

FIFTEENTH UNITED NATIONS SEMINAR ON THE QUESTION OF PALESTINE

Theme: "The inalienable rights of the Palestinian people"

United Nations Office, Nairobi
18-22 August 1986

CONTENTS

	Paragraphs	Page
Introduction	1-2	2
I. OPENING STATEMENTS	3-39	2
II. PANEL DISCUSSION	40-97	8
III. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	98-110	19

Annexes

I. Message from the participants in the Seminar to the Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Palestine Liberation Organization	22
II. Motion of thanks	23
III. List of participants and observers	24

INTRODUCTION

1. The Fifteenth United Nations Seminar on the Question of Palestine entitled "The inalienable rights of the Palestinian people" was held at the United Nations Office, Nairobi, from 18 to 22 August 1986 in accordance with the terms of General Assembly resolution 40/96 B. Seven meetings were held and 13 panelists presented papers on selected aspects of the question of Palestine.

2. The United Nations Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People was represented by a delegation consisting of H.E. Mr. Massamba Sarré (Senegal), Chairman of the Committee; H.E. Mr. Noel G. Sinclair (Guyana); Mr. Gerhard Richter (German Democratic Republic); Mr. Zehdi L. Terzi (Palestine Liberation Organization). Mr. Sarré was Chairman and Mr. Richter Rapporteur of the Seminar.

I. OPENING STATEMENTS

3. The opening session of the Fifteenth United Nations Seminar on the Question of Palestine was addressed by the Honourable Mr. E. Mweu, Assistant Minister of Foreign Affairs of Kenya. In his statement, he stressed that the people of Kenya, under the wise and dynamic leadership of President Daniel arap Moi, had consistently supported the national rights of the Palestinians, who were struggling for peace and security. Recent developments in the Middle East, whose stability and security were closely connected with those of Africa, made it imperative that the international community should work vigorously for peace in that troubled region. For peace to endure, it had to be comprehensively based on justice and the rule of law.

4. Kenya and the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) shared a common stand in various international forums, particularly in the United Nations. Furthermore, Kenya and the PLO shared a common abhorrence and strong opposition to the inhuman apartheid system of South Africa and the acquisition of other countries' territory by the use of force. Kenya and the PLO continued to condemn the evil régime in South Africa, which still defied international outcry for an end to apartheid.

5. Kenya and the PLO had always had a warm and cordial relationship and these relations continued to flourish in the spirit of brotherhood. Kenya recognized the PLO as the sole and authentic representative of the Palestinian people and gave it full diplomatic recognition on 4 October 1980. It continued to support the rights of the Palestinian people to self-determination, sovereignty and a State of their own and believed that no just and lasting peace could be achieved in the Middle East until the fundamental rights of the Palestinian people were fully recognized, including the right of all States in the region to live in peace within internationally recognized boundaries. Therefore, it was most important that Member States in the Middle East should strive to live in peace with their neighbours.

6. At the same opening session, Mr. Sarré, the Chairman, gave a brief account of the work of the Committee on the Exercise of

the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People. He stressed the particular importance that the Committee attached to the seminars in the various regions. He indicated the Committee's conviction that objective information on the question of Palestine would help to ensure more comprehensive coverage of developments in the region and promote public support in favour of an equitable and peaceful solution. Once all the facts surrounding the question of Palestine were known, the resultant better understanding of the question would help to convince even those who so far had been somewhat indifferent to the just cause of the Palestinian people.

7. The Committee was convinced that the African countries were in a position to play an active role in the search for a solution. African public opinion had to be mobilized, along with that of all the other regions, to make the voice of reason, the voice of peace and respect for people's rights in world affairs, better heard. It had to be mobilized to exert a more significant influence in the formulation of policies calculated to enable the Palestinian people to exercise its inalienable rights to self-determination and independence, rights which it had been unjustly denied for so long.

8. The General Assembly had, since its thirty-eighth session, endorsed the idea of an International Peace Conference on the Middle East. It had gone further, to invite the Security Council and the Secretary-General to undertake all preparatory measures to convene the Conference. In its resolution 40/96 D, adopted by the General Assembly at its fortieth session, it stressed the urgent need for additional constructive efforts by all Governments in order to convene the Conference without further delay and for the achievement of its peaceful objectives. It also called upon the Governments of Israel and the United States of America to reconsider their position towards the attainment of peace in the Middle East through the convening of the Conference.

9. Strongly supported by the majority of the States Members of the United Nations, the Committee fully endorsed the importance of such a Peace Conference and, as a matter of priority, continued to exert all efforts to promote its early convening. The views of the experts who participated in the Seminar would be of great value in assessing what still needed to be done in that field.

10. Dr. Abdul Rahman, Ambassador of the PLO to Kenya, conveyed a message from H.E. Mr. Yasser Arafat, Chairman of the Executive Committee of the PLO and Commander-in-Chief of the Forces of the Palestine Revolution.

11. In the message, it was stressed that the convening of the Seminar in Nairobi underscored the constant militant unity among the Arab and African peoples who had suffered under the old colonialism in all its forms. They had revolted against that colonialism and had been able to wrench their freedom, and independence. Despite those developments, the African continent and the Arab nation still suffered from two racist régimes: the racist zionist régime and the racist régime of South Africa.

12. Those two régimes threatened African stability and security as they threatened the security of the Arab nations and international security and stability in general, depending on the support and aid from United States imperialism on military, economic, political, diplomatic and informational levels. Ideological and military links which bound these two régimes had reached the level of close co-operation in the nuclear field, the making of the atomic bomb, and in the economic, commercial and cultural sectors.

13. The Palestinian Arab people, who were struggling with all their energy against the zionist racist régime which occupied their land, were fully aware of the struggle waged by the peoples of Namibia and South Africa against the twin of the Zionist régime in Palestine.

14. The PLO supported the struggle of the people of Namibia and South Africa, the position of the African front-line States and the international community to impose mandatory sanctions against the racist régime in Pretoria to force it to put an end to the policy of apartheid and to comply with Security Council resolution 435 (1978) requiring the independence of Namibia. It condemned arbitrary measures taken by the Pretoria régime against the African front-line States and reaffirmed its unswerving stand on the side of the militant Namibian people and their courageous revolution under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO).

15. Confronted with Zionist oppression, the Palestinian Arab people continued the struggle to wrench their liberty and to regain their inalienable national rights, affirming their absolute support for the PLO, their sole legitimate representative. The Palestinian people resisted the American-Zionist conspiracies, in which the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland participated, to create an alternative weak Palestinian leadership to the PLO which would succumb to the policy which the United States and Israel were attempting to impose on them.

16. The Palestinian Arab people would continue to work for the convening of the International Conference under the auspices of the United Nations, to be attended by the permanent members of the Security Council and also the concerned parties in the conflict, including the PLO, on an equal footing in accordance with General Assembly resolution 38/58 C.

