



**DIVISION FOR
PALESTINIAN RIGHTS**

**INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE
ON THE QUESTION OF JERUSALEM**

“Addressing the present and shaping the future of Jerusalem”

Jakarta, 14 and 15 December 2015

Contents

	<i>Page</i>
Executive summary	3
I. Introduction	5
II. Opening session	5
III. Plenary sessions	9
A. Plenary session I	9
B. Plenary session II	12
IV. Closing session	16

Annexes

I. Summary of the Chair	18
II. List of participants	22

Executive summary

The International Conference on the Question of Jerusalem under the theme “Addressing the present and shaping the future of Jerusalem” was organized under the auspices of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People and the Organization of Islamic Cooperation (OIC) and held in Jakarta on 14 and 15 December 2015.

The Conference provided up-to-date information on the current situation in Jerusalem, including social, economic and legal aspects of life under the Israeli occupation, with a special focus on religious sites, to inform policymakers and decision makers, civil society and the general public. It served as a forum for presenting ways forward, e.g. on how to enhance international efforts to halt unilateral Israeli actions, including the methodical demographical change of East Jerusalem, especially in and around the Old City, and possible ways forward for Jerusalem and its inhabitants. It offered a venue for an open exchange among Palestinian and international experts, practitioners, activists and academics.

The Conference consisted of an opening session, two plenaries and a closing session. Plenary session I, entitled “The status of Jerusalem today”, provided an overview of the current situation and its genesis, including unilateral actions to alter the character and status of Jerusalem, Israeli policy and actions at the holy sites; insight into the status of religious sites under local and international law; and a presentation on the issue of protection of civilians. Plenary session II, entitled “Historical and contemporary models of coexistence”, discussed the realities of pre-1948 Jerusalem, highlighted possible efforts to mediate scenarios of coexistence and looked at examples of post-conflict urban spaces and existing multi-communal entities.

In the sessions, participants described a reality in which Israel implemented a discriminatory policy to weaken the Palestinian presence. Following recent unrest, Israel had used excessive force and punitive house demolitions, and targeted children. Contrary to Israeli rhetoric of a “united and indivisible” Jerusalem, the separation wall built during the second intifada had isolated over 100,000 Palestinian inhabitants of Jerusalem in a “no man’s land” with no municipal services or law enforcement and with obstructions to access to the rest of Jerusalem.

On the status of religious sites under international law, it was noted that, while sovereignty over the city remained in dispute pending a permanent status agreement, no State currently recognized the claim of Israel to any part of the city, East or West, or to the holy sites. After Jordan had renounced all claims of sovereignty over East Jerusalem in 1988, it had retained its custodianship over the holy sites, which had been reaffirmed by treaties with Israel and Palestine. Jordan was protecting the Haram al-Sharif (Temple Mount) for the Palestinian people pending the establishment of an independent State. Peace began with respect for human rights, it was stressed, yet the Palestinians, a protected population under the laws of occupation, enjoyed little effective protection, either from the occupying Power or by the international community. The issue of protection had been subordinated to the politics of the conflict.

It was pointed out that, contrary to popular belief, pre-1948 Jerusalem had never been a segregated city; Arabs and Jews had lived side by side and interacted with each other. Violence had hardened religious, political and ethnic identities since then, and militantly religious groups had formed on both sides. After 50 years of occupation, Jerusalem was a city with a divided population, susceptible to intermittent violent conflict. The Haram al-Sharif (Temple Mount) was particularly contested, politicized and violent. Historically, physically partitioned cities did not prosper, as diversity, and also conflict, were the lifeblood of cities in general. Barriers between ethnic neighbourhoods offered a tempting solution in times of violent conflict but they created greater alienation and more extreme conflict down the road. Thus, shared public spaces should be considered essential to a viable city.

I. Introduction

1. The International Conference on the Question of Jerusalem was organized under the auspices of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People and the Organization of Islamic Cooperation, in accordance with the provisions of General Assembly resolutions 69/20 and 69/21, and held in Jakarta on 14 and 15 December 2015. The theme of the Conference was “Addressing the present and shaping the future of Jerusalem”.
2. The Conference consisted of an opening session, two plenary sessions and a closing session. The themes of the plenary sessions were “The status of Jerusalem today” and “Historical and contemporary models of coexistence”.
3. Representatives of 52 Member States and two non-member observer States, four intergovernmental organizations, two United Nations bodies and eight civil society organizations took part in the Conference. Twenty-nine media organizations were accredited. (See annex II.)
4. The Committee delegation was comprised of Desra Percaya, Permanent Representative of Indonesia to the United Nations and Vice-Chair of the Committee; Christopher Grima, Permanent Representative of Malta to the United Nations and Rapporteur of the Committee; and Riyadh Mansour, Permanent Observer of the State of Palestine to the United Nations.
5. On the margins of the Conference, the Committee delegation held bilateral meetings with the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Indonesia, Retno Lestari Priansari Marsudi, and representatives of the Foreign Affairs and Defence Committee of the Indonesian parliament.
6. The summary of the Chair on the outcomes of the Meeting (see annex I) was published soon after the Meeting concluded and is available from the website of the Division for Palestinian Rights of the Secretariat, as are the full papers of the speakers who provided a copy for distribution (see www.un.org/depts/dpa/qpal/calendar.htm).

