force in Afghanistan. These principles, which are basic tenets of the United Nations Charter and which constitute a prerequisite for the peaceful co-operation of peoples, are indivisible. Their violation and disregard in Afghanistan are therefore unacceptable. Furthermore, the appeal of the Federal Republic for a withdrawal of the Soviet troops is also based on humanitarian grounds.

The overwhelming majority of the States Members of the United Nations ask themselves how the policy of the use of force in Afghanistan pursued by the Soviet Union is compatible with its policy of verbal renunciation of the use of force in

(Mr. Lautenschlager, Federal
Republic of Germany)

the United Nations and in other forums. We are unable to consider all Soviet initiatives for the conclusion of agreements on the renunciation of the use of force - be they global or regional - as serious political offers as long as the Soviet Union continues to pursue its policy of the use of force against a sovereign State Member of the United Nations.

A solution to the conflict can and must be brought about only by political means.

The Federal Republic therefore supports the diplomatic process initiated by the Secretary-General. It regrets the lack of progress in negotiations, also stated by the Secretary-General in his report of 7 October 1985. Yet the Federal Republic hopes unswervingly that progress will be achieved in the Geneva talks, in particular as regards a time schedule for the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan.

The Federal Republic of Germany does not interfere in the domestic affairs of Afghanistan. The Federal Republic firmly rejects allegations to that effect which have been repeatedly made in recent months.

The Federal Republic of Germany feels deep sympathy with the Afghan people. We will therefore continue to support Pakistan, which has to bear the brunt of the war in Afghanistan, in caring for the nearly 3 million Afghan refugees now living in its territory. In this context the Federal Republic would like to thank the people and the Government of Pakistan once again for their humanitarian relief efforts for the benefit of these refugees.

The Federal Republic calls on all States Members of the United Nations to adopt draft resolution A/40/L.11, sponsored by Pakistan and other non-aligned States and thus express their support for the just cause of the Afghan people.*

* Mr. Moseley (Barbados), Vice-President, took the Chair.

Haji OMAR (Brunei Darussalam): For the sixth consecutive year, the General Assembly is today again considering the situation in Afghanistan. It was in December 1979 that a super-Power invaded a small, non-aligned Muslim neighbour, Afghanistan. The occupation continues until today despite the overwhelming support of the majority of the States Members of the United Nations in the General Assembly of a call for the withdrawal of foreign forces and the restoration of the independence of Afghanistan.

The aggression against Afghanistan and its occupation by foreign troops has been one of the most blatant and reprehensible cases of violation of the fundamental principles of international relations and international law. These principles, which are the basic tenets of this Organization, state that nations, in their international relations, should refrain from the use or threat of force against the sovereignty, territorial integrity or political independence of any State; that they should respect the principle of non-interference and non-intervention in the internal affairs of other States; and also that they should uphold the obligation of States to respect the sovereignty of others and the right of peoples freely to determine their own destiny.

Brunei Darussalam, a small State proud of its independence and sovereignty, looks upon the United Nations as our pillar of hope in the maintenance of international peace and security. It is the only international organ that we hold as the guarantor of our independence and sovereignty. Being small, we cannot fight aggression with force. Our shield and our weapon have always been the principles of mutual respect of each other's right to live in peace within secure borders. We believe that the great Powers of this earth have a special responsibility to uphold the principles of the United Nations Charter and to act with restraint. The smaller States, like us, look to the United Nations to protect and reinforce our sovereignty and territorial integrity.

(Haji Omar, Brunei Darussalam)

It is a contentious issue that any foreign troops entered Afghanistan at the invitation of the Government of Afghanistan. The people of Afghanistan are known to be proud of their independence and have never needed foreign troops to protect their independence. The will and the determination of the Mujahideen freedom fighters to stand up against overwhelming odds in their struggle against the might of the forces of a super-Power in order to free their country from foreign domination is telling evidence that no foreign occupation is welcomed. It is also a clear manifestation of their rejection of the puppet régime imposed on them. It is also evident that the function of the continued military occupation of Afghanistan is to prop up a puppet régime which has been rejected by the heroic Afghan people.

(Haji Omar, Brunei Darussalam)

My delegation believes that a solution to the Afghanistan problem cannot be attained by military means. This has now been shown quite clearly; the occupying forces must have realized it by now. They are in the wrong. The wrong cannot and should not be allowed to win out. A political solution should be seriously considered, as continuing reliance on a military approach to a solution will only create more human suffering and a graver regional and international situation. A political settlement of the situation in Afghanistan should be based on the principle of self-determination and respect for the territorial integrity of Afghanistan. Every nation must recognize the unquestionable right of other nations and their peoples to determine their own political, economic and social future without any outside interference. Only universal acceptance and application of the fundamental principle of non-interference can bring closer a solution to the situation in Afghanistan. It is imperative that Afghanistan's independence and its non-aligned status be restored and guaranteed.

One tragic consequence of the invasion of Afghanistan has been the creation of a massive flow of refugees. Millions of Afghans have become victims of the turmoil. They have fled their homes to seek peace, shelter and food in neighbouring countries, especially Pakistan and Iran. This imposes a great burden on those countries. This deplorable situation should be speedily resolved so that the Afghan refugees can return to their homes with a guarantee that they will be able to live in peace and security.

An early political solution safeguarding the legitimate rights and interests of the Afghan people remains the first objective that must be achieved through negotiations. My delegation would like to join other nations in voicing our support to the Secretary-General and his Personal Representative, Mr. Diego Cordovez, for their unceasing efforts in the search for a comprehensive settlement in line with the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly.

(Haji Omar, Brunei Darussalam)

My country is among the sponsors of draft resolution A/40/L.11, which has the overwhelming support of Member States. We urge those nations which have not lent their support to similar resolutions in the past to vote in favour of the draft resolution this year.

Mr. OUDOVENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): For many years the forces of imperialism and reaction, which created a tense military and political situation in and around Afghanistan, have been trying to bolster their armed interference in the affairs of that country with political and diplomatic pressure. That is the purpose of the discussion they have year after year imposed upon the United Nations, on the question of the so-called situation in Afghanistan. These attempts have nothing to do with the maintenance of international peace and security and are intended to worsen the situation around Afghanistan and to distract the attention of the United Nations from genuinely urgent international problems. As the representative of Afghanistan has already stated, the Government of that country considers discussion of the item on "The situation in Afghanistan" to be inadmissible interference in its internal affairs and demands that it be halted forthwith. The Ukrainian SSR fully supports that just demand.

The statements made this session by the Foreign Minister of Afghanistan, Mr. Dost, and the Permanent Representative of Afghanistan to the United Nations, Mr. Zarif, showed convincingly that the April Revolution opened the doors on a new stage in the life of the Afghan people, creating conditions favourable for the social and economic development of the country and increasing the level of the culture and prosperity of its people. The masses of the working people, supporting the policies of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan and of the Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, have become actively involved in building a new life. Great success has been achieved thus far on that path.

(Mr. Oudovenko, Ukrainian SSR)

In Afghanistan the achievement last year of a pre-revolutionary level of industrial production is considered important not only in the economic, but also in the political sphere. Democratic land and water reforms continue in the country, with increasing involvement of the farmers themselves. Eleven million peasants have been relieved of their debts to feudal lords and usurers. The State sector's share in the national economy has been increasing, and various forms of collective mutual economic assistance and co-operation are being developed.

As a result of measures being taken in Afghanistan, the worker's standard of living is on the increase. Suffice it to say that since the revolution the pay of workers has increased by one third. There is a campaign to eliminate illiteracy and the health care and education systems are being expanded.

The bases of revolutionary power are being strengthened, as shown by: the Loya Jirgah, the highest council of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, held in April with the participation of more than 2,000 representatives elected by the Afghan people; the High Jirgah of border tribes held in September; and the first democratic elections to local Jirgahs.

But the achievements of the Republic would be even greater if the forces of imperialism and internal and external reaction had not imposed an undeclared war upon Afghanistan. The present discussion has shown that those forces hypocritically don the mantle of the defender and supporter of the rights and freedoms of the Afghan people. Yet it is their armed intervention, their having sent mercenaries to sow terror and murder that poses the true threat to the Afghan revolution and to the territorial integrity and sovereignty of Afghanistan. That is what exacerbates the situation in that country and what has made Afghanistan take measures of legitimate self-defence.

(Mr. Oudovenko, Ukrainian SSR)

As we have heard in the course of this discussion, the main role among those waging an undeclared war against Afghanistan is played by the United States of America, which since the late 1970s has been carrying out its plans for strategic expansion in South-West Asia, the Persian Gulf and the Indian Ocean. To that end, Washington has spared no means, allocating millions of dollars to form and train counter-revolutionary gangs and to equip them with the most sophisticated modern weapons. With that money a whole network of camps and bases has been established in Pakistan, which has been turned into the main centre for carrying out the undeclared war against Afghanistan. Pakistan has become a genuine participant in that war.

Armed intervention in the internal affairs of Afghanistan is supplemented with ideological subversion, aimed at maintaining a psychological attack on Afghan and international public opinion. This year, the United States Congress decided to establish a subversive radio station, "Radio Free Afghanistan", and further appropriations are being granted to spread more lies and slanders. In fiscal year 1986, for example, more than \$500,000 has been allocated for subversive propaganda and ideological subversion. Washington has allocated more than \$1.5 million for aggression by imperialism and world reaction against the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan.

(Mr. Oudovenko, Ukrainian SSR)

If this year the United States has allocated in its budget more than \$300 million for that purpose, there are plans to raise it to \$600 million next year. We should add to that the tens of hundreds of millions of dollars being allocated in the capitals of many other countries to keep going the undeclared war against Afghanistan. This has caused untold suffering and deprivation for the Afghan people and significantly damaged the economy. However, as the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan and Chairman of the Revolutionary Council of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, Babrak Karmal, has noted:

"The efforts of the forces of imperialism and reaction to disrupt our economy and prevent progress will fail. Our enemies will achieve only one thing - they will completely expose their anti-people core."

In answer to the undeclared war against the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, the Afghan leader has said:

"In these circumstances we are, of course, taking all the necessary measures to defend the independence and territorial integrity of our fatherland. But let no one see in this a threat to neighbouring States. We do not want military superiority over anyone in the region. All we want is to defend our right to peace, progress and freedom. Our goal is peace and good-neighbourliness in our region."

We can see the essence of Afghanistan's peace-loving foreign policy in that statement.

The fact that there is no lack of constructive approach and goodwill from the Afghan side is shown by the foreign policy programme which is aimed at normalizing relations with the neighbouring States of Pakistan and Iran by political and diplomatic means. The main goal of such a settlement, as has been emphasized in

(Mr. Oudovenko, Ukrainian SSR)

statements by the Afghan Government, must be ensured by the complete cessation and guaranteed non-resumption of armed and other forms of interference from outside in the internal affairs of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan.

The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, just like all those who want to eliminate the tensions around Afghanistan, fully supports the constructive and realistic programme for a settlement put forward by the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan.

As can be seen from the Secretary-General's report in document A/40/709, during the current year, through the intermediary of his Personal Representative, Mr. Diego Cordovez, negotiations have continued between Afghanistan and Pakistan and some progress has been achieved.

It should be recalled that the Sofia Conference of the Political Consultative Committee of the States members of the Warsaw Treaty organization expressed support for those efforts aimed at a political settlement.

