

UNITED NATIONS



SECURITY COUNCIL

OFFICIAL RECORDS

NOV 13 1986

UN/DOCS/CONF/1986

THIRTY-FIFTH YEAR

2205th MEETING: 3 APRIL 1980

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2205)	1
Expression of thanks to the outgoing President	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The question of the exercise by the Palestinian people of its inalienable rights: Letter dated 6 March 1980 from the Acting Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/13832); Letter dated 24 March 1980 from the Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/13855)	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.

2205th MEETING

Held in New York on Thursday, 3 April 1980, at 10.30 a.m.

President: Mr. Porfirio MUÑOZ LEDO (Mexico).

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

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2205)

1. Adoption of the agenda

2. The question of the exercise by the Palestinian people of its inalienable rights:

Letter dated 6 March 1980 from the Acting Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/13832);

Letter dated 24 March 1980 from the Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/13855)

The meeting was called to order at 11.30 a.m.

Expression of thanks to the outgoing President

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): At the outset of this meeting I should like to pay a tribute, on behalf of the Council, to my predecessor as President of the Council, Ambassador Donald O. Mills of Jamaica, for the great diplomatic skill with which he presided over the work of the Council during March. I know I speak for all the members of the Council when I say how much we appreciated the courtesy, efficiency and statesmanship that he unfailingly displayed. As the representative of a Latin American country and on my own behalf I should like to stress this fact.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The question of the exercise by the Palestinian people of its inalienable rights:

Letter dated 6 March 1980 from the Acting Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/13832);

Letter dated 24 March 1980 from the Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/13855)

2. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): In accordance with the decisions taken at the 2204th meeting, I invite the representatives of Egypt, Iraq, Israel, Jordan and Lebanon to participate in the discussion without the right to vote and I invite the Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People and the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) to take places at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Abdel Meguid (Egypt), Mr. Bafi (Iraq), Mr. Blum (Israel), Mr. Nuseibeh (Jordan) and Mr. Tuéni (Lebanon) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber, and Mr. Kane (Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People) and Mr. Terzi (Palestine Liberation Organization) took places at the Council table.

3. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I wish to inform the members of the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Algeria, India, the Syrian Arab Republic and Yugoslavia in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the agenda. In accordance with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in conformity with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Bedjaoui (Algeria), Mr. B. C. Mishra (India), Mr. Mansouri (Syrian Arab Republic) and Mr. Komatina (Yugoslavia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

4. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The first speaker is the representative of Egypt. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

5. Mr. ABDEL MEGUID (Egypt): Mr. President, allow me at the outset to express my delegation's warmest congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of April. You represent a great country, Mexico, with which my

own country, Egypt, has friendly and close relations, and both countries have a long history that has enriched world civilization. You preside over a debate that is of great importance, not only to my country but to the whole world. I should like to assure you of the full co-operation of my delegation.

6. I take this opportunity also to pay a tribute to Mr. Mills of Jamaica, who presided over the Council during the month of March and guided its deliberations with great skill and warmth.

7. The Council is once more considering the most important issue in the Middle East, an issue that affects directly the peace and security not only of our region but of the entire world. It has become universally accepted now, more than ever before, that the attainment of a just and comprehensive peace should be based firmly on the legitimate rights of all the peoples in the area—foremost among them, the Palestinian people. We believe that all sincere efforts should be exerted to enable the valiant and long-neglected Palestinian people to exercise their inalienable rights. The application of the United Nations Charter and the rules of international law necessitates that such a prerequisite be realized without delay. It is no longer adequate to utter words of support for the Palestinian cause without their being translated into concrete action.

8. I wish to repeat that the establishment of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, which my country has always supported, was a concrete and timely step taken to enable the United Nations to elaborate the measures to redress past injustices. The General Assembly, in endorsing the recommendations of the Committee, requested the Council, on several occasions, to examine those recommendations and the programme of action contained therein. It is our earnest hope that the Council, the highest organ responsible for the maintenance of the peace and security of the world, will not fail to assume its responsibility for the realization of a just and durable peace in the Middle East, especially for the Palestinian people.

9. The Council has in fact been seized of this question on various occasions throughout the past 30 years and it is high time it took the necessary action. The Palestinian people ask no more than to regain and be enabled to exercise their inalienable national rights, like any other people in the world, so that they can, with all the peoples of the region, contribute positively to its prosperity and development.

10. I should like to seize this opportunity to pay a special tribute to Ambassador Falilou Kane of Senegal, the Chairman of the Committee, for his admirable and dedicated work in guiding the Committee in its deliberations. I wish to state once more that the recommendations of the Committee are balanced and con-

sistent with the basic requirements of international law, and they also faithfully reflect the principles of the Charter and the relevant United Nations resolutions. As was stated by the Chairman of the Committee before the Council last year [2155th meeting], all the members of the Council have at one time or another actually spoken in favour of the rights of the Palestinian people. In our opinion, this is a factor that should be conducive to the achievement of progress. In this context we welcome the decision of some States in recent months to support the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people, including the exercise of the right to self-determination.

11. Egypt fully recognizes the dimensions of the Palestinian question. Hence it has consistently striven for the realization of the Palestinian people's inalienable rights. Egypt's policy has therefore been to tackle this question directly and without any hesitation. President Sadat expressed Egypt's position in this context in his message to the special meeting to commemorate the International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian People, on 29 November 1979, when he stated:

"Egypt, supported by all countries that cherish peace and justice, supported the call emphasizing the necessity for the Palestinian people to obtain its inalienable rights in order to bring about a just and lasting peace which would enable all the peoples in the area to live in peace in their own countries, safe from threats or aggression. In all its endeavours, Egypt has made it clear that the achievement of peace in the Middle East should be based on the principles of international legitimacy and justice and on the recognition that the Palestinian issue is the crux of the conflict.