II. Opening session

7. The Vice-Chair of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, Permanent Representative of Indonesia to the United Nations Desra Percaya, chaired the opening session.
8. The Representative of the Host Government (Indonesia), Retno Lestari Priansari Marsudi, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Indonesia, pointed to the fact that Jakarta and East Jerusalem were “twin cities” as an indicator of the close ties between her country and Palestine that had led to the hosting of the conference. She expressed hope that, with other conflicts in the Middle East, e.g. those in the Syrian Arab Republic and Yemen, and growing threats of radicalism and extremism by Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) having diverted the attention of the international community, the Conference could provide an important impetus towards putting the issue of Palestine back on the global radar.

9. She encouraged participants to craft a formula for workable political and social solutions, focusing in particular on how people-to-people relations between Israelis and Palestinians could be strengthened. The spirit of coexistence was a necessary foundation for a meaningful peace process that would yield the ultimate result: ending the illegal occupation and creating a brighter future for Palestinians.

10. A statement was delivered on behalf of the Secretary-General of the United Nations by his representative to the Conference, Douglas Broderick, United Nations Resident Coordinator in Indonesia. He said that a growing one-State reality threatened to close the window of opportunity to reach the two-State goal, and indeed the Conference was taking place against a backdrop of one of the most serious eruptions of Israeli-Palestinian violence in recent years.

11. Any action that could be interpreted as attempting to change the delicate balance in Jerusalem, and particularly the status quo of the holy sites, carried with it the risk of conflict. Israel was called upon to reaffirm that it would not seek to divide the Haram al-Sharif (Temple Mount) and to strictly uphold the long-standing policy according to which Muslims prayed at and non-Muslims visited the holy sites.

12. While security cooperation between Palestinian and Israeli authorities must continue, it alone could not and would not address the violence. Leaders must urgently rein in incitement, Israeli security forces must ensure a calibrated use of force in response to incidents and all stakeholders must address the prevailing lack of a political horizon to end the occupation and achieve a negotiated two-State solution. Further, any violence and attacks against civilians, including rocket fire from Gaza, were unacceptable and had to stop.

13. He pledged support from the United Nations to help the parties bring the occupation and long-standing conflict to an end, in pursuit of a lasting vision of Israel and Palestine living side by side in peace and security, calling for the empowerment of “the voices of all those on both sides who want peace to prevail”.

14. The Assistant Secretary-General for Palestine and Al-Quds Affairs of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation, Samir Bakr, called upon the international community to intervene to rescue the two-State solution, which was now threatened by the occupying Power, and to act through the implementation of a political track with the participation of effective global partners. Such political efforts would begin with the adoption of a Security Council resolution that would include a clear political frame of reference, a specific time frame for an end to the occupation and international guarantees and agreed mechanisms for the implementation of all United Nations resolutions.

15. Delivering a statement on behalf of the President of the State of Palestine, Mahmoud Abbas, the Foreign Minister of the State of Palestine, Riad Malki, called upon the conference participants to act with resolve to ensure that issues addressed in their statements translated into intensified political, diplomatic and financial support by the United Nations, OIC and their members. Jerusalem was the beating heart of the Holy Land and the cornerstone of Palestinian identity and a Palestinian future, but its holy sites and history were under attack. While Palestinians in the city were subjected to aggression through forcible transfers, colonization,

home demolitions and revocation of residency cards, Israel was now attempting to blame them for the fire that it itself had ignited.

16. Although the inalienable rights of Palestinians were enshrined in international law, the world had failed to activate existing protection mechanisms. The question of Palestine remained the greatest test of the international system as a whole, which the world could not afford to fail. Resolutions and reports were not designed to describe realities, but to trigger action. Yet, despite the daily suffering caused by Israeli settlements, the wall and checkpoints, when was the world going to start worrying about the security of Palestinians and not only that of Israel?

17. The rapid deterioration on the ground was a direct consequence of the international community's inaction. To remedy it, settler terrorism must be outlawed, the Security Council would have to adopt a resolution supporting a timeline-based end to the occupation and States would have to ban settlement products and link their relations with Israel to its respect for the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people.

18. "Our freedom is non-negotiable," he said, adding that neither was the statehood of Palestine. The regional context and the many tragedies surrounding it had not made the Palestinian cause less relevant, and peace for all could, in fact, trigger a positive wave across the region and beyond. The city was also a symbol, which today stood as a testimony to double standards, injustice, racism and apartheid. Instead, he urged Jerusalem to be allowed to reach its destiny: an open and shared city of peace, tolerance and pluralism.

19. The Vice-Chair of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, Desra Percaya, recalled that, 68 years after General Assembly resolution 181 (II), which provided for the establishment in Palestine of a "Jewish State" and an "Arab State", with Jerusalem under a special international regime, the Jewish state had become a reality while the State of Palestine was under occupation and being denied the right to self-determination and the right to national independence and sovereignty.

20. Palestinians were understandably frustrated, as their lives were punctuated by a lack of freedom of movement in their own land as a result of roadblocks and checkpoints, a lack of dignity as a consequence of continual intrusion and scrutiny by Israeli security forces, a lack of employment and opportunity resulting from a stifled economy, and a lack of secured ownership of their homes. Palestinians were also subject to confiscations and demolitions, lack of access to their natural resources and exploitation of those resources by the occupying Power and, by and large, the lack of a future towards which to strive. The international community owed Palestinians a political horizon leading to the two-State solution before the situation on the ground spiralled out of control.