It is difficult not to agree with Afghanistan's position that such a settlement can best be achieved on the basis of direct negotiations with Pakistan. We hope that Afghanistan's negotiating partners will finally show the political will and take the necessary steps towards a political settlement.

Progressive socio-economic changes in the interest of the Afghan people are dashing their enemies' hopes to turn back the course of history. This process is irreversible. The Afghan people have reliable friends. In fulfilment of their international duty, major assistance for rebuilding and expanding the Afghan economy has been provided by the Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist community. Thanks to that assistance, 95 economic projects have been completed in

(Mr. Oudovenko, Ukrainian SSR)

the country. Just as the people of the other brother Republics, the Ukrainian people are proud of their contribution to the comprehensive international assistance to Afghanistan.

We have heard from this rostrum fabrications regarding the presence in Afghanistan of a limited contingent of Soviet forces. In this connection, I should like to state that in our country people are well aware of the serious trial that the Afghan people are undergoing, what the revolution has confronted from the very beginning, namely, the most vicious opposition by international imperialism and its allies which have started a broad and co-ordinated an armed intervention in the internal affairs of Afghanistan.

As I have already said, the forces of international imperialism, led by the United States, have unleashed a genuine undeclared war against the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan. That has led to real danger for the Afghan people's progressive achievements and Afghanistan's territorial integrity and sovereignty. In those conditions, the Soviet Union had to respond to the numerous requests of the Afghan Government and extend the hand of assistance to the Afghan people, which is linked to the Soviet people by long ties of friendship. Naturally, as long as foreign aggression exists against the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan that country will not remain alone in its struggle.

Any attempts to speak to People's Afghanistan in a language of force are pointless. Just as pointless is the policy of railroading through the United Nations resolutions on the so-called situation in Afghanistan. Such a policy is divorced from reality, shortsighted, doomed to failure, and constitutes blatant interference in Afghanistan's internal affairs. For that reason the delegation of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, as in the past, will vote against the draft resolution.

Mr. ERDENECHULUUN (Mongolia) (interpretation from Russian): The United Nations General Assembly is compelled once again to consider the so-called situation in Afghanistan. As occurred a few days ago in connection with the discussion of the so-called question of Kampuchea, once again attempts are being made to draw the United Nations into the aggressive plans of imperialism and its accomplices to turn it into an instrument for interfering in the internal affairs of a sovereign State. As before, discussion of this question in the General Assembly is nothing more than an attempt to poison the international atmosphere and distract our attention from the genuinely urgent problems of international life. For that reason, once again the Mongolian delegation expresses its strong disapproval of the discussion of this question.

The anti-Afghan campaign of lies and slander orchestrated here in the United Nations and outside it is supposed to serve as a smokescreen for waging the undeclared war against Afghanistan. Every year enormous funds are allocated for that war to arm and train counter-revolutionary units in camps deployed on Pakistan's territory and to purchase various kinds of armaments, including rockets, recoilless rifles and machine-guns.

Early this year the United States alone granted the Afghan Revolutionary Council \$280 million. Recently the United States Senate allocated for this undeclared war an additional \$250 million. As The Washington Post noted on 13 January 1985, secret Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) assistance to the rebels in Afghanistan has become the largest United States operation since the Viet Nam war.

(Mr. Erdenechuluun, Mongolia)

Apart from the enormous human casualties and suffering that the Afghan people have had to endure as a result of the war unleashed on Afghanistan by imperialist and reactionary circles, the damage done to the economy alone amounts to the astronomical figure of 35 billion afghanis. More than 2,000 schools, 130 hospitals, 500 mosques, 900 co-operatives and 14,000 kilometres of telegraph lines have been destroyed. That was referred to at a meeting of the General Assembly yesterday by the representative of Afghanistan, Ambassador Zarif.

For that reason, it is not the situation in Afghanistan but the continued military intervention from outside that is the main cause of the present tensions in South-West Asia. Imperialism cannot reconcile itself to the new realities, to the fact that the people of Afghanistan, having made their own historic choice, have taken the path of social and economic progress.

It must be noted that the tense situation in Afghanistan is being exploited by imperialist forces for a broader goal: to justify the building up of their military presence in the strategically vital areas of the Persian Gulf, the Middle East and the Indian Ocean.

The Mongolian delegation considers that a comprehensive political settlement of the Afghan situation must provide first of all for the cessation of armed attacks and of support for counter-revolutionary bands. It must provide also for guarantees against future interference in the internal affairs of Afghanistan. In that context, the Mongolian People's Republic fully supports the constructive proposals of the Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, aimed at normalizing relations with neighbouring States and achieving a comprehensive settlement of the situation in Afghanistan. I have in mind the well-known proposals of 14 May 1980 and 24 August 1981.

(Mr. Erdenechuluun, Mongolia)

We have followed with great attention and hope the efforts by the Secretary-General and his Personal Representative to promote the search for a political settlement. From the report submitted by the Secretary-General to this session of the General Assembly it is clear that during the negotiations the sides achieved agreement on many important elements of a political settlement. It is our delegation's hope that in the near future the procedural obstacles will be overcome and direct negotiations between the parties concerned will begin. We agree with the Secretary-General that, in connection with this procedural question as well as the substantive questions being discussed, what is important is political will. I would add that progress in this matter requires political will on the part of all countries concerned. The Democratic Republic of Afghanistan has shown such political will and a flexible approach.

The Mongolian People's Republic, which has the friendliest relations with the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, welcomes the impressive achievements of the Afghan people in overcoming centuries of backwardness and establishing the basis for a new society free of exploitation. Our support for the struggle of the freedom-loving Afghan people against the schemes of imperialism and reaction determines our attitude towards the draft resolution submitted under agenda item 28 and contained in document A/40/L.11. On that basis, the Mongolian delegation will vote against the draft resolution because it constitutes an attempt to interfere in the internal affairs of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan and would serve only as an obstacle to the negotiations being conducted, with the participation of the Representative of the Secretary-General, to achieve a just settlement of the situation in South-West Asia.

Mr. WASIUDDIN (Bangladesh): The General Assembly, for the sixth successive session, is considering the agenda item entitled "The situation in Afghanistan and its implications for international peace and security". At the preceding sessions, the international community expressed grave concern at the prevailing situation in Afghanistan and adopted resolutions, by overwhelming majorities, for a comprehensive political solution of the problem. We take part in the current debate, as we have done in the past, to add our voice to the expression of concern by the international community at the prevailing situation in Afghanistan and also to reiterate our firm and principled stand on this issue. We also believe that the present session should be an occasion to take stock of the efforts of the Secretary-General for a political solution to the problem. We have before us the latest report of the Secretary-General, contained in document A/40/709, which includes the outcome of his current efforts. We record our deep appreciation to him for those tireless efforts. We also commend his Personal Representative, Under-Secretary-General Diego Cordovez, for the valuable role he has played in facilitating a process of dialogue by the parties directly concerned.

On the question of Afghanistan, Bangladesh's position has all along been a firm and principled one. It is based on our deep and abiding commitment to the principles and purposes of the United Nations Charter and to the principles of sovereign equality of States, territorial integrity, non-use of force, non-interference and non-intervention in the internal affairs of other States, the right of every nation freely to choose its own political, social and economic system, and peaceful settlement of disputes. Those cardinal principles also constitute the quintessence of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries. It is in that context that we have reiterated our firm conviction that withdrawal of all foreign forces from Afghanistan is an essential prerequisite for a just and lasting

(Mr. Wasiuddin, Bangladesh)

settlement of the Afghan problem. We are equally convinced that the inalienable right of the people of Afghanistan to determine their own destiny should be restored to them. It is a matter of grave concern for all of us that, despite adoption of comprehensive resolutions by preceding sessions of the General Assembly, the Afghan people are still denied that basic right, owing to the continued presence of foreign forces in their country.

(Mr. Wasiuddin, Bangladesh)

The humanitarian aspect of the Afghan problem also deserves our particular attention. During the past six years, almost one-third of the Afghan population has been driven out of their country to seek refuge in neighbouring Pakistan and Iran. In Pakistan alone there are more than 3 million Afghan refugees while their number in Iran is reportedly close to 2 million. A refugee problem on this scale is indeed a source of increasing concern for the international community. In this connection, we would like to commend the efforts made by the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees to meet this mammoth challenge. It is obvious that necessary conditions would have to be created for the Afghan refugees to return voluntarily to their homes in safety and honour. The prevailing situation in Afghanistan is hardly the condition that could prompt these refugees to return to their homeland voluntarily. As long as foreign troops remain in Afghanistan, no amount of persuasion or assurances will convince them to return to their country. The return of the Afghan refugees is thus directly dependent on the withdrawal of all foreign troops from Afghanistan. Furthermore, the exodus of such a large number of Afghan refugees into neighbouring countries has further aggravated the security problem in the region. The serious escalation in the number of violations of Pakistan airspace and territory during the course of the year has once again demonstrated the need for immediate concrete action to achieve a comprehensive solution.

We are encouraged to note from the Secretary-General's latest report that there was a growing conviction among the parties directly concerned that "a negotiated settlement is the only possible way to achieve peace in Afghanistan" (A/40/709, para. 2). In paragraph 9 of his report, the Secretary-General has indicated that, during the current year, two rounds of proximity talks were held in

(Mr. Wasiuddin, Bangladesh)

Geneva and that the objective of these indirect negotiations was to work out a political settlement of the Afghanistan problem on the basis of four instruments, namely, a bilateral agreement on non-interference and non-intervention; a declaration (or declarations) on international guarantees; a bilateral agreement on the voluntary return of refugees; and finally, an instrument that would set out the interrelationships between these various elements and the withdrawal of foreign troops. We note with satisfaction from his report that substantive progress has been made in finalizing the first three instruments. It is regrettable that, due to the insistence of one of the parties on changing the existing format of proximity talks to direct talks, it has not so far been possible to make any progress on the crucial fourth instrument. We feel that the fourth instrument should be discussed and finalized on the same basis of proximity talks which led to the finalization of the first three instruments. Raising the issue of direct talks at this stage would undoubtedly stall the present process of negotiation. Here we share the important observations made by the Secretary-General in the last paragraph of his report where he underlined the need to exercise greater "political will" on the part of the parties concerned to keep up the momentum of the ongoing process of dialogue. We hope that at the next round of proximity talks, to be held next month, there will be a determined effort to break the current impasse.

In the light of the situation prevailing in Afghanistan, my delegation strongly feels that the momentum of the present diplomatic initiative should be stepped up for the early resolution of the Afghan problem in accordance with the principles of international law and the Charter of the United Nations. It is in this spirit that Bangladesh, as in the past, has co-sponsored the draft resolution contained in document A/40/L.11, which embodies all elements of a comprehensive

(Mr. Wasiuddin, Bangladesh)

solution of the Afghan problem. It is our earnest hope that the position of principle, as set out in the draft, will once again receive the strong and vigorous support of this Assembly. The current session is indeed historic as it marks the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations and we should take a firm and decisive course of action to bring about a just and comprehensive solution of the Afghan problem.

