

CD-1026 Transcription

AJC Steering Committee, International Relations Department [2].

2 November 1984.

M1: [00:00] Get comments from the floor. I don't want to usurp it all from the head of this table. I'd like to have some observations from those of you around the table. [Phil?]?

PHIL: Materialism and chauvinism attach to this question but there's not any (inaudible) dealing with the substance of the United Nations, with the program of the United Nations (inaudible) deal with the substance of the United Nations as well as with its personalities and (inaudible) I don't know (inaudible).

M1: But Phil, there is in the sense -- I was just going to say. Through Sidney and his activities, through the Blaustein Institute.

PHIL: (inaudible).

M1: What's that?

PHIL: (inaudible).

M1: Oh (inaudible) [01:00] well, of course the ad hoc committee that was functioning pretty well for some period of time in which we were involving as you well know not only laypeople from AJC but laypeople outside of AJC. And was utilized from time to time I think very very effectively. Not that

we shouldn't pursue that. But I think this is somewhat different. The nature -- let me tell you why I happen to feel this is of some interest. Because of some of the activities I've been involved in, I had become quite friendly and close to several of the third world particularly representatives from time to time. Unfortunately they've all left by now. But I have found that as a result of that, on occasions when there are issues of considerable interest to us, I was able to contact them and get some very helpful support. Tommy Koh, with whom I became quite friendly many years ago [02:00] and as you recall is the ambassador from Singapore. He's now in Washington. Well, Tommy Koh was outstanding in supporting many of the very important issues that we are involved in. I reminded Ivor Richard the other day of the occasion when Tommy Koh took Richard and several of them apart on the Zionism racism resolution and attacked them all for being hypocrites. This was at a small dinner meeting. There was the ambassador from Ghana. I can go down the list. And there are many of them. And these are opportunities that we have in New York, it seems to me, to be of help in that respect in getting across our point of view and our ideas and to get some -- incidentally the ignorance on the part of so many people. Phil, you know

that better now. In the Human Rights Commission. There are people who came to the Human Rights Commission meetings from many of these third world countries who never even read the declaration. [03:00] Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Till they got there or on the plane on the way up. And I think that there are opportunities to deal with many of these people. On many issues they're guided simply by their own foreign office. But they do have some input and you can be of some help and some influence. That's the sort of thing we're talking about here. Yes, [Ed?].

ED: I think this is historic. I think this proposal provides the rationale for the American Jewish Committee as an organization. A very specific purpose (inaudible) I feel that naturally we'll too well known for our model and we are not aware ourselves of the significance of our members or our membership. I think the trip to France without question opened my eyes. And I should think it opened the eyes of all those who attended that particular meeting. [04:00] It was awesome that the foreign minister of France spent two, three hours with five laypeople and one staff person from the American Jewish Committee analyzing France's role in the world today and asking opinion as to our feelings with regard to (inaudible) and the role France

should play. I think it was significant that the cardinal of France met with the American Jewish Committee and asked its opinion on how the Vatican should approach the issue of relationship with Israel. I think we all were astonished that we were the vehicle by which these extraordinary proposals were put out to the world. We had never realized the potential of this organization to operate in that sphere. [05:00] And this document I think is our realization. And I think that if we don't see it in that perspective, we're really missing the point of the significance of this proposal.

M1: Thanks, Ed.

M2: I would like to support what Ed has said. In reflecting on the way we have been received in a variety of places and the kind of image we conjure up among statesmen and so forth, our task it seems to me (inaudible) we come in with tremendous billing. The fact was that four presidents of Latin American countries arranged their calendars to see us. Sat there and said quote, "We know you are the most important organization in your colony." Or no. The most important colony in your country. [06:00] Yeah, most important colony in your country. But this organized approach to it. It serves so many of our purposes (inaudible) brings to us people who are going to be useful

in a function. It helps flesh out to a reality that which our image contains. And I would say that resources directed in this way creates an opportunity for a unique contribution by us (inaudible).

M1: Further comments. Like to have your opinions of this because we would like to get some kind of a consensus out of this group as to pursuing this. And any suggestions or ideas as to how we might do so. [Bruce?].