21. He recalled the collective responsibility of all United Nations Member States for Jerusalem, a particularly sensitive site. While tensions related to the holy sites in the Old City of Jerusalem had triggered a new wave of violence, the conflict was not about religion. Rather, it concerned the dispossession of a people and the occupation of a land. He called for the prevention, at all costs, of a religious dimension being injected to the conflict and expressed the hope that the Palestinian flag that now flew at United Nations offices all over the world would

one day symbolize the full realization of the two-State solution, with East Jerusalem as the capital of the State of Palestine.

22. Said Abu Ali, Assistant Secretary-General of the League of Arab States, said that the Meeting was taking place in the wake of grave actions by the occupying authorities against the holy sites and construction projects that would empty East Jerusalem of its Palestinian population. The League had spared no efforts in holding Israel accountable and in providing the necessary protection of the Palestinian people, including by appealing to the Security Council. Continued inaction by the international community would have serious consequences that could lead to a religious war.

23. The Ambassador of Morocco to Indonesia, Mohamed Majdi, said that Israel had used the difficult internal situation of the Palestinians and the preoccupation of the international community with fighting terrorism to pursue actions that would change the character of Jerusalem, including its demographic structure. Palestinian youth had suffered from despair owing to the refusal of Israeli authorities to reach any agreement on a political settlement. Morocco had hosted the first meeting of the OIC contact group on defending the cause of Palestine and Jerusalem.

24. The Ambassador of Jordan to Indonesia, Walid Al Hadid, said that the wave of Israeli violations included targeting Al-Aqsa Mosque through, among other things, restricting access by worshippers and attacking Mosque employees. Jordan would move forward to advance the protection of Muslim and Christian holy sites until the Israeli occupation ended, using every possible diplomatic and legal measure available. The continued Israeli violations would have an adverse political effect on relations between Israel and Jordan, not to mention deepen concerns over the peace process. The role of Jordan as custodian of the Islamic holy sites in Jerusalem needed to be enhanced to put an end to Israeli attacks against the sites.

25. A representative of Pakistan said that the past seven decades had been marked by moving one step ahead followed by two steps backwards. Resolving the Palestinian question was an international duty, and Pakistan would continue to support the revival of the peace process and the fulfilment of United Nations resolutions, as well as the end of the occupation and the establishment of the State of Palestine, with Jerusalem as its capital.

26. A representative of China said that China was gravely concerned about the recent intensification of violence in Jerusalem and called on all sides to make the utmost efforts to avoid any further escalation. To end the tensions, Israel must stop using excessive force. Efforts must also be made to push forward the peace process. The Palestinian people should enjoy their rights, including the establishment of an independent State, with East Jerusalem as its capital. China had been active in the peace process in the past and would continue to make efforts to ease tensions.

III. Plenary sessions

A. Plenary session I The status of Jerusalem today

27. Plenary session I was chaired by the Rapporteur of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, Permanent Representative of Malta to the United Nations Christopher Grima.
28. Shawan Jabarin, General Director of the Palestinian non-governmental organization Al-Haq, based in Ramallah, provided a snapshot of the situation on the ground, with details on the plight of Palestinians living in East Jerusalem, including by showing a short film about demolitions in Jerusalem that told the story of a 23-year-old man whose home and workshop had been bulldozed. Forced relocations, house demolitions and a deepening occupation of the city were among the daily realities, Mr. Jabarin outlined.
29. Since the annexation by Israel of East Jerusalem in 1967, the occupying Power had implemented a comprehensive policy of deepening its control over the city by weakening the Palestinian presence there and ties to the city. Describing a policy of pushing Palestinians out of the city, he referred to it as “ethnic cleansing”. The separation wall was not about security, but about keeping Palestinians out of Jerusalem, he asserted. Punitive house demolitions were another reality and an example of collective punishment that constituted a war crime.
30. The Israeli “Jerusalem Master Plan 2020” had been aimed at making the majority of the municipal population Jewish. Further, the Israeli courts had not provided any type of protection for Palestinians from home demolitions and other Israeli violations. Even though the High Court of Israel had stated that home demolitions were a breach of fundamental rights, it had stipulated that military commanders could “exercise their authority”. The long-term plan centred on ridding the city of Palestinians. Israeli police now shot to kill and had full authority to search anyone at any time. The current situation amounted to persecution.
31. Those practices had formed the root of the current problems, leading to an eruption of violence in September. It was now time for States to sever cooperation with Israel, ban settlement products and implement sanctions. Without those and other similar actions, he said, the situation would remain the same or worsen.
32. Geoffrey Aronson, former Director of Research and Publications at the Foundation for Middle East Peace and former editor of the *Report on Israeli Settlements in the Occupied Territories* in Washington, D.C., explained how, since the 1967 war and subsequent occupation of East Jerusalem, Israeli policies had changed the city map in response to events and challenges. The separation barrier, constructed after the second intifada in 2005, had especially affected those 100,000 Palestinian Jerusalem residents who now found themselves living “behind the wall”, cut off from essential municipal services and facing obstacles to their movement into the city centre, while at the same time Palestinian authorities were not allowed access to the area.