Mr. ZAIN AZRAAI (Malaysia): Many things have already been said in the course of this debate, but I should like to take a little time, first of all, to reflect on a statistic which, perhaps, more than any other, graphically tells the story, namely, that something like one in three Afghans is today a refugee. I am aware that there are claims that this figure is exaggerated, but surely a proportion of one in four is no consolation to anybody, including, I suggest, the Kabul authorities. Any régime which finds itself in this position - as the Kabul régime does - must surely conclude that something is very wrong indeed. But if this statistic does not carry sufficient conviction, let it reflect further on the following: first, that in addition to the external refugees, there are more than 1 million internal refugees or displaced persons inside Afghanistan itself; secondly, that the fighting in Afghanistan has gone on with increasing ferocity for six years - a period, I would remind the Assembly, which is longer than the entire Second World War; and thirdly, that, according to some estimates, nearly a million people have died as a result of this fighting.

These figures are surely staggering and compelling. Whatever one's predilection for finding an ideological explanation for the complexities of international life, it is surely impossible to ascribe the facts which I have just set out to the machinations of "counter-revolutionaries" or "imperialist agents", however devious or well-financed one believes them to be. These facts can be

(Mr. Zain Azraai, Malaysia)

explained only by acknowledging that the opposition to what is going on in Afghanistan today - the opposition to the Soviet military invasion and occupation of their country and the propping-up of an unpopular régime - is essentially indigenous. No other explanation will fit the facts. Such opposition is widespread and pervades the length and breadth of the country, including the interior far from the border with neighbouring States, right up to the gates of Kabul.

(Mr. Zain Azraai, Malaysia)

It has shown itself to be brave and resolute and has fought with ever-increasing effectiveness against overwhelming odds: to be precise, against some 150,000 Soviet troops, with enormous fire-power at their command, who have had to resort to military campaigns involving widespread and frequent air strikes and mass bombings against towns and villages, inflicting heavy casualties on the civilian population, the destruction of farmlands, crops and livestock, the mining of village tracks, and so on. Also, there continue to be increasing defections of Afghan soldiers from the ranks of the Kabul régime, so that the Afghan army constitutes today but one third of its original number.

None of this would have been possible if the opposition to the present régime in Afghanistan were indeed the work of "elements stripped of their privileges", or "elements fomented from outside", as has sometimes been alleged in this debate. The continuing resilience and tenacity of the freedom fighters of Afghanistan have been possible only because they spring from the depths and very roots of the historical nationalism and fierce pride of the Afghans, who have never sought external assistance in the defence of the freedom and sovereignty of their country and their people. This nationalism and this pride cannot be conquered by force of arms. They cannot be explained away by convenient ideological theories. The authorities in Kabul must know this well and they must come to terms with it - sooner, it is to be hoped, rather than later - if more Afghan blood and property are not to be needlessly sacrificed.

What I have said is the starting point for the position that Malaysia takes on the question before us. What is going on in Afghanistan is genuine national resistance against foreign aggression and foreign occupation, and in our view the international community must speak and act accordingly. To state this is not to embark upon an exercise in polemics or to be anti-Soviet - which is, I may say,

(Mr. Zain Azraai, Malaysia)

alien to Malaysian foreign policy - but we believe that the present debate is necessary and important, for reasons which I shall now set out.

First, what is happening in Afghanistan involves fundamental principles relating to national independence, territorial integrity and self-determination on which the United Nations must pronounce itself. Principles cannot be selectively applied or arbitrarily interpreted and to our mind the issues - namely, Soviet aggression in and occupation of Afghanistan and the denial to its people of the right to its own Government and way of life - are clear enough and must be censured. The violation of those principles threatens the very foundation of the independent inter-State system on which the safety and security of all of us, and particularly of small States, rest. To acquiesce in such violation, to evade our responsibility to pronounce upon it, on the pretext of contextual complexities or in the name of promoting restraint and moderation is to invite future danger.

Secondly, this debate sends a signal to the Afghan freedom fighters that we have not forgotten their plight, that our commitment to their cause endures.

Thirdly, and by the same token, this debate sends a message to the Soviet Union in unambiguous terms that, six years after the entry of Soviet forces into Afghanistan, we have the will and the stamina to see to it that peace and justice will return to Afghanistan and its brave people - a message in unambiguous but also unstrident language. As the Foreign Minister of Pakistan stated so lucidly yesterday, we all recognise the legitimate security interests of the Soviet Union in Afghanistan, and that, too, is worth repeating here.

Fourthly, this debate will help to reinforce the increasing support for peace and national reconciliation in Afghanistan and in that way to encourage and sustain the Secretary-General and his Personal Representative in their dedicated efforts to bring about a political solution to the conflict.

(Mr. Zain Azraai, Malaysia)

Fifthly, we hope and believe that this debate will encourage Pakistan, which has shown the utmost goodwill, and Afghanistan to persevere in their efforts to bring about a lasting and peaceful settlement.

The events of Christmas Eve 1979 in Kabul represent in many ways a watershed in the recent history of international relations. We have all paid the price since then - not least, I may add, the Soviet Union itself. But the most horrendous price has of course been paid by the people of Afghanistan, who have had to endure intolerable suffering and the devastation of their ancient land. Pakistan has seen its border violated repeatedly. The environment for peace and co-operation in South-West Asia has been shattered and the prospects of bringing about a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean have suffered a setback.

At the international level, the Soviet intervention in Afghanistan fills many of us with alarm and a deep sense of vulnerability, because we see a super-Power, a permanent member of the Security Council with special responsibility for maintaining peace and security in accordance with the principles of the Charter, displaying its contempt for those very principles. Furthermore, the Afghan adventure has dealt a heavy blow to détente and contributed to a dangerous deterioration in relations between the two super-Powers, which must be a matter of the utmost concern to us all. For the Soviet Union itself the price has been high, not merely in terms of the money and men which it has had to squander in a fruitless enterprise but, most of all, in terms of its standing and prestige in the world, not least among countries of the third world. The Soviet Union deserves the respect due to a super-Power, not the resentment due to an arrogant bullyboy. For us all, therefore, there is very much at stake in the early, peaceful and lasting resolution of the conflict in Afghanistan.

(Mr. Zain Azraai, Malaysia)

Looking at the situation as it currently obtains, I believe we may dare to entertain some hopes. Credit for this must go first of all to the freedom fighters themselves and we must therefore continue to give them every encouragement. Debates such as this in the United Nations have also helped and we must therefore persevere. Thus the report of the Secretary-General (A/40/709) this year, which sets out the persistent and exceptionally skilful efforts of his Personal Representative, Mr. Diego Cordovez, gives us some ground for hope. The Secretary-General has stated that he has been

"assured repeatedly that [these] efforts are strongly supported by the international community." (A/40/709, para. 2)

let us all continue to give him that assurance. He has also stated that:

"The Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America have reiterated on several occasions their Governments' support for a negotiated political settlement and for the continuation of [those] efforts." (para. 13)

Let us all applaud them and encourage them to continue on that path.

(Mr. Zain Azraai, Malaysia)

One point, however, has to be made in connection with the proximity talks that are currently being conducted under the aegis of the Secretary-General's Special Representative. These delicate negotiations have successfully brought about agreement on three of the four interrelated documents. The Foreign Minister of Pakistan has drawn our attention to a stumbling-block in relation to the negotiations on the fourth of these documents, which deals with the all-important issue of the withdrawal of Soviet forces from Afghanistan - namely, the insistence of the Kabul authorities on changing the format of these negotiations. Malaysia fully concurs with the position taken by Pakistan in this matter as we ourselves cannot see any justification for a change in the format, which has been so delicately arrived at and which has already proved so successful. If we are to continue to have faith in the commitment of the Kabul authorities to a peaceful settlement, we must hope that this procedural stumbling-block will be surmounted at the next round of talks to be held in late December.

When all is said and done, it is the plight of the Afghan nation - of individual men, women and children - which moves us all deeply. Within its limited resources Malaysia pledges to do all it can to be of assistance. Here my delegation would also like to add its voice to the expressions of admiration and gratitude to the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), to the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), to the various donor countries and to the many humanitarian organizations which have contributed so much to alleviating the untold miseries and sufferings of the Afghan people. Above all, Malaysia would like to pay its tribute to the Government of Pakistan and to the Government of Iran as the host countries caring for the largest exodus of refugees in human history. The Government of Pakistan has reported that it meets some 55 per cent of the annual expenditure of \$400 million for maintaining the Afghan refugees. This and other unquantifiable costs represent a tremendous burden on the

(Mr. Zain Azraai, Malaysia)

resources of a developing country, and the sacrifices of a nation such as Pakistan must earn the lasting respect and gratitude of the international community.

The General Assembly has before it a draft resolution, contained in document A/40/L.11, of which Malaysia is proud to be a sponsor, together with 45 other Member States. The present draft is for all practical purposes identical to resolution 39/13 on Afghanistan which was adopted by an overwhelming majority at the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly. I need not repeat here the principles for a peaceful settlement of the conflict in Afghanistan which it sets out and with which all in this Assembly are familiar. It does not condone Soviet behaviour in Afghanistan; neither does it express itself in condemnatory language. In tone it is not anti-Soviet. In substance it sets out fundamental principles of the Charter which all Member States have pledged to uphold. Malaysia believes that it represents a contribution to the lasting settlement of the conflict in Afghanistan and we therefore urge Member States to give it their overwhelming support and in that way send a signal to the Soviet Union and to the Kabul authorities of our calm but unyielding commitment to peace and justice in Afghanistan.

Mr. NOWORYTA (Poland): My delegation fully shares the view expressed here yesterday by the representative of Afghanistan, Ambassador Mohammed Zarif, that the item we are now discussing should never have been on the agenda of the General Assembly, for several reasons: first, because it is against the will of the Government and people of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan; secondly, because it is a clear interference in the internal affairs of a Member State of the United Nations which is unequivocally prohibited by the Charter of the United Nations itself; thirdly, because it does not help, as previous discussions have proved, to improve the situation created around Afghanistan; on the contrary, it merely artificially sustains tension, aggravating the situation and jeopardizing

(Mr. Noworyta, Poland)

peace and security in the region as well as outside it, thereby endangering global peace and security.

The scenario is not a new one. An anti-feudal revolution is initiated when a large majority of a nation has had enough of oppression, tyranny, exploitation and injustice by a corrupt, regressive and feudal monarchical régime. The revolution is welcomed and supported by large masses of the country and can only be victorious. Basic and much needed revolutionary transformations are initiated by the authorities representing the aspirations of the great majority of the nation. Step by step, those transformations are becoming a long-awaited reality.

But this reality is not the one that the reactionary forces are expecting. Therefore in order not to allow another revolution to consolidate itself, they are waging an undeclared war against the revolutionary country, creating numerous military camps in neighbouring territories, training counter-revolutionary groups for subversive activities inside the country in question and conducting different kinds of covert operations of ill-repute. At the same time, psychological warfare is waged against the revolution, distorting the truth about the realities in the country. On the other hand, not a single word is said about the great historical progressive transformations taking place in that country.

Such has been the scenario for many counter-revolutions in different parts of our globe. Such has been the scenario of the counter-revolution in Afghanistan since the beginning of the revolution in April 1978.

If such a situation around Afghanistan is sustained, then we can hardly foresee any favourable outcome for that country and for the region in the near future. The only solution of the situation created around Afghanistan is a political one, and it is deeply regrettable that instead of supporting the existing possibilities for such a political solution we are here wasting precious time and resources and engaging in discussions that lead nowhere. Poland commends the

(Mr. Noworyta, Poland)

efforts of the Secretary-General to achieve a political solution. We hope that the proximity talks that started in Geneva last year will lead to finding a negotiated political settlement. We are deeply convinced that direct talks between the most interested parties - that is, Afghanistan and Pakistan - as proposed so many times by the Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, would be of particular significance for achieving a speedy political solution.