BRUCE: I have an incomplete thought, and I'm going to put it out that way, because I'm not sure I know quite where it leads. But there seems to be if you will a geographical [07:00] basis of what this is about in New York reaching out to the UN people, etc. Aren't we missing the point? Isn't Washington a bit more important than New York when it comes to relationships and international affairs? Aren't the embassies located in Washington and only consulates in New York? Aren't the embassies in Washington far more important than UN attendees?

M3: Not necessarily.

M1: I don't know. Maybe Bookie can comment on that?

BRUCE: (inaudible) seems to me that there ought to be a center of gravity on what this is saying. And I certainly agree with both Ed and [Maynard?] but that sentence is missing. And as I say I haven't fleshed out the thought.

M1: Bookie?

BOOKBINDER: Well, I think -- I wish I didn't have to say it.

But I think the answer to his question is basically no. The embassies as a collectivity are not more important than the current officials of respective governments. But also (inaudible).

M1: (inaudible) New York and the UN.

BOOKBINDER: Oh I see. [08:00] The only obvious point I make is that any work done in New York or in the countries abroad should be coordinated as much as possible with the liaison that we ought to maintain with the embassies. But there's a very uneven quality of embassy and embassy personnel.

M1: I'll tell you one distinction. I think it's a valid distinction. And Bookie can correct me if I'm mistaken. You find that in New York that many of these representatives who are in New York, they're in a tremendous city. Many of them are really lost and are reaching out for this kind of contact. They want it. They would like it. They will welcome it. And they will participate in it. I don't know that that is as true in Washington. Frankly also I think in Washington they usually circulate more within their own circles, do they not? Within their own diplomatic -- I don't know.

BOOKBINDER: Well, first I want to go back to my first response. I think it could be misunderstood. I think you know that for 17 years I've said one of the areas we're [09:00] neglecting much too much is the Washington embassy operation. I don't want to give the idea I think it's unimportant. And we ought to try to correct that one. But I misunderstood your question in the first place about relative importance. They're all very important. They're all very important.

M1: (inaudible).

TANENBAUM: Quick response. Bruce, I'm glad you raised -- we really are talking about -- at least as I perceive it the document here, the first probe. I really see a long term comprehensive strategy that is three-tiered. The New York scene is clear in terms of the United Nations and that whole front of ambassadors from every country of the world. There is the Washington scene which we have begun to work on this year. We met with the Spanish embassy last week to talk about our Spanish mission after the board institute. It was extraordinary response we got. Spanish minister [10:00] asked for a memorandum immediately to send off to the foreign minister to arrange the highest level meeting, the king and queen of Spain and the foreign minister and the prime minister, when we're ready to go there. But

that's the second tier, the whole embassy front which we're now working on. David Harris has been providing important staff support with [Leo?]. And we've met now with perhaps, what, perhaps six, seven, eight embassies in Washington. And the responses from all of them have been very open and we've been able to register a number of our major concerns. The other tier that we haven't talked about which has I think important programmatic significance for us is that we have begun sending out memoranda with background materials to our chapter presidents around the country on visits to consul-generals. That is to say when we develop a program that regards for example combating hostility against Israel and Jews in the United Nations, we provided a background document, chapter and verse, to every chapter chairman [11:00] and our area officers. Probably a half dozen of our chapters already have had meetings with some of their top leadership with local consul-generals. And two weeks ago our Atlanta chapter gave us a report. The British consul-general in Atlanta said this was the first time that any Jewish group has sought him out in more than a decade of service in Atlanta. Never had any contact with the Jewish community there. And they asked for him to communicate concerns not only about the UN and Soviet Jewry but also about Nairobi. We've begun now moving on that front

(inaudible) so that there is a chance now to really give some chapter involvement in this work that is not simply Mickey Mouse. I mean there's a chance to impact. And now the consul-generals are saying, "We now hear from our embassy that you people are stressing this issue. And we're feeding that back to our foreign office." So it seems to me in terms of our programmatic objectives, our political objectives, moving in this direction, creating a structure that enables us to guide our work both in New York and Washington and in chapters around the country, [12:00] we've really got a very solid program plan here, which can make sense for us. But we have to count on -- one of the missing pieces here is that -- and one of the areas where I think our lay leadership can be enormously helpful to us, not only the steering committee but in chapters around the country, is to undertake responsibility for identifying people who would become special resources for us. Jewish leadership in local communities who may be involved in commerce or trade or political activity or legal activity or banking activity with foreign governments, who have access in an influential way with governments of various parts of the world. And we need to do that kind of identification and feedback so that we can begin building up each of these commissions and develop a kind of rapid

deployment force on given issues where we need people who can have real impact beyond that which we're having now.