33. Residents living in that area, called “Area X”, could not depend on authorities for city services, such as garbage collection and a police presence. As a result, since 2005 residents had lived in a practically lawless environment, with criminal elements asserting themselves. Since it was the only area of East Jerusalem where the Israeli authorities did not care about Palestinian illegal construction, multi-storey buildings had been constructed without any planning along roads built to accommodate a small village population. An administrative fiat was in effect excluding Palestinians from the city itself and the services it offered.

34. In recent months, some parts of the city had been in revolt against the status quo. In response, the Israeli authorities had reduced access and ease of travel to parts of East Jerusalem for those who lived within the separation wall. Silwan, for instance, was one area within the city inside the wall where residents might begin to suffer the kinds of access obstructions that had been experienced by residents in “Area X”. Mr. Aronson doubted, however, that most Israeli actions were part of a master plan; instead, they were responses driven by short-term thinking.

35. Victor Kattan, senior research fellow at the Middle East Institute of the National University of Singapore, provided a synopsis of the legal status of religious sites, with a particular emphasis on international law. The Haram al-Sharif (Temple Mount) had always been recognized as an important holy site to Islam and had been under the custodianship of the King of Jordan for almost a century, which had been recognized by Israel in its 1994 peace treaty with Jordan. When Israel annexed Jerusalem, the Knesset had even passed a law preventing the prohibition of access by worshippers to holy sites. Indeed, no State had recognized Israeli sovereignty over Jerusalem, East nor West, or its claim to the holy sites. Early plans to solve the question of Palestine had included the internationalization of Jerusalem, in order to not give power to any particular party to the conflict. Since the 1967 war and occupation, however, Jerusalem had progressively become a Jewish city, as part of a deliberate policy.

36. Makarim Wibisono, Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Palestinian territories occupied since 1967, shared his perspective, saying that, amid recent violence, peace had remained a distant goal.

37. Recent news reports reflected a glaring reality that there was a long way to go towards peace, he said. Stories of killings and violence provided a snapshot of existing policies and practices related to settlements, discriminatory planning and zoning, demolition of Palestinian homes and the excessive use of force by Israeli security forces, alongside other measures, such as withholding the bodies of Palestinians from their families for burial.

38. He pointed to the reality that while, under international humanitarian law, people under occupation were a protected population, in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, protection had been largely subjugated to the politics of the conflict. The victims of the conflict were the Palestinian mothers and fathers for whose sons and daughters there was little or no recourse to justice in the face of ongoing violations, but also both peoples – Israelis and Palestinians – who were kept in a perpetual state of slow-burning conflict.

39. The international community had an important role to play in pressing Israel to stop those and other occupation policies and practices, and promote respect for international law. In

response to the Israeli law in 1980 to treat the whole of Jerusalem as part of Israel, the Security Council, in its resolutions 476 (1980) and 478 (1980), had reaffirmed that the acquisition of territory by force was inadmissible and that measures by Israel to alter the geographic, demographic and historical character and status of the Holy City of Jerusalem were “null and void and must be rescinded”.

40. Since peace begins with respect for human rights, to realize a viable Jerusalem, more must be done now to improve the protection of the human rights of Palestinians and ensure respect for international humanitarian law. Until there was an East Jerusalem standing as the capital of an independent State of Palestine, the international community must continue to insist that Israel should abide by human rights and international humanitarian law.

41. After the presentations, Trias Kuncahyono, a Jakarta-based journalist at *Kompas* newspaper and the author of several books on the Middle East, posed the question of whether peace between Israel and Palestine was even possible. It was clear that the Palestinian goal of East Jerusalem as their capital ran counter to the position of Israel and that the city would have to be shared by both sides. As one of the world’s oldest cities and the centre of three major religions, Jerusalem was at the heart of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. United Nations resolutions had worked towards resolving conflict in the city, with dozens of resolutions proposed over the past five decades. Many remained unimplemented, however. The time had come for compromises and for moving forward in the peace process. The season of peace would arrive only if all States pushed Israel to respect United Nations resolutions, he said, and the one country that could force Israelis into action was the United States.

42. When the floor was opened for discussion, the Ambassador of Jordan to Indonesia said that his country was concerned that Israel was using new tools, such as shoot-to-kill orders for police officers, punitive demolitions and withholding the bodies of killed Palestinians.

43. Speakers from civil society groups expressed similar concerns. A representative from the Palestinian Cultural Organization of Malaysia said he was concerned that Israel would eventually divide the Aqsa Mosque compound. Having grown up in Hebron, 30 miles from Jerusalem, he said that his father had not been allowed to pray at Al-Aqsa Mosque for 15 years.

44. A representative of the United National Organization for Human Rights of Egypt said that Israel was expressing hatred and Islamophobia. Strong recommendations should come from the international community and protection must be provided at the holy sites. In the same vein, a representative of the Palestinian Return Centre in London stated that robust action was needed by the international community to right current wrongs. A researcher on Palestinian refugee issues asserted that most discriminatory policies had been taken with a view to depopulating the city.

45. Experts then addressed questions and made closing statements.

46. Mr. Jabarin said that, in regard to Palestinian residency rights in Jerusalem, Israeli revocations were part of a long-term plan to push Palestinians out of the city and out of the whole territory of historic Palestine. Thus, between 1967 and 1989, a total of 120,000

Palestinians had lost their right to return to the West Bank, and thousands of Palestinians in Jerusalem had lost their residency cards.

