



# Security Council

Fiftieth Year

## 3487<sup>th</sup> Meeting

Thursday, 12 January 1995, 3.30 p.m.

New York

*Provisional*


---

|                   |  |                     |
|-------------------|--|---------------------|
| <i>President:</i> | Mr. Cárdenas . . . . .   | (Argentina)         |
| <i>Members:</i>   | Botswana . . . . .   | Mr. Legwaila        |
|                   | China . . . . .  | Mr. Wang Xuexian    |
|                   | Czech Republic . . . . .                                       | Mr. Kovanda         |
|                   | France . . . . .   | Mr. Mérimée         |
|                   | Germany . . . . .  | Mr. Graf Zu Rantzau |
|                   | Honduras . . . . .   | Mr. Martinez Blanco |
|                   | Indonesia . . . . .  | Mr. Wisnumurti      |
|                   | Italy . . . . .  | Mr. Martino         |
|                   | Nigeria . . . . .  | Mr. Ayewah          |
|                   | Oman . . . . .   | Mr. Al-Khussaiby    |
|                   | Russian Federation . . . . .                                   | Mr. Lavrov          |
|                   | Rwanda . . . . .   | Mr. Munyampeta      |
|                   | United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland . . . . . | Sir David Hannay    |
|                   | United States of America . . . . .                             | Mrs. Albright       |

## Agenda

The situation in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina

Letter dated 4 January 1995 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/1995/6)

*The meeting was called to order at 5.10 p.m.*

**The President** (*interpretation from Spanish*): I should like at the outset of the meeting to apologize to everyone for the delay in starting the meeting, and to acknowledge the presence at the Council table of the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Italy, His Excellency Mr. Antonio Martino. On behalf of the Council, I extend a warm welcome to him.

#### **Adoption of the agenda**

*The agenda was adopted.*

#### **The situation in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina**

##### **Letter dated 4 January 1995 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/1995/6)**

**The President** (*interpretation from Spanish*): I should like to inform the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Egypt, Malaysia, Pakistan and Turkey, in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. Muhamed Sacirbey (Bosnia and Herzegovina) and Mr. Nobile (Croatia) took places at the Council table; Mr. Elaraby (Egypt), Mr. Thanarajasingam (Malaysia), Mr. Marker (Pakistan) and Mr. Batu (Turkey) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.*

**The President** (*interpretation from Spanish*): I have received a request dated 12 January 1995 from Ambassador Dragomir Djokic to address the Council. With the consent of the Council, I would propose to invite him to address the Council in the course of the discussion of the item before it.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda. The Council is meeting in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations.

Members of the Council have before them the letter dated 4 January 1995 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council, transmitting the report of the Co-Chairmen of the Steering Committee of the International Conference on the Former Yugoslavia, document S/1995/6.

Members of the Council also have before them document S/1995/21, which contains the text of a draft resolution submitted by the Czech Republic, France, Germany, Italy and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Members of the Security Council have received copies of a letter dated 11 January 1995 addressed by the Permanent Representative of Morocco to the United Nations, in which he transmits a note by the Contact Group of the Organization of the Islamic Conference. The letter and its annex will be issued as Security Council document S/1995/30.

The first speaker is the representative of Bosnia and Herzegovina, on whom I now call.

**Mr. Sacirbey** (Bosnia and Herzegovina): First, Mr. President, let me welcome you to your new position, and extend to you our warmest wishes for a successful month and our full cooperation in the endeavours of the Security Council under your leadership. Let me also acknowledge the capable and faithful commitment of the Permanent Representative of Rwanda to the position of the President of the Security Council for the previous month, and let me finally acknowledge the presence of the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Italy, a country that is a neighbour and friend of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, and welcome him to this Chamber.

The Security Council has before it a draft resolution, contained in document S/1995/21, to extend for another hundred days the easing of sanctions methodology adopted under resolution 943 (1994), of 23 September 1994, with respect to the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro).

The lessons of the last one hundred days compel us not to repeat the same mistakes, for none of the stated objectives behind resolution 943 (1994) have been realized.

At the same time, unfortunately, resolution 943 (1994) has set in motion a course that today is most difficult to reverse. Our attempt will be not to acquiesce in this course, or the mistakes, but to maximize what can be salvaged from what is clearly an effort that is quickly taking on water.

Resolution 943 (1994) was adopted, by less than a unanimous vote, to achieve at least the following stated goals:

First, to encourage the so-called Bosnian Serbs to accept the Contact Group peace plan by rewarding the Belgrade regime for perceived steps to cut off and further isolate the so-called Bosnian or Pale Serbs.

Secondly, to limit the resources available to the so-called Bosnian Serbs to continue their military campaigns and aggression in lieu of accepting this peace.

Thirdly, to encourage the Belgrade regime to take further steps to create an environment suitable for a durable and just peace and reverse the consequences of Belgrade's pivotal role as an aggressor against the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

I am afraid that we can all agree that none of those objectives have been realized. In fact, on the contrary, there is evidence that there are counter-productive consequences. The reasons for this are many.

Certainly, we can argue that the motivations of some who supported resolution 943 (1994), and, most importantly, the methodology established under it, were not consistent with the stated goals and objectives.

The mechanisms established pursuant to resolution 943 (1994) to monitor the border and implement the resolutions's stated objectives were flawed and inadequate from their inception. These established mechanisms ensured compliance by their inadequacy to witness and report non-compliance.

As a consequence, the Belgrade regime could usurp over-extended international observers to continue to echo its claim of no responsibility, while in fact continuing to fuel the fire that it had started in the Republic of Bosnia and

Herzegovina. By the way, I do not use the word "fuel" here just as an analogy. It was the very fuel transported under the blind supervision of the Co-Chairmen of the International Conference on the Former Yugoslavia (ICFY) that allowed the allied so-called Croatian and Bosnian Serbs to carry out their aggression against the Bihac region, occupy its safe area and cause danger, suffering and even death to United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR) personnel.

Effectively, a Security Council resolution has been hijacked to subvert its own stated objectives, to undermine other Security Council resolutions and mandates and to endanger the security of United Nations personnel.

None the less, we do not wish to associate only negative and subversive motives to resolution 943 (1994), for we believe that many who supported its adoption did so sincerely.

It is in this spirit that we welcome the elements of the draft resolution that are designed to strengthen the effectiveness of the border monitoring mission and its reporting methodology.

We also welcome the most obvious — but apparently not to all — clarification requiring that any transshipment of goods or personnel through or to the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina and the Republic of Croatia requires the approval of their respective Governments. This would appear to be a most basic element of respect for international law, but apparently not for those who have placed their persona above the territorial integrity and sovereignty of the two Republics as well as the authority of the Security Council's resolutions, in particular resolution 820 (1993).

With respect to the language in the draft resolution, we would like to clarify that our Republic concurs with all shipments of essential humanitarian supplies consistent with our territorial integrity and sovereignty.

Unfortunately, though, our endorsement of the changes and improvements on resolution 943 (1994) must be tempered by the following factors.

First, can the methodology of border monitoring — or, more accurately, reporting on border monitoring — be corrected, if in fact, there is a most basic design flaw? Although we can endorse the stated objectives behind the resolution, we must continue to question its application.

Therefore, we recommend that the next time the methodology comes before the Council for review — on or before 21 April 1995 — the Council should establish a new methodology that: first, no longer monitors the Serbians that are supposed to be monitoring the border, but actually monitors the border; secondly, provides the international monitoring force with adequate resources and manpower, certainly more than the couple of hundred people now lightly equipped to actually observe a border of approximately 500 kilometres; and, thirdly, is properly delegated under an appropriate command structure and authority consistent with a mandate designed to truly seal or monitor the border.

The current methodology established to deter violations of the Bosnian border with Serbia is nonsensical. It is analogous to allowing the rats to guard the cheese from the mice while a near-sighted cat is asked to report as to how much cheese is being taken and who is stealing it. The logic of this methodology only becomes clear once we understand that it is the rat who is dictating the terms to provide an alibi and demonstrate his innocence. Although the effectively blind cat can even smell the cheese on the rat's breath, it cannot report that it has actually seen the rat stealing the cheese.

The Security Council really should not be brought to the level of being dictated to by the rat, who has already even admitted previous treachery, and it can certainly afford to ensure that the cat at least has glasses.

Secondly, the Security Council cannot continue 100 days hereafter to further reward the Belgrade regime with another easing of sanctions, unless the Belgrade regime takes the most basic step to start to reverse the perverse ideology of a Greater Serbia, which it has initiated and still nurtures.

The Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) should not be allowed in the future to benefit from the self-serving claim that it is promoting peace with its neighbours until it recognizes the sovereignty and territorial integrity of its neighbours — the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina and the other former Yugoslav Republics.

Failure to recognize its neighbours and continue the status quo indefinitely allows the Belgrade regime to plead one case to the international audience, but, in fact, to maintain its ultra-nationalist credentials and still fuel the vision of a Greater Serbia.

Finally, the overall peace process that is in theory to be supported by the draft resolution is moribund as long as the so-called Croatian Serbs continue to conduct cross-border aggression against, and to occupy parts of, the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina in the Bihac region. This violation of the territorial integrity and sovereignty of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina has been directly facilitated by the misuse of resolution 943 (1994) and the delusions that led to its adoption.

The so-called Croatian and Bosnian Serbs could not have executed their coordinated assault against the Bihac safe area and region without the fuel and other supplies that were transported to the attackers as part of the misuse of the monitoring mission established pursuant to resolution 943 (1994) or, in fact, in direct avoidance of it.

Certainly, one must also wonder to what extent we are to be led to further delusions in believing that the so-called Croatian Serbs could have become full accomplices in the coordinated assault on Bihac without at least the acquiescence, if not the outright support, of Belgrade.

No matter what delusions may have been behind the course set out by resolution 943 (1994), and no matter what faults may endanger the very seaworthiness of the vessel, it is a ship that has been set sailing by the Security Council and therefore on which we are passengers, unwitting or otherwise. We therefore do not look to drill holes in the hull of this ship. On the contrary, we will look, as any passenger would, to bale out water, plug the leaks and keep the course steady.

However, the Security Council must take the responsibility of ensuring that the objectives of resolution 943 (1994) are being advanced and that the holes are being adequately plugged, or the ship must reverse course, with the realization that this effort by the Council was at least premature.

Just one final warning as we embark on the next 100 days: the rats are already abandoning ship.

**The President** (*interpretation from Spanish*): The next speaker is the representative of Croatia, on whom I now call.

**Mr. Nobile** (Croatia): Allow me, Sir, to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month and to assure you that my delegation is fully committed to assisting you on the many important issues that will come before the

Council, particularly those that concern Croatia and its neighbours.

I also extend my delegation's compliments to the Permanent Representative of Rwanda for the able way in which he led the work of the Council during December.

