CHAPTER VII

QUEST FOR REGIONAL PEACE - ROLE OF U.N. AND OTHER INTERNATIONAL AGENCIES

This chapter endeavours to present an indepth assessment of the initiatives undertaken by the United Nations, NAM Conferences, Organization of Islamic Community and the European Economic Community (EEC) with a view to maintain peace and security in South-west Asia which has been threatened in the wake of Soviet armed intervention in Afghanistan in December 1979 and the continued presence of Soviet forces in that country.

Initiatives by the United Nations

Maintenance of international peace and security is the main purpose of the United Nations. Article 1(1) of the Charter of the United Nations envisages the purpose of the UN:

To maintain international peace and security, and to that end: to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of the international disputes or situations which might lead to breach of peace. (1)

Thus when one member state is invaded by another, the United Nations is called upon to act accordingly by invoking the provisions of its charter. Similarly in the case of Soviet armed intervention in Afghanistan on 27th December 1979, the world body was urged by other member countries to take measures for Soviet withdrawal and help maintain peace and security in the region.

On 31st December 1979, the representative of China in UN in a letter to the UN Secretary-General charged that the Soviet Union had invaded Afghanistan on the pretence that it was fulfilling treaty obligations at the request of the Afghan Government. The latter further called for the cessation of Soviet aggression and intervention and withdrawal of the Soviet armed forces from Afghanistan. Subsequently, on 3rd January 1980, 52 member countries, the majority of whom were nonaligned countries, requested the president of the UN Security Council to convene an urgent meeting to consider the situation in Afghanistan and its implications for international peace and security.
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In response to this request the Security Council held six meetings between 5th and 9th of January 1980. While the 52-nations' agenda was being deliberated by the Security Council, the representative of the Soviet Union objected to the Security Council's consideration of the "so-called question of the situation in Afghanistan" because it amounted to intervention by the United Nations in the affairs of Afghanistan. The representative of Afghanistan while participating in the deliberations also objected to the Security Council's discussion on situation in Afghanistan and further added that the Soviet decision to send a limited military contingent to Afghanistan was taken in response to those requests and based on provisions of mutual treaty obligations of December 1978.

Besides the five permanent and ten non-permanent members of the Security Council, 32 other member states of UN also participated in the deliberations of the Security Council on the situation in Afghanistan. Bangladesh, China, Norway, Portugal, the United Kingdom and the United States in their statements made it clear that
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their acceptance of Afghanistan's participation in the deliberations of the Security Council should not be taken as a recognition of or support for the new regime in that country.

The Afghan Foreign Minister, while participating in the deliberations, reiterated his country's earlier stand of objecting to the Security Council's discussion on the situation in Afghanistan. The representative of the alleged Soviet Union alleged that since April 1978, the United States and certain other Western countries along with China had been intervening in Afghanistan's internal affairs, thus fomenting counter-revolution. The Soviet representative further added that once the outside interference stopped, Moscow would withdraw its forces from Afghanistan.

On 7 January 1980, a six-power draft resolution was presented before the Security Council. The draft resolution called upon the Security Council to reaffirm its conviction that the preservation of the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of

10. This draft resolution was sponsored by Bangladesh, Jamaica, the Niger, the Philippines, Tunisia and Zambia.
every state was a fundamental principle of the UN Charter. The draft resolution further deplored the "armed intervention" in Afghanistan. The six-power draft resolution was put to vote on 7 January 1980. It received 13 votes in favour to two against.\textsuperscript{12} Because of the Soviet veto, the draft resolution could not be adopted.

On 9 January 1980, Moscow and Manila moved a procedural draft resolution to be considered by the Security Council. When it was put to vote, the draft received 12 votes in favour, two against, with one abstention. It was adopted as resolution 462 (1980) by the Security Council.\textsuperscript{13} The resolution that the Security Council having taken into consideration the lack of unanimity of its permanent members, which had prevented it from exercising its primary responsibility, had thus decided to call an emergency special session of the General Assembly to examine the situation in Afghanistan and its implications for international peace and security.\textsuperscript{14}

\begin{enumerate}
\item[12.] UN Doc. S/13729, 7 January 1980.
\item[12.] German Democratic Republic (GDR) and Soviet Union voted against the draft resolution.
\item[14.] Ibid. UN Doc. A/ES-6/3, 10 January 1980.
\end{enumerate}
Consequently the question of situation in Afghanistan and its implications for international peace and security came up before the sixth emergency special session of the General Assembly, which deliberated from 10 to 14 January 1980. While participating in the discussions on the first day, the Afghan Foreign Minister told the General Assembly on 10 January 1980, that the holding of the emergency special session of the General Assembly was based on a misconception of developments in Afghanistan. He further emphasized that the developments including the deployment of a limited number of Soviet troops, were entirely domestic and bilateral issues which did not constitute any threat to peace and security in the area or the world at large.

The Soviet representative told the General Assembly that when Moscow sent its troops to Afghanistan, the very survival of the April 1978 revolution in Kabul was hanging in the balance. He further added that the Soviet military assistance to Kabul regime was compatible with the right of individual and collective self-defence as enshrined in the UN Charter.

17. Ibid.
Pakistan being a geographically contiguous country to Afghanistan where thousands of Afghans had taken shelter as refugees in early part of January 1980 was affected by the developments in Afghanistan. The Pakistan's representative told the General Assembly that no evidence had been presented to substantiate allegations of foreign interference in or around armed attack against Afghanistan. 18

The United States which had been blamed by the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan (DRA) and the Soviet Union for interfering in the internal affairs of Afghanistan and fomenting trouble on the Pak-Afghan border, denied these charges. The US representative told the General Assembly that in the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, there was no cold war squabble and called upon the UN not to remain silent in the face of open aggression "since this would be a violation of the only principle that small nations could invoke to protect themselves from the more powerful states." 19

On 14 January 1980, Pakistan on behalf of 24 countries, introduced a draft resolution, 20 which was
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adopted by the UN General Assembly as resolution ES-6/2 by a recorded vote of 104 to 18 with 18 abstentions. The resolution inter alia called for the immediate unconditional and total withdrawal of the foreign troops from Afghanistan, in order to enable its people to determine their own form of government. It also urged all parties concerned to assist in bringing about speedily, and in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter, conditions essential for the voluntary return of the Afghan refugees to their homes.

