

UNITED NATIONS



# SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-FIFTH YEAR

UN LIBRARY

APR 22 1988

UN/SA COLLECTION

**2235<sup>th</sup>** MEETING: 26 JUNE 1980

NEW YORK

---

## CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2235) .....	1
Adoption of the agenda .....	1
<b>The situation in the Middle East:</b>	
Letter dated 28 May 1980 from the Acting Permanent Representative of Pakistan to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/13966) .....	1

10

UN LIBRARY  
VEN 88 688  
UNISA COLLECTION

**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.

## 2235th MEETING

Held in New York on Thursday, 26 June 1980, at 10.30 a.m.

*President:* Mr. Ole ÅLGÅRD (Norway).

*Present:* The representatives of the following States: Bangladesh, China, France, German Democratic Republic, Jamaica, Mexico, Niger, Norway, Philippines, Portugal, Tunisia, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zambia.

### Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2235)

1. Adoption of the agenda
2. The situation in the Middle East:  
Letter dated 28 May 1980 from the Acting Permanent Representative of Pakistan to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/13966)

*The meeting was called to order at 11.10 a.m.*

### Adoption of the agenda

*The agenda was adopted.*

### The situation in the Middle East:

Letter dated 28 May 1980 from the Acting Permanent Representative of Pakistan to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/13966)

1. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with previous decisions [2233rd and 2234th meetings], I invite the representatives of Israel and Pakistan to take a place at the Council table, I invite the representatives of Egypt, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Mauritania, Morocco and the Syrian Arab Republic to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber and I invite the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) to take a place at the Council table.

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. Blum (Israel) and Mr. Naik (Pakistan) took places at the Council table, Mr. Elaraby (Egypt), Mr. Suwondo (Indonesia), Mr. Al-Ali (Iraq), Mr. Nuseibeh (Jordan), Mr. Tuéni (Lebanon), Mr. Kane (Mauritania), Mr. Laraki (Morocco) and Mr. Mansouri (Syrian Arab Republic) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber and Mr. Terzi (Palestine Liberation Organization) took a place at the Council table.*

2. The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Cuba, Kuwait, Qatar, Saudi Arabia and Senegal in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the agenda. In accordance with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in conformity with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. Roa-Kouri (Cuba), Mr. Bishara (Kuwait), Mr. Jamal (Qatar), Mr. Zowawi (Saudi Arabia), and Mr. Djigo (Senegal) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.*

3. The PRESIDENT: I should like to draw the attention of members of the Council to the following documents: S/14017, which contains the text of a letter dated 24 June from the representative of Tunisia to the President of the Security Council, and S/14018, which contains the text of a letter dated 24 June from the representative of Bahrain to the President of the Security Council.

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

5. Mr. BISHARA (Kuwait): In every debate on Palestine or the ramifications of the question of Palestine, I always look at the face of my friend, Mr. Terzi, who inspires me with ideas, and I always say that his serene countenance hides plenty of silent tears because of the aggravation of the decade.

6. Mr. President, I have known you for many years, for almost a decade in the United Nations. I have seen your outstanding performance this month, and not only do we congratulate you, but we congratulate ourselves. The success of a friend is a success also for his friends. Your success in discharging your duties this month brings to my mind the Vikings' ability as captains. I always say that we Kuwaitis are also a sea-oriented people, and we have two things in common with the people of Norway: production of oil and love of the sea. Sometimes I think that the Norwegians are the Kuwaitis of Scandinavia and that we are the Vikings of the Gulf. I say that not to conform to the usual rituals of congratulations, but

as a sincere expression of congratulations and sentiments.

7. Why are we here? Why this debate? Mr. Blum, in his brief statement the other day [2233rd meeting] attributed the debate to those who came here to instigate, to incite, to those who wanted to purvey hatred. I happen to disagree, and I came here and made a point of being the first speaker on this day on which there are no fewer than 20 speakers, as Mr. Terzi told me—a marathon of speeches—so that I might come with a constructive mind simply because I am worried.

8. When Jerusalem is talked about, it touches upon the nerves, the spirituality, the psychological being and the attachment of 800 million Muslims the world over. In the last year we have seen the world over a revival, a resurrection of Islamic fundamentalism. Perhaps that brought about a certain benefit the world over. As I came from Kuwait, I was struck by this revival of fundamentalism in Islam, a fundamentalism that brought about in the span of 90 years an Islamic empire, which spread from the frontiers of China to the shores of Spain. That spirit of fundamentalism believed in what the message of God should be.

9. On the other hand, on the West Bank in the last few months there have been daily incidents. Blood has been shed, violence has escalated, and religious passions have increased. These cannot be separated from the general picture of the revival of fundamentalism.

10. That is happening not only in the Muslim world. It is happening here. Some Zionists, some Israeli officials, come to the United States to recruit orthodox Jews to go and occupy the West Bank. Their religious fervour encounters another kind of religious fervour. That is why I attach great importance to this debate—because it has been, and it should be, an attempt to contain the religious confrontation that is bound to occur. I shall elaborate on that.

11. The second point is why we are here to debate the question of Jerusalem. I would very sincerely say that those who have leverage and could advise the Government of Israel should tell it frankly and bluntly and without any spices of compliment that the removal of Mr. Begin's office to East Jerusalem is not only a humiliation to Islam but an insult which the Muslim world will not accept. Therefore, it will set off another religious confrontation—not only between Zionism and Islam but, I am afraid, between Judaism and Islam, with incalculable consequences, as though we were returning to the religious wars of eight or nine centuries ago.

12. Therefore, under these circumstances, people of wisdom and people of reason should approach the Government of Israel not only to make it reconsider

but also to confirm that nothing of that sort will happen. That is why, as I have said, this debate is very significant. It is important to contain the religious fervour taking grip not only on the Muslim world but also on the other side, and to contain a dangerous decision that is about to be taken by the Israeli Government, a decision which boils down not only to an insult but also to the humiliation not of a nation or a country but of a religion. And the danger of an insult to a religion is that it mobilizes fanaticism and a desire for death, which means endless conflagration and war.

