



Executive Board

Consejo Ejecutivo

EX

Conseil exécutif

Исполнительный совет

94th session/94e session

94a. reunión/94 -я сессия

Paris, 1974

20 May - 25 June
20 mai - 25 juin

20 de mayo - 25 de junio
20 мая-25 июня

94 EX/SR.1-33
Paris, October 1974

Summary Records

Comptes rendus analytiques

Actas resumidas

Краткие отчеты

CONTENTS

MEETINGS HELD AT UNESCO HEADQUARTERS, PARIS
(SR.1-31)Item of
the Agenda

| | | |
|-----------------------|---|----|
| | <u>First meeting - Monday, 20 May 1974, at 11.5 a.m.</u> | |
| | Opening of the session | 2 |
| | Tribute to the memory of Mr. Jaimes Torres Bodet (draft resolution 94 EX/DR.1) | 2 |
| 1 | Adoption of the Agenda | 5 |
| | Organization of the work of the session | 11 |
| | <u>Second meeting - Monday, 20 May 1974, at 4 p.m.</u> | |
| 4.1 | Report of the Director-General on the Activities of the Organization | 15 |
| 4.1.1 and 4.1.2 | Printed report for 1973 | |
| | Report of the Special Committee regarding its in-depth study of the topics which it has to consider, taking as its basis the activities of the Organization in 1973 | 15 |
| | <u>Third meeting - Tuesday, 21 May 1974, at 10.10 a.m.</u> | |
| 1.1 | Replacement of a deceased member | 24 |
| 2 | Approval of the summary records of the 93rd session | 25 |
| 4.1 | Report of the Director-General on the Activities of the Organization (continued) | 25 |
| 4.1.1 and 4.1.2 | Printed report for 1973 (continued) | |
| | Report of the Special Committee regarding its in-depth study of the topics which it has to consider, taking as its basis the activities of the Organization in 1973 (continued) . . . | 25 |
| | <u>Fourth meeting - Tuesday, 21 May 1974, at 3.10 p.m.</u> | |
| 4.1 | Report of the Director-General on the Activities of the Organization (continued) | 33 |
| 4.1.1 and 4.1.2 | Printed report for 1973 (continued) | |
| | Report of the Special Committee regarding its in-depth study of the topics which it has to consider, taking as its basis the activities of the Organization in 1973 (continued) . . . | 33 |
| | <u>Fifth meeting - Wednesday, 22 May 1974, at 10.10 a.m.</u> | |
| 4.1 | Report of the Director-General on the Activities of the Organization (continued) | 45 |
| 4.1.1 and 4.1.2 | Printed report for 1973 (continued) | |
| | Report of the Special Committee regarding its in-depth study of the topics which it has to consider, taking as its basis the activities of the Organization in 1973 (continued) . . . | 45 |
| | <u>Sixth meeting - Wednesday, 22 May 1974, at 3.15 p.m.</u> | |
| 4.1 | Organization of the work of the session (continued) | 61 |
| | Report of the Director-General on the Activities of the Organization (continued) | 61 |

TWENTY-NINTH MEETING

Monday, 24 June 1974, at 10.10 a. m.

Present:

- President of the
General Conference: H. E. Mr. Toru Haguiwara
- Chairman: H. E. Dr. Gabriel Betancur Mejía (Colombia)
- Vice-Chairmen: H. E. Mr. Tooryalay Etemadi (Afghanistan)
H. E. Dr. Josef Grohman (Czechoslovakia)
H. E. Mr. Blaise Senghor (Senegal)
- Members: H. E. Dr. Ferdinand N'Sougan Agblemagnon (Togo), Mr. Hamad Alkhowaiter (Saudi Arabia), H. E. Mr. Léon Boissier-Palun (Dahomey), H. E. Mr. Francisco Cuevas Cancino (Mexico), H. E. Dr. Atilio Dell'Oro Maini (Argentina), H. E. Mr. Frederick E. De Silva (Republic of Sri Lanka), H. E. Professor Dr. Abdelwahab El Borolossy (Arab Republic of Egypt), Dr. Federico Garcia Capurro (Uruguay), Dr. Aklilu Habte (Ethiopia), Mr. Napoléon LeBlanc (Canada), Mr. Petson D.M. Lombe (Zambia), H. E. Dr. Enrique Macaya-Lahman (Costa Rica), Professor Lévy Makany (People's Republic of the Congo), Dr. Professor Sida Marjanović (Yugoslavia), Mr. William A. C. Mathieson (United Kingdom), Mr. Qudrat Ullah Shahab (Pakistan), H. E. Professor Sergei L. Tikhvinsky (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), Professor Kankam Twum-Barima (Ghana), Mr. Hector Wynter (Jamaica).
- Deputies: H. E. Dr. Jens Petersen, for H. E. Mr. Herbert Blankenhorn (Federal Republic of Germany), Prof. Dr. Alwin Westerhof, for Professor Kurt Blaukopf (Austria), Mr. Demodetdo Yako Pendje, for Mr. Bong'Ilanga (Republic of Zaire), Mr. Hu Cha and Mr. Chou Chi-chi, for Professor Dr. Ing. Chang Wei (People's Republic of China), H. E. M. Pierre Maillard, for Mr. Etienne Dennery (France), H. E. Mr. Raimundo Pérez Hernández y Moreno, for H. E. Dr. Ricardo Díez Hochleitner (Spain), Mr. Arto Kurittu, for Dr. Ilmo Hela (Finland), H. E. Mr. Sadi de Gorter, for Mr. Bernard J. E. M. de Hoog (Netherlands), Mr. Stanley F. Muka, for Mr. Yuda Komora (Kenya), Miss Nicole Sénécal, for Mr. Napoléon LeBlanc (Canada), Mr. Puniša Pavlović, for Dr. Professor Sida Marjanović (Yugoslavia), Mr. Leonard C. J. Martin, for Mr. William A. C. Mathieson (United Kingdom), H. E. Mr. Giacomo Profili, for Prof. Maria Luisa Paronetto Valier (Italy), Mr. Mahesh Dayal, for Mr. Gopalaswami Parthasarathi (India), H. E. Dr. Halim Saïd Abu-Izzeddin, for Dr. Fûad Sarrûf (Lebanon), Mr. Doudou Diene, for H. E. Mr. Blaise Senghor (Senegal), Mr. William B. Jones, for Mr. Edward O. Sullivan (United States of America), Mr. Ahmed Annabi, for H. E. Dr. Ahmed Taleb El Ibrahimy (Algeria), Mr. Keitaro Hironaga and Mr. Ken Ikebe, for H. E. Mr. Yukihisa Tamura (Japan), Mr. Juan Martabit Scaff, for Professor William Thayer (Chile), Mr. Simion T. Bazarov and Mr. Yuri S. Ivanov, for H. E. Professor Sergei L. Tikhvinsky (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), H. E. Mrs. Léda Miléva and Mr. Iordan Peev, for H. E. Professor Dr. Nikolaï Todorov (Bulgaria).
- Representatives: International Labour Organisation:
Mr. Gerald Larrue
Ibero-American Bureau of Education:
H. E. Mr. Remolo Botto
Arab Educational, Cultural and Scientific Organization:
Professor Dr. Ahmed Fathi Sorour
- Also present: H. E. General Ali Abu Nuwar (Permanent delegate of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan)
Mr. Nathan Bar-Yaacov (Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Israel: Director, Department for International Organizations)
- Secretariat: Mr. René Maheu (Director-General), Mr. John E. Fobes (Deputy Director-General), Mr. Richard Hoggart (Assistant Director-General for Social Sciences, Humanities and Culture), Mr. Gerard Bolla (Director, Department for Cultural Heritage), Mr. Alfonso de Silva (Secretary of the Executive Board).