Therefore, if we are serious and really eager to help the search for a political solution of the situation around Afghanistan, let us unequivocally support the efforts of the Secretary-General to that end and avoid political rhetoric, which can only harm such efforts. The draft resolution before us, if adopted, will lead us in exactly the opposite direction, as was the case with past resolutions of the same kind. Therefore, my delegation will vote against the resolution contained in document A/40/L.11.

(Mr. Noworyta, Poland)

In conclusion, may I quote from a statement General Wojciech Jaruzelski made during the visit of President Babrak Karmal to Poland last May:

"We support the activities of the Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan aimed at peaceful settlement of all external problems with neighbouring countries, through dialogue and with full respect for state sovereignty."

Mr. TURKMEN (Turkey): For the seventh time since 1979, we are co-sponsoring the draft resolution on the situation in Afghanistan. We are doing so in the conviction that the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly on Afghanistan reflect the strong expectations of the international community for a just political settlement of the crisis in Afghanistan and the restoration of peace in that country.

Despite repeated calls for an end to the unacceptable situation in Afghanistan, the continuation of the foreign domination of the country through the use of massive military force is a cause for deep concern and a destabilizing factor in international relations. Mindful of this situation's implications for international peace and security, we believe that this is an appropriate moment to make a renewed call and to give strong encouragement to the search for a just and lasting solution of all the problems arising from the grave situation in Afghanistan.

We wish once again to state our firm opposition to the transformation being imposed on the people of Afghanistan, a nation with which we have deep-rooted ties of historical friendship. For six years that nation has been waging a heroic struggle for freedom to resist the imposition, by the use of force, of political, economic and social prescriptions which are not its own choices. It is a moral duty for us to support the people of Afghanistan. We respect and admire the resolve of the Afghan people to exercise freely their inalienable right to

(Mr. Turkmen, Turkey)

self-determination, to secure the withdrawal of foreign military forces from Afghanistan and to ensure the voluntary return of Afghan refugees to their country. Peace cannot come to that country by defiance of the will of its people - the will to live as a free nation, as master of its destiny and its own land. This is basically how we look at the situation in Afghanistan.

The developments in Afghanistan have caused Pakistan to carry the burden of an international problem which did not arise at all out of its own actions. Pakistan has demonstrated humanitarian concern and generosity by accepting and caring for millions of Afghan refugees uprooted from their country as a result of the military operations of the past six years. Pakistan has acted with laudable restraint in the face of recurring violations of its airspace and territory. The more than 200 violations which have taken place in 1985, causing loss of life and damage to civilian property in Pakistan, are of particular concern. Pakistan has contributed constructively and in good faith to the search for a peaceful settlement of the question, for which it deserves the firm support and unreserved appreciation of the international community.

Over the past year we have kept a close watch on both the actual situation in Afghanistan and the negotiating process in Geneva, as well as contacts through other channels which may have an important bearing on this process.

The actual situation on the ground has not changed. Military force has continued to be used on a massive scale and indiscriminately against Afghan men, women and children. This has added to the immense suffering and the losses inflicted on the Afghan people as well as to the wanton destruction of the country. The loss of human life through aerial bombardments, the number of maimed and wounded and the total destruction of villages have reached staggering levels. All these have been perpetrated to quench the resistance of an entire nation which has shown that it is ready to sacrifice everything to regain its freedom.

(Mr. Turkmen, Turkey)

The use of force has not attained its purpose in any region of Afghanistan. It has only served to sharpen the will to resist, and large sections of the country have remained predominantly under the effective control of the Afghan people and resistance. The Afghan resistance represents the dignity of the Afghan people. It is not possible to label these people who have so admirably demonstrated their love of their country as bandits or counter-revolutionaries. The Afghan resistance is a genuine national liberation movement.

With regard to the negotiating process in Geneva, we have taken note of the report of the Secretary-General, whose endeavours to promote a political solution enjoy wide international support. Here we should like to pay a tribute to the Secretary-General and his Personal Representative for their sustained and dedicated efforts.

We understand from the report of the Secretary-General on the situation in Afghanistan, contained in document A/40/709, that in the course of the last year the negotiations conducted through proximity talks have proved to be fruitful to a significant extent. First of all, a comprehensive understanding has been developed on the form of a political settlement. This has enabled the Secretary-General to present to the parties four instruments, consisting of a bilateral agreement on non-interference and non-intervention, a declaration on international guarantees, a bilateral agreement on the voluntary return of Afghan refugees, and an instrument that would set out the interrelationships between these instruments and the solution of the question of the withdrawal of foreign troops from Afghanistan. This has enabled the parties to complete the formulation of two draft bilateral agreements, as well as the declaration on international guarantees, which has been conveyed to and considered by the Soviet Union and the United States as the designated guarantors. The Secretary-General has stressed in his report that the parties have participated in this exercise with renewed determination and vigour.

(Mr. Turkmen, Turkey)

These are positive developments which should be welcomed. It is evident that the negotiations have reached a crucial stage which necessitates that the central issue of the withdrawal of foreign troops be seriously addressed through the consideration of the draft instrument on interrelationships in the process of proximity talks.

However, as noted in the Secretary-General's report, it is regrettable that the continuation of the negotiations with a view to completing this exercise has been blocked as a result of the insistence of one party on changing the agreed procedural format for the process under way. Such demands do not augur well at a stage when the progress in the negotiations conducted through proximity talks has proved that the present format constitutes the proper framework in the search for a peaceful solution.

There is no justified reason for putting the established process in jeopardy. Insistence on such unjustified demands can only be interpreted as a lack of political will to address sincerely the substance of the matter. Therefore we hope that this difficulty will be overcome and further progress will be made during the next round of the proximity talks scheduled for December.

A free, independent and non-aligned Afghanistan at peace internally and with its neighbours will help to promote the quest for a more secure and stable order in the region and in the world.

Mr. LEWIS (Canada): The reports of the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) say it all. At regular intervals these short documents cross the desks of the missions here in New York, setting out in unemotional language the chronicle of a ghastly war. Each report - 'Afghan Sitreps' they are called - up-dates the activities of the Red Cross in the border areas of Pakistan. Let me quote briefly from report No. 40, issued in July of this year:

"During July, an exceptionally high level of military operations in Paktia Province (Afghanistan) resulted in the highest ever number of war casualties evacuated through the ICRC/Pakistan Red Crescent Society first-aid mobile post in Miramshah to the surgical hospital in Peshawar ... In addition to intense surgical activities, the orthopaedic and paraplegic centres were also very busy, and a high level of activity was recorded for all other ICRC programmes in favour of Afghan conflict victims."

Report No. 41, issued in early September, showed no let-up in the fighting. Indeed, throughout the summer of 1985 the casualties mounted. In the words of the Red Cross:

"The number of patients continued to increase during August, and over last week-end emergency measures had to be taken to strengthen ICRC's medical facilities with the provision of additional personnel and equipment."

The report goes on:

"The two surgical teams in Peshawar, as well as the specialized medical staff made available by the National Societies of Denmark, Finland, New Zealand, Norway and Sweden, had to cope with the highest number of admissions ever recorded at the hospital. For two weeks from the middle of August ... the hospital ... reached its maximum capacity, with the evacuation of two tents in the hospital compound ... It is not possible to further extend the capacity of the hospital and it is, therefore, necessary to establish an independent

(Mr. Lewis, Canada)

field hospital in Peshawar with the staff to run it, and to find additional staff for the existing surgical structure."

In the sorry human saga of invasion, depredation and tyranny the numbers recorded in these reports seem relatively low. For example, in the little field hospital in Peshawar during the month of July there were 199 war-wounded admitted, 478 surgical operations performed and 962 patients otherwise treated. But, take those figures, multiply them by the network of field hospitals and mobile emergency stations in Pakistan and Iran, as well as the tens of thousands of casualties dealt with in Afghanistan itself, and further multiply them by 12 months in the year and by the almost 6 years for which a war has raged with unrelieved ferocity and then note the constant references to surgical, orthopaedic and paraplegic procedures, and one has in the ICRC reports the microcosm of a nation massacred and mutilated.

Over 1 million dead; an equal or greater number physically scarred by battle for life; between 1 million and 2 million uprooted, ravaged and homeless in their own land; 4 million to 5 million as wretched refugees in Pakistan and Iran: is it any wonder that the Helsinki Watch Committee, in its recent study of Afghanistan, observed with eviscerating simplicity that "A whole nation is dying"?

And for what reason? This immeasurable human tragedy is made even more appalling because it is so utterly, inexplicably pointless.

The entire world knows that the Soviets were not invited in. The entire world knows that Afghanistan posed no threat - not even to Soviet secularism. Afghanistan was a middle-sized non-aligned Power whose neutrality was never menacing. The entire world knows that the Soviet invasion and occupation were not prompted by some startling geo-political imperative of the moment; the circumstances of December 1979 were hardly sufficient to merit a diplomatic note, let alone an act of aggression and war.

(Mr. Lewis, Canada)

Perhaps it is an expression of the ugly, age-long lust for territorial expansion - a Soviet version of lebensraum; perhaps it is some unfulfilled strategic design to reach a warm-water port; perhaps it is a deliberate policy, with as yet unstated objectives, to unsettle further that already destabilized region of the world; perhaps, having intervened to install a puppet régime, ideological rigidity took over and departure became impossible.

But, whatever the rationale, explicit or conspiratorial - and not a word of it is believable in any event - the Soviet Union in its war against the people of Afghanistan has reverted to the ethics, the excesses and the excrescences of Stalinism.

The Soviet Union, however, will not win. Russia has unleashed 115,000 troops, equipped with the most lethal and technological of modern conventional weaponry, but the people of Afghanistan cannot be subdued. No matter to what extent the Soviet high-altitude saturation bombing and helicopter gunships decimate civilian populations, reduce whole communities to ashes or turn the countryside to cinders, the Afghan Mujahideen fight on.

After nearly six dreadful years, it is now clear that the Soviet Union cannot impose a military solution. It might wish to make of Afghanistan a subservient, vassal state, but it will not succeed. The words of the Secretary-General's report ring true:

"Peace, and the degree of national reconciliation that it should entail to allow the Afghan people to decide their own future, cannot be attained by military means." (A/40/709, para. 2)

The only answer is a negotiated settlement which embraces the principles in the draft resolution before us and reflects the views expressed in this debate by the overwhelming majority of Member States of the General Assembly. It is an answer for which the Secretary-General and his Personal Representative have been

(Mr. Lewis, Canada)

nobly - at times, productively - striving. In that context, we more than welcome the pending third round of proximity talks.

But it all hangs on Soviet troop withdrawal. That is the sine qua non. Everyone understands it. If we are back here same time next year, it is solely because the Soviet Union continues to believe that nihilism is preferable to negotiation, that butchery is preferable to bargaining.

It all raises a series of inescapable hypocrisies.

Here we have a country, the Soviet Union, which regularly reminds this Assembly during debates on regional conflicts that resolutions, once passed, must be honoured. But the resolution on "The situation in Afghanistan and its implications for international peace and security" is never honoured by the Soviet Union.

Here we have a country, the Soviet Union, which regularly, almost obsessively, lectures this Assembly on the right to self-determination of certain peoples. But self-determination, when applied to the people of Afghanistan, becomes a nullity.