13. That is enough by way of introduction as to why we are here.

14. I should like very briefly to speak about Israeli policy on Jerusalem. Mr. Begin's favourite saying is that Jerusalem is the eternal, indivisible, united capital of Israel. I would say simply and in all honesty that such a posture is totally irreconcilable with peace. There will be no peace in the Middle East, not as a result of Mr. Lynwood's mission, the "mission impossible", and not as a result of a conference in Geneva or a conference even in heaven. As long as there is no return of Muslim rule over Jerusalem there will be no peace—simply because Jerusalem is synonymous with tranquillity and peace. The word "eternal" means perpetuity of hostility; the word "indivisible" means the indivisibility of war and Jerusalem; the word "united" means the disunity of the Islamic shrines, the disunity and mutilation of the Muslim body and the mutilation of the Palestinian religious body. Therefore, all these adjectives and all these sentences about the Israeli insistence on Jerusalem are totally irreconcilable, incompatible with peace and unacceptable and, as long as the Israelis insist thus, peace will remain a mirage in the desert.

15. Why do the Israelis insist upon occupation and annexation, upon expansionism? Simply because there is an ingrained belief in the supremacy of might, the power of might, the power of force. In this century, when there is supremacy and belief in might, it is bound to destroy international law, it is bound to kill the global political and religious structure. And, unfortunately, supremacy of might always emanates from something very strange, and that is an alliance between those who believe in the supremacy of might and those who are able to provide that might. I should like to refer to our friends the delegation of the United States. I shall come to them later.

16. The whole thing is an anachronism in the sense that, when I look to my left I see Mr. Terzi, a product of Jerusalem, a son of Jerusalem, and I see Ambassador Nuseibeh, an erudite friend and a very distinguished son of a distinguished family of Jerusalem, I remember that they are unable to go to their own land, while an adventurer Jew from Park Avenue called Rabbi Kahane goes there and does what? He engineers the blowing up of the Al-Aqsa Mosque. If he had

succeeded, we would not have been here today. God forbid. And the fact that he thought of it is the product of the encouragement of the supremacy of might. There are ramifications. Rabbi Kahane, Major Haddad in the south of Lebanon and others, the mutilation of the three mayors, the expulsion of many Palestinians—all are but illustrations of belief in the concept of the supremacy of might that is catered to by a super-Power. That is the whole structure we see, the political alliance. Mr. Kahane has not succeeded this time. But I would not rule out others plotting to do something similar soon.

17. I shall now say what we expect of this debate. We expect, first, that something will be done, that it will be said clearly and unequivocally that peace and Jerusalem are inseparable and that therefore the Israeli logic and argumentation cannot hold up on logical grounds—in other words, it is unacceptable; in other words, it is null and void.

18. What do we expect of the Council and this debate? I would in all fairness say that those who are unable to support something positive on Jerusalem will eventually pay the price, because I cannot rule out marches by fanatical mobs all over the Muslim world burning down the properties of those who could search for reconciliation, a search which would involve sanctions, which would reduce the high passions now taking over in the area, particularly in the West Bank, particularly between those orthodox fanatical Jews and those poor Palestinians that are under oppression and occupation.

19. We have not come here, in fact, to rub it in against anybody. We have not come here to provoke a debate which is unnecessary. We are not, as we have been portrayed by Ambassador Blum, purveyors of hatred. We come here with a constructive approach. If the flames of passions are not contained, they will rise higher and then everything will be set aflame. Not only properties which do not belong to Muslim countries but also the whole area will be affected, to the detriment of everybody.

20. We also expect from the Council an unequivocal stand on Israeli withdrawal, because that is the heart of the problem. As long as the Israelis occupy Jerusalem and other Arab territories with uninterrupted schemes for Jewish settlements, all our talk about peace, about negotiation and about international conferences on the Middle East are really a wild goose chase, an exercise in futility. We not only have to be practical and constructive but we have to take the bull by the horns. The behaviour of the Israeli Government is really like the behaviour of a bull in a china shop. We cannot accept that and the world cannot accept that.

21. We are talking here at this very moment about global negotiations, about economic co-operation between developing countries and the industrial

world. One of the demands of the industrial world is that we should ensure the supply of oil and energy at reasonable prices. My argument is that it is impossible, it is not in my power, to ensure the flow of oil to any industrial country because, as Mr. Arafat said very wisely, the two Ps, Palestine and petroleum, are inseparable. I say in all fairness that oil is inseparable from the Palestinian soil, not by design and not because we want this linkage, but simply because of the nature of the problem. When people are desperate, when they are oppressed and when they are punched in the teeth every day, they resort to whatever means are available to them to promote their own cause.

22. I should like to refer now to the United States delegation. I would say in all fairness that the United States has a very good Mission here, but it has a very bad policy. That is one of the salient yet painful facts of life. As a Muslim, I cannot accept from the United States reference to a statement read out 10 years ago by the then United States representative; in other words, the equating of the question of Jerusalem with the contents of a statement made by Ambassador Yost or Ambassador Goldberg, without having the details spelt out. That is totally unacceptable to the people in our area. When they ask me what Ambassador Yost or what Ambassador Goldberg said, my answer is, "I do not know what they said". I have looked at the statement; sometimes I understand it and sometimes I am befuddled by it. But on the whole, from the procedural point of view, I think it is unfair to the Islamic world to use this novelty on such a sensitive religious issue. Therefore, I would really suggest and advise the delegation of the United States that perhaps it should reconsider this novelty in order to satisfy, and not to increase, the high passions and the fervour of Islam. This is a procedure which people cannot understand. Even we who have been here in the United Nations for decades do not understand this novelty, let alone our people, the masses in Pakistan, in Indonesia and in the streets of Kuwait. How can they accept this identification of the United States position with the statement made 10 years ago? In other words, that statement is not reaffirmed, but is referred to, and there is a difference between being reaffirmed and being referred to. This is a novelty, and I advise the delegation of the United States, in all candour and sincerity, to reconsider it so as to eliminate any misunderstanding or misconception about United States policy on Jerusalem.