47. Turning to other points raised in the session, he said that more compromises were not needed, as Palestinians had compromised enough. The occupation forces were proactive, not reactive, and bulldozers were demolishing houses. The occupation should have been temporary, but Israel was acting as a sovereign authority and its economy was enjoying \$6 billion a year in income from the occupied territories. Responding to a question on the effectiveness of boycotts, he said that banning products had a more serious impact, as did sanctions. He suggested that OIC should issue a resolution guiding laws on tendering business contracts to ensure that vendors had no association with settlement or occupation businesses. Member States of OIC could pass such domestic laws. In addition, States should cooperate with the International Criminal Court.

48. Mr. Wibisono said that Indonesia was looking forward to playing a greater diplomatic role in the peacemaking and peacebuilding processes. Palestinians had limited or no protection of their rights and should be provided with assistance to regain their rights.

B. Plenary session II

Historical and contemporary models of coexistence

49. Plenary session II was chaired by the Rapporteur of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, Permanent Representative of Malta to the United Nations Christopher Grima.

50. Menachem Klein, a university professor and author based in Ramat Gan, Israel, provided a look at Jerusalem before the 1948 war had divided the city. There was a patently incorrect concept that Jerusalem had been separated into exclusive ethnic quarters prior to the war.

51. He said that, during the pre-war years, inhabitants had lived respectfully and peacefully in the city, with no “mental boundary” separating Arab and Jewish areas and where barriers of language and culture had posed few impediments, and there had been many mixed neighbourhoods. Residents who had ventured into the “physical sphere” of the “other” had felt quite at home there.

52. Archival research showed that there had been a sense of a shared space. Religious holidays had been celebrated in the open with members of other faiths taking part. Likewise, festivals and holy places had been shared by all the local people. Even after the 1919 and 1920 nationalist riots had left the Jewish community with mixed feelings, regular life had resumed, with Arabs and Jews apologizing to each other over the violence that had occurred.

53. According to Mr. Klein, when after the 1948/49 war the Israeli Government had reassigned vacant homes of Palestinian refugees to Jewish people, the new tenants had spoken of carefully guarding the original owners’ belongings. Many new residents had also signed Israeli Government waivers requiring them to vacate the premises within a month at the original

owner's demand. Over time and with changing Israeli policies, however, this initial approach had been pushed aside and forgotten.

54. Today, while one could not return to the past, one must learn from the inclusive social nature of the city's history, he stated. Indeed, the shared past needed to be studied to build a shared future.

55. Azyumardi Azra, rector of Syarif Hidayatullah State Islamic University in Jakarta, said that the shared history of peaceful religious coexistence in Indonesia had included a guarantee of the protection of life and property and recognized the basic principles of human rights long before the United Nations had adopted the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

56. Moving forward, there was a need to mainstream religious moderates so that those groups could play a bigger role on the road to Israeli-Palestinian peace. Dialogue needed to be intensified, first on an intra-Muslim and intra-Jewish basis and then between religious groups. Religious leaders must also strengthen dialogue to develop mutual respect and understanding to create peace in the city. The aim of religious dialogue spanned a range of issues, including early warning systems to avoid conflict. The Indonesian model for peaceful coexistence had demonstrated successful results. Intellectuals and non-governmental organizations must also be involved to put pressure on advancing the peace process.

57. Indonesia had a history of peaceful coexistence with Judaism and other religions. With regard to the situation in Palestine and Israel, while in the late 1990s trade relations with Israel had been discussed, in 2005 the Government of Indonesia had decided that formal ties with Israel would be possible only after peace had been reached. Indonesia was also planning to open a consulate in Palestine and had been active in encouraging dialogue between Muslim and Jewish, and Palestinian and Israeli, groups.

58. Wendy Pullan, Head of the Department of Architecture at Cambridge University, giving a presentation on examples of post-conflict urban spaces and existing communities, provided a range of options regarding what a Jerusalem of the future could look like. Currently, the patchwork of settlements in East Jerusalem, built primarily with a view to ensuring a continuity of Jewish space, had resulted in a situation of a fragmented eastern part of the city that could not simply be redivided without violent upheavals.

59. Using examples – Belfast, Beirut and Nicosia – she cited evidence that divided cities did not flourish. Temporarily erected barriers were usually an act of despair in times of extreme conflict that typically created long-term problems and, as was the case in Jerusalem, even more extreme conflicts. Shared public space, which could serve as a neutral area where both sides could meet, was inherently risky but necessary in building a viable city for all residents.

60. For example, in Nicosia, after the city had been split in 1974, the United Nations had brokered talks with the two mayors, shaping a long-term strategic plan based on the notion of reunification. While the plan had not been perfect and Nicosia had remained divided, the city had developed strategies for infrastructure and common spaces, which could be implemented after a peace agreement.

61. Of course, the current violence in Jerusalem and the intransigence of Israel had meant that there was little hope of creating such common space. Nevertheless, a shared city could be envisioned, especially since there were also concerns that, under current conditions, a future division of Jerusalem could disadvantage the Palestinians living there.

62. Given the Israeli policies in Jerusalem, even public projects that provided services to all residents of that highly divided city were seen as inherently political and one-sided. Thus, the light rail system built by Israel would, in other circumstances, be used by people across the spectrum; instead, it was boycotted by Palestinian residents of Jerusalem.