Here we have a country, the Soviet Union, which regularly denounces in this Assembly acts of territorial aggression and proclaims in this Assembly the sanctity of territorial borders. But when it comes to Afghanistan the aggression is naked and the increasing cross-border violations of Pakistan's territorial integrity matter not at all. It is awfully useful to have a dialectic which is so infinitely malleable.

Here we have a country, the Soviet Union, which is for ever reminding this Assembly of "gross and massive" violations of human rights. Yet before us is Afghanistan, where violations of human rights are not merely gross and massive, they are grotesque and universal. Nothing could convey it better than this excerpt from the Helsinki Watch report, whose findings, incidentally, were largely confirmed by the Special Rapporteur of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights:

(Mr. Lewis, Canada)

"From our interviews, it soon became clear that just about every conceivable human-rights violation is occurring in Afghanistan, and on an enormous scale. The crimes of indiscriminate warfare are combined with the worst excesses of unbridled State-sanctioned violence against civilians. The ruthless savagery in the countryside is matched by the subjection of a terrorized urban population to arbitrary arrest, torture, imprisonment and execution. Totalitarian controls are being imposed on institutions and the press. The universities and all other aspects of Afghan cultural life are being systematically 'Sovietized'."

Here we have a country, the Soviet Union, which worries in the Assembly about demands made upon important agencies within the United Nations system. But directly because of the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan there has been created in Pakistan the largest refugee population in the world, exacerbating significantly the crisis of resources within the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR).

Were it not for the selfless response of the Government of Pakistan, coupled with the extraordinary work of UNHCR, we would have an even greater disaster in South-West Asia.

None of that, however, seems to matter to the Soviet Union.

Above all, here we have a country, the Soviet Union, which regularly instructs this Assembly on the imperatives of peace. But this is a highly selective application of the principles of peace. It is meant for all the rest of us. It carefully omits Afghanistan.

As Canada said earlier, Afghanistan will not submit. The conflict may be taking an incredible toll, but there is no sign of subjugation. Karmal remains in power purely by force of Soviet arms. Hostility grows internally. The Government is at war with its own people. Indeed, despite the cruel and inhuman treatment

(Mr. Lewis, Canada)

which Russia inflicts on captured defectors and prisoners of war, there is increasing evidence, recently set out in a series of articles in The New York Times, of numbers of successful defections from the Soviet army to the ranks of the Mujahideen. That is not surprising. Some Russian soldiers are bound to rebel against so perfidious a war; some will inevitably be attracted to the Afghan cause.

The Soviet Union would wish to draw the curtains of silence over Afghanistan. It wishes it could wage its vengeful war in stealth and in private. It wishes the war were never reported in the press. Even now it attempts to staunch the flows of refugees so that word of military atrocities never reaches the outside world. It wishes these debates never occurred. It wishes the resolutions were never passed.

But it is up to this General Assembly to keep the Afghan cause alive and to make clear repeatedly the condemnation of the world. We must somehow persuade the Soviet Union that negotiation is the only route to world approval. The United States has suggested a regional initiative. It might well be worth pursuing. Anything is worth pursuing that brings the prospect of a settlement within the stated goals of this resolution.

When he spoke this morning, the Permanent Representative of the USSR made much of the benefactions bestowed upon the people of Afghanistan by Karmal of Kabul. "The campaign against illiteracy is being waged with success," he said. "Since the victory of the revolution," he added, "over 1 million Afghans have learned to read and write" (A/40/PV.72, pp. 19-20).

Since the victory of the revolution, over 1 million other Afghans have been slaughtered. In the choice between literacy and life, they would, like all the rest of us, have chosen life. But why must they make the choice? Why can they not have both?

That is the question the Soviet Union refuses to answer.

Mr. PAPAJORGJI (Albania): It is now almost six years since the Soviet social imperialists undertook their barbarous aggression against Afghanistan. During this period the General Assembly has rightly included in its agenda and considered this pressing question, which has brought about such grave consequences for the Afghan people. It has rightly condemned the occupation of that sovereign country. Freedom-loving peoples and countries all over the world continue to raise their voices in protest against that aggression and arbitrary occupation. They cannot but be indignant that the Soviet occupation troops have inflicted incalculable damage and suffering upon that country by generating a situation dangerous to peace and security in that region of Asia.

When, in December 1979, Soviet troops perfidiously attacked and occupied Afghanistan, Soviet propaganda made a great deal of noise, claiming that it had sent in an insignificant contingent of troops designed to stay there only temporarily. None the less the facts have testified that the Soviet social imperialists have no intention of leaving the country of their own will. In order to justify their shameful aggression, they have speculated, and continue to speculate, with the so-called treaty of friendship that they long ago imposed on Afghanistan. By so doing they have once again shown how dangerous it is for the freedom and independence of peoples when they trust such "defensive" treaties or agreements with the super-Powers. As time has explicitly proved, we have to deal with fascist aggression, with the military invasion of a sovereign country by an imperialist super-Power, which constitutes a flagrant violation of the principles and norms of international law. It is further testimony to what the Socialist People's Republic of Albania pointed out long ago: that Soviet social imperialism actually represents one of the most reactionary forces of our time, which, for the purpose of attaining its expansionist aims, has rooted its policy in the use of military force, and that that policy and that of American imperialism equally threaten the freedom and independence of peoples the world over.

(Mr. Papajorgji, Albania)

The Soviet social imperialists make every effort to cover up their aggressive and warmongering course with their demagoguery, which does not fail to show itself in the United Nations too, where they claim to be protectors of the peoples' rights and earnest supporters of their struggle against imperialism and neocolonialism. Against that background they talk about the so-called internationalist duty they are allegedly fulfilling with regard to Afghanistan in defending the victories of the revolution and the interests of the people of that country and, in a still wider perspective, even of the other countries of the area.

They make a great fuss about the so-called security of the Asian continent, even putting forth concrete proposals for the convening of a pan-Asiatic forum, similar to the Helsinki one. Soviet social imperialists are very much in need of such a farce so that their aggression against and their continuing occupation of Afghanistan will fall into oblivion and their expansionist plans and aims on that continent will be concealed. They did the same with the Helsinki Conference, to avert the attention of the peoples from their aggression against Czechoslovakia in 1968.

The development of events in Afghanistan clearly testifies that the freedom-loving peoples of that country have not become reconciled to the foreign occupation. The occupying forces of the Soviet social imperialists everywhere meet not only with growing hatred but also with the heroic resistance of the Afghan people. They are losing ground with each passing day. The mountains and crags of the country are being turned into graves for the occupiers, once more showing the world that there is no force that can vanquish a people determined to fight to the end for its freedom. The Kremlin aggressors are suffering the inevitable fate of all aggressors.

(Mr. Papajorgji, Albania)

In order to reduce their losses and escape the complete discrediting of their military potential that they have suffered through the liberation struggle of a small people, the Soviet social imperialists are resorting to methods of massive violence and terror. But the modern means they possess, the ill-famed scorched-earth tactics and the razing to the ground of whole villages and districts have met with no success. They can never defeat the fiery patriotism of the Afghan people or their indomitable will to be free and independent.

(Mr. Papajorgji, Albania)

In these difficult circumstances, the Soviet social-imperialists never fail to speak of the so-called political settlement of the Afghan problem, which is nothing but a well-known method used by imperialism and reaction to cheat public opinion and nourish illusions; everywhere their positions are being shaken by the liberation struggles of the peoples. In fact, these are but manoeuvres of the super-Powers in this region intended to give the impression that they are allegedly concerned about the rights of the Afghan people, about their freedom and independence and that of the other peoples of the region. The manoeuvres the Soviet social-imperialists aim at legalizing the status of the occupation of Afghanistan, at dealing a heavy blow to the liberation movement of the Afghan people and at gaining time to consolidate their positions. The constant reinforcement of the occupying army, as well as the wide purges in regions where resistance is stronger, are not signs of withdrawal, but of the longest possible stay. The so-called requests for an international guarantee made by the Government of Kabul, too, are a component part of the diabolic manoeuvres and tactics of the Soviet social-imperialists, serving their aims of opposing the struggle of the Afghan patriots.

In the circumstances, the delegation of the Socialist People's Republic of Albania deems it necessary to reiterate once more its viewpoint on this problem, stressing that the just solution of the Afghan question will be reached only if the Soviet occupying troops are entirely and definitively withdrawn. It can never be achieved through the compromises and political settlements that the enemies of the Afghan people offer. History itself has testified that aggressors never withdraw voluntarily from the countries they occupy. They are driven out only by the liberation struggle waged by the oppressed people. We are confident that the decisive factor in the just solution of the question of the Afghan people is only

(Mr. Papajorgji, Albania)

their determined fight for national liberation which enjoys the solidarity and support of the freedom-loving peoples the world over.

The Socialist People's Republic of Albania and the Albanian people have condemned and will always condemn the aggression and the continued occupation of Afghanistan by the Soviet social-imperialists. As in the past, they will continue in the future to support and express their solidarity with the just national liberation struggle of the Afghan people. They are firmly convinced that the Afghan people will drive the aggressors out of their country.

Mr. KASEMSRI (Thailand): For the sixth consecutive year, Afghanistan remains one of the most serious international problems of our time. The factors which precipitated the crisis have not yet disappeared, the prospects for a settlement remain uncertain, and recent events in Afghanistan indicate that more bloodshed is in the offing. Hence, the General Assembly must continue to be seized with this problem, which has seriously affected regional as well as international peace and security for the past six years.

Afghanistan has been the victim of the flagrant act of aggression which violates the principles of the Charter and international law. Other small developing and non-aligned States Members of the United Nations have been made to feel less secure by the ominous fact that this blatant breach of the Charter obligations and the fundamental principles of international law has been committed by one of the permanent members of the Security Council. It is as if one of the watchmen on the world watch-tower has become himself a raiding party; the effect on international peace and security cannot be overestimated.

There is another aspect of the situation in Afghanistan which is the source of the gravest concern, namely, the human tragedy befalling the Afghan civilian

(Mr. Kasemsri, Thailand)

population, including innocent children. For instance, in an article entitled "The Ordeal of Afghanistan" by Mr. John Keegan, published in The Atlantic Magazine of November 1985, the British correspondent, Mr. Mike Martin, was quoted as follows:

"We sat on the roof of a house where the wounded stayed, one man with perforated eardrums and shrapnel in his legs, another with hideous burns to his face and throat. You coped with the sight of serious wounds until the victims were children and all the arguments of a just war vanished. One small boy had had his legs welded together by the heat of bombs dropped on his father's fields, so that he was left with a single misshapened stump and he dragged himself along with a crutch. Another boy, about six, had had his face burnt off. His nose was gone and there was a hole in the middle of his face which gave him the appearance of a fish. It was his mouth."

The war in Afghanistan has resulted in the transformation of a quarter of its population into refugees in neighbouring States. In Pakistan alone there are almost 3.5 million Afghan refugees, the largest concentration of refugees in the world. The Islamic Republic of Iran also provides shelter to hundreds of thousands of Afghan refugees. Being faced with similar burdens arising from a similar situation in Kampuchea, Thailand appreciates all the more the noble sacrifices which have been made by the Governments of Iran and Pakistan, and wishes to express its admiration for the manner in which they have shouldered those heavy responsibilities on behalf of the international community. In this connection, my delegation also would like to express its deep appreciation of the humanitarian activities carried out by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and other international agencies in alleviating the plight of the Afghan refugees. It

(Mr. Kasemsri, Thailand)

is our hope that, when the situation permits, those Afghan refugees will return to their homes in safety and honour.