My delegation would also like to take this opportunity to welcome the Foreign Minister of Italy, His Excellency Mr. Antonio Martino, who is a high-ranking representative of a friendly neighbouring State.

Croatia welcomes the draft resolution before the Council. It contains elements that will be of great benefit to the peace process in Croatia and the region in general. It also contains elements that should enhance the credibility of the Council, following the reports and decisions regarding the illicit transfer of fuel into the occupied territories of Croatia from the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro). This draft resolution alleviates some of our concern that the international community may not be sufficiently determined in its quest for a durable peace in the region.

Paragraph 3 of the draft resolution extends the Yugoslav-Bosnian border blockade to affect Croatia. From now on Belgrade will not be able to send non-humanitarian assistance to the occupied territories of Croatia via the Bosnia and Herzegovina border, without consequences. Should the Belgrade authorities choose to violate paragraph 12 of resolution 820 (1993) in this way, the Council will be left with no alternative but to reinstate the sanctions that were suspended by its resolution 943 (1994).

The Council's decision in this regard is made with the same principles in mind as when paragraph 12 was included in resolution 820 (1993) in the first place — to reiterate Croatia's sovereignty over its entire territory; to promote economic reintegration between the Government and the local Serb authorities in the United Nations protected areas in Croatia; and to protect the Croatian citizens in the protected areas from the sanctions regime imposed on the occupier, the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro). Indeed, the reinforcement of this paragraph represents the Council's commitment to the spirit and the letter of that resolution. The Council's decision is especially welcome at a time when my Government is pursuing implementation of the economic reintegration agreement of 2 December with the same local Serb authorities.

This extension of the border blockade, however, is not complete. The border between the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) and Croatia's United Nations protected areas Sector East can still be used by Belgrade without consequences. The members of the Council should bear this in mind with regard to the next review of the issue, which will take place in a hundred days' time. This may be quite possible, as substantial human and financial resources will be released from Croatia at about that time, given my Government's decision today on the mandate of the United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR). The UNPROFOR resources would thus be usable for other alternatives. A complete blockade of the border between Serbia and Montenegro and Croatia in this way would further the peace process in Croatia.

My Government's decision on the UNPROFOR mandate, which was transmitted to the Secretary-General this morning and to your office, Mr. President, this afternoon, was taken with full regard for the international community's concerns and interests in the region. On this occasion I shall simply emphasize the words of my President — that the Security Council can continue to count, in full confidence, on Croatia's acting in a manner consistent with its long-standing constructive policy in the region.

Croatia will continue to support the work of the International Conference on the Former Yugoslavia and to look for a political solution consistent with Security Council and General Assembly resolutions, in a reasonable time-frame. We shall continue to negotiate the Z-4 political plan for Croatia with the Contact Group. We shall continue to work to implement the economic agreement of 2 December, with the assistance of the international community. But we shall not allow the annexation of any part of our sovereign territory.

We hope that the international community will be able, in the coming months, to seize the opportunity to assist Croatia to reintegrate its occupied territories in a timely and peaceful way. The draft resolution gives us great hope. I should like to take this opportunity to praise the sponsors of the draft resolution for their serious and skilful work.

A viable Croatia will as such also be able to play a more significant role in achieving the desired balance of power in the region — a balance that is still needed because of one party's rejection of the Contact Group plan for Bosnia and Herzegovina. A political solution for

Bosnia and Herzegovina does not appear likely in the near future. By addressing the situation in Croatia first, however, the international community can help Bosnia and Herzegovina, in the short term, by reallocating the necessary additional UNPROFOR resources into Bosnia and Herzegovina, and, in the long term, by creating conditions of balance favourable to continuing with the Contact Group plan for Bosnia and Herzegovina. This draft resolution is a small but important step in that direction.

**The President** (*interpretation from Spanish*): I thank the representative of Croatia for his kind words addressed to me.

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

**Mr. Batu** (Turkey): It gives me great pleasure to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of January. We are confident that under your able guidance the Council will successfully carry out its responsibilities.

I should like also to pay tribute to Ambassador Bakuramutsa of Rwanda for his able work as President of the Council last month.

It is also a great pleasure to welcome the Foreign Minister of Italy, a friendly and allied country.

On numerous occasions we have expressed before this Council our views on the ongoing tragedy in Bosnia. I do not intend to repeat them. Today, I should like to confine my statement to our hope that the agreement on the complete cessation of hostilities in Bosnia and Herzegovina will not remain simply an agreement on paper, but will become a first step towards the achievement of a just and viable peace. To that end, this agreement should not be allowed to lead in any way to a freezing of the situation on the ground. Such a freezing could seriously undermine the chances of a just and viable peace. Therefore, we believe it is high time for credible pressure on the Bosnian Serbs to make them accept the peace plan unconditionally. Such pressure should be exerted without further delay.

Unfortunately, there are reports that Serbian aggression is continuing in and around the Bihac region. The so-called Abdic forces and the Croatian Serbs should not be allowed to violate this agreement and the border between Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina. The Croatian Serbs' involvement in the aggression is a clear sign of defiance of

the relevant Security Council resolutions. Resolutions 824 (1993) and 836 (1993) clearly define the mandate of the United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR) *vis-à-vis* the safe areas. UNPROFOR is committed to defend the safe areas. The full implementation of this mandate is still a very urgent and vital need. In this context, we welcome the proposal of the Force Commander pertaining to the strengthening of UNPROFOR with a view to enabling it to contribute better to the implementation of the agreement on the complete cessation of hostilities. The reinforcement of UNPROFOR should be completed as soon as possible.

We have serious reservations about the draft resolution. The monitoring mechanism established under resolution 943 (1994) is not effective. There are still only about 200 monitors in the Mission. Because of this shortage of manpower for the monitoring of a long border, the effectiveness and credibility of the monitors are widely questioned.

On the other hand, it is true that the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) could play an important role in convincing Karadzic forces to accept the peace plan. The adoption of resolution 943 (1994) was based on the optimistic assumption that if Serbia and Montenegro had been encouraged it could have played an instrumental role to this end. However, a hundred days elapsed and the Serbs continued their defiance of the will of international community. The peace plan has still to be accepted by the Bosnian Serbs.

During this period we have also witnessed a new round of aggression against the safe area of Bihac, in which the Croatian Serbs were also involved.

Despite Serbia and Montenegro's claim that it has closed its borders with the Serb-held areas of Bosnia and Herzegovina, and despite the certification provided by the International Conference on the Former Yugoslavia (ICFY) Mission monitoring the border, many independent international sources acknowledge that the border continues to be violated through the transport of strategic material and personnel. It is extremely important that the monitoring mechanisms be strengthened and the number of monitors increased. In addition, serious consideration should be given to independent third-party sources.

Furthermore, having examined the report of the Co-Chairmen of the ICFY Steering Committee, we have once again learned that the border monitoring Mission, under the direction of the Co-Chairmen, has approved

fuel shipments to the so-called Croatian Serbs. This is a clear violation of the territorial integrity and sovereignty of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina and the Republic of Croatia, as well as of resolution 820 (1993). It was these fuel shipments that enabled Croatian Serbs to continue their aggression against the safe area of Bihac. Therefore, we hope that the adoption of this draft resolution will at least contribute to the termination of these shipments. We also look forward to the strengthening of mechanisms for deterring and reporting violations.

In conclusion, I once again strongly urge the Serbian side to accept the peace plan unconditionally.

**The President** (*interpretation from Spanish*): I thank the representative of Turkey for the kind words he addressed to me.

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

**Mr. Elaraby** (Egypt) (*interpretation from Arabic*): At the outset, Sir, allow me to express our congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month. We are confident that with your wisdom and well-known leadership qualities you will guide the Security Council to fruitful results in its consideration of the important international issues now before it.

I must also express our thanks to your predecessor, the Permanent Representative of Rwanda, for his efforts as President of the Security Council last month. I should also like to join others in welcoming the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Italy to the Security Council today.

The delegation of Egypt did not come here today to put forward new clarifications of, or explanations for, the current, deteriorating situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina. The picture is clear to all. My delegation will merely remind the Security Council of the many appeals made by Egypt and other States, particularly regarding the need for the Security Council to review its many resolutions on Bosnia and Herzegovina. There have been approximately 60 such resolutions to date, the majority of which were adopted under Chapter VII of the Charter, and their provisions have not been implemented. The Security Council should look into taking immediate, firm and effective measures to ensure the implementation of those earlier resolutions before adopting new ones on the subject.

We also wish to remind the Council that it is the fundamental duty of the international community, represented by the Security Council, to deal with the real causes of the current problem in Bosnia and Herzegovina and that it should not limit itself to addressing just one of its symptoms.

We had reservations when the Security Council decided, under resolution 943 (1993), to gradually ease sanctions, and we still have reservations today. No concrete progress has been made towards a political settlement of the military confrontation. Indeed, further Serbian aggression, by the Krajina Serbs against the Bihac safe area, took place in flagrant defiance of the Security Council and the entire international community. Furthermore, the report before the Security Council in document S/1995/6 includes references to current arrangements for channelling fuel shipments to the Serbs in Croatia at a time when they are not respecting the will of the international community, when their forces have not withdrawn from the Bihac safe area and when they have not acceded to the comprehensive agreement between the Bosnian Serb party and the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina on a cessation of hostilities, which was concluded under the aegis of the United Nations.

For years the Security Council has tried different means of exerting pressure on the aggressor responsible for the outbreak and continuation of the military confrontation in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Sanctions have been among the effective means used by the Council. Serbia and Montenegro was called upon to fulfil various interrelated commitments, one of which was to cut off supplies to Serbs in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Another was to exert pressure on the Bosnian Serbs so that they would respond to international efforts to accept the peace plan put forward by the international Contact Group, which included a commitment to international sanctions against any intransigent party rejecting the plan. But the Serbian party continues to hold its intransigent position, while the Government of Bosnia has accepted the international offer, with its concomitant international guarantees, and has accepted the cease-fire agreement, as called for by the United Nations. Therefore, the international community must ensure implementation of the settlement plan and continue to exert international pressure, including sanctions, until the party rejecting the plan abides by the will of the international community.

The position of the international community must be based on the principles of international legitimacy. The

international community cannot simply put forward plan after plan, only to meet with the rejection of the Serbian party; that would only show the Serbians that intransigence is rewarded, because the next step will be a new plan with new concessions for them. For that reason, the delegation of Egypt calls on the Security Council to adopt a draft resolution under which international military observer forces will be deployed along the borders between the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) so as to ensure effective monitoring and the cutting of the supply line between Serbia and Montenegro and the Serbs in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The Security Council is called upon today to look anew into further measures to ensure the genuine protection of the safe areas in Bosnia and Herzegovina, because these are the only lands in that State Member of the United Nations that are under the control of the Government. The Council is also called upon to consider temporary measures until a final, peaceful settlement to the dispute is reached and the consequences of aggression are eliminated. That can be done only through the full implementation of the resolutions of the United Nations. The Security Council must stand up for all States in all parts of the world, without any discrimination.

