

UNITED NATIONS



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-EIGHTH YEAR

UN LIBRARY

1724th

MEETING: 13 JUNE 1973

OCT 2 - 1980

UN/SA COLLECTION

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1724)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in the Middle East:	
(a) Security Council resolution 331 (1973);	
(b) Report of the Secretary-General under Security Council resolution 331 (1973) (S/10929)	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.

SEVENTEEN HUNDRED AND TWENTY-FOURTH MEETING

Held in New York on Wednesday, 13 June 1973, at 10.30 a.m.

President: Mr. Yakov MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics).

M. Al Saffar (Bahrain) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

Present: The representatives of the following States: Australia, Austria, China, France, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Panama, Peru, Sudan, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America and Yugoslavia.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1724)

1. Adoption of the agenda.
2. The situation in the Middle East:
 - (a) Security Council resolution 331 (1973);
 - (b) Report of the Secretary-General under Security Council resolution 331 (1973) (S/10929).

The meeting was called to order at 11.05 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in the Middle East:

- (a) Security Council resolution 331 (1973);
- (b) Report of the Secretary-General under Security Council resolution 331 (1973) (S/10929)

1. The PRESIDENT (*translation from Russian*): In accordance with the decisions taken by the Security Council at previous meetings, I intend, with the consent of the Council, to invite the representatives of Egypt, Israel, Jordan, the United Republic of Tanzania, Chad, the Syrian Arab Republic, Nigeria, Algeria, Morocco, the United Arab Emirates, Somalia, Guyana, Mauritania, Kuwait, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Lebanon, Iran and Bahrain to participate, without the right to vote, in the Council's consideration of the situation in the Middle East.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. M. H. El-Zayyat (Egypt) and Mr. Y. Tekoah (Israel) took places at the Council table; and Mr. A. H. Sharaf (Jordan), Mr. S. Salim (United Republic of Tanzania), Mr. H. G. Ouangmotching (Chad), Mr. H. Kelani (Syrian Arab Republic), Mr. E. O. Ogbu (Nigeria), Mr. A. Bouteflika (Algeria), Mr. M. Zentar (Morocco), Mr. A. Al-Pachachi (United Arab Emirates), Mr. H. Nur Elmi (Somalia), Mr. R. E. Jackson (Guyana), Mr. M. El Hassen (Mauritania), Mr. A. Y. Bishara (Kuwait), Mr. J. Y. Jamal (Qatar), Mr. O. Sakka (Saudi Arabia), Mr. E. Ghorra (Lebanon), Mr. F. Hoveyda (Iran) and Mr. S.

2. The PRESIDENT (*translation from Russian*): I invite the first speaker on the list for today's meeting of the Council, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Saudi Arabia, to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

3. Mr. SAKKAF (Saudi Arabia): Mr. President, allow me to thank you for granting my request to be allowed to express the views of my Government on the item under consideration.

4. It is six years now since the Zionists occupied territories belonging to three States Members of the United Nations. It was by illicit means and all kinds of pressures brought to bear on the United Nations that Palestine was artificially partitioned in 1947.

5. My Government has, from the very beginning, taken a definite and consistent position concerning the Palestinian question. His Majesty King Faisal, in his historic speech delivered on 26 November 1947, on the eve of the infamous resolution of the partition of Palestine, declared:

"Today should not be considered as Palestine Day. In fact, it is United Nations Day. It is the day when either justice or tyranny will prevail. It is the day when either right or wrong will be upheld.

"Remember that in the preamble of the Charter you have pledged before God and history that you would stand firm against the aggressor and direct your effort to establish world peace and international security. Is not what is being attempted today in Palestine a case of flagrant aggression? Is it not tyrannical that an international organization is intervening to partition a country in order to present a part of it to the aggressor?"¹

6. I, myself, when I had the honour of representing His Majesty King Faisal Bin Abdul Aziz on the occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations in 1970, made it clear that Zionism is an aggressive, expansionist and racial movement that is basically in conflict with all the lofty ideals of mankind and constitutes a continuous danger to world peace.²

¹ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Second Session, Plenary Meetings, 125th meeting.*

² *Ibid.*, Twenty-fifth Session, Plenary Meetings, 1877th meeting, para. 202.

7. We regret to have to note that since the Palestinian question was brought to the attention of the United Nations scores of resolutions have been adopted condemning Israel for its aggression. The non-compliance of Israel with all those resolutions is known to all of you.

8. In short, Israel saw fit to ignore the United Nations resolutions and has been consolidating its occupation of Arab territories in utter violation of the letter and the spirit of the United Nations Charter.

9. Our deep concern for peace and stability in the Middle East is rendered more serious by the inability of this Organization to put an end to the aggression of a Member State which has flouted the basic purposes and principles of the Charter.

10. I do not intend to engage in polemics. The position of my Government has been clearly expressed and is to be found in the records of this Organization. However, I deem it is necessary once again to repeat here the position of my Government in the simplest terms. First, we firmly insist on the complete and unconditional withdrawal of Israeli forces from all the Arab territories occupied since June 1967. Second, we firmly uphold the right of the Palestinian people to return to their homeland. Should the Palestinians be denied that right, there can be no solution to this problem. Third, we should like to make it absolutely clear that my Government, like, I am sure, every other Arab Government, stands strongly behind Egypt in declaring that, if the Zionists refuse to withdraw from the occupied territories, there will be no other choice than to resort to action which will compel them to do so.

11. Within 25 years, the Zionists expanded their authority by force to territories that have gone far beyond the 1947 lines. Hence, as long as the Palestinians are denied access to their homeland we do not see how peace can be established in the region. It would be an understatement to say that the situation is fraught with great danger which may easily pave the way to a world conflict.

12. It is high time for you, members of the Council, to prevent the outbreak of a war which may spread and get so out of hand as to endanger the whole of mankind. We do not wish to sound as if we were alarmists. However, it is quite possible that a chain of events that may unfold from the dangerously unstable Middle East situation could easily force the hands of many Governments inside as well as outside the region, to take action from which there may be no return.

13. Once more we find it is our duty to raise our voice, not so much to protest past inaction on the part of the Council, but to solemnly warn its members that evading a prompt solution may lead to a situation which even the super-Powers would not be able to contain.

14. Mr. ODERO-JOWI (Kenya): Mr. President, before touching on the substance of the subject on our agenda, I should like on behalf of my delegation to congratulate you on your elevation to the important position of President of this august Council. My delegation is confident that during this month you will bring to bear on the work and

proceedings of this Council your vast experience, your skill and tact as a diplomat and the revolutionary spirit of your great country. My delegation hopes that the personal prestige of your good self and the dynamism of the country you represent will act as positive catalysts and will help us to find solutions and answers to some of the burning problems of the world such as the current item on the agenda of the Council. Beyond that, we are happy to see you presiding, Sir, because your presidency of this Council helps to strengthen the happy and cordial relations which exist between your great country and mine. My delegation will give you its full co-operation because we know that in these matters co-operation between your Government and people, on the one hand, and my Government and people, on the other, is vital. This occasion affords both our countries the opportunity to work in a common endeavour in this Council for peace, co-operation among nations and security for all.

15. I should not like to let pass this opportunity to express my delegation's gratitude and appreciation to your predecessor, my brother and colleague Ambassador Abdulla of the Sudan, for the energetic and able manner in which he conducted the affairs of the Council during the month of May. Ambassador Abdulla's remarkable and brilliant performance as last month's President of the Council was a credit not only to his country but also to the tradition of this august Council.

16. I wish to take this opportunity also to express my delegation's gratitude to the Secretary-General and, through him, to Ambassador Gunnar Jarring, for their untiring efforts in pursuit of peace in the Middle East, efforts which are brought out so clearly in the report before us submitted by the Secretary-General [S/10929].

17. I am addressing the Council today in two capacities: first, as representative of the Republic of Kenya in the Security Council and, secondly, in discharging the responsibility which has been conferred on my Foreign Minister and the Foreign Ministers of Nigeria, Chad, the United Republic of Tanzania, Guinea and Algeria, who have been designated by the Organization of African Unity (OAU) to be its spokesmen on the item currently before the Council. In this connexion, I wish to convey to you, Mr. President, the most sincere apologies of the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Kenya, Mr. Njoroge Mungai, who could not participate in this debate because of illness.

18. Under Article 52 of the Charter of the United Nations, OAU is Africa's regional body concerned with matters relating to co-operation in the maintenance of international peace and security in our region. To fulfil this function, OAU, as far back as 1963, stated its belief that "the United Nations is an important instrument for the maintenance of peace and security among nations and for the promotion of the economic and social development of all peoples".

19. In order fully to harmonize the objectives and activities of OAU with those of the United Nations, the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of OAU in 1963 adopted a resolution, subsequently endorsed by the General Assembly of the United Nations, which stated that OAU

"Reaffirms its dedication to the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter and its acceptance of all obligations contained in the Charter".

20. It is on behalf of OAU and, consequently, on behalf of Africa, that my delegation is speaking today to state its view and affirm its position on the issue before the Council—namely, the situation in the Middle East. As an African regional organization, OAU naturally takes three positions which have a direct bearing on the item on the Council's agenda. They are: OAU's concern for the peace and security of its members; the territorial sovereignty and integrity of States members of OAU; and non-aggression on any of its members. On these three matters the charter of OAU states *inter alia*:

"The member States, in pursuit of the purposes stated in article II, solemnly affirm and declare their adherence to the following principles:

"1. the sovereign equality of all member States;

"2. non-interference in the internal affairs of States;

"3. respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of each State and for its inalienable right to independent existence;

"4. peaceful settlement of disputes by negotiation, mediation, conciliation, or arbitration".

I have quoted this article partly to underline our adherence to the fundamental question of the territorial integrity of all States and partly to demonstrate to the Council the similarity of the fundamental principles of OAU and those of the United Nations.

21. Regarding the specific issue on the Council's agenda, OAU's involvement stems from the tenets and fundamental principles of its charter as well as from the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations. OAU has been seized with the problem of the situation in the Middle East over a number of years and a study of the resolutions and declarations adopted at sessions of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of OAU since its inception shows a pattern of growing concern, disappointment, disenchantment and sense of danger. This is because OAU cannot turn a blind eye on the fact that the territory of one of its founding members, the Arab Republic of Egypt, has been the object of military occupation since June 1967, contrary to the purposes and principles not only of the Charter of the United Nations, but also of OAU itself.

22. I should like first to enumerate the various decisions of OAU on the Middle East crisis since the outbreak of the six-day war to the present. The main aim of this exercise is to show the gravity with which African countries view the situation, and the rationale of the collective African position and attitude in relation to the situation in the Middle East.

23. First, at its fourth ordinary session held in Kinshasa, in September 1967, the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of OAU solemnly

(a) Reaffirmed its adhesion to the principles of respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of member States;

(b) Voiced concern at the grave situation prevailing in the United Arab Republic, an African country whose territory is partially occupied by a foreign Power;

(c) Expressed its sympathy to the United Arab Republic; and

(d) Decided to work within the United Nations in order to secure the evacuation of the United Arab Republic's territory.

24. Secondly, the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of OAU meeting in its fifth ordinary session in Algiers in September 1968:

(a) Again reaffirmed its support for the United Arab Republic;

(b) Called for the withdrawal of foreign troops from all Arab territories occupied since 5 June 1967, in accordance with the resolution adopted by the Security Council on 22 November 1967; and,

(c) Appealed to all members of OAU to use their influence to ensure strict implementation of that resolution.

25. Thirdly, at its sixth ordinary session in Addis Ababa, in September 1969, the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of OAU:

(a) Reaffirmed its opposition to the occupation by force of any part or the whole of one country by another;

(b) Reaffirmed its solidarity with the United Arab Republic;

(c) Emphatically reaffirmed the contents of the resolution adopted at the fifth session of the OAU Assembly, in Algiers in September 1968, quoted above.