17. The Seminar decided to send a message to Mr. Arafat, thanking him for his message (see annex I to the present report).

18. H.E. Mr. Noel G. Sinclair (Guyana), representing the United Nations Council for Namibia, reiterated its firm solidarity with the struggling people of Palestine. It was the firm conviction of the Council that the prospects for a lasting peace in the Middle East began and ended with the enjoyment by the Palestinian people of their inalienable rights, including their right to their own independent State. It followed from that that the Palestinian people had to participate in any discussions or negotiations concerning their future, and they had to do so through their chosen representative, the PLO, their sole authentic representative.

19. The involvement of the United Nations in the legitimate struggle of the peoples of Namibia and of Palestine was as old as the United Nations itself. The struggle of the Palestinian people was inseparable from that of the Namibian people. It was with very good reason that the General Assembly of the United Nations devoted special attention to the question of collaboration between the racist régime of Pretoria and the Zionist régime of Tel Aviv. That collaboration had to be exposed and denounced.

20. There was a need to identify ways of exerting pressure on the régime in Tel Aviv and on its powerful backers to comply with the relevant resolutions of the United Nations on the question of Palestine. A special responsibility lay with the Security Council to act without further delay to secure implementation of its own relevant resolutions. It was regrettable that the Council continued to be prevented from adopting the recommendations of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People.

21. The Council for Namibia reiterated its endorsement of the call for the convening of an International Peace Conference on the Middle East. The holding of such a Conference would provide an opportunity for some positive movement towards a comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the Middle East. The Council also supported the call for intensified support for the Palestinian people, in particular to their sole, authentic representative, the PLO.

22. Mr. Abdelmahmoud A. Mohamed (Sudan), representing the United Nations Special Committee against Apartheid, noted with

deep regret that the Palestinian people were still denied their inalienable right to self-determination. This was due to Israel's intransigence, expansionist policy and its relentless oppression of the Palestinian people in order to usurp their fundamental rights. In its policy of continued provocations and intransigence, Israel was defying the will of the international community and flouting international law, including the Charter of the United Nations.

23. Both the question of Palestine and of apartheid were of the gravest concern to the international community. Both problems emanated from the denial of the right of self-determination to the peoples concerned. All attempts made so far to bring about a just, comprehensive and lasting solution to the question of Palestine as well as to bring about the end of apartheid had failed. The denial of the right to self-determination, with the attendant subjugation of peoples to alien and discriminatory rule, was the most fundamental violation of all their rights. This denial was the lot of Palestinians as of Namibians and Africans in South Africa.

24. Israel in the Middle East and the Pretoria régime in southern Africa practised policies of destabilization of the neighbouring States. Israeli authorities discriminated against and oppressed the Palestinian people, the Pretoria régime established the equally inhuman system of apartheid against the South African black majority. There were many striking similarities between the discriminative and aggressive policies of Zionism and apartheid. That two of the most oppressive régimes in the world, Israel and South Africa, had close links historically, ideologically, commercially and militarily was well documented. At a time when the Palestinian people, the people of South Africa and the people of Namibia were going through crucial phases in their struggles for freedom, it was important to emphasize the ways in which the two racist régimes supported each other.

25. The issue of collaboration between Israel and South Africa had been and continued to be a matter of concern to many Governments, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations. The most serious aspects of the collaboration between Israel and the apartheid régime related to military and nuclear matters. The international community was preparing to undertake drastic measures to eradicate the inhuman system of apartheid. In that critical situation it was of paramount importance to stop the continuing trend of increasing collaboration between Israel and South Africa. The Special Committee believed that the international community had the right and the responsibility to exert all influence at its disposal to make Israel desist from such collaboration.

26. The Seminar received a message from H.E. Mr. Oscar Oramas-Oliva (Cuba), Acting Chairman of the Special Committee on the Situation with Regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, which emphasized that the Special Committee attached great significance to the mobilization of international opinion towards the attainment of the objectives of the United Nations on the question of self-determination for all peoples under alien and colonial domination. The situation in the region continued to constitute a crisis which bore the explosive potential of a conflict that would seriously endanger international peace and security. It was particularly relevant in that context to recall that the General Assembly had repeatedly called for the full and speedy exercise by the Palestinian people of their right to self-determination without external interference and to national independence and sovereignty, as well as their right to return to their homes and property from which they had been displaced and uprooted. It was incumbent upon the international community to make a positive and significant contribution and, in so doing, to ensure that no action be taken which would so exacerbate the situation, that a just settlement would be rendered more difficult to achieve.

27. It was of particular importance to recall General Assembly resolution 38/58 C which, among other things, had called for the convening of an International Peace Conference on the Middle East. The proposed Conference had received a wide measure of support as an indispensable vehicle by which a legal and political framework acceptable to the vast majority of the international community could be worked out in order to enable negotiations to proceed with full respect for universally recognized international principles and with all the parties concerned being on an equal footing and with equal rights.

28. H. E. Mr. Mohamed Sharif, head of the Mission of the League of Arab States in Nairobi, emphasized that the Middle East problem constituted a point of tension in the world which continued to threaten world peace if a just and comprehensive solution to the heart of the conflict, the question of Palestine, could not be found. Peace could not be achieved without adherence to international legality and the implementation of United Nations resolutions on Palestine. The Arabs, being desirous to solve a conflict that threatened the whole world, and guided by the recommendations and resolutions of the United Nations, had proposed a plan for a peaceful solution to the conflict, namely the Fez Summit Plan endorsed on 9 September 1982. In spite of the international welcome for this generous initiative, it had been adamantly rejected by Israel.

29. Israel's logic in the Middle East was similar to the logic of apartheid in South Africa. The South African régime challenged United Nations resolutions and insisted on occupying Namibia without any right or legal validity. It had been only natural that a strategic alliance should have emerged between the two régimes to counter the African and Arab boycotts. Economic, military, nuclear and political co-operation between them was moving ahead. The right of pursuit practised by Israel in the Middle East was imitated by South Africa.

30. Peace could not be achieved in the Middle East region as long as Israel continued to ignore material facts, attempted to impose on the international community fait accompli, and denied international legitimacy by rejecting the United Nations resolutions on Palestine.

31. The Palestinian people possessed every right to self-determination and to an independent State under its legitimate leadership. Without the achievement of that, peace would not be attained in the Middle East. Mankind with the exception of very few, supported those rights. It was hoped that those few would return to the right track, reason, logic and legitimacy.

32. Mr. Nabil Maarouf, representing the Organization of the Islamic Conference, conveyed greetings of H.E. Mr. Sharifeddin Pirzada, Secretary-General of that Organization, and stressed that the tyranny and oppression to which the Palestinian people were being subjected resembled very closely those to which the people of South Africa were being subjected since the two racist régimes in South Africa and occupied Palestine were established on injustice and owed their continuity to the blood of the peoples of the two areas who were the genuine owners of the land.