**The President** (*interpretation from Spanish*): I thank the representative of Egypt for the kind words he addressed to me.

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

**Mr. Marker** (Pakistan): Allow me warmly to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of January. Having had the privilege and the pleasure of serving with you on the Council, I have no doubt that your wide experience and diplomatic skill will guide the work of the Security Council to a highly successful conclusion. On behalf of my delegation, I also wish to take this opportunity to express deep appreciation to your predecessor, Ambassador Manzi Bakuramutsa of Rwanda, for so capably accomplishing the work of the Council in December 1994.

I also wish to convey my delegation's respect and welcome to the Foreign Minister of Italy, His Excellency Mr. Antonio Martino.

The Pakistan delegation once again expresses its deep concern at the grave situation that continues to prevail in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Despite the strenuous efforts of the international community, the root cause of the prolongation of this unfortunate tragedy remains unaddressed. This is, quite clearly, the aggression by the Bosnian Serbs against the legitimate Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina. These acts are rendered all the more outrageous by the refusal of the Bosnian Serbs to accept the peace plan presented by the Five-Nation Contact Group, by their continued defiance of United Nations resolutions and by the continuation of their abhorrent practice of "ethnic cleansing".

The Pakistan Government, along with other members of the Organization of the Islamic Conference, has always believed that only stern and effective measures by the Security Council could rectify the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina. We believe it is essential that the resolutions of the Security Council should be effectively enforced, in particular those that authorize the use of force and air strikes. The lack of resolve in fully implementing these resolutions has emboldened the Serbs in their intransigence and enabled them to continue their assault on the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

My delegation, which voted against Security Council resolution 943 (1994), did so because we were firmly of the view that it was beyond the capacity of a small number of monitors to certify the uncertifiable. The fact that the Bosnian Serb authorities have been able to continue their military aggression has, regrettably, justified our earlier apprehensions.

My delegation has carefully studied the Secretary-General's letter (S/1995/6), together with its annex, the report provided by the International Conference on the Former Yugoslavia. We find the contents of the latter document to be both unsatisfactory and disturbing. The report of the resource limitations, while commendable in its accuracy, is also, by the same token, somewhat incriminating. If we add to this the nature and the reality of porous borders, then the implications become obviously ominous, and reports of the Bosnian Serbs' receiving substantial military assistance should therefore come as no surprise.

It was the expectation of the Pakistan Government that the prolonged refusal by the Bosnian Serb party of the five-nation Contact Group peace plan would



automatically trigger the action agreed upon by the members of the Contact Group against the defaulting party. Meanwhile, let it not be forgotten that the Bosnian Government has, despite the iniquitous nature of the territorial adjustment, given its agreement to the peace plan.

In conclusion, my delegation would wish to reiterate the decision of the Seventh Islamic Summit Conference, held in Casablanca from 11 to 15 December 1994, which expressed its opposition to the lifting of the sanctions against Serbia and Montenegro, as well as any easing of sanctions, until such time as Serbia and Montenegro fully implements the following conditions: first, recognizes the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina within its internationally recognized boundaries; secondly, accepts the placement of United Nations forces on the borders for effective monitoring; and thirdly, implements the five-nation Contact Group peace plan, including full withdrawal from all occupied territories of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

**The President** (*interpretation from Spanish*): I thank the representative of Pakistan for the kind words he addressed to me.

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

**Mr. Thanarajasingam** (Malaysia): At the outset, let me congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for this month. We welcome the arrangements you have made to bring about greater transparency in the work of the Council as well as this opportunity to debate developments pertaining to the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Our deep appreciation also goes to your predecessor, the Permanent Representative of Rwanda.

Like the preceding speakers, we too wish to welcome the presence and participation of the Foreign Minister of Italy.

My delegation has already made known our position in relation to resolution 943 (1994); we did so in the Council debate on this issue on 23 September 1994, when we strongly argued against the adoption of that resolution. We maintained, and continue to maintain, that its adoption was premature and that it would merely reward the aggressors.

The minimum requirements for any reappraisal of the sanctions regime remain unmet. Those requirements are

recognition by Serbia and Montenegro of the international borders, sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, as well as of the Republic of Croatia and of all other States of the Republic of former Yugoslavia, and the establishment of an adequate and effective monitoring mechanism for the interdiction of military supplies across the borders of Serbia and Montenegro to the Bosnian Serbs. We are not convinced as yet that the border has been effectively closed, in the absence of an effective mechanism to fully verify such action. There are reports, including some from representatives of the five-nation Contact Group, of continuing violations of the border of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Given this situation, it would indeed be more appropriate for the Security Council to reconsider and to take measures to suspend the implementation of resolution 943 (1994). In our view, any review by the Council on this issue should be undertaken after due consideration with all States concerned, including the Contact Group of the Organization of the Islamic Conference (OIC), as well as the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina. We wish to reiterate our deep sense of regret at the fact that the Security Council, despite the appeal made by the OIC to defer the adoption of resolution 943 (1994) last September, did not find it possible to do so.

We wish to remind the Council that the sanctions were imposed against Serbia and Montenegro in the wake of blatant Serbian aggression against Bosnia and Herzegovina and the massive violations of human rights of its people. This aggression is still continuing, as reflected in developments in the Bihac region. Accordingly, the international community should resist any easing of sanctions as long as all conditions stipulated by the Security Council are not fully met, including the return of territories occupied by force and "ethnic cleansing".

My delegation wishes to reiterate the urgent need to strengthen the monitoring team so that it would be able to discharge its duties more effectively. Clearly, to have only 200 monitors stationed along the borders is grossly inadequate. There is the additional need further to improve the monitoring process in terms both of resources and of manpower, as well as its methodology. While appreciating the commitment of members of the monitoring team, we are concerned that the actual system of monitoring continues to be confronted by serious constraints. As such, we seriously question the capability

of the monitoring team to carry out its duty given the constraints, including lack of necessary resources.

My delegation has studied the report of the Co-Chairmen dated 4 January 1995 (S/1995/6) and we have found it to be vastly inadequate in terms of the certification regarding the closure of the border. Specifically, we do not believe that the Co-Chairmen could only address in the report information that could be confirmed only through a first-hand source. This would certainly hamper the work of the Co-Chairmen. They should also be allowed to work on the basis of information received from third sources. We understand that, under the present arrangement, in order for the monitor team to undertake an investigation from information received from third sources, it would need to seek the permission from the host country before it could make any investigation. The process of obtaining the approval would take at least 24 hours, and by that time the investigation would prove to be too late as incriminating evidence would have been removed. This procedure needs to be rectified if the monitoring team is to carry out its work more effectively. In this regard, we do note that the present draft resolution seeks to address some of these concerns that I have just raised.

My delegation wishes to express its concern over reports that the Border Monitoring Mission has facilitated fuel shipments through the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina from Serbia and Montenegro to the Croatian Serbs within the Republic of Croatia. This shipment of fuel has violated the territorial integrity and sovereignty of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina and is not consistent with the terms of paragraph 12 of Security Council resolution 820 (1993). In our view, the violation of the territorial integrity and sovereignty of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina alone should have been a sufficient basis to terminate this arrangement. Furthermore, the Croatian Serbs continue to occupy areas within the Bihac region and have all along coordinated their assault against the Bihac "safe-area" with the Bosnian Serbs.

Malaysia welcomes the cease-fire and cessation of hostilities agreement signed on 23 and 31 December 1994, respectively. However, we are deeply concerned over the continuation of hostilities in the Bihac area led by the Croatian Serbs and their cohorts. We strongly condemn the cross-border aggression by the Croatian Serbs against the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina and demand the withdrawal of the Croatian Serbs from the Republic.

**The President** (*interpretation from Spanish*): I thank the representative of Malaysia for his kind words addressed to me.

In accordance with the decision taken at this meeting, I now invite Ambassador Dragomir Djokic to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

**Mr. Djokic:** May I at the outset congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of January this year.

I should also like warmly to welcome the Foreign Minister of Italy, His Excellency Mr. Antonio Martino, with whose country Yugoslavia has had a long history of friendly and good neighbourly relations.

The decision that the Security Council is about to take on the extension of the partial suspension of sanctions against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia is a thoroughly inadequate response to the great efforts and contribution that Yugoslavia has been making in the search for a just and lasting solution to the crisis in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

As is well known, the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia has fulfilled all the obligations and met all the conditions set by the relevant Security Council resolutions by which the sanctions regime was established. In addition, Yugoslavia has accepted the peace plan of the Contact Group on Bosnia and Herzegovina, as it has accepted all the other peace proposals, and has done everything in its power to influence the Bosnian Serbs to do the same.

In this framework, my Government has consistently fulfilled its commitment to sever all political and economic contacts with the Bosnian Serb leadership. This has been clearly confirmed by the reports of the Co-Chairmen of the Steering Committee of the International Conference on the Former Yugoslavia, which have certified that the Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia is continuing to meet its commitment to close the border between the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and the Republic of Srpska. Therefore, the decision by the Council to extend only the very limited partial suspension of the sanctions for just another 100 days and to put forward new conditionalities and restrictions is certainly very disappointing. It reflects a lack of political will to assess objectively the positive and constructive role of the Federal Republic of

Yugoslavia in the search for a peaceful solution to the civil war in Bosnia and Herzegovina. It ignores the fact that the decision to close the border with the Bosnian Serbs was a unilateral one, for which the Yugoslav Government asked for the assistance of the Mission of the International Conference on the Former Yugoslavia.

References in the draft resolution concerning the export of products from the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia to the Krajina Serbs have absolutely nothing to do with the primary objective of the closure of the border, which is to influence the Bosnian Serbs to accept the Contact Group's peace plan. It represents an attempt to impose new conditions on the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, which is unacceptable. The draft resolution, in fact, is not a mere extension of the partial suspension of the sanctions, but actually calls for the cessation of practically all economic relations between the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and the Krajina Serbs. Moreover, it seeks to exact an indirect recognition of Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina, which is unacceptable to the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia before the overall political solution to the crisis has been found and accepted by all parties concerned. This approach is counter-productive and harmful, particularly in this delicate phase of the peace process, which is demonstrating some signs of progress.

By opting again to maintain the greatest part of sanctions against Yugoslavia, the Security Council is in fact playing into the hands of the extremist elements in Bosnia and Herzegovina and in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, thus continuing to encourage the war option. This, of course, fuels the ambitions of the hardline Bosnian Muslim leadership, which feels that the continuation of the sanctions against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and the Serb nation as a whole is the shortest way to realize its extremist political goals. At the same time, the perpetuation of the sanctions also strengthens the hand of the Serb extremists, who argue that, no matter what the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia is doing, the sanctions will remain in place and therefore the war option should be pursued.