"The initiatives undertaken by Egypt are but a continuation of the sacrifices it has made in the past so that the Palestinian people might obtain its freedom and exercise its right to self-determination. We believe that those initiatives are now paving the way for the Palestinian people to recover its rights and establish its national entity in its homeland. . . . The people of Palestine, after such a long period of suffering and oppression, is waiting for the international community, and particularly the countries of the area, to translate their words of solidarity into actual deeds so that the Palestinian people may attain its freedom and right to self-determination".

12. I need not emphasize that President Sadat's initiative has put an end for ever to a stagnant situation of "no war, no peace" that has been forced on the Middle East and on the Palestinians in particular. The movement we witness today, whether here in the United Nations or in other parts of the world or in the region itself, has been affected by this initiative. His initiative opened the door to serious work and concrete action for the achievement of a just and comprehensive peace in the area and for the realization of the inalienable national rights of the Palestinian people.

13. It is to be noted with regret that Israel is every day creating more and more obstacles to impede the achievement of this comprehensive and just peace. The decisions of the Israeli Government to confiscate land in Arab Jerusalem or elsewhere in the occupied Arab territories or to establish new settlements affirm for us the Israeli Government's continued disregard of international law and the relevant binding international conventions. Such decisions have, moreover, created serious obstacles which hinder the faithful implementation of the Camp David accords, under which Israel is committed to honouring the rights of the Palestinian people. The Egyptian Government strongly condemns such measures and considers them null and void. In this regard, the Egyptian Government stresses the special importance it attaches to the status of Jerusalem and the preservation of the legal, historical and spiritual rights of all Arabs and Moslems in the Holy City in order to create conditions for coexistence among the adherents of the three monotheistic religions. The Israeli Government's decision contravenes its international obligations and constitutes a flagrant defiance of the will of the international community as expressed in the recent resolution, unanimously adopted by the Security Council, that deplored Israel's settlement policy in the occupied Arab territories, including Jerusalem [*resolution 465 (1980)*].

14. As I did in my statement to the Council in August last [2161st meeting], I should like once again to affirm in very clear terms that Egypt has wholeheartedly supported and continues to support all meaningful and constructive efforts aimed at facilitating the implementation of Council resolution 242 (1967) and of all relevant United Nations resolutions. Our record in this regard is unparalleled and our contributions have been acclaimed by the international community. We realize, however, that the implementation of resolution 242 (1967) has eluded the international community for over a decade by reason of divergent interpretations of its provisions. It is therefore of great importance to note in this context that the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by war, as stipulated in that resolution was finally affirmed in practical terms in the peace treaty between Egypt and Israel, article I of which confirms that the Israeli withdrawal shall be to the international boundary. This principle of withdrawal to international boundaries is applicable to the territories of the other parties concerned in the conflict. At this crucial stage, the legitimate and inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, including their right to self-determination, should be fully addressed and realized so that a just and lasting peace may be achieved in the Middle East. This is Egypt's firm and long-standing position.

15. Egypt's commitment to the Palestinian cause is total and unwavering. We are also committed, in conformity with the Charter and the relevant resolutions, to the achievement of a just and comprehensive peace settlement. The stagnation that has plagued and

frustrated the realization of peace in our region had to be dissipated. Genuine attempts to begin a meaningful peace process had to be made. Egypt did wage war, in the exercise of its inherent right of self-defence, when circumstances dictated no other course of action. But at a certain moment, peace had to be our sole objective and its attainment our sacred obligation. We recognized this obligation. Only those who have experienced the scourge of war could appreciate and cherish the true meaning of peace. That is why President Sadat, at the height of the October 1973 war, proposed convening a peace conference to resolve the Arab-Israeli conflict. Peace, however, cannot prevail in our region unless it is just and comprehensive and unless it embraces all the peoples in the area, including the Palestinians and the Israelis. The time has come for serious work, without rhetoric or polemics. Let us unite our efforts to establish peace in the Middle East on the basis of respect for the rights of States and peoples, mutual respect and mutual recognition.

16. It is therefore high time that the international community, represented in the Security Council, recognized the plight of the Palestinian people. As is now apparent, the core of the Middle East problem is the Palestinian question. Any delay will only lead to more tension, instability and even bloodshed, and more waste of energy—not for progress, but on war effort and destruction.

17. Time is running out. The peoples of the region, and especially the Palestinian people, are looking to the highest organ of the United Nations to act quickly and decisively in order to restore to everyone his inalienable rights and to prevent turmoil from engulfing the Middle East once again.

18. The foregoing was the original statement which I had intended to deliver at the last meeting; at that time I agreed to postpone its delivery till the next meeting because of the lateness of the hour. But in the light of the deliberate attempts to misinterpret our intentions, misrepresent our policies and even distort established facts, I feel in duty bound to respond and set the record straight. As a matter of policy, Egypt does not engage in polemics or the exchange of diatribes. This position, however, does not emanate from weakness. I would like to stress here that we fully realize that some may disagree with our approach. We respect the right of everyone to disagree, but we strongly object when it comes to unwarranted and irresponsible abuse. Our record is well known and we genuinely believe that histrionics and heaped-up slanders will not benefit the Palestinian cause. I speak now more in sorrow than in anger.

19. Certain allusions were made—and probably will be made again—which called in question Egypt's commitment to the Palestinian cause. Let me at the outset state very clearly that such allusions are categorically rejected by my Government. Egypt has never

claimed to speak for, or on behalf of, the Palestinian people. It should be recalled that, following his historic initiative in 1977, President Sadat called for a meeting in December 1977 to prepare for the convening of the Geneva Peace Conference. The Palestinians, as well as the other Arab parties concerned, were invited. The peace process was attacked before it even started. Some opted not to participate. That was their privilege.

20. I need not emphasize that Egypt never attempted to create a Palestinian group under its domination, as some others did and are still doing. Such divisions, in our view, would only weaken the Palestinian cause. Egypt's hands are clean. Not one single Palestinian was ever harmed by Egypt. We take pride in the fact that all our actions, whether in warfare or in the pursuit of peace, have tended in one direction—namely, towards the enhancement of the Palestinian cause and the strengthening of Palestinian national unity. It is to be noted, however, that it was Egypt first that proposed, as far back as 1972, the formation of a Palestinian Government in exile and Egypt that has consistently advanced Palestinian national rights in all international and regional forums.