33. The international community had demanded of the Palestinian people that they should follow a moderate course in the pursuit of their objectives so that they might be able to support and assist it to regain their rights. The Palestinian people represented by the PLO - their sole and legitimate representative - had favourably responded to those appeals. The PLO had demonstrated the required diplomatic flexibility. But more plots and machinations aimed at the final liquidation of the Palestinian cause, more conspiracies to exterminate the Palestinian people, as well as the active pursuit of the policy of changing the features of their land and history of occupied Arab Palestine were the results.

34. The Middle East region was currently living under a situation of no war and no peace. It appeared that the United States was trying its utmost to maintain that situation in the region through the use of its international standing as a big Power. It provided massive armed assistance to Israel in such a way that ensured a state of permanent superiority for Israel and had signed the Treaty of Strategic Alliance. Moreover, it also prevented the establishment of peace by its rejection of all attempts and proposals aimed at realizing a just and lasting solution in the area, and resorted to the use of its veto right in the United Nations Security Council to abort the desire of the entire world to restore peace in the Middle East region. Such a state of affairs placed international peace and security under constant threat.

35. The Palestinian problem, which was the core of the ongoing conflict in the Middle East region, was a clearly defined one: a

people who were expelled from their land and were pursued even in the Diaspora. These people had resisted and were still resisting and would continue to resist until they regained their inalienable rights. The problem was well known and solutions were available. But, so far, peace had not been achieved. The obstacle standing in the way of achieving peace was, as was well known, the Zionist entity.

36. The Organization of the Islamic Conference reiterated its full commitment to the Palestinian cause and to the rights of the Palestinian people. Practical means had to be found to exercise effective influence upon the United States to respond favourably to the opportunities available for the establishment of peace in the area. All efforts had to be undertaken to convene the International Peace Conference on the Middle East. The peace process in the area could not succeed without the full participation of the PLO as a major party in any dialogue or negotiation. There would be no peace without the full recognition of the historical and inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, including its rights to return, to self-determination and to the establishment of its own independent State, with its capital of Al-Quds Al-Sharif, on its national soil.

37. The Seminar received a message from the Chairman of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) reiterating the support of the Organization for the just cause of the Palestinian people under the leadership of the PLO to obtain and exercise its inalienable rights.

38. At the 3rd meeting, Mr. Abdillah Ali Dualeh, representing OAU, gave a brief account of the resolutions relating to the question of Palestine adopted by the Council of Ministers of OAU at its recent session.

39. The Seminar adopted a motion of thanks expressing its appreciation to the Government and people of Kenya for hosting the Seminar (see annex II to the present report).

II. PANEL DISCUSSION

40. Four panels were established to consider different aspects of the question of Palestine. These panels and their panelists were as follows:

(a) Panel I: "The International Peace Conference on the Middle East (United Nations General Assembly resolution 38/58 C), the need for such a Conference, efforts and prospects to promote a successful outcome and benefits thereof":

Mr. Amadou Deme (Senegal), Mr Emmanuel Douma (Congo), H. E. Mr. El-Bakaye Kounta (Mali), Dr. Aheed Osman (Egypt), Dr. Ahmed Mohamed Refaat (Egypt), Mr. El Hadji Ousmane Sarr (Senegal);

(b) Panel II: "The role of the Palestine Liberation Organization":

Dr. Ameen Haseera (Palestinian)

(c) Panel III: "Africa and the question of Palestine:

(i) African public opinion;

(ii) Relations between Israel and South Africa";

Dr. Richard Andriamanjato (Madagascar), Mr. R. E. Barlay (Sierra Leone), Dr. Bukar Bukarambe (Nigeria), H.E. Mr. Rachid Driss (Tunisia), Mr. Patrick Hayford (Ghana);

(d) Panel IV: "The United Nations and the question of Palestine":

H.E. Mr. Noel G. Sinclair (Guyana).

41. The expert members of the various panels agreed on summaries of the presentations and discussions on each of the topics. The Seminar decided to include these summaries in the report.

Panel I: "The International Peace Conference on the Middle East (United Nations General Assembly resolution 38/58 C), the need for such a Conference, efforts and prospects to promote a successful outcome and benefits thereof"

42. The Seminar was of the view that among contemporary international problems, the Middle East conflict was, by its very origins and its implications, by far the most complex and one which continued to be a threat to peace and international security. Its complexity demanded an early solution because the longer the problem remained unsolved, the more difficult would a just solution be.

43. Historically, the United Nations had inherited the problem at the time of its establishment, when it partitioned Palestine and created Israel. Since then, it had been continuously seized of the problem, as evidenced by the numerous resolutions that had been adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council.

44. Unfortunately, those who wished to maintain the *status quo* had opposed any attempt by the United Nations to settle the question of Palestine. Nevertheless, it remained, for historical, institutional and political reasons, most qualified to provide the framework for the search for a solution.

45. The question of Palestine was now an international problem in the fullest sense of the word. It was no longer possible, therefore, for solutions to be found by bilateral negotiations. The United Nations alone could provide the framework which would guarantee to all parties to the conflict the security, impartiality and the equality necessary for serious negotiations which would result in a just and lasting solution.

46. The International Peace Conference on the Middle East called for by General Assembly resolution 38/58 C offered the best opportunity to find a just solution to this intractable question and would provide the necessary framework for such negotiations.

47. The International Conference on the Question of Palestine held in Geneva in 1983 had, in its Declaration, listed the major guiding principles which should govern any concerted action for the purpose of resolving the question of Palestine.

48. Those guidelines included:

- (a) The attainment by the Palestinian people of its legitimate, inalienable rights, including the right to return, the right to self-determination and the right to establish its own independent State in Palestine;
- (b) The right of the Palestine Liberation Organization, the representative of the Palestinian people, to participate on an equal footing with other parties in all efforts, deliberations and conferences on the Middle East;
- (c) The need to put an end to Israel's occupation of the Arab territories, in accordance with the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force, and consequently, the need to secure Israeli withdrawal from the territories occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem;
- (d) The need to oppose and reject such Israeli policies and practices in the occupied territories, including Jerusalem, and any *de facto* situation created by Israel as were contrary to international law and relevant United Nations resolutions, particularly the establishment of settlements, as those policies and practices constituted major obstacles to the achievement of peace in the Middle East;
- (e) The need to reaffirm as null and void all legislative and administrative measures and actions taken by Israel, the occupying Power, which had altered or purported to alter the character and status of the Holy City of Jerusalem, including the expropriation of land and property situated thereon, and in particular the so-called "Basic Law" on Jerusalem and the proclamation of Jerusalem as the capital of Israel;
- (f) The right of all States in the region to existence within secure and internationally recognized boundaries, with justice and security for all the people, the *sine qua non* of which was the recognition and attainment of the legitimate, inalienable rights of the Palestinian people as stated in subparagraph (a) above.

49. The attainment and the exercise of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people remained fundamental to any solution. They recognized the rule of law in ensuring justice and security for both the Israelis and the Palestinians.