26. Fourthly, at its seventh ordinary session in September 1970, the Assembly:

(a) Expressed its grave concern that for over three years a part of the territory of a sister African State was still under occupation by foreign troops, which would threaten world peace;

(b) Reaffirmed its earlier resolutions on the same subject, and again called for the withdrawal of foreign troops from all occupied Arab territories to the lines of 5 June 1967 in implementation of Security Council resolution 242 (1967);

(c) Further expressed its solidarity with the United Arab Republic and appealed to all member States of OAU to support the efforts of the United Nations Special Representative to implement resolution 242 (1967), taking into account that it cannot be implemented conditionally or partially; and,

(d) Requested all States members of OAU to use their influence to ensure the full implementation of that resolution.

27. Fifthly, in June 1971, at its eighth session, the Assembly of OAU once again:

(a) Reaffirmed emphatically its previous resolutions on the subject and called for the immediate withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from all Arab territories to the lines of 5 June 1967, in implementation of resolution 242 (1967);

(b) Expressed its full support to the efforts of the Special Representative of the United Nations Secretary-General to implement resolution 242 (1967) and to his initiative for peace of 8 February 1971;

(c) Reaffirmed its solidarity with the United Arab Republic and appreciated the positive attitude reflected in its reply of 15 February 1971 to the Special Representative's initiative for peace as a practical step for establishing a just and lasting peace in the Middle East;

(d) Deplored Israel's defiance of that initiative and called upon it to make a similar positive reply to the Special Representative's initiative for peace of 8 February 1971; and,

(e) Requested the current Chairman of OAU to consult with the Heads of State and Government so that they could use their influence to ensure the full implementation of resolution 242 (1967).

28. Sixthly in the aftermath of the abortive OAU initiative to seek a peaceful solution to the Middle East crisis, at its ninth ordinary session the OAU Assembly, in Rabat, in June 1972, once again:

(a) Congratulated Egypt for its co-operation with the Committee of Ten African Heads of State and Government, and for its positive attitude and its continuous efforts for the restoration of peace in the region;

(b) Deplored Israel's negative and obstructive attitude which prevents the resumption of the Jarring mission;

(c) Invited Israel publicly to declare its adherence to the principle of non-annexation of territories through the use of force, and further, invited Israel to withdraw immediately from all the occupied Arab territories to pre-June 1967 lines in accordance with resolution 242 (1967);

(d) Reaffirmed in the name of African solidarity and in pursuance of article II, paragraph 1 c; of the OAU charter, its effective support to the Arab Republic of Egypt in its legitimate struggle to recover totally and by every means its territorial integrity.

29. Article II, paragraph 1 c, of the OAU charter calls upon OAU member States to defend their sovereignty, their territorial integrity and independence. The Assembly in Rabat urged all States members of OAU to give Egypt every assistance, called on all Members of the United Nations to take all initiatives for the immediate and unconditional

withdrawal of Israel from the Arab territories, and condemned Israel's attitude which impedes the implementation of resolution 242 (1967) based on the Charter of the United Nations, which forbids, under any pretext, the acquisition of territories through the use of force.

30. Finally, the OAU Assembly requested all States Members of the United Nations to refrain from supplying Israel with any weapons, military equipment or moral support likely to enable it to strengthen its military potential and to perpetuate its occupation of Arab and African territories.

31. The result of the latest endeavours by OAU to help solve the Middle East conflict is contained in the OAU Assembly resolution of May 1973 which has been circulated as a document of the Council [*see S/10943*].

32. As a representative of one of the OAU member countries designated by the Assembly of Heads of State and Government, as one of Africa's spokesmen at this Council and in the face of the struggles and endeavours by OAU as outlined earlier, my mandate can be stated as follows.

33. In relation to the principles and the purposes of the Charter of the United Nations, we are charged with the task of taking action in relation to the Middle East conflict in accordance with Article 1 of the Charter of the United Nations which states:

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

34. Because it is already the verdict of this Council and the General Assembly that the existing situation in the Middle East constitutes a threat to international peace and security, we are mandated to request the Security Council to exercise its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security in relation to the Middle East situation. Furthermore, we are directed to insist that in discharging these duties, the Security Council must act in accordance with the principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations and the various declarations, decisions and resolutions of this Council and the General Assembly.

35. In this respect, my delegation would like to draw the attention of the Council to the responsibility of Members of the United Nations to fulfil, in good faith, the obligations assumed by them in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and the solemn undertaking by Member countries to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the integrity and political independence of any State. My delegation would also like to recall the provisions of the following declarations, resolutions and decisions of the General Assembly and the Council.

36. I should like to refer to General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples, which is a basic resolution of the General Assembly. The international community cannot remain unconcerned when the territory of a Member State is being subjected to a régime which is akin to a new form of colonialism.

37. I should like to draw your attention to the resolution on permanent sovereignty over natural resources which clearly prohibits the exploitation of natural resources from the territories presently occupied by Israel for the benefit of Israelis, as is happening at the moment.

38. I should like to refer to the four Geneva Conventions regulating the conduct of warfare, particularly the Geneva Convention on the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, which should be strictly adhered to in order to safeguard the right of civilian populations in the occupied Arab territories, so as to ensure the protection of their human rights.

39. Finally, I wish to refer briefly to the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations. I refer to resolution 2625 (XXV), which was unanimously adopted during the commemorative session of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Organization. Among the many principles which were proclaimed therein, I wish to refer to the first principle, namely

"The principle that States shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations."

Under this principle, the following elaboration was made:

"Every State has the duty to refrain in its international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations. Such a threat or use of force constitutes a violation of international law and the Charter of the United Nations and shall never be employed as a means of settling international issues.

"...

"Every State has the duty to refrain from the threat or use of force to violate the existing international boundaries of another State or as a means of solving international disputes, including territorial disputes and problems concerning frontiers of States.

"Every State . . . has the duty to refrain from the threat or use of force to violate international lines of demarcation, such as armistice lines, established by or pursuant to an international agreement to which it is a party or which it is otherwise bound to respect. Nothing in the foregoing shall be construed as prejudicing the positions of the parties concerned with regard to the status and effects of

such lines under their special régimes or as affecting their temporary character.

"...

"The territory of a State shall not be the object of military occupation resulting from the use of force in contravention of the provisions of the Charter. The territory of a State shall not be the object of acquisition by another State resulting from the threat or use of force. No territorial acquisition resulting from the threat or use of force shall be recognized as legal."

40. Those provisions are very relevant to the Middle East crisis and the interpretation of Council resolution 242 (1967), which, my country continues to believe, offers the only basis for an equitable and just resolution of the crisis. There cannot be a derogation, for any reason whatsoever, from the principle of the territorial integrity of States and the concomitant duty not to violate existing international boundaries and indeed international lines of demarcation. In this connexion, we should like to see all States which participate in this debate, particularly the African States, which are mostly weak and small, clearly declare the inadmissibility of acquisition of territory by force of arms. The security of one State cannot be guaranteed through the acquisition of vantage points or strategic positions on the territories of neighbouring States.

41. In the opinion of my delegation, it is therefore erroneous to interpret resolution 242 (1967) as forming the basis for a general revision of boundaries in the area so as to arrive at what are called secure and recognized boundaries. That could never have been the intention of the Council, because that would have amounted to sanctioning an illegality. This is contrary to existing boundary pre-emptory norms of international law, that is, the sanctity of existing boundaries and respect for the territorial integrity of all States. This principle of the sanctity of existing boundaries was only last year endorsed by the International Law Commission in its draft articles on the succession of States in respect of matters other than treaties.

42. It is the firm belief of the delegation of Kenya that, even at this late stage, the solution to the Middle East conflict still lies in the realistic implementation of resolution 242 (1967). The situation that now exists in the area—of "no peace and no war"—can hardly be expected to last for very much longer before a general conflagration erupts which would seriously threaten international peace and security not only in the Middle East but in the whole world. The present situation of forcible occupation of the territory of a member State of OAU by an extracontinental Power poses a negative precedent which might be emulated by the racist colonial minority régimes in southern Africa under the guise of the so-called secure and recognized boundaries. More significantly, the confrontation in the Middle East diverts Africa's resources and efforts from the liberation struggle in southern Africa. Unfortunately, it can only prolong the deprivation and suffering of our people in southern Africa.

43. The manner in which the present crisis has developed poses a serious challenge to the international community,

particularly through the widespread resort to terrorism. My delegation is particularly perturbed at the use of terrorism by official organs of the State of Israel, which, we fear, might be copied or emulated by the racist, colonialist and minority régimes of southern Africa. We are not being alarmist at all. In fact, the racists are already thinking along those lines. In an article entitled "Fear Grows on Black-White Borders" published by *The Times* of London on 9 June 1973, that is, four days ago, there appears the following:

"The liberal English-language papers have been noisily critical of President Kaunda for his handling of the incident, and one of the more conservative columnists, writing in the English-language *Financial Gazette*, suggested that it would be a good thing to send South African saboteurs into Zambia.

"The point was taken by a former commandant-general of the South African Defence Force, General S. A. Melville, who mooted the formation of a private mercenary force to launch 'reciprocal terrorist-style attacks on Zambia and Tanzania'."

44. On the issue of violence, members will remember that I had the following to say on 18 April 1973 in this Council while discussing the situation in Lebanon:

"We cannot but regret the human suffering that has ensued as a result of this situation. We thus strongly condemn all acts of aggravation of the situation and all acts of terrorism and counter-terrorism; we passionately condemn these in the name of human dignity and in the name of peace. Terrorism is not a commodity for export." [1709th meeting, para. 8.]

45. Therefore we wish to address an appeal to the Government of Israel, a country with which my country has always enjoyed friendly diplomatic relations, to reassess its policy and heed the voice of the international community in its call for peace with justice for all States in the Middle East. It is only with peace that the tragedy of suffering, particularly of the Palestinians can be resolved. We appeal to Israel to abandon its present arrogance, its militaristic posture and its ethnic idiosyncrasy; we appeal to the people of Israel to eschew the pursuit and worship of expansionism and militarism, for Israel stands to gain considerably more by adopting a peaceful policy towards its neighbours than from its present policy of toughness towards its neighbours. Israel stands to gain if only it can heed the voice of the international community, the voice of the Organization of African Unity and the voice of the United Nations Security Council. Those who believe in hawkish policies should remember that six years ago Israel was one of the most popular countries, but Israel's present posture serves only to isolate it from its friends and well-wishers.

46. The PRESIDENT (*translation from Russian*): I thank the representative of Kenya for his statement and for his kind words about my country and about the development of friendly relations between the Soviet Union and Kenya. I fully share his view in that regard and, for my part, I would like to express my great satisfaction at the development of

friendly relations between the Soviet Union and Kenya. I am proud to have had the honour to participate directly in the development and strengthening of relations of friendship and co-operation between the USSR and Kenya, and to visit your country, Mr. Ambassador, and its fine capital, with which, as we say, I fell in love at first sight. I also had the great honour to be received by your distinguished President, Mr. Kenyatta, and to have a very interesting conversation with that outstanding fighter for Africa's freedom. I can assure you for our part that the Soviet Government and people will continue in future to make every effort to develop and strengthen friendly relations between the Soviet Union and Kenya, and between the Soviet Union and all sovereign States in Africa.

47. Mr. DE GUIRINGAUD (France) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, first of all, as is customary, I should like to convey to you the congratulations of the French delegation on your assumption of the presidency of our Council. Everyone here is aware of your great experience and your authority. We will certainly need those qualities if the difficult and important debate that we have just begun on the situation in the Middle East is to be concluded and brought to an end.

48. The exceptional presence in this room of several Ministers for Foreign Affairs, the sustained attention with which the opening statements have been listened to, the place which the international press is giving to our work—all of this shows indeed the major interest in this debate that our Council has decided to hold at the request of the Arab Republic of Egypt. The purpose of this discussion, in accordance with the provisions of resolution 331 (1973), adopted on 20 April last, is to consider the situation in the Middle East since June 1967. Accordingly, it is not merely a question of studying any particular aspect of the conflict, but rather one of seeking the means for putting an end to this situation within arrangements respecting the resolutions of the United Nations.

