

UNITED NATIONS

UN LIBRARY

FEB 5 1973



UN/SA COLLECTION

# SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-FOURTH YEAR

**1512<sup>th</sup>** MEETING: 15 SEPTEMBER 1969

NEW YORK

---

## CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1512) .....	1
Adoption of the agenda .....	1
The situation in the Middle East: Letter dated 28 August 1969 addressed to the President of the Security Council by the representatives of Afghanistan, Algeria, Guinea, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, the Niger, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Southern Yemen, the Sudan, Syria, Tunisia, Turkey, the United Arab Republic and Yemen (S/9421 and Add.1 and 2) .....	1

## NOTE

*Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.*

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/. . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements of the Official Records of the Security Council*. The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*. The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

## FIFTEEN HUNDRED AND TWELFTH MEETING

Held in New York on Monday, 15 September 1969, at 3 p.m.

*President:* Mr. Y. A. MALIK  
(Union of Soviet Socialist Republics).

*Present:* The representatives of the following States: Algeria, China, Colombia, Finland, France, Hungary, Nepal, Pakistan, Paraguay, Senegal, Spain, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America and Zambia.

### Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1512)

1. Adoption of the agenda.

2. The situation in the Middle East:

Letter dated 28 August 1969 addressed to the President of the Security Council by the representatives of Afghanistan, Algeria, Guinea, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, the Niger, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Southern Yemen, the Sudan, Syria, Tunisia, Turkey, the United Arab Republic and Yemen (S/9421 and Add.1 and 2).

### Adoption of the agenda

*The agenda was adopted.*

### The situation in the Middle East

Letter dated 28 August 1969 addressed to the President of the Security Council by the representatives of Afghanistan, Algeria, Guinea, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, the Niger, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Southern Yemen, the Sudan, Syria, Tunisia, Turkey, the United Arab Republic and Yemen (S/9421 and Add.1 and 2)

1. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Russian*): In accordance with the previous decisions of the Council, I now propose, with the Council's consent, to invite the representatives of Israel, the United Arab Republic and Indonesia to take the places reserved for them at the Council table so that they may participate in the discussion of the item on the agenda without the right to vote.

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. Y. Tekoah (Israel), Mr. A. El-Erian (United Arab Republic) and Mr. H. R. Abdulgani (Indonesia) took places at the Council table.*

2. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Russian*): In accordance with other decisions taken earlier by the Council, I

now propose to invite the representatives of India, Somalia, Jordan, Saudi Arabia, Ceylon, Malaysia, Lebanon and Tunisia to take the places reserved for them at the sides of the Council chamber, since the space at the Council table is limited.

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. A. S. Gonsalves (India), Mr. A. A. Farah (Somalia), Mr. M. H. El-Farra (Jordan), Mr. J. M. Baroody (Saudi Arabia), Mr. H. S. Amerasinghe (Ceylon), Mr. S. A. L. M. Hashim (Malaysia), Mr. E. Ghorra (Lebanon) and Mr. S. El Goulli (Tunisia) took the places reserved for them.*

3. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Russian*): Before the Council takes up the item on the agenda, I should like to call on the Secretary-General for a brief statement.

4. The SECRETARY-GENERAL: At the 1509th meeting of the Security Council, on 11 September, you, Mr. President, drew my attention to terrorist threats against Permanent Representatives of Member States of the United Nations, and asked me to study the matter, together with the representative of the United States, so that the necessary measures could be taken.

5. I wish to inform the Security Council that I have been in contact with the Permanent Representative of the United States. I have been assured that police protection is being provided to the delegations concerned on a round-the-clock basis. Should further protection be required, I am advised that the United States Mission would arrange for it upon request, as it has always been prepared to do in the past. I have also been assured that the United States authorities are examining appropriate steps to prevent the occurrence of similar threats. It is my intention to keep up my contacts with the Permanent Representative, and I shall keep the Council informed of developments.

6. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Russian*): I thank the Secretary-General for this information. I am sure the members of the Security Council and the Council as a whole will take note of it.

7. The Security Council will now continue its consideration of the item before it. The first speaker on my list is the representative of Jordan, whom I now invite to take a place at the Council table and to address the Council.

8. Mr. EL-FARRA (Jordan): I really do not have much to say on the Israeli statement of this morning [1511th meeting], especially since we should all like to see our deliberations come to an early and final conclusion. What

Mr. Tekoah said this morning has become by now an old record. You have heard him repeat these falsehoods time and again; you have heard me answer all of them during the present debate of the Security Council, as well as during the earlier debates, of last June and July, when the Council was discussing the question of Jerusalem. I have asked to speak, however, to emphasize certain common points which my delegation finds in the statements of the delegations of Israel, the United States, and the United Kingdom.

9. The three seem to be united in their contention that there is no evidence to support our charge. The United States went so far as to say this morning: "... we have seen no shred of evidence to support the allegation that the act of suspected arson which occurred at the Haram Ash Sharif on 21 August was other than an individual act". [1511th meeting, para. 66.]

10. Last Friday, we heard Lord Caradon say: "I cannot believe that any Government, any country, any community would plan or perpetrate such a revolting outrage." [1510th meeting, para. 13.]

11. Even if we assume for the sake of argument—and only for the sake of argument—that there is no sufficient judicial evidence before the Council to warrant the finding that Israel committed the crime of arson, do not the United States and the United Kingdom have a clear picture of the political circumstances that led to the committing of this crime? Do not the United States and the United Kingdom have good reason to believe that the Israeli occupation, the Israeli defiance of the unanimous resolutions of the Security Council and the continued Israeli violations created the situation which facilitated the committing of that grave crime? Do they not believe that the fact that Israel was permitted to take the law into its own hands could have encouraged an individual to commit the crime we are now discussing?

12. I was indeed surprised to hear my colleague Mr. Yost, representative of the United States, take the floor to welcome Israel's announcement that the hearings of the Commission of Inquiry and the trial of the suspected arsonist would be public and open to observers from any country or of any faith.

13. I was hoping that Mr. Yost would be the first to reiterate a provision in a decision for which he had voted on 3 July of this year [resolution 267 (1967)], when the Security Council unanimously—with, I repeat, the vote of the United States—reiterated the invalidity of all legislative measures taken by Israel aiming at the annexation of Jerusalem. Mr. Yost and the United States Government did know—it was announced by me in this Council, it was published in *The Jerusalem Post*, it was announced by the Israeli Government—that this Committee of Inquiry was constituted in accordance with the law which this Council had declared invalid. Mr. Yost and the United States Government did know that the other trial would also invoke provisions the application of which was declared invalid. To come and welcome a step taken in accordance with legislation which the Council, in its wisdom, has declared invalid does not help in easing tension in the area.

14. These laws are invalid; they were declared invalid; the Council asked Israel to rescind them; the Council promised

to meet for action in case of failure. So far Israel has not abided by the injunction of the Council. And now we hear the United States saying in effect: "We welcome the steps taken in accordance with invalid legislation"—which is unfortunate, to say the least.

15. As I said, we have adduced enough evidence, and even more circumstantial evidence. But on the question of responsibility, one indeed wonders: when the late Count Bernadotte was murdered by the Israeli terrorists in cold blood in 1948—a murder which was condemned by the United Nations authorities as an "outrage against the international community and an unspeakable violation of elementary morality"—why did neither the United States nor the United Kingdom object to the finding that that murder constituted "a breach of the truce of utmost gravity for which the provisional Government of Israel must assume full responsibility"?<sup>1</sup> Why did we not hear the voices of the two great Powers on that question? That crime was also committed within the territory administered by the forces of Israel.

16. But even if we take the logic of Israel—and apparently the logic of Israel appeals to certain of the great Powers—let us recall that simply because two freedom fighters passed through the airport of Beirut, Lebanon, Mr. Tekoah came before the Security Council to say that Lebanon was responsible. That being the case—and let us not take Arab logic but Israeli logic—then the Israelis are responsible for this crime. The act of resistance is a legitimate act, but the crime of arson is an illegitimate crime.

17. Did the United States help Jordan, the friend of the United States, to repel the Israeli attacks against Jordan? We are not asking the United States to help us apply Israeli logic and thus to attack the airport at Tel-Aviv or Lydda. Our friends who promised us many things did nothing to protect Jordan or to help stop the napalm and the jets. Instead of doing that, they are sending Phantoms to accommodate Israeli aggression, thus feeding the Israeli arrogance of power.

18. My second point is the following: the United States representative, Mr. Yost, the United Kingdom representative, Lord Caradon, and the Israeli representative, Mr. Tekoah, would like us to consider the question of Al Aqsa in isolation. They say that it is not desirable to re-examine the question of Jerusalem now. But the Security Council is convened to consider a situation threatening world peace and security. How can we ignore all the circumstances that have led to this situation? How can we ignore the complaint submitted by 25 Members from Asia and Africa?

19. My third point is this: both the United States and the United Kingdom would like to see resolutions 252 (1968) of 21 May 1968 and 267 (1969) of 3 July 1969 reaffirmed. The words used by my good friend Lord Caradon at last Friday's meeting were:

"That resolution was clear, it was strong, it was unanimous. We do not want or need to add to it.