21. With respect to allegations regarding the Camp David accords, we have clearly stated, more than once—and I repeat it here today—that those accords constitute only the first step and not the final settlement. At Camp David, Egypt extracted from Israel, for the first time, a pledge to apply resolution 242 (1967) to the West Bank and Gaza, to recognize the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people and resolve the Palestinian question in all its aspects.

22. We realize, however, that a pledge needs to be translated into action and carried out, and that is the rationale of the ongoing peace process. It should be underlined and appreciated that a sincere attempt to change the stagnant *status quo* is now under way. Changing the *status quo* is the logical first step towards the realization of the inalienable rights of the Palestinians. The Palestinian people alone should determine its future. President Sadat has emphasized that point on many occasions. I repeat today that the Palestinian people alone has the right to accept or refuse any result. In its endeavours to find a solution, Egypt was motivated by a sincere desire to alleviate the sufferings of the Palestinians under Israeli military occupation in the West Bank and Gaza, through transitional arrangements. Regrettably, some who are not actually living under the yoke of military occupation do not grasp the dimensions of our endeavours.

23. An attempt was made at the last meeting to raise doubts about the Egyptian army, that same army that bore the brunt of defending the Palestinian and Arab causes for over 30 years. It was the Egyptian army that fought, sacrificed and shed blood for the Arab and Palestinian causes. It was that army that supported all just causes in the Middle East and in Africa. The efforts now being made to modernize and update its

equipment will make it an asset to the whole Arab nation and an assurance of stability and legitimacy—I repeat, stability. The strength of Egypt is the strength of the whole region and a support for all just causes. Thus attempts to question the sincerity and commitment of the Egyptian leadership are counter-productive and doomed to failure.

24. It is now high time to follow the model of African maturity, the model of the Patriotic Front which diligently worked, in the military and political fields simultaneously, without losing sight of its ultimate goal: the attainment of independence. The Republic of Zimbabwe, which will soon join us at the United Nations as the newest independent Member State, should teach everyone the lesson of how to rise above rivalries and never to allow those who pay lip service to a cause to change its course and objectives. The leaders of Zimbabwe proved to the world at large that they were not only genuine freedom fighters but astute and accomplished statesmen as well.

25. Our hands are stretched out to all the forces of sincerity which genuinely strive for the achievement of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people. Egypt, for its part, will continue to spare no effort until the valiant Palestinian people attains its sacred right to determine its own future. We will not be dissuaded by doubts, distortions or slander. To those who excel in rhetoric and who criticize our approach, we simply say "Produce a viable alternative". Any party that can produce better results will surely enjoy the support of Egypt. Should our approach fail, we shall have the courage to admit it. Regardless of the final outcome, Egypt's contribution to the Palestinian cause is unmatched.

26. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The next speaker is the representative of Jordan. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

27. Mr. NUSEIBEH (Jordan): Mr. President, as this is the first occasion on which I have spoken in the Council this month, I wish to express my sincere congratulations to you, on your assumption of your high office. I am certain that, as a son and statesman of valiant Mexico, you will steer the deliberations of the Council, especially on this crucial issue, with wisdom and prudence.

28. It is my pleasure also to express my deep appreciation to your predecessor in the presidency, Ambassador Mills of friendly Jamaica, who presided over the work of the Council during the month of March with his widely acknowledged statesmanship and diplomatic acumen.

29. I wish to take the opportunity of the Easter festivities which are so closely associated with our Holy Land to extend to you, Mr. President, and to all the other members of the Council, my delegation's heartiest felicitations and best wishes.

30. It is saddening that so many residents of Jerusalem and Christians of the Arab world and the Near East are unable to take part in the joyous celebrations and it is saddening also to see those Christians who are celebrating doing so under Israeli bayonets and machine guns.

31. The last thing the Council needs is yet another discourse on the genesis and the continual and alarming erosion of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people. If knowledge is a spur to action, then such knowledge is already available in abundance. Suffice it here to recall that those rights were brutally butchered in an unprecedented manner, ironically enough shortly after the United Nations came into existence, almost 35 years ago—presumably to re-establish an international order based on the rule of law, moral norms, justice and peace.

32. Succeeding generations of statesmen, many of whom have now passed away, have been arguing this tragedy before the Security Council and other international forums for decades on end, but to no avail. Retrogression—and not one iota of redemption—has been the outcome of those sustained efforts.

33. Prudent choice of time and timing, we are advised—and we are also fully aware—are of crucial importance. That could well be so, but only if time were by some miracle to come to a standstill, to a standoff, to allow for a breathing spell and avert the capricious exploitation of time. But, alas, that is not the case. Time is Israel's most precious commodity, or so it calculates, to enable it to bring in new immigrants, sequester as much land as it can imminently absorb—it already has close to 32 per cent of the 1967 occupied territories in Jerusalem and the West Bank alone—and thus fulfil its long-standing designs to take over the whole of Palestine and well beyond, as circumstances permit. The whole game is a race against time to confront the world with a new *fait accompli*.

34. Aggressive and expansionist Israel has set its navigational instruments in pursuit of its goals of "expanded conflict", and not peaceful coexistence based on mutual benefit. That this is, in the final analysis, a collision course, a time-bomb which can lead only to an "expanded explosion", is cavalierly and ominously spelt out, and relished, in the book entitled *None Will Survive Us: The Story of the Israeli A-Bomb*, by Eli Teicher and Ami Dor-On, two Israeli journalists. That book has been banned and its publication has been barred by the Israeli military censor, General Shani. The A-bomb development, as the Council is aware, has been the accomplishment of Israel-South Africa collaboration since the mid-1960s, because those two countries are united in their common racist goal of blackmailing and subjugating the vast masses of humanity in Asia and Africa.