50. The International Conference on the Question of Palestine had considered it essential for an International Peace Conference on the Middle East to be convened with the aim of negotiating and finalizing a comprehensive, just and lasting solution of the Arab-Israeli conflict, including the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination. The Conference was to be convened under the auspices of the United Nations with the equal participation of all parties directly involved, including the PLO, as well as the United States, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and other States concerned.

51. The merit of this formula for participation in the Conference was that it did not exclude any of the parties to the conflict. Indeed, it protected the right of all concerned parties to be present at the settlement on equal terms. That was in direct contrast to Israel's insistence on settling the question outside the United Nations without the participation of the PLO, one of the interested parties. Moreover, the United States would have the opportunity of participating in every stage leading to the convening of the Conference and, therefore, could have no valid reason for objecting to the very idea of the Conference.

52. The Seminar was convinced of the vital and urgent need for the convening of the Conference as called for by resolution 38/58 C. The nature of the problem, the interests of the many parties concerned, and its global repercussions made it imperative that solutions should be sought through collective efforts under the auspices of the United Nations. Only at the Conference table could solutions be found that were acceptable to all and took into account the rights and interests of all parties concerned and not merely the narrow strategic interests of one party.

53. Such a Conference would make it extremely difficult for anyone to retain territory acquired by aggression and, at the same time, would provide the necessary guarantees for the accords concluded at the Conference.

54. The Seminar stressed that the PLO should be an equal participant in the Conference as the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people. It emphasized at the same time its view that the Palestinian problem could not be solved without the participation of the PLO.

55. The Seminar regarded as most important that participation in the Conference should be conducted in a constructive spirit and that all participants should be motivated by the political will to find a solution conducive to the establishment of peace in the Middle East.

56. The vital importance of the Conference was reflected in the fact that the majority of States had expressed their strong support for the holding of the Conference. That was also a reflection of the political will of the international community.

57. It was regrettable, therefore, that almost three years after the idea of the Conference had been put forward, positive steps towards the convening of the Conference had yet to be taken. The Seminar noted that the President of the Security Council, on 14 March 1986, in his reply to the Secretary-General of the United Nations regarding the results of consultations amongst members of the Security Council, had indicated that the majority of the members of the Security Council were of the view that the Conference should be held with the least possible delay. Others, however, had felt that conditions were not favourable at that juncture and considered that further consultations should take place.

58. The Seminar hoped that all those in support of the Conference, and that was the overwhelming majority of the international community, would unite to overcome the obstacles posed by the refusal of Israel and the United States to agree to participate in such a Conference. It was the refusal of these two States alone that obstructed progress towards the convening of the Conference.

59. The attention of the Seminar was drawn to the increasingly active participation of non-governmental organizations in furthering the objectives of the United Nations on the question of Palestine. Non-governmental organizations had, at the annual United Nations International Non-Governmental Organizations Meetings on the Question of Palestine, repeatedly expressed their strong support for the convening of the International Peace Conference on the Middle East under the auspices of the United Nations as specified in United Nations resolution 38/58 C and had declared their readiness to work towards the convening of that Conference.

60. The Seminar felt that in this International Year of Peace, it was most important that the international community should exert all its efforts in finding a just, comprehensive and lasting solution to a problem which had resisted solution for so long.

Panel II: "The role of the Palestine Liberation Organization"

61. It was customary to regard the Palestine Liberation Organization solely as a national liberation movement of the Palestinian people. In fact, its role went beyond the normal and recognized task of such a movement. The PLO was not fighting only for the recovery of the national political rights of the Palestinian people, but also for the reconstruction of a dispersed society, uprooted from its geographical framework and its historic environment as a result of the creation of the State of Israel and the wars that followed.

62. The political identity, the very existence of the Palestinian people, was denied. Since 1967, Israel had pursued a policy of judaization and annexation in the occupied territories, starting with Jerusalem and the Golan Heights, and establishing and reinforcing settlements on national and private land confiscated or expropriated. The other aspect of that policy was linking the economic infrastructure of the occupied territories with that of Israel. The purpose of that policy was to make it seem that Palestine was dead and could not be brought back to life. That was the heart of the whole Middle East problem.

63. The Palestinian people had refused to remain passive in their new situation, to be deprived of their right of self-determination. Having established their objective, they had found a weapon to achieve it - the PLO. But because of the special nature of the Palestinian problem, the tasks of the PLO had of necessity to go beyond the traditional concept of the liberation struggle.

64. The PLO was not only fighting against foreign occupation, but to rebuild a nation which was fighting for existence. To that end it had set up military and civil, social, cultural and economic institutions to meet the needs of the Palestinians as far as possible, and to form the infrastructure of the future Palestinian State it meant to create.

65. Towards the mid-1950s the Palestinians had recovered sufficiently from the shock of dispersion and occupation to begin the search for a solution to the problem resulting from the establishment of Israel on part of their territory and from the fact that the Palestinians were now a stateless nation. The just nature of the Palestinian struggle for national liberation entailed the creation of truly Palestinian parties and specifically Palestinian institutions.

66. The constitution of the Palestine Liberation Organization Movement (Fatah) had to be seen in that context and the Arab States decided at their summit in January 1964 to establish the PLO. The PLO functioned autonomously, although not independently of the Arab States, until 1967, the year of the second Arab-Israeli war. It was at that time that the bases of the present institutions of the PLO were laid in order to meet the social, political and military needs of the struggle for the political existence of the Palestinian people and for the liberation of Palestine.

67. The PLO passed through many trials from the Black September massacre of 1970 to the massacre of Sabra and Shatila in 1982, through the war it suffered in Lebanon in 1975/76, the siege of Beirut in 1982 and the bombardment of its headquarters in Tunis in 1985. In spite of those events, the PLO had asserted itself thanks to the strength it drew from the Palestinian people's allegiance to it and from other friendly peoples and States that supported the Palestinian cause and recognized the PLO as the sole, legitimate representative of the Palestinian people.

68. That support derived also from the work done by the PLO among the Palestinian people, in its name, and which was based on:

(a) Assertion and consolidation of the unity of the Palestinian people and of its national identity, engaging the entire people in the struggle for self-determination. In that area, the success of the PLO was indisputable, since it had made the Palestinian people a key element in the quest for a settlement to the Palestinian question, which thus became the heart of the Arab-Israeli conflict.

(b) Formation of a new generation of Palestinians with dignity and confidence in their potential, the capacity to contribute to the social, economic, political and intellectual advancement of their people, the ability to ensure better defence of its interest and its cause, by ensuring that the young generation was given the opportunity of vocational education, or by obtaining or allocating school and university scholarship.

(c) The many forms of assistance to be provided to the Palestinian people in the occupied territories in order to help them to remain there and resist Israeli occupation and expansionism more effectively.