49. At the request of the Council the Secretary-General has drawn up a detailed report retracing the efforts undertaken by his Special Representative, Ambassador Jarring, in pursuance of resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967. My delegation would like to extend its thanks to the Secretary-General and to his Special Representative for the care with which this report has been prepared. In precise and objective language, this document clearly brings out the respective positions of the parties regarding the application of the principles contained in resolution 242 (1967). It emerges from this document that the reply given by Israel to Mr. Jarring's aide-mémoire of 8 February 1971 [*S/10403, annex I*] constitutes one of the primary obstacles to the application of that resolution and to the beginning of a process leading to peace.

50. Despite the lack of any results from the efforts that they have made heretofore with patience and courage—and we wish to pay a tribute to them for that—the Secretary-General and Mr. Jarring state that they are prepared to continue with their task in the hope of facilitating a solution.

51. No one among us, I think, can doubt that a general and final settlement of this new "question of the Middle

East" is essential, and all of the statements made so far around this table testify to that. The situation which prevails in that particularly sensitive area, despite the cease-fire instituted in the month of August 1970, still remains fraught with dangers, both in itself and because of the serious risks it entails. This situation is contrary both to the spirit and the letter of the Charter, to the rules of international law, to the resolutions of the United Nations, and also to the very interests of the parties and indeed of all the countries of the region.

52. The continued occupation by Israel of sizable areas of territory belonging to three neighbouring Arab countries obviously constitutes a standing violation of the principles recognized by the community of nations, and in particular the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force. It is appropriate therefore to put an end to that situation in conditions which are in accordance with the various resolutions of the United Nations, and in particular resolution 242 (1967), and which provide all of the parties concerned with the guarantees indispensable for the establishment of a lasting peace. Of course we understand Israel's concern to safeguard its security, but we do not think that the occupation of territories that quite obviously belong to neighbouring countries is likely to ensure that security. Those countries have an inalienable right to sovereignty and territorial integrity; no one can dispute the fact that they have this right, and it is only legitimate that they should appeal to our Organization to have it respected. I cannot believe that Israel can seriously envisage establishing satisfactory relations with its neighbours as long as this occupation continues; and we all know that this occupation increases resentments, blocks all initiatives and undermines any chance of peace.

53. Speaking on behalf of Africa, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Nigeria has told us of "the deep concern" displayed by all African countries at the continued occupation by Israel of part of the territory of the Arab Republic of Egypt; he said that in this very room. This concern—which other African speakers have echoed—is, we may say, felt by all those who fear that the Middle East may become the theatre of a new confrontation, while a general climate of relaxation of tension appears to be emerging everywhere else.

54. If the need for a settlement therefore appears evident, the principles on which such a settlement should be based are themselves well known. These principles are, first of all, those of international law as they are proclaimed in the Charter, and in particular that principle which provides that "Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force". These principles, moreover, are those which are defined under resolution 242 (1967).

55. There is no need for me to restate the importance of that text which in our opinion has a two-fold advantage of having been adopted unanimously and of spelling out the respective obligations of the parties. Furthermore, it has acquired special merit in the fact that it was accepted by three of the parties to the dispute: Egypt, Jordan and Israel. We also know that the *aide-mémoire* of Mr. Jarring met with a favourable reception at Amman.

56. With respect to the text of resolution 242 (1967) itself, it is clear that Israel's commitment to withdraw from the territories occupied in June 1967 should be balanced by an end to belligerence and by recognition of the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of the States concerned, including of course Israel, a Member of our Organization and recognized as such ever since it was created.

57. The two essential elements in resolution 242 (1967) are inseparable: no withdrawal without commitments for peace, but no commitments for peace without withdrawal. That is why the Israeli response to Mr. Jarring's *aide-mémoire* constitutes a prior condition which nothing can justify. The dialogue should be started on a footing of equality and not on a footing of relations of force. In stating that it will not withdraw to the lines obtaining prior to 5 June 1967 Israel is undermining the balance in resolution 242 (1967). As regards the concept of "secure and recognized boundaries", this is in no way contradictory to the principle of withdrawal from the territories occupied in June 1967. It simply expresses the need to define and authenticate once and for all the frontiers between the countries involved by giving them the status of internationally recognized frontiers. As we have always said, this definition of frontiers does not mean that certain changes of minor importance by common agreement cannot be introduced in the lines of 4 June 1967 in the interest of the parties, and this without any infringement of the principle of the territorial integrity of States. As regards Egypt more particularly and taking into account the case of Gaza, there is no doubt that there exists between Egypt and Israel an internationally recognized frontier.

58. With regard to the provisions of resolution 242 (1967) which appear in paragraph 2 and which concern freedom of navigation, refugees and the demilitarized zones, they give a precise idea of the international guarantees that will have to be provided either in order to facilitate the execution of the agreement to be prepared or in order to ensure its lasting character.

59. I should like to talk now about the Palestine refugees whose position was dealt with in General Assembly resolution 194 (III) of 11 December 1948. After the war of June 1967 the problem acquired new dimensions. Beyond its humanitarian aspects, for which the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East is responsible, its political aspect has appeared and developed in recent years to such a degree that no settlement could or henceforth should overlook the problems of the Palestine people.

60. I turn now to the role which should devolve upon the Council in this affair. Whereas the situation in the Near East has appeared on the agenda of the United Nations for more than a quarter of a century, and although dozens of resolutions have been adopted on this question both by the Council and the General Assembly, without their having so far the results that were expected, we cannot fail to satisfy the moving and legitimate request put to us by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Egypt. And it is not that we should attempt to impose solutions which, since they do not have the support of the parties would remain a dead letter, but it

seems to me that it is our duty to make a fresh effort in order to emerge from the impasse in which we find ourselves and to facilitate the search for and the application of a settlement.

61. Seen in this light it would seem that the Council should clearly reaffirm the validity of resolution 242 (1967) in its totality, having in mind the fact that any change would threaten to break the balance of the resolution. It should naturally take into account the other United Nations resolutions as well as the recent report of the Secretary-General. But it would appear that its role cannot be confined to recalling the past. Quite the contrary, it should speak out in favour of a resumption of the action which has been carried out heretofore by the Secretary-General and his Special Representative in order—to use the language of paragraph 3 of the resolution—“to promote agreement and assist efforts to achieve a peaceful and accepted settlement”. We know quite well that the likelihood of direct negotiations is still ruled out. If the goal to be attained is of course the fact that in due course a peace agreement should be completed which would of necessity imply the mutual commitment of the parties, it is equally evident that the intervention of the United Nations is essential to achieve this goal, and therefore one should not rule out any suggestion or new mediation to this end.

62. The French delegation is ready to participate in concrete fashion in this task, in close co-operation with the other members of the Council. I shall not go back over the efforts that France, side by side with other countries, has never ceased to exert in recent years, in particular by providing its full support to the Jarring mission, to enable the United Nations to discharge the task entrusted to it. That was the purpose of the meeting of the permanent members of the Council. We remain ready, for our part, to resume this action, and it is not we who are responsible for the fact that it is not being continued.

63. In conclusion, I should like to make an appeal both to the members of the Council and to the countries directly concerned. I would appeal to members of the Council to agree to speak out clearly on the means of putting an end to the conflict. I would appeal to the parties concerned, and primarily to Israel, to agree to apply, under the aegis of the Council, resolution 242 (1967). The vital interests of the peoples of all the countries of the region, the interests of the international community as a whole and the interests of peace are at stake.

64. The PRESIDENT (*translation from Russian*): As the representative of the SOVIET UNION, I should like to express my great satisfaction at the fact that a similarity of views on the matter before the Council exists between the French and Soviet leaders, and has been officially set down in international documents. In the Soviet-French communiqué relating to the talks held between the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Comrade Leonid Ilyich Brezhnev, and the President of France, Mr. Pompidou, at Zaslavl, in the Soviet Union, on 11-12 January 1973, we read:

“The Soviet Union and France declare their profound concern at the fact that the situation in the Middle East

remains dangerous. They reaffirm that the Security Council resolution adopted on 22 November 1967 should be put into effect. They favour the view that, in accordance with that resolution, the Special Representative of the United Nations Secretary-General, Mr. Jarring, who was entrusted by the Security Council with promoting such a settlement, should continue his mission with a view to the establishment of a just and stable peace involving the withdrawal of Israeli forces from all the occupied territories, the recognition by all the countries concerned of the sovereignty, political independence and territorial integrity of each State in the area, and also respect for the rights and interests of all peoples in the area, including the Arab people of Palestine.”

65. In my capacity as PRESIDENT of the Security Council, I now invite the representative of the United Arab Emirates Mr. Al-Pachachi, to take his place at the Council table and to make his statement.

66. Mr. AL-PACHACHI (United Arab Emirates): Mr. President, I should like first of all to thank you and members of the Security Council for giving me this opportunity to take part in your present discussions. I am particularly happy, Mr. President, to see you presiding over the Council in this important debate. I have had the privilege of working with you for many years in this house and I have always admired your great qualities and your ability as the eloquent and dedicated spokesman of your great country.

67. I should also like to express our appreciation to the Secretary-General for his useful and informative and objective reports, and to his Special Representative, my friend Ambassador Jarring, for his tireless efforts in the cause of peace.

68. As the newest member of this Organization, the United Arab Emirates welcomes this opportunity to express its views on the great issue which for 25 years has preoccupied the United Nations. As an Arab country in the Middle East we are vitally concerned with the serious threat to the peace and security of the area arising out of Israel's continued occupation of the lands it seized in June of 1967.

69. We are disturbed by the apparent failure of the United Nations so far to deal effectively with this dangerous situation. The United Nations as the embodiment of man's quest for peace cannot evade its responsibility. An international organization which fails to deal with the world's most dangerous conflict would neither obtain nor deserve the respect of mankind. We shall not shirk our responsibility to do everything possible within our modest means to help the Arab States concerned to recover their lost territories and to bring about by diplomatic means a more objective, even-handed and just attitude by those who have yet to play a role commensurate with their responsibilities and world-wide interests.

70. In the many speeches and interventions, which I have a feeling he immensely enjoys, the gentleman sitting on my right has dealt with three themes: first, that resolution

242 (1967) does not require Israel to withdraw from all the territories it occupied in 1967; secondly, that new boundaries must be negotiated directly with the Arab States concerned and, thirdly, that the root cause is the Arab attitude to Israel's very existence and security.

71. Let me deal with the question of secure and insecure boundaries and the meaning of resolution 242 (1967) in this regard. A great deal has been heard from the Israel side about the vulnerability and insecurity of the armistice lines which separated Israel from its Arab neighbours until the war of June 1967.

72. The fact of the matter is that until the outbreak of that war Israel had never complained about the so-called vulnerability and insecurity of the armistice lines. Quite the contrary; it considered them highly satisfactory, and its main aim for 18 years was concerned with the transformation of those lines into permanent and recognized frontiers. Let me quote from Mr. Eban's statement before the General Assembly in October 1966—only eight months before Israel launched its war of aggression of 1967:

"Behind the armistice frontiers established by agreement between Israel and its Arab neighbours in 1949, the national life of sovereign States has become crystallized in an increasingly stable mould. There is some evidence that thoughtful minds in the Middle East are becoming sceptical about threats to change the existing territorial and political structure by armed force. Such threats, and the policies concerted to support them, offend the spirit and letter of the United Nations Charter. They violate bilateral agreements freely negotiated and solemnly signed. They undermine the central principles of international civility... for they encounter insuperable obstacles... in the opposition of the world community to the alteration by aggressive force of legally established and internationally recognized situations.

"... [We] regard the present armistice lines as immune from any change without consent".³

Yet we all know that eight months later Israel did exactly what Mr. Eban cautioned the Arabs against.

73. That shows conclusively that the slogan concerning the vulnerability and insecurity of the 4 June 1967 armistice lines is only a convenient excuse to justify Israel's territorial expansionist ambitions. That is why in the General Assembly, when it met in emergency special session one week after the end of hostilities in June 1967 and before Israel clearly and openly declared its expansionist aims, all of Israel's staunchest supporters in the Assembly felt that what was needed was transformation of those armistice lines into permanent and recognized boundaries, thus fulfilling the hope voiced by Mr. Eban eight months earlier. That is why the Latin American draft resolution,⁴ which was supported by the United States and was

unopposed by Israel, demanded the urgent withdrawal of all Israel's forces from all the territories occupied.