35. If Israel has seen fit to acquire an atomic arsenal and endanger world peace on alleged and paranoid

grounds of survivability, then what should the Palestinian people think, that people whose survival and fate are not hypothetical postulates but a fact of life compounded by the passage of every day, every month and every year? Is this kind of nihilism conducive to peace in decades to come?

36. What the Council is seized of in the current deliberations is, in the simplest terms, the ongoing and relentless cannibalization of Palestinian rights, and hence the very fate and survival of the Palestinian people. What does the international community propose to do to restore them to the mainstream of national and international existence, as we witness the final chapter of their agonizing demise being written blatantly, openly, admittedly, and with full speed, by their tormentors?

37. It is sad to reminisce and reflect, having lived through the original sin and the grind, that the dismemberment of Palestine and the uprooting of its people occurred in an overheated, irrational atmosphere not dissimilar from that which we are living through today. The people to pay the ultimate price are once again the Palestinian people.

38. In the fateful years 1947 to 1948, the Palestinians, who constituted two thirds of the inhabitants of Palestine and owned upwards of 90 per cent of its lands, found themselves the hapless victims of awesome forces which they were powerless to countervail. A global rivalry, chilling into a cold war, on the one hand, and the most unscrupulous and ruthless application and misuse of internal Zionist pressure, on the other, had conspired to bring about the undoing of the Palestinians. So intense had been the abuse of internal parochial naked power that even a sympathetic President Truman bitterly complained in his memoirs of the intensity of the heat to which he had been subjected to subvert his judgement, and the judgement of those celebrities around him, like James Forrestal, George Marshall and many others, who were trying to serve their country's national interest as they perceived it. It is hardly surprising, therefore, that anyone who indicates some understanding of the Palestinian and Arab plight is immediately maligned and branded a "damned Arabist".

39. Today we face a similar situation—but with a fundamental difference. In the earlier cataclysm there were, in the perception of segments of the international community, two sides to the coin, some leeway and some glimmer of hope for rectification and accommodation. Today Israel has eliminated all reasonable, or even minimal, options and is confronting the world with only one, monolithic side, with its face protruding menacingly from both sides of the coin, emitting nothing but lethal and sinister signals, for all to see and hear, that the Palestinian people's destiny and survival in their ancestral home are sealed, and the process is being systematically targeted and pursued in a one-way trek to non-existence.

40. Israel, in letter and in spirit, has actually and factually, by words and by deeds, torpedoed Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), not to speak of the legally valid, long-standing United Nations resolutions on Palestinian national as well as individual rights.

41. That fact alone would have prompted and warranted the urgent convening of the Council to consider what practical steps should be taken to confront present and continuing aggression and defiance by a recalcitrant Member State, in accordance with the provisions of the Charter. This course of action would have been called for even if the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, established by the General Assembly in 1975, had not had to meet a deadline, set at the last, the thirty-fourth, session of the General Assembly, which had mandated that Committee to seek Council action, not later than 31 March 1980, on the implementation of its recommendations towards resolving the Palestinian issue. Indeed, the clear-cut statement at the last meeting by Israel's representative is an audacious message that there is no longer a Palestinian question.

42. The Committee and its Chairman, Ambassador Kane, deserve the highest commendation for their tireless, persistent and painstaking work over a span of several years and for their genuine efforts to promote the achievement of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East by redeeming Palestinian rights which, since they are long delayed, are rights denied. It is a truism to reiterate that the core of the Middle East conflict is the question of Palestine. If its centrality is almost universally recognized and if the overwhelming majority of mankind, as represented in the General Assembly, has endorsed the validity of the Committee's recommendations at the thirty-first, thirty-second, thirty-third and thirty-fourth Assembly sessions, then it is incumbent upon the Council to take positive action on the Committee's recommendations, whose validity has been undiminished by the passage of time and whose urgency has been highlighted by events.

43. If the situation pertaining to the question of Palestine is to be unlocked from its prolonged stalemate, then something must be done about that. The Committee's recommendations are a synthesis of United Nations resolutions, made in the light of present conditions. They comprise a policy programme of implementation which grapples with almost all the conceivable variables which might arise in the long-entangled issue and which endeavours pragmatically, following a coherent time-table, to find appropriate solutions. Positive action by the Security Council on the recommendations endorsed year after year by the General Assembly could create the necessary conditions for a just and lasting peace in the Middle East because, as the Committee's last report stresses,

"the recommendations . . . are the basic principles relating to the problem of Palestine within the Middle East situation".¹

And what is the alternative? An unending drift towards disaster?

44. It is becoming more and more meaningless to talk about Palestinian rights in the abstract, as though accomplishing a ritual, an exercise to lighten an afflicted conscience. The Palestinian people, whether under occupation for 13 years or in exile, find little sustenance in such soothing words or in decisions and pledges unfulfilled, while all they see is the ground disappearing from beneath their feet like quicksand.

45. The time is long overdue when the Israelis should cease being over-obsessed with claims about security, for the ultimate security—carried to absurdity—is the security of the grave. It is the Palestinians whose security and survival have been massively undermined. Under conditions of a just and lasting peace, excessive obsessions with security would become meaningless, and people's minds and energies would be devoted to more productive and rewarding pursuits. This is human nature, which must not be belittled or overlooked.

46. The time is equally long overdue when the Israelis should recognize their guilt in the destruction of the lives of the Palestinian people. Such recognition can only be attained within a framework of real justice, real restoration and real dignity. Then and only then will we look forward to a new era free from fear, guilty consciences, suffering and a future disaster which would engulf us all.

47. There have been attempts by the myopic and the blind supporters of Israel, right or wrong, to disparage the work of the Committee as though it were a self-appointed private study group. It may be appropriate to remind them that the recommendations of that dedicated Committee reflect the common purpose, the decisions and the conscience of the vast majority of mankind.