ANNOUNCEMENT CONCERNING THE PRIVATE MEETING HELD ON 24 JUNE 1974

1. The SECRETARY read out the following announcement:

"During its private meeting on 24 June 1974, the Executive Board considered item 8.8 of the Agenda:

1. The Board adopted a resolution concerning the remuneration of the Director-General, which will be published in the decisions of the present session.
2. It noted the action the Director-General has taken, with effect from 1 January 1974, with respect to the remuneration of the Deputy Director-General. "

STATEMENT BY MR. WYNTER

2. Mr. WYNTER said that at some suitable moment he wished to make a proposal under agenda item 6.3 concerning the representation of Granada at the eighteenth session of the General Conference.

3. EL PRESIDENTE declara que toma nota de la petición del Sr. Wynter.

- (3) The CHAIRMAN said that he had taken note of Mr. Wynter's request.

Point 4.4.1 - RAPPORT DU DIRECTEUR GENERAL EN APPLICATION DE LA RESOLUTION 93 EX/4.5.1 (Jérusalem) (94 EX/14)

Projet de résolution présenté par M. Agblemagnon, M. Alkhowaiter, M. Pendje, suppléant de M. Bong' Ilonga, M. El Borolossy, M. Etemadi, M. Greguš, suppléant de M. Grohman, M. Makany, Mme Marjanović, M. Dayal, suppléant de M. Parthasarathi, M. Abu-Izzedin, suppléant de M. Sarrûf, M. Senghor, M. Annabi, suppléant de M. Taleb El Ibrahimî, et M. Ivanov, suppléant de M. Tikhvinsky (94 EX/DR. 16)

4.1 Le DIRECTEUR GENERAL présente le rapport (94 EX/14) qu'il a établi en application de la décision 93 EX/4.5.1 (Jérusalem). Comme le Conseil exécutif l'a rappelé dans cette décision, le Directeur général avait déjà été invité à diverses reprises, et notamment par la résolution 3.422 adoptée par la Conférence générale à sa dix-septième session, à poursuivre ses efforts en vue d'assurer la présence réelle de l'Unesco dans la ville de Jérusalem. A cette fin, comme il l'a indiqué au Conseil à sa 93e session, il avait désigné le professeur Raymond Lemaire comme son représentant pour Jérusalem et l'avait habilité à se rendre dans cette ville chaque fois que cela serait approprié et nécessaire pour enquêter sur l'application ou la non-application des résolutions pertinentes de la Conférence générale et du Conseil exécutif. M. Lemaire est secrétaire général du Conseil international des monuments et des sites (ICOMOS), organisation non gouvernementale dotée du statut consultatif de la catégorie A auprès de l'Unesco. M. Lemaire s'est rendu deux fois à Jérusalem depuis la session précédente du Conseil : en décembre 1973 et en avril 1974. Le Directeur général a estimé, en effet, que deux séjours, même relativement brefs, étaient préférables à un séjour prolongé parce que cela permettait de se rendre compte de l'évolution de la situation.

4.2 Le Directeur général tient à remercier les autorités pour les facilités dont son représentant a bénéficié dans l'exercice de sa mission. Celui-ci a pu agir dans un climat favorable et ne s'est heurté à aucun obstacle dans l'exercice de sa mission. Son mandat, comme celui du Directeur général lui-même, était limité : il devait constater les faits et formuler éventuellement ses observations sur les points ayant fait l'objet de résolutions, mais il n'avait pas à apprécier ces faits car c'est à la Conférence générale et au Conseil exécutif qu'il appartient, s'ils le jugent bon, d'en tirer des conclusions. En d'autres termes, le représentant du Directeur général est un témoin et le rapport dont le Conseil est saisi est un témoignage. M. Lemaire a certes formulé, au cours de ses entretiens avec divers responsables, des avis et des conseils, mais ceux-ci avaient un caractère strictement technique et visaient uniquement à faciliter la mise en oeuvre des résolutions de la Conférence générale et du Conseil exécutif.

4.3 En ce qui concerne l'annexe au document 94 EX/14, il s'agit d'un résumé établi par le Secrétariat à partir des rapports de M. Lemaire, qui l'a lui-même approuvé après y avoir apporté quelques petites modifications. On peut constater que, pour les questions qui font l'objet des Sections III et V, l'évolution intervenue entre décembre 1973 et avril 1974 a été dûment notée. Quant

à la Section VII, qui a traité à l'urbanisation et à la conservation de la ville et du site historique, elle appellerait à elle seule de très longs développements, étant donné la complexité du problème. Toutefois, s'agissant d'un rapport de fait, on s'est borné à rendre compte de façon succincte mais claire des éléments nécessaires pour apprécier la situation en avril 1974. Il est bien évident que ce sont les intentions, les préparatifs et les plans qui détermineront la situation future, mais que, pour les apprécier, on est nécessairement entraîné à des interprétations. Le Directeur général s'en est volontairement abstenu pour conserver au rapport son caractère de témoignage.

5.1 Mr. ABU-NUWAR, Permanent Delegate of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, speaking at the invitation of the Chairman, recalled the various decisions of the General Conference and the Board which had led up to 93 EX/Decision 4.5.1, in particular 90 EX/Decision 4.3.1, General Conference resolution 3.422 adopted at the seventeenth session, and 92 EX/Decision 4.5.1.

5.2 The Board was meeting once again to consider Israel's violation of the resolutions and decisions adopted by the General Conference and the Board. The announcement at a previous session of Israel's acceptance of the Director-General's representative had appeared to some members to show a change of heart, but the Board was now obliged to recognize that nothing, in fact, had changed. While that did not surprise him personally, he felt sure that other members of the Board, as well as the delegations to the General Conference, must have expected more tangible results, especially in view of the desperate situation now prevailing in Jerusalem. The fact was that Unesco's presence in Jerusalem could in no way be described as effective. The Director-General's representative had taken no measures whatever to curb the actions of the Israeli authorities. Reading the report was like reading a treatise on archaeological excavation, bearing no relation to the actual city of Jerusalem. The report was unclear, ambiguous and imprecise a shortcoming for which Mr. Lemaire had already been criticized. It came to no conclusion as to whether Israel was respecting Unesco's decisions or not. From it, one gained the impression that Mr. Lemaire had been sent to Jerusalem as a technical adviser to the Israeli authorities. The basic alterations in the features of the Holy City were totally ignored.

