



DIVISION FOR  
PALESTINIAN RIGHTS

TWENTY-SECOND UNITED NATIONS SEMINAR  
ON THE QUESTION OF PALESTINE  
(SIXTH NORTH AMERICAN REGIONAL SEMINAR)

Theme: "The inalienable rights of the Palestinian people"

United Nations Headquarters, New York  
19-20 June 1989



CONTENTS

	<u>Paragraphs</u>	<u>Page</u>
INTRODUCTION .....	1- 3	2
I. OPENING STATEMENTS .....	4-15	2
II. PANEL DISCUSSION .....	16-49	5
III. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....	50-67	15

Annexes

I. Resolution adopted by the Seminar participants on 19 June 1989 .....		21
II. Message from the participants in the Seminar to H.E. Mr. Yasser Arafat .....		22
III. List of participants and observers .....		23

## INTRODUCTION

1. The Twenty-Second United Nations Seminar on the Question of Palestine (Sixth North American Regional Seminar), entitled "The inalienable rights of the Palestinian People", was held at United Nations Headquarters, New York, on 19 and 20 June 1989, in accordance with the terms of General Assembly resolution 42/66 B of 2 December 1987.
2. Mrs. Absa Claude Diallo (Senegal), Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, was Chairman; Mr. Alexander Borg Olivier (Malta), Rapporteur of the Committee, was Vice-Chairman; and Mr. Tom Obaleh Kargbo (Sierra Leone) was Rapporteur of the Seminar.
3. Four meetings were held and 12 panelists presented papers on selected aspects of the question of Palestine. In addition, representatives of 57 Governments, Palestine, two non-member States, three United Nations organs, six United Nations specialized agencies and bodies, three intergovernmental organizations, as well as two national liberation movements attended the Seminar (see annex III).

### I. OPENING STATEMENTS

#### Message of the Secretary-General of the United Nations

4. At the opening meeting, a message of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Mr. Javier Pérez de Cuéllar, was read out by his Representative, Mr. Naseem Mirza, Chief, Division for Palestinian Rights. The message noted that the Seminar was taking place at a time of heightened tension in the region, particularly in the occupied Palestinian territory. The continued deterioration of the situation underscored the need for an urgent effort by the international community, led by the Security Council, to promote an effective negotiating process based on Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) and taking fully into account the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people, including self-determination.
5. The message stressed that the presence of diplomats, scholars and experts in the Seminar confirmed the concern of the international community regarding the question of Palestine and its determination to assist in promoting a comprehensive, just and lasting settlement to this serious problem. The invaluable activities of eminent personalities could play a very important part by making the situation better known and by mobilizing public opinion everywhere in support of the rights of the Palestinian people, thereby helping to bring about a peaceful solution to the long-standing conflict.
6. The message said that the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, since its inception in 1975, had been engaged in tireless efforts aimed at securing for the Palestinian people the

exercise of its inalienable rights. The Committee had undertaken a number of important and useful activities in the fulfillment of its mandate. Activities of the Committee, including regional seminars, symposia and international meetings for NGOs, publications, studies and the annual commemoration of the International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian People had contributed to increase international awareness in all parts of the world of the rightfulness of the Palestinian cause.

#### Statement of the Chairman of the Seminar

7. Mrs. Absa Claude Diallo, Chairman of the Seminar, pointed out that the purpose of the regional seminars was to mobilize public opinion for Palestinian rights and to promote the priority objective of convening the International Peace Conference on the Middle East. International calls for a just solution of the Palestine question had not been heeded. The Committee had organized international seminars, symposia and other events on different aspects of the problem, including journalists' roundtables.

8. The peace initiative by the Palestine National Council and the proclamation of the State of Palestine had imparted new momentum to the peace process. The Committee had appealed to those countries opposed to the convening of the Conference to reconsider their positions. Objections by one of the permanent members of the Security Council had prevented the convening of the International Peace Conference. Meanwhile, the situation in the occupied Palestinian territory continued to deteriorate as the Israeli authorities intensified their repression against the Palestinian people. They had killed and wounded large numbers of Palestinians, including many children, had desecrated holy places, destroyed houses of Palestinians, detained Palestinians without trial and had committed other atrocities and outrages. The Palestinian population must be protected from such acts. The Security Council had been rendered unable to ensure such protection. Without urgent action, the situation would continue to deteriorate.

#### Message from the Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Palestine Liberation Organization

9. A message from Mr. Yasser Arafat, Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), was read by Mr. Zuhdi L. Terzi, Permanent Observer for Palestine to the United Nations. In the message, it was emphasized that the Seminar coincided with the beginning of the nineteenth month of the Palestinian uprising, the intifadah, which was more firm and resolute than ever. By means of this uprising, the Palestinian people affirmed its determination to defend its territory and national and human dignity.

10. Since the beginning of the occupation, the Israeli authorities had proved unable to subdue the uprising by means of military force. The authorities were trying to achieve that same end by means of suspect political proposals

and plans, the latest calling for the holding of elections for the Palestinian population of the occupied territories. The intention of this and other plans was to circumvent the great achievements won by the intifadah, to subdue the uprising and to deceive international public opinion by appearing to take an initiative towards securing peace in the region. The Palestinian people had announced its categorical rejection of this plan. At the same time, it had declared its strong adherence to and respect for the concept of elections as a democratic process, provided that such elections were held subsequent to the withdrawal of Israeli forces from the occupied Palestinian territory, and under international supervision, as part of a comprehensive peace process, so that the Palestinian people might exercise self-determination in complete freedom and without any outside intervention.

11. The Palestinian peace initiative was based on the convening of the International Peace Conference on the Middle East. There could be no doubt that just peace could not be brought about unless the Palestinian people was permitted to recover and to exercise its inalienable national rights, including the right to return and the right to self-determination and the establishment of its own independent state with Jerusalem as its capital.

12. The Palestinian peace plan was consistent with international law and with the international position concerning the convening of the International Peace Conference. It was astounding that the United States should side with Israel in raising obstacles to the efforts undertaken by the Secretary-General of the United Nations, and by the Security Council to ensure the convening of the Conference. The PLO confirmed that it welcomed the current dialogue with the United States Administration and urged it to develop and enhance that dialogue in the interests of making progress towards the achievement of a just peace in the region. The United States, as a major Power, bore particular responsibilities for the maintenance of international peace and security in the world. By constantly rejecting the International Peace Conference on the Middle East and placing various obstacles in the way of international efforts, it was helping to prolong the suffering of the Palestinian people under Israeli occupation and also to prolong the conflict in the region, thus threatening international peace and security in the world and the stability of the region.

#### Other statements

13. At the opening meeting, Mr. Tesfaye Tadesse, 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, Mr. Guennadi Oudovenko, Acting Chairman of the Special Committee against Apartheid, Mr. Daya Perera, Chairman of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories, Mr. Ahmet Egin Ansay, Permanent Observer for the Organization of the Islamic Conference and Mr. Tebogo Mafole, Chief Representative of the African National Congress of South Africa, also made statements in support of the exercise by the Palestinian people of its inalienable rights and for the achievement of a just, comprehensive and lasting settlement of the question of Palestine.