<sup>1</sup> Official Records of the Security Council, Third Year, Supplement for October 1948, document S/1004.

Certainly we do not wish to detract from it, If we tinker with it, it will come to bits. We should not destroy it. We should strongly and unanimously maintain it." [1510th meeting, para. 11.]

20. I ask you, Mr. President, and all my colleagues around this table, members of the Security Council: do you adopt resolutions to be reaffirmed, reiterated and re-emphasized only? Does not the Council have a duty to see to it that its resolutions are respected and implemented, since they do constitute the law of the United Nations? What do you want me to report to my people and Government about your resolutions and the present stand of the United States and the United Kingdom? Resolution 267 (1969) calls on Israel to rescind certain measures it had taken. Paragraph 7 of resolution 267 (1969) determines that, in case of no response or of a negative response, the Security Council shall reconvene without delay to take action. Shall I report to my people and Government that Lord Caradon would like them to forget paragraph 7? It reads:

"Determines that, in the event of a negative response or no response from Israel, the Security Council shall reconvene without delay to consider what further action should be taken in this matter."

21. Shall I tell my people that Lord Caradon, someone who lived in the area, who witnessed Israeli terrorism and who is more qualified than any member round this table to speak the truth about these crimes and this terrorism wants them to forget about anything more than a reaffirmation of past resolutions? Should they frame the Council's resolutions and hang them on the wall as a permanent and living reminder of the inaction of the Security Council and of the political expediency of the United States and the United Kingdom? Shall I report to them, and to our people now under Israeli occupation, that the whole world condemned the arson as a deplorable crime but that Lord Caradon, upon instructions from his Government, called it merely "an attempt" to burn the sacred Mosque; and that, while Israel has called it arson, the United Kingdom calls it "the dreadful crime of attempting to burn the Mosque" [ibid., para. 13]. Shall I tell every Jordanian citizen, both in the occupied part of Jordan and in the east bank of Jordan, that the so-called friends of Jordan do not react to support them in the Security Council against Israeli crimes, nor do they react to the Moslem world in Asia and Africa which is seeking a legitimate, factual and moderate resolution reflecting the reality of the situation.

22. When the Moslem world and all of the 14 Arab States come before the Security Council with a clear-cut case, when they request specific, positive steps to remedy a grave situation, and indeed when they at a very grave and solemn moment come with a factual draft resolution [S/9445] with respect to the arson that occurred in the Al Aqsa Mosque, we find the United States and the United Kingdom objecting to that minimum request and insisting on a mere routine draft resolution. On the other hand, the question arises: what is the present attitude of the same Western Powers vis-à-vis Israel? It is the very same attitude that they have vis-à-vis Rhodesia and South Africa: help, support, economic assistance and United States military equipment.

23. The United States announced that it will not vote for this resolution. It confined its stand to expressions of sentiments; and Jordan is grateful to the United States for those sentiments. On the other hand, to accommodate Israeli aggression the United States is sending Phantom jets to Israel. The United States talks about peace but by its actions it is accommodating war. It is causing escalation in the area, causing more bloodshed and more crimes.

24. My fourth and last point, on which both the United States and the United Kingdom agree, is that we should not allow our debate to make a peaceful settlement difficult to achieve. We have been hearing the very same words since November 1967, the very same call for patience. The United States, the United Kingdom and Israel have reached the conclusion that the Security Council should state propositions on which "we all whole-heartedly agree". That idea appealed to Mr. Tekoah this morning. He is in full agreement with the United States and the United Kingdom. This is what Mr. Tekoah said to the Council this morning after hearing the appeal or request made by the United States and the United Kingdom: "We must seek what unites us".

25. Is that attitude really, genuinely, honestly and sincerely conducive to peace? Can that behaviour lead to any success as long as United States policy is concentrated not only on protecting Israeli aggression, but also on opposing any attempt, through this Council, to help in putting an end to the Israeli arrogance of power? Indeed, how can any big Power be influential in its efforts for peace if it does not maintain the right image? The abstention of the United States on the draft resolution now before the Council will certainly damage the image of the United States in many parts of the world. The arguments adduced in favour of the abstention will not convince anybody. It is a clear-cut attempt to cover up a policy of expediency.

26. Mr. PINIES (Spain) (*translated from Spanish*): Mr. President, allow me to express my thanks to all the representatives who have addressed such kind words to me with regard to my work as President of the Council last month. With regard to yourself, Mr. President, I have already had occasion previously to wish you every success, and you may be sure you can count on my full co-operation to that end.

27. Once again the Security Council is meeting to take a decision on an event which has occurred within the framework of the conflict in the Middle East. However, the act we are considering today has new features which make it particularly reprehensible. The conscience of the world, whether of believers or unbelievers, has been shaken with indignation on learning of the incredible occurrence of the burning of the Al Aqsa Mosque, a Holy Place of the Moslem world in the very heart of Jerusalem. The Spanish people is a religious people which understands and shares the grief of Islam on this day of mourning.

28. Apart from the confused circumstances which appear to have attended this disaster, my delegation considers it appropriate to point out a fact which lies at the very base of any responsibility: the maintenance by Israel of the military occupation of the Holy City, contrary to the

unanimous resolutions of this Council. It seems entirely appropriate to my delegation that, in the draft resolution submitted by the representative of Pakistan so brilliantly and with such profound conviction, we should again stress the principle that the acquisition of territory by force is inadmissible. Annexation by force of arms is now impossible under the new legal order established by the Charter of the United Nations. The passage of time can never consolidate an unjust situation which is contrary to the tenets of international law, the principles and provisions of the Charter, and the resolutions of this organ and the General Assembly, adopted in a constructive attempt to lay the foundations of a just and lasting peace.

29. That brings us to the very root of the problem: Israel's reiterated will to disregard the resolutions of the United Nations, a form of conduct which deserves the strongest rejection by the Security Council, as expressed in the draft resolution which has been submitted for our consideration.

30. An explosive situation, aggravated daily by new acts endangering the peace and security of that region and of the world continues to prevail in the Middle East. This Council, on which rests the primary responsibility for the maintenance of peace, has on many occasions dealt with that complex and urgent problem from various points of view, and in its resolutions—many of which were adopted unanimously—it has laid down the principles which must serve as the basis for a political settlement of the conflict. However, its decisions, which have been motivated by the sole aim of solving the dispute on the basis of justice and respect for the interests of the parties concerned, have run up against the determined will of Israel to turn a deaf ear to any appeal which does not agree with its interests. Thus the resolutions of the Security Council, like those of the General Assembly, have so far been unable to turn Israel from the course it has laid down for its own convenience. My delegation will therefore vote in favour of the draft resolution now before us [S/9445], whose operative paragraph 5 condemns Israel's rebellious attitude towards the resolutions of the United Nations.

31. These are, in brief outline, the reasons which lead my delegation to support the draft resolution submitted by Pakistan. We listened with great interest to the appeal the representative of Israel made for co-operation and goodwill in his statement at the 1507th meeting. We cherish the hope that, as proof of this positive state of mind, Israel may accept and comply with the resolutions of the Security Council, resolutions which contain the elements of a political, negotiated and just settlement of a conflict which is gravely endangering the peace of the world and the existence of this Organization itself.

32. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Russian*): I wish to thank Mr. Piniés for the words he has addressed to me.

33. Since the list of speakers is coming to an end, I should now like, in my capacity as the representative of the UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS, to make a statement on behalf of the Soviet delegation on the question before us.

34. Everybody here is well aware of the amount of attention the Security Council has been obliged to devote

to the problem of Jerusalem. The Council has adopted two resolutions [252 (1968) and 267 (1969)] on the situation in that City, occupied by Israel as a result of the June 1967 aggression; two resolutions concerning the status of Jerusalem have been adopted by the General Assembly [2253 (ES-V) and 2254 (ES-V)].

35. All the decisions of the United Nations on the question of Jerusalem are based on a clear line of principle reflecting the conscience and the will of the Member States of the United Nations, namely, that the military seizure by Israel of the Arab part of Jerusalem is illegal, that the usurper has no right to change the status of Jerusalem or to rule there as he sees fit, and that he must leave the Arab part of the City.

36. In its resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967, the Security Council called for the withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from the occupied Arab territories without, of course, making any exception either for the Arab part of Jerusalem or for any other Arab territory seized by Israel whatever.

37. That is the firm position of the Security Council, the principal organ of the United Nations on which the Members of this Organization have placed the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. The decisions of this body are binding upon Member States, and must be implemented. This is not a matter of anyone's willingness or unwillingness: it is an obligation assumed by every Member of the United Nations under Article 25 of the Charter.

38. The fact is, however, that the decisions of the Security Council concerning Jerusalem are not being implemented by Israel. Many representatives have already mentioned that here. Israel continues to occupy illegally the Arab part of Jerusalem, as well as other Arab territories. It is undermining a peaceful settlement in the Middle East, based on Council resolution 242 (1967), advancing annexationist claims to Arab lands, including the Arab part of Jerusalem, and pursuing a policy of repression, arbitrary rule and forcible Israelization of the occupied territories. And it is precisely because of this aggressive policy that the situation in Jerusalem is constantly deteriorating and the atmosphere is becoming more and more tense.