74. Mr. Arthur Goldberg, who could hardly be described as an Arab sympathizer, said the following as late as 14 July 1967, more than a month after the end of hostilities:

"One immediate, obvious and imperative step is the disengagement of all forces and the withdrawal of Israeli forces to their own territory."⁵

He did not speak about withdrawal to recognized and secure boundaries. He spoke of withdrawal to their own territory—meaning the territory they occupied prior to the war of 1967.

75. The differences of opinion that separated the Members of the United Nations during the emergency special session were related not to the question of withdrawal, on which there was unanimous agreement, but to the other questions having to do with belligerency, freedom of navigation, mutual recognition, and so on. Those differences, as we all know, were finally resolved in Security Council resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967. When that resolution was introduced in November of that year by the British representative, Lord Caradon, he declared that the policy of his Government was that stated by the then Foreign Secretary, Mr. George Brown, in the General Assembly a few weeks earlier. And he read out that statement:

"I should like to repeat what I said when I was here before: Britain does not accept war as a means of settling disputes, nor that a State should be allowed to extend its frontiers as a result of a war. This means that Israel must withdraw. But equally, Israel's neighbours must recognize its right to exist, and it must enjoy security within its frontiers. What we must work for in this area is a durable peace, the renunciation of all aggressive designs, and an end to policies which are inconsistent with peace."⁶

76. Now, as we all know, a representative in the Security Council can speak only on the basis of, and all his actions must stem from, the declared policy of his Government. The draft resolution that was presented by Lord Caradon could only be considered a reflection of British policy, because it would be unthinkable for a British representative in the Security Council to present a draft resolution at variance with and contrary to the declared policy of Her Majesty's Government as stated by the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs. But we are told that somehow the draft resolution presented by the British delegation was different, in letter as well as in spirit, from the declared policy of the sponsor of that resolution.

77. We are here as representatives of Governments, and everything we do in the Council reflects the policy and attitude of our Governments. Therefore, to say that the declaration of Mr. George Brown somehow did not relate to

³ *Ibid.*, Twenty-first Session, Plenary Meetings, 1428th meeting, paras. 112 and 113.

⁴ *Ibid.*, Fifth Emergency Special Session, Annexes, agenda item 5, document A/L.523/Rev.1.

⁵ *Ibid.*, Fifth Emergency Special Session, Plenary Meetings, 1554th meeting, para. 91.

⁶ *Ibid.*, Twenty-second Session, Plenary Meetings, 1567th meeting, para. 91.

the draft resolution is, I think, wrong and at variance with United Nations practice.

78. So let me recapitulate. As late as October 1966 Mr. Eban declared that the armistice lines could not be changed by force and could be altered only by mutual consent. Far from considering them vulnerable and insecure, he wanted to transform them into permanent frontiers. That was also the view of Israel's supporters who voted in favour of the Latin American draft resolution in the General Assembly which demanded the urgent withdrawal of Israel's forces from all occupied territories. That was the view of Mr. Arthur Goldberg, who said that withdrawal was an immediate, obvious and imperative step. That was the background against which the Security Council adopted its resolution 242 (1967), after having heard the important clarification made by the sponsor of that resolution regarding the policy of his Government.

79. With this background how can it be seriously argued now that what the Council meant was that the Arabs should make major territorial concessions while the occupation continues? As members of the Council are no doubt aware, the omission of the words "all" and "the" from paragraph 1 of the resolution was explained privately to Arab delegations at the time as meaning that they really related to the possibility of minor and mutually agreed rectifications of the frontier, and certainly not to substantial changes which Israel now openly demands.

80. In an article in the quarterly journal, *Foreign Affairs*, Mrs. Meir graciously said that Israel would not seek to retain all or most of Sinai, but she demanded the Golan Heights, Gaza, parts of the West Bank and, above all, the whole of Jerusalem.

81. Having repeatedly and publicly made these demands, and having formally informed the Special Representative of the Secretary-General that it would not withdraw to the pre-5 June 1967 lines, Israel now asks for direct negotiations, which can really mean only one thing: negotiations on the extent of territorial concessions the Arabs would have to make. With such a background, negotiations held in the shadow of Israel's occupation of Arab lands could only end in failure, unless the Arabs are ready to surrender and concede all of Israel's territorial demands which, of course, they will never do.

82. Israel's earlier territorial demands, though not as explicit as they are now, and its insistence on direct negotiations, were not unknown when the Security Council met in November 1967. The two demands, however, were rejected not only by the Arab States, but by practically the entire membership of the Organization. Israeli territorial demands were rejected because they were clearly contrary to the Charter, and that is why the resolution emphasized the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force. Direct negotiations were also not accepted, because the majority felt that the United Nations had a responsibility to play a central role in bringing about a settlement. It was recognized that asking the Arabs to negotiate without certain conditions and guarantees and without any framework of principles would give an enormous advantage and leverage to the Israeli negotiator and destroy any balance

and equity in the negotiating positions of the two parties. That is why a Special Representative of the Secretary-General was appointed and that is why certain principles and guidelines were agreed to provide the basis of a settlement.

83. I come now to the final point which the Israeli representative said was the crux of the matter, namely, the refusal of the Arabs to accept Israel's existence, and their threat to its security. The representative of Israel considered every statement made by an Arab representative in the Council asking for a just peace in accordance with the United Nations resolution, and indeed any mention of the Palestinians and their rights, as proof of a sinister design to destroy the State of Israel. But what are the facts?

84. Jordan and Egypt, two of the States most directly concerned, have accepted resolution 242 (1967) and have agreed to enter into a peace agreement with Israel on the basis of reciprocal commitments and obligations in accordance with that resolution. In spite of that, Israel continues to harp on the theme of the threat to its security and the Arab danger to its very existence. It is really quite extraordinary for the representative of Israel to tell us here with a straight face of the threats to Israel's security while Israel's armies occupy Arab lands and when its troops and air forces attack the neighbouring Arab countries whenever and wherever they choose. Whose security is really threatened by Israel's well-equipped and powerful war machine? The neighbouring Arab countries live in the shadow of Israel's undisguised expansionist ambitions. Yet we Arabs are continually being asked what is the reason for our enduring hostility to Israel.

85. Our conflict with Zionism arose because the Zionists planned to establish a State in a country overwhelmingly Arab in population, in land ownership, in language and in culture. The Zionist intent to establish a State in a country inhabited by another people is the seed and fountainhead of all the tribulations that have afflicted the Holy Land. Such an intent was bound to be opposed by the Arabs. For what nation in the world would give up its homeland to accommodate another? But according to Zionist mythology, Arab resistance against Zionist intent to take away the country is itself aggression. According to the game the Zionists want to play in Palestine, there must be two sets of rules: one set allows the Zionists to use every manner and means of force to establish themselves, and another set lays down that their victims must not resist. The Zionists want to act against the Arabs and, at the same time, prevent the Arabs from reacting.

86. The conflict in which the Arabs were caught was not of their choosing, and in this conflict any fair-minded person must surely see that from the beginning they have always been, as they still are, on the defensive. The record of Israel's continuing aggression against the people of Palestine would fill volumes. The active quest of greater Israel now stands revealed, with no need for erudite proof. The kind of terms that Israel is thinking of dictating are well beyond its capacity, as it must know, for Palestine is the hub of the Arab heartland and at its centre lies Jerusalem, for which our people fought and died in centuries past. In its long history the Arab nation has

suffered misfortunes far greater than the one our people is engulfed in today. But its resilient and indomitable spirit enabled it to overcome its past tribulations, as it will surely overcome its present agony.

87. Over the centuries invaders far more formidable than Israel have come and gone, but our nation remains secure and free in its homeland. For over a century our people have been subjected to wave after wave of colonial intrusions. The Zionist invasion is the last and most vicious and dangerous of these colonial onslaughts. The Zionist invasion draws its inspiration and driving force from the dreams and aspirations of those tormented souls, the products of the European ghettos. The countless years of humiliation and oppression inflicted on the Jewish people in Europe, culminating in the Hitlerite holocaust, have left, it seems, a deep scar in the spiritual make-up of the European Jews who today guide the destinies of Israel. All the frustrations and hatreds of centuries are now finding a new outlet against the Arabs.

88. But what a cruel irony of fate that the Arabs, in whose lands the Jews have found a haven and refuge from the unspeakable horrors of medieval Europe, are today the victims of such relentless hatred. A clear indication of this state of mind can be found in what we have seen here during the past week, a display rare in the annals of the United Nations, of venomous invective and uncompromising hostility from the representative of Israel. What we have heard from him reflects accurately, I regret to say, the present thinking and mood of Israel's rulers—intransigent, arrogant, aggressive, intoxicated with success and oblivious of all the great values which made the Jewish faith such an enduring moral force in the world. What we have been hearing is the voice of triumphant militarism bent upon the achievement of each and all of its objectives by force of arms, determined to transform Israel into a garrison State living by war and sustained by continuous expansion.

89. Before I conclude my statement I should like to make it quite clear that we have come here in quest of peace and I should have liked very much to have avoided an exchange of polemics with the representative of Israel. But having listened to him for a whole week, it has become necessary for us to answer. Let me tell him one thing in conclusion. There are many in Israel, we are told, who have studied our history and our culture—foremost among them the Foreign Minister of Israel, Mr. Eban. They must be aware of the reserves of inner strength and the powers of resiliency of the Arab nation and must know better than most that Israel cannot forever continue taking the posture of a conqueror annexing territories, expelling people and dictating its terms of peace. Unless it wishes to remain forever an outcast and an enemy it must first recognize that a grievous injustice has been inflicted on the Arab people of Palestine and that only through respect for their rights as human beings, entitled to freedom and security in their own homeland, can a beginning be made to establish conditions of peace and harmony which will endure because they are based on justice and not on the fluctuating fortunes of war.

90. The PRESIDENT (*translation from Russian*): I invite the representative of Lebanon, Mr. Ghorra, to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

91. Mr. GHORRA (Lebanon): Mr. President, I wish first of all to express to you and to the members of the Council, the appreciation of my delegation for allowing us to participate in your deliberations on the situation in the Middle East, a question of vital importance to Lebanon.

92. I should like to join in the congratulations extended to you, Sir, on your assuming the presidency of the Council. The tributes paid to you are a vivid expression of the general esteem in which you are held by all delegations. Your positive contributions to the work of the United Nations are of long standing and have earned you the recognition and appreciation of your colleagues. May I be permitted also to express my delegation's and my personal satisfaction at the friendly and ready co-operation that you have always extended to us during many trying debates here in the Council. This co-operation reflects the friendly relations which have been developing between our two countries.

93. It has become ritual to describe the situation in the Middle East as a threat to international peace and security. This is a truism recognized by all. There exist in the area enough explosives and inflammable emotions and materials to make that threat potentially dangerous. Fears of minor or major conflagrations have justified the persistent search for settlement of the Palestinian question and the consequences of the war of June 1967, in order to avert catastrophe. The United Nations and individual nations have on many occasions and in one form or another deployed sufficient efforts to achieve peace in the Middle East, only to see them break down on the rock of Israeli intransigence. This intransigence remains the stumbling block on the road to a just and lasting peace.

94. Twenty-five years have passed since 1.5 million Palestinians have been driven out from their ancestral homeland by Israeli forces. Six years have elapsed since the Israeli aggression against the three Arab States of Egypt, Jordan and Syria, which resulted in the occupation by the Israeli armed forces of large areas in those countries. Five and a half years ago, precisely on 22 November 1967, the Security Council adopted unanimously its resolution 242 (1967) having for its objective the achievement of a peaceful settlement of the Middle East problem. The Arab Governments and peoples of the Middle East find themselves after all these years still exposed to Israeli violence and occupation, sustained and supported by militaristic and expansionist policies and an ever-growing military establishment. It is therefore needless for me to apprise the Council of a situation fraught with constant dangers.