23. My second point with respect to the United States is that it is not really fair to highlight the importance of the Islamic decisions on Afghanistan. When we were discussing Afghanistan, everybody hailed the decisions on Afghanistan of the Islamic Conference. Yet when we speak here about Jerusalem, everybody shuns the decisions on Palestine of the Islamic Conference. To me Afghanistan is important, but it is my survival that is linked with Palestine. I read in *The New York Times* the other day that the United States Senate unanimously passed a bill calling on the Soviet

Union to withdraw its troops from Afghanistan. That is fair and we support it. But I cannot accept the subordination of the question of Palestine and the highlighting and overstressing of the question of Afghanistan, an imbalance which is really detrimental to me. I am not threatened, as I have said here before, by the rumbling of the Soviet Union's tanks. I am threatened by Mr. Begin's policy. I am threatened by the insecurity of the area that is due to Israeli expansionism and Israeli illogic. I do not like to use unflattering adjectives.

24. Therefore, this global pilgrimage about Afghanistan does not really hold water with us. We want Palestine; we want a clear position of the United States on withdrawal. Since the Rogers plan they have dropped saying anything about withdrawal. Every time we talk about withdrawal, their new formula is that resolution 242 (1967) applies to all fronts. But that is not convincing to our people. It is very ambiguous at best. With respect to settlements, we have favoured coming to the Security Council. The whole purpose of coming to the Council is not to stay put but to keep up the political pressure. It is better to utter words than to use bullets. It is better for us to come to the United Nations and to speak out in the Security Council, sometimes calmly and sometimes with passion, but it is better to utter words than to resort to violence. When we spoke to them about having this debate, they said, "Do not have it, because you will ruffle the feathers of Camp David". That is not true. As I told them privately, we are not the people who are upsetting the apple cart. Who is upsetting the apple cart? It is Mr. Begin by his policy of the escalation of Jewish settlements. I have nothing to do with Camp David. I have no special love for Camp David. Perhaps I am mistaken—history may prove that we are right or that you are right—but we think that it is unfair for the United States to be totally aligned on Camp David with the Israeli policy at the expense of its own interests in the future in our area. After all, we Kuwaitis never forget that early in the century the only hospital we had was built by an American missionary—by American money, in fact. So there was goodwill, and that goodwill should not be wasted on an alliance that will not bring about any progress.

25. Before concluding my brief statement, there is something I should like to say, namely: a call for moderation on Jerusalem, which is something we sometimes hear about at international conferences, is impossible because moderation on Jerusalem means the abandonment of Islamic rights in that city. We grew up as children in Kuwait never knowing where Jerusalem was. But we did know that Jerusalem was sacred, was holy, that we had spiritual attachments to it. We never thought about where it was or studied its history because at that time we were poor and did not have textbooks in our schools. We did know, however, that Jerusalem was under Islamic rule. Let me put it this way for the sake of total clarity: it is inconceivable that there should be an abandonment

of Islamic rights in Jerusalem in order to establish peace. In other words, there will never be peace as long as there is pressure on the Islamic world, on the Muslim world, on Islam to abandon its historical existence, its spiritual existence and spiritual message in Jerusalem.

26. I am afraid because our area at this stage is marked by the escalation of high passions—religious and nationalistic passions, and a vendetta type of violence. It is incumbent upon the Council to contribute to cooling off those passions, to staving off violence, to heading off confrontation, which may involve religious elements or countries—indeed all areas—outside the immediate region. In other words, if the confrontation takes on a quality of religious fervour, then the whole Islamic world will be in total ferment, and, as I said earlier, I do not rule out the marching of mobs against the properties of anybody who opposes the return of Islamic rule to Jerusalem. From Jerusalem the message of peace started and to Jerusalem the message of peace will come back. Without the supremacy of Islam, the rule of Islam, in Jerusalem—there will never be peace in the area, regardless of what formula mankind can ingeniously contrive.

27. We should concentrate constructively on this point: how to avoid a collision based on religion and high passion. It is my sincere hope that polemics and acrimonious exchanges will be dropped, simply because they serve no purpose but constitute a setback for those who resort to them.

28. I was very much impressed by the statement the other day [2233rd meeting] by the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization. Although a victim of eviction, a globetrotter looking for a home in which to live, he spoke with restraint, dignity and responsibility. That is the type of statement we expect on such a highly sensitive issue. Speeches telling us that we are purveyors of hatred or defenders of incitement will not only really harm the debate but I think they will harm those who make them. I should urge that we use restraint in our language so that we might come up with a document which, while not necessarily commanding unanimity, would not arouse dissension. It is our duty to work to that end because the Islamic world cannot accept, cannot tolerate and cannot afford a dissenting voice on Jerusalem. That would be harmful to those who raise it, harmful to the image of the United Nations and harmful to everybody, including myself.

29. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is Mr. Clovis Maksoud, to whom the Council extended an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure at the 2233rd meeting. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

30. Mr. MAKSOUD: Again we meet in the Council to discuss, deliberate and take the necessary action on Israel's latest aggression and on the latest consequences of its Zionist plans of annexation. This time

the issue before the Council pertains to Israel's declared objective of putting what might be called the final touches on its *ex cathedra* and unilateral swallowing up of the Holy City of Jerusalem. The proposed basic law, along with the declared plan of Israel to transfer the Prime Minister's office as well as the Israeli Cabinet conference room to East Jerusalem, is but the latest signal—indeed manifestation—of Israel's unrelenting determination to tear Jerusalem away from its natural, normal and national ties and to distort irrevocably its unique, universal, spiritual and religiously pluralistic character.