39. During the past two years the Security Council has repeatedly received reports and official information concerning attempts by the occupying forces to annihilate and eradicate the Arab character of the Old City of Jerusalem. Arab inhabitants have been forcibly expelled from their homes; Arab residential sections have been destroyed; the economic life of the Arab part of Jerusalem has been deliberately subordinated to the requirements of the Israeli military economy. All this has made the situation more acute, heightened tension and increased the threat to peace.

40. It was precisely this climate of violence, terror and arbitrary rule under the conditions of the occupation régime that was conducive to the occurrence, in the Arab part of the City of Jerusalem, of the new scandalous act of vandalism—the setting on fire of the Al Aqsa Mosque. Against the background of the arbitrary rule practised by

the occupation forces in Jerusalem, the wireless news agencies' reports of the arson committed at the Al Aqsa Mosque—one of the most important historical and religious monuments of Jerusalem, revered by many millions of people in different parts of the world—deeply disturbed world public opinion.

41. This event, directly affecting the interests and feelings of the peoples of all the Moslem countries, also cannot leave other States indifferent, regardless of the faith to which their citizens belong or whether they profess any religion at all.

42. The great founder of the Soviet State, Vladimir Ilyich Lenin, the centenary of whose birth will be celebrated next year, 1970, taught us and repeatedly stressed "the need to take care to avoid any offence to the feelings of religious believers".

43. Soviet public opinion, as was mentioned in the TASS statement of 30 August 1969 [S/9426], was profoundly outraged by the burning of the Al Aqsa Mosque, a unique and most ancient monument of Arab architecture in the Middle East, a site to which many of the faithful have made pilgrimages and which is considered to be one of the Moslem Holy Places.

44. The Soviet people, through the bitter experience of the Patriotic War of 1941-1945 against the fascist enslavers, know that aggression and seizure of the territory of others go hand in hand with the use of the most barbarous methods of annihilation of the most valued historical monuments, the destruction and defilement of religious places. Suffice it to say that, on the territories of our country occupied by the enemy during the years of the Second World War, the German fascist invaders destroyed and damaged 1,670 Orthodox churches, 237 Roman Catholic churches, 532 synagogues and 258 other buildings belonging to various religious cults.

45. The arson at the Al Aqsa Mosque is not merely a criminal offence. This is a case of mockery, under the occupation régime, of people's religious feelings, of attempts against unique historical values highly respected by all civilized mankind.

46. The fact that the arson of the Al Aqsa Mosque was committed under the conditions of the continuing occupation of Jerusalem cannot be and is not fortuitous. Whatever the Israeli authorities assert, however, they may try to justify themselves before world public opinion, it is impossible to separate the fact of Israel's occupation of Jerusalem and the occupation policy pursued by the occupation authorities in that City from the fact of that monstrous crime, the arson at Al Aqsa Mosque. And during the discussion of the item before us a great many representatives have already spoken of that, with only a few exceptions. The one fact is the inevitable result of the other. The burning of the Mosque, a Holy Place of the Moslem world, is a direct result of the aggression, occupation and policy of annexation being practised by Israel towards Jerusalem and the other Arab territories. The Israeli authorities will never be able to shed the responsibility for this crime.

47. But that is not all. The arson of the Al Aqsa Mosque, like a bright flash of lightning on a dark night, has cast its ominous glare on the general situation in the Middle East. That fire has again shown the entire world all the enormous danger to international peace which Israel is creating by its aggressive policy towards the Arab countries—a policy of hostility and hatred, desire for annexation of Arab territories, and continued refusal of a political settlement in the Middle East. This is a policy of war and annexation, and if Israel does not renounce it, it can ultimately lead to nothing but new serious military confrontations in that region, with all the dangerous consequences to all the peoples of the Middle East and to international peace and security.

48. Whoever assesses the situation realistically, whoever feels responsibility for the fate of peoples and for international peace, cannot fail to recognize that the criminal act of the arson at the Al Aqsa Mosque serves as clear confirmation of the undeniable fact that the continuation of the occupation of Arab lands is constantly and increasingly aggravating the situation and creating a direct threat of war. This is an objective fact; there is no getting away from it and it would be the height of folly and irresponsibility to close our eyes to this factual reality.

49. That being the case, however, it becomes even more indispensable, and still more urgent, that the United Nations and the Security Council take effective action to oblige Israel to implement the Council's resolution of 22 November 1967 and its other decisions on the Middle East, including its decisions with regard to Israel. The Security Council must require Israel to submit to its decisions unconditionally and without delay. The whole world condemns the outrageous behaviour of the occupiers in Jerusalem and the other Arab territories.

50. The aggressive policy pursued by the Israeli extremists, who are recklessly pushing their country into ever new aggressive adventures, as the representatives of the United Arab Republic, Algeria, Jordan, India, and a number of other speakers have mentioned in their statements, can only bring dire calamity upon the people of Israel itself. The latest provocation by Tel-Aviv against the United Arab Republic all too clearly evidences, as the TASS statement of 30 August pointed out, the need to take urgent measures to eliminate the consequences of the imperialist aggression by Israel, and first and foremost to secure the immediate withdrawal of the Israeli army from the occupied Arab territories.

51. It is the duty of the Security Council and of all peace-loving peoples to compel the aggressor to put an end to his policy of aggression, arbitrary rule and oppression, to desist from annexation of foreign territories, and to oblige him to agree to a political settlement based on the Security Council resolution of 22 November 1967.

52. We also cannot fail to note another aspect of the matter, namely, that the impunity of Israel's present provocative behaviour creates a dangerous precedent for the impunity of aggressive actions, which the United Nations and all peace-loving States cannot tolerate. Procrastination in reaching a settlement in the Middle East does not serve

the interests of the peoples involved; it only aggravates the conflict and causes the atmosphere to become more inflamed.

53. The Soviet Union, standing firmly in favour of the establishment of a lasting peace in the Middle East, and of a political settlement based on Security Council resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967, cannot and will not consider the maintenance of the present situation in the Middle East as acceptable from the standpoint of the cause of peace. That situation cannot be accepted: it is fraught with dangers which are far too great.

54. The discussion in the Security Council of the proposal submitted by 25 Moslem States concerning the arson of the Al Aqsa Mosque in Jerusalem was an even more graphic demonstration and further confirmation, on the eve of the twenty-fourth session of the United Nations General Assembly, of the moral and international political isolation of Israel and those who aid and abet it. All this should show the Israeli people the dangers of the path along which its extremist leaders are taking the country.

55. The Council must clearly proclaim the political and moral responsibility of Israel for the arson at the Al Aqsa Mosque, for the tense situation in the Arab part of Jerusalem, and in the other occupied Arab territories. The Council must demand that Israel liberate all the Arab territories seized in June 1967, withdraw all the Israeli troops from those territories, and achieve a peaceful political settlement in the Middle East based on the resolution I mentioned above.

56. The delegation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has carefully studied the draft resolution submitted by the representative of Pakistan [S/9445] on behalf of 25 Member States of the United Nations. On the whole, the Soviet delegation considers this draft resolution acceptable and supports it, although it is self-evident that the USSR delegation would have preferred the Security Council to adopt a stronger resolution on the question under consideration, which is plainly and directly connected with the general situation in the Middle East.

57. Speaking now in my capacity as PRESIDENT, I call on the representative of Israel to speak in exercise of his right of reply.

58. Mr. TEKOA (Israel): On 29 August 1969, at 1530 hours GMT, the following was broadcast by Radio Prague:

*"Rudé Právo* expresses disenchantment with the Arab States. To reduce the Arab-Israeli conflict to a holy war against the enemies of Islam cannot arouse support for the Arab cause."

59. The disenchantment has been world-wide and it is no surprise at all that it should have reached also countries of Eastern Europe. It may, however, be cause for surprise that even in this instance the Soviet Union has been unable to rise above sterile animosity and unreserved identification with Arab extremism, and make a constructive contribution to our discussion. The assortment of name-calling, fact-twisting and sanctimonious protestations about Soviet love

for religion to which the Security Council has been treated today by the representative of the USSR is all too familiar. It simply confirms the fact that the Soviet Union has not thus far mended its ways in the Middle East conflict and that, in disregard for international law and the United Nations Charter, its policy and actions which have contributed to and encouraged Arab belligerency until now remain unchanged. As long as they do remain unchanged, it is of course futile to hope that the Soviet Union can be a partner in peace-making. It is rather like associating a law-breaker in law and peace-keeping.

60. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Russian*): In my capacity as representative of the UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS, I should like to draw attention to the fact that the Israeli representative has singled out the statement of the Soviet delegation for special preference in his reply. That is his usual practice. Our statement contained nothing new or different from what we have often said before.

61. The Israeli representative recalled the constructive contribution which the Soviet Union has made to the cause of a settlement. Yes, the Soviet Union has made, does and will tirelessly make its constructive contribution to the cause of a political settlement in the Middle East, based strictly on the resolutions of the Security Council. Until such time as Israel understands this, we shall continue to hear replies like that which we have just heard from the Israeli representative.

62. Speaking now as PRESIDENT of the Council, I should like to say that the next speaker on my list is the representative of Saudi Arabia. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to address the Council.

63. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): Our colleague from Israel has repeated the assertion time and again that Jerusalem is a Jewish city and has been so from time immemorial. In one of my past speeches before the Council—and I do not have to repeat what I said—I stated that Jerusalem was the city of Salem. If we go into the philology—to leave aside the archaeology of the area—we know that even the wife of Moses was an Arab from Petra, and the Nabataeans and also those of the area gave that name to the city. I do not have to repeat what I have made clear in one of my previous interventions. However, we can go around in circles saying that the Jews identified themselves with Jerusalem because of Judea and Israel during the Roman times. Also, perhaps if we go back as far as Moses is concerned—and there are doubts, according to Freud, whether Moses was a Jew; we know that he was a Hamite; we know that his wife was a Nabataean—we find that all this historical appreciation of Mr. Tekoa is lost in the mist of history. I may remind him of the Dead Sea Scrolls that are shedding new light also on who was there.

64. We know that the tribes—they were Semitic tribes—came from Ur of the Chaldees in Mesopotamia before they went to the land of Canaan, which is Palestine. That is where Abraham flourished. Jacob, the son of Isaac, moved with his sons to the land of Canaan; and the land was populated by Semitic people. We do not deny the fact that the Jews of the area—who were called Jews, after the name

of the fourth son of Jacob, whose name was Judah—were Semites of the area, too. We never denied the fact that they were part of the indigenous people of Palestine—because, the Canaanites were Semites, the Arameans were Semites, the Nabataeans were Semites, the Arabs were Semites; and those tribes that came from Ur of the Chaldees were a minority among the Semites.

65. I am talking history, I am citing Jewish scholars, too—European Jewish scholars—who deny that the Jews as such populated the area. We have only to turn to Genesis, chapter 34, to see how the so-called Jews, if I may say so, moved from Mesopotamia to the land of Canaan. I do not have to repeat that story of circumcision and how they put those who were circumcised to the sword because Dinah, their sister, was defiled by the king of the Canaanites in that small area. The Bible is available to everyone. And what did they do during the third day, when everyone was in pain? They put the Canaanites to the sword, their cousins, their brothers—because they are of the same stock.

66. Now, who comes to teach us and say “My people, my people, my people”? A Khazar from central Europe. He represents the Khazars who propagated that movement. He cannot say “My people”. There are many orthodox Jews who do not want to be called your people.

67. Just before I left this country in July I was given a leaflet by an orthodox Jew which I will read to you. You cannot represent these Jews, and I will mention other Jews that you cannot represent. The leaflet states: “The Jewish people are in no way connected with the State of Israel”—this leaflet was published here in the United States. For your information, no Arab asked them to do that. And here, what do those orthodox Jews say?

“From time immemorial ‘Jews’ have been synonymous with loyalty to the teachings of the Torah. The State of Israel is founded on the concepts of utter contempt of the Torah, for the Torah forbids a man-made Jewish State in any form—even in a strictly religious form. The State of Israel is not and cannot be a ‘Jewish State’. The Zionist politicians who founded the State went so far as to steal the sacred name of ‘Israel’. That name is really representative of loyalty to the Torah. The State of Israel from its very inception (at the Zionist Congresses at the end of the 19th century) has purposefully and methodically fought directly and indirectly to destroy the Torah.

“We, loyal Jews—we, the true ‘Israelites’—reject the politicians, both here and in the Holy Land, who claim to speak in the name of all Jews.

“ . . .

“Jews don’t take innocent youths and demoralize them in socialist ‘kibbutzim’.

“Jews don’t burn up airplanes in Beirut (or anywhere else).

“Jews don’t establish man-made States or engage in political agitation or rebellion.

“He who has been tainted with Zionism has ceased to be a loyal Jew. The only spokesmen for Jews are the

genuine Torah-true sages. The Zionists do not and cannot speak in the name of ‘Jews’. As for the ‘religious Zionists’: the very expression is a lie. According to the teachings of the Torah, the Jewish religion and Zionism are at war with each other; and no accommodations are possible. Be assured that what has been stated above is the only true, authentic Torah viewpoint on the subject. Those Jewish scholars, and religious leaders, who actively or passively support the Zionist war against the Torah know that we speak the truth. They should let the faith of their fathers be their guide.

“They should preach what the genuine Torah-true sages practise!”

and so on and so forth.

68. That is only one faction which does not believe in Israel. What about those Jews who are loyal citizens of States in which they were born, or of States of adoption? Many of them have told me personally that their religion is something personal between them and their Creator, and they do not believe that Judaism, a noble religion, should be used as a motivation for an economic or, for that matter, political end.

69. And this morning, I believe, Mr. Tekoah said—I am paraphrasing him, of course: “Jerusalem is the capital of all the Jews.” When we say “capital” there is a political implication in the word. What about the American Jew? What about the English Jew, or the Russian Jew? Does he consider that he has two capitals—one capital in Moscow or in London or in Paris or in Washington, or wherever Jews may be found, and at the same time that he has a capital in Jerusalem?

70. How can Mr. Tekoah say that Jerusalem is the capital of the Jews because Judaism has evolved in the Holy Land? Nobody contests the point that Judaism has evolved in the Holy Land. So did Christianity evolve in the Holy Land. Is Jerusalem the capital of Christendom? No, it is not. Is Rome, where the Vatican is located, the capital of all the Catholics? Even His Holiness the Pope does not call the Vatican the capital of all the Catholics; he is much wiser than to say that. He knows that Catholics are loyal to the various nations to which they belong. And the Vatican is called a Holy City.

71. So is Jerusalem a Holy City. But to whom does it belong? Does it belong to the usurper, to the conquerors, to those who took it by force of arms? If this Council is going to say that anyone may take a holy city, or an unholy city, for that matter—any territory—by force of arms, then let us fold up the United Nations. We are supposed here to be the arbiters not only of the principle of self-determination which was enunciated by Mr. Wilson in the Fourteen Points at the Conference of Versailles, but of the principle which was elaborated into a right in the United Nations Organization: the principle of self-determination. It took us eight years here in the United Nations to elaborate that into a human right, with all the opposition we encountered from erstwhile colonial countries. And they try to tell us that there is no such thing as a right of self-determination; there is only a principle. I have lived long enough to hear the

term "right to self-determination" used in the parliaments and chambers of deputies of those erstwhile colonial Powers, which had negated such a right to self-determination.

72. Is a religion a nationality, I ask for the hundredth time in this Council since 1947. If so, your own countries have Moslems, Orthodox, Baptists—many sects and atheists. Each, then, on the basis of belief, should break up and form a State or a Republic, or whatever you call it, on the basis of religion. The United States has many religions and sects. Who but the Zionists ask for a State to be based on religion? There is nothing new in history.

73. I am going to quote a passage from a paper which I delivered before the American Academy of Political and Social Science in July 1949—over 20 years ago—and I will show you how at one time Christianity was used as a motivation for political and economic ends; the result was wars, massacres, suffering and tribulation. One would think that this is all behind us, but we find a movement in the twentieth century which is assuming the same pattern, without regard to the indigenous people of the region, using the traditional force of arms and power and duplicity in order to consolidate themselves—those Zionists—in the Holy Land. It seems man has learned very little from the lessons of history.

74. With your permission, Mr. President, I shall quote from the paper that I presented. It was published in the annals of the American Academy of Political Science in Philadelphia, July 1949, and read:

"Before the end of the eleventh century, the famous proclamation of Urban II galvanized the European community. Diverted from their internal economic ills, they unleashed their forces on the inhabitants of Western Asia. The words of Urban II are worth quoting:

"Let none of your possessions detain you, nor solicitude for your family affairs, since the land which you inhabit is too narrow for your large population. Nor does it abound with wealth. It furnishes scarcely food for its cultivators. Hence it is that you murder and devour one another, that you wage war and frequently you perish by mutual wounds. Let therefore hatred depart from among you and let quarrels and wars cease. Enter upon the road to the Holy Sepulchre. Wrest the land from the wicked race and subject it to yourselves."

"The history of the crusades which inflicted so much sufferings on both East and West is too familiar to bear repetition in this paper."

75. This is what Zionism is doing. It is a new crusade. Where are the crusades now? They are in the annals of history. Where will Zionism be a decade or so from now? I do not want to answer the question, because it is in the power of the Zionists to bring a cataclysm into this world. They have given themselves away.

76. Mr. Tekoah referred in one of his statements to certain eccentrics when some of us cited what was said in the symposium which was held in Jerusalem and from which I

quoted the other day. I did not want to encumber the Council at that time with all that took place at the symposium. Incidentally, the event was reported in two of the major newspapers of Israel for the benefit, I guess, of public opinion after the June 1967 war. I shall read out the following:

"Dr. Schlesinger in the symposium said the following:

"What frightens me most is when one hears the participants in this symposium say that the presence of a Mosque on the Mountain of the House is not a tragedy. This person refuses also to see a tragedy in the presence of a church, and not a Mosque. It is frightening to discover that Judaism and Jewish education lead us to see with satisfaction or to consider it not a tragedy that idol worship is in existence on the Mountain of the House. For even though mosques are not idol worship, it would be difficult not to consider Catholic churches as idol worship."