Keeping in view the serious implications for international peace and security arising out of the continued presence of the foreign armed forces in Afghanistan, the 32 countries in a joint letter on 16 July 1980, urged the General Assembly to include in its provisional agenda of the thirty-fifth session, an item entitled, "The situation in Afghanistan and its implication for international peace and security." 22

Afghanistan opposed the inclusion in the agenda of the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly, the item "Situation in Afghanistan and its implications for international peace and security". The Afghan

22. Ibid., p. 1.
representative Zarif, while addressing the General Assembly on 19 September 1980 called such a step as "unwarranted, unfounded and unjustified, and runs counter to the basic principles of the United Nations Charter". The Afghan representative further said that there was no threat to regional or world peace and security emanating from the events in Afghanistan: "on the contrary it is Afghanistan that is being subjected to armed aggression and other forms of interference from abroad". He further expressed the view that as soon as "acts of aggression from outside and other forms of interference" into the internal affairs of Afghanistan were terminated and their non-intervention was guaranteed, the limited Soviet military contingent would withdraw from Afghanistan.

The Soviet representative, Troyanovsky, while addressing the General Assembly on 19 September 1980, said that his country was "profoundly opposed" to the inclusion of the item on situation in Afghanistan on the agenda of the General Assembly. He further added

24. Ibid., p. 17.
25. Ibid., pp. 18-20.
that the raising of such an issue served "the interests of imperialist and hegemonistic forces which are attempting to use this inflated propagandistic and slanderous campaign against Afghanistan in order to perpetuate their own counter-revolutionary aggression," 27 against Afghanistan.

However, the Malaysian representative, Zainal, while addressing the General Assembly, on 19 September 1980, supported the move to include the item on situation in Afghanistan” on the agenda of the General Assembly for the following six reasons:

(i) Soviet military action in Afghanistan is an outright invasion - an intervention and interference by a super power in the internal affairs of a non-aligned country. Thus, the world community must give serious attention to the obvious violation of an important tenet of its charter;

(ii) This invasion has aroused great concern in the world community;

(iii) This particular intervention by foreign forces in Afghanistan has caused serious instability in the area and in fact threatened peace and security;

(iv) The influx of Afghan refugees into Pakistan and Iran has caused considerable dislocation in these countries and has become a major concern for the UN;

27. Ibid., pp. 23-25.
(v) Intrusion of foreign forces into Afghanistan has resulted in increasing tension in the world community;

(vi) The Special session of the General Assembly has adopted specific resolutions calling for the withdrawal of those foreign forces but those resolutions have not so far been complied with. (28)

In view of the above mentioned reasons, the Malaysian representative urged that the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly should deliberate on the situation in Afghanistan and its implications for international peace and security.

The Chinese representative Ling Qing, while speaking in the General Assembly on the issue of situation in Afghanistan said on 19 September 1980, that the Soviet Union had invaded Afghanistan and "at this very moment the Soviet occupation forces are continuing their savage and brutal massacre of the .... Afghan people." (29) While referring to the resolution adopted by the General Assembly in January 1980, which called for the immediate, unconditional and total withdrawal


29. Ibid., pp. 28-30.
of Soviet troops from Afghanistan, the Chinese representative said: "However, the Soviet Union has not only refused to pull out its troops from Afghanistan but continued to escalate its war of aggression against Afghanistan, in an attempt to turn Afghanistan into a springboard and an outpost for aggression and expansion in South Asia and in Gulf region by the Soviet Union." 30 China urged the General Assembly to include the item on its agenda of the thirty-fifth session.

The Pakistan delegate, Naik, while referring to the earlier resolution adopted by the General Assembly in January 1980 and its non-compliance by the Soviet Union said: "The situation within Afghanistan continues to deteriorate thus posing a serious threat not only to regional stability but to international peace and security". 31 Pakistan also urged the General Assembly to adopt the item on its agenda.

Consequently, the General Assembly adopted the item entitled "situation in Afghanistan and its implications for international peace and security" as item 116 on its agenda for the thirty-fifth session. 32
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The Afghan Foreign Minister, Mohammad Dost, while addressing the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly, on 25 September 1980, said that the resistance and counter-revolution against the Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan was being supported by the US Imperialist, Chinese hegemonists and some reactionary Islamic regimes. He further said that the hostile activities against the DRA were being launched from the territories of Pakistan and Iran. In this regard the Afghan Foreign Minister referred to the elaborate programme put forward by Kabul on 14 May 1980 for the political settlement of the situation obtaining in Afghanistan. This programme envisaged a guarantee for complete termination and non-resumption of all acts of armed aggression against Afghanistan so that negotiations on political settlement and normalization of relations with Pakistan and Iran could be held on the basis of strict respect for the sovereignty and sovereign rights of the DRA.

On 20 November 1980, the General Assembly, adopted a resolution with 111 in favour, 22 against and 12

34. Ibid., p. 56.
abstentions. 35 This resolution reiterated the spirit of earlier resolution passed by the General Assembly on 14 January 1980. The only difference was that the second resolution was milder in its criticism because it used the phrase "grave concern" instead of "strongly deplores" as was the case with the first resolution on the presence of foreign troops in Afghanistan.

During 1981, the General Assembly, remained seized of the issue of situation in Afghanistan, on 19 January 1981, the Afghan representative to the General Assembly, transmitted a 17 January statement by its government reporting earlier offers of amnesty and guarantees to Afghan who had left the country and were willing to return to Afghanistan. 36

The then Secretary-General of the United Nations, Kurt Waldheim, appointed, on 11 February 1981, Javier Perez de Cuellar, his Special Representative, to explore the possibilities of negotiations over political settlement of Afghan crisis in pursuance of the resolution


passed by the General Assembly, on 14 January 1980.