That the sanctions have never managed to accomplish the goals they were imposed for in the first place, except to severely punish the most vulnerable segments of the population, was unambiguously stated in the Secretary-General's "Supplement to An Agenda for Peace" (S/1995/1). By making a decision to lift or substantially alleviate the sanctions, the Council would marginalize those extremist positions and would indeed make a significant contribution to the peace process.

Unfortunately, in the past hundred days the very limited suspension of the sanctions established by Security Council resolution 943 (1994) has also not been entirely fulfilled. Despite a clear call by that resolution to the sanctions Committee to adopt appropriate streamlined procedures for expediting its consideration of applications concerning legitimate humanitarian assistance, the Committee has in fact resorted to an ever stricter implementation of the sanctions. Due to the inflexible positions of some delegations, the Committee consistently rejected requests for the export of gas for humanitarian purposes to the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, even though all conditions concerning the monitoring and control by the World Health Organization of the consumption of the gas were met. The sanctions Committee has also steadfastly refused to allow the import into the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia of raw materials for the pharmaceutical industry, which is a necessary precondition for the regular supply of medicaments to the population. The Security Council for its part has ignored the request of the Prime Minister of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia for the one-shot export of \$70 million worth of goods, whose proceeds would have been used for the import of emergency humanitarian products.

Furthermore, even though resolution 943 (1994) clearly allowed all civilian passenger flights to and from Belgrade Airport, it has not yet been possible to purchase or even make reservations for tickets from United States territory to Belgrade, a matter about which the Mission of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia informed the Chairman of the sanctions Committee in its letter of 31 October 1994.

As the Council has now decided to extend the partial suspension of the sanctions, it is to be hoped that these shortcomings and flaws in the interpretation of resolution 943 (1994) will be overcome.

The Federal Republic of Yugoslavia is convinced that the plan of the Contact Group, as a basis for the continuation of the peace process, is the rational and viable way to end the crisis in Bosnia and Herzegovina

and to establish a just and lasting solution. For its part, it is prepared to continue to make efforts towards that end.

In this framework, any linking of the further suspension of sanctions against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia to conditions that were not valid at the time when the sanctions were imposed, or have no connection with the resolution of the crisis in Bosnia and Herzegovina, cannot be acceptable. By pursuing this policy, the Security Council in fact continues the practice of punishing the citizens of a sovereign country for events over which it has no control, which is a definite abuse of Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations and is highly inhumane.

In spite of the fact that the Security Council has failed so far to properly weigh the constructive role that the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia has been playing with regard to the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Yugoslavia will continue to pursue the option of a peaceful, negotiated settlement, which it continues to believe is the only one possible and which it is convinced is in the best interests of all the peoples of the Balkan region.

I would like to offer the following comments in connection with some of the statements made during the debate. My delegation categorically rejects the untrue and malicious allegations made by certain delegations. The situation in the former Yugoslavia is far too serious for the Council to be manipulated in order to satisfy the domestic and political propaganda needs of certain countries. Those delegations that have again chosen to put forward such allegations have thus clearly shown that they are not striving to reach a just and lasting peaceful solution.

I must admit that my delegation is surprised and disappointed that the Security Council did not grant its request to sit at the Council table throughout the discussion of this item, which exclusively refers to the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. It is all the more incomprehensible why the Council decided to make this precedent, when such a request was granted in the past. I should like to believe that the Security Council reached such a decision in particular circumstances, and that it is only an unwanted exception, which will not be repeated.

**The President** (*interpretation from Spanish*): I thank Ambassador Djokic for his kind words addressed to me.

It is my understanding that the Council is ready to proceed to vote on the draft resolution before it. Unless I hear any objection, I shall put the draft resolution to the vote.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

I shall first call on those members of the Council who wish to make statements before the voting.

**Mr. Martino** (Italy): Mr. President, let me begin by offering my most sincere compliments on the dynamic and authoritative way in which you are presiding over the work of the Security Council in the month of January.

For me it is a special honour and a source of deep satisfaction to deliver my country's first statement in the Security Council, a body that has taken on a pivotal role in managing the complex and treacherous international balances that emerged with the end of the cold war. On this occasion I reaffirm Italy's active and ongoing commitment to the Council's work of maintaining international peace and security amidst the tumult and strife of this new page of history.

In a century beset by terrible conflagrations, the Bosnian crisis has the unenviable distinction of being one of the worst of them. It has lasted over 30 months, and it has had a tremendous impact on public opinion — all the more so in Italy, where these dramatic events are happening right on our doorstep.

However much has been done in these years to settle this crisis, even more remains to be done. On the positive side, the protagonists of the conflict have been brought to the negotiating table. A massive humanitarian effort has helped to alleviate the suffering of the civilian population. To the greatest extent possible, a spillover of the conflict has been avoided. Finally, the parties have been persuaded to sign a cease-fire agreement, and an agreement for a complete cessation of hostilities effective as of 1 January. We fervently hope that they will fully comply, so as to allow the negotiations to be resumed and brought to a swift and successful conclusion.

We are quite hopeful that the recent agreements will be fully implemented, and provide a solid and permanent foundation on which to relaunch and revitalize the negotiations. We must immediately build on this achievement by strongly encouraging the parties to return to the negotiating table as soon as possible, lest we lose momentum or even undermine seemingly consolidated results.

But let us not lose sight of our long-term goals: a lasting peace, stability in the region and the region's introduction into the fold of the free, democratic, and

prosperous commonwealth of European nations. These goals remain absolute priorities for the international community. Together with other members of the international community, we will work patiently and with perseverance towards these ends.

Sanctions against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) have proved effective, inducing Belgrade to accept the logic of negotiations. But it was the prospect of suspending and alleviating sanctions that convinced Belgrade to cooperate with the peace process by pressuring the Bosnian Serbs to accept the proposed peace plan, which has already been accepted by the Government of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina. We are convinced that any feasible peace strategy must include Belgrade. Therefore, if we want to maintain our leverage with Belgrade at this stage we must be flexible in our approach to sanctions through a balance of incentives and disincentives.

Of course, should the positive trends we are presently witnessing not be confirmed in the future, and the Secretary-General report that the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia has backtracked on its closing of the Bosnian border, the draft resolution sponsored by the four member countries of the European Union and by the Czech Republic provides for the termination of the sanctions suspension.

On the other hand, should our optimism be rewarded, paragraph 7 of the draft resolution provides for the possibility of the Council's considering additional measures "in the light of further progress in the situation".

We hope that this possibility materializes as quickly as possible, in such a way as to allow the alleviation of sanctions with humanitarian implications. I am thinking, for instance, of the possibility of financial transactions for the purpose of supplying hospitals. Let us not forget that sanctions hurt people more than they do Governments. By creating the perception of an international conspiracy against the country, sanctions often tend to rally the people around the Government rather than mobilize them against it. If sanctions are to maintain their usefulness as an instrument of international policy, they must be applied cautiously.

We favour the extension of resolution 943 (1994), to eventually be followed by provisions to benefit the people of Serbia and Montenegro rather than their Government. While such an approach would not ensure an immediate solution to the Bosnian crisis, it would certainly help create favourable conditions for relaunching the peace process.

Finally, whatever progress has been made can be attributed at least in part to our cohesiveness. If our house is divided against itself, we will only perpetuate that division among the very people we are seeking to help. By the same token, our unity of purpose and intent can only instil that spirit among the factions, and help remove the last obstacle from the path to a fair, balanced and global political solution to the Bosnian crisis.

**The President** (*interpretation from Spanish*): I thank the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Italy for his kind words addressed to me.

**Mr. Al-Khussaiby** (Oman): At the outset, Mr. President, and on behalf of my country, allow me to convey to you and to your friendly country, Argentina, my sincere congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this first month of the year. My delegation would like to take this opportunity to reaffirm to you its readiness to fully cooperate with you and your delegation.

We would also like to take this opportunity to thank the Ambassador of Rwanda for his fine captaincy during the closing month of 1994 and to applaud the excellent work done by the retired members of the Security Council — Djibouti, Pakistan, New Zealand, Brazil and Spain, whose contributions will be felt for many years to come.

We also welcome the new members of the Council and assure them of our cooperation at all times. May I also take this opportunity to welcome the Foreign Minister of Italy.

Here we are starting the new year and deliberating for the fourth year on the conflict in the former Yugoslavia. Undoubtedly, today's deliberations on the question of the suspension of sanctions imposed on the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) are of due relevance to the events in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The measures taken by the Government of Belgrade to close its border with the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina to any transshipment of goods except foodstuffs, medical supplies and necessary clothing to meet essential humanitarian needs were positively met by resolution 943 (1994), adopted on 23 September 1994, suspending certain measures for a period of a hundred days.

My delegation would like to stress that it was because of the readiness of the authorities in Belgrade to seal the international border with the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina to help isolate the Bosnian Serbs, who had rejected the territorial settlement plan, that the Security Council took the necessary action. We also want to remind the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) that any continued easing and further easing of the sanctions would be subject to how it meets all its other obligations and to other positive steps that it takes. They should include the following measures.

First, maintenance of the effective closure of the international border between it and the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina and further efforts by it to enhance the effectiveness of the closure, including the prosecution of persons suspected of violating measures to that end, and the sealing of border crossing points, as requested by the Mission of the International Conference on the Former Yugoslavia (ICFY) and as called for in the third preambular paragraph of the draft resolution.

Secondly, full cooperation with the Co-Chairmen of the Steering Committee of the ICFY and of the Mission to the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) which is entrusted with the task of monitoring the closure of the border.

Thirdly, recognition of and respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina and the international border.

Fourthly, condemnation of all hostile acts by the Bosnian Serbs, the so-called Krajina Serbs or any other group that violates the Security Council's resolutions on the conflict in the former Yugoslavia and faithful cooperation with international efforts to bring about a peaceful settlement of the crisis.

Fifthly, cooperation with the International Tribunal to prosecute persons responsible for war crimes in the territory of the former Yugoslavia.

My country confirmed its position *vis-à-vis* suspension of the sanctions upon the adoption of resolution 943 (1994), which we supported. Our position stemmed from our commitment to support the Contact Group's efforts to create an environment of isolation for the Bosnian Serbs until they accept the widely supported territorial settlement plan, which was supported by all the other parties to the

conflict, including the Government and Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Although more than three months have elapsed since the Council's adoption of resolution 943 (1994), the situation in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina has not changed for the better. On the contrary, it has worsened, especially around the safe area of Bihac. Fighting goes on, and the siege and strangulation of cities is as common as it was in the past. Roads to towns and cities are still blocked, and the movement of civilians and the access of humanitarian convoys are still hindered. Most important, the territorial settlement remains in limbo, due to the defiance of one party.