31. That you, Mr. President, are presiding over these deliberations ensures a leadership and guidance that will instil in them a level of wisdom and sense of purpose that has always been the nature of your contribution in the Council's work. I should like to take this opportunity to express my deep appreciation for the kind invitation extended to the League of Arab States and to me, and to underline the appreciation of the League for the efforts, diplomatic and concrete, that your friendly country, Norway, has exerted concerning the problems of the Arab region.

32. We are confronted today, as the Council has often been confronted, with a situation that eludes rational scrutiny. Here is Israel, a Member State, arrogating to itself the right to prejudge issues that are on the agenda of the United Nations. We are dealing with a situation in which the world community has repeatedly emphasized to that Member State its demands that Israel rescind its illegal acts in Jerusalem, desist from the continuous pursuit of its plans to annex Jerusalem and declare the city its capital, and further desist from taking measures designed to pre-empt the outcome of the deliberations in this body. This situation is so mind-boggling that censure and condemnation are no longer sufficient or adequate. Resort to the sanctions provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter has thus become the only course which offers the possibility of deterrence and relevance, and is the course required to enhance the credibility of the Council.

33. It is necessary for us to go beyond the precise issues that are being dealt with elaborately here: that is, Israel's unilateral actions in Jerusalem, its obliteration of the city's demographic, national and cultural character, as well as the city's multifaceted spiritual function for the world in a wider context. If this is done, then the United Nations, as well as the world community, will be able to anticipate the course of Israel's unfolding of its expansionist, aggressive and annexationist designs. If that is clearly envisaged, it then follows that the United Nations and the world community could and must forestall the tragic consequences that are inevitable when Zionist plans remain unchecked.

34. It is essential that we recognize that Israel's actions and policies in Jerusalem are an inherent part

of the very basic ideology upon which Israel is predicated—namely, zionism. The designs of zionism on Jerusalem, as well as on the whole of Palestine, are well established and documented. The timing of Israel's measures to achieve its designs is determined usually by its assessment of the nature, the level and the scope of international resistance to them.

35. For example, when Israel claims that it "liberated" Jerusalem in 1967, it is not considering its occupation of Jerusalem as the "acquisition of territories by military aggression" but as "liberation". The question is, "liberation" from whom and from what? For Israel to assume that its conquests and annexations are aspects of "liberation" is calling in question the seriousness and the gravity of what confronts the international community. When Israel equates its unilateral annexation of Jerusalem with "liberation", it is in fact asking the world, which has condemned and unanimously refused to recognize Israel's measures, to change its position to comply with the diktat of the Israeli occupation authorities.

36. Furthermore, Israel's measures in Jerusalem are intended to insulate it from accountability to this world body: it seeks to deny its answerability with regard to the genuine religious, spiritual, cultural and emotional ties that many people of different lands have for Jerusalem. In addition to its forcible eviction of the inhabitants, Israel has desecrated the Holy Places and eradicated the city's authentic identity. Israel seeks to render Jerusalem an expression of its own exclusivist, racist institutions and ideology and to suppress the meaning that Jerusalem has for the Palestinians, for the Arabs and for the Islamic and Christian worlds by creating *faits accomplis* that ultimately mutilate its historical, national and spiritual personality.

37. Israel seeks to relegate Jerusalem to a position that not only reduces it to an extension of Israel's settlements under its colonial policy but also renders it a staging point for the consolidation of Israel's annexation of more than 30 per cent of the West Bank, under the guise of what is called Greater Jerusalem.

38. Hence Jerusalem, instead of being the arena for universal faiths, religions and cultures, which discover one another in unity through diversity, has been reduced from that noble role to that of a staging ground for expansion, exploitation, violation, colonization and oppression. Therefore what we are witnessing is not only Israel's mutilation of the historical constant and national aspect of Jerusalem, but a derailment of Jerusalem's religious and spiritual functions.

39. It is often stated that Jews have a spiritual and particular association and affinity with Jerusalem. That is true and it is legitimate. But religious and spiritual affiliations of people of Jewish faith and per-

suasion do not constitute under any circumstances a claim that will legitimize conquest, annexation, aggression and the denial of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people. In fact the whole thrust of Israel's behaviour in Jerusalem, its unilateral action and its annexationist policies tend to distort the religious component of Jewish association with Jerusalem rather than enhance it. As we have often stated, we consider Judaism part of our spiritual heritage and a component of universal and moral imperatives, but when Israel seeks to make Judaism exclusivist in approach it erodes its universal character and its function in enriching spirituality. To render Jerusalem unilaterally the capital of the Zionist State is to enshrine racial exclusivism in a manner that violates the universal oneness that all religious and spiritual values are committed to realizing. Hence the notion that Judaism has an affinity and a spiritual association with Jerusalem cannot be under any circumstances an excuse to render Jerusalem the arena in which zionism plays havoc with all moral and spiritual imperatives.

40. Israel claims that because there has been a Jewish presence in Jerusalem, that gives Israel the right to make this presence a point of departure for exclusivist claims. By what right does Israel claim that if there have been Jews in Jerusalem, that makes Jerusalem the preserve of the Zionist State? Jews who are in Jerusalem or any part of the Arab world have always been considered, perceived and treated as Arabs of Jewish faith. Being an Arab has never implied the assumption that one cannot be a Jew. It is in that context that Judaism is, as I stated, part of our heritage, while zionism can be rightly construed as an ultimate corruption of Judaism.

41. It is for that reason that we in the Arab world have never postulated that if an Arab is of any particular religious persuasion, he is therefore something different from an Arab. It is that which renders Arab nationalism a function of egalitarian humanism and, in contradistinction, zionism an instrument and a vehicle of Jewish alienation.