(d) The establishment of political, economic and cultural links throughout the world, particularly with States supporting the struggle of the Palestinian people. It was with those States, and particularly the African ones, that the PLO had concluded economic and technical co-operation agreements based on mutual interest and reciprocal solidarity. The PLO economic institution - SAMED - existed in some 10 African countries for that purpose. The function of SAMED, however, was not only one of training and production. It was also to make Palestinian economic and trade staff into ambassadors of their people and of their revolution to friendly countries who required them. The Palestinian people did not possess the material or financial resources to assist them but relied for that purpose on their base capital - their grey matter and experience.

69. The official visits paid by Mr. Yasser Arafat, Chairman of the PLO Executive Committee, to some 15 African States during the past three months were evidence of the importance the PLO attached to friendship and solidarity between the African peoples and the Arab peoples in general and the Palestinian people in particular. The PLO supported the convening of a second Afro-Arab summit meeting (the first such meeting had taken place in Cairo in 1977) in order to develop political and economic relations between Arab and African States and harmonize their policies with a view to effective co-operation in the struggle against under-development and against Zionist expansionism in Palestine and apartheid in South Africa.

70. The African countries had shown their solidarity towards the Arab world and the central cause of the Palestinian question by breaking off diplomatic relations with Israel - some of them in 1967 and others in 1973. It was in 1973 that Arab-African relations assumed a new dimension and were extended to the economic field. The OAU Council of Ministers had decided to establish a Committee to explore the possibilities of economic co-operation with the Arab countries. The PLO role was to act within the Arab economic and financial institutions of which it was a full member to consolidate that co-operation.

Panel III: "Africa and the question of Palestine:

- i. African public opinion
- ii. Relation between Israel and South Africa"

71. During the discussion on that subject it was stated that the development of informed public opinion on any issue or set of issues was rarely an easy or automatic process. It was indisputably, however, a necessary task in the context of the question of Palestine where the rights of a people were being infringed. It was also difficult to discuss African public opinion in general as a region. However, it was noted that public opinion was an important and fundamental element which could contribute to, and be utilized in the search for peace in the Middle East based on a just solution of the problem of Palestine. This element, therefore, had to be mobilized to inject the voice of reason into world affairs and had to be enhanced by a deeper understanding and awareness of all the aspects of the problem of Palestine.

72. The plight of the Palestinian people was one that was viewed with profound sympathy by the peoples and Governments of Africa. There had been support for the struggle of the Palestinian people from the earliest stages of the independence of Africa's countries themselves, and special attention had always been paid to the question of Palestine in the framework of the Organization of African Unity. A deep interest and active involvement in the search for a just, comprehensive and lasting solution to that problem represented the natural and understandable response of the African peoples who themselves had experienced colonial domination, oppression and exploitation. Therefore, African support for the Palestinian cause was the sympathetic identification of a common struggle against imperialism, colonialism and racism. It was also felt that greater solidarity should be exercised by the African and Arab people in their common cause.

73. African public opinion held the view that a lasting and abiding peace in the Middle East could only come through the recognition of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people to self-determination and the right to their own independent State under the leadership of the PLO. Self-determination was a principle very dear to the African continent, a continent still saddled with wars of liberation from foreign occupation and domination.

74. African States noted a close similarity between the situation in the Middle East and southern Africa. Both South Africa and Israel had racist régimes with aggressive policies which caused not only human suffering, but also threatened the sovereignty and stability of African and Arab States. Those racist régimes remained intransigent as ever, pursuing the inhuman policies of apartheid and zionism, respectively, in spite of repeated condemnation by the international community. The Israeli and South African aggressive policies were not confined to their own territories, but extended beyond their borders to neighbouring countries where frequent raids were mounted resulting in serious loss of lives and property. Such daring violations of the sovereignty of those States were in contradiction to the aims and objectives of the Charter of the United Nations. That attitude had been particularly frustrating to many African States genuinely committed to change the status quo in South Africa. It emphasized that the liberation of the people in Namibia and South Africa and the of the people of Palestine were part of the same struggle. The Seminar expressed its solidarity with the struggle of the people of Palestine, a solidarity that was particularly strong due to the history of the decolonization process on the African continent and the role that the independence movement had played, and continued to play, in achieving self-determination and national independence.

75. The international system of information, generally dominated by Western Powers, played an important role in the attitudes of groups and individuals. The mass media emphasized divisions among the Palestinians, Arab internal conflicts, "Arab terrorism", and reported less frequently what was happening inside the occupied Arab territories, the daily repression by the occupying Power against the Palestinian people as well as the mischievous consequences of the policy of settlements' implementation.

76. Public opinion in Africa needed a clearer depiction of the Palestinian question in order to have a positive attitude and to support the struggle of the Palestinian people, which was close to that of their brethren in Namibia and South Africa. In Africa there were more urgent problems, immediate ones, those of hunger, of development. One fact had to be underlined: very few countries in Africa had renewed their diplomatic relations with Israel. Those relations were cut by all the members of OAU after the 1967 war, showing that even if they were not well informed of the detailed situation, they didn't approve of the Zionist's disregard of United Nations resolutions and the continuation of military occupation of Arab land. Those despicable methods were the same as those of South Africa.

77. Solidarity between all the human rights supporters was necessary to stop all forms of racial discrimination, to destroy the apartheid concept, to bring about the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), granting independence to Namibia, and United Nations resolutions concerning the Middle East and the Palestinian question. World peace was threatened by Israel's attitude and that of South Africa. Both those Governments followed a policy of racial discrimination and ignored United Nations resolutions. Furthermore, they had established channels of co-operation among themselves, thus reinforcing régimes detrimental to their African and Arab populations.

78. The most dangerous field of activities in which both racist régimes seemed to have close consultations and even co-operation was the field of nuclear weapons. Wide presumptions, supported by political statements and press reports, led one to believe that they had launched a well-studied programme of mutual assistance in the field of nuclear research, with the knowledge and the co-operation of some big Powers. Generally, such endeavours were conducted with secrecy and the truth was very difficult to establish. One could try only to understand the motivations of such behaviour. The danger was that such weapons could be used either against Africa or an Arab country by those racist régimes, for the implementation of their discriminatory policy.

79. To counter the challenge posed by the increasing collaboration between the racist régimes of South Africa and Israel in political, economic, military, nuclear and other fields, it was necessary to step up co-operation and strengthen solidarity, both on regional and international levels.

80. The point was also made that particular attention should henceforth be directed towards countries still not sufficiently supportive of the just cause of the Palestinian people, so as to correct the misperception and distortion on the question of Palestine and concerning the PLO conveyed by Israel and its supporters. In the contemporary world, it was highly anomalous that the Palestinian people should be denied the exercise of their inalienable right to self-determination enjoyed by other peoples. The fault for that situation lay squarely on Israel.

81. It was important that the public media should play a more responsive role in providing a more balanced reporting on the Middle East and, in particular, on the plight of the Palestinians as a dispossessed and harassed people. Institutions such as universities, colleges, research institutes, churches and other religious establishments as well as national and international non-governmental organizations had a crucial role to play in the formation of public opinion. Those institutions had to be urged to give wider coverage and more balanced treatment to the question of Palestine.