5.3 The report did not begin to fulfil its essential purpose. Everyone knew that the Arab part of Jerusalem was under Israeli occupation. The occupying power had no right to make any changes in the city, to pass any legislation which might affect the Holy Places. It was outrageous that the report should speak of the adoption of a new master plan for the city. Unesco's terms of reference with regard to Jerusalem were perfectly clear, and the report should have been precisely related to them. Instead, it dealt with technical matters, making no mention of changes in the features of the city, confiscations, the building of blocks of flats, the flouting of human rights. Israel was waging open war upon the Moslem and Christian heritage of Jerusalem, but in the technicalities of the report the basic issue had been lost.

5.4 The report was not entirely valueless in that it clearly showed that violations of Unesco decisions continued, excavations still went on, the character of the city was deliberately being changed, a new master plan was under discussion. It was up to the Board to judge the report, to decide from what it said whether Unesco's decisions were being implemented, whether cultural rights were being respected, whether proper courtesy was being shown to international organizations. It was high time for the Board to consider effective measures for preventing a country which flouted Unesco's decisions from remaining a Member.

6. Le DIRECTEUR GENERAL fait observer que le document 94 EX/14, y compris son annexe, a été établi par lui d'après les rapports de son représentant. Si l'on a des objections à formuler sur cette annexe, c'est donc le Directeur général qu'on doit critiquer, et non M. Lemaire.

7.1 Mr. ABU-IZZEDDIN pointed out that the protection of Jerusalem was becoming a permanent item on the Board's agenda, for the simple reason that one Member State, which owed its very existence to the United Nations, persisted in flouting the resolutions of the General Conference and the decisions of the Executive Board, as well as the resolutions of the United Nations itself, on Jerusalem.

7.2 The origin of the problem lay in the military occupation of the city by Israel on 6 June 1967, since when, contrary to all established rules and to the decisions of the United Nations and Unesco, the occupation authorities had taken a series of illegal actions that would change the status of the city, its historical aspect and its particular features. They had started by annexing Old Jerusalem to Israel - an act referred to in Israeli terminology as "unification". They had then proceeded to force a change in the city's appearance by levelling a whole quarter in order to lay out a plaza in front of the wailing wall. They had surrounded the city with high buildings in order to concentrate in it the largest possible number of Jewish immigrants. They had begun large-scale excavations, especially under and around Harem-Esh-Sharif.

7.3 These illegal actions had been considered on many occasions by the General Conference and the Board, which had practically exhausted the resources of technical terminology in their vain attempts to put a stop to Israel's doings. In particular at its seventeenth session, the General Conference had adopted resolution 3.422 which called upon the Director-General, among other things, to establish an effective presence in Jerusalem and thus make possible the actual implementation of the resolutions of the Conference and the Board. At its 92nd and 93rd sessions, the Board had followed up that resolution, inviting the Director-General at the previous session to submit a comprehensive report.

7.4 The report (94 EX/14) was now before the Board. It consisted of four parts: a reference to the designation of Mr. Lemaire as the Director-General's representative, the terms of the Board's previous decision, information about the dates of Mr. Lemaire's two missions and the facts noted and observations made by him. In his view, the report did not respond completely to the invitation addressed to the Director-General in operative paragraph 3 of resolution 3.422 adopted by the General Conference at its seventeenth session, and in operative paragraph 7 of 92 EX/Decision 4.5.1, which were the basic decisions of Unesco. The Director-General had refrained from analysing the report in the light of those decisions, merely transmitting it without comment to the Board. In that connexion, he would be grateful for clarifications from the Director-General.

7.5 The terms of reference established by the General Conference included an instruction to study and report on changes to the features of the Holy City and through the Unesco presence to make possible the effective implementation of Unesco resolutions and decisions, in particular those provisions calling upon Israel to preserve all sites and buildings, and to desist from alterations and excavations. However, Mr. Lemaire, whose skill and knowledge he wished to commend, seemed to have confined himself to purely technical matters. On the only occasion when he went further, in paragraph 20, he attributed the views he stated to others.

7.6 Nevertheless, from the limited number of points dealt with by Mr. Lemaire, it clearly emerged that the Israeli authorities had not complied with Unesco's decisions. Excavations were still being carried out, alterations were continuing and it did not need an expert to see the changes made to the Holy City since its illegal occupation. In view of those facts, it was the Board's duty to take the right decision at the right time to impose respect for Unesco and to safeguard one of the most revered places on earth.

8.1 Mr. EL BOROLOSSY associated himself fully with the statement made by the previous speaker.

8.2 At its last session, the Board had decided to re-examine the question in its substance and had invited the Director-General to present to it a comprehensive report on the implementation of the various resolutions and decisions adopted by the General Conference and the Board. In response to that invitation, the Director-General had submitted a report containing facts noted and observations made by his representative during two one-week visits to Jerusalem. It was important to view the report in the light of the basic decision taken by the Board, namely 92 EX/Decision 4.5.1, which called upon the Director-General's representative to study and report on changes in the features of the Holy City. The report touched on that issue in paragraphs 20 and 21, but made no mention of alterations, damage or mutilation since 1967.

8.3 If, for some reason, the Director-General's representative was unable to report on that point, he would like to draw the Board's attention to certain facts. In a book entitled "The Destruction of Jerusalem", the author, an architect named A. Kutcher, who had worked for a planning department in Jerusalem, stated that the city had become to the Israelis a source to be exploited. The authorities were selling its visual and symbolic heritage for cash. Furthermore, an Israeli newspaper published in December 1970 claimed that Jerusalem was being turned into a kind of Los Angeles. But such evidence was scarcely necessary. Anyone who had known Jerusalem before 1967 and saw it now would notice the ruthless transformation and outrageous changes that had been made. It did not need a Unesco expert to tell the Board that.

8.4 Paragraph 21 of the report referred to information regarding the preparation of a new master plan to cope with traffic and building problems. It claimed that no legislation existed to protect the city's heritage, therefore adoption of the master plan would "freeze" the situation for a time. Why, one wondered, did the author not state exactly what that situation was? And who could ignore the existence of the International Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict?

8.5 From the report, despite its shortcomings, it was clear that archaeological excavations had continued in Jerusalem since its occupation in 1967 and that they were damaging many historical sites, to the extent of disaster in some cases. In addition, changes and alterations in the features of the Holy City were still going on. Together they amounted to systematic cultural aggression, unparalleled in modern times, and a challenge to world public opinion.

8.6 As a sponsor of joint draft resolution 94 EX/DR.16 he called upon the Board to defend its own decisions, and to bring a serious and deteriorating situation to the attention of the General Conference, which would have to decide what further measures it wished to take against a rebellious Member State. He felt confident that both the Board and the General Conference would face up to their responsibilities.

9. Mr. SHAHAB said he shared the feelings of apprehension and dismay expressed by the representatives of Jordan, Lebanon and Egypt. He had listened to their statements with a deep sense of pain and felt sure that their revelations would shock the conscience of mankind. He wholeheartedly supported the draft resolution.