Once again my delegation supports a draft resolution that we hope will pave the way to peace. My delegation will therefore vote in favour of the draft before the Council.

**The President** (*interpretation from Spanish*): I thank the representative of Oman for his kind words addressed to me.

**Mr. Graf Zu Rantzau** (Germany): Allow me at the outset to assure you, Mr. President, of my delegations's full confidence in your wise counsel and guidance of the Council. I should also like to express our appreciation for the excellent work done by your predecessor, the Permanent Representative of Rwanda, Ambassador Bakuramutsa.

In addition, I should like to thank the Permanent Representative of Oman for the kind words of welcome that he addressed to, amongst others, my delegation.

It also gives me great pleasure to welcome the presence at the Council table of His Excellency Mr. Antonio Martino, the Foreign Minister of Italy, a member State of the European Union.

The day must come when the conflict in the former Yugoslavia, with all the atrocities and suffering of innocent people caused by it, is settled. Serbian nationalism — the ruthless readiness to wage war for more territory — was and continues to be a main cause of this conflict. This is clearly visible in the unresolved situation in Bosnia, as well as in the Serb-held territories of Croatia.

Early last fall, after an important policy shift by the Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia

(Serbia and Montenegro), the Security Council, through resolution 943 (1994), granted a provisional, limited and revocable suspension of certain sanctions on the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. Today, a hundred days later, the Security Council must decide on two important questions.

First, did the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia authorities implement the border closure effectively and did they cooperate with the Mission of the International Conference on the Former Yugoslavia? Secondly, did Belgrade sustain its course with regard to acceptance of the Contact Group plan and its break with the Pale leadership?

This is no easy or routine matter. After very careful scrutiny of all available information, we have reached the conclusion that both these questions can be answered with a sober 'Yes'. At the same time, there is in our view no reason for any special acknowledgement with regard to the line followed by the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia authorities. A peace-oriented policy by Belgrade is, after all, in the best interests of the people of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia themselves.

After the adoption of resolution 943 (1994), fuel sent from the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia has facilitated military activities of the Krajina Serb forces, who continue to be active in border-crossing attacks on the Bihac area. This was and remains completely unacceptable. We demand that all so-called Krajina Serb forces withdraw from Bosnian territory. We have supported the inclusion of new provisions in the draft resolution, with the aim of cutting off shipments of fuel and other non-humanitarian supplies through Bosnia to the United Nations protected areas. We also welcome the fact that in future the mission of the International Conference on the Former Yugoslavia (ICFY) will report on whether the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia side is complying with this specific requirement.

The message of the draft resolution to be adopted today is clear. Belgrade must continue to hold course. What is necessary are deeds, not words. The Federal Republic of Yugoslavia authorities must withhold all support for the Bosnian Serb military. They should physically block all crossing points that the ICFY Mission cannot monitor continuously. We urge Member States to provide the ICFY Mission, to whose dedicated personnel we pay tribute, with any information that might be relevant for its reports. On their side, the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia authorities must maintain their current cooperation with the ICFY Mission and not give rise to any suspicion that they turn a blind eye to smuggling efforts or other violations of the border of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

We must be certain that the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia authorities remain firm in this respect.

But our expectations of Belgrade go beyond that. The Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) continues to bear major responsibility for everything that has happened in the former Yugoslavia. This is why we expect the Belgrade Government to fully use its influence with the various Serb parties to bring them closer to a negotiated solution. They must bring home to the Bosnian Serbs that there is no alternative to accepting the Contact Group peace plan as the basis for a peaceful settlement. They must also tell the Croatian Serbs in the United Nations Protected Areas, in clear terms, that any political concept more far-reaching than regional autonomy in Croatia is unrealistic.

Belgrade itself must move closer to important further steps, and thus prove, by its deeds, that it has really changed its policy in the former Yugoslavia. Mutual recognition between all States of the former Yugoslavia at the earliest possible date is an urgent political necessity. Such mutual recognition would, in our view, dramatically change the political landscape in this region and greatly enhance the chances of ending the conflict. At the same time, bold steps in this direction by Belgrade would allow a bold reaction by the international community.

The recent agreements between the Bosnian parties on a cease-fire and on a complete cessation of hostilities for roughly the next hundred days provide a new opportunity for intensified peace efforts. Together with our partners in the Contact Group, we are already pressing ahead for negotiations to achieve an overall settlement on the basis of the acceptance of the Contact Group's peace plan as a starting point. With regard to the United Nations Protected Areas, too, we urge the parties to negotiate constructively on the international plan, once it is finalized, and we call on Belgrade to support this process.

When resolution 943 (1994) was adopted last September, I had the honour to speak for the European Union in this forum. Let me reaffirm what I then emphasized: those who persist in a policy of war and obstruction will be isolated and only prolong the suffering of their own people. Those who move forward on the course of peace will get our support and will be able to lead their people into a better future.

**The President** (*interpretation from Spanish*): I thank the representative of Germany for the kind words he addressed to me.

**Mr. Legwaila** (Botswana): Let me take this opportunity, first of all, to extend my sincere congratulations to you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of January. My delegation has full confidence and trust in your capacity to discharge the duties of this important office in the very efficient and wise manner for which you are known. May we also convey through you our sincere gratitude and appreciation to your predecessor, the Permanent Representative of Rwanda, for the excellent manner in which he conducted the work of the Council in December.

My delegation is also grateful for the very warm welcome extended to us by all the members of the Council. We pledge to cooperate fully with the President and all delegations in the Council's important work.

On behalf of my delegation, let me also welcome the Foreign Minister of Italy to the Council.

The delegation of Botswana thanks the Co-Chairmen of the Steering Committee of the International Conference on the Former Yugoslavia (ICFY) for the comprehensive report before the Council on the effectiveness of the closure of the border between the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) and the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina. We have scrutinized the report very carefully, and the detailed analysis of the monitoring system is very informative indeed. The conclusions spelt out at the end of the report are, of course, of critical importance.

The report is generally positive. It indicates that, sporadic incidents of smuggling notwithstanding, Belgrade is trying its best to honour its obligation to close the border with Bosnia and Herzegovina. We are told that in cases where violations were brought to its attention, the Government took appropriate measures and responded in a satisfactory manner. It is this constructive role which has persuaded my delegation to support the adoption of the draft resolution before us today.

But I must say this: we labour under no illusion. The border between Serbia and Bosnia and Herzegovina has not been rendered impenetrable by any means, and we would be deluding ourselves were we to be so trusting as to believe that no contraband traverses it.

At the same time, it is my Government's position that the closure of the border with Bosnia should not be an end in itself. President Milosevic of Serbia is, inescapably, a key player in efforts to find a peaceful solution, not only to the war in Bosnia and Herzegovina, but also to the Yugoslav crisis as a whole. The leverage he has on the Serbs in Bosnia is widely recognized and must be put to good use. It is our hope that the cooperative spirit shown to Belgrade — deservedly or not — by the Security Council in the draft resolution we are just about to adopt will encourage President Milosevic to exert substantial pressure on his brothers across the border in Bosnia to accept the Contact Group plan, which has already been accepted by Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The agreement recently signed by the parties in Bosnia and Herzegovina for a complete cessation of hostilities has opened up encouraging prospects for a peaceful resolution of the crisis in that troubled part of the Balkans. We are encouraged by the reports from the United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR) which indicate that the situation is generally calm in the country, though there are violations here and there. What is left, therefore, is for the leaders, in a positive spirit, to sit down and negotiate seriously and in good faith the end of that terrible conflict.

**The President** (*interpretation from Spanish*): I thank the representative of Botswana for the kind words he addressed to me.

**Mr. Kovanda** (Czech Republic): Allow me at the outset to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency. You certainly lost no time in exercising your firm, effective and businesslike leadership. I also congratulate Ambassador Bakuramutsa of Rwanda on the job he did last month.

Let me also thank the Security Council members that left us at the end of last year. Our delegation certainly learned a tremendous amount from them, and we appreciated their support throughout the year. We also welcome the incoming members, three of which, not losing any time, have already delivered their first statement here. And today I welcome in particular the presence of Italy's Foreign Minister, His Excellency Mr. Martino, in this Chamber.

We are discussing a draft resolution that can be described as "the son of resolution 943 (1994)". The Czech Republic figures among its sponsors, and there is



a certain logic to this, for we co-sponsored the "original" resolution, resolution 943 (1994), as well.

Resolution 943 (1994) recognized a certain shift in the attitude of the leaders of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro). We all remember that they had long thwarted various attempts by the international community to seek a solution in the former Yugoslavia. Then, in the fall of 1994, an important shift occurred: they accepted the territorial arrangement for the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, as proposed by the Contact Group, which the leaders in Pale did not. This difference between the Serb leaders in Belgrade and those in Pale was accentuated further when the Belgrade Government closed down the border with Pale-controlled territories of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The Security Council decided not to ignore this fissure between the two leaderships, but, rather, to accentuate it further and capitalize on it. To this end, we adopted resolution 942 (1994), tightening sanctions on Bosnian Serbs, and on its heels resolution 943 (1994), slightly alleviating sanctions on the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. In so doing, we gave the Belgrade leadership the benefit of the doubt, assuming for the moment that its apparent change of heart was serious and would be long-lasting. We were running a certain risk as well. Belgrade might have played another trick and gone on in its old ways. There were safeguards built into resolution 943 (1994), though; the sanctions in question were only suspended, and a well-defined mechanism could have reintroduced them without much ado.

The Mission of the International Conference on the Former Yugoslavia (ICFY) dealing with monitoring the border between the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina now has 184 international members from 16 countries, including the Czech Republic. It is about to be increased to 220 members. It controls some 70 checkpoints, most of them around the clock, on 540 kilometres of border. The work its members are doing is awesome, often involving great physical exertion, and my delegation would like to pay tribute to them here.

What the ICFY Mission can do is no doubt limited, and some of the limitations are significant. Nevertheless, the authorities of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia are cooperating with the Mission. They do react to complaints as they receive them. They have taken measures that clearly distance them from any smuggling that does occur. And we have seen no evidence that those authorities would have

condoned, let alone participated in, the violations of the border regime that the Mission has detected. The situation on the border is far more favourable today than it was when we adopted resolution 943 (1994).

That is why my delegation sees no reason to change the regime that resolution 943 (1994) introduced. We would have agreed to an extension even longer than another hundred days, but we have no problem with the proposal at hand. The safeguards of resolution 943 (1994) continue in place, unchanged, just in case Belgrade still turns out to be of two minds.

Moreover, this new draft specifically reconfirms paragraph 12 of resolution 820 (1993), an issue which has been of particular concern to Croatian authorities.