95. It is true that Lebanon, which did not participate in the hostilities of 1967, is not directly concerned with resolution 242 (1967). However, the Lebanese Government and people are constantly and gravely concerned about the ordeals suffered by our sister Arab States because of Israeli occupation and the perpetuation of the agony of the Palestinian people. A certain disenchantment pervades the Arab peoples because of the lack of progress in all the efforts dedicated to the establishment of the conditions of tranquillity, stability, peace and security that are necessary to usher our region into an unprecedented era of progress and prosperity. Their hopes have given way to despair and

frustration and to a pessimistic conviction that the international community is incapable of facing up to Israel and making it respect the international will, law and order.

96. A widely held view is that this review of the Middle East situation constitutes a test to determine whether the Council is in fact and deed, rather than in words and resolutions, the custodian of peace and security as it was meant to be by the provisions of the Charter. It is a challenge to stimulate, activate and enhance the authority and the role of the Council. It stands to gain immeasurably by its actions, for which it is eminently qualified.

97. The Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt has considered it to be its duty, not towards its own people alone, but also towards the Arab countries and peoples, to request the Security Council to review the Middle East situation, as this situation faces an insuperable deadlock. The Foreign Minister of Egypt, Mr. El-Zayyat, has fully, ably and squarely requested the Council to review and appraise the situation in the light of the past six years' developments and of the report that our esteemed Secretary-General has submitted to the Security Council about the untiring and commendable efforts of his personal representative, Mr. Jarring. Mr. El-Zayyat and previous Arab and non-Arab speakers have fully expounded all the facts and the various historical, judicial and political aspects of the question. It is, therefore, not my intention to repeat them. My intention is to emphasize some points which we consider important to us in Lebanon as well as to the Arab peoples and to the Palestinian people in particular.

98. The first point I should like to raise is the question of the Lebanese-Israeli General Armistice Agreement.

99. Early in 1949 Israel concluded with the neighbouring States Armistice Agreements ending the hostilities which had arisen amongst them in 1948 and providing for a future peace settlement. The Agreements were confirmed by decisions of the Security Council on 11 August 1949—resolution 73 (1949). The Council became juridically their executive overseer. Following the war of June 1967, Israel unilaterally denounced the Agreements in contravention of international law and Security Council resolutions. The United Nations still maintains that the Agreements are valid and binding.

100. The Lebanese Government has continuously maintained that the Lebanese-Israeli Armistice Agreement of 1949 denounced by Israel in August 1967 is still valid and in effect. That view was communicated to Mr. Jarring by the Foreign Minister of Lebanon on 21 April 1969, and it was confirmed in later communications to him. The Security Council, by adopting its consensus of 19 April 1972 [S/10611], acquiesced in the stationing along the Lebanese borders of additional United Nations observers, at the express request of Lebanon and in conformity with the Armistice Agreement—and this was done, Sir, partly during your presidency of the Council.

101. The Security Council in its resolutions 270 (1969), 316 (1972) and 332 (1973) has confirmed the validity of that Agreement. The Agreement establishes a demarcation line which runs along the recognized Lebanese international

borders. The denunciation by Israel of the Agreement smacked of bad faith. Mr. Ralph Bunche in his report to the Security Council on 20 July 1949 stated: "any breach of their terms"—that is, of the Armistice Agreements—"would involve a most serious act of bad faith" [S/1357, part I, para. 4].

102. Israel has abused its denunciation of the Armistice Agreement by launching several aggressive attacks against Lebanon, for which it has been condemned on several occasions by the Council. There was a time when it suited Israel to uphold the Armistice Agreements because it found in them benefits to suit its interests. I would recall here what Mr. Eban stated on 4 August 1949:

"...the provisional settlement established by the Armistice Agreements is unchangeable until a new process of negotiation and agreement has been successfully consummated" [433rd meeting, p. 13].

"...

"Israel will observe each of these Agreements and every part and section thereof. It will maintain them scrupulously in every respect until a new agreement is reached" [Ibid., p. 14].

103. Therefore it is abundantly clear that the Armistice Agreement is still valid and alive. The Secretary-General in the introduction to his report to the General Assembly in 1967 stated *inter alia*:

"There is no provision in them"—that is, the Armistice Agreements—"for unilateral termination of their application. This has been the United Nations position all along and will continue to be the position until a competent organ decides otherwise".⁷

It is our conviction that that remains the position of the United Nations. It is a position the Lebanese Government adheres to. The sanctity of international agreements must be respected. This is an elementary principle of law. Those agreements command even more respect when, sanctioned by the Council, they become governed by the law of the United Nations.

104. Now I should like to address myself to the wider problem of peace in the Middle East. My delegation cannot but reiterate the often repeated principle that in order to be achieved and to last peace must be based on the administration of justice to the Palestinian people and on the withdrawal of Israeli forces from all the Arab territories occupied as a result of the hostilities of 5 June 1967.

105. With regard to the first point, the Lebanese Government and people have assumed a leading role in the defence of the legitimate and inalienable rights of the Palestinian people since the inception of the Palestinian question. At no time has Lebanon relinquished that role. Today we are as attached to it as we ever were, regardless of the traumatic and unsettling developments which have overtaken the Lebanese scene in recent weeks.

⁷ Ibid., Twenty-Second Session, Supplement No. 1A, para. 43.

106. We must all remember at all times that the convulsions and upheavals we witness in the whole Middle East—not in Lebanon alone—find their primary cause in the tragedy that was visited upon the Palestinian people by the Zionist-Israeli aggression of 1948. The obstinate refusal by Israel and the incapacity of the United Nations to render justice to the Palestinian refugees in accordance with United Nations resolutions have maintained them in the camps and in a state of misery, despair and frustration.

107. Twenty-five years of exile have embittered them while the usurpers of their ancestral homeland and their properties have enjoyed the fruits of their military conquests. Allow me to cite here what Mr. Kalyl Abou Hammad, the Foreign Minister of Lebanon, stated regarding this matter in the general debate of the General Assembly on 26 September 1972:

“The creation of the State of Israel was accompanied by the mass exodus of the inhabitants of Palestine, provoked by threats, intimidation and terror. Today there is a new Diaspora of wandering Palestinians and displaced Arabs, who cannot and do not want to be assimilated in any other country.”⁸

108. Is the Palestinian people destined to live in a permanent diaspora, denied the right to reintegrate its ancestral homeland? Its inalienable rights to return and to self-determination have been recognized by many resolutions adopted by the United Nations and in many statements delivered by leading heads of delegations at the General Assembly and elsewhere.

109. In this respect, the right of the Arab people of Palestine to self-determination was recognized long ago by none other than Mr. David Ben-Gurion, the former Prime Minister of Israel. During a conference held in Berlin in 1931 he stated:

“The right to self-determination is a universal principle. We are totally in favour of the right of all peoples to self-determination, and it goes without saying that the Arab people in Palestine has the right to self-determination. This right is not limited and cannot be conditioned by our own interests. This freedom of self-determination of the Arabs cannot be hampered out of fear of the obstacles which it may create with regard to our own accomplishments. It may be that the achievement of their aspirations to self-determination will create grave difficulties for us, but that is no reason for refusing them their rights.”⁹

110. The settlement of the problem of the Palestinian people is an essential element for the establishment of peace in the Middle East. I wish to refer in this respect to only one significant statement which I cited in a previous debate. It was made by the United States Secretary of State, Mr. William Rogers, in a speech on 9 December 1969 in which he said that “there can be no lasting peace without a just settlement of the problem of those who were made

homeless in 1948 and 1967”. And Mr. Rogers added “There is a new consciousness among the young Palestinians who have grown up since 1948 which needs to be channelled away from bitterness and frustration toward hope and justice.”

111. The yearning of the Palestinian people to return to its homeland is strong and unyielding. To that people and to all of us it is incomprehensible that Israel and the Zionist forces can resort to all sorts of pressure to bring more foreign Jews to Israel under the slogan, “let my people go”, while the Palestinian people, living in squalor in the confines of its homeland, is denied the right of return.

112. This debate could very well be placed in the context of the on-going process of quest for peace. But are we nearer to peace today than we were when resolution 242 (1967), for instance, was adopted on 22 November 1967? Despite all the efforts made since then, my delegation maintains that the situation in the Middle East suffers from a dangerous deterioration, despite the apparent adherence to the cease-fire and other positive elements which have been evoked in the Council. Arms continue to flow into the area; Israel is strengthening its foothold in the occupied areas by creating new facts which are making a peaceful settlement a more complicated and difficult objective to attain. Israel not only has undermined and nullified all efforts deployed for peace, but has constantly raised its stakes and demands, impeding further the chances for agreement on a peace settlement.

113. Israel has wilfully widened the area of conflict by provoking, since December 1968, an area which had hitherto been calm and peaceful. I refer specifically to Lebanon. The multiple and repeated acts of Israeli aggression against Lebanon in violation of international law, the Charter of the United Nations and the Lebanese-Israeli General Armistice Agreement of 1949 have brought us before the Council on nine occasions. The Israeli actions have been condemned in several resolutions adopted by the Council.

114. Progress towards peace can be achieved when Israel decides to co-operate earnestly with the United Nations and the international community. Israel can take a big step forward by implementing the resolutions of the Council, but not by using them for semantics.

115. The Israeli Foreign Minister, Mr. Eban, stated in the Knesset on 28 May last that his Government would not accept any addition to or explanation or reformulation of resolution 242 (1967). Ambassador Tekoah echoed this view here in the Council. For the Israeli Government would want us to believe that that document is immutable, untouchable and sacrosanct. Ambassador Tekoah went to great lengths to convince us that the resolution envisaged only “withdrawal from occupied territories”, and not withdrawal from all the occupied territories.

116. In this respect, we should like to make the following remarks: Israel did not wait for the outcome of the efforts undertaken by the Secretary-General and his representative, Ambassador Jarring, or by other States endeavouring to promote agreement on implementation of the resolution. It

⁸ *Ibid.*, Twenty-seventh Session, Plenary Meetings, 2041st meeting, para. 40.

⁹ Quoted in French by the speaker.

decided from the outset to go it alone and decided upon its own course for that implementation.

117. No sooner had its troops entered the Arab sector of Jerusalem than it declared the annexation of that sector. It maintains now that Jerusalem is not negotiable; it has undertaken a huge master plan in the Holy City with a Jewish goal: to make it a Zionist exhibition, as the Minister of Housing, Mr. Sharaf, once said. This is being done in flagrant violation of several General Assembly and Security Council resolutions enjoining Israel from taking, in contravention of the Geneva Convention of 1949 and of those resolutions, any action which affects the geographic character and demographic composition of the Holy City.

118. The problem of Jerusalem is of paramount interest to us in Lebanon, country of Christians, Moslems and Jews. It is needless to re-emphasize its importance to Islam, being its third holiest city. But to Christianity, it is the prime Holy City, and the 10 million Christians of the Middle East feel deep concern about its future.

119. The Apostolic Delegation to Jerusalem, Archbishop Laghi, was reported to have said that "when the Arabs leave Jerusalem, Christianity leaves with them". And the Christians have indeed been leaving Jerusalem. Their exodus was described by Archbishop Joseph Raya of Galilee as a "distressing stampede without hope or joy". Pope Paul VI expressed his anxiety about the Christians of the Holy City when on 11 April 1971 he said the following:

"Today, we must look with affection in our hearts to the Christian community of this Holy Land, already so sorely tried in the course of history, these our brothers, who live where Jesus lived, and who, surrounded by the holy places, are the successors of that ancient and very first Church, from which all the other churches take their origin."

His Apostolic Delegate expressed the fear that the role of Christianity in the Holy Land may soon be reduced to "no more than keepers of museums and curators of shrines".

120. A group of religious leaders representing all Christian and Moslem denominations in Lebanon met on 6 June, last week, in the Catholic Archbishopric of Beirut. They addressed to the Security Council a cable—and we hope that you have it in your possession, Mr. President—in which they requested the Council to take effective measures to preserve the holiness of the Holy City and to prevent its Judaisation, rejecting strongly that might makes right.