The patriotic struggle of the Afghan people against the foreign aggressor deserves the sympathy and support of all freedom-loving countries and peoples. Thailand will continue to support the just cause of the Afghan people in their valiant struggle to free their homeland from foreign occupation.

The position of Thailand regarding the question of Afghanistan has been firm and consistent. It has been based on Thailand's deep commitment to the principles and purposes of the Charter and to the principles of the sovereign equality of States, territorial integrity, non-use of force, non-interference and non-intervention in the internal affairs of other States, the right of people to self-determination and the peaceful settlement of disputes. It is in this context that we have consistently reiterated that the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly must be fully implemented, that foreign troops must withdraw from Afghanistan unconditionally, and that the independent and non-aligned status of Afghanistan must be restored, so as to ensure that the Afghan people will determine their own destiny, free from outside interference. Moreover, the Afghan refugees must return in safety and honour to their homeland. Any political settlement of the Afghanistan question must be based on the legitimate rights of the Afghan people, taking into account also the legitimate rights of the Afghan people, taking into account also the legitimate security concerns of the neighbouring States. This is the only way that lasting peace and stability in Afghanistan and in the region can be realized.

(Mr. Kasemsri, Thailand)

The Secretary-General enjoys our full support and confidence in his efforts towards a peaceful political solution to the conflict. In this connection, my delegation wishes to express its deep appreciation to him and to Mr. Diego Cordovez, his Personal Representative, who has devoted himself to the difficult task of trying to bring about a negotiated settlement of the Afghanistan problem. It is my delegation's hope that those efforts will bear fruit in a political settlement which will respond fully to the legitimate aspirations and interests of the Afghan people.

We fully support the reasonable position taken by Pakistan, as reiterated yesterday by its Foreign Minister, on a process of negotiation between the parties. We call for the finalization without further delay of the instrument on the withdrawal of Soviet forces from Afghanistan, with a definite timetable by means of the format that has proved successful in the previous stages of negotiation.

My delegation is convinced that the draft resolution (A/40/L.11) provides a just and reasonable framework for a political settlement of the Afghanistan problem, the resolution of which would contribute to the return of peace and stability to that region and beyond. My delegation has therefore joined 45 other countries in sponsoring the draft resolution and urges other peace- and justice-loving countries to support it.

Mr. SARRE (Senegal) (interpretation from French): Once again, and for the sixth consecutive year, the General Assembly is obliged to consider the situation in Afghanistan. That is because the grave matters that led the United Nations and international bodies to take up the matter have lost none of their relevance today.

The Afghan question, like other cases of interference in the internal affairs

(Mr. Sarré, Senegal)

of Member States that are considered each year in the Assembly, proves that, despite professions of faith made at this rostrum, the principles of the San Francisco Charter continue to be, 40 years later, remote objectives yet to be attained rather than day-to-day realities of contemporary international relations.

The rule of law - particularly non-intervention and respect for territorial integrity, sovereignty and independence, the right of peoples to self-determination and the non-use of force in international relations - has gradually been lost sight of over the past six years, to the benefit of matters sometimes considered to be power interests.

Whatever reasons are given to explain or justify the foreign intervention in Afghanistan, the least that can be said is that it constitutes a flagrant violation of the principles that govern inter-State relations and of the code of ethics of the community of States.

That is why, on the basis of the principles of the Charter, the United Nations defined at an early stage the conditions on which a solution to the Afghan problem should be based. It is hardly necessary to recall that they are: the withdrawal of foreign troops from that country; the restoration of the right of the Afghan people to decide its own fate, without external interference or constraints; and the creation, through negotiations between the parties concerned, of conditions making possible the return of the Afghan refugees to their homes.

Unfortunately, the situation has hardly improved. More than 20 per cent of the Afghan people have been obliged to leave their homes to live as refugees in other countries, with unforeseeable consequences for the maintenance of peace, security and stability in the region.

It is true that in the diplomatic sphere it has been possible to discern some positive signs in the negotiations conducted under the auspices of the Secretary-General, whom we congratulate on his efforts. In the past few months the

(Mr. Sarré, Senegal)

consultative machinery that has been set up has made it possible to iron out some of the difficulties that emerged during the talks. It is to be hoped that the parties concerned will maintain to the end the good intentions that they have shown so far.

In any event, for the sake of peace it is essential to maintain the dynamic of the negotiations, by promoting to a greater extent a serious, constructive dialogue within the framework of the relevant United Nations resolutions.

Senegal, which has always opposed interference in the internal affairs of other States, especially when it takes the form of armed intervention from outside, wishes to take this opportunity once more to express its great concern at the failure to arrive at a peaceful political solution to the question. It will continue to support the peace efforts made at various levels, convinced that persistence in trying to find a solution through force can only aggravate the conflict and increase tension in the region.

Perseverance in those peace efforts will in the long run make it possible to remove the Afghan issue from the impasse in which it finds itself and to make real progress towards the political solution for which the Organization of the Islamic Conference, the Non-Aligned Movement and the United Nations have been waiting for six years.

It is in that spirit that Senegal is again a sponsor of the draft resolution on the Afghan question this year. The generous, responsible and objective approach advocated in the draft resolution is designed to facilitate the negotiations now under way between the parties concerned, while not losing sight of the fundamental principles of the Charter.

By supporting the draft resolution, as they have done in previous years, the overwhelming majority of Member States will reaffirm their determination to restore justice, peace and understanding in Afghanistan.

Mr. ELAIGWU (Nigeria): The situation in Afghanistan and its implications for international peace and security are once again the focus of the Assembly's attention. In spite of the laudable and energetic efforts of our untiring Secretary-General and his indefatigable Personal Representative, Mr. Diego Cordovez, a negotiated political settlement continues to be elusive. A reported stalemate on the procedure for negotiations has - temporarily, as we prefer to hope - slowed the momentum that characterized the process initiated by the Secretary-General's Personal Representative.

(Mr. Elaigwu, Nigeria)

Meanwhile, the concern of the international community for the plight of the Afghans and the situation in the border areas of the region has again been manifested by the diversity and long list of Member States sponsoring the draft resolution under agenda item 28. The Afghans are still denied the opportunity to plan their lives and to regulate their social and economic development. The loss of life continues almost unabated. Large numbers of the peace-loving people of Afghanistan have had to flee their country and assume refugee status in neighbouring countries. The hope of returning to their beloved country is regrettably distant. It is even more disturbing that there is no definitive timetable in sight for the conclusion of diplomatic negotiations for a political settlement of the problem.

The report of the Secretary-General, document A/40/709 of 7 October 1985, none the less gives us some encouraging reasons not to be totally despondent. In its totality the report may be regarded as a message of hope. We prefer to be optimistic in this regard. The parties to the conflict have met as often as possible. There has been some progress - albeit limited and of marginal comfort - in their negotiations. In our view, the report also highlighted an important element. I refer specifically to the reported conclusion of the formulation of a declaration of international guarantees. The countries directly involved in the search for a solution and those Governments that would provide international guarantees of any final solution have reportedly stated and reiterated their support for a negotiated political settlement and the continuation of the efforts of the Secretary-General. As highlighted in the Secretary-General's report, existing difficulties which are not and should not be insurmountable could be attributable to insufficient political will and accommodation by the principal parties to the problem.

(Mr. Elaiqwu, Nigeria)

We cannot but urge the redoubling of efforts for the creation of a political climate in Afghanistan that will be conducive to achieving a political settlement of the crisis and enabling the refugees to return to their homes to participate in their country's political and economic processes. In this respect my delegation wishes to reaffirm the view previously stated in this Assembly that the preservation of the sovereignty, territorial integrity, political independence and non-aligned character of Afghanistan, as well as the right of the people freely to choose their own form of political, economic and social system, remain essential conditions for the peaceful settlement of the problem. We implore the Secretary-General and his Personal Representative not to relent in their efforts in the search for a lasting solution to the Afghan crisis.

The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to speak in exercise of the right of reply. May I remind members that, in accordance with General Assembly decision 34/401, statements in exercise of the right of reply are limited to 10 minutes for the first intervention and to 5 minutes for the second, and should be made by representatives from their seats.

Mr. R. M. KHAN (Pakistan): In some statements made today and yesterday - and I am referring in particular to the statements by the representative of the Soviet Union today and by the Kabul representative yesterday - several baseless allegations have been made against Pakistan. I would briefly highlight a few facts to expose those allegations and also to correct the false assertions which have been made in regard to the diplomatic process in order to mislead international opinion.

Those who respect facts and care for the truth know that the Soviet troops entered Afghanistan not at the request of the Afghan Government, but to overthrow the Government of Hafizullah Amin in Kabul. They know that the Soviet troops brought to Kabul on their tanks the leader of the present régime, who has since been

(Mr. R. M. Khan, Pakistan)

sustained in authority by over 120,000 Soviet troops and the most sophisticated conventional weapons at their disposal. There is a name for such a régime: it is simply a puppet régime.

The two statements to which I have referred cite random reports from the Western press. The fact remains that in the coverage of the war in Afghanistan over the past six years one cannot find even a single reference in the Western press or the third-world press - excluding countries of the Soviet-line system - that accept the claim that the Soviets entered Afghanistan on invitation. The international press invariably and correctly describes the Soviet troops as invaders. Indeed, the international community, in the United Nations as well as the Non-Aligned Movement and the Islamic Conference, has called the Soviet action a military intervention in flagrant violation of the principles of the Charter.

Much has been said about the situation around Afghanistan. Yes, there is a situation around Afghanistan, which is the reality of the 5 million Afghan refugees, representing one third of the entire population of Afghanistan, who have fled from persecution and are now living in exile as refugees. The foreign military interventionists and their handful of collaborators are responsible for the genocidal war which has forced one third of the country's population to seek refuge outside. It is those collaborators who must bear the shame of this mass exodus.

There is also the reality of the situation inside Afghanistan, and that is the resistance of the Afghan people, which has not been crushed despite the ruthless military campaigns, brutal reprisals, indiscriminate bombardments, destruction of villages and burning of crops by a foreign army of occupation. That deadly intervention has resulted in the loss of nearly 1 million Afghan lives and caused the exodus of 5 million Afghan nationals.

(Mr. R. M. Khan, Pakistan)

It is a blatant abuse of common intelligence and a travesty of facts to describe that heroic resistance as an activity carried out by bandit groups. If those facts are all propaganda, then one may ask: why are foreign journalists prevented from freely entering Afghanistan and determining for themselves the situation in that country? Allegations of propaganda by representatives of countries that allow only a filtered view of the Afghanistan situation in their national press and block the authentic views and reactions of the international community from reaching their people carry little credibility.

It has been alleged that the consideration of the Afghanistan situation by the General Assembly is a violation of international law. The fact is that the General Assembly was seized of the Afghanistan situation only after the Soviet Union vetoed a draft resolution in the Security Council in January 1980 that called for the immediate withdrawal of the invading troops. Since then, the General Assembly has repeated its call for the withdrawal of the foreign troops, only to have its call rejected by those who are responsible for the invasion. Similar appeals from the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and the Organization of the Islamic Conference have met the same fate. The claim that the General Assembly's consideration of the Afghanistan question is illegal is preposterous and amounts to accusing the Assembly of inconsistency. The General Assembly has been consistent; its decisions have always upheld justice and objectivity.