M1: [Ted?] and then Ed. Yes.

TED: Because this is so important and we've been working on it [13:00] almost eight years now (inaudible) first West Germany, France (inaudible) by Howard Friedman to the UK to see what might be done there and other trips. All of these committees do not spring into existence at once. Otherwise there are going to be inevitably some failures. And failure should not attend this kind of effort. What areas are you going to (inaudible) initially and what do you see as the next step (inaudible).

M1: My own notion is that we would -- I would suggest that since we have made such a good start in Western Europe, that should be our number one. To try to formalize that effort. [14:00] And we're already a good ways down the road as a result of what's been going on for the last six to eight years in that area. I think the next area -- I speak for myself now because I haven't discussed this with anyone else -- is South America. We've also made a good start. But I agree with you. We've got to take this step by step and not jump into the whole area at one time. Marc, do you have anything to add?

TANENBAUM: I think Leo (inaudible) part of it has to do with our analysis of what is happening geopolitically. And one of the reasons we've gone into Europe in this organized way is that the EEC is a central political factor in many of the issues of human rights, international programs against terrorism. Look at the role of the EEC now in Central America, the Contadora process. There's developing a self-consciousness now on the part of the ten [15:00] countries. They also play a role in the Middle East. France's role with regard to Lebanon and Syria. France's role in Africa. Our concentration, it seems to me, ought to be in the places where we can have the greatest catalytic effect in terms of Jewish interest. At the point at which the detente between the United States and the Soviet Union was at the lowest, the Soviet Union was keeping lines open with the European community, with France, with Germany, with England. And that's one of the reasons we began to move there. We needed other alternatives for trying to have some impact on the Soviet Union outside of what was then locked in in the declined relationship. So in part the decisions will have to be made by that. We may have to make shifts depending on some international changes. But as for the moment, it's clear to us that the European community, the European Parliament on Human Rights, the whole NATO group

are critical factors in terms of the defense of constitutional democracies, upholding human rights, and the defense of the Jewish interests. So we're going to give that [16:00] primary concentration in a systematic way. I think it is a question of priorities. And it does have to do with resources that [Lee?] is pointing to. And (inaudible) we want you to take a look at the budgetary implications of this. You cannot run this operation with our present limited secretarial staff and limited budget in terms of travel and other things. And while we're talking about a modest increase, it's essential to do this work seriously. You've got to provide the infrastructure that makes it possible. Otherwise we'll approve it, we'll give it a blessing, but it won't really be a serious undertaking, unless we can staff it in a way that enables us to do the work that needs to be done.

M1: Ed.

ED: I think (inaudible) not direct response to your remark but (inaudible) we're seeing here is the institutionalization of what has been largely a theoretical (inaudible) by the American Jewish Committee (inaudible) and what we're doing now is twofold. One, we're developing relationships [17:00] with those with whom we can have an impact. For example we were talking about the UN (inaudible) as opposed to

Washington (inaudible) many, indeed most, of those people in New York will eventually be their ambassadors in Washington.

M4: (inaudible).

M5: Some of them are ambassadors (inaudible).

TANENBAUM: (inaudible) foreign ministries.

M1: Some are in both places. Some are ambassadors both places.

ED: They all play a role. They would not be in New York City or the UN if they weren't geared for a more significant role in their governments. Is that a clarification? All right. And I think this is an extraordinary opportunity because of our base in New York to take advantage of that. Moreover, going back to the trip that we mentioned, we had not been significantly aware of the [18:00] signal impact of the American Jewish Committee as an organization on many of these people. Perhaps it's good that our reputation, Maynard, is greater than we might feel it should be. Nevertheless, reality and perception are very important. And we no exception to that.

M1: All right. Does anyone else have any other comment they would like to make on this subject? Because if not, it seems to me that I've heard nothing that indicates any disagreement with this program. And a great deal of support for it in this group here. So can I assume that it's the

feeling of this group that we should pursue this? And that we're prepared to support not only the concept but the necessary wherewithal with which to bring it into effect? Yes, [Sal?].