48. While hoping against hope that the Council will not be prevented from shouldering its responsibilities under the Charter by taking positive action for an equitable resolution of the Palestine question, the international community is determined, in the case of the Council's failure to reach unanimity, to call for an emergency special session of the General Assembly, as the repository and trustee of Palestinian rights. Firm solidarity among the overwhelming majority of mankind in indisputably righteous causes, such as the questions of Palestine and southern Africa, can be formidable indeed; sufficiently so, when adequately marshalled, to support the Charter and to uphold the rule of international law.

49. It is inconceivable that the will and the whims of the privileged few should silence, stifle or otherwise subvert what the international community believes to be just, lawful and humane. Finding the key to success, however, is contingent upon true and effec-

tive solidarity, which, in spite of temporary setbacks, is assuredly emerging. Mahatma Gandhi did not have lethal weapons to achieve the emancipation of India—and even if he had had them, he would not have used them. His message was more powerful than all the weapons that might have been arrayed against his noble mission. And so it is with a newly emerging world, seeking freedom and justice for all and determined to attain it.

50. Last, yet foremost, is the question of Jerusalem. There have been disturbing developments to which the Committee makes reference in paragraph 30 of its report. I wish to make it crystal clear that the heart and soul of the entire Palestine and Middle East question is the destiny of holy Jerusalem, which under no circumstances whatsoever can be forsaken. This is an immutable truth which I need not reiterate. This is our unshakable conviction—and each country is, of course, entitled to its convictions.

51. But there is another aspect to the problem of Jerusalem which has aroused, and continues to arouse, the gravest concern and puzzlement because of its possible implications. Strangely enough, it stems from a misreading of a physical fact rather than from a subjective value judgement. When the United States abstained last July on Council resolution 452 (1979), which condemned Israeli settlements in the occupied territories, including Jerusalem, it explained its abstention on the grounds that the resolution included Arab Jerusalem as an occupied territory. A similar difficulty seems to have arisen in relation to the mention of Jerusalem last month in resolution 465 (1980). It is incomprehensible that references to Jerusalem should have given rise to any difficulty or confusion, considering that all those references were made in the context of the description of an irrefutable fact observed by at least a quarter of a million inhabitants of the Holy City, in addition to numerous journalists, consuls general—including the American Consul General—and, if further verification were needed, even by satellites.

52. Can anybody deny that at some time after 11.00 p.m. on Monday, 5 June 1967, the Israeli army began its advance against Arab Jerusalem? It is unnecessary to prove what the Israeli aggressors themselves have described in detail, what those who took part in that action have said in several books on the occupation of Arab Jerusalem. It is therefore superfluous to prove that Arab Jerusalem was physically occupied by the Israeli army in 1967. If that is the case, by what process of logic can anybody deny that it is an occupied territory, along with the West Bank and other occupied Arab territories and that, therefore, the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War of 12 August 1949² should automatically apply to it?

53. If the said references to Jerusalem in the two resolutions had included any mention of the status of

Jerusalem or to its future, then reservations would have been understandable. Besides, Arab Jerusalem is considerably larger than the shrunken Jerusalem of 1967; for 70 per cent of West Jerusalem—mistakenly named Israeli—is Arab-owned, according to the delineation made by a commission chaired by Mr. Fitzgerald, in the zoning of boroughs and municipalities within the international *corpus separatum* decided upon by the General Assembly. We would have had our own reservations if the two resolutions had such implications, which are contrary to United Nations decisions.

54. The appropriate time to stipulate status and delineations will be when a final solution is achieved to the question of Palestine, including Jerusalem. But until that is achieved, it is flying in the face of facts to deny that Arab Jerusalem of 1967 is an occupied territory to which the Geneva Convention is applicable. Any ambivalence on this point cannot but be construed as condoning the unlawful and unilateral annexation of Arab Jerusalem and would be contrary to the international community's unanimous rejection of that annexation by Israel in June 1967. Since the United States has, since 1967, consistently rejected such annexation as illegal, it is essential to have a clarification as to whether there has been a change in that position on this central issue.

55. Having made what I hope has been a serious statement on the issue before us, I had planned to stop right here. I have been criticized for making somewhat longer statements than I should. Not surprisingly, however, the representative of the Zionist entity which is in occupation of the whole of Palestine in violation of United Nations resolutions, has adhered to his traditional practice of diverting attention from the serious to the comical and farcical, but not without ominous overtones. In what he described as myths flying in the face of history and present-day political realities pervading the United Nations, he has indulged in falsification and propagated myths which can only be described as a calculated insult to the intelligence and learned wisdom of the Council. That should not surprise anyone, considering that the Zionist movement has been, from its inception, the biggest conspiracy of the modern era, nurtured on myths and slogans which even the founders of the movement knew for what they were, although they persisted in spreading them to an unknowing world.

56. They spoke of "a country without a people"—meaning Palestine—and "a people without a country"—meaning the Jewish citizens of the most advanced countries in the world. The truth is that Palestine had its indigenous population of 800,000 people at a time when the continental United States in the year 1800 had only 4 million inhabitants. Another myth concerned "making the deserts bloom", whereas Palestine in the eighteenth century, 200 years before any Jews set foot there, and particularly Galilee, was one of the largest cotton producers in the world, for

the purchase of whose produce the three industrialized countries of Europe, Great Britain, France and Holland, were competing. The Jaffa oranges and all known fruits and vegetables were in great abundance long before the Zionist incursion. The only area of desert, namely, the Negev, is still a desert except for a small strip around Beersheba which the Israelis were able to water in the 1960s, having unlawfully stolen and diverted the Jordan River from its basin, in violation of established and recognized international law. I might add that there are a few other things that blossom there, such as the Daymona atomic complex and two huge threatening airfields at present under construction with United States financing.