(Mr. R. M. Khan, Pakistan)

The Kabul representative also spoke of an understanding among the interlocutors that the fourth instrument, relating to withdrawals, would be discussed through direct talks. This is a patently false assertion. There has never been any agreement between the interlocutors to hold direct talks to discuss the fourth instrument or any other matter. The Foreign Minister of Pakistan stated yesterday that Pakistan would have no difficulty whatsoever if the notes embodying the understandings and the various texts of the instruments prepared by the Secretary-General's Personal Representative were released. Such a step could enable the international community to assess for itself the correct position and the truth about the various aspects of the diplomatic process.

The fact is that, in the sincere pursuit of a settlement, Pakistan has shown maximum flexibility to facilitate the finalization of the three instruments relating to bilateral agreement on non-interference, international guarantees and voluntary return of refugees. However, when the time came for the consideration of the question of withdrawals the Kabul side, as on previous occasions, blocked further progress by demanding direct talks.

Clearly, the issue of direct talks has been raised to obfuscate the central issue of the withdrawal of foreign troops. Recent Soviet statements also raise doubts about Soviet willingness to consider withdrawals within the framework of the comprehensive settlement being worked out through the good offices of the Secretary-General. Clearly, by demanding direct talks a crude attempt is being made to realize through the negotiating process the objectives of the 14 May 1980 Kabul proposals, put forward with Soviet blessing. Such attempts at setting aside the question of withdrawals and reversing the logic of facts must be rejected firmly.

Mr. ZARIF (Afghanistan): The Assembly heard yesterday, and also just now, a statement by the delegation of Pakistan in which the speakers kept repeating the master's voice of their régime. In our statement yesterday and in all other statements that we have delivered on the item in the Assembly we have given numerous and incontrovertible facts, proving without even the smallest grain of doubt that armed interference and aggression against Afghanistan by United States imperialism, Chinese hegemonism, the dictatorial régime of Pakistan and their assorted reactionary allies started only weeks after the victory of the April 1978 revolution and escalated incessantly to such a level as to force Afghanistan to seek military assistance from the Soviet Union. Hypocritical rhetoric has not helped and will not help the delegation of Pakistan to whitewash the bloody crimes they have committed and continue to commit against the people of Afghanistan.

Nobody could fail to notice that Pakistan's statement was strikingly identical in tone to that set by the present tenant of the White House. It was clearly intended to serve as a gambit on the chessboard of United States strategy for undermining the prospects of the forthcoming Soviet-American summit meeting in Geneva. It was also intended to balance the régime's liability for the thousands of millions of dollars acquired as a pay-off for such services.

How is it possible for Pakistan to deceive the whole world about the facts pertaining to the existence of armed aggression and other forms of interference against Afghanistan before 27 December 1979, or to the existence of around 120 mercenary training camps in Pakistan and eight guerrilla centres in China?

How is it possible for Pakistan to expect the General Assembly to believe that Pakistan stands for peaceful negotiations and the settlement of disputes with Afghanistan while in the same breath it reaffirms its commitment to the continuance of the filthy undeclared war which it shamelessly describes as "a heroic war of liberation".

(Mr. Zarif, Afghanistan)

The demagogic calls for the withdrawal of "foreign troops" from Afghanistan are also belied by facts established a long time ago. I will quote some passages from a report prepared by the Washington-based Center for National Security Studies entitled "Reagan's Secret Wars", as follows:

"In May 1980 Chinese Defence Minister Geng Biao visited Washington, where he and Secretary of Defense Harold Brown urged their two countries to adopt a common strategic response ... in Afghanistan ... American rhetoric has kept pace with US aid to the resistance in Afghanistan ... In January 1980, William Beecher" - of the Boston Globe, quoting one high-level United States official - "reported that the purpose of ... US covert operations was to make the [war] ... 'long, bloody and expensive' ... Chinese Vice-President Deng Xiaoping expressed a similar intention in an August 1980 interview with Oriana Fallaci. Deng said ... 'We must try very hard to tie down the Soviet Union for several years [in] Afghanistan' ... One indication that the United States shared Deng's strategy ... was provided by Zbigniew Brzezinski in a 1981 interview ... The way to implement the Deng-Brzezinski strategy is for the United States to send arms into Afghanistan and call loudly for negotiations, but to block a negotiated settlement. Overt US policy ... is to provide the Soviets with a way out of Afghanistan ... but there are troubling indications that the US actions have been at odds with this strategy. The best test of the American intentions to date has been the US attitude toward the 'indirect' negotiations between Afghanistan and Pakistan ... The American officials told The New York Times [in April 1983] that the US had decided the previous fall to step up the quantity and quality of weapons being sent to the Afghan resistance after a months' long debate between 'bleeders' in the Administration, who wanted to draw more Soviet troops into Afghanistan and more cautious officials, who wanted to limit the aid ... They also noted

(Mr. Zarif, Afghanistan)

publicly for the first time that Pakistan's refusal of a separate accommodation with Moscow was part of an understanding with Washington in connection with the \$3.2 billion aid package provided by the United States Administration."

That was a quotation from one of the studies prepared by an American institution very close to the Administration.

The ulterior motives of the United States, China and Pakistan have been evident right from the beginning. The United States and Pakistan strategic military alliance, which turns the latter into a regional gendarme and the headquarters of the notorious CENTCOM, have posed a serious threat to the security and stability of our region. This is particularly causing anxiety in the light of the fact that the aggressive and adventurist military dictators of Pakistan have waged three all-out wars against their neighbours since Pakistan's creation less than four decades ago. Pakistan has been the source of the dirty, imperialist, hegemonist and reactionary undeclared war against Afghanistan and a staging ground for interference in the internal affairs of other neighbouring countries.

In order to cover up their repeated acts of aggression against Afghanistan, the military authorities in Islamabad have levelled baseless and cheap allegations to the effect that Afghan air and ground forces have violated Pakistan's territory. As the saying goes, "He who lies has a short memory." This is evident from the great discrepancies in the number of alleged violations and casualties quoted by the Islamabad authorities on different occasions.

It is Afghanistan whose territory is being consistently violated by Pakistan's armed forces and militia and by the mercenary bandits stationed there.

The military junta in Islamabad and its representatives at the United Nations should not dare to arrogate to themselves the right to speak even on behalf of the fraternal people of Pakistan, let alone in the name of the Afghan people.

(Mr. Zarif, Afghanistan)

The verdict of the Pakistani people on the military dictatorship in that country, which is sustained by the use of the brute force and bayonets, has been unequivocal. The people of Pakistan, represented by virtually all political parties of the country which held the central and all provincial Governments after the only free elections in Pakistan's history, have also made clear their position against the regime's present hostile policy to Afghanistan and in favour of the normalizaion of relations.

(Mr. Zarif, Afghanistan)

The people of Afghanistan, a free, independent and sovereign nation, has never allowed in the past and shall never allow in the future any self-proclaimed guardian to insult its national pride and honour.

The issue of the so-called Afghan refugees was once again used to add a sentimental façade to the psychological and propagandistic war against Afghanistan. The facts regarding the forgery and fabrication of the numbers of bona fide refugees have been revealed by sources no less authoritative than the United Nations and the United States Committee for Refugees in their own independent surveys of the camps. Even the Pakistani authorities themselves could not ignore the increased leakage of the truth about the numbers, and decided to revise their figures, bringing them down by more than 500,000. The revised figures too have been seriously challenged by independent sources. Naturally, the Pakistani authorities are counting the seasonal nomads, large numbers of local inhabitants and the counter-revolutionaries among the refugee population.

The declaration of general amnesty proclaimed by the Revolutionary Council of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan paved the way for the voluntary, safe and unhindered return of bona fide refugees to Afghanistan. It is deplorable that the Pakistani authorities and their counter-revolutionary stooges have not allowed the dissemination of the general amnesty declaration among the so-called refugees and have physically prevented the repatriation of large numbers of those who wished to return, using armed force and political and economic coercion.

The fact is that Islamabad has used and continues to use the issue of the so-called Afghan refugees as a means of spreading deceptive propaganda and for the purpose of pocketing hundreds of millions of dollars from Governments and international relief agencies. Instead of screaming about the plight of the so-called Afghan refugees, the Islamabad military dictators would do better to

(Mr. Zarif, Afghanistan)

start thinking about the humanitarian ordeals to which they have condemned the hundreds of thousands of Pakistani Biharis who remain in Bangladesh, barred from Pakistan.

In this context, they and their criminal allies have alleged that religious teachings have been eliminated from the educational system in Afghanistan. Nothing could be farther from the truth. The policy of the Government as regards protecting the religious beliefs and traditions of the people is probably more democratic and sympathetic, compared with that of any of the Islamic countries where Islam is supposed to be the official ideology of the Government -

The PRESIDENT: I am sorry to have to interrupt the representative of Afghanistan, but his 10 minute period is up. I therefore ask him to be kind enough to conclude his statement.

Mr. ZARIF (Afghanistan): The creation of the Council of Religious Scholars, the establishment of the Ministry of Religious Affairs, the expenditure of billions of afghanis on the construction and repair of mosques in holy places, financial support for priests and religious scholars, the subsidy of pilgrimage costs, and other things are undeniable examples of the policy of the Government in that regard. But Pakistan's self-styled "guardians of Islam" and their United States and Chinese sympathizers, who wish to introduce their own version and style of Islam, have no right to teach us how to be good Moslems. After all, it was Afghanistan which, for better or worse, imposed Islam on the -

The PRESIDENT: I am sorry. I must interrupt the speaker and ask him to conclude.

Mr. SAFRONCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): We shall not take up the Assembly's time by refuting the slanderous diatribes uttered by representatives who have clearly lost all sense of proportion and who have forgotten the nature of the rostrum from which they are speaking.

Unfortunately, however, certain speakers have chosen to ignore the objective facts of the situation surrounding Afghanistan and have been distorting the character of the unselfish revolutionary assistance provided by the Soviet Union and other countries friendly to Afghanistan. They have been disregarding the facts, which attest to the broad military intervention against the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan being carried out from the territory of Pakistan by mercenaries armed and trained through channels of the United States Central Intelligence Agency.

Attempts have been made by the representative of Pakistan to hide Pakistan's involvement in the aggression against Afghanistan, although the representative of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan has just made a worthy rebuttal of his remarks.

Anyone can see that the strong language and raised voice of the representative of Canada cannot legitimize his arguments. A lie repeated dozens of times remains a slanderous lie nevertheless. Aggression and intervention cannot be covered up by fabrications. The representative of Canada attempted to cast aspersions on the position of the Soviet Union on questions under discussion at the United Nations. But that endeavour was in vain, for everyone knows perfectly well that it is the Soviet Union which initiated discussion in the United Nations of questions concerning the struggle against the nuclear threat, the curbing and limitation of the arms race, particularly the nuclear arms race, the prevention of an arms race in outer space, and other exceedingly important problems of concern to all of mankind.

(Mr. Safronchuk, USSR)

It is well known too that the Soviet Union has always supported and continues to support people fighting to throw off the imperialist yoke and foreign occupation and struggling to attain freedom and independence. The representative of Canada will never succeed in adulterating the essence and substance of the Soviet position or in casting aspersions on our position, which is well known to all.