SAL: (inaudible) [19:00] this is an area that has great appeal because of the nature of (inaudible) international affairs by its nature (inaudible) it's also somewhat treacherous. There's the potential for our being used in subtle ways (inaudible) hearkening back to our visit to France. Marc, I say this out of ignorance. I'm not sure what the positive effect of a visit like that may be. If (inaudible) simply to try to neutralize criticism of Jewish groups in the United States, the policy of France to be the principal arm merchant to the Arab world, one way of doing that is to [20:00] grant access to Jewish groups in the United States, to bring them into a process of discussion (inaudible) in the process of that seek to neutralize what would otherwise be legitimate criticism on the part of American Jewry of France's policies in the Middle East. I give that as only one example. My own activities (inaudible) government always presented that same problem. I never knew whether I was persuading them or they were persuading me.

M1: Or both.

SAL: Or both. Whether in effect they were getting Jewish support (inaudible) in return for what were paper promises to increase rights of Jews (inaudible) it's a very very difficult area (inaudible) we're always operating with the most limited databases compared to the person with whom we're discussing (inaudible) we don't have access [21:00] and won't have access (inaudible) persons we're dealing with have a larger agenda (inaudible) although I don't intend by my comments to discourage (inaudible) being suggested. Indeed I think it's good institutionally and could create some very positive results for the Jewish community worldwide. It is an area that is highly sophisticated and one in which we should proceed with caution. Not in terms of trying to extend ourselves. But when we get into (inaudible) discussions we need a high degree of sophistication. And I would suggest if we embark on this, Marc, from a staff standpoint, we ought to try to involve if we can someone in the professional foreign policy (inaudible).

M1: I'll just comment. Phil wants to speak next. [22:00] I think what you've said is actually correct. We were exposed to that in Paris.

SAL: (inaudible) as an example. I don't have enough knowledge (inaudible).

M1: But on the other hand I recall our meeting with Chirac, who is presumably going to be the next president of France, in which he did exactly what you talked about with respect to the Middle East and Iraq and so forth. And I recall very well the discussion led by Howard at that time which was certainly a clear recognition on our part and indication to him that we totally disagreed with his whole point of view. Howard did a beautiful job on that score. So much so that he wanted to continue our meeting on for -- he'd given us 45 minutes or an hour. But he wanted to continue the meeting. But I think our next meeting was with President Mitterrand and had to leave. And he's coming here after the election. His staff told us that at the time and he wants to arrange continued discussion with us. [23:00] So there is clearly recognition on our part of what they were trying to convey to us. And I think a very effective presentation particularly by Howard on that subject at that time. But what you say is absolutely true. Is there anyone else who has anything further they want to say about -- oh, Phil. I'm sorry.

PHIL: (inaudible) don't want anything from us. And the sophistication Sal suggests becomes necessary because of that. But this whole program falls on its face if (inaudible).

M1: Can I just add to that and say? The minister of trade and tourism. We pressed her to attend the -- what was it? Electronics -- economic conference in Israel, which was taking place in a few weeks. She had already [24:00] requested that we arrange a meeting here for her in New York. It was a result of that pressure that she changed her schedule. She was supposed to go to Mexico. And she did lead a delegation to Israel. When she came to New York, we in turn had a very very good representation for her at AJC in New York. So I think we recognize that it's a double -- all right.

TANENBAUM: Let me just say that I don't think there's any sense at least on the part of I think our leadership of the commission and the staff. The moral ambiguities of all of this and risk factors involved. But you don't go into this business unless you take that into account. I think that we have, I think as Leo and others have indicated, we had objectives. And we achieved some of them. Some of them even more dramatically than I think we realized at the time. After Madame Cresson, Laurent Fabius, who's now the prime minister of France, [25:00] after we made the case that they were isolating Israel by virtue of not attending Israel's economic conference, went on a mission subsequently. And began negotiating a whole series of

economic trade relations. There is a tradeoff. And they do want something from us. And we're very clear about that. And they're very clear about that. But we make it clear that there are negotiations of things that we can do, recognizing our appropriate limited role. We're not the American government. But within that context, there are things we can do. So I think there's growing awareness. And as we get more of our experienced and sophisticated laypeople involved we will have greater depth and greater sense of the ambiguities we have to deal with. Leo had to go out. Why don't we just acknowledge some questions? Howard, do you want to chair our meeting for us? Yes, [Martin?].