42. This is why the destiny of Jerusalem is so central, not only to our national and spiritual life, but to the very fibre of our intellectual pursuits and our national purpose. The legitimacy of Arab claims on Jerusalem is not only rooted in cumulative historical, legal and demographic arguments. It is equally to be found in the very nature of our identification with what is universal, what is international and what is humanist. This is so not because of any superior claim the Arabs have to legitimacy or any preponderance of self-righteousness in our position. It is due to the fact that the Arabs in general, and the Palestinians in particular, start with the premise that we are accountable to the world community and that we are answerable to its institutions as manifested in the Charter and resolutions of the United Nations. It is our belief that what are at stake in the battle for Jerusalem are the shared

values of mankind, which the exclusivist claims of Israel seek to usurp, an Israel intent upon playing havoc with all efforts towards a human and universal outlook and commitments.

43. It is with an understanding of this that we consider the Israeli "guarantees" about allowing people of different religions to have access to the Holy Places in Jerusalem as intrinsically patronizing, while the guarantees that we, the Arabs, provide for free access are inherent in the very foundation of our body politic.

44. The immediate reason for the present convening of the Council is to articulate and give visibility to the international consensus concerning Jerusalem. However, the articulation of this will and its visibility must not be construed as adequate or sufficient to assuage the deep wound that Israel's behaviour in Jerusalem inflicts on the world body politic. It must be the ultimate priority of the Security Council not to exacerbate the hurt but to heal the wound. Hence, the Council must adopt the measures that will put an end to the usurpation that Israel carries out day after day in our Jerusalem.

45. Jerusalem evokes for nearly all mankind positive meanings and intimate associations. That is why it is unique and intensely significant. That is why there has always been near unanimity concerning its fate.

46. However, it must be noted that the efforts of the Council have been thwarted by a particular licence that the special relationship of the United States with Israel provides the latter. True, the United States position has been clear as to the status of Jerusalem. It must be pointed out that the temptation during a United States presidential election year to dangle before Israel the prospect of legitimizing its usurpation of Jerusalem or of recognizing it as a capital is quite strong. Scurrying for what is described as the Jewish vote by overbidding on the future of Jerusalem is, to put it mildly, inexcusable. Let me state it quite frankly and in order that there be no equivocation: Jerusalem is not up for grabs and its destiny is inseparable from the destiny of the Arab nation to which it belongs. For the Arab world, no relations are worth maintaining if they have to include even a semblance of tolerating Israel's usurpation of Jerusalem. So we hope that, as some of the presidential and congressional candidates rush to underwrite and adopt Israel's illegal status in Jerusalem, they do not lose sight of the damaging consequences our legitimate reaction will have on the future of relations. Furthermore, placating Israel at the expense not only of legitimate Arab rights and aspirations, but also at the expense of undermining the authority and legitimacy of international consensus and of the United Nations, is dangerous for the prospect of a United States contribution to a comprehensive and just peace in the region, as well as being morally wrong and politically unwise and unhealthy.

47. I mention this here, knowing full well that the more responsible elements among United States decision makers and opinion makers are putting the brakes on the obscene rush to opportunism. We are eager to send from here the message that the injection into any political platform of "recognition of Jerusalem as a capital" will be an unnecessary and under any circumstances intolerable provocation and will warrant reactions that all concerned are most eager to avoid.

48. How soothing the Pope's statements on Jerusalem were. That he chose to convey to President Carter a deep concern on the pivotal role of Jerusalem testifies to the resilience of the Vatican's consistency on the future of the Holy City. We hope that the Pope's position will reinforce the United States commitment to what is legal and what is moral on the issue of Jerusalem. The Pope, in the few words he spoke on Jerusalem, expressed the inner and authentic yearnings of all mankind.

49. The members of the League of Arab States are also members of the Islamic Conference, which initiated the debate on the question of Jerusalem today. Islam's involvement with Jerusalem touches the nerve centre of current Islamic awareness and sense of identity. For the Muslim world, not only is Jerusalem interwoven in its spirit and its formation, but it is also the centre of Palestine, held close and dear to Muslims everywhere.

50. To the Vatican and to our brothers in the Muslim world, we express a special and deep appreciation for having again, and very recently, affirmed the commitment to Jerusalem as an act of faith.

51. The European heads of State, meeting at Venice, moved a significant step forward in coming to grips with the core issue in the Middle East crisis. Their input and their position will not only be useful and constructive, but will help dispel the false euphoria generated by the Camp David accords. This will undoubtedly contribute to strengthening international resistance to Israel's transgression on Jerusalem.

52. To our African, Latin American and Asian friends, and to those in the socialist camp, we should like to say that their supportive roles will be remembered as integral and organic elements in our common struggle.

53. Perhaps those two others, partners in the Camp David accords, will now realize that what is at stake in Jerusalem is not only the fate of an occupied city in Palestine, but also the humiliation that Zionism seeks to inflict on those who placate it, a humiliation that can be avoided only by our Egypt rejoining the Arab consensus and the United States rejoining the international consensus.

54. Jerusalem can recharge the batteries of the credibility of the Council. This can be done.

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

56. Mr. ROA-KOURÍ (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Mr. President, I wish to thank you and the other members of the Council for having afforded me the opportunity to take part in this important debate. At the same time, I should like, on behalf of my delegation, to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Council. I am confident that with your renowned diplomatic talents and skill you will lead the present deliberations to a satisfactory conclusion.

57. For Cuba, as well as all the other non-aligned countries—over whose Group in the United Nations it is my honour to preside—the question of Jerusalem is inextricably linked to the problem of the exercise of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people and to the attainment of a comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the Middle East. While the Palestinian question, as affirmed by the heads of State or Government of non-aligned countries in the Havana declaration, "is the crux of the Middle East problem and the essential cause of the Arab-Israeli conflict, the City of Jerusalem is an integral part of occupied Palestine [and] must be evacuated in its entirety and restored unconditionally to Arab sovereignty".<sup>1</sup>

58. For the non-aligned countries,

"All measures taken by Israel in the Palestinian and Arab territories since their occupation, including construction work, modifications and alterations designed to transform the political, cultural, religious, physical, geographic, social and demographic characteristics are illegal and null and void."<sup>2</sup>

59. The decision by Prime Minister Menachem Begin to transfer as soon as possible his offices, the Cabinet's meeting rooms and the conference rooms of its Commissions to East Jerusalem, as well as to house several Israeli ministries in the three buildings under construction in the Al-Sheikh Jarrah area of that part of the city, constitutes a violation of the legal status of Jerusalem as defined by the United Nations and is an inadmissible attempt to take up residence in a territory acquired through the use of force.