10.1 M. ALKHOWAITER remercie le Directeur général pour la manière dont il a présenté le document 94 EX/14 et pour les efforts qu'il a déployés, avec l'aide de son représentant, en vue de mener à bien sa mission. Toutefois, ce rapport n'a pas que des côtés positifs ; il a aussi des côtés négatifs. Il ne s'agit pas en effet d'un rapport complet, contrairement à ce que le Conseil exécutif avait demandé à sa 93e session. Les faits sont constatés, mais les critiques sont d'ordre purement technique et l'attitude générale est celle d'une neutralité passive. Le rapport montre, toutefois, que les fouilles qui défigurent la ville de Jérusalem se poursuivent et qu'Israël refuse donc de se conformer aux décisions de l'Organisation.

10.2 Comme l'a dit le ministre de l'Habitat dans une conférence de presse dont le New York Times a rendu compte, la politique menée par Israël a pour but de faire de Jérusalem une ville juive. Elle se traduit par la confiscation de terres arabes et la démolition du patrimoine culturel, lequel n'a jamais été propriété juive. Le temple qu'on prétend exhumer à Haram esh-Sherif n'a jamais existé : c'est une légende, un prétexte que l'on invoque pour dénuder la ville.

10.3 Depuis plus de six ans, Israël occupe illégalement des territoires arabes. Les décisions prises par l'Unesco en ce qui concerne Jérusalem n'ont jamais été respectées par ce pays. Si le document 94 EX/DR.16, dont M. Alkhowaiter est un des coauteurs, n'est pas adopté, si les sanctions envisagées ne sont pas appliquées, Israël continuera à faire fi de ces décisions et Jérusalem perdra complètement son caractère.

11.1 M. ANNABI se bornera, pour ne pas répéter ce que les orateurs précédents ont dit, à quelques remarques d'ordre général. La poursuite des fouilles, qui entraîne des destructions considérables dans la ville, constitue un défi permanent à l'Organisation des Nations Unies et à l'Unesco. Alors que Jérusalem est une ville sainte pour les chrétiens et les musulmans et qu'elle fait partie du patrimoine culturel de toute l'humanité, les Israéliens veulent la défigurer pour en faire la ville sainte d'une seule confession : le judaïsme. Ils veulent transformer une occupation temporaire en une occupation définitive au mépris du monde arabe et de la communauté internationale. Le document 94 EX/14 dénonce à juste titre la "croissance anarchique de la ville et d'une spéculation immobilière non contrôlée". Cela résulte de l'occupation de Jérusalem par Israël et de la spoliation dont les Palestiniens sont victimes. Il est regrettable que la voix de ces derniers ne puisse être entendue dans cette enceinte, car le vrai problème est celui de leur retour. Ce problème ne connaîtra de solution définitive qu'au moment où l'objectif de la résistance palestinienne, à savoir l'instauration d'un Etat palestinien démocratique, aura été atteint.

11.2 La Conférence générale a demandé au Directeur général d'assurer la présence de l'Unesco à Jérusalem. Le Directeur général a fait des efforts dans ce sens, mais le document dont le Conseil est saisi n'est pas satisfaisant quant à sa forme. Il n'est pas aussi clair que les documents habituellement présentés au Conseil. La Conférence générale a précisé que la présence de l'Unesco visait à assurer l'application des décisions du Conseil et de la Conférence. Le rapport aurait dû commencer par une analyse de ces décisions avec, en regard, la description de la situation actuelle. Le témoignage que constitue ce rapport aurait dû porter expressément sur un certain nombre de points précis. Tel qu'il est, cependant, il est suffisamment accablant pour justifier pleinement le vote du projet de résolution présenté dans le document 94 EX/DR.16.

12.1 Проф. С. Л. ТИХВИНСКИЙ считает, что постоянное присутствие ЮНЕСКО в Иерусалиме необходимо для контроля над соблюдением Израилем резолюций ЮНЕСКО. Он заявляет, что нельзя спасать памятники одной культуры, разрушая памятники другой культуры.

12.2 Из письменного доклада г-на Лемэра и из выступлений на настоящем заседании послов Иордании и Ливана явствует, что Израиль незаконным образом захватил Иерусалим - арабскую территорию, и нарушает положения Гаагской конвенции и решения Генеральной конференции ЮНЕСКО и Исполнительного совета ЮНЕСКО.

12.3 Проф. Тихвинский разделяет высказанную всеми выступавшими до него критику в отношении доклада г-на Лемэра: этот доклад чисто технический, узко профессиональный и не соответствует возложенной Генеральным директором на г-на Лемэра задаче. Однако даже в этом докладе при всех его недостатках, можно найти вопиющие нарушения Гаагской конвенции и резолюций Генеральной конференции. В пунктах 12, 13 и 14 этого доклада за чисто технической терминологией видно, что Израиль продолжает производить археологические раскопки на чужой территории. В пункте 16 говорится, что "реставрация Эль Акса ведется медленно"; за этой лаконичной формулировкой скрывается многое. В пункте 17 признается небрежное отношение израильских властей к старинным зданиям и повреждение ими исторических памятников. В пункте 19 доклада опять указывается на то, что реставрационные работы ведутся медленно, а в пункте 20 г-н Лемэр признает существование бесконтрольной спекуляции недвижимостью в Иерусалиме и ведущуюся в настоящее время хаотическую застройку города.

12.4 Проф. Тихвинский повторяет, что, несмотря на то, что доклад далеко не отвечает возложенной на г-на Лемэра задаче, из него все-таки явствует беспрецедентная культурная агрессия Израиля, которую можно сравнить с политикой Гитлеровского фашизма, варварски разрушавшего памятники на оккупированных им территориях. Поэтому Исполнительному совету ЮНЕСКО невозможно уклониться от политической оценки действий Израиля. Культурная агрессия Израиля и полное игнорирование Израилем решений ЮНЕСКО являются еще одним проявлением общей политики Израиля - игнорировать все решения международных организаций. Новым примером этому служит недавняя зверская бомбардировка израильской авиацией лагеря палестинских беженцев в Ливане, где были убиты женщины, дети и старики. Все это свидетельствует о преднамеренном, наглом нарушении Израилем резолюций Генеральной Ассамблеи и Совета Безопасности ООН, а также Исполнительного совета и Генеральной конференции ЮНЕСКО.

12.5 Проф. Тихвинский считает, что нынешняя резолюция Исполнительного совета, одним из соавторов которой является Советский Союз, должна осудить действия Израиля. И хотя, по его мнению, редакция этого проекта резолюции недостаточно остро освещает положение, она представляет собой достаточную базу, чтобы осудить Израиль и потребовать от Генерального директора усиления присутствия ЮНЕСКО в многострадальном городе Иерусалим.

(12.1) Mr. TIKHVINSKY felt that there should be a continuous Unesco presence in Jerusalem in order to ensure the observance of Unesco resolutions by Israel. The heritage of one culture should not be destroyed in order to preserve that of another.

(12.2) Mr. Lemaire's written report and the statements made by the representatives of Jordan and the Lebanon at the current session had made it clear that Israel, having illegally occupied Jerusalem, which was Arab territory, was violating the provisions of The Hague Convention and of the resolutions of the General Conference and Executive Board of Unesco.