121. The unanimous position of the Council has been made clear on many occasions about Jerusalem. Secretary of State Rogers emphasized in his speech of 9 December 1969—to which I referred—the United States position on Jerusalem. He said:

"We have made clear repeatedly in the past two and a half years that we cannot accept unilateral actions by any party to decide the final status of the city."

The United States delegation reiterated this position in its statements and voting on various resolutions in this Council concerning Jerusalem.

122. Israel has gone further in its unilateral implementation of resolution 242 (1967). It declared that the Golan Heights are not returnable to Syria and that it intends to retain them for security reasons. It proceeded to establish in the area scores of civilian and paramilitary settlements. Over 50 settlements have already been established in the Golan Heights, the West Bank, the Gaza Strip and Sinai. General Dayan has been advocating the construction of major new Israeli urban settlements in several strategic areas, amongst which a city for 250,000 in the southern part of the Gaza strip.

123. In Sharm-el-Sheikh, Israel has established settlements and laid claim to the area. It has built a road connecting Israel with it. Its designs to annex a large strip of Sinai have never been concealed. The Foreign Minister of Egypt has raised a fundamental question. He has requested a pronouncement whether acquisition of territory by force is permissible under the United Nations Charter. The Charter and several resolutions and declarations adopted by the United Nations have made it crystal clear that acquisition of territory by force is not permissible.

124. Israel forgets that we are living in the era of the United Nations and not during those ages when it was common to acquire territories by force. The return to the old practices of war and conquests will only bring disaster to this Organization and to the world. International public opinion is strongly opposed to the use of force in international relations and to the acquisition of territories by force. The resolutions adopted by the Organization of African Unity at Addis Ababa, and ably and clearly communicated to the Council by a distinguished group of Foreign Ministers representing that organization, testified to where the public opinion and the official position of Africa stand. The resolution adopted by the Conference of Foreign Ministers of Non-Aligned Countries at Georgetown, Guyana and also communicated to this Council on 8 June 1973 [see S/10944] does not leave any doubt about this point.

125. The Security Council did not delegate to Israel the prerogative of interpreting resolution 242 (1967). It delegated to the Secretary-General and his personal representative the definite mission of its implementation. Mr. Jarring has diligently and patiently sought to fulfil his mission. His aide-mémoire of 8 February 1971 appears to have been intended to break the deadlock; it was considered to make a breakthrough. Hopes have risen sharply as a result of the positive and constructive reply of Egypt to that aide-mémoire on 15 February. Egypt has undertaken definite commitments including that of entering into a peace agreement with Israel. Those hopes were soon to be dashed by Israel's intransigence. Egypt was considered more forthcoming than expected and was widely commended on its stand.

126. The context of discussions and thinking at the time Mr. Jarring established his aide-mémoire appeared to have encouraged the principle that Israeli troops should withdraw to the Egypt-Palestine international recognized line—and I wish to underscore this particular point.

127. In good faith, Egypt replied positively to the Jarring aide-mémoire of 8 February 1971 and made definite

commitments to implement resolution 242 (1967). The Egyptian move was universally hailed as a breakthrough. Resolutions by the United Nations and other international organizations commended Egypt on its positive, constructive and forward-looking move. But Israel, which gave at that time the impression that it was engaged in serious talks through Jarring, balked and never since made an attempt to participate in the reactivation of the Jarring mission or in any constructive initiative to break the deadlock.

128. If an earnest and detached summing up of Minister El-Zayyat's statements in the Council is made, we cannot escape coming to the conclusion that Egypt is in earnest search for a peaceful solution within the framework of the United Nations based on the principles of the Charter, reiterated and amplified many times by various resolutions and declarations of the United Nations.

129. The Arab countries want peace and need peace. Contrary to Israeli propagandists, they do not wish any nation ill. They look forward to co-operation hoping that no nation wishes them ill.

130. The financial crisis, the energy crisis, the traditional bonds of friendships and co-operation existing in trade, education, tourism, are positive elements to further improve and develop relations between the Arab countries and the industrially and technologically developed countries, many of them represented around this table. The future holds tremendous possibilities for improved relations and closer co-operation. In soberness, wisdom and a determined will to act that future would be made brighter on the basis of understanding and respect for the Arab legitimate rights and aspirations. Mutually beneficial relationships could be further developed on the basis of fairness, impartiality and justice. The disruptive forces of the Israeli policy of militarism, adventurism, intransigence and unbridled ambitions should not be allowed to operate in such a way as to jeopardize those objectives. The consequences of the disruptive Israeli forces could not and should not be underestimated.

131. We quite agree with President Nixon when he speaks in his report to Congress on United States foreign policy for the 1970s, dated 3 May 1973, about the

"... outward-looking economic relations among the Middle East, North Africa, the European Community and the United States. This"—he said, requires "stable and dependable relations between suppliers and consumers of energy."

The President set as one of the tasks of his policy the strengthening of United States ties

"... with all its traditional friends in the Middle East and restore bilateral relations where they have been severed".

132. Lebanon's policy has always had as its axis peace, friendship and co-operation. It is our sincere hope that the actions the Council is called upon to take will enhance its effectiveness in promoting, achieving and effecting peace in the Middle East as to enable its peoples to dedicate their

resources and energies to assure their future generations a better and brighter life.

133. The PRESIDENT (*translation from Russian*): I thank the representative of Lebanon, Ambassador Ghorra, for his statement and for the words of friendship addressed to me, and also those referring to the development of friendly relations between our countries. For my part I should like to associate myself with that view, and to express my satisfaction at the state and the development of relations of friendship and co-operation between our two countries.

134. The representative of Israel has asked to be allowed to speak in exercise of the right of reply, and the representative of Egypt has asked to be allowed to make a statement. I intend to call on them both. I call on the representative of Israel.

135. Mr. TEKOA (Israel): The representative of France referred to the continuation of the Israeli presence in territories held since 1967. In connexion with that, it is necessary to bear in mind the following.

136. First, Israeli forces find themselves in the areas which came under Israel's control in 1967 as a result of a war of aggression pursued by the Arab States against Israel since 1948 and as a result of the attempt made in 1967 by Egypt and by other Arab States under Egypt's direction to liquidate Israel, as announced at the time by President Nasser.

137. Second, the Israeli forces remain on the present cease-fire lines in accordance with the Security Council's cease-fire resolutions.

138. Third, the provision for withdrawal from those lines is, as indicated also by the representative of France, linked to and contingent on the provision regarding the establishment of secure and recognized boundaries.

139. Fourth, those boundaries are to be established under resolution 242 (1967) by agreement between the parties. There has thus far been no Arab willingness to negotiate such agreement without prior conditions with Israel.

140. Fifth, the requirement to determine for the first time between Israel and the Arab States secure and recognized boundaries is of a general character. It does not exclude Egypt. All the armistice agreements with Jordan, Syria, Lebanon and Egypt specified that the armistice lines were provisional lines and should not in any way prejudice the rights, claims and positions of either party in the ultimate settlement. The Egyptian-Israeli Armistice Agreement went further. It stated specifically that the demarcation line "is not to be construed in any sense as a political or territorial boundary ...".¹⁰

141. There could be no more unequivocal a formulation. Israel and Egypt have clearly undertaken not to regard the old military lines as a territorial boundary. Israel cannot be expected 25 years later to give a different interpretation to

¹⁰ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Fourth Year, Special Supplement No. 3*.

that commitment and to accept that there was a territorial boundary between Israel and Egypt when the existence of such a boundary was specifically declared by both parties not to be.

142. I took note of the observation made by the representative of France regarding the possibility of agreed changes in the old lines. But I took particular note of the specially significant statement made by the representative of the United Arab Emirates that in fact the Arab delegations were told and knew in November 1967 that resolution 242 (1967) provided for the possibility of such changes in the old lines. This is the fundamental, the decisive principle. The determination and precise extent of those changes must, of course, come through agreement between the parties. It is good that we found corroboration of this central principle of change of the old lines in the statement of an Arab representative.

143. We heard today from three additional Arab representatives. Their interpretations of the war waged by the Arab States against Israel for 25 years, just like the interpretations of the Arab speakers who had preceded them, brought to mind the story of how Nasrudin created truth. The story goes as follows.

“‘Laws as such do not make people better,’ said Nasrudin to the King; ‘they must practise certain things, in order to become attuned to inner truth. This form of truth resembles apparent truth only slightly.’ The King decided that he could, and would, make people observe the truth. He could make them practise truthfulness. His city was entered by a bridge. On this he built a gallows. The following day, when the gates were opened at dawn, the Captain of the Guard was stationed with a squad of troops to examine all who entered. An announcement was made: ‘Everyone will be questioned. If he tells the truth, he will be allowed to enter. If he lies, he will be hanged.’ Nasrudin stepped forward. ‘Where are you going?’ ‘I am on my way,’ said Nasrudin slowly, ‘to be hanged.’ ‘We don’t believe you!’ ‘Very well, if I have told a lie, hang me!’ ‘But if we hang you for lying, we will have made what you said come true!’ ‘That’s right; now you know what truth is—YOUR truth!’ ”

That is my reply to the statements by the Arab representatives today.

144. As an example of the kind of truth that is being produced by this method I would mention an interview by Amir Taheri with King Faisal of Saudi Arabia, published in an Iranian newspaper, *Taihan International*, on 18 March 1972. I shall quote only two statements by the Head of State of Saudi Arabia. First, “The Zionists were responsible for unleashing upon mankind the torrential invasions of the Mongols.” Secondly, “Marx, Engels, Lenin, Trotsky and Stalin were all Jews and Zionists.”

145. As far as Lebanese truth is concerned, what in the Lebanese representative’s pronouncement should in fact be accepted as truth and what as deliberate misrepresentation? What is fact, and what fiction? What is the real position of the Lebanese Government, and what is merely propaganda phraseology?

146. For years representatives of Lebanon assured the United Nations and the world—as did Ambassador Ghorra today—that their country is innocent, peace loving and not involved in the Arab warfare against Israel. Is that the truth? Or is the truth to be found in the statement made on 30 May 1967, on the eve of hostilities with Israel, by the Foreign Minister of Lebanon, Mr. Hakim, who said: “In a total war, the Arabs will use all means. It would be a long war, with no cease-fire until final victory.” Or is the truth about the peace-loving intentions of Lebanon toward Israel to be found in the fact that in recent years Lebanon has served as a principal base for the murderous Arab terror operations against Israeli civilians and against innocent men, women and children outside the Middle East?

147. Could credence have been given in the past to the Lebanese statements in the Security Council—in this Council—when they denied the presence in Lebanon of any concentrations of terrorist groups and the existence of any of their camps, training centres, information offices and headquarters? Was it right at the time that certain members of the Security Council accepted those unfounded claims at face value, only to be confronted with the real facts when the terrorist organizations themselves began to issue official communiqués openly describing their presence on Lebanese soil, their attacks from Lebanon against Israel and their encounters with Israeli forces in Israeli defence actions directed against the terrorist centres and bases and causing casualties among the terrorists themselves?

148. Members of the Security Council still remember the Lebanese representative’s emotional accusations that Israel was attacking innocent refugees in refugee camps. Was that the truth? Or is the truth revealed in the recent attacks of the Lebanese armed forces on terrorist bases located right inside the refugee camps?

149. We have heard the Lebanese representative claim repeatedly in this Council chamber that there are 300,000 Palestinian refugees in Lebanon. Should the number given by him be accepted as correct, or the one appearing in the Secretary-General’s report, now before this Council, which is 160,723—only half the Lebanese figure?

150. Was the representative of Lebanon telling the truth when he used to claim plaintively that the presence of Palestinian refugees in Lebanon made terrorist operations against Israel from Lebanon inevitable? Is not the truth rather to be found in the statement of Lebanon’s President Franjieh, who on 4 May 1973 said, with reference to the murder groups, “We cannot accept an army of occupation”? Is not the truth rather in the fact that for years and years Lebanon, with the Palestinian refugees within its borders, remained completely outside the sphere of terrorist operations, and its frontier with Israel served as an example of tranquillity?