57. But let us come now to more serious falsifications in the Israeli representative's mythology. First is his atrocious claim that the Palestinian Arabs long ago achieved self-determination in what he called the Palestinian Arab State of Jordan. He seems to be arrogating unto himself the right not only to create States but also to name them. How the people of Jordan for thousands of years, their ancestors the Nabateans, the Arabs and other races and the Palestinians have felt and feel about the identity of their countries does not bother him in the least. Second is his claim that two States were established on the territory which was the Palestine Mandate between the two world wars. One is an Arab State which he called Jordan, and the other is a Jewish State, which he called Israel.

58. Let us first take the League of Nations Mandate. Deceptively and deliberately, the representative of the Zionist entity has tried to confuse two issues by omitting the most important of them as far as the Mandate is concerned. Article 22 of the Covenant of the League of Nations had actually recognized provisionally the independence of Palestine as far back as 28 June 1919. That article reads as follows:

"Certain communities formerly belonging to the Turkish Empire have reached a stage of development where their existence as independent nations can be provisionally recognized subject to the rendering of administrative advice and assistance by a Mandatory until such time as they are able to stand alone. The wishes of these communities must be a principal consideration in the selection of the Mandatory."

59. The representative of the Zionist entity in occupied Palestine is fully aware of the fact that when the independence of Palestine was recognized under Article 22, the Palestinian people constituted more than 90 per cent of the entire population. The Jewish inhabitants were a tiny insignificant portion of that population. The same provisional recognition of independence was conceded to Jordan, Syria, Lebanon, Iraq and all the other Arab countries which were a part of the Ottoman Empire. What is deceptive in the Israeli representative's claim is that he omitted to

recognize this fact and jumped over to the Balfour Declaration,³ which was incorporated into the Mandate for Palestine on 24 July 1922, three years later.

60. But in spite of the illegality of the Balfour Declaration, inasmuch as it was made behind the backs of the Palestinian Arabs and without their consent, and even though it favoured the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, that Declaration stated categorically, "it being clearly understood that nothing should be done which might prejudice the civil and religious rights of the existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine"—even though the non-Jewish communities, of course, constituted 90 per cent of the population—"or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country". The civil rights include at least the right of an indigenous inhabitant to remain on his land, in his home, on his farm and in his homeland. That same donor, namely, Great Britain, in the age of ignorance, specifically requested of the League of Nations that the provisions in the Mandate pertaining to a Jewish home in Palestine should not apply to Jordan. In 1946 the Mandate over Jordan was terminated and Jordan achieved its independence under the name of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan.

61. What about Palestine? On 29 November 1947 the General Assembly adopted resolution 181 (II), which provided for the establishment of a Palestinian Arab State far larger than the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, and a Jewish State in parts of Palestine, with Jerusalem as an international *corpus separatum*. The Security Council was requested specifically by the General Assembly to take the necessary measures, as provided for in the plan of partition, for that plan's implementation. Even though that request was made specifically to the Council, it unfortunately failed to act on the creation of the proposed Palestinian Arab State. The failure to implement the establishment of the Palestinian Arab State was not the consequence of the verbal refusal by the Palestinian Arabs to countenance the dismemberment of Palestine, but was the result of Israel's implementation, three days after the adoption of resolution 181 (II), of the "Delep" plan to overrun by force as much of Palestine as it could, in accordance with a long-prepared plan for that purpose. Was there a plebiscite among the Palestinians or any other democratic process to ascertain the wishes and views of the Palestinian people?

62. Indeed, the Israelis seized most of Palestine while the British Army was still there and before the entry of any of the Arab soldiers who entered Palestine when the Mandate ended on 14 May 1948 to save the remnants of the Palestinian territory earmarked as part of the Palestinian Arab State and to spare the remnants of the Palestinian people that had not yet become refugees the atrocities and massacres which people like Begin of the Irgun and Shamir, the present Foreign Minister of the Zionist entity and leader of the Stern Gang, were perpetrating against the largely

unarmed Palestinian people. I think the Stern Gang has something to do with the United Nations, inasmuch as there was an involvement with the murder of the late Count Folke Bernadotte, and I had had luncheon with him on that same fateful afternoon before he crossed over and was murdered by the Stern Gang. Now Mr. Blum is lecturing the Council on terrorism, unmindful of the fact that it was his groups that introduced it on a grand scale to the Middle East.

63. Clearly, therefore, the Palestinian Arabs were never given the slightest chance to exercise their right of self-determination in their ancestral homeland before, during or after the Mandate. In short, Palestine is Palestine and Jordan is Jordan, and it is an exercise in futility to try to cheat or to deprive the Palestinians of their right to self-determination in their ancestral homeland; it is also an act of aggression against another sovereign independent State, recognized by the United Nations for a quarter of a century as the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan.

64. Ambassador Blum further asked why it was that there was no Palestinian State when the West Bank was united with Jordan. That is a good question and the answer is simple. There could have been no Palestinian State on a truncated and dismembered territory, cut off from the sea and from all sides except the east. A Palestinian State had to await a final Palestinian settlement based on United Nations resolutions. That could have been achieved at Lausanne in 1949—almost 30 years ago—and the Arab parties concerned signed the Lausanne Protocol,⁴ but the Israelis reneged on it after having initialled their agreement and of course, ensured their admission to the United Nations.

65. Article 2 of the Act of Unity between the West Bank and the East Bank of 24 April 1950 states:

“To assure the safeguarding of all Arab rights [in Palestine] and, defending those rights by all legitimate means and with full faith, and without prejudicing the final settlement of its just cause, within national aspirations, Arab co-operation and international justice.”

66. Jordan has always maintained that when the moment came for a final solution to the Palestine problem, the Palestinians themselves should determine their future and decide their destiny. The General Armistice Agreements of 1949⁵ also stressed that those Armistice Agreements would in no way prejudice the final settlement of the Palestine problem.