82. Symposia organized by the United Nations or other organizations were a pressing necessity for the African non-governmental organizations. Through those means, the churches, labour unions, women's groups and other non-governmental organizations could be sensitized. Special consideration had also to be given to wider observance of the International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian People, which had been established by United Nations General Assembly resolution 34/65 D to be 29 November each year, and the occasion had to be taken to give maximum coverage to the question of Palestine.

83. Every effort had to be made to step up the widespread dissemination of information, as one of the major contributions to the achievement of a just solution of the problem of Palestine on the basis of the attainment of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people in Palestine. The Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People and the United Nations Division for Palestinian Rights had an important role in such dissemination of information. Furthermore, the United Nations Department of Public Information was requested to make every effort to ensure that accurate information on the question of Palestine received the widest possible dissemination.

Panel IV: "The United Nations and the question of Palestine"

84. The question of Palestine remained close to the hearts of the people of Africa because of the similarity that the struggle of the Palestinian people bore to the struggle of the people of Africa. Apartheid, Namibia and Palestine were questions that had appeared on the United Nations agenda almost since its inception. The international community had assumed a sacred trust for Namibia and Palestine more than 60 years ago under

the mandate of the League of Nations and those questions had been closely linked with the activities of the international organization.

85. While still in its infancy, the United Nations had, on 29 November 1947, adopted resolution 181 (II) which approved the plan for the partition of Palestine. The plan had provided for the creation of an Arab and a Jewish State, but so far only the Jewish State had come into being. That State, Israel, had become a Member of the United Nations in 1949 on conditions of its compliance with the terms of resolution 181 (II) which had recognized the right of the Palestinian people to their own State, and resolution 194 (III) adopted in 1949 which had recognized the right of return of Palestinian refugees. However, as it was well-known, Israel had completely disregarded the assurances which it had given, contributing thereby to the question of Palestine. With the adoption of resolution 181 (II), the question of Palestine had become inextricably a responsibility of the United Nations.

86. However, the fact that the evolution of the question of Palestine was intertwined with that of the United Nations was no mere reflection of historical coincidence. It was rather a reflection of the reality that the issues which lay behind the tragedy of the Palestinian people went to the very heart of principles upon which the United Nations was founded - namely, respect for the dignity of peoples and the sovereignty of States and the pursuit of peaceful intercourse among nations and peoples.

87. The right of the Palestinian people to self-determination and the sovereignty of the Palestinian people over Palestine had been repeatedly and unequivocally recognized in resolutions adopted by the United Nations.

88. The evolution in status of the Palestine issue and of Palestinian representation in the United Nations took a significant step forward in 1974 when the question of Palestine was included as a separate item on the General Assembly's agenda for the first time since 1952. In that same year, the PLO was invited to participate in the Assembly's proceedings on the question of Palestine as the representative of the Palestinian people.

89. As important was the Assembly's reaffirmation of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people in Palestine, including: (a) the right to self-determination without external interference; (b) the right to national independence and sovereignty and (c) the inalienable right of the Palestinians to return to their homes.

90. Lack of progress in implementing the exercise of those rights had resulted in the General Assembly establishing the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People in 1975. That action underscored the fact that the question of Palestine lay at the core of the Middle East conflict and that a solution had to be found which ensured the implementation of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people. International recognition of, and significant priority to, the Palestinian cause became manifest in the following years by the resolutions adopted by the different organs of the United Nations.

91. The recommendations of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People themselves had been repeatedly approved by the General Assembly since 1976; however, the opposition of a permanent member of the Security Council had prevented the Council from taking action on them.

92. The Committee, however, had continued to be active in pursuing implementation of its recommendations and had initiated much of the action taken by the General Assembly on the question of Palestine. Indeed, as a consequence of its initiative, the International Conference on the Question of Palestine was held in Geneva in 1983.

93. Since then, the International Peace Conference on the Middle East called for by General Assembly resolution 38/58 C had become the focal point of the work of the Committee since it believed that the Conference would mark a significant step towards the achievement of a solution of a problem that was long overdue.

94. The political solution of the question of Palestine remained the primary responsibility of the United Nations in spite of all the difficulties involved. The Seminar agreed that the United Nations had a crucial role to play in the search for a negotiated peace in the Middle East which would ensure justice for all people in the region; lack of progress hitherto did nothing to diminish its obligation to continue to press toward with its attempts for a solution.

95. The Seminar recognized that unlike the case of Namibia, for example, that of Palestine was not one where the United Nations was playing a role supportive of the safeguard efforts of the liberation movement on the ground. Because of the particular character of the question of Palestine it was in the United Nations more than elsewhere that progress was being recorded.

96. The Seminar considered that since 1974, thanks to the efforts of the United Nations, with the full and unequivocal support of the PLO, there had been a gradual but marked evolution in the question of Palestine, to the point where the international community was now sensitized, as never before, to the facts of the Palestinian situation and the need for early action to ensure the enjoyment by the Palestinian people of their inalienable rights, in particular their right to their own independent State. Also the PLO had become the interpreter, as far as the Organization was concerned, of the wish of the Palestinian people.

97. United Nations efforts had reached an impasse over the question of the holding of an International Peace Conference on the Middle East with the refusal by the United States and Israel to support that initiative. The Seminar made a fresh assessment of the difficult situation facing the United Nations in the attitude of those two States, but resolved that the response of the Organization should not be one of despair. It determined that the Committee, as well as non-governmental organizations, should intensify their efforts to inform public opinion throughout the world, but more particularly in the United States, of the facts of the Palestinian situation with a view to exerting increased pressure for change in that country's attitude towards the question of Palestine.

III. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

98. Despite intensive efforts by the United Nations, hitherto the search for a peaceful settlement of the Middle East conflict remained elusive and the situation in the region continued to be unstable. Recent events in the Middle East highlighted the increasing urgency of solving that most complex problem. Delay only prolonged the plight of the Palestinian people and encouraged acts of violence. Ever present was the threat of renewed conflagration which could cause further suffering and create additional obstacles to peace. That had a profound influence on the stability of that region and consequently posed a threat to international peace and security.

99. The Seminar, concerned over the dangerous situation in the Middle East, was profoundly convinced that the vital interests of the peoples of that region, as well as interests of international security as a whole, urgently dictated the need for the speediest attainment of a comprehensive, just and lasting settlement of the Middle East conflict.