77. Where are the Christians? Most of them are no longer Christians; those at least who are at the head of Christian countries are secular. But here they are giving warning that the mountain in Jerusalem where there may be churches, and anything that is near the temple that has been destroyed would desecrate Judaism, because this Zionist considers the Catholics as idol worshippers because they have the Virgin Mary statues, the statues of Saint Joseph and others.

78. And then Mr. Tekoah says that Jerusalem is the capital of the Jews. Why? Why should it not be the capital of the people who lived there? How was Palestine partitioned and who partitioned Palestine? Of course our friends the British were vague about it. They were dancing on too many roofs in the days of the Conservatives of Mr. Balfour. They promised one thing to the Arabs in 1916 and in 1917 they promised one thing to the Jews, because they were losing the war against the Germans in the First World War. The Zionists of the United Kingdom railroaded the United States into the First World War. We can produce documents on that, on the role that Mr. Brandeis played with Mr. Wilson. We know what happened in the erstwhile Savoy Plaza, at the Conference of the Zionists and the good American Jews who opposed them, saying, "We are loyal Americans". I mentioned at one time Mr. Morgenthau, who was appointed the United States Ambassador to Turkey in the First World War. He was there in 1917. He was the grandfather of Mr. Morgenthau who is Attorney General in New York City and the father of Henry Morgenthau Jr., who became a Zionist in contravention of the wishes of his father, who was the Secretary of the Treasury under the late Franklin D. Roosevelt. Not all the Jews could consider Jerusalem as their capital.

79. And if they did, it would be to the sorrow of many Jews because they would be taunted by racists one of these days who would say, "What are you doing here? Go back to your capital, to the hornets' nest." I call it hornets' nest because if the Arabs do not have sufficient arms nowadays, at least they are like a hornets' nest—they come from all directions. I do not think it is pleasant to live in a hornets' nest.

80. Mr. Tekoah spoke in a low key during this session so as not to touch on the susceptibilities of the Moslems in the world, but once in a while he could not hide his sarcasm. I want to tell you what they have in mind. I have a newspaper in my hand. It is the French newspaper *Le Monde*—an issue dated 4 July 1969. The article is entitled “The Ghetto of the Victors”. This is the third article of a series entitled “What should we do with the Palestinians”. It is “from our special correspondent Eric Rouleau”.<sup>2</sup> Do not be frightened, I am not going to read the whole article. I am going to read the last paragraph, which unmasks the Zionists who allegedly went there to bring democracy into our midst. What kind of democracy? The democracy of the sword, that dialectical democracy that does not obtain any more in the Western World, the democracy that depends on building up the image of a person, the democracy with ghost-writers, the democracy-perverted as it has been—that rationalizes its aggression. With the permission of the President I shall read this paragraph in the original French as I did not have time to translate it:

“Isn’t a prolonged occupation likely to undermine the traditional values of the Jewish people? To this question, which the American journalist, Stewart Alsop, asked the Israeli Prime Minister, Mrs. Golda Meir, she replied last April: ‘I shall be frank with you. I don’t want a gentle, liberal, anti-colonialist and anti-militarist Jewish people. It would then be a dead people.’”<sup>2</sup>

81. It will be a dead people if it is anti-colonialist, if it is liberal, if it is sweet. This is the Premier, a lady, who is talking. She does not want to be sweet, she does not want to be anti-colonialist, she does not want to be liberal. For then “we will have a dead people”.

82. Jerusalem is the capital of the Jews? By what yardstick? Mr. Tekoah said that the Jews had a right to worship in peace in Jerusalem. He should know from history that they were never molested—throughout Islamic history. The Semitic Jews were our brothers, not our cousins; and these people, if they had come for a national home without any political strings attached or interpretations, if I may say so—the interpretations or the construction they put on the national home—nobody would have taken issue with them in the Arab world. Why should we? People of all religions flocked to Jerusalem, people of all Christian and Moslem sects, and no one was molested on account of his religion or the particular sect to which he belonged. But this movement is like the movement of the Crusades when Urban II thought of diverting his vassals’ attention to retard the national movements of those days from seceding from the Church. It was a diversion and the Crusades were initiated; and the propagandist of those days was Peter the Hermit. It is a sad episode in the history of the Middle East. One can make statements, but they have to be proven.

83. A minority of 2 million or 3 million Zionists represented by Mr. Tekoah and others claim that God gave the Jews the Holy Land of Palestine. Time and again I have said that God was never in the real estate business, and I have asked for the title deeds to be presented here. I asked my good friend Lord Caradon to see if in Chancery Lane or

somewhere where they keep the archives there is any record that Mr. Balfour had the power of attorney from God Almighty to promise something that did not belong to him. I ask my good friend Ambassador Yost, who knows our area very well, whether Mr. Truman had a right, because he wanted to muster votes, to give something that did not belong to him. Just because the Zionists played on the sentiments of innocent Jews in the United States and England, converted them into a sort of a dream of a State, must the Arabs pay the price? We have come here time and again since 1947 without any results. Mr. Truman said in his memoirs: never had the White House been subjected to such pressures: indeed, even his partner in the haberdashery store in Kansas was sent to him to tell him “Do something for those poor Jews”. Mr. Weizmann was admitted into the kitchen gate or the back door of the White House so that no one might know.

84. Mr. Truman is still alive. He said in his memoirs that he also acted from humanitarian motives. Humanitarian motives? What about Hiroshima and Nagasaki, which he wiped out when Japan was on the point of surrendering?

85. Whom do they think they are fooling? My colleague from Jordan rightly put many questions this afternoon to the representatives of the United Kingdom and the United States. And I ask: what have we Arabs done to you, the United Kingdom or the United States, so that you line yourselves up with Israel against your own interests? Sooner or later, the Arab people will no longer be controllable by their Governments. At one time, I remember, the Arab people in the region used to say “God in Heaven and the Americans on earth”, because they were isolationists then. The last time I was there, I was told “God in Heaven, and the helpers of Israel are the devil incarnate”. In the estimation of the Arab people, they are like that proverbial angel that fell from Heaven to become the devil. The devil is a legendary character.

86. Who is sending napalm? Who is sending military planes to bomb us? An alien people 7,000 miles away from the Holy Land, abetting another people coming from Central Europe. What have the Arabs done to the United Kingdom or to the United States, or to the Western World for that matter? We have opened our doors wide for them. They have economic interests; they have oil interests; they trade with us. We had never discriminated against the Jews before that, but now we do not know what Jew is a Zionist and what Jew is not a Zionist—and this makes it bad for the Jews who are not Zionists. We do not want to trade with the Zionists because they are usurpers.

87. Time and again we have heard this chorus from Mr. Tekoah: “my people”, “the Jewish people”. His people are only those who, regrettably, were brain-washed with political Zionism—not the spiritual Zionism which we all respect, but the terrestrial sort of Zionism which flourishes only on force and usurpation. Has it occurred to you that people are getting tired of both the Jews and the Arabs the world over? We do not care if they get tired of us. We are 100 million. But what about you, my dear Sir? One day, when things go wrong in certain Western countries—and there are activists all over the Western countries, as there are in other parts of the world—they will say: “All our

<sup>2</sup> Quoted in French by the speaker.

troubles come from the Jews”, and the Jews will be persecuted even though they are innocent. You will become scapegoats. Have you not noticed from history that you have been scapegoats, many a time, unjustly? The other day I mentioned van der Lubbe and the *Reichstag*—an excuse for Hitler’s persecuting the Communists and the Jews. If you want to burn your hands and burn the Arabs with you, why should you jeopardize innocent Jews all over the world, American Jews whom you are daily brain-washing to the effect that Israel is their homeland or should be their homeland, and that Jerusalem should be the capital of the Jews? It never will be that, except for the period of usurpation. And for heaven’s sake, when I talk here in the Council, it is with the hope that I may draw your attention to the facts of life, that you cannot exist in the midst of 100 million people who are against you.

88. The Arabs may fight like cats and dogs amongst themselves over ideologies, over certain national interests, but they are one when it comes to the usurper—just as the Christians joined the Moslems during the days of the Crusades to fight the invader from abroad.

89. Things are getting too serious for the Council to be complacent. Whether it passes resolutions by consensus or by vote, one thing is certain. It is that your great country, Mr. President, and the great country of the United States has it within its power to take up a lofty principle of the Charter—and I refer to the principle of self-determination—as the basis of a just solution. But if you keep shilly-shallying, as has been done, unfortunately, by your policy-makers, this problem will trail on and may, despite all your prudence, make you miscalculate because of the high stakes involved in the area. And then the calamity would occur.

90. As I mentioned once in the Council, Tsarist Russia and the United Kingdom sent an ultimatum to Mohammad Ali when the armies of his son, Ibrahim Pasha, reached Konya. At that time, in 1840, Tsarist Russia had its eyes on the Bosphorus. And the United Kingdom wanted a weak Turkey so that it might guarantee its route overland to Alexandria, to the Red Sea, its route to India. Both your erstwhile Governments sent an ultimatum to Mohammed Ali in Egypt telling him to withdraw his troops—or else. Tsarist Russia was not on such good terms with the Government of the United Kingdom. But they saw a common interest by sending that ultimatum asking Mohammad Ali’s troops to withdraw. And he withdrew, because he was a wise man. He said: Well, during the days of the war between Turkey and Greece, the Sultan promised to make me a Khedive if I built him a fleet, which I did. But he reneged on his promise. Can you persuade him to make me a Khedive? They said: That is easy. And this explains the foundation of the Khedivian house in Egypt.