Resolution adopted by the Seminar

14. The Seminar unanimously adopted a resolution (annex I) requesting the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council to join in an immediate communication to Israel, requesting that it should rescind the recent order for the deportation of Palestinians.

Message sent by the Seminar

15. The Seminar adopted a message to Mr. Yasser Arafat, Chairman of the Executive Committee of the PLO (annex II).

II. PANEL DISCUSSION

16. Two panels were established. The panels and their panelists were as follows:

(I) Panel I: (a) "The urgency of convening the International Peace Conference on the Middle East; (b) the intifadah in the occupied Palestinian territory and its impact on the achievement of a comprehensive settlement of the Middle East conflict":

Mr. Mordechai Bar-On (Israel), Rev. Elias Chacour (Palestinian), H.E. Mr. Rafael Estrella (Spain), Mr. James Graff (Canada), Ms. Zahira Kamal (Palestinian), Mr. Latyr Kamara (Senegal), Mr. Paul McCloskey (United States of America), Ms. Margaret McCormack (United States of America), Mr. Jack O'Dell (United States of America), Mr. V.P. Vorobyov (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), Mr. James Zogby (United States of America);

(II) Panel II: "The role of the Palestine Liberation Organization in the social, cultural, economic and political development of the Palestinian people":

Mr. Mohammad Abu Kosh (Palestinian).

*Panel I*

(a) The urgency of convening the International Peace Conference on the Middle East; (b) The intifadah in the occupied Palestinian territory and its impact on the achievement of a comprehensive settlement of the Middle East conflict

17. Mr. Mordechai Bar-On, former member of the Israeli Knesset and Research Fellow of the Ben Gurion Center, gave an analysis of the current situation in Israel. He expressed the view that the intifadah had evolved into a new

routine for both the Palestinians and the Israelis. The economic loss caused by the partial Palestinian boycott had not been insignificant, but quite marginal with respect to the economy at large. Tourism and the construction industry suffered most. The international scene had changed irrevocably.

18. Mr. Bar-On turned to the situation in the Israeli Army, describing the moral and disciplinary problems which many soldiers, and especially commanders, confronted when they were sent to suppress the intifadah. To handle the situation, special educational material had been prepared. He noted that a growing gulf between the high command and the soldiers and low-ranking officers had been created. He pointed out that the confusion and contradictions stemmed from a total misconception of what the intifadah was basically about and what the limits of power were in coping with it. The Israelis must acknowledge a genuine popular uprising, a genuine national struggle, which according to all historical precedents cannot be suppressed.

19. He stressed that the individual Israeli was not exposed to the horrors of the occupation, unless he served as a soldier in the territories or was a settler. The number of people who advocated "annexation" had declined significantly during the months of the intifadah.

Mr. Bar-On expressed the view that public opinion in Israel had lost much of its importance. The most significant developments occurred now primarily in the ranks of the political élite. Any changes resulted rather indirectly - via the impact of the intifadah on the world scene - on the policy of the PLO and of King Hussein and eventually on the attitude of the American Administration. During his trip to Washington, Mr. Shamir was obliged to commit himself to an interim arrangement which would include elections and some form of self-rule for the Palestinians. These commitments explicitly excluded any negotiations with the PLO or any form of Palestinian statehood. He stressed that his initiative was a far cry from a magnanimous offer of conciliation.

20. Mr. Bar-On turned to new trends in the Israeli peace movement, indicating that from the outset of the intifadah, Peace Now and the other peace groups had maintained an ongoing momentum of activities. Several monitoring institutions were created, "friendly visits" of Israelis to hospitable villages in the occupied territory were organized and new opportunities for an open dialogue between the hostile sides were provided. He concluded by saying that the great progress made by the PLO in the last few months might, therefore, encourage those working in support of the Israeli peace movement.

21. Rev. Elias Chacour, a Christian Palestinian, doctor in Theology and Melkite priest living in Galilee, Israel, expressed the view that any development of the Palestinian entity would have to carry the burden of 40 years of occupation. It was surely vital for any nation to liberate itself. It was even more important to watch the possible corruption of empowerment, the bitterness and hatred and inclination to vengeance. There was an obvious example in the result of Jewish empowerment and the deterioration of their liberation into oppressive militarism. The Palestinian had become the victim of the children of martyrs of the concentration camps. The intifadah was the expression of the "power of the powerless". It was the end of a dream and the



dawn of reality, it was the call of realism. He noted that the Palestinians were at the point of resurgence and resurrection of a Palestinian nation.

22. A just solution of the conflict was the prerequisite to reconciliation and to forgiveness. The only remaining justice for all was some sort of partition that leads to a two-State solution for two peoples. The Palestinians looked for a mature critical solidarity and a recognition of the Palestinian people's legitimate rights in Palestine. Now was the time to ensure both the right of existence to Israel and the right to independence and to statehood for the Palestinians. He called for a negotiated solution that left no refugee without a home and a homeland in his own land of origin: Palestine. He demanded a stop to insane systematic collective punishments, a stop to the blowing-up of homes and to the imprisonment of thousands of children and of elderly people. He urged that schools and universities of the West Bank be reopened.

23. Mr. Rafael Estrella, a Senator from Spain and member of the Executive Committee of the Parliamentary Association for Euro-Arab Co-operation, expressed the view that the intifadah had brought about substantial changes in the Near East conflict, affecting Palestinians, Israelis, Arabs, and international public opinion. For the main protagonist, the Palestinians living in the occupied territories, it had become an instrument for articulating the action of a whole people, increasing their pride, solidarity and cohesion. The intifadah had thus facilitated the consolidation of Palestinian nationalism beyond Arab nationalism, which seemed to be on the wane. The intifadah had proved to be much more efficient than years of armed struggle, and it had increased the role of people living in the occupied territory within the PLO, which had succeeded in adopting revolutionary changes by accepting Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) as well as all other United Nations resolutions related to the conflict.

24. Israel, for the first time, was confronted with a situation which it was unable to manage and the Israeli Defence Forces (IDF), the sixth largest army in the world, was useless to act in this war with no fire where military action becomes unjustified violence against unarmed civilians, cruelly harming children and women. He pointed out that the major achievement of the intifadah had been the increase in the cost of occupation in political, economic and moral terms; Israeli society hardly understood why they could not engage in a dialogue with the PLO while the United States Administration, their solid ally, was doing so.

25. The solid stand of the PLO and the cohesion of the Palestinian people had affected, too, the Arab countries as a whole; for the first time, they had unanimously followed the position adopted by the PLO leadership. Jordan, on its side, had disengaged from the West Bank, thus breaking the concept "Jordan is Palestine" used by both Mr. Shamir and Mr. Peres. He further stressed that the intifadah, the PNC in Algiers and the subsequent events at Geneva had, to a great extent, consolidated the Palestinian legitimacy while weakening the traditional attitude towards the legitimacy of Israeli occupation.