151. In the light of all that, what value can be attached to the statements, claims and disclaimers, accusations and protestations voiced today by the Ambassador of Lebanon? If Lebanon is really interested in peace, why does it not set an example to others?

152. There are no territorial problems between Israel and Lebanon. Why does not Lebanon enter into negotiations

with Israel and conclude a peace agreement with it? Why has it preferred to stay out of the orbit of the peace-making efforts? The reason is obvious. Despite its allegations of a desire to attain peace with Israel, Lebanon will do nothing to make peace a reality.

153. So much distortion and sometimes absurdity has been heaped by Arab representatives on this Council—as, for instance, by the representative of the United Arab Emirates, regarding the Jewish people, the history of the Jewish State, Jews, Palestinian Arabs and Palestine—that it is important that the record of this debate should reflect also the true facts on these matters.

154. It was at the dawn of time when peoples, States, civilizations and religions were still in a formative stage that a nation was born, destined to preserve its identity and survive through the ages till our days. It was a time when in most parts of the world the concept of community was confined to the tribe or to the city. The political unit was based on loyalty to a king or emperor rather than on ethnic affinity. It was then that the Jewish people emerged as a nation, distinct not only in its political personality but also as a separate cultural and religious entity. For more than a thousand years this people maintained its sovereignty over the land of Israel.

155. When the Roman Empire conquered nation after nation the Jewish people stubbornly resisted, clinging to its independence, its faith and civilization, and it was the last people in the Mediterranean basin to be subdued in the year 70 A.D. Part of the nation was uprooted by the conqueror and carried away into bondage in distant lands. Those who remained continued to resist and to rebel again and again.

156. In the year 132 they succeeded in restoring their independence for several years, only to be crushed once more by the Romans. The conquerors tried to suppress Jewish sovereignty even by erasing the name of the country and they, the conquerors, renamed the country Palestine. The Jews refused to give up their struggle.

157. In the year 352 they rose again in revolt against Roman rule. In 614 they raised an army which, together with Persia, put an end to the domination of the Roman empire in the Holy Land. Thereafter, waves of invaders swept across the country. First came the Arabs, who ruled until the year 1072. Then the Seljuks, and after them the Crusaders. The latter took Jerusalem in 1099 and massacred the Jews of the city. After the Crusaders appeared the Mamelukes, and in 1517 the Ottomans, who remained in power for four centuries.

158. The Jewish population dwindled under the impact of massacre and exile. However, the land remained the centre of Jewish life and learning, producing works of great national and cultural significance.

159. In the meantime, the Jews exiled to foreign lands preserved their identity as a nation and remained bound to their homeland by the civilization and religion of which they were bearers. Their faith, culture, customs, food and even their clothing made their lives a continuation of the existence in their homeland. They celebrated holidays

based on the history of the land of Israel or on climatic and agricultural seasons which prevailed there in the land of Israel. Forbidden by their faith to intermarry with non-Jews, they remained a distinct people transmitting their national heritage from generation to generation. Persecuted by their neighbours on account of their Asian origin and Oriental civilization, the Jews knew and felt that they were strangers and that their home remained in Israel. Through the centuries they strove to return to it, individually, in groups, in mass movements. That was Zionism, their love of Zion, their national liberation movement. Day after day, three times a day, they prayed that they may go back to the land of their fathers and re-establish their independence.

160. For the attachment to their nation, for the bonds with their homeland they paid with their lives. The Crusaders butchered them in all parts of Europe. The Spanish Inquisition burnt them at the stake. They were slaughtered in the Russian pogroms, and gassed and annihilated by the millions in the Nazi holocaust. Yet they never surrendered; they never abandoned their heritage, and always remained a nation proud of its identity, linked to its land by myriad bonds.

161. During this time the land of Israel stood desolate. Its successive conquerors saw in it occupied territory. It never became a sovereign State again. The Arab and other Moslem rulers never considered its ancient capital Jerusalem even as an administrative centre throughout history. Those of the conquerors who settled in the land were few, their populated localities sparse. They never saw themselves as being different from the inhabitants of the neighbouring lands. They never produced a national culture of their own. They never aspired to be regarded as a separate political entity.

162. Travellers who visited the area described it always as a dying land. The Frenchman Volney who toured Palestine in 1785 wrote that it was "desolate". A. Keith, writing some decades after Volney, commented: "In his [Volney's] day the land had not reached its last degree of desolation and depopulation". By 1883 Colonel Condor, author of *Heath and Moab*, calls Palestine "a ruined land". Mark Twain was shocked by the land's "desolation" as he described it in *Innocents Abroad*. In the nineteenth century there were only about 150,000 settled inhabitants and an equal number of nomads.

163. Indeed, until the mass return of Jews at the end of the last century and especially since World War I, the picture of Palestine is one of a wasteland inhabited by clusters of impoverished peasants in debt to absentee landlords residing in Beirut, Damascus or Cairo.

164. The population began to increase and the country to develop only with the beginning of organized Jewish return a century ago. In 1922 the Arab population of the whole of Palestine was 565,000. By 1947 it grew, largely by Arab immigration from abroad, to 1.2 million, an increase of 100 per cent. During the same period Egypt, for instance, saw its population increase by only 25 per cent. In Trans-jordan, which was separated in 1922 from Western Palestine and was closed to Jewish immigration, the Arab population remained static.

165. In information bulletin No. 6 of 1962, UNRWA reports:

"A considerable movement of people is known to have occurred, particularly during the Second World War years when new opportunities of employment opened up in the towns and on military works in Palestine. These war-time prospects and generally the higher rate of industrialization in Palestine than in neighbouring countries attracted many immigrants from those countries, and many of them entered Palestine without their presence being officially recorded."

166. Thus it is clear that the majority of the Arab inhabitants of Palestine at the time Israel attained its independence, were immigrants who had come from neighbouring Arab States in a migration that paralleled the arrival of Jews in the country.

167. In these circumstances it was not surprising that Arab nationalists did not regard Palestine as a separate national or political personality.

168. As late as May 1947, Arab representatives informed the United Nations in a formal statement:

"Palestine was part of the Province of Syria . . . Politically the Arabs of Palestine were not independent in the sense of forming a separate political entity."

This was an Arab statement before the United Nations.

169. In 1952 the well-known Arab statesman and scholar Charles Malik wrote in the quarterly *Foreign Affairs*:

"Greater Syria was dismembered, the southern and northern parts being put under different administrations."

170. On 31 May 1956 Ahmed Shukairy, the founder and head of the Palestine Liberation Organization, announced in the Security Council: "It is common knowledge that Palestine is nothing but southern Syria". [724th meeting, para. 44.] This has been the traditional Arab view of Palestine.

171. As recently as 17 October 1966 the representative of Syria, Ambassador Tomeh, declared in the Security Council:

"We as Syrians consider Palestine to be, and to have been, historically, geographically and from every point of view a part of Syria . . . When we speak of Palestine we feel we are speaking about part of our own country." [1308th meeting, para. 130.]

172. Indeed, the Arabs never looked upon Palestine as a land with a distinct political personality, or upon its inhabitants as a separate people. Throughout history, it was only in the eyes of one people and one people alone—the Jewish people—that the land was different and separate from other lands, that it was the cradle of its national aspirations.

173. In history this has been recognized by the Arabs themselves. The Koran states with reference to the Jews: "Enter, O my people to the Holy Land which God hath destined for you." The Arabic name for Jerusalem, El Quds, is derived from el-Maqdus, which is the Arab form of the Hebrew Hamikdash—meaning the Holy Temple. Whose Holy Temple? The Jewish Temple.

174. On 23 March 1918 Sharif Hussein, the ruler of Mecca, published an article in *Al Qible* in which he said:

"... we saw the Jews from foreign countries streaming to Palestine . . . The cause of the causes would not escape those who had the gift of a deeper insight; they knew that the country was for its original sons for all their differences, a sacred and beloved homeland. Experience has moved their capacity to succeed in their energies and their labours . . . The return of these exiles to their homeland will prove materially and spiritually an experimental school for their brethren (the Arabs) . . ."

175. Emir Feisal, the father of modern Arab nationalism, declared on 12 December 1918 in an interview with Reuters:

"The two main branches of the Semite family, Arabs and Jews, understand one another, and I hope that as a result of an interchange of ideas at the Peace Conference, which will be guided by ideals of self-determination and nationality, each nation will make definite progress towards the realization of its aspiration. Arabs are not jealous of Zionist Jews and intend to give them fair play. . . ."

176. On 3 January 1919 Emir Feisal signed on behalf of the Arab Kingdom of Hedjaz the celebrated agreement with Dr. Weizmann, representing the Zionist Organization in which provisions were made for co-operation between the Arab State and Jewish Palestine.

177. The attitude changed with a change in Arab leadership. The facts of the situation did not alter but the policies of certain Arab leaders did. Brotherhood and co-operation were replaced by hostility and violence. Enmity toward Jews was so extreme that in later years some of these leaders became Nazi sympathizers and collaborators, and spent the war period in Berlin advising Hitler and Eichmann on the genocide of Jews. Arab leaders who today invoke human rights and seek the support of African and Asian States had no inhibitions about associating themselves with the Nazi policies and actions regarding Africans and Jews.

178. It was by the use of force that these Arab leaders tried to deprive the Jewish people of its inalienable rights as a nation. The methods used by them were terrorism against civilians and aggression by regular armed forces. These methods were applied to prevent Israel's independence and to destroy Israel as a sovereign State once independence was achieved.

179. In the United Nations Arab representatives accompany their denial of the historic justice of Israel's rebirth by incessant distortions and vilification of the Jewish people. The history of the Jewish people is falsified beyond

recognition, its religion abused, its culture deprecated. The Jewish people is portrayed in fact as a non-people.

180. Thus a fantastic proposition is put forward alleging that the conversion to Judaism of the Khazar King and 4000 of the nobles in the Volga region, about 800 years before the first Jews began to arrive in Russia by way of Germany, Poland and Lithuania, turns the entire Russian and even European Jewry into descendants of the Khazars. To this is attached the claim that for some inexplicable reason these alleged descendants of the Turkic Khazars abandoned their own language and chose for their vernacular a German dialect—Yiddish.

181. No less absurd is the reference to Israel as a foreign European State, though it is common knowledge that even today, even if we disregard the thousands of years of historic bonds with the land of Israel, the majority of Israel's citizens are Israeli born and almost half of them are Jewish refugees from Arab lands and their families. Besides, it is an irony of fate that Jews, oppressed and discriminated against by Europeans for being of Semitic Asian stock should be vilified as Europeans by their own Semitic brethren.

182. Freed of distortion, acrimony and abuse, treated in a spirit of mutual respect and understanding, the problem of Jewish and Arab rights in Palestine becomes a tractable one.

183. There are a number of basic, undeniable facts.

184. First, the re-establishment of Jewish independence, after centuries of struggle to overcome foreign conquest and exile, is a vindication of the fundamental concepts of equality of nations and of self-determination. To question the Jewish people's right to national existence and freedom is to deny the central precepts of the United Nations.

185. Second, throughout history, only the Jewish people saw the land of Israel as a distinct political entity, as the centre of its national existence and of its civilization. All other inhabitants who settled there, after the Jews had been uprooted by foreign invaders, regarded themselves and the country as integral parts of larger entities, political, national and religious.

186. Third, the Arab inhabitants of the land have always considered themselves to be part of the larger Arab nation, which has vindicated its rights to self-determination and independence in 18 sovereign Arab States, with several more on the way to achieving independence.

187. Fourth, within the area of Palestine itself, the aspirations of the Arab people to sovereignty have been met twice by the international community. In the period of the League of Nations, Transjordan was cut off from the remaining part of Palestine, the West Bank, closed to the Jews and established as a separate Palestinian Arab entity. The United Nations responded again to Arab claims and called for the establishment of a second Arab State in Palestine, alongside the Jewish State.