63. The current violence and the intransigence of Israel meant that there was little hope of creating common public spaces. Ethnic cleansing was a reality and there needed to be protection for Palestinians immediately, she said. It was also necessary for the international community to go beyond immediate strategies and begin thinking about the future, she concluded.

64. Opening the discussion, Tova Norlen, a visiting fellow at the School of Advanced International Studies at Johns Hopkins University in Washington, D.C., summarized her personal history with Jerusalem before asking the experts a series of questions. As a high school student, she had lived in a house in the former “no man’s land” between East and West Jerusalem, which meant she had become acutely aware of the differences between the two parts.

65. As with other ethnic conflicts – for instance in Lebanon, Bosnia and Kosovo – violence had driven apart identities. The construction of conflicting identities was so much easier than their deconstruction, and the knowledge of how those hardened identities had been created did not mean that one could just remove the barriers and undo the events in order to go back to a harmonious Jerusalem.

66. Asking Mr. Klein about the issue of the deconstruction of hardened polarized identities, she noted that there were now generations of religious Israelis who might become just as militant as their jihadi counterparts. She also asked whether creative solutions could be worked into a two-State solution in which both sides could agree that they were living on land that was also sacred to others.

67. She asked Ms. Pullan how the separation that had caused physical and psychological barriers could be reversed. She recalled the practice of settlers in Jerusalem avoiding street traffic by travelling from roof to roof to get to yeshivas in the Muslim quarter, resulting in a vertical ethno-religious segregation of the urban space. Further, if divided cities did not flourish, how could solutions for Jerusalem be found that would also address the needs of the Palestinians to have at least a nominal division of the city in order for the Palestinian part to become the capital of an independent Palestinian State, she enquired.

68. During the discussion, the representative of Jordan said that dialogue was very important in that it provided shared perspectives. Nevertheless, the problem at hand had passed beyond the stage of dialogue. The focus should now be on putting pressure not on Palestinians to compromise but on the right-wing Government of Israel to abide by international law and implement United Nations resolutions.

69. A representative of the Global Peace Foundation of Malaysia asked about a solution for the current situation. A representative of the Ramallah-based Al-Haq asked Mr. Klein for his views on refugee Arabs being denied the right of return to their homes. A representative of civil society from Indonesia asked how Jerusalem could maintain the title of “city of peace”.

70. Ms. Pullan said that the issue of separation of communities went beyond only settlers on the rooftops; settlers were in fact building tunnels under the city that were being used for tourism, prayer and archaeological excavations. Such tunnels had “sandwiched” Palestinians, with hostile settlers on the rooftops and underneath. That worrying concern could not simply be removed in an easy way. Every city had conflict and, to the extent that conflict could be channelled in positive ways, public space was key to the proper functioning of a city, a notion that had to be nurtured.

71. In her research on a dozen divided cities, she found that none had flourished. The current situation in Jerusalem was both a political and a religious conflict. One possible solution would be to establish an open city for all residents, with political capitals removed to Tel Aviv and Ramallah.

72. Mr. Azra said that the origins of the current conflict were political. Over time, however, it had become difficult to distinguish between political and religious conflicts. Some Indonesian groups, in their support for Palestine, had used religious doctrine. Egypt, Jordan and Turkey had diplomatic relations with Israel. When Indonesia suggested opening trade relations with Israel, however, the notion had been rejected on religious grounds. Indonesia supported Palestine and at the same time encouraged dialogue among the Palestinian groups.

73. Mr. Klein said that, while it was impossible to return to the past, the past should not be forgotten. Both Jews and Arabs were then known as Palestinians and the Palestinian identity had been jointly developed since the late nineteenth century. The shared past needed to be studied to build a shared future. There needed to be a change in perspective in order to clearly see the other side’s attachment to the land and that Palestine belonged to all of its citizens, as Jerusalem belonged to all citizens and communities.

74. Regarding refugees, Israel practiced double standards, he said, with Jewish people allowed to return to the land of Israel when Palestinians could not get back their properties. The legal system, which was currently separate for East Jerusalem and the West Bank, should also be changed. The challenge for scholars and professionals was to discuss how the two sides should share, instead of divide, Jerusalem without destroying the city.

75. The Permanent Observer of the State of Palestine to the United Nations, Riyad Mansour, stated that some of those sentiments about Jerusalem’s indivisibility could not stand the test of reality. During the recent youth uprising in Jerusalem, the façade and pretention that the city was eternally united had not survived the span of two weeks. Intellectuals could debate issues but should remember the situation on the ground.

76. There was also the notion of attachment of both sides to the land. For a Palestinian, Palestine was the homeland. Political thinking was now embracing an acceptance of two States.

Yet, Israel was trying to impose on Palestinians the notion that they did not belong to the land, branding it as the Jewish homeland.

77. Ms. Pullan said it was clear that Jerusalem was not a united city, a notion that was an Israeli myth. Yet, it was not divided either, but in fact fragmented, a result of long-term Israeli planning. She expressed concern about a divided city resulting from the current reality, with Israel enjoying a position of power and influence. In that regard, she said she would be concerned that the city would be divided in an unequal way that would be detrimental to the Palestinians.