91. Cannot Russia and the United States send a joint ultimatum, as they did in 1940, saying: “Withdraw, or else . . .”? There is something mysterious there. Since you are not sending an ultimatum, the rest of us here can do nothing except wait. This reminds me of a line in Milton’s sonnet *On His Blindness*. We are prepared to wait, knowing that justice will prevail. That line is: “They also serve who only stand and wait”.

92. Mr. SHAHI (Pakistan): Mr. President, I am grateful to you and to my colleagues around this table for allowing me to speak once more in this debate. When I presented the draft resolution contained in document S/9445 on Friday, I had the opportunity to outline the principal considerations behind it. Since then a number of my colleagues have made their comments. It might therefore be useful briefly to recapitulate the main points which, I submit, need to be kept in the forefront of our minds if the Security Council is to discharge its responsibility in the situation placed before it by 25 Member States of the United Nations through their letter of 28 August.

93. At the very beginning of this debate I said that the attempt to set fire to the holy Al Aqsa Mosque was an unparalleled event: unparalleled in its horror and in the depth of the reaction which it provoked across all national, ethnic and religious frontiers. The position before the Security Council in so far as this event is concerned can be summarized as follows.

94. First, the event produced such world-wide revulsion and caused such anguish to the followers of Islam in all continents as to call for meaningful action by the Security Council; otherwise a sense of the gravest injustice is bound to grow which cannot but be a danger to international peace and security.

95. Secondly, as the Security Council is not a court of justice, and as it has no means for judicial investigation at its disposal, its concern is not to determine the issue of criminal responsibility for the act of arson in the sacred shrine, but to deal with the political circumstances which surround that act and which, if allowed to continue, yield no assurance whatsoever that an act of this nature will not recur in the future.

96. Thirdly, these political circumstances are inextricably associated with the military occupation of the Old City by Israel and with Israel’s attempts to annex the City in defiance of decisions of the Security Council, in violation of the recommendations of the General Assembly, and in determined opposition to the wishes of the people of the City.

97. Fourthly, the issue is not one of a conflict between two religious claims, but that of the preservation of the sacred character of the shrines of all faiths, which is not possible under any military occupation. When such occupation is maintained by the forces of a movement which has exhibited a strong revivalist bias and which includes followers who pursue clearly Messianic goals, the feeling that these shrines are threatened is bound to grow and be widespread.

98. May I now add a word or two in amplification of those points. As regards the world-wide reaction to the event of 21 August, nothing could make it clearer than the fact that this issue has been referred to the Security Council by as many as 25 Member States, most of which are not directly involved in the Middle East conflict. I trust that it has not escaped the notice of the members of the Council that while our agenda reads “The situation in the Middle East”, the representatives of Ceylon, India, Indonesia and

Malaysia have participated in this debate because they feel that the interests of their countries "are specially affected", to use the phrase in Article 31 of the Charter, by this situation. Those countries, along with Pakistan, constitute the bulk of South Asia and contain a not inconsiderable segment of the population of the world. This gives an indication of the magnitude of the problem created by the incredible event.

99. As regards its nature, it should be obvious that it is not limited in time. The injury done to the holy Mosque has inflicted a wound on the human soul which is not of the type that can heal with the passing of years. International situations change, power relations fluctuate, foreign policies of Governments are reappraised; but what affects the deepest allegiances of man remains unforgotten and influences generations still unborn.

100. If constructive action is not promptly taken to remove the effects of the event of 21 August, the result will be that, over and above the situation in the Middle East, a state of permanent hostility will be created affecting a variety of peoples and countries and focusing on the situation in Jerusalem.

101. As regards the second and third points, I have already said that we do not seek a condemnation of the evil act that took place on 21 August. That act, by whomsoever committed, stands self-condemned. Nor do we seek that the Security Council should pronounce itself in such a manner as to imply the complicity of Israeli authorities in the act. We do not demand any unjustified conclusions based on inadequate evidence. But we do submit that the act, being so unprecedented, could not but have been facilitated by a set of circumstances that are the direct outgrowth of the Israeli occupation of the Holy City. Even if one were to accept the Israeli version of the event, the fact that the suspected arsonist subscribed to a fundamentalist creed is significant. His belief that his most execrable act would mark a stage in the fulfilment of a prophecy blends easily with the outlook of zealots and religious academicians in Israel.

102. The representative of Israel told us the other day that pious Jews would not even tread on what he called the Temple Mount, the mount on which the holy Al Aqsa stands. This may be true of pious Jews, but I am sure the Israeli representative would not claim that their piety is all-pervasive in Israel. The irreverent and indecorous behaviour towards the holy shrines which has been fostered by the Israeli occupation of Jerusalem is apparent from the following report carried by *The New York Times* of 25 August:

"There have been innumerable complaints... that Israelis have picnicked on prayer platforms in the compound and have allowed girls with bare arms and mini-skirts onto the premises."

In this context let me refer to the order recently issued by His Holiness the Pope barring access to Saint Peter's Basilica to those who are not appropriately dressed.

103. The Security Council has also been informed of the excavations permitted by the Israeli authorities in the

vicinity of the holy Mosque, which cannot but endanger the physical substructure on which the building rests.

104. These may appear to be trivial matters, but they symbolize the collapse of those ruling conventions, those restraints and proprieties which have been and will be the best safeguards against any act of desecration of the holy shrines.

105. In considering these matters we are not alleging that Israel is deliberately set upon acts which would culminate in the destruction of the Holy Places. The important issue here is not what Israel intends or does not intend to do. We have no means of verifying the sincerity or otherwise of Israeli claims that they are determined to protect the holy shrines. But we do know that these claims have not been accepted by the people who matter in this regard, the people of the Holy City of Jerusalem. Even if these claims are regarded by us as honest, the fact remains that neither the people of the Holy City nor Moslems anywhere else have the slightest confidence that there is any assurance of the safety of the Holy Places under Israeli control.

106. The Israeli representative spoke of the spontaneous collaboration between Israelis and Arabs in extinguishing the fire on 21 August. But how does he explain that soon after the outbreak of the fire the people of the Old City, women and children included, were denouncing Israel? I do not have to quote the numerous press reports relevant in this connexion. Those reports demonstrate the fact that there is a complete breakdown of confidence in Israel—indeed, a resentment towards its policy of annexation—among the people of Jerusalem. It is this fact which, along with the established international concern with the Holy City, furnishes the basis of the resolutions of the Security Council on Jerusalem.

107. It has been rightly said that Israel bears a heavy responsibility towards the followers of both Islam and Christianity in the matter of the preservation of the Holy Places in Jerusalem. Let me make it clear that the issue is not whether Israel is competent to discharge that responsibility. The issue is: how and by whom was that responsibility transferred to Israel? Can the military conquest of the Holy City be considered as bestowing a title on Israel, especially when the claim to such a title sets at naught an established order sanctified by history and consecrated by the sacrifices of generations of both Moslems and Christians?

108. I cannot overstress the final point, that in considering this situation the Council is dealing with a political matter and is not concerned with any religious conflict. It was the desire to avoid such a conflict, in reality or in appearance and not to foment it, which prompted 25 Member States to come to the Security Council so that it might resolve the situation. Can it be said that there is any one among them which seeks to exploit this situation politically? That not a single one of the Arab States referred this situation to the Security Council on the date that it originated, on 21 August, belies such a charge. In fact, the Arab States only joined in the initiative taken by the non-Arab Moslem States. I wish the Council had been a witness to the consultations that took place among the 25 Member States.

Had it been, the Council would have known how careful all of us were not to seek any political advantage. But the fact is that the only remedy for the situation confronting us lies in action by the Security Council to terminate the Israeli occupation.

109. What are the remedies we seek? The draft resolution [S/9445] seeks to give the answer. To appreciate it, it is necessary to realize what it does not set out to do. First, it does not contemplate that the Security Council pronounce itself on the issue of criminal responsibility for the act of arson which took place on 21 August. I must stress that paragraph 3 of the text does not contain a judicial or quasi-judicial determination. Any construction of that paragraph which would convey a suggestion that it does so is, I submit, unwarranted.

110. Secondly, it does not, as I submitted before, seek any new departures. On the contrary, it is entirely based upon and is within the framework of the previous resolutions of the Security Council on Jerusalem. The condemnation in paragraph 5 is nothing but the logical sequel to the "censures in the strongest terms" contained in paragraph 3 of resolution 267 (1969).