In view of the fact that the Special Representative of the UN Secretary-General had been entrusted the task of finding means to get negotiations on Afghanistan initiated, the Government of DRA, transmitted to the Secretary-General a statement, on 26 August 1981, which contained the views of the Afghan Government on the political settlement of the Afghan crisis.

The statement mentioned that the main objective of the DRA was to secure complete and reliable cessation of armed and any other intervention in Afghan affairs and to create conditions that would make further interference impossible. 37 It further envisaged that an international guarantee should be provided by the Soviet Union, the United States and others with cessation and guaranteed non-recurrence of armed intervention and any other interference in the domestic affairs of Afghanistan. 38 The statement finally reiterated the willingness of the Afghan government to initiate negotiations in this regard with Iran and Pakistan either bilaterally or trilaterally. 39
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The UN Secretary-General submitted his report to the General Assembly on 6 November 1981 on the situation in Afghanistan which noted that the Special Representative of the Secretary-General had visited thrice, Islamabad and Kabul in April and August 1981 and held discussions with the senior officials of these countries. The report further added that an understanding had been reached in August 1981 on the substantive issues to be negotiated. The Secretary-General in his report expressed the hope that the approach adopted could facilitate the search for an amicable political solution which would ensure that Afghan people would be able to decide their own destiny free from foreign intervention and interference.

The thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly deliberated on the situation in Afghanistan. The Japanese representative to the General Assembly, Sonoda, told the Assembly on 23 September 1981 that the Soviet military occupation of Afghanistan was an undisguised challenge to international justice and to the UN Charter. Japan urged Moscow to "heed the repeated calls of the inter-
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national community and immediately withdraw its troops from Afghanistan and respect the Afghan people's right of self-determination". The Foreign Minister, Mohammad Dost, while addressing the General Assembly on 23 September 1981, reiterated his Government's determination to hold direct talks with Pakistan and Iran and called upon these countries to get down to the negotiating table without further delay.

On 16 November 1981, Pakistan's delegate, Nawaz told the General Assembly that the massive induction of Soviet armed forces into Afghanistan "was and continues to be a grave issue in which the international community has a profound stake..." Pakistan on behalf of 45 countries introduced a draft resolution in the General Assembly the same day which aimed at facilitating the process of initiating a dialogue for the peaceful settlement of the Afghanistan crisis. The operative part of the draft resolution was consistent with that of the previous relevant General Assembly resolution.

43. Ibid.
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The draft resolution *inter alia* called for:

- the immediate withdrawal of the foreign troops from Afghanistan;
- preservation of the sovereignty, territorial integrity, political independence and non-aligned character of Afghanistan;
- 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; the creation of necessary conditions which would enable the Afghan refugees to return voluntarily to their homes in safety and honour. \(^{(47)}\)

In his concluding remarks the Pakistan delegate expressed the hope that the draft resolution would receive the full support of the General Assembly.

However, the Afghan representative Zarif, while addressing the General Assembly on 16 November 1981 expressed his country's "profound dissatisfaction and regret" on the debate on "so-called Afghan question" which was imposed on the General Assembly. \(^{(48)}\) He further added that the debate was "unwarranted and unjustified and that it runs counter to the basic principles of the United Nations and has nothing to do with the real efforts aimed at resolving the outstanding problems of our region". \(^{(49)}\) While opposing the draft resolution, the


\(^{(48)}\) Ibid., p. 16.
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Afghan representative said: "There is no doubt that the adoption by this General Assembly of any resolution hostile to Afghanistan would only impede progress on the way to a political settlement". 50

The Soviet representative Troyanovsky, while participating in the debate, told the General Assembly on 16 November 1981, that his country strongly opposed the draft resolution. "If the United Nations finds itself dragged into a fruitless and harmful discussion of the so-called Afghan question, this looked at objectively would only play into the hands of those who wish to wreck a political settlement and preserve tension in South West Asia to serve their own imperialist and hegemonist interests." 51

India's representative to the United Nations, R.D. Sathe, the then Foreign Secretary of India, while addressing the General Assembly on 19 November 1981, expressed grave concern over the developments in Afghanistan. He further added that intervention and interference in the internal affairs of Afghanistan had not ceased and "withdrawal of foreign troops remains to be accomplished and other outside powers are using the situation to

50. Ibid., p. 42.
51. Ibid., p. 66.
draw the nations of the region into larger strategic arrangements which could call seriously into question the commitment of those nations to the policy of non-alignment. 52

While expressing India's concern over the induction of sophisticated arms into Pakistan on the pretext of Afghan situation, R.D. Sathe further said "while the problems posed by the situation within Afghanistan were themselves causing concern, the adoption of front-line postures and the induction of sophisticated arms could only prove detrimental to any confidence building between states..."53 The Indian representative said that the adoption of yet another draft resolution unacceptable to some of the countries directly involved would only be counter-productive.

Participating in the debate, in the General Assembly on 19 November 1981, Pakistan's representative, Naik while objecting to India's charges of Pakistan adopting a front-line posture and induction of sophisticated arms into that country, said that Pakistan was a front-line state in the sense that, following the Soviet

53. Ibid., p. 7.
military intervention in Afghanistan and the eruption of a national resistance against Kabul regime, Pakistan had become the victim of circumstances.\textsuperscript{54} While denying the induction of sophisticated weapons into Pakistan, Nair said: "In the course of the next five years Pakistan intends to purchase a limited quantity of modern equipment from the United States.... This will in no circumstances disturb the four to five times superiority that India already enjoys over Pakistan."\textsuperscript{55}

The US representative, Mrs. Jean Kirkpatrick told the General Assembly on 20 November 1981 that the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan had a shattering effect upon the prospects for the continued stability of South Asia and the Persian Gulf, "deepening anxieties throughout the vital region and raising the spectre of a wider conflict".\textsuperscript{56} While supporting the 45-power draft resolution, the US representative said "it is only fitting, therefore, that the United Nations should affirm the basic and most cherished purpose of the Afghan nation, which is to regain its ancient homeland and so that it

\textsuperscript{54} Ibid., p. 116.

\textsuperscript{55}

\textsuperscript{56} UN Doc. A/36/PV.62, 20 November 1981, p. 15.
may once again be independent and live at peace."