100. While strenuous attempts had been made to find a solution, the situation in the region was further complicated by Israel's actions in the occupied territories. The situation relating to the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people continued to deteriorate. Israeli policies of illegally maintaining Jewish settlements and confiscating Arab-owned lands in the occupied Palestinian territories continued. They were accompanied by measures designed to stifle all forms of political, cultural, social and economic expression of the Palestinian people. Actions to strengthen control over most aspects of life, with the objective of obstructing the self-generating development of the occupied territories and to turn them into a dependent entity aiming at its final absorption and annexation, continued. Those policies were in direct contravention of the Charter of the United Nations, international treaties and conventions, the basic principles of international law and the various resolutions of the United Nations relating to different aspects of the question of Palestine, and led only to the exacerbation of tension in the area, further hindering endeavours toward a peaceful solution.
101. The denial of the exercise of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people remained the core of the conflict in the Middle East and no comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the region could be achieved without the full exercise of those rights, including the right to self-determination and to create its own independent State, and without the complete withdrawal of Israel from Palestinian and other Arab territories occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem. The settlement of that problem remained a continuous responsibility of the United Nations.
102. Those States Members of the United Nations who did not support the attainment by the Palestinian people of its inalienable rights should reconsider their position towards the solution to the problem. The way to establish a just and lasting peace in the Middle East was by convening the International Peace Conference on the Middle East under the auspices of the United Nations and with the participation of all parties to the Arab-Israeli conflict, including the PLO, the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, as well as the United States, the USSR and other concerned States, in accordance with the guidelines laid down by General Assembly resolution 38/58 C. In that connection, the United States and Israel should reconsider their negative position and agree to the convening of the Conference.
103. In the International Year of Peace proclaimed by the United Nations, it was in the interests of international peace and security that all States endeavoured to persuade the United States and Israel to reconsider their current positions towards the convening of the Conference, so that it could be held without any further delay.
104. The Seminar appealed to the members of the Security Council, and in particular to its permanent members, in exercising their responsibilities for the maintenance of international peace and security, to make every effort to achieve the convening of the International Peace Conference on the Middle East without further delay.
105. The Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People had an important role to play in promoting the convening of the Conference. The intensification of efforts to fulfil its mandate and to implement its recommendations as well as political and diplomatic endeavours to reach a comprehensive, just and durable settlement of the conflict in the Middle East were essential.
106. Strong bonds existed between the African States and peoples and the people of Palestine in its struggle to secure the implementation of its inalienable national rights and the creation of a State of its own in Palestine. The position of Africa as manifested in the declarations and resolutions of the Organization of African Unity was one of solidarity with the Palestinian people's struggle and one of support for a comprehensive, lasting and just settlement of the question of Palestine on the basis of the resolutions of the United Nations. The plight of the Palestinian people was one that was viewed with profound sympathy by the peoples and Governments of Africa. A deep interest and active involvement in the search for a just, comprehensive and lasting solution to the problem of Palestine through all means represented the natural and understandable response of Africans who themselves had experienced colonial domination. On the other hand, the Palestinian people who were struggling against Israeli occupation and annexation and for the exercise of their inalienable rights in Palestine were fully aware of the struggle waged by the peoples of Namibia and South Africa against the twin of the racist régime in Palestine, the apartheid régime in South Africa.
107. The most distressing manifestations of the continuation of that abhorrent policy of colonial domination were the practice of apartheid in South Africa and Namibia and the oppressive and racist policies of Israel in the occupied Palestinian Arab territories. Both the question of Palestine and of apartheid were of the gravest concern to the international community. Both problems emanated from the denial of the right of self-determination to the peoples concerned. Israel in the Middle East and the Pretoria régime in southern Africa practised policies of destabilization of the neighbouring States. The international community was more and more getting prepared to undertake drastic measures to eradicate the inhuman system of apartheid. In the current critical situation, it was of paramount importance to stop the continuing trend of increasing collaboration between Israel and South Africa. The Palestinian people and South African blacks suffered from that collaboration, which served as one of the sources of power of the apartheid régime in Pretoria and helped Tel Aviv to strengthen its hold on the occupied Arab territories. The Seminar urged the international community to exert all influence at its disposal to make Israel and South Africa desist from such collaboration. To counteract that collaboration Afro-Arab Solidarity at all levels should be promoted and strengthened.
108. It was important that the media play a more responsive role in providing a more balanced reporting on the Middle East and, in particular, on the plight of the Palestinians in and outside the occupied territories as a dispossessed and harassed people. Institutions such as universities, colleges, research institutes, churches and other religious establishments, as well as national and international non-governmental organizations, had a crucial role to play in the formation of public opinion. Those institutions should be urged to give wider coverage and more balanced treatment to the question of Palestine.
109. The PLO, as well as all Arab States, should increase and intensify their efforts to sensitize public opinion everywhere, and particularly in those regions where there was currently little understanding or awareness of the plight of the Palestinian people. The Palestinian case should be presented by varied means of public information in simple terms so as to ensure more widespread comprehension of the realities of the situation.
110. Every effort should be made to step up the widespread dissemination of information, as one of the major contributions to the achievement of a just solution to the problem of Palestine on the basis of the attainment by the Palestinian people in Palestine of their inalienable rights. The Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People and the Division for Palestinian Rights of the United Nations Secretariat had an important role in such dissemination of information. Furthermore, the United Nations Department of Public Information should make every effort to ensure that accurate information on the question of Palestine received the widest possible dissemination.

MESSAGE FROM THE PARTICIPANTS IN THE SEMINAR TO THE CHAIRMAN OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE PALESTINE LIBERATION ORGANIZATION

The Fifteenth United Nations Seminar on the Question of Palestine being held from 18 to 22 August 1986 at the United Nations Office in Nairobi acknowledges with deep appreciation your message addressed to the Seminar. We are gathered here, in the capital of friendly Kenya, whose people and Government have consistently supported the Palestinian cause, to consider how best a comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the Middle East can be established through a solution to the question of Palestine, the core of the Arab-Israeli conflict. To achieve this, it is imperative that the Palestinian people exercise its inalienable rights, including its right to return, to self-determination and to establish a State of its own in Palestine. The convening of the International Peace Conference on the Middle East as called for by the United Nations in its General Assembly resolution 38/58 C is a necessary step for a solution to this problem and would contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security.

We convey to you and to the Palestinian people under the leadership of the Palestine Liberation Organization, its sole and legitimate representative, our greetings of support and solidarity in your just struggle for the recognition, attainment and exercise of your inalienable rights in Palestine.

Annex II

MOTION OF THANKS

The Fifteenth United Nations Seminar on the Question of Palestine being held from 18 to 22 August 1986 at the United Nations Office in Nairobi wishes to convey its sincere thanks to the people and Government of the Republic of Kenya for hosting the Seminar. The Seminar wishes to express its appreciation to the Honourable Mr. E. Mweu, Assistant Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Kenya, for his personal concern and contribution to the Seminar. The Seminar also expresses its appreciation to the people and Government of the Republic of Kenya for their support of the struggle of the Palestinian people under the leadership of the Palestine Liberation Organization, its sole legitimate representative, for the exercise of its inalienable rights in Palestine.