The draft at hand resembles a technical resolution, extending certain measures in place, but its role really is primarily political. In this light, even the ICFY Mission is playing a political role, inasmuch as it underscores the importance of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia's playing ball with the international community. It is in the best interests of the international community to continue to stimulating Belgrade to exert pressure on Pale.

As for the future of sanctions themselves, this is not the time even to consider their further abatement. The European Union, through the delegation of Germany, suggested in the General Assembly a series of steps that the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia could fruitfully adopt. Of these, the mutual recognition of States of the former Yugoslavia, within their internationally recognized borders, is a step that we, too, have repeatedly recommended. In this light, we look forward to further progress in the former Yugoslavia.

**The President** (*interpretation from Spanish*): I thank the representative of the Czech Republic for the kind words he addressed to me.

**Mr. Martinez Blanco** (Honduras) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Speaking for the first time we are speaking in the Security Council as one of its members, I wish to congratulate you, Sir, in my capacity as Permanent Representative of Honduras, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of January. My delegation is convinced that under your usual skilful leadership the work of this Council will be fruitful. You and the other members of the Council can rely on our cooperation.

We also congratulate your predecessor, the Permanent Representative of Rwanda, on the very skilful way in which he discharged his duties as President of the Council in December. We also join in welcoming the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Italy.

My delegation is grateful to the Secretary-General for presenting the third report of the Co-Chairmen of the Steering Committee of the International Conference on the Former Yugoslavia, pursuant to the provisions of paragraph 3 of resolution 943 (1994), adopted by the Council on 23 September 1994.

The Co-Chairmen of the Steering Committee have certified that the Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) is continuing to meet its commitment to close the border between that Republic and the areas of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina under the control of Bosnian Serb forces.

The report indicates that the authorities of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia are cooperating constructively with the Mission of the International Conference, that the Mission has freedom of movement within the territory of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and that it continues to enjoy the cooperation of the Yugoslav authorities.

In general, the report reflects optimism prompted by the apparently satisfactory way in which the monitoring process on the border is proceeding. These monitoring arrangements may help to improve the political process aimed at achieving peace and ensuring the viability of the agreements on a cease-fire and cessation of hostilities, signed in December by the Bosnian parties in conflict.

The report indicates that the improvement has facilitated the provision of humanitarian relief by the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and by the Red Cross, as reflected in the reports that the United Nations Protection Force regularly provides to the members of the Security Council on the situation on the ground.

Despite the apparently irreconcilable positions of the parties in dispute, my delegation takes the view that the suspension for a further hundred days of the restrictions and other measures referred to in paragraph 1 of resolution 943 (1994), as well as in operative paragraphs 1 and 3 of the draft resolution, is a significant step that will contribute to the political process aimed at peace and reconciliation.

My delegation therefore supports all of the draft resolution submitted by the sponsoring countries. But we

must also keep in mind that serious incidents continue to take place in that turbulent and conflict-wracked area, and we must therefore urge all the parties in conflict strictly to comply with all the resolutions of this Council and the agreements reached between themselves.

**The President** (*interpretation from Spanish*): I thank the representative of Honduras for the kind words he addressed to me.

**Mr. Ayewah** (Nigeria): The delegation of Nigeria extends its courtesies to you, Sir, as you assume the presidency of the Security Council for the month of January. We are convinced that you will bring your proficiency to bear on the work of the Council. You may rest assured of the cooperation of my delegation as you discharge your important duties.

I should also like to convey my delegation's gratitude to Ambassador Manzi Bakuramutsa, the Permanent Representative of Rwanda, for the able manner in which he guided the affairs of the Council in the month of December.

We welcome into membership of the Council Botswana, Germany, Honduras, Indonesia and Italy, and wish them well as they take their places in the Council and make their contributions to its work in promoting international peace and security.

We also welcome to the Security Council the Foreign Minister of Italy, His Excellency Mr. Antonio Martino and thank him for his powerful contribution to the debate.

During the consideration on 23 September 1994 of resolution 943 (1994), on the easing of some of the sanctions imposed on the FRY (Serbia and Montenegro), my delegation expressed its reservations primarily because of the timing. The thrust of the resolution and its main provisions, which called for the suspension of sanctions on civilian air travel and sporting and cultural activities, were generally agreeable to my delegation. We agreed with the need to find ways and means of encouraging the FRY authorities to maintain their acceptance of the Contact Group peace plan and cut off the link between Belgrade and Pale.

However, the context in which we considered the draft was one that we wished had been different. We said then that, had we considered the resolution after the receipt by the Security Council of a report from the

Secretary-General that the Co-Chairmen of the Steering Committee of the International Conference on the Former Yugoslavia (ICFY) had certified that the authorities of the FRY were effectively implementing their decision to close the border between it and the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, my delegation would have voted in favour of the draft resolution. Since that was not the case, my delegation abstained in the voting. In doing so, we however expressed the hope that the FRY authorities would live up to their commitments by effectively implementing their decision to close the international border between the FRY and the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Since the adoption of resolution 943 (1994), we have received the monthly reports of the ICFY Mission, which has confirmed that the political decision taken by Belgrade to break off political and economic relations with the Pale Serbs has been maintained. Furthermore, the ICFY in paragraph 28 of its latest report confirmed the new important measures adopted by Belgrade in response to the observations of the Mission to ensure the effective closure of the borders to all goods except food, medicines and other humanitarian supplies.

These developments are positive and encouraging, and we welcome them and call on the FRY authorities to continue in that mode. None the less, we are aware of the existing loopholes along the 450-kilometre border through which violations could occur, and have indeed occurred in the past. These incidents have undermined the effectiveness of the sanctions imposed under resolution 942 (1994) and also disrupted the balance contained in resolution 943 (1994) between effective border closure and easing of sanctions. In this regard, my delegation recalls the proposal of the Caucus of the Non-Aligned Movement during the month of December 1994 to ensure strict implementation of paragraph 12 of resolution 820 (1993) and resolution 943 (1994). We had presented this proposal to the Council in the form of a draft resolution, which was however vetoed. We found the imposition of this veto difficult to understand, in the face of the fighting that was going on then in the Bihac area, which we felt was being sustained by fuel diverted to the Krajina Serbs across the border into Croatia. What is more, the draft resolution was intended to reinforce the existing measures in place.

We have noted the incorporation of some elements of that proposal in the current draft before us; operative paragraphs 3 and 5, we believe, contain substantial improvements over the provisions of resolution 943 (1994). Furthermore, the inclusion of operative paragraph 2 — a proposal of the Caucus of the Non-Aligned

Movement — in the draft is another important element. We are grateful that the co-sponsors of the draft resolution were able to include this reference to the mutual recognition of the sovereignty, territorial integrity and international borders by all the States in the region. Acknowledgement and acceptance of this principle by all States are no doubt germane to the solution of the crisis in the Balkans.

In view of the foregoing and given the recent improvement in the prospects for the peaceful settlement of the conflict in the territory of former Yugoslavia, my delegation believes, in the light of the agreements on a cease-fire and cessation of hostilities, that an affirmative vote on this draft resolution would give an added push to the peace process. As a result, my delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution.

**The President** (*interpretation from Spanish*): I thank the representative of Nigeria for his kind words addressed to me.

I now call on the representative of China.

**Mr. Wang Xuexian** (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): I would like warmly to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of this month's presidency of the Security Council at this auspicious time of the year, when everything is taking on a fresh look. I am convinced that, given your wisdom and rich experience, you will guide the Council's work to success. I also wish to thank Ambassador Bakuramutsa, last month's President, for having successfully conducted the work of the Council during that month.

I should like also to take this opportunity to express my regret at the departure of the members who left the Council at the end of last year. I commend them for the work they did in the Council, and I hope they will continue to be concerned in the Council's work.

I wish also warmly to welcome our new partners — the representatives of Botswana, Germany, Honduras, Indonesia and Italy. We pledge our complete cooperation with them in the Council's work.

The Chinese delegation would like, too, to welcome warmly the Foreign Minister of Italy, His Excellency Mr. Antonio Martino. We are glad to have him present during our work today.

Since the adoption of Security Council resolution 943 (1994), the situation along the border between the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and Bosnia and Herzegovina has been stable. The three reports of the Co-Chairmen of the International Conference on the Former Yugoslavia (ICFY) transmitted by the Secretary-General to the Security Council have stated that the cooperation between the FRY Government and the International Conference's Mission continues to be satisfactory; the FRY Government continues to fulfil its commitment and the border between the FRY and Bosnia and Herzegovina remains effectively closed. We are pleased by this development and we welcome it.

The Chinese delegation has all along supported the political efforts of the international community, including those by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General and the Co-Chairmen of the ICFY to resolve peacefully the question of Bosnia and Herzegovina. We are of the view that the efforts made by the FRY in implementing Security Council resolution 943 (1994) are aimed at urging the Bosnian Serbs to accept the peace plan.

In the past month further measures have been taken by the FRY to keep the border more effectively closed, which is a great support for the work of the international Mission. Therefore, the international community should encourage the FRY Government to continue to fulfil its commitment and to make further efforts to bring peace to Bosnia and Herzegovina, so as to enable the parties concerned to take further positive steps to advance the process of a comprehensive political settlement of the conflict in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The Chinese delegation holds that the conflict in the former Yugoslavia should be settled peacefully through negotiations and dialogue. We in principle are not in favour of settling the dispute there through sanctions or mandatory measures, for that has been proved to be of no help to the settlement of problems, but would, rather, aggravate contradictions in the region, bring tremendous sufferings to its peoples and cause serious damage to the economy of third countries that implement the sanctions, particularly those neighbouring the FRY. Similar concerns and views were expressed by the Secretary-General in document S/1995/1.

Based on that position, the Chinese delegation supports the extension of the relevant provisions on easing sanctions in resolution 943 (1994) and will vote in favour of the resolution that we shall adopt. At the same time, the Chinese delegation wishes to point out that there are some

elements in the draft resolution, relating to resolutions 757 (1992) and 820 (1993), on which the Chinese delegation has, on the basis of our position of principle, expressed reservations on previous occasions. Our position on them remains unchanged today.

**Mr. Lavrov** (Russian Federation) (*interpretation from Russian*): At this first formal meeting of the Security Council in January 1995, may I begin by congratulating you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency and wishing you all success in carrying out this responsible mission. I would like to assure you that you can count on our support.

I would also like to ask the Rwandan delegation to convey our gratitude to the Permanent Representative of that country, Ambassador Bakuramutsa, for the intensive work he carried out, together with his delegation, in presiding over the Security Council last December.

I would also like to join those colleagues who have expressed gratitude to the representatives of the States that were non-permanent members of the Security Council in 1993 and 1994 for cooperating in our work, and would like to welcome the new members. May I also, through the Italian delegation, convey our gratitude to the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Italy, Mr. Antonio Martino, for his statement.