After the discussions, the 45-power draft resolution was put to vote on 20 November 1981 and was adopted by the overwhelming majority in the General Assembly by 116 votes to 23 with 12 abstentions as resolution 36/34(58).

The Credentials Committee set up by the General Assembly held its meetings during September and December 1981. The US representative while addressing the Credentials Committee said that the fact that the United States had not raised any objection to the Afghan credentials did not imply acceptance of that country's regime nor acquiescence in the installation of Soviet-directed authorities as a result of the USSR military occupation of Afghanistan. However, the Soviet Union contested the US argument. The Soviet representative told the Credentials Committee that the Afghan Government had been established as a result of

57. Ibid., p. 22.
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60. UN Doc. A/36/517/Add. I, December 1981.
a popular revolution, and casting doubts on its legitimacy was tantamount to denying the right of peoples to self-determination and was interference in the internal affairs of a sovereign state.62

In 1982, the question of situation in Afghanistan was again taken up in the General Assembly where the concerned countries - Pakistan, Afghanistan, Soviet Union and others reiterated their respective positions. On 29 November 1982, the General Assembly adopted a resolution on Afghanistan by 114 in favour, 21 against and 13 abstentions. The resolution inter alia said that it:

(i) Reiterates that the preservation of the sovereignty, territorial integrity, political independence and non-aligned character of Afghanistan is essential for a peaceful solution of the problem;

(ii) Reaffirms the right of Afghan people to determine their own forms of government and to choose their economic, political and social system free from outside intervention, subversion, coercion or constraint of any kind whatsoever;

(iii) calls for the immediate withdrawal of foreign troops from Afghanistan. (63)

62. Ibid.
The thirty-eighth session of the General Assembly held in November 1983, was again occupied with the question of situation in Afghanistan. While addressing the General Assembly on 25 November 1983, the representative of the United Kingdom, Sir John Thomaon, said that the General Assembly was debating on situation in Afghanistan for the fifth time indicated that "it is a matter which touches the conscience of international community". 64 He urged all the members of the General Assembly to "live upto that responsibility" by supporting draft resolution A/38/L.17 and hoped that the Soviet Union would realize that "its own interests can be served only by a peaceful settlement". 65

The Soviet representative, Troyanovsky, while addressing the General Assembly on 25 November 1983 said that it was futile to bring every time the issue on situation in Afghanistan before the United Nations -

The discussion on this problem for those who have created it artificially and dragged it to the forum of the United Nations, is nothing other than a device for gross and blatant interference in the internal affairs of Afghanistan and a further attempt, through General Assembly, to force upon that sovereign state something that is actually being rejected by its country and people. (66)

65. Ibid., p. 11.
66. Ibid., p. 17.
The Soviet delegate said that his country would vote against the draft resolution "on the so-called situation in Afghanistan... inasmuch as they reflect the intervention of certain states to interfere in the affairs of Afghanistan and to alter the course of events there in their own favour." 67

The US Ambassador to the United Nations, Mrs. Jean Kirkpatrick, while participating in the debate on draft resolution on Afghanistan told the General Assembly on 25 November 1983 that the continuing war conducted by the Soviet Union against the people of Afghanistan "poses a challenge to the ability of the United Nations effectively to defend the bedrock Charter principle prohibiting aggression against the territorial integrity and political independence of the member states." 68 The US Ambassador further added that her government believed that the draft resolution outlined a fair and comprehensive solution to the situation in Afghanistan. 69

India's representative to the United Nations General Assembly, Ramachandran told the General Assembly

67. Ibid., p. 23.
68. Ibid., p. 46.
69. Ibid., p. 53.
on 26 November 1983 that the "situation ritualistic declarations over the years have not really brought us any nearer to a solution". While commenting on the draft resolution being debated by the General Assembly, the Indian representative further added that it could prove counter-productive unless it contributed to a greater understanding of the complexity of the problem and encourages the parties concerned to avoid further aggravation of the situation, or its exploitation for ulterior motives. The Indian representative further added that India's concern over the development affecting Afghanistan and the region as a whole "originates from the fact that our security and national interests are vitally affected by developments that impinge on the security of our neighbours in the subcontinent."

While commenting on the draft resolution, the Indian representative said: "Much to our disappointment this draft resolution is more or less along earlier lines.... My delegation would not be in a position to support the present draft."

71. Ibid.
73. Ibid., p. 17.
After the deliberations the draft resolution was adopted by the General Assembly as resolution 39/13 by 116 in favour, 20 against with 13 abstentions.

During 1985, the question of situation in Afghanistan was again brought before the fortieth session of the General Assembly. Pakistan's representative to the UN, Sahibjada Yaqub Khan introduced a draft resolution, On the situation in Afghanistan on 12 November 1985 on behalf of 46 countries. Pakistan's representative said that the adverse consequences of the Afghan problem bear directly on the security environment and stability of the countries of South West Asia and having grave global ramifications. The 46-power draft resolution did not include any new point and was the reiteration of earlier resolutions adopted by the General Assembly.

Pakistan's representative further said that the draft resolution reflected a constructive approach by emphasising the imperative need for a just political settlement of the problem rather than engaging in "sterile polemics". While concluding his speech, the Pakistani

75. UN Doc. A/40/PV.71, 12 November 1985, p.6
76. Ibid., p. 16.
representative hoped that the support by the members of the General Assembly to the draft resolution would reflect that the moral authority "reflected in the overwhelming support by the draft resolution will promote the early realization of a just political settlement, based on the withdrawal of foreign forces from Afghanistan and will enable the heroic Afghan people to be once again the masters of their own destiny." 77

The Afghan representative, Zarif, while expressing his country's views on the 46-power draft resolution in the General Assembly on 12 November 1985 said that General Assembly was dragged into the debate on situation in Afghanistan for the last six years which was "unwarranted, unjustified and illegal exercise". 78 He further added that the United States, China and Pakistan were disinterested in the solution or any settlement of the prevalent situation in South West Asia. 79 While conveying his country's categorical and vehement rejection of the draft resolution the Afghan representative said: "If adopted the resolution will be totally void of any moral or