Mr. R. M. KHAN (Pakistan): Two lies do not make a truth, nor can many lies serve to obscure truth.

The representative of Kabul tried to reinforce one canard with another. That is all I have to say about the repetition of the familiar allegations we heard from him. The falsehood of those assertions has already been exposed by many speakers who have participated in this debate, and who have scrutinized the facts in the light of the circumstances under which foreign troops intervened in Afghanistan in December 1979, the reaction of the Afghan people inside and outside their country, the magnitude of the suffering inflicted upon them by the Soviet intervention, and the reaction of the international community.

(Mr. R. M. Khan, Pakistan)

The Kabul representative made a reference to April 1978. Let me add a word about the turmoil that shook Afghanistan at that time and has shaken it since then. Let me also say that no one has accused Pakistan of those upheavals which the country experienced in the form of successive assassinations of three presidents: the execution of President Daoud in a coup, the assassination of President Taraki, and the murder of President Hafizullah Amin. All those shocking events had nothing to do with Pakistan: the first two were the result of an internecine conflict manipulated by an outside hand, and the last was a direct consequence of the Soviet military intervention in December 1979.

If the charge of interference and the claim that the Soviets entered Afghanistan on invitation were true, may I ask why not a single Afghan has been found among the millions living abroad who welcomed the Soviets in his country? The Afghan expatriates remain as vigorously opposed to the presence of those interventionist forces as their fellow countrymen within Afghanistan.

It is also a fact that, despite repeated charges of interference from Pakistan, not a single Pakistani soldier has ever been found on Afghanistan's soil. Which foreign troops are in Afghanistan? They are more than 120,000 Soviet troops who are fighting the Afghans.

If I were to quote the Western press - and the Kabul representative has been quoting it very often - it would be to give one example which would also reveal some truth for others who have spoken in exercise of the right of reply. I have here an item that appeared in The Philadelphia Inquirer of 15 May 1985 in which the following is stated:

"Soviet forces supported by tanks and armoured personnel carriers attacked 12 villages whose inhabitants were suspected of aiding Islamic guerrillas fighting the country's communist Government and the Soviet forces supporting it.

(Mr. R. M. Khan, Pakistan)

"Soviet troops surrounded the villages and gunned down civilians who tried to flee as the soldiers and tanks moved in, setting fire to houses, looting and smashing property ...

"More than 100 people were killed in each of the villages of Kas Aziz Khan, Charbagh, Bala Bagh, Sabzabad, Mandrawer, Haide Khan, Pul-i-joghi and other unidentified communities ..."

That is only one quotation about the situation inside Afghanistan and what the intervention is doing to ravage that land.

The PRESIDENT: I am sorry that I have to interrupt the representative of Pakistan but the five-minute period is up. May I ask him to be good enough and conclude his statement.

Mr. R. M. KHAN (Pakistan): The Soviet representative has spoken about "objectivity". If objective assessment of a political situation exists anywhere, it is to be found in the decision of the General Assembly, which represents the universality of the conscience of the international community. The tragedy of Afghanistan can be brought to an end only by heeding the call of this international body.

Mr. YU Mengjia (China) (interpretation from Chinese): At yesterday's and today's meetings many representatives in their statements have clearly shown the true facts about the Afghanistan situation. No matter how much the representative of the Kabul régime wants to lie and cast aspersions, he cannot cover up the fact that the suffering results from the foreign invasion of Afghanistan and the sabotage of peace and security in South-West Asia and throughout the rest of the world. Therefore the falsehoods of the Kabul representative are not worthy of refutation.

However, there is one point that I want to raise. Just now the representative from Kabul said - and he wants us to believe - that the Chinese leaders wish to tie

(Mr. Yu Mengjia, China)

down the Soviet troops in Afghanistan. That is completely false. The Chinese leadership has always stood for the withdrawal of foreign troops from Afghanistan. We think that is the crux of the problem. As soon as the Soviet troops are withdrawn from Afghanistan the situation there will return to normal. Therefore, if there are those who want to tie down the Soviet troops in Afghanistan they are not the Chinese. The foreign troops want to stay in Afghanistan voluntarily.

Mr. ZARIF (Afghanistan): I shall continue from where I left off.

The Government's policy of protecting the religious beliefs and traditions of the people is probably the most democratic and sympathetic compared to any of those Islamic countries where Islam is supposed to be the official ideology of the Government.

Creation of the Council of Scholars, establishment of the Ministry of Religious Affairs, expenditure of thousands of millions of afghanis on the construction and repair of mosques and holy places, financial support for priests and religious leaders, subsidization of pilgrimage costs and others are undeniable examples of the policy of the Government in this regard. But Pakistan's self-styled guardians of Islam and their United States and Chinese sympathizers who wish to introduce their own version of Islam have no right to teach us how to be good Muslims. After all, it was Afghanistan which, for better or worse, imposed Islam on the conquered areas of the sub-continent.

It is obvious that Pakistan wishes to use the process of negotiations with Afghanistan as a cover for the continuation of its aggressive policies.

(Mr. Zarif, Afghanistan)

Afghanistan and Pakistan have assumed a moral commitment to preserve the confidentiality of the negotiations. The General Assembly has been a witness of repeated violations by the Pakistan delegation of that moral obligation in the past few years.

Our strict adherence to the gentlemen's agreement should in no way be construed as reluctance to have not only the notes for the record and the texts of the understandings released to the public but also the minutes of all rounds of negotiations, should such a step prove necessary.

What Pakistan tries to portray as a new stand by Afghanistan on direct negotiations has been a consistent and principled position of my Government before and during the course of direct and proximity negotiations.

(Mr. Zarif, Afghanistan)

The reality is that bringing the parties to the negotiating table was and still is the main purpose and basic objective of the mission launched by the Secretary-General. We refer representatives to the verbatim records of all the previous Assembly debates on this item, since 1980, in which we have repeatedly pointed to the overriding necessity of starting direct bilateral negotiations. Faced with the stubborn and intransigent refusal of Pakistan to negotiate directly, we agreed that the Representative of the Secretary-General be used as an intermediary, in order to pave the way for an early start of direct negotiations. Adopting a constructive and flexible approach, we ensured the achievement of a measureable degree of progress in the preparation of the drafts of the required instruments for direct negotiations. It will be in the course of direct negotiations that we shall not only finalize the drafting of the first three instruments but also start the discussion and drafting of the fourth instrument.

Also in regard to the order of priorities, Pakistan, trying - in vain - to put the cart before the horse, finally had to bow to reason and accept the discussion of non-interference and non-intervention, which it should have done in the first place.

We wish to state before this body that Afghanistan does not see any advantage, acceptance or legitimacy to be gained from negotiations with a corrupt, dictatorial and unpopular régime. We said yesterday, and we repeat today, that our people - and only our people - constitute the source of our legitimacy. Soliciting acceptance from régimes that have been rejected by the people of their own countries is not a habit of the Afghan people.

We once again call on Pakistan to take into consideration the supreme interest of their people and the interest of the peoples of the entire region and abandon once and for all the policy of serving as a pawn in the hands of imperialism and hegemonism. We call on Pakistan to start direct negotiations on the basis of the

(Mr. Zarif, Afghanistan)

principles of sovereign equality, peaceful coexistence, non-interference and non-intervention in internal affairs, respect for national sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence, and peaceful settlement of disputes.

In his second statement in exercise of the right of reply, the representative of the Islamabad régime stated that no Government of Afghanistan had extended an invitation to the troops. That is a lie, a sheer lie. As a matter of fact, his President, who used to be the Chief Marshal/Administrator of Pakistan, extended that invitation to us in July 1979, when a delegation of Afghanistan visited his capital. That Afghanistan is not allowing foreign journalists -

The PRESIDENT: I am sorry to have to interrupt the representative of Afghanistan, but the five minutes allowed for the second statement in exercise of the right of reply are up. I would therefore ask him to be kind enough to conclude his statement.

Mr. ZARIF (Afghanistan): We do allow journalists, but of course not those who are disciples of imperialism and the reactionary régime of Pakistan.

As for the understanding reached with regard to negotiating the fourth instrument during the direct negotiations, the records are there. We would also call the attention of the Assembly, and particularly the delegation of Pakistan, to a statement made by the Foreign Minister of Pakistan on his arrival at Islamabad airport from the Geneva negotiations. In that statement he unequivocally said that such an understanding did exist.

Mr. LEWIS (Canada): The direction of this brief statement in exercise of my right of reply will be obvious. There are three things I wish to say.

First, when the representative of the Soviet Union refers to objective facts, he mangles the use of language as all of us understand it in this Assembly. The phrase "unselfish revolutionary assistance" is actually, as we all know, the

(Mr. Lewis, Canada)

premeditated military decimation of a nation. If I may be allowed to paraphrase from Shakespeare's "Macbeth", all the perfumes of Araby will not wash the blood from those hands.

Secondly, the Soviet representative is right when he says that a lie repeated dozens of times does not make a truth. That is indeed correct. Repeated assertions that the Kabul régime was freely installed and is freely representative does not make it true. Repeated assertions that Soviet motives are blameless does not make it true. Repeated assertions that the Afghan people's resistance is an exercise in terrorism does not make it true. The truth in the Soviet position is impossible to divine.

Thirdly, that makes the entire Soviet self-defence palpably hollow, and it is not retrieved by a diversion to questions of the Soviet stand on nuclear war. There is no exoneration about Afghanistan to be found in a diversion to another subject. The hypocrisy in the Soviet position on Afghanistan stands unanswered. The Soviet policy in Afghanistan violates every standard of civilized international behaviour and the principles of the Charter. If that causes Canada to speak with some vigour, we make no apology for it.

Mr. SAFRONCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The representative of Canada, in the statement he has just made, has yet again confirmed that he does not wish to heed the voice of reason and that he continues to ignore the real facts.

The Soviet Union, as I said, provides unselfish internationalist - not revolutionary - assistance to the people of Afghanistan, as it does to the peoples of other nations that are the victims of imperialist aggression and foreign interference. That certainly cannot be said about the policy of Canada, which shows solidarity with the racist régime of South Africa and strong trade links

(Mr. Safronchuk, USSR)

through hundreds of millions of dollars of capital investment in that country, and which opposes the adoption of real, effective sanctions against the racist Pretoria régime, and against Israel, which occupies Arab territories.

So it is not for the representative of Canada to lecture the Soviet Union about how to behave in respect of the defence of the sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence of peoples.

Mr. LEWIS (Canada): I gather that this must be my final statement in exercise of the right of reply, and I shall again be brief.

I shall respond with dismissive dispatch to the proposition that Canada shows solidarity with the racist régime of South Africa. That is preposterous nonsense. But, of course, it is again the device of diversion. All of us have learned in this Assembly that when countries attempt to divert debate, it reflects a profoundly weak cause.

The Soviet representative asks us to heed the voice of reason. The delegation of Canada is happy to heed the voice of reason. The voice of reason lies in the draft resolution before the Assembly, which I hope will be adopted by an overwhelming majority tomorrow. And if by some miraculous conversion the Soviet Union subscribes to the dictates of that resolution and follows the counsel that it has proposed the rest of us follow, then it too will have abandoned a menacing and destructive irrationality, in favour of more thoughtful and useful international behaviour. But Canada, frankly, does not expect it.

The meeting rose at 8 p.m.