He appreciated that the 12 EEC countries had all voted for General Assembly resolution 43/176 and kept on moving forward and that the United States Administration had decided to engage in a dialogue with the PLO.

26. He further said that, as a reaction to the intifadah and international pressure, the Israeli Prime Minister had recently launched an initiative to hold elections in the occupied territories, which was far from meeting the requirements of the international community: nevertheless, the PLO had been able to send the ball back to the Israeli court when, instead of simply rejecting the plan, it had put some easy-to-understand conditions required for holding the election. The question therefore now was not whether the Palestinians accepted Mr. Shamir's plan but whether he and the Israeli Government would accept the required conditions.

Meanwhile, the Israeli Government was putting pressure on the Palestinians by increasing repression, continuous curfews, economic and labour obstacles, and the like. He called for increasing pressure on Israel to put an end to these practices, for broader action to help Palestinians to build up their own infrastructure and to reduce their reliance on Israel, thus creating the basis for a future State, and to take action towards a peaceful settlement of the conflict. Co-ordinated action to prepare the International Peace Conference as agreed at Geneva would convince Israel that the illegal occupation of Palestine will never be acceptable to the international community.

27. Mr. James A. Graff, an Associate Professor of Philosophy, gave evidence of the alarming situation of Palestinian children in the occupied territories. He stressed that the Israeli practices constituted state violence. Palestinian children were among the prime targets of Israeli state violence - physical and psychological. He stated that the force used by Israeli authorities to disperse demonstrating children and young adults had clearly violated the principle of proportionality and human standards. Disproportionate violence used against civilian targets with a view to intimidation, within the context of a political struggle, was clearly a form of terrorism - it was state terrorism. He stated that the Israeli Government had massively targeted children as objects of state violence. He called for an immediate halt to those horrors and for an international effort to heal the physical and psychological wounds they had caused. He noted that there had been no prosecutions for the atrocities.

Mr. Graff noted that the closure of schools would have far-reaching and long-lasting consequences, impeding normal cognitive development. A whole primary school generation of Palestinian children on the West Bank would have been set back educationally. He condemned the demolition of houses by way of collective punishment which was strictly forbidden under the Fourth Geneva Convention of 1949. He referred to detentions as another aspect of state violence inflicted on children.

28. Focusing on the children of Palestine, he underscored the urgency of convening a United Nations-sponsored international peace conference, of ending Israeli occupation, and of moving immediately to enable Palestinian educators and health professionals to address both the needs and the challenges. He stressed that Palestinian children, like their elders, were in urgent need of protection from Israeli troops and settlers. Optimally, a United Nations force could provide that protection. The Government of Israel should be subjected to diplomatic and economic pressure to admit such a force, to observe

the requirements of the Fourth Geneva Convention to which it was a signatory, and to withdraw its troops. He requested that the mandate of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA) should be expanded to provide protection and services to all Palestinians in the Israeli-occupied Palestinian territories. Also, the International Committee of the Red Cross should be encouraged and assisted in expanding its protective presence and in undertaking the delivery of emergency medical services.

29. Ms. Zahira Kamal, Chairperson of the Palestine Federation of Women's Action Committees, stated that the popular uprising in the occupied territories was a natural outcome of the suffering of the Palestinian people over the last 20 years. The current uprising differed from previous popular uprisings in that, from the moment of its eruption, it put forth with clarity its main objective: an end to the occupation and the achievement of national independence. The unified leadership of the intifadah had emerged as the organ giving direction to the struggle against the occupation, and as the party concerned with administering the affairs of the masses in place of the occupation authorities. The fact that the uprising had identified its main objective as the end of the occupation and the achievement of independence, and the fact that as the main weapons in the struggle the stone and civil disobedience had been chosen, had enabled hundreds of thousands of Palestinians to participate in daily confrontations with the occupation.

30. She pointed out that the repressive Israeli measures in response to the intifadah had brought about a change in world opinion, making it more supportive to the Palestinians. Those changes in world opinion must be reflected in the adoption of practical steps guaranteeing an end to the occupation and the recognition of the right to return and the right to self-determination and the establishment of an independent state. She expressed the view that the recognition by Egypt and Jordan of the State of Palestine had been a clear victory over the Camp David Accords and other schemes. She called for membership of the State of Palestine in the World Health Organization, in view of the deteriorating health conditions in the occupied territories and in the refugee camps in exile.

31. She then discussed the "peace plan" put forward by Mr. Shamir. She said that the details of the Israeli scheme expressed the three Israeli noes: no to withdrawing from the occupied territories; no to an independent Palestinian State; and no to a dialogue with the PLO. The plan ignored the essence of the crisis in the region. She indicated that the Israeli Government was putting forth its plan while continuing to escalate its repressive measures. The attempt to find points of convergence between the Palestinian peace plan and the Israeli plan would not be successful. The former was a serious attempt to achieve a comprehensive and lasting peace while the latter refused in principle to recognize the Palestinians' right to self-determination. The Palestinian position recognized the principle of two States and called for peace negotiations within the framework of an international conference. She appealed to the five permanent members of the Security Council to shoulder their responsibilities and to work towards speeding up the convening of an effective international peace conference.

32. Mr. Latyr Kamara, Honorary Ambassador of Senegal, expressed the view that the uprising must be seen as the expression not only of a genuine awakening of Palestinian national identity, but particularly of the Palestinians' willingness to take their destiny into their own hands. He said that it was important that the international community should, by means of action and increased pressure, put an end to Israel's determination to maintain the status quo in the occupied territories at any price. The situation required an urgent solution. He stressed that the United States Government itself had also been concerned about what was happening in the occupied Palestinian territories. The solution would be the convening of an international peace conference on the Middle East. He pointed out that apart from the Government of Israel, which by no means expressed the average opinion of its people, the entire international community might be said to support the idea of an international peace conference, despite the position of qualified opposition taken by the United States. The Soviet Union had, on the contrary, expressed its unflinching support for the organization of an international conference. The Western European countries, too, were engaged in facilitating the convening of an international conference. It was, therefore, clear that a broad consensus had emerged in the international community around the principle of convening the International Peace Conference. He expressed the view that time was working against Israel, whose stubbornness, refusal to take account of the current reality and even suicidal attitude were beyond all understanding.

33. Mr. Kamara welcomed the idea of establishing a preparatory committee for the Conference. The Conference would bring together all the conditions required for providing legal guarantees and respect both for the interests of the parties involved and for international norms. No further delay should be tolerated. The United States should be the first and most resolute to exert significant pressure on Israel in order to break the deadlock which exists in an increasingly anachronistic and unacceptable situation. The United States should go further and take a firm decision to assume a positive role in the settlement of the Middle East conflict - a role in keeping with its responsibilities as Israel's principal ally, as a great Power, and as a permanent member of the United Nations Security Council, which was, in fact, responsible for the implementation of General Assembly resolution 181 (II) on partition, which established and guaranteed the international legitimacy of a Palestinian Arab State alongside the State of Israel. He concluded by saying that the time had come for countries and international organizations to give serious consideration to strategies for exerting pressure and imposing a variety of economic and political sanctions against Israel and the United States, parallel with the current diplomatic efforts, in order to make them accept the United Nations resolutions.