77. Ibid., pp. 19-20.
78. Ibid., p. 21.
79. Ibid., p. 49.
legal validity and therefore without any effect on the Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan. 80

Participating in the debate over the draft resolution in Afghanistan, the representative of India, told the General Assembly on 12 November 1985 that India was deeply concerned over the developments in Afghanistan: "Our concern over the developments affecting Afghanistan and the region as a whole originates from the fact that our own security and national interests are vitally affected by developments that impinge on the security of our neighbours in the subcontinent." 81 India expressed its disappointment over the draft resolution being "along the lines of the one adopted last year (1984)" 82 and asserted that it could not support the draft resolution. 83

Expressing the views on the draft resolution on Afghanistan, the Chinese delegate Li Luye told the General Assembly on 12 November 1985 that "since the invasion and occupation of Afghanistan by foreign troops, peace in that part of Asia has been undermined and the security of China also come under threat." 84 The Chinese

---
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delegate further said that his country was in favour of the draft resolution and "calls on all other countries to give it their support." 85

On 13 November 1985, the Afghan delegate, Zarf, told the General Assembly that draft resolution on Afghanistan constituted a gross violation of the UN Charter and "outright flagrant interference in the internal affairs of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan". 86 The Afghan delegate reiterated that his country strongly rejected the draft resolution and would vote against it. 87

Consequently the 46-power draft resolution was adopted by 122 votes to 19 with 12 abstentions as resolution 40/12 by the General Assembly on 13 November 1985. 88 The similar pattern was repeated in November 1986 when the General Assembly adopted a resolution of Afghanistan by 122 votes in favour, 19 against with 14 abstentions. 89

85. Ibid., p. 107
86. UN Doc. A/40/PV.74, 13 November 1985, p. 47.
87. Ibid., p. 49.
88. Ibid., p. 52.
89. The UN Weekly Newsletter (New Delhi) 30 November, 1986.
Table 1

Voting Pattern in the General Assembly, 1980-86

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Votes</th>
<th>For</th>
<th>Against</th>
<th>Abstentions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 1980</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 1980</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 1981</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 1982</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 1983</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 1984</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 1985</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 1986</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The above table makes it abundantly clear that when the issue of Soviet intervention in Afghanistan came before the General Assembly in early January 1980, it enlisted the support of 104 members and the members increased with the passage of time reaching up to 122 in November 1986. The number of countries voting...
against the resolution fluctuated between 18 and 23, 18 in January 1980; 23 in 1981 and by 1986 it declined to 19. The majority of countries voting against the resolution belonged to the Soviet bloc.

The above table makes it discernible that the countries abstaining from voting on the resolution on situation in Afghanistan registered a gradual decline. In January 1980, their numbers stood at 18 which declined to 12 in November 1980. However, during the subsequent years it fluctuated between 12 and 14 with 14 in November 1986.

It is evident from the above analysis that majority of the member countries of the United Nations have been opposed to the Soviet intervention in Afghanistan and their line of approach throughout remained more or less same. Main proponents also remained the same, so the absentees and of those who opposed. It further supports the dichotomous situation in the World order, specially in the context of Afghan issue.
Geneva Talks on Afghanistan

The Geneva talks is a part of the UN initiative to solve the Afghan problem. The process of Geneva talks was initiated by the UN Secretary-General, in pursuance of the General Assembly resolution 35/37 of 20 November 1980 which urged the Secretary-General to facilitate negotiations among the parties concerned so as to achieve a political solution. Accordingly, the Secretary-General appointed Javier Perez de Cuellar, his Under-Secretary General for Special Political Affairs, now UN Secretary-General, as his personal representative to hold discussions with concerned governments.

Consequently, the personal representative of the UN Secretary-General visited Pakistan and Afghanistan in April 1981 and discussed with the leaders and officials of the respective governments. The Secretary-General in his report to the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly on 6 November 1981 observed that both Afghanistan and Pakistan emphasized their desire for a peaceful solution and welcomed his representative's visit as a positive step in a diplomatic process that might lead to negotiations.

91. Ibid.
92. Ibid.
that though the discussions of the Special Representative with the Governments in Islamabad and Kabul were inconclusive, yet both sides indicated their desire to pursue them further.

In May 1981, the UN Secretary-General during his visit to the Soviet Union, exchanged the views on situation in Afghanistan with the Soviet leaders. Moscow assured the Secretary-General that the former favoured a political settlement and expressed its support for a continuation of the efforts towards a peaceful resolution of the problem.93

In early August 1981, the Personal Representative of the Secretary-General visited Islamabad and Kabul and held discussions with the leaders and senior officials of both the governments. The Secretary-General in his report to the General Assembly noted that consequent upon his Personal Representative's in Kabul and Islamabad "an understanding was reached on the substantive issue to be negotiated but differences still remained on the question of the format of the future negotiations."94 Both countries also agreed to continue the talks in New York, the UN Headquarters on the occasion of the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly.

93. Ibid., p.2.
94. Ibid.
On 24 August 1981, Kabul issued a statement explaining its position on a number of substantive questions with regard to the format of future negotiations and expressed its readiness to hold bilateral negotiations in case Pakistan and Iran also showed such a desire. In early October 1981, the Secretary-General reported that Afghanistan and Pakistan had agreed to a preparatory discussion through his personal representative on the issues to be negotiated. The permanent representatives of both Kabul and Islamabad were designated as interlocutors to hold discussions with the Secretary General's personal representative. Finally, the Secretary General in his report observed that the steps taken during the course of the recent consultations have shown that the approach adopted can indeed facilitate the search for a fair political solution which will ensure that the Afghan people will be able to determine their own destiny, free from foreign intervention and interference.

In 1982, following the elevation of Javier de Cuellar as the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Diego Cordovez, the UN Under Secretary-General for Special Political Affairs, was appointed as the new
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Personal Representative of the Secretary-General to facilitate negotiations between Afghanistan, Pakistan and other concerned parties on Afghan problem.