Today marks the expiration of the first hundred days from the date of the partial suspension of sanctions against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (FRY). When resolution 943 (1994) was adopted a fundamental factor in the position of many States was the thought that the policy of the Government of the FRY should be judged not on the basis of words but on the basis of concrete deeds, which must be taken into account when decisions are made as to the further suspension of sanctions. As previous speakers have said, no one is left in any doubt that the FRY Government's announced intentions have been matched by concrete deeds. The Council has received four reports from the Co-Chairmen of the Steering Committee of the International Conference on the Former Yugoslavia (ICFY), corroborating the effective implementation by Belgrade of its decision to close the border with Bosnia and indicating a high degree of cooperation by the FRY authorities in the solution of problems as they arose. Such assessments are based in particular on information provided by the international members of the ICFY Mission, who are deployed on the very border and are in full control of the situation,

extending cooperation in the delivery of humanitarian supplies across the border.

It is also important to bear in mind the political aspects of the question. During the past hundred days all of us have become convinced that the constructive line of the Yugoslav Government is yielding practical results. The economic agreements signed between the Croatian Government and the local Serbian authorities in the United Nations Protected Areas mark the attainment of the long-awaited objective of the establishment of a *modus vivendi* in the Republic of Croatia. Two weeks ago an agreement on the complete cessation of hostilities in Bosnia and Herzegovina entered into force. Lastly, encouraging changes have occurred in the attitude of the Bosnian Serb leadership towards the peace plan of the Contact Group. All this positive change unquestionably became possible to a large extent thanks to the constructive and consistent line of the Yugoslav Government.

Russia is convinced that for all these reasons there were more than adequate grounds for agreeing on new measures to encourage Belgrade, in accordance with paragraph 5 of resolution 943 (1994), in which the Security Council clearly stated its decision

“to keep the situation closely under review and to consider further steps with regard to measures applicable to the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) in the light of further progress in the situation”.

We believe that progress was there for all to see, and the Security Council could already as a minimum decide on the indefinite extension of the measures provided for in resolution 943 (1994) and also consider a further easing of sanctions.

In this connection, we proceed from our position of principle, which assumes a need for an adequate and timely reaction to positive changes occurring in the policies of all States to which sanctions are applied. To our great regret, the Council could not agree on a draft resolution which would have provided for further measures of encouragement and thereby give impetus to the peace process. Indeed, the draft resolution before us provides for a number of completely unwarranted innovations, which run counter to the recommendations of the Co-Chairmen of the ICFY, and which we fear are capable of threatening the gains achieved through the efforts of the Contact Group. In the consultations we clearly stated our concerns, but, to our great disappointment, they were not taken into account. For

this reason, in unreservedly favouring the extension of the partial extension of sanctions, Russia cannot share responsibility for the possible negative consequences of the adoption of this draft resolution in its current form, and cannot support it.

We hope that the principle already agreed upon in the Security Council — that a deserving party should be encouraged — will be implemented in the future more consistently. This is essential, both for the sake of contributing to the peace process and for reasons of elementary justice. Russia intends to continue cooperating actively with our partners in the Contact Group and with all the members of the Security Council in the settlement efforts for Bosnia and the former Yugoslavia as a whole.

**The President** (*interpretation from Spanish*): I thank the representative of the Russian Federation for the kind words he addressed to me.

I shall now put to the vote the draft resolution contained in document S/1995/21.

*A vote was taken by show of hands.*

*In favour:*

Argentina, Botswana, China, Czech Republic, France, Germany, Honduras, Indonesia, Italy, Nigeria, Oman, Rwanda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

*Against:*

None

*Abstaining:*

Russian Federation

**The President** (*interpretation from Spanish*): There were 14 votes in favour, none against and 1 abstention. The draft resolution has been adopted as resolution 970 (1995).

I shall now call on those members of the Council who wish to make statements following the voting.

**Mr. Mérimée** (France) (*interpretation from French*): The beginning of your presidency has already demonstrated that the Council is in safe hands, Sir. We are pleased, but not in the least surprised.

I should like to convey my delegation's gratitude for the Rwandan presidency last month, which met all our expectations.

My delegation welcomes the Council's decision to extend the suspension of certain sanctions applicable to the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro), which were adopted in September in resolution 943 (1994). That resolution took account of a basic change that had occurred in August, when the Belgrade authorities, which had accepted the Contact Group's plan, decided to break off political and economic relations with the Pale leadership.

Since then the authorities of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) have honoured their commitment to close the border with the territories of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina under Serbian control and have cooperated with the observer Mission of the International Conference on the Former Yugoslavia (ICFY). All the reports of the Co-Chairmen of the Steering Committee of the Conference attest to this. My delegation considers that the renewal of the suspension of certain sanctions applicable to Belgrade is therefore perfectly justified.

Following the conclusion of an agreement on the general cessation of hostilities, it is important to give fresh impetus to the process of negotiations on the basis of acceptance of the Contact Group's plan as a starting point. My delegation strongly encourages the authorities of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) to continue to honour their commitments, to further improve their cooperation with the Mission of the International Conference on the Former Yugoslavia and to continue to support the plan and the action of the Contact Group in the quest for a political solution in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

**The President** (*interpretation from Spanish*): I thank the representative of France for the kind words he addressed to me.

**Sir David Hannay** (United Kingdom): May I congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of your office and thank the Ambassador of Rwanda for the work he did in December. May I also welcome the new members who joined the Council on 1 January.

The economic sanctions imposed by this Council on the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (FRY) and the Bosnian Serbs in successive resolutions have undoubtedly been a major factor in the recent progress towards creating the necessary conditions for ending the chaos in the former

Yugoslavia. Their impact on the FRY economy was largely responsible for Belgrade's decision last August to break with the Bosnian Serbs and to support unconditionally the Contact Group peace plan for Bosnia. The FRY authorities' decision to reinforce this change in their policy by accepting an international presence on their border with Bosnia was welcome and significant. The Co-Chairmen of the International Conference on the Former Yugoslavia (ICFY), the Mission Coordinator, Mr. Pellnas, and all the members of the Mission deserve our praise for their work, often under difficult conditions and involving long hours. We call on Member States to make the resources available so as further to strengthen the Mission's work in the months ahead.

It was in recognition of the significance of the FRY authorities' decision and the importance of the break between Belgrade and Pale that the Council adopted two resolutions last September. Resolution 942 (1994) extended and tightened sanctions against the Bosnian Serbs, and resolution 943 (1994) allowed for the limited suspension of sanctions against the FRY, provided that the ICFY Co-Chairmen continued to certify that the FRY was complying with the terms of its original decision to close its border with Bosnia. The Co-Chairmen have now submitted four reports, all of which have certified that the FRY authorities are fulfilling their commitments. There have, of course, been instances of leakage. But our observation has been that the FRY authorities have reacted quickly and taken the necessary steps whenever reported violations have been brought to their attention by the ICFY Mission. We welcome the action that they have taken to maintain the effective closure of that border. It is essential that this cooperation be continued and intensified if the suspension of sanctions is to be sustained.

The resolution which the Council has just adopted, and of which my country was a sponsor, represents a reasonable and balanced response to the cooperation from Belgrade over the past hundred days. The resolution allows for a further hundred days' suspension of the various measures set out in resolution 943 (1994). It seeks to remove any ambiguity about the application of resolution 820 (1993) concerning transshipments across the FRY-Bosnian border. And it directs the sanctions Committee to give a clear priority to applications for humanitarian assistance to the FRY.

Sanctions are imposed to achieve changes in policy, not to punish. They reinforce the strategy pursued by the Contact Group, of which my country is a member, to

increase the pressure on the Bosnian Serbs to return to the negotiating table. It is essential that Belgrade continue to support the Contact Group approach, to maintain the embargo on the Bosnian Serbs and to keep up pressure on the Krajina Serbs to cease violations of the Croatian-Bosnian border and to implement the economic agreement in Croatia. As we have said before, further sanctions relief is possible, but only if further substantial progress is made towards the objective of the achievement of a lasting political settlement in the former Yugoslavia.

**The President** (*interpretation from Spanish*): I thank the representative of the United Kingdom for the kind words he addressed to me.

**Mr. Wisnumurti** (Indonesia): I should like at the outset, Sir, to extend my delegation's congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for this month. We remain fully confident that with the wisdom and diplomatic skill you have shown in the past you will provide the Council with effective leadership.

May I also express our appreciation to your predecessor, Ambassador Manzi Bakuramutsa, the Permanent Representative of Rwanda, for the able guidance he provided the Council during last month.

May I also avail myself of this opportunity to express my delegation's gratitude for the words of welcome by the members of the Council to Indonesia as one of its new members. Let me also join other members of the Council in welcoming the Foreign Minister of Italy in our midst.

The Security Council has been seized of the conflict in Bosnia and Herzegovina for nearly three years. It is a conflict which poses a continuing threat to the maintenance of international peace and security. The death and destruction, the atrocities committed and the suffering it has inflicted is of such magnitude that it has shocked the world. Denied its right to defend itself as a result of an ill-conceived arms embargo, Bosnia and Herzegovina faces the bleak prospect of a forcible dismantling of its multi-ethnic, multi-cultural and multi-religious society, the brutal decimation of its people and the erosion of its independence and sovereignty.

The wanton aggression by the Bosnian Serbs has been sustained by the stark military imbalance in their favour, which they have exploited to seize what now amounts to 70 per cent of Bosnian territory in their bid to carve a "Greater Serbia" out of Bosnian soil. Condemnation, warnings,

sanctions and international isolation have not deterred them from aggression and duplicity.

Meanwhile, the pleas of the people of Bosnia and Herzegovina for effective international intervention, or at least the lifting of the arms embargo, have gone unheeded. The consequences of a continued arms embargo on the victims of the conflict are obvious: there will be more killing of defenceless civilians, more atrocities and more destruction.

The Bosnian Serbs' rejection of the peace plan launched by the five-nation Contact Group means only that they intend to keep up the slaughter. While the siege and strangulation of Sarajevo continues, we have witnessed their brazen attacks on "safe areas", as evidenced by their treacherous assault on the town of Bihac. In this instance, the United Nations Protection Force failed to discharge fully its mandate to block or repel the aggression of the Bosnian Serbs. Recent developments in the Bihac region were particularly disturbing, as they involved cross-border aggression by the so-called Croatian Serb forces, launched from the United Nations Protected Areas in the Republic of Croatia. Meanwhile, the repatriation of hundreds of thousands of refugees and a sharp increase in the number of displaced persons have further aggravated the already deteriorating situation.

Realization of the hope engendered by the agreements on a cease-fire and the cessation of hostilities that were reached last month — the hope that the agreements would lead to the termination of war and to a durable and just peace — remains elusive, as the aggressors have continued to violate with impunity the commitments they made under the agreement.