(12.3) The speaker associated himself with the criticisms of Mr. Lemaire's report made by all the previous speakers. It was purely technical and narrowly professional in its approach and did not meet the requirements of the task with which the Director-General had entrusted its author. But despite its many deficiencies, the report gave evidence of patent violations of The Hague Convention and of resolutions of the General Conference. In paragraphs 12, 13 and 14, the highly technical terminology did not conceal the fact that Israel was continuing to undertake archaeological excavations on territory belonging to another country. In paragraph 16, the laconic statement that restoration work on the El Aksa Mosque was "progressing slowly" was highly significant. Paragraph 17 admitted the Israeli authorities' neglectful attitude to historic buildings and the damage which had been done to ancient monuments. Paragraph 19 again spoke of the slow progress being made with restoration work and in paragraph 20 Mr. Lemaire admitted that anarchic urban construction and uncontrolled land speculation were rife in Jerusalem.

(12.4) Thus, although the report was far from corresponding to the terms of reference given to Mr. Lemaire, it nevertheless bore witness to Israel's unprecedented cultural aggression, which could be compared with Nazi Germany's barbaric policy of destruction of historic monuments in occupied territories. It was therefore impossible for the Executive Board to avoid making a political judgement of Israel's actions. Israel's cultural aggression and its complete disregard for Unesco decisions was consistent with Israel's general policy of ignoring all decisions made by international organizations, a further

example of which was the savage bombing of Palestinian refugee camps in the Lebanon by the Israeli Air Force, killing women, children and old people. All these were examples of a calculated, brazen defiance by Israel of resolutions adopted by the United Nations General Assembly and Security Council and by the Executive Board and General Conference of Unesco.

(12.5) The Executive Board resolution of which the Soviet Union was a co-sponsor must condemn Israel's action. Although the resolution as drafted did not throw a sufficiently sharp light on the situation, it was an adequate basis for condemnation of Israel and for asking that the Director-General should strengthen Unesco's presence in the long-suffering city of Jerusalem.

13.1 Mr. HU CHA expressed his support for draft resolution 94 EX/DR.16 and resolutely condemned Israel for its illegal Zionist actions in Jerusalem. The question arose: why could Israeli Zionism for so long occupy Arab territories and turn millions of Palestinians into refugees? Why could it damage the holy places in Jerusalem which had always belonged to the Arab people? The root cause was that it had the backing of the Super-Powers behind.

13.2 He confirmed his country's support for the Arab people in their struggle against Zionism. That struggle must go hand-in-hand with the struggle against racialism, colonialism and all other forms of oppression. Only when all the occupied territories had been recovered and the national rights of the Palestinian people restored could the question of Jerusalem be solved.

13.3 Since the resolutions and decisions referred to in draft resolution 94 EX/DR.16 had been adopted before the restitution of China's rights in the United Nations, he reserved the right to express reservations on any viewpoint with which China was unable to agree.

14.1 Mr. ETEMADI said that, in spite of the climate of settlement now prevailing in the Middle East, the question of Jerusalem, a city cherished by the Arab people and by all mankind, could not be set aside. The General Conference and the Board had hoped that by establishing Unesco's presence in Jerusalem, it would be possible to ensure the effective implementation of the resolutions and decisions of the General Conference and the Board.

14.2 The report of the Director-General's representative, however, said nothing about the implementation of those decisions. Thus, while thanking the Director-General for the report, he felt obliged to state that he regarded it as a first step only, a preliminary technical survey. Of course the situation was extremely difficult, but the report clearly showed that the occupying authorities had failed to respect Unesco's decisions. The Director-General's representative had been allowed to visit sites and report on what he saw, but when it came to the implementation of resolutions, no co-operation had been forthcoming from the authorities. Since Israel was violating the decisions of the General Conference and the Board, he agreed that the matter should be submitted to the General Conference at its eighteenth session.

15.1 Mr. DE SILVA said he regretted that the Board had once again to take up the question of Jerusalem, a matter of concern to the whole world. From the Preamble and Article 1 of the International Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict, it was clear that Jerusalem formed part of the world's cultural heritage. Everyone, whatever his faith, was vitally concerned with the threat to the Holy City. The actions being performed there constituted an aggression on the letter and spirit of The Hague Convention, which the Israeli authorities were openly defying. In the following articles, the Convention set forth the various steps which could be taken to enforce compliance with its terms, leading eventually to the taking of sanctions.

15.2 He sincerely hoped that the Israeli Government would agree to co-operate more thoroughly with the spirit of the Convention, by showing proper respect for the city of Jerusalem and in particular by desisting from turning it into a series of housing estates.

16.1 Mr. BAR-YAACOV, Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Israel: Director, Department of International Organization, speaking at the invitation of the Chairman, said he realized that the subject under discussion was so controversial that it inevitably aroused deep emotions. It had already come up many times, so the relevant facts ought by now to be known.

16.2 In order to obtain the facts, the Director-General had been authorized to send a representative to Jerusalem and he had indicated in document 92 EX/16 that through that arrangement he considered he had complied with resolution 3.422 adopted by the General Conference at its seventeenth session. The Executive Board had endorsed that statement.

16.3 The draft resolution at present before the Board bore a questionable relationship to the facts presented in the Director-General's report. One member had even said that the Board did not need an expert to inform it of the shameful changes which had been made in Jerusalem. But the Board itself had agreed to appoint a representative for Jerusalem and greater respect and attention should be paid to his report.

16.4 Paragraph 3 of the draft resolution noted that Israel had changed and altered the features of Jerusalem, although the sponsors themselves had admitted that nothing in the report justified that statement. On the contrary, paragraphs 20 and 21 of the report, which concerned town-planning and the conservation of the city, contained very positive statements indicating the awareness of the planning authorities of the need for regulations. That was a constructive attitude.

16.5 One member had referred to the events of 1947, an issue more appropriate to the Security Council and the General Assembly than to Unesco. In 1947, the United Nations had indeed decided on the establishment of a Jewish State, but not one other State in the region had recognized Israel.

16.6 It should also be noted that the permissibility of archaeological excavations under The Hague Convention had been the subject of differing views. According to the Commissioner-General, nothing in the Convention said they were not permissible. Moreover, as stated in document 88 EX/47, excavation was notably increasing knowledge of the Holy City. So the conclusion to be drawn was that archaeological excavations were of value to the cultural heritage, rather than a threat to it. As the New York Times had pointed out, after the seventeenth session of the General Conference, research conducted since occupation had done more to advance Biblical archaeology than all the work of the preceding century and Member States of Unesco would do well to join together in an international effort rather than to allow political factors to inhibit scholarly research.

16.7 He recalled the statement in document 83 EX/12 to the effect that the problem of the conservation of monuments in Jerusalem had to be considered in a climate of development and the heralding in document 92 EX/16 of the Director-General's representative for Jerusalem as a positive development. In that light, the report would be seen to be constructive. Paragraph 15, for example, referred to important reinforcement work and restoration. Paragraphs 16, 17, 18 and 19 dealt with the restoration of both Moslem and Christian monuments, for which responsibility rested entirely with the appropriate Moslem and Christian authorities. If, in spite of the report, the draft resolution condemned one party without any factual basis, the Board had to ask itself what was the rôle and efficacy of the representative for Jerusalem.