Diego Cordovez, the Personal Representative of the UN Secretary-General instead of visiting the respective capitals of the concerned countries, started holding consultations with the interlocutors at Geneva. Thus the first round of "indirect talks" was held at Geneva in 1982. Cordovez held discussions with the interlocutors of Afghanistan and Pakistan. However, Iran refused to take part in the discussions but urged that it should be kept informed about the developments. There was no immediate outcome of the talks which led to its postponement. However, it was agreed that the "proximity talks" veered around four main points:

(i) withdrawal of foreign troops from Afghanistan;
(ii) Non-interference in the internal affairs of States;
(iii) International guarantees of non-interference; and
(iv) voluntary return of the refugees to their homes.

Because of the uncooperative attitudes of both Afghanistan and Pakistan, the Geneva talks could not make any headway until the middle of 1983. The proximity talks held in June 1983 resulted in the preparation of

99. Ibid.
a 23 page draft agreement for the consideration of
concerned parties. Diego Cordoevez claimed that 95
per cent of the agreement was in hand. But there was
no tangible outcome.

Another round of "proximity talks" was held from
29-30 August 1984; the special Representative, Diego
Cordoevez described the talks as a "diplomatic process
initiated by the Secretary General in order to reach a
comprehensive settlement of the situation relating to
Afghanistan". Diego Cordoevez visited Kabul and Islamabad from
3 to 15 April 1984 and held discussions with the
leaders and senior officials of the two countries. The
Secretary-General in his report to the General
Assembly claimed that Cordoevez succeeded "in procuring
agreement on a number of specific steps, both substantive
and procedural, in order to give impetus to the
diplomatic process".

100. Munawar Noorani, "Afghanistan Negotiations:
Implications for the US of an impasse", Journal of South Asian and Middle Eastern Studies


102. Proximity Talks Relating to Afghanistan", UN
Monthly Chronicle (New Delhi), vol. XXI, no. 7

103. UN Doc. A/39/513.
The Secretary-General visited Moscow in July 1984 where he had exchange of views with the Soviet leaders. He observed in his report: "Soviet Government encouraged me to continue my efforts and reaffirmed its support for a negotiated settlement." 104

The "set of understanding" worked out in Kabul and Islamabad in April 1984 became the basis for the August 1984 "proximity talks". The underlying objective of the set of understanding was to attempt to solve within the context of the formulations of the various instruments required for the implementation of the comprehensive settlement of the serious difficulties that had arisen last year. 105 A spokesman for Secretary-General said that the August "proximity" discussions had been technical in nature and the Personal Representative, Cordovez, considered the meeting as an "interim stage but an essential one in the process". 106

While addressing a press conference on 17 September 1984, the Secretary-General said: "We are working on the basis of a package which consists of several points
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on which the parties have already agreed. We think it important that all aspects of the problem be considered as a package; that package character of negotiations is extremely important.". 107

During the August 1984 round of negotiations at Geneva, the question of the form the settlement was carefully considered by the interlocutors who agreed that the provisions concerning non-interference and non-intervention would be included in a bilateral agreement. 108 However, no agreement could be reached on the form of other aspects of the settlement.

During Diego Cordovez's visit to Kabul and Islamabad in May 1985 an understanding was reached that the political settlement should consist of a set of instruments that would include 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 an instrument that would envisage the inter-relationship between the afore-mentioned instruments and the
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solutions of the question of the withdrawal of foreign troops in accordance with agreement to be considered between Afghanistan and the Soviet Union. 109

During the Geneva talks held in June 1985, it had become virtually possible to complete formulations of the two draft agreements between Afghanistan and Pakistan on covering the principles of mutual relations, in particular on non-interference and non-intervention, the other containing all arrangements for the voluntary return of the refugees.

However, the draft regarding the refugees could not be finalized because it required that the satisfaction of the refugees had to be ascertained before finalizing it. 110 During this round of proximity talks the formulation of declaration of international guarantees to be made individually or jointly was also concluded and the text was conveyed to Moscow and Washington, the designated guarantors for their comments.

During the proximity talks held in Geneva on 27-30 August 1985, the Afghan interlocutor, while
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referring to one of the understandings reached at the
inception of the diplomatic process reiterated that
negotiations on the instrument of inter-relationship
should be conducted in the 'direct talks'.\textsuperscript{111} While
Pakistan also invoking the same understanding, argued
that a change in the format of the negotiations was
not "yet justified". Thus there emerged differences
of opinion which resulted in the non-adoption of the
draft instrument on inter-relationship. In the mean-
while, the designated international guarantors - Moscow
and Washington, had sent their comments which were
considered by the respective interlocutors.

The yet another round of proximity talks held
in Geneva in the beginning of August 1986 was adjourned
on 8 August 1986 because of differing attitudes of
Afghanistan and Pakistan on draft instrument of
"inter-relationship".\textsuperscript{112}

Despite the fact that Geneva talks have protracted
over six years yet it is worth mentioning that the UN
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(Bombay), vol. XXI, no. 4, 23 August 1986,
p. 1473.
Secretary-General and his Personal Representative have played commendable role in continuing the diplomatic process which has succeeded in achieving break-through on broad issues and efforts are still on. One can hope that the remaining issues would be resolved soon. It is evident from the above analysis that Geneva talks under the auspices of the UN have succeeded to some extent in untangling the Afghan knot.