34. Mr. Paul McCloskey, lawyer and former member of the United States House of Representatives, expressed the view that during the intifadah the children of Palestine had done more to advance Palestinian justice and ultimate self-determination than all of the diplomatic rhetoric, United Nations resolutions and statements by national leaders around the world. They had affected the American political process. He then explained the governmental processes in the United States and said that United States Middle East policy was determined by the Congress. Since the early 1970s, the tightly organized

American-Jewish community had controlled the American political process. The Jewish community in America had been traditionally Democratic. No Democrat could aspire to higher office, the Senate or White House, without strong Jewish support or money. Until the intifadah, the Jewish community in the United States had thus been able to control the American process absolutely by intimidating every individual.

35. He pointed out that the intifadah had caused the average American to identify with the abuses the intifadah rose against, and more particularly, the oppressive actions of the Israelis to crush it. For those reasons, the intifadah had been successful. He stressed that the true political process of America was when public opinion finally forced Congress to take action. The intifadah had started the American political process in motion. The next step, i.e. ending the occupation, would follow. But the American political process was slow. The intifadah had forced the process to begin.

36. Ms. Margaret McCormack, a political consultant and former Congressional aide, stressed that the intifadah had forced official reactions inconceivable six years ago, and events moved rapidly creating qualitatively new circumstances. She expressed the view that the current state of euphoria could have been an extremely dangerous one for Israeli-Palestinian peace activists if joy over small victories was not tempered with serious reflection, analysis and careful co-ordination of tactics and strategies with world-wide Palestinian solidarity and peace movements.

She then gave a short analysis of the Middle East policies of the Reagan and the Bush Administrations. She noted that since 1967, United States policy had been consistent in asking Israel to give up the occupied territories; but dropping all mention of any international conference, ignoring the issues of Jerusalem and the Golan Heights, excluding Syrian participation, and reiterating firm opposition to the notion of Palestinian statehood, the Bush Administration had, in fact, tilted United States policies further towards Israel and narrowed the peace options.

37. She then discussed the Israeli election plan, which could be analysed under the concept of "demonstration elections". To test the plan, she proposed the following litmus test: freedom of speech must be guaranteed; the media must be free; there must be freedom to organize intermediate groups; there must be an absence of instruments of state-sponsored terror, freedom of organization of political groups, and absence of fear and intimidation on the part of the general population. The analysis made clear that the election plan was primarily a public relations exercise aimed at deflecting criticism of Israeli policies.

38. She noted that members of Congress were registering continued decline in support for Israel in the light of television reports. The PLO was now engaged in a very difficult public relations strategy. The Palestinians had gained little space in the United States since the beginning of the intifadah, but the space must be secured and widened. The two victories were: the recognition by Americans that Palestinians were people with their own identity and nationality, and the PLO was accepted as a legitimate organization in the United States. She concluded that all support groups must intensify and

co-ordinate their efforts and made a number of suggestions for appropriate action.

39. Mr. Jack O'Dell, International Affairs Director of the National Rainbow Coalition, pointed out that in the final months of the decade of the 1980s, the Middle East as a foreign policy issue in the United States had finally gained a status of primary importance, alongside southern Africa, Central America and disarmament. Public opinion had decidedly shifted to the side of justice, while public policy was still locked into the requirements of serving the myth of the so-called "special relationship" between the United States and the State of Israel. He expressed the view that the historic significance of the current uprising rested not only in its affirmation of the dignity and the determination of the Palestinian people to be free from a brutal, terroristic military occupation, but also in the fact that the groundswell of sacrifice and hope was consciously cementing the unity of the Palestinian people and creating the administrative and organizational framework for a viable, sovereign Palestinian State. The consolidation and expansion of the intifadah in its varied forms of resistance activity was a development to be expected.

40. He stressed that Israel's occupation of the West Bank and Gaza continued at high human cost for the Palestinian people. It also represented a dissipation of moral, capital, growing internal division within Israeli society, and a burdensome financial cost - all of which was contributing to the polarization within Israeli society. Reliable estimates had the intifadah costing the Israeli economy more than \$100 million a month. He pointed out that the people of the United States, in concert with the international community, needed to act for peace in Palestine and Israel in 1989. The PLO had stated its readiness to negotiate with Israel and had offered a peace programme as a basis for negotiation. Growing numbers of Israelis were calling for Israel to negotiate with the PLO. The recent United States decision to enter into dialogue with representatives of the PLO had drawn broad support from the American people.

41. He congratulated the United Nations General Assembly for its timely action in 1988 in adjourning its session in New York and reconvening at Geneva to receive the testimony of Mr. Yasser Arafat, Chairman of the PLO. The significance of that action had not been lost on the American public, and the movement for peace and justice in the United States was greatly indebted to the United Nations for that statement of principle in accordance with the rights of all people to self-determination. The American public was increasingly aware that their tax money was supporting a brutal military occupation in the West Bank and Gaza.

The "Jackson Doctrine", projected in the 1988 presidential elections as the corner-stone of a peace policy for the United States, was committed to practical action on the question. Enlightened public opinion could be mobilized to intervene and effect a disengagement of the United States from supporting that situation, opening up new possibilities for peace in the Middle East, a region traumatized by war and calculated injustice. He concluded that the convening of an international conference under the auspices of the United Nations, including all parties concerned, was the next step for moving forward the peace and justice agenda in the Middle East.

42. Mr. V. P. Vorobyov, Lecturer at the Moscow State Institute for International Relations, stressed that the discussion of the problem of Palestine today had to take into account the new and important factors which had arisen in the situation in the Middle East. He expressed the view that the positive trends, which were gaining ground throughout the world, were creating favourable conditions for a decisive breakthrough in the search for a peaceful settlement to the Arab-Israeli conflict and to the core of that conflict, the question of Palestine. A breakthrough should have been possible on the basis of freedom of choice and a balance of interests. Today, as a result of the intifadah and its international impact, the situation in the Middle East was favorable to the implementation of Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) through the convening of an international conference. He pointed out that for the first time in the history of the Palestinian resistance movement, those decisions had brought the PLO position into conformity with international law and standards of legality. Today there was no task more important than that of beginning the practical preparations for the convening of an international conference. The United Nations and, in particular, the Security Council, could make a vital contribution to the conference. He expected the Security Council to work out balanced recommendations.