16.8 References had been made to the changed situation in the Middle East since the Board's last session. Many developments had indeed occurred. There had been renewed fighting, a ceasefire, and military disengagement. He would have hoped that a parallel disengagement might have taken place in the political field. In his view, the draft resolution before the Board did nothing to advance progress in the area. A one-sided condemnation could only do harm and would not meet with a positive response in objective opinion anywhere in the world. The Board should not appoint itself prosecutor, judge and jury all in one.

17.1 Mr. WYNTER pointed out that the Board's task was to examine what had taken place since the last session and to consider what action should be taken now. Its principal concern in the present instance was with the preservation of the cultural heritage represented by Jerusalem. The political context, however crucial was not Unesco's responsibility.

17.2 The main decisions the Board was called upon to implement were contained in resolution 3.422 adopted by the General Conference at its seventeenth session. In response to that resolution the Board, at its 92nd session, had noted the first step, namely the establishment of a Unesco presence in Jerusalem. At its 93rd session it had noted the appointment of the Director-General's representative and had called for a comprehensive report. That report had now been submitted.

17.3 While it was true that the report made no attempt to relate the representative's findings to the General Conference's instructions, a close reading nevertheless supplied the necessary information. It clearly showed that excavations were continuing, and in some cases had produced positive results. The representative also drew attention to the dangers of the excavations. It could be concluded from the report that Israel was co-operating with the Director-General's representative, although it was unfortunate that he had to depend for information on those participating in the work. By his own count, seven positive aspects emerged from the report and sixteen negative ones; on balance, a negative result.

17.4 The draft resolution submitted to the Board covered three main points: 1. it noted the report; 2. it interpreted the report; 3. it submitted the matter to the General Conference. With regard to the third point, he had assumed that the issue would in any case be placed before the General Conference, and merely wished to suggest the addition of the words, "within the competence of Unesco". As regards the second point, he wondered whether the Board would wish to condemn the State of Israel or the violations perpetrated by Israel. As to the first point, he saw no difficulty in noting a report which the Board itself had called for. Finally, he believed that in paragraph 4 the Board should state that the violations of General Conference resolutions were continuing. He would welcome an opportunity of discussing those amendments with the sponsors.

17.5 He wondered whether the Director-General's representative would make a further visit to Israel before the General Conference met and, if so, proposed that a fresh report be submitted.

18.1 Mr. ABU-IZZEDIN, speaking in exercise of his right of reply, recalled that the spokesman for Israel had referred to the comment that it did not require an expert to note the changes in the features of Jerusalem. In that connexion, he recalled that many meetings had been held before Israel had agreed to accept the presence of the Director-General's representative in Jerusalem. Perhaps Israel now regretted that decision and wanted to get rid of him.

18.2 The spokesman for Israel had also accused the sponsors of the draft resolution of disrespect for the report. It was grotesque for a country that had flouted all United Nations resolutions to apply the word "disrespect" to the attitude of the Arab countries towards the Director-General's report.

18.3 It had also been claimed that the report did not justify the condemnation of Israel's illegal activities in Jerusalem. The point the sponsors of the draft resolution had made about the report was that it did not fully correspond to the terms of reference laid down by the General Conference. Nevertheless, it contained proof of continuing violations by Israel.

18.4 The spokesman for Israel had said that no State in the region had recognized Israel. But which Israel were the Arab countries to recognize: that of 1947, 1948, 1950, 1956, 1967 or 1973? Jerusalem was a Holy City, not a place for property speculation. It was part of the cultural heritage of mankind, including the Jews themselves.

18.5 Finally, the spokesman for Israel had said that the restoration of Moslem and Christian sites was entrusted to the Moslem and Christian authorities themselves. Israel's reason for doing that was that it had been responsible for setting fire to the El Aksa Mosque and desecrating the Holy Sepulchre.

19.1 Mr. EL BOROLOSSY, speaking in exercise of his right of reply, said that he was by now accustomed to the ambiguity of Israel's statements in all United Nations organizations. The spokesman for Israel had claimed that one member had said that no expert was needed to note the changes that had taken place in Jerusalem. What he himself had said, after giving evidence of wholesale destruction, was that it was not necessary to be an expert in order to see the difference between Jerusalem as it had been and Jerusalem as it was now.

19.2 The spokesman for Israel had also claimed that the issue was controversial. That was not so. The illegality of Israel's occupation of Jerusalem had been declared by the United Nations itself.

19.3 Finally, he had not set himself up as prosecutor, judge and jury. He had merely put the case and left it to the Board to decide.

20.1 Mr. WYNTER said that after conferring with the sponsors of the draft resolution he had decided to submit formally his amendments in the hope that they might lead to a wider consensus within the Board.

20.2 He therefore proposed that paragraph 3 be amended to read as follows:

"Noting the report of the Director-General (94 EX/14) on the visits of December 1973 and April 1974 made by his representative to the city of Jerusalem."

20.3 In paragraph 4 he proposed the addition, after the word, "Convinced," of the phrase, "from certain aspects of the report" and the deletion of the words "as the General Conference at its seventeenth session had stated in resolution 3.422".

- 20.4 He proposed that paragraph 6 be amended as follows, "Condemns the persistent violations by Israel of the. . . ."
- 20.5 The following words should be added to the end of paragraph 7: "for decisions to be taken on further appropriate measures within its competence".
- 20.6 Paragraph 8 should be deleted.
21. Mr. EL BOROLOSSY said that if the new version of the draft resolution ensured a consensus within the Board, he would have no objection to the proposed amendments. However, he would like to add the words "against Israel" after the words "decisions to be taken" in paragraph 7.
22. Mr. WYNTER pointed out that the addition of those words would be restrictive, limiting the measures to action against Israel. He would prefer to leave open the possibility of taking measures on behalf of the city of Jerusalem.
23. Mr. EL BOROLOSSY said that if there would be no further discussion of the matter, he would accept Mr. Wynter's proposals.
24. Mr. IVANOV, supported by Mr. GROHMAN, proposed the debate should be closed and that an immediate vote be taken on the draft resolution, as amended.
25. El PRESIDENTE pone a votación la moción de clausura del debate.
- (25) The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the motion for the closure of the debate.
26. El Consejo aprueba la moción de clausura del debate por 24 votos a favor, ninguno en contra y 11 abstenciones.
- (26) The motion was carried by 24 votes to none, with 11 abstentions.
27. El PRESIDENTE pone a votación el proyecto de resolución 94 EX/DR. 16 con las enmiendas presentadas por el Sr. Wynter.
- (27) The CHAIRMAN put to the vote draft resolution 94 EX/DR. 16 as amended by Mr. Wynter.
28. El Consejo aprueba el proyecto de resolución 94 EX/DR. 16 con las enmiendas propuestas por el Sr. Wynter por 24 votos a favor, ninguno en contra y 11 abstenciones.
- (28) Draft resolution 94 EX/DR. 16, as amended by Mr. Wynter, was adopted by 24 votes to none, with 11 abstentions.
29. Mr. JONES speaking in explanation of his vote, said that his country shared the interest and concern of all nations with regard to the need to protect the city of Jerusalem and all other historical sites and monuments. For that reason his Government had ratified the World Heritage Trust Convention. The Board's discussions on such issues should be based on objective facts and should not become politicized. Despite certain reservations, his delegation had abstained on the draft resolution as a whole because it was aware of the sensitivities involved and in the light of the efforts of the United States Government to reach a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

The meeting rose at 1 p. m.