78. Ms. Norlen said the concern should be more about how East Jerusalem could flourish once a peace agreement fully established a Palestinian State. There was attachment to the land by both peoples and discussions on that issue should address the fact that many were denying that notion.

IV. Closing session

79. The Director General for Multilateral Affairs at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Indonesia, Hasan Kleib, underlined the importance of the protection of Jerusalem and access for people of all faiths, and peaceful coexistence as a way forward towards a sustainable future for Jerusalem. Nevertheless, Israeli illegal actions to alter the status and demographic composition of the city were obstacles. While those practices were to be condemned, he said that condemnation was no longer enough. Persistent illegal policies and practices needed to be persistently confronted. Concerted efforts were needed towards the realization of the collective Palestinian dream of establishing a viable State and achieving peace and security in the region by removing all obstacles to those goals. The members of the Committee must play a stronger role in clearing all obstacles to the creation of a viable Palestinian State, with East Jerusalem as its capital.

80. The Permanent Observer of the State of Palestine to the United Nations, Riyad Mansour, said it was significant that the conference had been convened in Indonesia, a democracy of considerable size with the largest Muslim population in the world. Jerusalem was the heart of the State of Palestine and the issue of Jerusalem should be addressed within the framework of ending the occupation. While Palestinians accepted three major religions having spiritual bonds with Jerusalem, that could not be translated into a justification for a connection with a State.

81. The reality demanded advancing the question of providing international protection for the Palestinian people, he said. The Geneva Conventions outlined the relations between the occupier and the occupied. When the occupying Power abandoned its responsibility to protect the occupied and became in fact the aggressor against them, then it became the international community's responsibility to provide protection, an issue that would be discussed in the Security Council, he said.

82. The General Assembly also had a responsibility to provide protection, and United Nations agencies, which had a large presence on the ground, could also be involved in discussions on the protection of civilians.

83. International conferences on Jerusalem jointly organized by the Committee and OIC were not convened to reiterate existing principles and positions, but to move in the direction of practical steps, he stated. Thus, while the State of Palestine was pursuing efforts at the International Criminal Court, it was high time for OIC to pursue legal options to hold Israel responsible, including through domestic courts and the International Court of Justice.

84. The Vice-Chair of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People and Permanent Representative of Indonesia to the United Nations, Desra Percaya, acknowledged the fruitful exchanges during the conference. While Jerusalem was the most difficult of the final status issues, and was fraught with religious significance, he reiterated that this conflict was not about religion. It was about the dispossession of a people from their rights and their land. Any attempt to portray it in religious terms would serve only those who wanted to present the Palestinian cause as an extremist and intractable issue, justifying a strong security response appealing to the fears of the international community, and thus perpetuating the occupation.

85. Turning the struggle for Palestinian rights into a religious conflict would also contribute to efforts being made by fanatics who wished to corrupt and misguide Muslim youth worldwide. Such a situation would most likely push further away any possibility of achieving Palestinian rights.

86. The international community must take concerted action to persuade Israel to cease provocations and violations, particularly on the Aqsa Mosque compound. All efforts must be made to provide the Palestinian people with a positive perspective that showed that they would not be abandoned by the nations of the world because of other conflicts and concerns. The message needed to be clear, that “we will not cease our efforts until the Israeli occupation has ended, until the Palestinian people have achieved their inalienable rights in a free and sovereign State of Palestine, with East Jerusalem as its capital.”

Annex I

Summary of the Chair

1. The International Conference on the Question of Jerusalem was convened in Jakarta, Indonesia on 14-15 December 2015, under the auspices of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People (CEIRPP) in cooperation with the Organization for Islamic Cooperation and the Government of the Republic of Indonesia. The Conference provided up-to-date information on the current situation in Jerusalem to inform policy and decision makers, civil society, and general public; a forum on how to enhance international efforts for a halt to unilateral Israeli actions, and discuss possible ways forward for Jerusalem and its inhabitants; and a venue for an open exchange among experts, practitioners, activists and academics.
2. Invited to the conference were all United Nations Members and Observers, inter-governmental organizations, UN Agencies, civil society organizations, think tanks, and the media. Fifty-five Member States and two Observer States participated. The Meeting was open to the public and generated significant media interest.
3. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of Indonesia, H.E. Mrs. Retno L.P. Marsudi, said support for all people under occupation including Palestine was a constitutional mandate of Indonesia. Recalling the 60th anniversary of the Bandung declaration, she said Jakarta was a twin city of East Jerusalem. Indonesia was supporting Palestine politically; it co-sponsored the resolution to raise the Palestinian flag at the United Nations, and also built capacity for Palestinians. Despite the best intentions and efforts of the international community, however, Israel continued to impose a “reign of terror” in the Occupied Palestinian Territory. As the prolonged Israeli occupation further destabilized the region, she called on the Security Council to ensure Israeli compliance with international law. The issue of East Jerusalem was of strategic importance not just to Palestine and Israel, but for all Muslims, Christians and Jews. Indonesia envisaged East Jerusalem as the capital of the State of Palestine. While looking for a political solution, one of the areas to be examined is how people-to-people relations between Israelis and Palestinians can be strengthened. The spirit of co-existence is a necessary foundation for a meaningful peace process.
4. In his message to the Meeting at the opening session, the Secretary-General of the United Nations emphasized that the conference was taking place against the backdrop of one of the largest eruptions of violence in years. Jerusalem is sacred to billions including Muslims, Jews and Christians, and any action interpreted as changing the status quo carried the risk of conflict. He called on both sides to rein in incitement and for Israeli forces to use force in a calibrated way. Continued security cooperation between Israel and Palestine remained vital, but security measures alone could not solve what was in essence a political conflict. Parties must refrain from establishing facts on the ground, and attacks against civilians must stop. He looked forward to the revitalized Quartet, in cooperation with regional partners, to create conditions for a return to negotiations.