43. He expressed the view that the constant tension in the Middle East and the steady arms build up were a danger not only to the peoples of the region but also to those of the entire world. In the Middle East, a military potential had been created that was considerably in excess of the region's real economic and demographic weight in the world. It was, therefore, essential that the search for a settlement to the Middle East conflict should become international in scope. He then turned to the position of Israel and pointed out that the "Shamir peace plan" was designed to perpetuate the status quo in the region. Israel would oppose the creation of a Palestinian State and would not hold any talks with the PLO. He appreciated the fact that the Middle East problem continued to be a focal point of contacts between the Soviet Union and the United States of America. He said the United States Administration's view of the conflict, while containing certain positive elements, was somewhat vague. While the political rights of the Palestinian people were recognized by the United States in a general way, that people was denied its fundamental right, the right to self-determination and to create its own State.

44. Mr. James Zogby, Executive Director of the Arab-American Institute, pointed out that today the struggle for Palestinian self-determination and for the protection of Palestinian human rights was not only a struggle against the Israeli occupation and the policies of the occupation but it was also a struggle against United States political support that sustained, and to a real extent, provided international support for the occupation and its policies. The United States policy sought, in order to avoid international isolation and to deflect criticism from itself and its ally Israel, to construct a deliberately vague scenario, the "Baker plan". The essence of that plan was to create the illusion of movement to disguise the reality that there is no real movement towards fulfilment of Palestinian rights. It represented not a change in policy but an effort to come to an accommodation, in language only, with new realities.

45. The signal that would indicate a real United States change in policy was the extent to which the United States indicated clearly its willingness to break with Israel on any one of the three Israeli "noes". He indicated three reasons that such a change in policy would not come at that time. First, the ruling Israeli coalition was clearly opposed to any recognition of Palestinian rights. Secondly, for the present time the ability of the pro-Israel lobby in the United States to structure both official opinion and the terms of the official debate remained beyond challenge. The pro-Israel mindset that that lobby had created dominated the policy stances of elected officials in both parties. They had blocked any substantial debate on Palestinian rights from within the establishment of both parties. A third factor was the competition between the two parties in support of Israel.

46. He expressed the view that other key players in the Middle East issue had failed to provide a significant, substantial challenge to the obstructionist role of the United States. Neither the Soviet Union, nor the European allies of the United States, nor the Arab States had acted to substantially and publicly challenge the United States role in that issue. He concluded, therefore, that work in the United States was of critical importance in moving the issue forward. The strategy was to form an alternative coalition to that which dominated, and to strengthen it in all its forms. Only a coalition, coming from the progressive, peace, human rights community could effectively challenge United States Middle East policy. As an example, he referred to the 1988 presidential elections and the success of the peace and human rights coalition in ending the silence and beginning a national debate on the question of Palestinian rights. He said that in the absence of any real challenge from other involved parties, the only way real change would come in the Middle East was when change came in America.

## *Panel II*

### The role of the Palestine Liberation Organization in the social, cultural, economic and political development of the Palestinian people

47. Mr. Mohammad Abu Kosh, Director in the Department of Economic Development of the Palestine Liberation Organization, pointed out that the aim of the Israeli economic policies in the occupied territories was to control the economy and to develop the resources on lines best suited to the purpose of the occupying Power. He stressed that the economic policy of the Israeli occupation authorities was not limited in its goal to the control and exploitation of the national resources of Palestine but it served also to "de-Palestinise" it in order to facilitate its annexation. He expressed the view that the intifadah constituted, inter alia, a national revolt against the Israeli economic domination and policies, and led to genuine Palestinian efforts of economic self-reliance. He pointed out that the economy of Palestine was basically agricultural. Now the Palestinian agricultural sector suffered from the lack of finance. Further, the Israeli occupation



authorities had confiscated about 52 per cent of the total area of the Palestinian land and had allocated it for expansionist purposes. The authorities had also taken control of the Palestinian water resources.

48. The traditional Palestinian industries were based on local agricultural production. Therefore, the problems facing the agricultural sector were almost automatically reflected in the industrial sector. He stressed that the Israeli occupation had rendered the Palestinian national economy susceptible to the inflationary conditions of the Israeli economy. Turning to foreign trade, he said that the Palestinian market constituted the second largest market after that of the United States of America for Israeli exports. Instead of being an engine for economic development, the foreign trade of the occupied Palestinian land had become an engine for underdevelopment, and that had happened as a result of the deliberate Israeli occupation policies punctuated by restrictive measures including fiscal and monetary ones against the Palestinian protective sectors, and encouragement including subsidies for Israeli firms to control the Palestinian market.

49. Drawing the attention to the economic implications of the intifadah, he pointed out that among the various brutal measures by the Israeli authorities to halt the uprising had been economic measures like banning of Palestinian exports and imports or delivery of foodstuffs. Subsequently, the Palestinian people had taken the initiative by boycotting the Israeli products. Delinking the Palestinian national economy from the Israeli economy and a high degree of self-reliance had become major goals. He described several economic projects which, it was hoped, would receive external support and assistance.

### III. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

50. The participants<sup>1/</sup> in the Seminar expressed their conviction that recent developments regarding the Arab-Israeli conflict and its core, the question of Palestine, have created a new momentum for bringing about a solution to this complicated and dangerous conflict on the basis of resolutions of the United Nations and within its framework. These developments are mainly due to the courageous and determined struggle of the Palestinian people to attain and exercise its inalienable rights, primarily the right to self-determination, as dramatically manifested in the continuing Palestinian uprising, the intifadah, in the occupied Palestinian territory. The present international climate, which is characterized by increasing co-operation and the political will to solve regional conflicts in a peaceful way through negotiations, is specially conducive to the search for a comprehensive, just and lasting settlement of the question of Palestine. It is important that this historic opportunity not be missed.

51. The participants welcomed the results of the Nineteenth Extraordinary Session of the Palestine National Council held at Algiers in November 1988, and, in particular, the political statement as well as the proclamation of an independent Palestinian State as a positive contribution towards a peaceful settlement of the conflict in the region. The decision adopted by the PNC at

Algiers and the position outlined by Mr. Yasser Arafat, Chairman of the Executive Committee of the PLO, in his address to the United Nations General Assembly at Geneva on 13 December 1988, as well as in other forums, are important landmarks in the international endeavours towards achieving a just settlement of the question of Palestine and have resulted in increased support by all sectors of the international community for the convening of the International Peace Conference on the Middle East.

52. The Seminar welcomed the initiation of a dialogue between the United States and the PLO as a positive measure which contributed to redressing the imbalance between the parties. It was hoped that the dialogue would lead to the removal of obstacles in the way of convening the International Peace Conference on the Middle East which, among other things, should ensure the full exercise by the Palestinian people of its legitimate national rights in Palestine. The wish was expressed that such contacts would lead to concrete developments and to a comprehensive settlement of the conflict. The Seminar urged the Government of the United States to continue its contacts with the PLO and to broaden the political scope of this dialogue.

53. The participants stressed that the ongoing uprising of the Palestinian people, now in its nineteenth month, confirms, in no uncertain terms, that the Palestinians are determined to resist, reject and end Israeli occupation of Palestinian territory occupied since 1967. The peace initiatives taken by the Palestinian leadership as well as the proclamation of the independent State of Palestine by the PNC at its nineteenth extraordinary session, have received enthusiastic support from an overwhelming majority of States who have hailed it as a concrete contribution towards peace. Significantly, a large number of States (over 90) have already formally recognized the State of Palestine.