188. Fifth, the existence in Palestine today of one rather than two Arab States does not alter the fact that the Arab

population of Palestine exercises its right to political independence within a sovereign Palestinian Arab entity. On 14 January 1963 King Hussein declared: "Jordan is Palestine, and Palestine is Jordan". Mr. Anwar Nuseibeh, a former Jordanian Defence Minister, who now lives in Jerusalem, stated on 23 October 1970:

"The Jordanians are also Palestinians. This is one State. This is one people. The name is not important. The families living in Salt, Irbid and Karak maintain not only family and matrimonial ties with the families in Nablus and Hebron. They are one people."

189. Mr. Sharaf, Jordan's representative, declared in the Security Council on 11 June 1973: "The new Jordan, which emerged in 1949, was the creation of the Palestinians of the West Bank and their brothers in the east." [1721st meeting, para. 130.]

190. It is clear, in the light of those facts, that the allegations that the Palestinian Arabs have not yet vindicated their inalienable rights to self-determination and statehood are without foundation. The Arabs of Palestine exercise these rights in the Palestinian State of Jordan. They are free, of course, to decide on the name and political structure of their State. Their rights cannot, however, put in question the Jewish people's rights to self-determination and independence in their ancient homeland, just as the fact of Jewish statehood does not and cannot be interpreted as having created a so-called problem of the inalienable rights of the Palestinians.

191. The PRESIDENT (*translation from Russian*): I call on the representative of Egypt.

192. Mr. EL-ZAYYAT (Egypt): I promise that I am not going to go back to the dawn—or even the noon—of history, I am not going to take you on an Odyssey into the land of myth, and I am not going to filibuster. I have three points which I think I should make, but I cannot begin without reacting to two points that have just been made.

193. First, I wonder what the "strangers" living as citizens of the 15 States represented at this table would have to say about the description of them as "strangers living in foreign lands". What would the Jews living in India, in Indonesia, in Kenya, in Panama, in Peru, in the Sudan, in the Soviet Union, in the United Kingdom, in the United States, in Yugoslavia, in Australia, in Austria, in China and in France say about this? It is not up to me to say.

194. Second, I should like to plead not guilty to the accusation that we vilify people when we call them "Europeans". In our dictionary "European" is not an insult.

195. What is really serious is that a new theory has just been set forth in this Council, and we cannot let it go unchallenged. Somehow this Council is accused of apparently having ordered the occupation of Egypt, Syria and Jordan, this occupation to remain in effect until Israel desires to change the lines of the occupation. The Council does not need any protestation from my side against this absurd and ridiculous, if revealing, theory. That is the first point.

196. The second point is this. I do not really know whether the representative of Israel has such a low opinion of your intelligence and ours. I hope he does not. He keeps speaking about the lines of the Armistice Agreements and keeps forgetting about the international borders between all the land of Palestine under British Mandate and the then neighbouring States. The international borders, if not sacred, are certainly protected by the law of nations, and any infringement of those borders is pure aggression and an act of war. The partitioning of Palestine and the moving lines which were frozen in 1949 in the Armistice Agreements were of course not territorial or political boundaries. We in Egypt have insisted on giving the quotation that has just been cited—not to protect Egypt but to protect the Palestinians, who may or may not exist in the mind of Mr. Tekoah but who do exist in the world of reality. It is up to them, if and when they desire, to put the territorial and political boundaries between them and the Jewish State—if and when they desire to accept the partition resolution of 1947, which they deem to be unjust. The pitiful efforts again to confuse this Council and its representatives do not need any reply on my part.

197. My third and last point is this. As we see in the verbatim records of the 1722nd and 1723rd meetings, they claim—and they have claimed again today—that the only door that might lead to peace in the Middle East is the door of negotiations without any prior conditions. I have a text, and only one, to reply to this. It says that there are two points to make: the first a military point: the second a psychological one. And it goes on:

“We cannot be expected to negotiate while fingers are put across our throat to throttle us. And there is, more importantly, the psychological aspect: you do not go into a room to negotiate an agreement with somebody who has just taken your pocketbook out of your pocket. You say to him: ‘Look, you put that pocketbook back first to create the minimal conditions necessary for us to reach viable agreements in the future’.”

198. The statement I have just read is not a replica of another statement I made in the past, or of another long dissertation on how to forge history; this text is from the record of a WNBC television network programme of 24 September 1970, broadcast at 8 a.m. It was said by Mr. Abba Eban, the Foreign Minister of Israel, in an interview with Pauline Frederick and others.

199. We feel a bit ashamed of ourselves, Mr. President: we are not asking the thief to put the pocketbook back into our pocket before having anything meaningful; in our reply to Ambassador Jarring we simply and modestly asked for an honourable commitment that this pocketbook would be put back into our pocket.

200. The PRESIDENT (*translation from Russian*): The representatives of the United Arab Emirates and Saudi Arabia have asked to be allowed to speak in exercise of the right of reply. One of them has mentioned the possibility of convening an afternoon meeting in order to enable the Council to hear those speakers. On the other hand, the present meeting could be continued in order to enable them to state their views now; an afternoon—or rather, an evening—meeting would not then be convened.

201. I call on the representative of Saudi Arabia.

202. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): I think it will take me some time to correct certain assertions made by Mr. Tekoah, especially because they are in my field: this historical field. While he came to Palestine—I have researched this, and if I am wrong I stand to be corrected—from somewhere in the Balkans or southern Russia by way of Shanghai, I have been seized of this question since before he was born and am familiar with the historical area; I know something about it. Now, there were many, many mistakes in his statement, and it will take me time to take them up point by point. Of course, he made those points to bolster his argument.

203. I do not wish to keep my colleagues here around this table for another three-quarters of an hour, or even half an hour, and my good friend the Minister of State, Mr. Al-Pachachi, might take another 10 minutes, which would make an hour. I think it would defeat our own purpose to keep you here that long. So I would propose a compromise—although it is not up to me to do so, it is by your consent that I appear at this table—namely, that, with the consent of the members, you give me the floor, Mr. President, the next time you meet, regardless of whether it is this afternoon or tomorrow. I would certainly be agreeable to that, and anyway I will obey you. If you want me to speak this afternoon, I will do so, because I have a great deal of respect for you, Sir; and I must also have consideration for the others.

204. Mr. SEN (India): We are all interested in history, logic, truth and justice, but I think we are also interested in our hunger, particularly as there is a social engagement with the Foreign Ministers and others present. So I would suggest that, if it suits all the other members of the Council, we adjourn now and perhaps meet later, at any time suitable to you, Mr. President, and the other members, and listen to all these historical dissertations and the various aspects of justice and truth.

205. The PRESIDENT (*translation from Russian*): As I understand it, the representative of Saudi Arabia does not object to being given an opportunity to speak at the next meeting. At the same time, the representative of the United Arab Emirates has told me that he wishes to make a very short statement of five minutes. If it lasts five or ten minutes, we can sit here for another five or ten minutes. Accordingly, perhaps we could call on him and hear the representative of Saudi Arabia tomorrow. I see no objections. I invite the representative of the United Arab Emirates to take a seat at the Council table to make his short statement.

206. Mr. AL-PACHACHI (United Arab Emirates): I apologize to you, Mr. President, and to the other members of the Council, particularly my friend the representative of India, with whom I share a feeling of hunger. Personally, I would have preferred to speak at another meeting, but since, Sir, you have seen fit to call on me now, I will be very brief, as I promised.

207. I said earlier in the day, in my first statement, that apparently Mr. Tekoah immensely enjoys making state-

ments in this Council. I think he has proved it beyond any doubt this time by inflicting upon us a long historical dissertation at a most inconvenient time. But he made one or two points in reference to me personally to which I should like to reply.

208. The first point related to my statement that Arab delegations were privately informed in November 1967 when the sponsors of the resolution tried to explain the omission of the words "all" and "the" in paragraph 1 of the resolution, saying it was done to open the possibility of agreed minor modifications that might be mutually convenient to the parties. Now, that is a far cry from the occupation of Sharm-el-Sheikh, Gaza, the Golan Heights, Arab Jerusalem and other parts of the West Bank, which Israeli leaders have openly claimed. Therefore, I was surprised—perhaps pleasantly surprised—when Mr. Tekoah said that if that was our understanding, then perhaps the situation could be looked at in a different light.

209. Does that mean that Israel is prepared to agree to the principle of withdrawal from the occupied territories subject to such minor modifications to be agreed upon for mutual convenience? If that is the case, then I think the Israelis should inform the Special Representative of the Secretary-General without any delay that they agree to withdraw from the territories occupied in June 1967, subject to such minor modifications. They should also mention what minor modifications they have in mind. But, as I said, this is a far cry from the announced policies of expansion made by the Prime Minister of Israel and several of her Ministers in which they mentioned specifically that Israel would not relinquish control of Sharm-el-Sheikh, of Gaza, of the Golan Heights, of Arab Jerusalem and certain parts of the West Bank itself.

210. Now, Mr. Tekoah also accused us of considering the Jews as a non-people. It seems to me that practically half of his statement was devoted to the task of proving that the Palestinians were a non-people, that somehow they did not exist, that there is no country called Palestine, that it has always been part of some other administrative area in the Arab world. The fact of the matter is that since the Arab conquest, and in fact before the Arab conquest, there has been large-scale Arab immigration into Palestine from Arabia. But with the Arab conquest in the seventh century the whole country became Arabized. Its language became Arabic, its culture became Arabic, and this was the situation for 1,300 years.

211. Now surely a country which has been a predominantly Arab country for 1,300 years cannot overnight be turned into an alien immigrant population, because if we are going to rewrite history and give rights to people who enjoyed them 2,000 or 3,000 years ago, one can imagine what complete chaos there would be in the world. The fact is that independent Jewish sovereignty in Palestine has not lasted more than 700 years during a long history of nearly 4,000 years.

212. There were peoples in Palestine long before the ancient Hebrews made their appearance there, and other

peoples came into Palestine after the Jews went out of it. Therefore, it is necessary to remember this: that the important factor is that the people who inhabit the land should be given the right of self-determination, not the people who inhabited that land nearly 2,000 years ago. And in 1918, after the First World War, 93 per cent of the population of Palestine was Arab. More than 99 per cent of the land was owned by Arabs. The country had been predominantly Arab in culture and language for nearly 1,400 years.

213. Mr. Tekoah made a great deal of the fact that Palestine at various times in history was administered as part of Syria. Well, we do not deny that. But Syria is an Arab country, and the fact that Palestine was considered as an integral part of an Arab country does not put it outside the Arab nation and the Arab world. On the contrary, Palestine, whether as part of Syria or independent, has always been part of the Arab world since the seventh century of the Christian era.

214. In fact, far greater numbers of Jews lived in my country of birth, Iraq, than in Palestine over many centuries. In fact, in Iraq, the Jewish community, which was one of the oldest in the world, flourished and many of its great prophets and great theologians lived and worked in the valley of the two rivers. Also, it is a fact that the Jews always flourished under Arab rule, especially so in the Arab Caliphate of Cordoba in Spain.

215. Mr. Tekoah mentioned the Spanish Inquisition and the Crusades. It is a fact that the Arabs suffered under the Spanish Inquisition and the Crusades as much as, if not more, than the Jews. I would also add another historical instance in which the Jews and Arabs stood together to try to repel the Mongolian hordes when they invaded Baghdad in the thirteenth century. When Baghdad was finally taken by the grandson of Genghis Khan, Kublai Khan, and destroyed, and the population put to the sword.

216. But the basic fact of the matter is that Palestine and its people have been an integral part of the Arab nation for more than 13 centuries, and that gives them rights, as any other people in the world, to exercise their right of self-determination in their ancestral homeland. Take, for example, the people of Latin America or the United States. Now, the European inhabitants of this Western Hemisphere came only 500 years ago, less than half of the period during which the Arab people of Palestine lived in Palestine. Does that mean that they should have no rights in the country of their birth? Constant generations of Arabs lived in Palestine and they should be given the right of self-determination.

217. Mr. President, I promised to make a short statement. I could go on to discuss the historical aspects of this question, but I am sure that Mr. Baroody will be able to do that far better than I can at tomorrow's meeting.

The meeting rose at 2.40 p.m.

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.

如何获取联合国出版物

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 dirijase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.