60. This desire for expansion on the part of the Israeli State is nothing new. On 2 August 1948, David Ben Gurion, who was then Prime Minister and Minister of Defence of Israel, officially and unabashedly proclaimed, that

"since the area of Jerusalem was in the hands of the Israeli Army and since it was the duty of the Army to ensure public safety, law and order, the laws of the Israeli State would apply in this occupied territory".

Take note that he admitted that it was occupied territory. On 7 June 1967, the notorious Moshe Dayan stated:

“The Israeli Defence Forces have liberated Jerusalem. We have reunified the divided city. We have returned to this the most sacred of places never to leave it again.”

61. A lawyer might say that, when you have a confession, no evidence is necessary. The *corpus separatum* under international régime which Jerusalem was and should be in accordance with General Assembly resolutions became the *corpus delicti* of Zionist aggression and occupation.

62. It is a curious “liberation” which turns the true citizens of a place into vassals, expelling them from their homes, confiscating their property and confirming the arbitrary actions of 1948 in defiance of the unequivocal will of the international community and to the detriment to the universal character of the city as the seat of places sacred to Jews, Muslims and Christians.

63. The Zionist State bases its alleged right to Jerusalem on two fallacies, one historical and one legal. Its representatives argue that Jerusalem is the historical capital of Israel and that Israel is the successor to a previous Jewish State.

64. A brief analysis shows the absence of all historical or legal basis to such allegations. It was the Canaanites and not the Jews who founded Jerusalem. The Jewish kingdom established by David 1,000 years before our times, which had Jerusalem as its capital, lasted for 73 years and was divided into two rival and hostile kingdoms—that of Israel, with the capital in Sichem, Samaria, and that of Judah, with the capital in Jerusalem. The Assyrians destroyed the former in 721 B.C. and the Babylonians destroyed the latter in 586 B.C.

65. For more than 2,000 years, up to the illegal occupation of the western part of Jerusalem and the establishment of the Zionist State, there was no Jewish régime at all in Palestine. However, Jerusalem went from Jebusite hands to Semite—that is, Jewish—hands, to Babylonian, Assyrian, Greek, Roman, Persian, Christian, Arab, Turkish and British hands before being divided into the Israeli and Jordanian sectors in 1948. In the meantime, the Palestinians—the descendants of the Canaanites—remained in Jerusalem for most of that period of 25 centuries.

66. If, as has been seen, the claim that Jerusalem is the historical capital of the State of Israel totally lacks validity, from a legal standpoint such a claim becomes even more untenable. How could a State which was established by a United Nations resolution in 1947 proclaim itself to be the successor of the Jewish Biblical monarchies which existed 25 or 30 centuries ago? The strict sense of international law

does not allow such fantasy to have any real existence and science fiction prefers the penumbra of outer space to the irrefutable evidence of *civitas terra*.

67. Let us not be fooled, then. The simple truth is that Israel, the illegal occupier of Arab and Palestinian lands, is attempting to have it its own way at any price and to confront us with the *fait accompli* of a Zionist Jerusalem for the Zionists in accordance with its ideal and intolerable model.

68. Whoever is not in agreement with that gross distortion of the principles and international norms approved by the United Nations will certainly be called “anti-Semite, fanatic and intolerant” by those attempting to convince the world that “Jewish” means “Zionist” and hiding behind the solidarity that every honourable man has felt with a people upon which through the centuries the darkest forces of history have been visited, in order to commit no less reprehensible deeds against the Palestinian people and the Arab countries.

69. The Government of Israel has violated United Nations resolutions on the legal status of Jerusalem. From 1948 to 1950 it occupied and annexed most of the new city and in 1967 the old city; it altered the demographic structure of Jerusalem, displacing more than 100,000 Palestinian refugees; it systematically violates the human rights of its original inhabitants; it has destroyed or damaged historical and religious Muslim sites, such as the Maghrabi area and the Al-Aqsa Mosque; and now it is attempting to consolidate its conquest by moving its headquarters there permanently. In the light of international law, the status of Israel in Jerusalem is that of a military occupier. All the actions referred to are therefore illegal under the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949.<sup>3</sup>

70. The Sixth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Havana, stated that “the restoration of Jerusalem to Arab sovereignty is an indispensable condition for a durable peace. Israel should be compelled to adhere to the relevant resolutions of the United Nations Security Council regarding Jerusalem and the Holy Places.”<sup>4</sup> Similarly, the Conference

“appealed to members of the Non-Aligned Movement to take firm measures, including severance of diplomatic and economic relations, with countries which formally or by implication recognized the city of Jerusalem as the capital of Israel.”<sup>4</sup>

71. The Zionist State persists in its defiant attitude only because it enjoys the unconditional political, diplomatic, economic and military support of a permanent member of the Council: the United States. Even the nine Western allies of this country, recently meeting at Venice, declared that they would not

accept any unilateral initiative designed to change the status of Jerusalem [S/14009]. Now it is the facts that count and not speeches.

72. World public opinion awaits the decision of the Council.

73. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

74. Mr. MANSOURI (Syrian Arab Republic): Mr. President, I thank you very much for giving me this opportunity to speak before the Council.

75. First of all, I should like to express my congratulations to you on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for this month. The long-standing friendly relations between our two countries as well as your great experience and high qualifications assure us that you will conduct the work of the Council in a very efficient manner.

76. I should at the same time like to pay due respect to your predecessor, Ambassador Oumarou of the Niger, for the efficient manner in which he presided over the work of the Council last month.