111. There remains paragraph 4, which calls upon Israel "to observe the provisions of the Geneva Conventions governing military occupation". Even this is based on what has been said before in the Security Council and in the General Assembly. May I quote here the words of the representative of the United States at the Council meeting on 1 July 1969:

"The United States considers that the part of Jerusalem that came under the control of Israel in the June 1967 war, like other areas occupied by Israel, is occupied territory and hence subject to the provisions of international law governing the rights and obligations of an occupying Power. Among the provisions of international law which bind Israel, as they would bind any occupier, are the provisions that the occupier has no right to make changes in laws or in administration other than those which are temporarily necessitated by his security interests, and that an occupier may not confiscate or destroy private property. The pattern of behaviour authorized under the Geneva Convention of 12 August 1949 and international law is clear: the occupier must maintain the occupied area as intact and unaltered as possible, without interfering with the customary life of the area, and any changes must be necessitated by the immediate needs of the occupation. I regret to say that the actions of Israel in the occupied portion of Jerusalem present a different picture, one which gives rise to understandable concern that the eventual disposition of East Jerusalem may be prejudiced, and that the private rights and activities of the population are already being affected and altered." [1483rd meeting, para. 97.]

112. In the above-quoted passage the representative of the United States referred not only to the Geneva Convention but also to international law as governing the rights and responsibilities of military occupation. Therefore, I should like to make an amendment to paragraph 4 of the Pakistan draft resolution [S/9445]. The amendment is the follow-

ing: After the words "Geneva Conventions", the words "and international law" should be interpolated. The first part of paragraph 4 would thus read as follows:

"Calls upon Israel scrupulously to observe the provisions of the Geneva Conventions and international law governing military occupation and to refrain from causing any hindrance . . .".

113. Lastly, I would briefly refer to the trial that Israel has instituted against the accused Rohan on a charge of arson and to the measures which are said to have been taken for the restitution of the damage. May I here state the position of the 25 Member States whose consensus is reflected in the draft resolution before us, namely, document S/9445, regarding that trial and the measures for repairs.

114. The position of the 25 Moslem States was set out in their communication of 22 August as follows:

"It follows"—that is, from Security Council resolutions 252 (1968) and 267 (1969)—"that neither the Security Council nor any Member State of the United Nations, faithful to its decisions, can extend even an implicit recognition to the validity or legitimacy of Israeli authority over the Holy City. No tacit consent can, therefore, be given to any measures which, in order to delude world public opinion, the Israeli authorities may announce towards an inquiry into the cause of the outbreak of fire in the holy mosque and the repair of the damage caused."<sup>3</sup>

115. In conclusion, I can do no better than to sum up the lessons brought home by the tragedy of Al Aqsa and Jerusalem in the words of Ambassador Amerasinghe of Ceylon, who represents not an Arab or even a Moslem State, but a State whose population is overwhelmingly Buddhist. This is what Ambassador Amerasinghe said at the meeting of the Council on 12 September.

"The fire that started in Al Aqsa must not be allowed to spread throughout the world. It must not be permitted to consume and destroy, but must be employed to cleanse and heal. It is neither through the punishment of the culprit nor through the restoration of the shrine, nor through the fervent expression of sympathy—the genuineness of which we have no reason to question—that Israel can redeem itself.

"The only act of restitution that can eradicate the bitterness and resentment created by this incident and set in train a process that could lead to peace and harmony is the relinquishment of Israeli control over Arab territory which it now, in the judgement of the Security Council and the General Assembly, unlawfully occupies. This result could be achieved only if the Security Council itself showed sufficient unity and determination to assert its authority. The act of redemption which we seek on the part of Israel might well create that spirit of forgiveness, compassion and mutual tolerance which could prove to

<sup>3</sup> See *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-fourth Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1969*, document S/9447, annex I.

be a far more reliable guarantee of a final settlement of the Middle East question than any contractual arrangement." [1510th meeting, paras. 32 and 33.]

116. Mr. President, may I express to you and also to your predecessor, Ambassador Piniés, my admiration for the dignity and authority with which you and he have presided over our deliberations.

117. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Russian*): I thank the representative of Pakistan for the kind words he has addressed to me.

118. Mr. BERARD (France) (*translated from French*). Mr. President, now, when you are about to put the draft resolution submitted by Pakistan to the vote, my delegation would like to ask for a separate vote on paragraph 4 of this text.

119. As a matter of fact, rather than referring to the "Geneva Conventions governing military occupation", we would have liked the draft resolution to refer to the Convention and Protocol for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict.<sup>4</sup> The latter texts seem to apply more relevantly than the former to the case we are considering during our present debate, namely, the burning of the Al Aqsa Mosque.

120. We take full note of the amendment just proposed, on behalf of the co-sponsors, by the representative of Pakistan, and thank him for it, since we see it as a marked improvement, but it does not, however, satisfy us completely.

121. For that reason, I would ask you, Mr. President, under rule 32 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure, to be good enough to put the draft resolution to the vote in parts, requesting our colleagues to decide first on paragraph 4 by a separate vote.

122. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Russian*): The representative of Israel has asked to speak in exercise of his right of reply and I now call on him.

123. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): I shall be very brief indeed. At this morning's meeting I quoted from the Bible, which says: "Jerusalem shall be called the City of truth". I continued, "Indeed, Jerusalem asks for truth and reverence. Its sacredness abhors falsehood and abuse" [1511th meeting, para. 99].

124. Yet, unfortunately, the representative of Pakistan, the sponsor of the draft resolution before the Council, comes before us in the very last moments before the vote and tries to urge members to vote for the draft mainly for two reasons. First, in a spirit of bigotry, he alleges that Israel has profaned the Al Aqsa Mosque. This falsehood is an abuse not only of the sacredness of Jerusalem but of Al Aqsa itself.

125. I have here the records of the Committee of Inquiry. An examination of those records will clearly show that the

<sup>4</sup> Signed at The Hague on 14 May 1954 (see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 249 (1956), No. 3511).

entrance to the entire Mosque compound through all the gates is controlled by Moslem guards and that these guards work under instructions not to permit, and in fact do not permit, the entry of any person immodestly attired.

126. Secondly, the representative of Pakistan urges members to vote for the draft resolution, threatening that if they do not, the Middle East will find itself in a state of continuous strife. It is precisely of such threats that the campaign of warlike incitement which has led to this debate is so made up. It would be most regrettable to give further encouragement to such incitement.

127. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Russian*): I call on the representative of Pakistan to address the Council in exercise of his right of reply.

128. Mr. SHAHI (Pakistan): It is indeed regrettable that even at this hour the representative of Israel remains impenitent and accuses everyone, the rest of the world, no matter how outraged their feelings are, of bigotry. Alas, there can be no hope when there is such insensitivity.

129. With regard to the statement that what my delegation has said is a threat, I leave that to the judgement of the Security Council. At this moment I shall not accept the invitation of the Israeli representative to reopen this debate on a note of acrimony.

130. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Russian*): The discussion of the question submitted for the consideration of the Security Council by 25 States has been concluded. The Security Council will now proceed to take a decision on this matter.

131. The representative of Pakistan has submitted a draft resolution [S/9445] for the Council's consideration. As he has stated, the proposals contained in that draft reflect the views and assent of all the 25 States which requested consideration of this item, the question of the fire at the Al Aqsa Mosque in Jerusalem, which was put before the Security Council.

132. Some members of the Council have stated their position concerning this draft. Other members have announced their intention to explain their vote following the vote on the draft.

133. The representative of France has addressed a request to the sponsor of the draft for a separate vote on paragraph 4 of the draft resolution, under rule 32 of the provisional rules of procedure, which states:

"Principal motions and draft resolutions shall have precedence in the order of their submission.

"Parts of a motion or of a draft resolution shall be voted on separately at the request of any representative, unless the original mover objects."

134. With regard to the request of the representative of France, I shall request the sponsor of the draft resolution, the representative of Pakistan, to state his views on this matter, after which we shall proceed to the vote.

135. Mr. SHAHI (Pakistan): With respect to the motion made by the representative of France, Mr. Bérard, my delegation has no objection to a separate vote on paragraph 4 of the draft resolution submitted by the delegation of Pakistan.

136. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Russian*): If no other representative wishes to speak, we shall now proceed to the vote on the draft resolution [S/9445]. I shall first put to the vote paragraph 4, which will be voted upon separately in accordance with the wish of the representative of France and with the consent of the representative of Pakistan, on the basis of rule 32 of the provisional rules of procedure.

*A vote was taken by show of hands.*

*In favour:* Algeria, China, Hungary, Nepal, Pakistan, Senegal, Spain, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Zambia.

*Against:* None.

*Abstaining:* Colombia, Finland, France, Paraguay, United States of America.

*Paragraph 4 was adopted by 10 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.*

137. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Russian*): We shall now proceed to vote on the draft resolution as a whole, including the amendment to paragraph 4 made by the representative of Pakistan, the sponsor of the draft, which has already been adopted.

*A vote was taken by show of hands.*

*In favour:* Algeria, China, France, Hungary, Nepal, Pakistan, Senegal, Spain, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Zambia.

*Against:* None.

*Abstaining:* Colombia, Finland, Paraguay, United States of America.

*The draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.<sup>5</sup>*

138. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Russian*): Some representatives have expressed the wish to speak after the vote, and I shall therefore call on them.