**Non-aligned Initiative**

The Nonaligned countries have also expressed their concern over the Afghanistan situation in correspondence with their constant stand at UN Assembly. The Conference of the Foreign Ministers of the Non-aligned countries held in New Delhi, on 9-13 February 1981, viewed with grave concern the situation in South West Asia and agreed that "it carries dangerous consequences for the peace and stability of the region". Viewing the situation in Afghanistan with particular concern, the declaration called for a political settlement on

the basis of withdrawal of foreign troops and full respect for the independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity and nonaligned status of Afghanistan. 114

The Foreign Ministers of the Nonaligned countries affirmed the right of Afghan refugees to return to their home in safety and honour and in this regard called upon all concerned to work towards such a settlement which would ensure that the Afghan people would determine their own destiny free from outside interference and which would enable the Afghan refugees to return to their home. 115 The declaration called on all the states to exercise restraint to avoid further endangering of peace and security of the region and take such steps as would lead to the creation of conditions conducive to stable and harmonious relations among the states of the region. 116

The Ministerial meeting of the Coordinating Bureau of Nonaligned Countries held at Havana, the Cuban capital from 31 May to 5 June 1982, also expressed serious concern over the situation in Afghanistan. The
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final communique issued after the meeting reiterated the call made at New Delhi Ministerial Conference held in February 1981 for a political settlement of Afghan problem. The final declaration extended full support to "the constructive steps taken on this regard by the Secretary-General of the UN and called upon all the states to exercise restraint to avoid further endangering the peace and security of the region. The issue of situation in Afghanistan was also deliberated at the Seventh Summit of the Nonaligned Countries held in New Delhi, from 7-12 March 1983. The final declaration noted with great concern the situation prevalent in South West Asia in the wake of Afghan development. While lauding the efforts undertaken by the Secretary-General to seek a political solution of Afghan problem, the Seventh NAM Summit urged the continuation of such measures "with a view to
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promoting an early political settlement of the problem in conformity with the ideals and principles of the NAM. 120 The other parts of the resolution on Afghanistan were reiteration of the earlier resolutions.

The same stand was reiterated in the final communique issued after the Meeting of the Ministers and the Heads of delegation of the Nonaligned countries to the thirty-ninth Session of the UN General Assembly at New York from 1 to 5 October 1984. 121 Similarly, the Final Declaration issued by the meeting of the Foreign Ministers of the Nonaligned countries held at Luanda from 4 to 7 September 1985 also contained the same resolution on Afghanistan. 122 The Final communique issued by the Meeting of the Ministers and Heads of delegation of the Nonaligned countries to the fortieth session of the UN General Assembly, held at New York on 10 October 1985 had also reiterated the same resolution. 123 The Ministerial Meeting of the NAM Coordinating Bureau held in New Delhi in April 1986 also reaffirmed the earlier stand. 124
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Initiatives of the Organization of Islamic Conference

In the wake of Soviet intervention in Afghanistan the Organization of Islamic Conference (OIC) has expressed its grave concern about the developments in Afghanistan. In its first extraordinary session held in Islamabad, Pakistan, from 27-29 January 1980 the Foreign Ministers of the Islamic countries, unanimously adopted a resolution 1/EOs, which inter alia noted that "the Soviet occupation of Afghanistan constituted a violation of its independence, and aggression against the liberty of its people and a flagrant violation of all international covenants and norms, as well as a serious threat to peace and security in the region throughout the world." While condemning the Soviet military aggression against Afghanistan, the resolution denounced and deplored it as a flagrant violation of international laws, norms of the Charter of the UN and the Charter of the Organization of the Islamic Conference. It called upon all peoples and Governments throughout the world to "persist in condemning this aggression and denounced it as an aggression against
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Human Rights and a violation of the freedom of the people which cannot be ignored."127 Apart from calling for the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of all Soviets stationed in Afghan territories, the Conference reiterated that the Soviet troops should refrain from acts of oppression and tyranny against the people of Afghanistan."128

The OIC took the bold decision of suspending the membership of Afghanistan from the Conference and called upon the member countries to withhold recognition to the "illegal regime" in Afghanistan and "severe diplomatic relations with that country until the complete withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan."129 It also urged the member countries to ensure through appropriate bodies not to participate "in Olympic games being held in Moscow in July 1980 unless the Soviet Union in compliance with the call of the UN General Assembly and Islamic Conference withdraws its troops forthwith from Afghanistan."130
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The eleventh conference of Foreign Ministers of Islamic countries held in Islamabad in May 1980 adopted a resolution 19/11, SC on Afghanistan, which represented a substantial softening of the January 1980's emergency conference's strong condemnation of the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. The resolution established a Ministerial Committee consisting of Tunisia, Iran and Pakistan empowering them to open negotiations with all parties involved in Afghanistan, including Soviet Union, to solve the Afghan crisis. The resolution adopted by the meeting called for:

i) The immediate withdrawal of Soviet troops
ii) Recognition of the Afghan people's rights to choose their own form of government and socio-economic-political system;
iii) Respect for the independence, territorial integrity and nonaligned status of Afghanistan; and
iv) Creation of conditions within that. (132)

The OIC has consistently and continuously taken up substantial decisions on Afghanistan in its periodic sessions. The Third Summit Conference of the OIC held at Mecca, Saudi Arabia, on 25-28 January 1981 also

adopted a resolution 3/3-P(IS) on the situation in Afghanistan. The Conference viewed with "grave concern" the continued Soviet military occupation of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan and the consequent impediments which stand in the way of the Muslim people of Afghanistan to exercise their right to determine their political future according to their will. It strongly urged for the creation of appropriate conditions to enable the Afghan refugees to return to their home land in safety and honour. The resolution further called for accelerating all efforts to ensure that "Afghanistan remains an independent and nonaligned state and to enable its people to exercise in all freedom their right to express their will as regards the system of their own choosing."

The Coordinating meeting of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the Organization of the Islamic Conference held at New York on 10 October 1983, while
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expressing its serious concern over the deplorable situation in Afghanistan resulting from the fact of the continuing foreign presence in that country evinced its interest in the "efforts exerted by the Special Envoy of the Secretary-General of the United Nations and by the Islamic Republic of Pakistan, with a view to finding a solution for the problem which this strife-torn Muslim country (Afghanistan) is experiencing." 137 It also demanded the cessation of armed intervention by "foreign forces in the internal affairs of their brotherly country, and the retreat of these forces from Afghan territory and reaffirms the right of the Afghan people to adopt a system of government of their choice." 138

The fourteenth Islamic Conference of Foreign Ministers was held at Dhaka, Bangladesh, from 6 to 10 December 1983 and unanimously adopted a resolution 13/14P. 139 The resolution expressed serious concern over the continued Soviet military intervention in Afghanistan and the consequent impediments which stand in the way of the people of Afghanistan to exercise their right to determine their political future according to their free will." 140
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While expressing its deep concern over the perpetuation of Soviet intervention in Afghanistan, the Conference reiterated its demand for the immediate total and unconditional withdrawal of foreign troops from Afghanistan. It further called for increasing efforts to ensure that "Afghanistan remains independent and regains its Islamic and nonaligned character." 