THIRTIETH MEETING

Monday, 24 June 1974, at 3.25 p.m.

Present:

- President of the
General Conference: H. E. Mr. Toru Haguiwara
- Chairman: H. E. Dr. Gabriel Betancur Mejía (Colombia)
- Vice-Chairmen: H. E. Mr. Tooryalay Etemadi (Afghanistan),
H. E. Dr. Josef Grohman (Czechoslovakia)
- Members: H. E. Dr. Ferdinand N'Sougan Agblemagnon (Togo), Mr. Hamad
Alkhowaiter (Saudi Arabia), H. E. Mr. Léon Boissier-Palun (Dahomey),
H. E. Mr. Francisco Cuevas Cancino (Mexico), H. E. Dr. Atilio
Dell'Oro Maini (Argentina), Mr. Etienne Dennery (France), H. E. Mr.
Frederick E. De Silva (Republic of Sri Lanka), H. E. Professor Dr.
Abdelwahab El Borolossy (Arab Republic of Egypt), Dr. Federico
García Capurro (Uruguay), Dr. Aklilu Habte (Ethiopia), Mr. Bernard
J. E. M. de Hoog (Netherlands), Mr. Napoléon LeBlanc (Canada),
Mr. Peterson D. M. Lombe (Zambia), H. E. Dr. Enrique Macaya-
Lahmann (Costa Rica), Professor Lévy Makany (People's Republic of
the Congo), Dr. Professor Sida Marjanović (Yugoslavia), Mr. William
A. C. Mathieson (United Kingdom), Professor Maria Luisa Paronetto
Valier (Italy), H. E. Professor Sergei L. Tikhvinsky (Union of Soviet
Socialist Republics), H. E. Professor Dr. Nikolaf Todorov (Bulgaria),
Professor Kankam Twum-Barima (Ghana)
- Deputies: H. E. Dr. Jens Petersen and Dr. Rüdiger Pernice, for H. E. Mr.
Herbert Blankenhorn (Federal Republic of Germany), Professor Dr.
Alwin Westerhof, for Professor Kurt Blaukopf (Austria), Mr.
Yacoubou F. Barra, for H. E. Mr. Léon Boissier-Palun (Dahomey),
Mr. Demodetdo Yako Pendje, for Mr. Bong'Ilanga (Republic of Zaire),
Mr. Hu Cha and Mr. Chou Chi'chi, for Professor Dr. Ing. Chang Wei
(People's Republic of China), Mrs. Mercedes Cabrera, for H. E. Mr.
Francisco Cuevas Cancino (Mexico), Dr. Alfredo Corti, for H. E. Dr.
Atilio Dell'Oro Maini (Argentina), Mr. Jean Chesneau, for Mr.
Etienne Dennery (France), H. E. Mr. Raimundo Pérez Hernández y
Moreno, for H. E. Dr. Ricardo Díez Hochleitner (Spain), Mr. Jaromir
Strnad, for H. E. Dr. Josef Grohman (Czechoslovakia), Mr. Arto
Kurittu, for Dr. Ilmo Hela (Finland), H. E. Mr. Sadi de Gorter, for
Mr. Bernard J. E. M. de Hoog (Netherlands), Mr. Stanley F. Muka, for
Mr. Yuda Komora (Kenya), Miss Nicole Sénécal, for Mr. Napoléon
LeBlanc (Canada), Mr. Sylvestre Souka, for Professor Lévy Makany
(People's Republic of the Congo), Mr. Puniša Pavlović, for Dr.
Professor Sida Marjanović (Yugoslavia), Mr. Mahesh Dayal, for Mr.
Gopalaswami Parthasarathi (India), H. E. Dr. Halim Safd Abu-
Izzeddin, for Dr. Fūad Sarrūf (Lebanon), Mr. Doudou Diene, for H. E.
Mr. Blaise Senghor (Senegal), Mr. Constantine Warvariv, for Mr.
Edward O. Sullivan (United States of America), Mr. Ahmed Annabi,
for H. E. Dr. Ahmed Taleb El Ibrahimi (Algeria), Mr. Keitaro
Hironaga and Mr. Yoshimori Miyamoto, for H. E. Mr. Yukihisa
Tamura (Japan), Mr. Simion T. Bazarov, for H. E. Professor Sergei
L. Tikhvinsky (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), Mrs. Cecile
Eistrup and Miss Beverly King, for Mr. Hector Wynter (Jamaica)
- Representative: Arab Educational, Cultural and Scientific Organization:
Professor Dr. Ahmed Fathi Sorour
- Secretariat: Mr. René Maheu (Director-General), Mr. John E. Fobes (Deputy
Director-General), Mr. Richard Hoggart (Assistant Director-General
for Social Sciences, Humanities and Culture), Mr. Alberto Obligado
Nazar (Assistant Director-General for Communication), Mr. James
Merritt Harrison (Assistant Director-General for Science), Mr. Manuel
Jimenez (Director, Bureau of Relations with Member States and
International Organizations and Programmes), Mr. Alfonso de Silva
(Secretary of the Executive Board)

Point 4.4.1 - RAPPORT DU DIRECTEUR GENERAL EN APPLICATION DE LA DECISION
93 EX/4.5.1 (Jérusalem) (94 EX/14) (suite)

Projet de résolution présenté par M. Agblemagnon, M. Alkhowaiter, M. Demodetdo Yako Pendje, suppléant de M. Bong'Ilonga, M. El Borolossy, M. Etemadi, M. Gregus, suppléant de M. Grohman, M. Makany, Mme Marjanović, M. Mahesh Dayal, suppléant de M. Parthasarathi, M. Abu-Izzeddin, suppléant de M. Sarrûf, M. Senghor, M. Annabi, suppléant de M. Taleb El Ibrahimî, et M. Ivanov, suppléant de M. Tikhvinsky (94 EX/DR. 16) (suite)

1. El Sr. GARCIA CAPURRO explica su voto declarando que su país y él son amigos del Estado de Israel y de su pueblo y que al votar en favor del proyecto de resolución que figura en el documento 94 EX/DR. 16 hubo de violentar a ese sentimiento. Declara que en su voto de miembro del Consejo Ejecutivo no ha de verse ninguna connotación política, sino únicamente el reflejo de una opinión personal inspirada en razones filosóficas, en el principio de tolerancia cristiana y en su amor a la cultura, para defender en común, en el organismo al cual incumbe esa tarea, un testimonio del pasado y del presente que no ha de ser de nadie en particular porque es de todos.

(1) M. GARCIA CAPURRO explique que son pays et lui-même éprouvent à l'égard de l'Etat et du peuple israéliens des sentiments d'amitié auxquels c'eût été faire violence que de voter en faveur du projet de résolution figurant dans le document 94 EX/DR. 16. Il ne faut voir, ajoute-t-il, dans le vote qu'il a émis en tant que membre du Conseil exécutif aucune connotation politique, mais uniquement le reflet d'une opinion personnelle fondée sur des considérations philosophiques, sur le principe de la tolérance chrétienne et sur l'amour de la culture, opinion à laquelle est associé le désir de voir les membres de l'Unesco défendre conjointement, conformément aux idéaux de l'Organisation, un témoignage du passé et du présent qui ne saurait appartenir à personne en particulier, puisqu'il est la propriété commune de tous.