77. We are meeting here today to discuss one part of an urgent and important question, the question of the policy and activities of the Israeli Zionists in the occupied Arab territories. Indeed, the Council is now seized of the question of the attitude of the Israeli Government as shown by its attempt to change the physical character, demographic composition, institutional structure and status of the Holy City, Al-Quds Al-Sharif. This meeting comes in response to the worry and concern of over 900 million Muslims in the world as expressed through the Eleventh Islamic Conference of Foreign Ministers, held at Islamabad from 17 to 22 May 1980, at which there was a call for an immediate meeting of the Security Council to examine the dangerous situation arising from the latest decision by the Israeli authorities seeking to annex and declare Al-Quds Al-Sharif—the Holy City of Jerusalem—as the capital of Israel.<sup>5</sup> The Conference also called upon the Security Council, in case of defiance by Israel, to impose against that State the sanctions called for in Chapter VII of the Charter.

78. Ever since the occupation of Jerusalem in 1967 up to now, the Israeli authorities have been trying to impose the Israeli plan to obliterate the Arab character of Jerusalem and have persisted in ignoring all United Nations resolutions in this regard. Those Israeli attempts were deplored, condemned or censured by different bodies of the United Nations.

79. It is a well-known fact that the United Nations has adopted a number of resolutions on the question of Jerusalem's destiny. It might be worth mentioning

that General Assembly resolutions 2253 (ES-V) and 2254 (ES-V), adopted in July 1967, declared that all measures taken by Israel to change the status of Jerusalem were invalid and called upon Israel to rescind those measures and to desist forthwith from taking any action that would alter the status of the Holy City. The Security Council also dealt with this question and adopted resolutions 242 (1967), 252 (1968), 267 (1969), 271 (1969), 298 (1971), 446 (1979) and 465 (1980). All these resolutions have affirmed the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by military conquest and declared all legislative and administrative actions taken by Israel to change the status of the City of Al-Quds, including the expropriation of land and property, transfer of population and legislation aimed at the incorporation of the occupied section, to be totally invalid.

80. I return to the declaration issued by the European Community on 13 June 1980 following their meeting at Venice [*ibid.*] at which they stated that they would not accept any unilateral initiative designed to change the status of Jerusalem. In this connection, we deem it imperative to comment on the paragraph related to the status and future of the Holy City. That paragraph, in my Government's view, did not refer to the basic facts about Jerusalem, first, that Jerusalem is an integral part of the occupied Arab territories and consequently its people are entitled to the right of self-determination. Secondly, that paragraph did not refer to the withdrawal of the Israeli occupying forces, on the one hand, or to the basic United Nations resolutions on Jerusalem, on the other, an omission that might imply a stand contradictory to those resolutions.

81. I should like to bring to the attention of the Council the United States position with regard to Jerusalem. Ambassador Goldberg, the United States representative, declared on 14 July 1967 in the General Assembly<sup>6</sup> that the status of Jerusalem should not be decided unilaterally. The United States repeated its position when Ambassador Yost, addressing the Security Council on 1 July 1969, stated:

“The United States considers that 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.” [*1483rd meeting, para. 97.*]

Lately, President Carter, in his 3 March statement as reported in the press, stated that: “We strongly believe that Jerusalem should be undivided”. On 14 March, President Carter once again in a press conference said:

“We agreed on a paragraph in the Camp David accords concerning Jerusalem. It called for, and we

still believe that there should be, an undivided Jerusalem”.

82. The latest Israeli move to introduce and discuss in the Knesset a bill declaring Jerusalem the capital of Israel is a flagrant violation of Israel's responsibilities as an occupying Power as stipulated in the Geneva Conventions and is against all the rules of international law. The Israeli authorities, in their continued defiance of international law and of the wishes of the world community, have announced recently that the Government is going ahead in moving Begin's offices, the Government conference room and some other Israeli institutions to East Jerusalem. That act is in total disregard of resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly.

83. One wonders how the Israeli authorities can defy and ignore the desires and wishes of the international community. There is no doubt that they are counting on United States support for their illegal occupation. As a matter of fact, as recently as 1 June in a television interview, the President of the United States openly declared:

“We have a veto power that we can exercise if necessary to prevent this Camp David process from being destroyed or subverted, and I would not hesitate to use it if necessary”.

84. The contradictory statements of the officials of the United States Administration indicate, however, that the United States stand on Jerusalem may have already undergone a basic change. Is it that the Administration of such a great Power has become hostage to the wishes and designs of the Zionist movement in a presidential election year? We in Syria have no illusions whatsoever about the imperialist American-Zionist co-operation with the Zionists in the Middle East.

85. In conclusion, throughout history Al-Quds Al-Sharif has been well known as the City of Peace. But how true is that under Israeli occupation? Peace has lost its meaning when the population of a city has been living under occupation for the last 13 years. It has not known the freedom it used to enjoy under Arabic sovereignty through the centuries. There is no doubt that the liberation of Al-Quds from its occupiers is a matter of prime concern to all Arabs as well as to all believers in the world, regardless of their respective religions. It is the sacred duty of every believer to help in liberating Al-Quds. There is, as has been repeated time and again, no doubt that peace in the Middle East cannot be achieved without the fulfilment of two essential elements: first and foremost, the Israeli forces should withdraw from all the occupied Arab territories, including Jerusalem; and, secondly, the Palestinian people should be able to exercise their inalienable rights, including the right to self-determination and sovereignty and to a sovereign independent State in their homeland.

86. Finally, we think it is high time for the Council to shoulder its responsibility and act accordingly to find a way to respond to the wishes and desires of all the believers in the world and vote accordingly and unanimously to force Israel to abide by all the Council and General Assembly resolutions relating to Al-Quds Al-Sharif.

87. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Israel wishes to speak in exercise of his right of reply. I call upon him.

88. Mr. BLUM (Israel): I see little purpose in engaging in polemics with Mr. Maksoud. The nature of his approach to the Arab-Israel conflict was expressed in one basic concept which he himself today revealed to the Council. He stated that the Arabs have considered the Jews who have lived in their midst as Arabs of the Judaic faith. That, then, is the extent and limit of the tolerance which Mr. Maksoud and those for whom he speaks are willing to display towards Jews. Self-determination for others is not part of their exclusivist *Weltanschauung*.