54. The participants agreed that it was incumbent upon the Government of Israel to respond positively to the stand taken by the representatives of the Palestinian people which has been welcomed and praised by the international community. Israel can no longer ignore the national aspirations of the Palestinians and deny them their political rights. The Seminar considered that the so-called peace initiative proposed by the Israeli authorities was inadequate. Under the Israeli plan, the only function of the elected delegates would seem to be to rubber stamp the policies of the occupying Power. Any viable peace proposal must include interim measures of protection for the Palestinian people and measures which would enable the Palestinians to exercise fully their rights to self-determination. The participants noted that as long as the Israeli election proposals remained separate from the final objective of the exercise by the Palestinian people of its right to self-determination, they would be nothing but a device for perpetuating Israeli occupation.

55. The Seminar took note of and welcomed the resolutions on the question of Palestine, adopted at the forty-third session of the General Assembly on 15 December 1988 at Geneva. In particular, it stressed the significance and timeliness of resolution 43/176 of 15 December 1988 calling for the convening of the International Peace Conference on the Middle East, under the auspices of the United Nations, with the participation of all parties to the conflict, including the PLO, on an equal footing, and the five permanent members of the

Security Council, based on Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) and the legitimate national rights of the Palestinian people, primarily the right to self-determination. It expressed its full support for the principles contained in paragraph 3 of resolution 43/176, as a basis for the achievement of a comprehensive peace. Cognizant of the role of the Security Council in maintaining international peace and security, the participants in the Seminar urged the Council to expedite the convening of the International Peace Conference on the Middle East, and to adopt interim measures, including the deployment of a United Nations peace-keeping force to safeguard the physical security of the inhabitants of the occupied Palestinian territory, and to bring about stability in the region pending agreement on a final comprehensive settlement. The participants considered that it was incumbent upon Israel to terminate its occupation in compliance with resolution 242 (1967) and to accept the terms for a lasting and comprehensive settlement, as agreed by the international community as a whole, as stated above.

56. The participants regretted that one permanent member had prevented the Security Council from taking action on measures indispensable to ensuring the safety and protection of Palestinians in the occupied Palestinian territory. They pointed out that taking into account the gravity of the acts of violence and repression by Israeli authorities against Palestinian civilians in the occupied territory, the Security Council should assume its responsibilities and to provide for the protection of the Palestinian people under occupation. They called on Israel as the occupying Power to respect the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, and accept the de jure applicability of the Convention to the Palestinian and other Arab territories occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem, and fully comply with its obligations under that Convention.

57. The participants expressed serious concern at the continued grave violations of the human rights of the civilian population in the occupied territory. The entire international community, as represented at the United Nations and other forums, has repeatedly declared that the Israeli acts of violence against the Palestinians in the occupied Palestinian territory are blatant violations of the provision of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, which is fully binding on Israel - a State party to the Convention. The Israeli actions are also contrary to United Nations resolutions and to the generally accepted norms of international law. In Gaza especially, new measures to control the movement of individuals had produced tinder-box conditions which could ignite at any moment. In the West Bank, settler vigilantism threatened to degenerate into large-scale blood-letting. New extremist elements were taking over and had begun killing women and children. The participants strongly opposed the presence of settlers in the occupied territories. They expressed the view that the Israeli policy of establishing settlements in the occupied territory was not only a usurpation of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, but also an obstacle to the solution of the Arab-Israeli conflict.

58. The participants drew particular attention to the damaging effects of the blanket closure of schools, including primary schools and kindergartens, as well as the barring of any alternative teaching in the West Bank, which had

serious implications for the education and cognitive development of an entire generation of Palestinian children. The participants noted further that these massive violations of human rights had not succeeded in ending the intifadah and were bound to fail. Moreover, persistence by Israel in acts of aggression against neighbouring States, in particular Lebanon, endangered security in the region.

59. The participants expressed their concern at the repressive economic measures by Israel aimed at bringing about the economic strangulation of the occupied Palestinian territories. In particular, the participants expressed outrage at the policies of large scale uprooting of trees, appropriation of water resources and wanton destruction of houses and buildings, which are causing irreparable damage to the environment and very serious social and economic consequences for the Palestinian people under occupation.

60. The Seminar appealed to the Security Council to take urgent measures to protect the Palestinian people under occupation, to guarantee the safety and security and the legal and human rights of the Palestinian refugees in all the territories under Israeli occupation. The United Nations system as well as international, regional and national organizations should continue and strengthen their humanitarian assistance to the Palestinians under occupation and to Palestinian refugees. In particular, the Seminar urges an expansion of the Refugee Affairs Officer Programme of UNRWA which provides some measure of protection by monitoring behaviour towards the Palestinians by Israel, the occupying Power. The Seminar believes that the number of Relief Agency Organizations (RAO) in the occupied Palestinian territory should be increased to provide 24 hours' monitoring services. The participants urged as well the establishment of staffed neuro-surgical facilities in suitable hospitals in Gaza and Nablus, to permit immediate treatment of the increasing number of Palestinian civilians suffering serious head wounds, to prevent death and permanent disability. At present, Maquassed Hospital is the only hospital in East Jerusalem which has such facilities. Palestinians suffering serious head wounds must be transported either to Tel Aviv or to Jerusalem for treatment, which results in delays threatening their lives or causing permanent handicaps.

61. The Seminar also urges the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) and other suitable United Nations agencies to establish programmes to address the special needs of Palestinian children psychologically and emotionally traumatized by IDF and settler violence directed against them, their families, neighbours and peers. The Seminar supports as well the expansion of the protective role of the International Committee for the Red Cross (ICRC) and the extension of its activities to provide emergency medical services at all levels. Participants believe that ICRC could be helpful in establishing the neuro-surgical facilities referred to above. Sustained and increased support should be channelled through all available means, including the agencies and bodies of the United Nations system, in particular through UNRWA, as well as through non-governmental organizations (NGOs) working directly in the occupied territory. The Seminar considered that intensified efforts towards genuine development of the occupied territory, with the close involvement of the Palestinian people through its representative, the PLO, must be a necessary accompaniment of renewed efforts to achieve a political solution of the question.

62. The Seminar affirmed that the denial of the exercise of the legitimate national rights of the Palestinian people remains the core of the conflict in the Middle East and that a comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the region cannot be achieved without the full exercise of those rights, and without the withdrawal of Israel from the Palestinian territory occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem, and other occupied Arab territories. It further affirmed that the PLO is the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, and, as such, is an essential party to any negotiations aimed at resolving the conflict by peaceful means.