It is against this backdrop that my delegation views the tragedy that has befallen the people of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Indonesia must reiterate that an unjust peace should not be imposed on Bosnia and Herzegovina, and that the Bosnian Serbs should not be allowed to dictate terms for a political settlement. Appeasing the Bosnian Serbs could lead to a tragedy on an even greater scale than is evident now in that embattled land. The international community should vigorously pressure the Bosnian Serbs to accept the peace proposal of the five-nation Contact Group.

The delegation of Indonesia has noted the reports submitted by the Co-Chairmen of the Steering Committee of the International Conference on the Former

Yugoslavia. We fully sympathize with the members of the Mission for the hardships to which they are being subjected in carrying out their tasks under severe financial, physical and operational constraints and in stressful conditions. These simply increase our appreciation of the reports.

Indonesia's principal concern, however, is that, despite the reports' certification that the Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia is continuing to meet its commitment to close its border with the areas of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina under the control of the Bosnian Serb forces, there have been widespread allegations of violations in the form of the transportation of strategic materials and personnel. Reports of the illegal supply of contraband fuel by the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia to the so-called Krajina Serbs in the United Nations Protected Areas in Croatia, as well as Serbian deployment of surface-to-air missiles around the Gorazde, Zepa and Srebrenica safe areas, are illustrative of our concern about the extent to which the border closure has in fact been effected.

The question of the transportation of fuel is included in the latest report of the Mission, but my delegation would have liked to see the question of the alleged supply of air-defence systems across the border of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and in areas of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina under Serb forces similarly addressed. It is our view that, unless concerns such as these are addressed, the International Conference Mission to the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia runs the risk of being increasingly regarded as irrelevant to the developments on the ground.

The perception of discrepancy between actual developments on the ground and the certifications issued by the Mission on the continued commitment of the Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia to close its border with the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina is almost inevitable, given the constraints under which the Mission has had to work and, in particular, the terms of reference within which it has had to operate. Without wishing in any way to belittle the dedication of the members of the Mission, we must recognize that under the current terms of reference, and given the limitation of resources under which it has had to operate, its capacity more effectively to ensure compliance by the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia with its commitment seems to have been compromised.

As regards the draft resolution now before us, it should be recalled that my delegation has already expressed its reservations concerning the easing of sanctions against

the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, as called for in Security Council resolution 943 (1994). In our view, such action was premature. It was taken with undue haste and in utter disregard of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia's complicity in the whole crisis. Equally important, resolutions adopted by the Council in this context have explicitly stipulated the steps that the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia should take if sanctions were to be eased. These clearly went beyond the mere promise to close the border with the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Specifically, Indonesia attaches particular importance, *inter alia*, to the following measures that should be taken before the easing of the sanctions regime: recognition by the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia of the independence and territorial integrity of Bosnia and Herzegovina; effective defence of the "safe areas" and enforcement of exclusion zones; termination of the arms embargo against the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina; ending of the unconscionable policy of "ethnic cleansing" by Bosnian Serbs; and full cooperation by the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia with the international war crimes tribunal, including the surrender of wanted suspects for trial. In short, there should not be any easing of sanctions unless and until all consequences of aggression are reversed and territories occupied through the use of force are surrendered.

My delegation therefore has serious reservations regarding the provision for an extension for a further hundred days of the suspension of sanctions, as contained in the draft resolution before the Council. Despite the dedication shown by the members of the Mission, we doubt whether its monitors can effectively police a 450-kilometre border, when previous estimates called for a far bigger Mission. We therefore call for concerted efforts to strengthen the Mission's capacity and to ensure the fulfilment by the Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia of its solemn commitment to close its border with the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

In particular, we should like to underscore the fact that during the past hundred days there has been little to indicate that the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia has initiated steps, beyond the alleged closure of its border with the Federal Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, to fulfil the requirements laid down in the relevant Security Council resolutions, steps that are necessary if the sanctions against it are to be lifted.

Despite our misgivings, we are fully cognizant of the positive elements contained in the draft resolution before



us. We are heartened, for example, by the fact that, through the draft resolution, the Council calls upon all States and others concerned to respect the sovereignty, territorial integrity and international borders of all States in the region. We particularly welcome the provision in the draft resolution which reaffirms the requirement contained in paragraph 12 of resolution 820 (1993) that imports to, exports from and transshipment through the United Nations Protected Areas in the Republic of Croatia and those areas of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina under the control of the Serb forces — with the exception of essential humanitarian supplies — shall be permitted only with proper authorization from the Government of Croatia or the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina. This provision goes some way towards addressing the concerns about the illegal supply of fuel to the so-called Krajina Serbs, to which we referred earlier.

Against this background, and despite our misgivings about the extension of the easing of sanctions against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, my delegation voted in favour of the resolution just adopted. Our position on this matter is based on the understanding that since resolution 943 (1994) has already initiated the process of relaxing sanctions, the Government in Belgrade will scrupulously fulfil the commitments that it has undertaken. Our endorsement is also predicated upon the stipulation that should at any time the Secretary-General report a wilful violation the suspension of sanctions will be terminated forthwith.

It would be reasonable to expect that the conduct of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia will be above reproach. Otherwise, its Government must be prepared to face even more and tougher sanctions. Finally, it should prevail upon the Bosnian Serbs to accept the peace proposals advanced by the five-nation Contact Group and already accepted by the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

**The President** (*interpretation from Spanish*): I thank the representative of Indonesia for the kind words he addressed to me.

**Mrs. Albright** (United States of America): Let me congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency. Your energy and fairness have already been of immeasurable help this month, and I am sure they will continue to be. I would also like to warmly thank the Permanent Representative of Rwanda for his hard work during December.

Let me join my colleagues in welcoming our new colleagues to what is going to be a very busy period for the Security Council and in thanking those who have just completed their term. Of course, through the Italian Mission, we would very much like to welcome Foreign Minister Martino; we are glad he was here.

The sanctions regime that the Council has enacted over time is vital to our effort to persuade the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) and the Pale Serbs that a peaceful resolution of the Bosnia conflict is in their interest. The resolution we have just adopted is an indication that our effort to persuade Belgrade to pressure the Pale Serbs to accept a just and viable peace has begun to show results. There should be no doubt that my Government's willingness to support this resolution was a direct result of our conclusion that the Government in Belgrade has moved to implement its decision to close the border by making it less porous over time, a process which it significantly augmented by imposing new measures in recent weeks.

But further efforts must be made to ensure that the border is more effectively closed. In that context, we are especially gratified that the Council is today reaffirming its prohibition of transshipments through Bosnian territory controlled by the Pale Serbs. By doing so, we are not adding any sanctions provisions. Transshipments through Bosnian Serb-controlled territory to the United Nations Protected Areas in Croatia without the permission of the relevant Governments were, and continue to be, clear violations of paragraph 12 of resolution 820 (1993). The United States expects that paragraph to be complied with.

There have been suggestions made, not by members of this Council, that the provisions of paragraph 12 of resolution 820 (1993) do not apply to shipments from Serbia and Montenegro to Serb-held territory in Croatia. This contention is obviously inconsistent with the Council's previous decisions, including the border closure we are reviewing today. Tolerating illegal transshipments to the United Nations Protected Areas in Croatia without an assurance that these goods would not find their way back into Bosnian Serb-controlled territory undermined the logic of the border closure. There can be no doubt that these illegal transshipments were an obvious contravention of the letter and spirit of our resolutions. The Security Council is reaffirming that these transshipments are prohibited. We expect that others will accept the Council's decision and take their guidance from it.

However, the effectiveness of the border closure will require continued vigilance by the international community, the monitoring Mission of the International Conference on the Former Yugoslavia (ICFY) and the officials of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. We cannot allow any backsliding towards Belgrade's earlier, inadequate level of compliance. Although we believe that the border closure is now effective — in large part because of the actions taken by officials of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and the ICFY Mission in the 40 days leading up to our decision today — we expect to see continued improvement over the next 100 days.

In particular, we expect that there will be physical closure of all border crossing points not covered by the ICFY Mission on a 24-hour basis; dismantlement of river ferries and physical closure of ferry sites; continued monitoring of train shipments transiting Bosnia and Herzegovina; an end to exports exiting from Bosnia and Herzegovina; control of smuggling, even by individuals; an end to all logistic and other support for the Bosnian Serb military; the thorough investigation and diligent prosecution and punishment of persons violating the border closure; and the severance of telecommunications links between the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and Pale Serb-held territory, which the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia itself imposed but recently rescinded.

We look forward to the Secretary General's periodic reports on the status of the border closure and, in particular, to the certification on transshipments required under operative paragraph 5. An inability to make such a certification will have consequences. During the next 100 days we expect that Belgrade will continue to implement the measures described in the Co-Chairmen's 4 January report and move ahead on additional measures, including those I have mentioned, that are needed to ensure effective compliance with its commitment to close the border.

**The President** (*interpretation from Spanish*): I thank the representative of the United States for the kind words she addressed to me.

I shall now make a statement in my capacity as representative of the Argentine Republic.

First of all, on behalf of my delegation, I wish to express my pleasure at the presence this evening in the Security Council of the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Italy, Mr. Antonio Martino. In addition, my delegation thanks the delegation of Rwanda for its work last month under the leadership of Ambassador Manzi Bakuramutsa.

My delegation voted in favour of resolution 970 (1995) after having carefully studied the reports submitted every 30 days by the Co-Chairmen of the Steering Committee of the International Conference on the Former Yugoslavia, as requested under paragraph 3 of resolution 943 (1994). Those reports, the most recent of which is contained in document S/1995/6, provide the certification of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia's implementation of the closure of its border with the areas of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina controlled by Bosnian Serb forces.

The Argentine Republic notes with satisfaction the effective fulfilment of the commitments undertaken by the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. We would also like to emphasize that for a bit more than three months that country has been cooperating with the observers of the Steering Committee of the International Conference on the Former Yugoslavia.

None the less, there are still important steps that need to be taken by the Government of that country in the peace process. For example, we hope it will soon formally recognize the sovereignty of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina. The resolution we have just adopted extends the suspension of sanctions for another period of 100 days and, thanks to the experience we have acquired, improves the relevant monitoring procedures. The Argentine Republic reaffirms its belief that in this case the application or suspension of sanctions should be used to encourage measures leading to a peaceful, negotiated settlement in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The Argentine delegation wishes to take this opportunity to highlight the agreements for a cease-fire and cessation of hostilities reached by the parties to the conflict in Bosnia and Herzegovina recently — last December, to be exact. We consider them highly significant, and they give us renewed hope that progress can be made towards a lasting agreement between the parties, based on the Contact Group's peace plan, that will put an end to this conflict that has for too long been bleeding the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

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

There are no further speakers. The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The Security Council will remain seized of the matter.

*The meeting rose at 7.50 p.m.*