2. M. DIENE déclare que la position de son gouvernement a toujours été motivée, en la matière, par le désir de voir donner effet aux résolutions de la Conférence générale et du Conseil exécutif, qu'elles aient trait à la préservation de l'intégrité de Jérusalem, à la sauvegarde des biens culturels et religieux qui s'y trouvent ou au mandat du représentant du Directeur général. Ce gouvernement a donc été déçu par l'aspect formel et essentiellement technique du rapport qui a été présenté au Conseil, rapport qui a cependant le mérite de donner tous détails utiles sur les fouilles qui ont été entreprises à Jérusalem par les autorités occupantes. Ayant constaté que ces fouilles se poursuivaient, la délégation sénégalaise a été conduite à se joindre, pour des raisons de principe, aux auteurs du projet de résolution 94 EX/DR. 16. Elle partage la manière de voir des représentants des pays arabes et considère notamment, comme M. Annabi, que le problème en cause ne pourra être définitivement résolu qu'à partir du moment où il aura été mis fin à la spoliation du peuple palestinien.

3. El Sr. PEREZ HERNANDEZ declara que ha escuchado con respeto al representante de Israel, pero que comparte plenamente la tesis sostenida por los países árabes y, por consiguiente, ha votado en favor del proyecto de resolución que figura en el documento 94 EX/DR. 16. Por razones subjetivas, puesto que España está fraternal y entrañablemente unida en la historia a los países árabes y, por razones objetivas, porque las excavaciones que se prosiguen afectan sin duda alguna el patrimonio cultural de Jerusalén. En el entendimiento, claro está, de que la cuestión ha de quedar circunscrita a la esfera de competencia de la Unesco y no ha de politizarse.

(3) M. PEREZ HERNANDEZ déclare que, bien qu'il ait respectueusement écouté l'exposé du représentant d'Israël, il continue à faire pleinement sienne la thèse des pays arabes et a donc été conduit à voter en faveur du projet de résolution figurant dans le document 94 EX/DR. 16. Son attitude a été motivée, non seulement par des raisons subjectives car des liens fraternels unissent historiquement l'Espagne aux pays arabes, mais aussi par des raisons objectives : il est en effet incontestable que la poursuite des fouilles a pour effet de porter atteinte au patrimoine culturel de Jérusalem. Quoi qu'il en soit, il importe de ne pas politiser la question, donc de ne pas sortir, pour l'examiner, des limites qui correspondent au domaine de compétence de l'Unesco.

4. La Sra. CABRERA declara que votó a favor del proyecto de resolución que figura en el documento 94 EX/DR. 16, tal como quedó enmendado, aunque hubiera preferido una redacción más conciliatoria del párrafo 6, que permitiese a la Unesco una labor más flexible y, por ello, más constructiva.

(4) Mme CABRERA déclare qu'elle a voté en faveur du projet de résolution 94 EX/DR. 16, tel qu'il a été amendé. Elle eût cependant préféré, pour le paragraphe 6, une rédaction plus conciliante qui, en laissant à l'Unesco une plus grande marge de souplesse, lui eût permis de mener une action plus constructive.

5. M. BOISSIER-PALUN constate que, malgré les injonctions répétées du Conseil, Israël a poursuivi des fouilles dont les conséquences peuvent être dommageables, alors que cela n'avait rien d'urgent et que des négociations étaient en cours pour la restauration de la paix. Estimant qu'Israël n'avait pas fait preuve de l'esprit de conciliation nécessaire, M. Boissier-Palun a voté en faveur du projet de résolution 94 EX/DR. 16.

6.1 M. AGBLEMAGNON souligne que son pays est très attaché à la défense du patrimoine de l'humanité et spécialement de celui de Jérusalem, ville dont l'importance transcende les problèmes politiques particuliers qui s'y posent. Le Togo est en outre très soucieux d'assurer le respect des décisions prises par les organisations internationales.

6.2 Lors de la 93e session du Conseil exécutif, le gouvernement israélien s'était montré disposé à accueillir le représentant du Directeur général et à lui faciliter la tâche, ce qui sous-entendait l'arrêt des fouilles entreprises. Or le rapport du Directeur général - dont il convient de souligner l'objectivité - montre que les fouilles ont malheureusement été poursuivies. Dans ces conditions, M. Agblemagnon a cru devoir se joindre aux auteurs du projet de résolution 94 EX/DR. 16, puis voter en faveur de ce texte.

7.1 Le DIRECTEUR GENERAL regrette que la clôture des débats du Conseil ne lui ait pas laissé la latitude de répondre aux critiques formulées contre le document 94 EX/14 et, ce faisant, d'apporter des éclaircissements et des apaisements sans doute utiles. Il semble néanmoins qu'en adoptant une résolution qui invoquait ce rapport pour justifier une prise de position, le Conseil ait montré que le document permettait effectivement d'apprécier les changements survenus depuis 1968. En tout cas, il ne paraît pas juste d'affirmer que rien n'a été fait, ni que rien n'a été obtenu.

7.2 Le Directeur général formule ensuite quelques observations sur la façon dont le Secrétariat va maintenant devoir poursuivre sa tâche. Il souligne en premier lieu qu'à ses yeux le paragraphe 3 de la résolution 3.422, adoptée par la Conférence générale à sa dix-septième session, demeure valable. Il priera donc M. Lemaire de se rendre à nouveau à Jérusalem avant la prochaine session de la Conférence générale pour y assurer la présence de l'Unesco selon les modalités antérieurement définies.

7.3 Le Directeur général constate en second lieu que le Conseil ne l'a pas prié de présenter de rapport à la Conférence générale au sujet du nouveau point qu'il a décidé d'inscrire à l'ordre du jour de celle-ci. Cependant, il ne lui paraît pas opportun de laisser la Conférence générale sans information sur une question aussi délicate. Il lui soumettra donc un rapport de caractère purement factuel.

7.4 Enfin, le Directeur général annonce qu'au moment où la question viendra en discussion à la Conférence générale, il a l'intention de faire en son nom personnel et tout en gardant présentes à l'esprit les limitations que ses fonctions lui imposent, une déclaration sur le problème de la sauvegarde de Jérusalem. Avant de prendre congé de la Conférence générale, le Directeur général désire en effet libérer sa conscience sur ce point, considérant que, dans les documents qui lui ont été demandés, il n'a jamais pu s'exprimer aussi complètement, aussi sincèrement et d'une manière aussi réaliste qu'il l'aurait souhaité.

Item 6.3 - INVITATIONS TO THE EIGHTEENTH SESSION OF THE GENERAL CONFERENCE
(94 EX/25) (continued)

8. Miss KING, seconded by Mr. DE SILVA, proposed that Granada be included in the list of States to be invited to send observers to the eighteenth session of the General Conference.

9. Mr. MATHIESON expressed his support for the proposal.

10. The proposal was adopted.