Annex III

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS AND OBSERVERS

Delegation of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People

Mr. Massamba SARRE
Permanent Representative of Senegal to the United Nations, Chairman of the Committee

Mr. Noel G. SINCLAIR
Permanent Representative of Guyana to the United Nations

Mr. Gerhard RICHTER
Counsellor, Permanent Mission of the German Democratic Republic to the United Nations

Mr. Zehdi L. TERZI
Permanent Observer of the Palestine Liberation Organization to the United Nations

Panelists

Dr. Richard M. ANDRIAMANJATO (Madagascar)
Mr. R. E. BARLEY (Sierra Leone)
Mr. Bukar BUKARAMBE (Nigeria)
Mr. Amadou DEME (Senegal)
Mr. Emmanuel DOUMA (Congo)
H.E. Mr. Rachid DRISS (Tunisia)
Dr. Ameen HASEERA (Palestinian)
Mr. Patrick HAYFORD (Ghana)
H.E. Mr. El-Bakaye KOUNTA (Mali)
Dr. Ahmed OSMAN (Egypt)
Dr. Ahmed Mohamed RIFAAT (Egypt)
Mr. El Hadji Ousmane SARR (Senegal)
H.E. Mr. Noel G. SINCLAIR (Guyana)

Member States

Algeria

H.E. Mr. Mostefa Bouakaz, Ambassador, Nairobi
Mr. Belkacem Madani, Minister-Counsellor, Embassy, Nairobi

Brazil
Mr. Jayro Coelho, Head, Middle East Division I, Ministry of External Relations

Burundi
Mrs. Beatrice Ntahondi, First Secretary Embassy, Nairobi

Cyprus
Mr. Costas Papademas, High Commission, Nairobi

Czechoslovakia
Mr. Frantisek Hudak, Attaché, Embassy, Nairobi

Democratic Yemen
Mr. Ali Atef, Embassy, Nairobi

Egypt
H.E. Mr. Ahmed Abdelfattah Haggag, Ambassador, Nairobi
Ms. Fatma Bahgat, Press Officer, Embassy, Nairobi

Ethiopia
Mr. Debebe Hailu, Counsellor, Embassy, Nairobi

India
Mr. S.R. Channan, High Commission, Nairobi

Iran, Islamic Republic of
Mr. Mohammed Sharif Mahdavi, Embassy, Nairobi

Iraq
Mr. Sabah Al-Zhairi, Embassy, Nairobi

Kenya
Hon. Mr. E. M. Mweu, Assistant Minister for Foreign Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Nairobi

Kuwait
Mr. Sulaiman Al-Rashdan, Chargé d'affaires a.i., Embassy, Nairobi

Morocco
H.E. Mr. Jamal Eddine Ghazi, Ambassador, Nairobi
Mr. Ahmed Benriane, Second Secretary, Embassy, Nairobi

Nigeria
Mr. Mu'azu U. Mohammed, Counsellor, Permanent Mission, New York
Mr. M. G. Omotosho, Second Secretary, High Commission, Nairobi

Philippines
Mr. Zoilo M. Alberto, Chargé d'affaires a.i., Embassy, Nairobi

Poland
Mr. K. Kurowski, Counsellor, Embassy, Nairobi

Saudi Arabia
H.E. Ambassador Gaafar M. Allagany, Head, International Organizations Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Mr. J. Aqueel, Embassy, Nairobi
Mr. A. Al-Jahdali, Embassy, Nairobi

Mr. I. Zain Al-Abedeen, Embassy, Nairobi

Somalia

Mr. Ibrahim Warsame, Embassy, Nairobi

Mr. Abdurahman Dini, Embassy, Nairobi

Sri Lanka

Mr. Balachandra Alagaratnam, Second Secretary, High Commission, Nairobi

Sudan

Mr. Ali Yousif Ahmed, Counsellor Embassy, Nairobi

Mr. Ahmed Gaafar Al-Karim, Embassy, Nairobi

Thailand

Mr. Kamjit Onruang, Counsellor, Embassy, Nairobi

Mr. Sukho Piromnan, First Secretary, Embassy, Nairobi

Mr. Ittipom Boonprarong, Third Secretary, Embassy, Nairobi

Uganda

Mr. Jesse Mutenga, High Commission, Nairobi

Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic

Mr. Yuri G. Zybanov, Secretary-General, Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics

Mr. Oleg Oserov, Ministry of Foreign Affairs

United Arab Emirates

Mr. Ahmad Nassar Al-Khaja Second Secretary, Embassy, Mogadiscio

United Republic of Tanzania

Mr. Maki B. Luhanga, High Commission, Nairobi

Yugoslavia

Mr. Ilija Popovic, Counsellor, Embassy, Nairobi

Zaire

Mr. Kalombo Tshibadi, Embassy, Nairobi

Zambia

Mr. Harry K. Mutumba, High Commission, Nairobi

Zimbabwe

Mr. Thomas Matutu, High Commission, Nairobi

Member States represented by observers

Argentina

Mr. Manuel A. Fernandez, Second Secretary, Embassy, Nairobi

Chile

Mr. Pedro Oyarce, Chargé d'affaires, Embassy, Nairobi

Mr. Hector Faundez, Embassy, Nairobi

Colombia

H.E. Mr. Miguel Angel Rengifo, Ambassador, Nairobi

Mr. Gabriel Gonzalez, Second Secretary, Embassy, Nairobi

Greece

H.E. Mr. Alexandre Afenduli, Ambassador, Nairobi

Mr. Photi Yannopoulos, Embassy, Nairobi

Mexico
Mr. Hector Raul Acosta, Embassy, Nairobi

Spain
H.E. Mr. Mariano Baselga Mantecon, Ambassador, Nairobi

Venezuela
Mr. Oscar A. Aguilar-Pardo, First Secretary, Embassy, Nairobi

Non-member States represented by observers

Republic of Korea
H.E. Mr. Dong-Jin Choi, Ambassador, Nairobi
Mr. Tae-Sook Park, Counsellor, Embassy, Nairobi

United Nations organs

United Nations Council for Namibia
H.E. Mr. Noel G. Sinclair (Guyana)
United Nations Special Committee against Apartheid
Mr. Abdelmahmoud Mohamed (Sudan)

United Nations programmes and specialized agencies

United Nations Center for Human Settlements
United Nations Environment Programme
United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations

Intergovernmental organizations

League of Arab States
H.E. Mr. Mahmoud Shareef Mahmoud, Director, Nairobi
Mr. M. Khogaly, Office, Nairobi
Mr. S. Hamdoun, Office, Nairobi
Mr. E. Kenyi, Office, Nairobi

Organization of African Unity
Mr. Abdillahi Ali Dualeh, Chief, General Political Affairs Section

Organization of the Islamic Conference
Mr. Nabil Maarouf, Director, Palestine and Jerusalem Department

National liberation movements

Palestine Liberation Organization
H.E. Dr. K. Abdul Rahman, Ambassador, Nairobi
Mr. Sofian Al-Khaldi, Embassy, Nairobi

—