139. Mr. JAKOBSON (Finland): My delegation abstained from the voting that just took place for reasons that were indicated in the statement I made earlier today. I should like to emphasize in particular that while we join in condemning the act of arson committed against the Al Aqsa Mosque and reaffirming the position taken by the Security Council on the status of the City of Jerusalem, the Finnish Government is not prepared to accept without any impartial investigation the charge of Israeli responsibility

<sup>5</sup> See resolution 271 (1969).

implied by the text of the resolution which was just adopted.

140. Several suggestions were made in the course of the debate as to how such an investigation could have been carried out, and we regret that none of them was taken up.

141. Lord CARADON (United Kingdom): I made my Government's views very plain when I spoke last week. I do not wish or need to add to them or detract from them in any way at all. I still strongly maintain that a unanimous conclusion was possible and was certainly desirable. I know that great care and long discussions were devoted to the resolution on which we voted. Perhaps it tried to accommodate too many different views. In any event I do not believe that anyone was satisfied with the result. Certainly my Government was not.

142. The representative of Pakistan made a very important statement formally on behalf of the sponsors when he spoke last Friday. He said then:

"... we allege no complicity by Israel in the act [of 21 August]. To see a connexion between the act of arson and the direct complicity or otherwise of Israel in that regard is to give a meaning to our text which was not our intention to give." [1510th meeting, para. 67.]

That was a particularly important statement because we too do not hold the Israeli Government guilty or at fault in regard to the fire. In that respect I welcome the further statement made by the representative of Pakistan today. For our part we deplore the accusations which have been made or implied without adequate evidence. My Government would never be associated with any such baseless allegation or false insinuation. I am sure from what other members of this Council have said that there are many in the Council who feel as we do in this respect.

143. On the agreed understanding which the representative of Pakistan, as sponsor of this resolution, has put before us, we were able to accept the provision in the resolution which otherwise seemed to us both obscure and objectionable.

144. There are other sections of this resolution which we dislike and, as I said when I spoke last week, we should have greatly preferred a straightforward, strong, unanimous decision of the Council, preferably in the form of a general consensus. What test, then, did we have to apply to the resolution presented to us? Three things we considered were necessary, and I stated them before. We should be content to say in the clearest language conceivable, first, that all members of the Council stand on the firm ground we have already taken up on Jerusalem; secondly, that we should utterly condemn the attempt to burn the sacred Mosque; and thirdly, that we wish to make what has happened not a reason to give up but a reason to press on, to press on with our search for the lasting peace which every day becomes more desperately urgent.

145. I stand by those words. We hoped that a unanimous consensus amongst us could be accordingly achieved. That would have been much the best result. We greatly regretted

that our proposal was not adopted. It is, however, because we saw in the resolution the essentials of a reaffirmation of the stand we have taken on Jerusalem and a condemnation of the contemptible act of arson that we were prepared to vote for it. It is in that spirit and, indeed, in the spirit of the dignified and impressive message received on 22 August—the day after the arson occurred—the message from the representatives of the 25 Moslem countries, a message addressed, as we will remember, to the President of the Security Council, that we were able to vote for the resolution which has just been passed.

146. We did so in the hope that we can now turn our minds, without reservation, to a new and urgent endeavour to search for the common ground of agreement on which a just settlement must be built. Here I would merely say that I have previously made our position on the questions at issue perfectly plain. I said before that I cannot believe that any Government, any country, any community would plan or perpetrate such a revolting outrage. The representative of Jordan referred to that statement. I do not wish in any way to alter it. He asked what message he can take from me to his Government and his country.

147. I will tell him what message he can take. He can tell his Government and his country, if he wishes to be accurate, that we voted for resolution 252 (1968) and we voted for resolution 267 (1969) and we stand by our votes; that on the question of Jerusalem my country has throughout taken a sure and consistent stand. He can tell them the words that I used before, that we do not accept, that we will not tolerate any unilateral attempt to prejudice or prejudice the future of the Holy City.

148. Mr. President, as I say, we saw in the resolution before us the principal purposes which we had ourselves previously stated, and we were therefore able to accept them. Now I should say that we should look, I am sure we should feel that we should look, to the future and particularly that we should consider what settlement we can look to in regard to the Holy Places. We trust that whatever final settlement is achieved in the Middle East it will provide for the preservation of the Holy Places and for their protection and for free access to them for those of all religions. On that we can surely all agree. Indeed, that agreement may make it easier for us to go forward to wider agreement, the wider agreement we all so urgently require.

149. In spite of all setbacks and all frustrations and all delays and all misrepresentations, it is our determination to pursue that aim undeterred and undiscouraged. We shall pursue that aim because we believe that the continuation of the present situation in the Middle East would prove disastrous for both sides. We shall pursue that aim because we believe that both Arabs and Israelis—both—need peace; and both will be condemned to untold suffering if we allow the present dreadful drift to continue.

150. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Russian*): I have no other speakers on my list. If no other representatives wish to speak now, this will conclude our discussion of the question.

151. I call on the representative of Israel.

152. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): The Security Council deliberations on the fire which occurred at Al Aqsa on 21 August are terminated. The resolution voted on by the Council is composed of two elements. One concerns the fire. The other was introduced for purposes of exploiting the fire for political controversy. And the provisions drafted for that purpose on to the resolution are a repetition of inequitable, unrealistic views voted in the past. In that sense these provisions are like certain currencies: the more that are printed, the less valuable they become.

153. Indeed, as some representatives have stated, and repeated today, at this very meeting, Jerusalem's destiny cannot be decided unilaterally. In addition to being the centre of Holy Places—sacred, venerated, inviolable—Jerusalem is a living city of 200,000 Jews, 65,000 Arabs and 5,000 people of other nationalities. These citizens of Jerusalem cannot be deprived by unilateral vote, derived from purely political considerations, of their inalienable human right to the unity of their city, to the peace and security and welfare which in its integrity Jerusalem offers them.

154. The delegation of Israel notes with appreciation that a significant number of States members of the Security Council have withheld their support from the resolution. My delegation notes also that of the eleven members which voted for it six have no diplomatic relations with Israel. Moreover, two of those members, Algeria and Pakistan, are among the co-signers of the letter of 28 August 1969 to the President of the Security Council [*S/9421 and Add.1 and 2*] requesting the meeting on the fire in the Al Aqsa Mosque. Thus, under Article 27 of the Charter of the United Nations they should have refrained from participating in the vote.

155. With regard to the resolution's provisions which refer to the Al Aqsa fire, it is evident that even the supporters of the resolution were not ready to accept the charges against Israel, voiced in the Arab capitals, in connexion with the fire on 21 August, and reiterated here by the more extreme of the Arab representatives. Indeed, the Council deliberations have clearly established that Israel had no hand in the fire at Al Aqsa.

156. The sponsor of the draft resolution, the representative of Pakistan, actually informed the Security Council, on behalf of the 25 Member States which requested the Council to meet, that "we allege no complicity by Israel in the act". Responsible international conduct and the need to prevent interreligious hatred make it incumbent, particularly on the Moslem Governments, to explain this truth to their peoples.

157. I should like to take this opportunity to express, on behalf of my Government, appreciation of the attitude adopted by responsible Moslem Governments which refuse to be drawn into the Arab design of exploiting the fire of 21 August for the purpose of inflaming passions and increasing political tension. It is to be noted also that all suggestions to superimpose on measures already undertaken to ascertain the facts, repair the damage and safeguard the Holy Places have not been adopted or even pressed. Though indeed the outcome of a case still *sub judice* cannot be

forecast, nobody need feel any doubt about the probity and independence of the Israel judicial inquiries or court proceedings. All religious communities can remain confident regarding the status and inviolability of their Holy Places. Israel has ensured that the Holy Places of Judaism, Christianity and Islam shall be administered by the religions which hold them sacred. Moreover, in a spirit of concern for historic and spiritual traditions, my Government has taken steps aimed at reaching arrangements with representatives of international religious bodies for assuring effective expression to the universal character of the Holy Places. For the first time in recent decades, where there was once an assertion of exclusive and unilateral control over the Holy Places exercised in sacrilegious discrimination, there is now freedom of access for all and recognition of the world's religious interests in the Holy Places. Israel's esteem for the world of Islam is deeply rooted in history. Our respect for Islam's religious values is profound. We seek understanding and harmonious coexistence among all faiths. Religious hatred has no place in Jewish consciousness. Calls to religious hostility today in any part of the

world are anachronistic and constitute a throw-back to the past. They are better left buried in the mire of history.

158. Our efforts should be directed towards the future. In it, religious respect and tolerance will go hand in hand with political conciliation and understanding.

159. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Russian*): I should like to draw to the attention of the representative of Israel the fact that neither the Charter nor any rule of procedure of the Security Council provides that the presence or absence of diplomatic relations with the States concerned in the consideration of a question deprives a State Member of the Security Council of the right to express its attitude to a draft resolution by its vote.

160. The discussion of the item under consideration is thus concluded with the adoption of the resolution by a majority vote. There are no other representatives who wish to speak, and the meeting is therefore adjourned.

*The meeting rose at 6:35 p.m.*

---

#### **HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS**

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

#### **COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES**

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre librairie ou adressez-vous à: Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

#### **КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ**

Издания Организация Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Поводите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

#### **COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS**

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.

---