63. The Seminar appreciated the efforts of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People to secure universal recognition of the inalienable national rights of the Palestinian people, and of its recommendations, made in its report in 1976, and repeatedly endorsed by the United Nations General Assembly since then, for ensuring the exercise by the Palestinian people of those rights. The Seminar also noted with satisfaction the increased support at the United Nations for the programme of action undertaken by the Committee. It urged the international community to sustain and strengthen its support for the Committee's activities and endeavours, in particular its efforts for facilitating the convening of the International Peace Conference on the Middle East.

64. The Seminar stated that the international community was deeply and firmly convinced of the urgent need to achieve a just, comprehensive and lasting political settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict. There was a broad consensus regarding the need for convening the International Peace Conference on the Middle East in accordance with General Assembly resolution 43/176. Movement towards peace in the region was facilitated by the carefully balanced Palestinian position. The continuing obstacle was the inflexible attitude of Israel. The participants called on Israel to abandon its negative position and to respond positively to international efforts to attain a just settlement.

65. The Seminar welcomed the positive results of the Arab Summit held at Casablanca, Morocco, in May 1989. The Arab States, once more, committed themselves to meaningful political and economic support to the Palestinian uprising. The Seminar welcomed, in particular, the unequivocal support of the Summit for the convening of the International Peace Conference on the Middle East. These actions taken unanimously by the Summit contributed to efforts for achieving a peaceful settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict and its core, the question of Palestine.

66. The Seminar noted with satisfaction that public opinion in North America was becoming increasingly aware of the plight of the Palestinians under occupation and the urgent need to find a just solution to the question of Palestine. The Seminar agreed that efforts should be continued and intensified to mobilize official and public opinion in North America, especially through the use of the media and activities of national and international NGOs. The United Nations should undertake additional efforts to disseminate factual and up-to-date information on the question of Palestine, the plight of Palestinians under occupation and the urgent need to provide international protection to the Arab civilians in the occupied territory, as

well as the measures required to be taken for the achievement of a just solution to the question of Palestine on the basis of the attainment and exercise by the Palestinian people of its inalienable rights. The Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People and the Division of Palestinian Rights have an important role in the dissemination of such information.

67. The Seminar considered that the media and public institutions, universities, colleges, research institutes, churches and other religious establishments, as well as national and international NGOs, have a crucial role to play in the formation of public opinion and in influencing official policy, particularly in the United States and Canada. Those institutions and the media should be urged to give wider coverage and more balanced treatment to the question of Palestine.

#### Notes

<sup>1/</sup> On 20 June 1989, Mr. Mordechai Bar-On, in a written communication, informed the United Nations Division for Palestinian Rights that he wanted to express his appreciation of the work of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People and his gratitude for the opportunity given to him to participate in the Seminar. He felt much sympathy with most of the wording of the conclusions and recommendations of the Seminar, yet he felt that he could not endorse them formally, since on some important points he held different convictions. He added that the document was drafted, understandably, from the perspective of the Committee which stressed the rights of the Palestinians, but that it gives little consideration to the problems of Israel in this tragic conflict.

Annex I

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE  
SEMINAR PARTICIPANTS ON 19 JUNE 1989

Resolved:

That taking into consideration Security Council resolutions 607 (1988) of 5 January 1988 and 608 (1988) of 14 January 1988 on the subject of deportation and pursuant to the Fourth Geneva Convention of 1949, this twenty-second United Nations Seminar on the Question of Palestine respectfully asks that the Secretary-General of the United Nations and the President of the Security Council join in an immediate communication to the Government of Israel requesting that the announced order for the deportation of Palestinians from the occupied territories be rescinded and that Israel abide by the provisions of the Fourth Geneva Convention with regard to any future consideration of the deportation of residents of the occupied territories.

Annex II

MESSAGE FROM THE PARTICIPANTS IN THE SEMINAR  
TO MR. YASSER ARAFAT

We, the participants of the Sixth North American Regional Seminar, being held from 19 to 20 June 1989, in New York, at United Nations Headquarters, wish to express our deepest gratitude for your gracious message of support conveyed to the Seminar by Mr. Zuhdi L. Terzi, Permanent Observer for Palestine to the United Nations. We take this opportunity to applaud the Palestine Liberation Organization, the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, and endorse your extraordinary efforts to open a substantive dialogue for peace in the Middle East and to introduce a new way of thinking about the future.

We reaffirm our solid support for the struggle of the Palestinian people to exercise its legitimate and inalienable national rights, as dramatically demonstrated over the past year in the intifadah in the occupied Palestinian territory. We salute the historic Palestinian peace initiative launched by the Nineteenth Extraordinary Session of the Palestine National Council held at Algiers from 12 to 15 November 1988, and in particular the proclamation of the State of Palestine, as a bold and significant contribution towards the achievement of peace in the Middle East.

The Seminar welcomes the initiation of a dialogue between the United States and the PLO as a positive measure which contributes to redressing the imbalance between the parties. It is hoped that the dialogue would lead to the removal of obstacles in the way of convening the International Peace Conference on the Middle East which should ensure the full exercise by the Palestinian people of its legitimate national rights in Palestine. The wish is expressed that such contacts would lead to concrete developments and to a comprehensive settlement of the conflict. The Seminar joins in urging the Government of the United States to continue its contacts with the PLO and to broaden the political scope of this dialogue.

We reaffirm our unconditional commitment to support the people of Palestine until the full realization of an independent and sovereign Palestinian State is achieved. We sincerely hope that the results of the Seminar will contribute positively to the achievement of a just, lasting and comprehensive settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict of which the question of Palestine is the core.



Annex III

*LIST OF PARTICIPANTS AND OBSERVERS*

Panelists

Dr. Mohammad Abu Kosh (Palestinian)  
Mr. Mordechai Bar-On (Israel)  
Rev. Elias Chacour (Palestinian)  
H.E. Mr. Rafael Estrella (Spain)  
Mr. James Graff (Canada)  
Ms. Zahira Kamal (Palestinian)  
H.E. Mr. Latyr Kamara (Senegal)  
Mr. Paul McCloskey (United States of America)  
Ms. Margaret McCormack (United States of America)  
Mr. Jack O'Dell (United States of America)  
Mr. V.P. Vorobyov (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)  
Mr. James Zogby (United States of America)

Representative of the Secretary-General

Mr. Naseem Mirza, Chief, Division for Palestinian Rights

Member States

Afghanistan	- Mr. Eshaq Roshan-Rawaan Chargé d'affaires a.i.
	- Mr. Haji Razmi Second Secretary
Bahrain	- Mr. Saeed Al-Faihani First Secretary
Bangladesh	- Mr. Abdul Hannan Counsellor
Brunei Darussalam	- Mr. Suyoi Haji Osman Deputy Permanent Representative
	- Mr. Haji Damit Haji Chuchu Second Secretary