67. As for the problem of the Palestinian refugees, it is their inalienable and elemental right to return to their homes and homeland. It is sanctified every year by General Assembly resolution 194 (III) of 11 December 1948. Besides, one of the Ten Commandments states categorically “Thou shalt not steal”. By what right can any individual or group of individuals

confiscate and live in someone else's house and plunder his property, his furniture and all he has? Anyone can build a house on his own piece of land, but he cannot simply live on the toil, sweat and savings of someone else.

68. What Ambassador Blum called a second refugee problem and an exchange of populations is simply untrue. I think that people in the know are all too well aware of the unconscionable efforts the Jewish Agency exerted to get the Jews out of their Arab countries and into Palestine. The means used ranged from the carrot and stick tactics through incitement to anti-Jewish riots, as was later disclosed, to outright bribery and corruption of certain people in those countries to help to get those citizens of Jewish faith out. The names of some of the people who were involved in that clandestine operation are known—or was it clandestine? But forgetting about the past, the Arab countries from which citizens of the Judaic faith had emigrated have declared their readiness to welcome those emigrants who want to go back home and to return their property to them. Are the Israelis willing to do the same for Palestinians in exile? That is the acid test of intentions and the Arab countries are willing to accept the test at any time.

69. Finally there is the alleged, mythical connection between the question of Palestine and the energy crisis. It is a slur not only on the sanctity of the Palestine question, but also on the solidarity of the overwhelming majority of mankind which has always supported Palestinian rights, long, long before there was even talk of energy, less still of an energy crisis. But I should leave the answer to that calculated insult to all the States and nations to whom it was directed.

70. As for media manipulation and mind control, I do not have to tell anybody who controls, conditions and manipulates public opinion in pivotal parts of the world, for it is an open secret.

71. When the Israeli representative spoke at the last meeting, he certainly had an official message to convey to the Council, a message that could not but have been received with the deepest concern. It could not have escaped the attention of the Council. It is an extremely ominous message, particularly when delivered before the Council. The Israeli message is a public repudiation of all Council and General Assembly resolutions on Palestine and the situation in the Middle East, and principally resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) of the Council and 181 (II) and 194 (III) of the General Assembly, pertaining to total Israeli withdrawal from the occupied territories and the Palestinian people's right to return to its homeland and to determine its future on its national soil.

72. The message is also an open act of aggression against the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, an independent sovereign State Member of the United Nations, because it classifies that State as a part of

Palestine and, by the Zionists' well-known sorcery, names it the national homeland of the people of Palestine. In the message he alleged that the Palestinian people had long ago established their State and determined their own future. What can one answer to such falsifications? The fact that Jordan belongs to the people of Jordan, as Palestine belongs to the Palestinian people, is totally abrogated by the representative of the racist Zionist entity.

73. That statement is a most dangerous statement of policy, one that impels both the Government and people of Jordan, as well as the people of Palestine, to reassess their positions, if they have not already done so. It would also require the United Nations to withdraw its recognition of the Zionist entity, whose admission to membership in the Organization was conditional upon an Israeli pledge, given by Israel's Foreign Minister before the General Assembly, to abide scrupulously by the provisions of resolutions 181 (II) and 194 (III) in resolving the Palestine problem. On the basis of that pledge, Israel was admitted to membership in the United Nations. This is a fact that all members can find in the records. Those resolutions referred to Palestine as defined in the attached maps. One can see the maps referring to Palestine and not to Jordan, a sovereign and independent State, which was unconditionally admitted to membership in the United Nations in 1955.

74. It is needless to state that aggressive Israel stands alone and condemned in defying almost the entire world, which believes in justice, freedom and the rule of law.

75. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The next speaker is the representative of Iraq. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

76. Mr. BAFI (Iraq): Mr. President, I should like at the outset to congratulate you on the occasion of your assuming the presidency of the Council. The relations between our two countries are good and friendly and benefit the interests of both our countries and peoples. I should also like to express the Iraqi delegation's appreciation for the way in which Mr. Mills of Jamaica conducted the Council's work during the month of March.

77. The Council has been convened at the request of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, which once again has urged the Council to take a decision on the recommendations repeatedly endorsed by the General Assembly in its resolutions during the thirty-first, thirty-second and thirty-third sessions and in resolution 34/65 A, adopted at its last session.

78. Iraq is profoundly concerned over the decision of the Zionist authorities to establish two so-called "live-in schools" in the city of Al-Khalil in occupied

Palestinian territory. This decision is an obvious sequel to the Zionist authorities' earlier decision authorizing Jewish settlement in that Arab city. We would further recall that resolution 465 (1980), unanimously adopted by the Council, calls upon Israel to dismantle existing settlements and, in particular, to cease, on an urgent basis, the establishment of new settlements in the Arab territories, including Jerusalem. The resolution also determined that all measures taken by Israel to change the demographic composition or status of the Palestinian and other Arab territories, including Jerusalem, have no legal validity. Iraq would also like to refer to the letter dated 25 March addressed to the President of the Security Council by the representative of Morocco, Chairman of the Islamic Group, expressing grave concern over the expropriation by the occupation authorities of additional Arab lands north of the Holy City of Jerusalem and the confiscation by those authorities of 150 hectares of land in the village of Al-Khadar near Bethlehem [S/13859].

79. Even *The New York Times* reported on 27 March that

"Palestinian leaders eluded Israeli troops and held a secret rally today to protest plans to settle Jews in all-Arab Hebron.

"... Mayor Fahd Qawasma had slipped out of City Hall, which was being watched by a dozen armed Israeli troops under orders to prevent a planned sit-in demonstration.

"The Mayor . . . joined a protest rally at another site attended by about 400 West Bank civic and religious leaders.

"[The rally] coincided with the first anniversary of Israel's peace treaty with Egypt."

80. The attitude of the Zionist occupation forces is bound to aggravate the already serious situation in the occupied Arab and Palestinian territories. The Zionist entity alone will bear full responsibility for the grave consequences of its expansionist policy.