**Initiatives by the European Economic Community**

The European Economic Community (EEC) has also taken initiatives to defuse the Afghan crisis. In the wake of Soviet military intervention in Afghanistan on 27 December 1979, the EEC announced on 3 January 1980 its decision to suspend food aid to Afghanistan. On 15 January 1980, a meeting of the Foreign Ministers of the EEC held in Brussels, issued a statement denouncing the Soviet intervention in Afghanistan as a serious violation of the principles of international relations and as "flagrant interference in the internal affairs of a nonaligned country belonging to the Islamic world."
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The statement further viewed the Soviet intervention in Afghanistan as a threat to peace, security and stability in the region, including the Indian subcontinent, the Middle East and the Arab World. 145 The statement further added that the Soviet justification for its action was "unacceptable" and Moscow should "immediately withdraw its troops and allow the Afghan people to determine their own future without foreign interference". 146

EEC's meeting held at Maastricht, the Netherlands in March 1981 adopted a resolution on Afghanistan which inter alia expressed grave concern over the uninterrupted Soviet military operations on the people of Afghanistan. 147 It further added:

The European Council calls for the withdrawal of foreign troops from Afghanistan permit the people of Afghanistan to exercise fully their right to self-determination, and for Afghanistan to return to its traditional status as an independent state, neutral and nonaligned. (148)
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The European Economic Community presented a substantial set of proposals on 30 June 1981 which could form the basis of international negotiations on Afghanistan issue. It envisaged a two stage international conference on the future of Afghanistan, each stage being an integral part of the negotiations.\textsuperscript{149}

The first stage of the proposed conference envisaged the inclusion of five permanent members of the UN Security Council, Pakistan, Iran and India, as well as the Secretary-General of the United Nations and the Secretary-General of the Organization of Islamic Conference. The proposed conference was to "work out international arrangements designed to bring about the cessation of external intervention and the establishment of safeguards to prevent such intervention in future time ensuring Afghanistan's independence and non-alignment."\textsuperscript{150}

The second stage of the proposed conference was to be attended by all of the above parties and also by the representatives of the Afghan people. Its objective was to reach agreement on the implementation

\textsuperscript{149} New York Times, 1 July 1981.

of agreements reached in stage one and on "11 other matters designed to assure Afghanistan's future as an independent and nonaligned state". 151

On 5 July 1981, the Soviet Union was presented the EEC's set of proposals and the former rejected it on the grounds that the primary negotiating partners to be included in the envisaged talks did not "include the Afghanistan Government itself". 152

Lord Carrington, the representative of the United Kingdom to the UN General Assembly, while speaking on behalf of EEC told the General Assembly on 22 September 1981 that the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan constituted a grave breach of the UN Charter and "... has brought untold sufferings for millions of Afghan people and untold problems for the countries to which large members of them have fled." 153 While referring to EEC's proposal for a three-stage conference on Afghanistan, Lord Carrington said: "If the Soviet Union is sincere in its stated desire to withdraw its troops in the context of a political solution, then the proposal of
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the Ten (EEC) offers a way for negotiations to begin. 154

In another resolution adopted by the EEC at a meeting held at Copenhagen on 5 December 1982, the EEC urged among other things that the people of Afghanistan should be permitted to regain their national sovereignty and independence and the status of a nonaligned state. 155 The resolution further affirmed EEC's readiness to support any realistic efforts to achieve a political solution of Afghanistan problem. 156

The meeting of the Foreign Ministers of the member countries of the EEC was held in Paris on 14 May 1984. It adopted a resolution on Afghanistan which expressed concern over the continued Soviet armed incursions in the various provinces of Afghanistan. 157 The resolution reiterated the attachment of the EEC countries to the principles set forth in the resolution adopted by the UN General Assembly and renewed the appeal to the Soviet Union to implement those resolution and thus
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"contribute to the efforts undertaken to that end by the Secretary General of the United Nations." 158

The representative of Luxembourg Philippe to the UN General Assembly, while speaking on behalf of the EEC told the General Assembly, on 11 November 1985:

The large scale military intervention by the Soviet Union in Afghanistan in 1979 was a shock to the international community and it remains one of the most serious violations of the Charter of the United Nations... Through this act of force against the people of a nonaligned developing country the Soviet Union has given the world proof of its determination to pursue goals even if it must resort to the massive sustained use of its military power. (159)

He further reiterated that EEC would favour any proposal put forward for a political solution to the extent that they were based on the principles as envisaged in various resolutions of the United Nations. While reaffirming EEC's support for the diplomatic initiative undertaken by the UN Secretary General, the representative of Luxembourg said: "We shall continue to follow the efforts made by the Secretary General and his Personal Representative, Diego Cordovez to reach a political settlement
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within the framework of the United Nations. "160

Thus, it is evident from the above analysis that EE.C not only expressed its concern over the situation obtaining in Afghanistan in the wake of Soviet armed intervention but also suggested the holding of an international conference on Afghanistan. It has also supported the moves undertaken by the UN Secretary General.

The foregoing analysis reveals that the United Nations has been trying its level best to solve the Afghan crisis. The question of Soviet intervention in Afghanistan has been continuously debated in the General Assembly which has adopted resolution every year on situation in Afghanistan. The resolutions adopted by the UN General Assembly have been supported by the Organization of Islamic Conference, the NAM, European Economic Community and even other regional organizations. Though the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly on Afghanistan are recommendatory in nature, yet they are supported by the overwhelming majority and carry weight of international public opinion.

The initiatives undertaken by the Secretary General and his Personal Representative, Diego Cordovez
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through general talks have made some headway and
given the political will of the concerned parties -
the Soviet Union, Afghanistan, Pakistan with secured
guarantees by the United States and the Afghan knot
will soon be entangled. Thus as analysed in the first
chapter that it devolves on the United Nations to
maintain peace and international security, thus the UN
would be fulfilling its objective and discharging its
international responsibility.