89. That is how Mr. Maksoud views the right of self-determination of the Jewish people and its right to national independence and sovereignty. Mr. Maksoud, it should be remembered, expressed here the views of the member States of the new League of Arab States and has thus highlighted the root-cause of Arab hostility to Israel—that is, the unwillingness to recognize not only the Jewish State but even the existence of the Jewish people.

90. I have great admiration for Ambassador Bishara's rhetorical skills. Yet I feel constrained to note that, despite the ostensible reasonableness of his statement, it must be viewed as an extremely dangerous manifestation of incitement and, I would say, even fanaticism. Here we have this self-proclaimed Viking of the south who comes to warn us of the prospect of a holy war of Islam against Judaism. This is inflammatory and incendiary talk, even if Mr. Bishara warns us against that possibility. Beyond that, Ambassador Bishara was openly threatening the Council, and through it the entire international community, with the use of the Arab oil weapon. Since he represents here one of the leading oil producers, members of the Council will wish to take note of this element of oil blackmail, which has been introduced here for the first time in such an open and blatant manner.

91. Ambassador Bishara also brought into our debate the motif of might versus right. To attribute to the Jewish people and to the State of Israel a preference for might over right is, to put it very mildly, and with all due respect to Ambassador Bishara, slightly comical. Here you have one of the smallest nations on earth, a nation constantly threatened with extinction by its neighbours from the very day it achieved its independence, a State that was overrun by all its neighbours on the day of its birth, being accused of

a preference for might over right. And who makes this charge? The representative of a group of countries that have never to date reconciled themselves to the very existence of my country; a group of countries that have set up a terrorist organization known as the PLO for the specific purpose of bringing about the destruction of my country; a group of countries whose territory is more than 500 times larger than that of my country; a group of countries that are immeasurably richer than my country; a group of countries whose combined military strength by far exceeds and outstrips not only that of Israel but also that of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; a group of countries that holds a grip over much of the oil on which so much of the world's well-being depends; a group of countries whose population is dozens of times larger than that of my country. Who, then, represents might here and who represents right?

92. Incidentally, Ambassador Bishara also speaks here for a country which to date has refused to accept Council resolution 242 (1967). I have waited in vain for an announcement by him that his country is now ready to accept that resolution.

93. Ambassador Bishara presented himself as a spokesman of reason and moderation, but he left no doubt in the minds of his listeners that he was indeed a spokesman for incitement and hatred, blackmail and intimidation. He has thus helped us in clarifying the real motives underlying this debate and for that, with your permission, Mr. President, I should like to express to him my gratitude.

94. The PRESIDENT: Mr. Maksoud, to whom the Council extended an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure, wishes to make a further statement. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

95. Mr. MAKSOUD: We are very clear in our position of stating that throughout our history and throughout our present political commitment, to be a Jew in the Arab world cannot and does not necessarily mean that one cannot be an Arab and a Jew at the same time. I emphasize this point because to be a Jew in the Arab world does not disqualify that Jew from being an Arab. To that extent, we do not consider this to be an act of "tolerance", because the word "tolerance" presumes a patronizing attitude, a gift that we might give to the Jews who are Arabs. To be a Jew and an Arab is a matter of right for the Jew if he so wishes. That is why when we say that to be a Jew it does not necessarily mean that he is no longer an Arab if he happens to be a citizen of an Arab State. That is in

contradistinction to the very definition of the concept of a "Jewish State", which presumes that the ultimate objective of Israel is to build a Jewish State, which by definition excludes non-Jews from the right of citizenship by the law of return.

96. Furthermore, Mr. Blum says that this is the extent of the tolerance that we are willing to display; but we state very clearly and openly that the Arabs do not and will not practise discrimination. We realize that, like in all societies in the world, there might have been instances of discrimination in Arab States. But while discrimination to us, as it is to many parts of the world, is a problem, a consequence of socio-economic dislocation, to Israel, as it is to South Africa, discrimination is institutional and a policy.

97. Then when people ask about the unwillingness to grant the right of self-determination for the Jews, our question, which has been a constant philosophical question throughout, is: Which Jews want the right of self-determination? Is that a right that should be exercised by all Jews everywhere, irrespective of their actual legal and political citizenship in their respective countries? Does not this right undermine the sense of a tie of an organic relationship of an American, a British, a Soviet, an Indian or an Arab Jew with his State, with his nation? Does that not undermine the fact that he has rationally and consciously chosen to be a citizen of that particular country? Does it not undermine and erode that sense of belonging by deliberately saying that lingering must be a right of self-determination in building and belonging to an exclusively Jewish State?

98. These are serious matters which lead us to the conclusion that Israel and Zionism seek to disenfranchise Jews who are citizens of many countries of the world, depriving them of their right of self-determination as citizens in their respective countries. That is our philosophical, national and political position.

*The meeting rose at 12.50 p.m.*

---

#### NOTES

<sup>1</sup> A/34/542, annex, sect. I, para. 102 a and d.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, para. 102 f.

<sup>3</sup> United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 75, p. 287.

<sup>4</sup> A/34/542, annex, sect. I, para. 126.

<sup>5</sup> A/35/419-S/14129, resolution No. 4/11-P.

<sup>6</sup> *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifth Emergency Special Session, Plenary Meetings*, 1554th meeting.





---

### كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

يمكن الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع أنحاء العالم. استعلم عنها من المكتبة التي تتعامل معها أو اكتب إلى: الأمم المتحدة، قسم البيع في نيويورك أو في جنيف.

#### 如何购取联合国出版物

联合国出版物在全世界各地的书店和经售处均有发售。请向书店询问或写信到纽约或日内瓦的联合国销售组。

#### 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 libraire ou adressez-vous à : Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

#### КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Наводите 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 dirjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.

---