MARTIN: While I certainly agree with (inaudible) I think maybe sometimes we ought to differentiate between [26:00] situations depending on the level that we're at and also the people with whom we're dealing. And (inaudible) opportunity we had with the AJC leadership delegation that went into East Berlin and met with the man who's the head of church-state relations (inaudible) we met with the American ambassador of East Berlin. What we were told was that even though we did not know what their motivations are, that any contact is important because there was such limited contact. They thought that any contact would have a

positive result. Obviously there's a great risk in doing that. But in those kinds of limited situations (inaudible).

M1: All right. I am going to assume we have unanimous support for this program. Unless somebody indicates they're -- this is a democratic procedure.

M6: (inaudible) a matter of course when we do any exploration of this kind, [27:00] check in with State Department (inaudible).

M1: Oh yes. Oh yes.

TANENBAUM: (inaudible) area desk, the regional desk and every -- before we go to any embassy, trying just to get some sense of what the lay of the land is.

M1: That's what we've been doing on these other meetings.

M6: (inaudible) come back and brief the area (inaudible).

TANENBAUM: Sometimes they ask for it.

M7: Will it be appropriate to ask for brief comment from any one of you about how this relates to the work and the contemplated work of the World Jewish Congress? To what extent we will be competing with, overlapping, challenging? Or do you want to wait some other time?

M1: Well, I would suggest. We've only got a half hour left. And I must say that someone's going to have to explain to us what the contemplated work of the World Jewish Congress is (inaudible).

M7: I withdraw the question.

M1: No, he wants to respond.

TANENBAUM: It is in the air. And is a matter of concern. And I'm very much concerned about it [28:00] in terms of when meetings are set up. And our president Howard Friedman meets with Kohl. And there's much more prominence given to what Edgar Bronfman does around the country going around collecting presidents. The problem which we need to acknowledge because --

M8: (inaudible).

TANENBAUM: That's right. And our own distillery. The distinction is -- it's important for us to understand this. If I think we felt that Edgar Bronfman of the World Jewish Congress was doing this job with depth and with continuity over a long range period of time, then I think we would have to ask ourselves the question. Why are we going into this? Are we simply competing for institutional interests? In fact the reality is that first of all the World Jewish Congress does not have a constituency in the United States. It has no base [29:00] in America's political or economic reality. Apart from Bronfman's own personal role, which is what is being built on. Secondly. There is no follow-up in depth programmatically with any of these governments. The kinds of things that we've begun to do with Madame Cresson.

The kinds of meetings we're preparing to set up with Madame [Rody?] on human rights and women's rights in Nairobi we are able to do because we have the constituency and we have the program. There is follow-up in depth which we've begun. The things we've been doing in Germany. The World Jewish Congress will have a meeting with Kohl, and that's the end of the relationship. We've had now a decade of exchange programs, of bringing over leadership, of educating people, of publishing textbooks, of meeting conferences of teachers, political leaders. There is a depth, a dimension to this which we bring to this which is a real contribution.

M1: All right. May I drop this, please? I know we have unanimous approval of this program and support for it. And I just don't want to prolong it. [30:00] We've got about 20 minutes to go. And we've got to move into the other room shortly. May I just go back to one item we passed over earlier? And that was on UNESCO. I'd like to ask David. You have statements here with prior discussions. I'd like to have David bring you up to date on conversations that he has had with a person of some influence whose name we can't disclose in the State Department. And the last conversation he's had as of this morning as to recent developments. So David, would you please summarize the --

HARRIS: OK. You have in your kits the update on UNESCO which was prepared as of approximately a week ago. And we had thought that it would be the last word prior to the NEC meeting, [31:00] because the executive board meeting of UNESCO in Paris was just finishing toward the end of October and we were afraid we would not have an analysis of what happened there. As you'll recall for those who attended the last steering committee meeting and the board of governors meeting, the recommendation was made that we postpone any action on UNESCO until such time as we had a clearer picture of what happened at the executive board meeting in Paris. And as Leo said, as recently as this morning I was in touch with a friend at the State Department who's been intimately involved and who was in Paris and who gave us the following balance sheet. He said the picture was mixed. On the positive side of the ledger, and let me run through some of the things briefly. It really ought to be Sidney Liskofsky who gives this report because I'm somewhat new to the language. But the notes are in front of me, so let me give it. Firstly he said that [32:00] there was a recommendation for a zero growth budget in UNESCO, which is an important issue for the United States. Although there was also provision for as much as a 2% increase in third world programming which is of some