Bulgaria	- Mr. Vitia Bozhkov Second Secretary
Chile	- Mr. Fernando Danús First Secretary
China	- Mr. Wang Shijie Counsellor
Cuba	- H.E. Ms. María de los Angeles Florez Alternate Permanent Representative
Cyprus	- Mr. James Droushiotis First Secretary
Czechoslovakia	- Mr. Petr Hála Counsellor
Djibouti	- Mr. Dysane A. Dorani First Counsellor
	- Mr. Issa Daher Bouraleh Third Counsellor
Egypt	- Mr. Nabil Fahmy Counsellor
	- Mr. Sherif Refaat Third Secretary
	- Mr. Ehat Fawzy Third Secretary
Gabon	- M. Jean-Pierre Tchibena-Makosso First Counsellor
German Democratic Republic	- Mr. Dirk Hielscher Second Secretary
Grenada	- H.E. Mr. Lamuel A. Stanislaus Permanent Representative
Greece	- Mr. Dimitris Platis First Secretary of Embassy
Hungary	- Mr. Miklós Endreffy Deputy Permanent Representative
Indonesia	- H.E. Mr. Agus Tarmidzi Deputy Permanent Representative
	- Mr. Amin Rianom Minister Counsellor

- Mr. Kristio Wahyono  
Third Secretary
- Iran (Islamic Republic of) - Mr. Ahmad Hadjihosseini  
Third Secretary
- Iraq - Mr. Sabeh Talat  
Minister Counsellor
- Jordan - H.E. Mr. Abdullah Salah  
Permanent Representative
- Mr. Shaker Arabiat  
Minister Plenipotentiary
- Mr. Ibrahim Awawdeh  
Second Secretary
- Kuwait - Mr. Sabah Al Sabah  
First Secretary
- Lao People's Democratic Republic - M. Bounkham Theuambounmy  
Second Secretary
- Lesotho - Mr. T. Kolane  
Political Counsellor
- Mr. A.T. Ralebitson  
First Secretary
- Madagascar - Mr. Jean de Dieu Rakotozafy  
Counsellor
- Malaysia - Mr. Ghazzali Abdul Khalid  
Deputy Permanent Representative
- Mr. Adnan Othman  
Second Secretary
- Malta - H.E. Mr. Alexander Borg Olivier  
Permanent Representative
- Mauritania - Mr. Mohammed Mahmoud  
First Counsellor
- Mexico - Mr. Federico Salas  
Counsellor
- Mr. Pablo Macedo  
Second Secretary
- Nicaragua - Erich C. Vilchez  
Counsellor

Nigeria	- H.E. Mr. Lawrence O.C. Agubuzu Deputy Permanent Representative
	- Mr. Edward Egbara Minister Counsellor
Pakistan	- Mr. Arif Ayub Counsellor
Panama	- Mr. Darío Chirú First Secretary
Peru	- Mr. Julio Garro Second Secretary
Philippines	- Mr. Bayani S. Mercado Second Secretary
Qatar	- Mr. Nassir Abdelaziz Al-Nasser Counsellor
Romania	- Mr. Ioan Voicu Minister Counsellor
Senegal	- H.E. Mrs. Absa Claude Diallo Permanent Representative
Sierra Leone	- H.E. Mr. Tom Obaleh Kargbo Permanent Representative
Singapore (Observer)	- H.E. Dr. Chan Heng Chee Permanent Representative
	- Mr. Mark Hong Deputy Permanent Representative
Spain	- Mr. José Riera Counsellor
Sri Lanka	- H.E. Mr. Daya Perera Permanent Representative
Sudan	- H.E. Mr. Amin Magzoub Abdoun Permanent Representative
	- Mr. Osama S. Nugdalla First Secretary
Swaziland	- Mr. Joel M. Nhleko Third Secretary

Syrian Arab Republic	- Mr. Khalil Abou-Hadid First Secretary
Thailand	- Mr. Noppadon Theppitak Second Secretary
Togo	- H.E. Mr. Koffi Adjoyi Permanent Representative
	- Mr. Nolana Ta-Ama Second Counsellor
Trinidad and Tobago	- H.E. Mrs. Marjorie Thorpe Permanent Representative
	- Mrs. Margaret King-Rousseau Second Secretary
Tunisia	- Mr. Mohamed Salah Tekaya First Secretary
Turkey	- Mr. Fuat Tanlay Counsellor
Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic	- Mr Yuri Zybanov Executive Secretary Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	- H.E. Mr. V.P. Polyakov Member of the Collegium Ministry of Foreign Affairs
	- Mr. G.P. Tarasov Assistant to the Minister for Foreign Affairs
	- Mr. A.F. Chistyakov Head of Branch Dept. for Middle Eastern and North African Affairs Ministry of Foreign Affairs
	- Mr. S.O. Shokhine Third Secretary Dept. of United States and Canadian Affairs Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Uruguay	- Ms. Adriana Lissidini Second Secretary
Venezuela	- Mr. José E. Acosta-Fragachán First Secretary

- Yugoslavia - Mr. Zeljko Jerkic  
Counsellor
- Zambia - H.E. Lt. Gen. P.D. Zuze  
Permanent Representative
- Mr. I.Z. Chabala  
Deputy Permanent Representative
- Mr. G.M.S. Mfula  
Counsellor (Political)

Non-member States represented by observers

- Holy See - Brother David Carroll  
Adviser
- Korea, Republic of - Mr. Jung Ho Keum  
Counsellor
- Mr. Joo Seok Kim  
First Secretary

United Nations organs

Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation  
of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries  
and Peoples

H.E. Mr. Tesfaye Tadesse (Ethiopia)

Special Committee against Apartheid

H.E. Mr. Guennadi I. Oudovenko (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic)

Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human  
Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories

H.E. Mr. Daya Perera (Sri Lanka)

United Nations specialized agencies

- FAO - Mr. Jean S. Camara  
Representative at the  
United Nations a.i.

- Mr. Frederick H. Weibgen  
Senior Liaison Officer
- ILO - Mr. Georges Minet  
Deputy Director  
Liaison Office with the  
United Nations
- UNESCO - Mrs. Neh Dukuly-Tolbert  
Senior Liaison Officer
- WHO - Mr. J.M. Kilker  
External Relations Officer

United Nations bodies

- UNCHS - Mr. D. Johal  
Director  
Office of Programme Co-ordination
- UNHCR - Mr. Madjid Madani  
Acting Representative

Intergovernmental organizations having received  
a standing invitation to participate in the sessions  
and the work of the General Assembly as observers

- League of Arab States - H.E. Dr. Clovis Maksoud  
Ambassador
- Ms. Rihab Kanawati  
Counsellor
- Mr. Hassan Abdeldaim  
Attaché
- Mr. Mohamed Morsi  
Attaché
- Organization of African Unity - Mr. Gebre E. Dawit  
Assistant Executive Secretary  
(Political Affairs)
- Organization of the Islamic Conference - H.E. Mr. Ahmet Engin Ansay  
Permanent Observer

Other organizations having received a standing invitation  
to participate in the sessions and the work  
of the General Assembly as observers

Palestine

- Mr. Zuhdi L. Terzi

National liberation movements recognized  
by the Organization of African Unity

African National  
Congress of  
South Africa

- Mr. Tebogo Mafole  
Chief Representative

\* \* \*