81. The aggressive Zionist entity is still occupying Palestinian and Arab territories by force and violating tens of relevant resolutions and decisions adopted by the United Nations over more than 30 years, the fourth Geneva Convention of 1949² and the established principles of international law. Given this series of provocations to the Arab nation and the Islamic world, Iraq and several other Arab countries have many times demanded that the Council apply the sanctions which are provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter. Yet in the face of all these challenges, the Council is continually prevented from taking action against Israel's sinister and defiant policies. The reason for that is the United States' continued use of, or threat to use, its veto in any decision taken against its pampered and protected protégé.

82. As if all this did not go far enough in hurting the interests of the Arab people, the United States continued its policy of defying the whole Arab nation by engineering the Camp David accords and the separate "peace" treaty between the Sadat régime and the Zionist entity, thus denying the whole Palestinian people its inalienable right to self-determination, including the setting up of its own independent State, over all of its national soil, as has been affirmed by the two Arab Summit Conferences held in Baghdad and Tunis in 1978 and 1979 respectively.

83. One month ago the world in general, and the Arab and Islamic world in particular, witnessed with disbelief how the leadership in Washington bowed in fear to the Zionist organization's pressures in New York and disavowed its own chief delegate's vote. However, we are informed by the American media themselves that we shall continue to witness this kind of electoral auctioneering until the month of November.

84. Nevertheless, Iraq and the rest of the Arab world deeply believe that the real interests of the American people would be served by its joining the vast majority of the world's countries in supporting the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people and not in backing and encouraging the extremist, out-dated and adventurist Zionists in Tel Aviv who are applying old Fascist means and methods in denying a whole distinct people its country, suppressing the inhabitants, confiscating their lands and even draining the waters. The imperialist circles in the United States should realize more than anybody else where their policies of supporting injustice in the world against the legitimate rights of peoples will lead them. The downfall of the Shah's régime, the fall of Somoza in Nicaragua and the racist régime in Rhodesia, are but a few of the events that have taken place in the last few months. History will keep repeating itself.

85. The President of the Republic of Iraq, Mr. Saddam Hussein, took the initiative, in line with the principles of the non-aligned movement, of declaring the National Charter, which he read out on 8 February [S/13816]. The following principles were given in the President's speech:

"1. Rejecting the presence of armies, military forces or any foreign forces and bases in the Arab homeland or facilitating their presence in any formula or under any pretext or cover, and for any reason, with any Arab régime not abiding by this principle to be boycotted politically and economically and its policies to be resisted by all available means.

"2. Banning recourse to the utilization of armed forces by any Arab State against any other Arab State, and settling any disputes that might arise between the Arab States by peaceful means under the principles of joint national action and the supreme Arab interest.

"3. The principle mentioned in paragraph 2 above shall apply to the relations of the Arab nation and Arab States with the nations and countries neighbouring the Arab homeland."

Naturally, as members know, the Zionist entity is not included because the Zionist entity is not considered a State but a deformed entity occupying an Arab territory. It is not covered by these principles.

"Thus, recourse is not permitted to the utilization of armed forces in disputes with these countries except for self-defence or defending national sovereignty against threats that might encroach upon the security of Arab States and their vital interest.

"4. Arab States shall, all together, embark upon solidarity against any aggression or violation by a foreign party of the regional sovereignty of any Arab State, or launching of an actual state of war on it. These countries shall launch a joint retaliation to such aggression or violation to foil it by all means and techniques, including military action, collective political and economic boycott and in all other fields necessitated by national interest.

"5. Confirming the abidance of Arab States by international laws and conventions concerning the utilization of territorial waters, air, and land by any country not in a state of war with any Arab State.

"6. The Arab States shall avoid international disputes and warfare, and abide by total non-alignment to any party to such disputes or war, unless any party of the dispute or war has committed a violation of Arab territorial sovereignty and the firm rights of the Arab countries guaranteed by international laws and conventions. The Arab States shall refrain from having their military forces participate, in full or in part, in any military wars or disputes in the area and outside it on behalf of any foreign country or party.

"7. The Arab States shall undertake to establish developed and constructive economic relations among them, with a view to providing and promoting a joint basis for Arab economic reconstruction and development and Arab unity. The Arab States shall avoid any conduct that might cause damage to such relations or impede their continuance and development, regardless of differences among Arab systems and such marginal political differences as might take place among them, so long as the parties concerned are abiding by the principles of this Declaration. The Arab States shall abide by the principles of national economic collaboration, with the economically solvent Arab States undertaking to contribute all forms of economic assistance to the Arab countries in such a way as to preserve them against possible dependence on foreign powers, hence a possible encroachment on their national independence and will.

"8. Iraq, as it presents the principles of this Declaration, confirms its preparedness to abide by them vis-à-vis any Arab State or any party abiding by them; Iraq is prepared to discuss the Declaration with the Arab brethren and listen to their remarks about it, so as to reinforce the effectiveness of its principles and consolidate its implications. Iraq also confirms that this Declaration does not constitute an alternative to the Arab League Charter or the Treaty on Joint Defence and Economic Co-operation between the Arab League States. On the contrary, Iraq considers the Declaration as a consolidation of the Charter and the Treaty, and a development of both of them to be consistent with the emerging international conditions and the dangers confronting the Arab nation and the national responsibilities involved under present and future circumstances."

86. The "National Charter" has been addressed to the Arab Governments. Up to the present time, 17 of

the 21 members of the Arab League have supported it. Talks are under way at the present time for the convening of an Arab summit conference to discuss the articles and the principles it contains.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.

NOTES

¹ *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-fourth Session, Supplement No. 35, para. 55.*

² *United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 75, p. 287.*

³ *Official Records of the General Assembly, Second Session, Supplement No. 11, vol. II, annex 19.*

⁴ *Ibid., Fourth Session, Ad Hoc Political Committee, Annex, vol. II, doc. A/927, annexes A and B.*

⁵ *Official Records of the Security Council, Fourth Year, Special Supplement No. 1 to 4.*

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

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

如何购取联合国出版物

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

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

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

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

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

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

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

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

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