potential concern to the United States. Not for the implications of third world programming per se. But rather for the fact that it would again perhaps increase a budget which the United States is anxious to contain. Secondly, the recommendations of the temporary committee were approved en masse although without implementation mechanisms. One of the important issues addressed was the issue of what is euphemistically referred to as complex issues in quotation marks. Which really reads as contentious issues. And how they're dealt with at UNESCO. And it was agreed that contentious issues could be referred to a special committee of the board to take them out of the full executive board. [33:00] And in this way perhaps as the United States sees it to either contain or in some cases perhaps sidetrack those complex or contentious issues. But a further US proposal to have as few as five members of the executive board succeed in making this recommendation was turned down. Which leaves therefore the need for a majority to refer a contentious issue from the full board to a special part of the board. There was an omnibus resolution passed with respect to guidelines for programming for consideration by the director-general in the 1986 and 1987 program years. And unlike previous such resolutions, this one contained no references to national

liberation movements and no reference to the new world economic order. And although the language was far from perfect from the US viewpoint, it was still characterized as more concrete, more training- and technical-oriented, more within the scope of UNESCO's mandate, and less ideological than previous such resolutions. [34:00]

Further, the reforms proposed by the director-general, which was an outgrowth as you'll recall of the five working committees which had been created with respect to such issues as management and personnel, which are themselves contentious issues for all of us, was also approved.

Additionally the life of the temporary committee was extended for another year to deal not just with program suggestions and recommendations but also with methods for implementation. Which is another key US demand. Of specific concern and interest to all of us, in a gesture to the Jewish community, the 850th birthday of Maimonides to be commemorated next year was officially designated as a UNESCO commemoration. Although it was also noted that the Soviets objected to reference to Maimonides as a mystic [35:00] saying that there is no room for mystics in the mandate of UNESCO. And so the reference was changed from mystic to thinker in describing Maimonides. Further, with respect to Middle East resolutions, which have often been a

point of contention in UNESCO, and a concern to us, it was described to me that they were resolved this time more amicably than in previous years. There were two resolutions. One was postponed until next year for consideration and the other was described as quote so mild that the US joined with only minor reservations expressed. And it was noted too that the Israelis were pleased with the outcome with respect to consideration of Middle East issues at this executive board session. With respect to another area of concern of ours, the human rights complaint mechanism which Sidney Liskofsky has been so involved with. [36:00] We were concerned that the Soviet efforts to sap the human rights mechanism might succeed. In fact approval for its continued existence at least through 1987 was given as a recommendation by the executive board despite Soviet objections. The list of positive results goes on. Let me briefly give some of the more negative results as seen by our State Department. As indicated earlier, there was some concern about the prospect of a 2% growth in the budget for third world programming. And there was concern that the seven US resolutions which were intended for submittal were in not one case -- in not one case -- passed. Of the seven, two were considered particularly important by the United States. One with respect to the budget and one with respect

to protecting minority rights. That is the minority within the UNESCO executive board. [37:00] In all seven cases, the resolutions were not passed. Additionally a Nordic resolution originally proposed by Iceland but with full US support with respect to the urgent need for some kind of prioritization of programming at UNESCO was also not fully considered. And of some concern therefore to the US. The GAO report of the United States was not accepted for consideration by UNESCO because of a procedural motion on a technicality that it was in draft form rather than final form. This too troubled the United States. In describing the attitude of Mr. M'Bow, the director-general of UNESCO, we were told that he was at times petulant with respect to US proposals. At other times [38:00] cryptic. At still other times even helpful. Especially trying to contain the third world to accept a zero-growth budget. But on the whole he didn't seem to play a particularly important role. It seems not wanting to make himself the issue at the executive board meeting. We were told that from our allies, some of whom, as you'll recall, specifically Great Britain, Denmark, the Netherlands and West Germany, themselves had written letters about certain aspects of UNESCO procedure, there was some support. On the whole it was mixed support. The Israelis themselves were not on the executive board.

They were there as observers. And we don't have a full reading yet from the Israelis on their reaction to the meeting. In sum, it was clear from this discussion that the decision on UNESCO will be made sometime between November 7th and December 31st. It was clear [39:00] from the --

END OF AUDIO FILE