5. The Vice Chair of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, H.E. Ambassador Desra Percaya noted that Palestinian life in the occupied territory were characterized by the lack of freedom and prospects for the future in their own land. He emphasized that this conflict, including the latest round of tensions and violence around Jerusalem, was not about religion but about the dispossession of a land and people living under occupation. Injecting a religious dimension to the conflict should be avoided at all costs, he stressed. At the same time, the status quo of religious sites must be respected, in line with existing agreements between Israel and Jordan.

6. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of the State of Palestine, H.E. Mr. Riad Al Malki said that Jerusalem was under attack. Israel attempted to blame Palestinians for a fire it had ignited. But Palestinians would continue struggling to fulfil their inalienable rights; yet, the world had failed to activate the existing mechanisms of protection and accountability. Resolutions and reports were not designed to describe realities but to trigger action, he stressed. It was the responsibility of States not to render aid or assistance to illegal Israeli actions. Furthermore, States must also consider settlers' organizations as criminal and terrorist organizations and act accordingly. The Security Council must adopt a resolution for ending the occupation with a clear timeframe to achieve a two-State solution based on the 1967 borders, including as regards Jerusalem. States must prohibit any ties between their Governments, their entities, their companies and their citizens with the occupation and notably the settlement regime by refusing to hold meetings with settlers, including officials or members of Knesset, prohibiting companies from being involved in the occupation and banning settlement products. States must also condition their relations with Israel with its respect for the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people. States not only have a right but also a duty to recognize the State of Palestine on the 1967 borders, including East Jerusalem.

7. The Assistant Secretary-General of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation, H.E. Mr. Samir Bakr recalled that the OIC was originally established to defend Jerusalem. The grave violations perpetrated by Israel to empty the Holy City of its Palestinian inhabitants in addition to the violations committed against Jerusalem's Islamic and Christian sanctuaries, represented an act of "ethnic cleansing" which constituted war crimes and crimes against humanity, which makes it incumbent on the international community to confront them, he opined. The continuation of the Israeli aggressions would further spread the conflict and risked giving it a religious dimension. The international community needed to ensure international protection for the Palestinian people. He paid tribute to the European Union for its policies in favour of the two-State vision, particularly the recent decision to label settlement products. However, much more was needed. The Security Council should adopt a resolution that provides a clear political reference and a specific timeframe for an end to the Israeli occupation, coupled with international guarantees and agreed mechanisms for its implementation.

8. In the ensuing sessions, participants discussed the situation in Jerusalem, the status of holy sites under international law, and international protection and human rights. Participants described a reality in which Israel implemented a discriminatory policy to weaken the Palestinian presence, which some described as "ethnic cleansing". Thousands of Palestinian homes are slated for demolition, with few building permits issued to Palestinians compared to illegal settlements which continue to flourish. Palestinians continued to face residency revocations.

Following recent unrest Israel has used excessive force and punitive house demolitions, and targeted children. Contrary to Israeli rhetoric of a “united and indivisible” Jerusalem, the separation wall built during the second intifada had isolated over 100,000 Palestinian inhabitants of Jerusalem in a “no man’s land” with no municipal services, no law enforcement and with access obstructions to the rest of Jerusalem. A similar dynamic has recently been imposed on other Palestinian neighbourhoods in the wake of the current unrest. A participant identified a deliberate Israeli plan to purge Jerusalem of its Palestinian inhabitants, while another described it as an ad hoc response driven by developments.

9. On the status of religious sites under international law, it was noted that while the sovereignty over the city remains in dispute, pending a permanent status agreement, no State currently recognizes Israel’s claim to any part of the city, East or West, or to the holy places. After Jordan renounced all claims of sovereignty over East Jerusalem in 1988, it retained its custodianship over the holy places, which was reaffirmed by treaties with Israel and Palestine. Jordan is protecting the Al-Haram Al-Sharif for the Palestinian people pending the establishment of an independent State. Peace begins with respect for human rights, it was stressed, yet the Palestinians, a protected population under the laws of occupation, enjoy little effective protection either from the Occupying Power or the international community. The international community had an important role to play, but the issues of protections have been subordinated to the politics of the conflict. A Palestinian participant called on States to sever cooperation with Israel, ban settlement products and impose sanctions, given its human rights record towards Palestinians.

10. The conference then considered historical and contemporary models of coexistence. It was pointed out that, contrary to popular belief, pre-1948 Jerusalem was never a segregated city. Arabs and Jews lived side by side and interacted with each other. Violence has hardened religious, political and ethnic identities since then. Militantly religious groups have formed on both sides. After 50 years of occupation Jerusalem is a city with a divided population susceptible to intermittent violent conflict. Al-Haram Al-Sharif (Temple Mount) is particularly contested, politicized and violent. While history could not be reversed, history teaches that physically partitioned cities do not prosper. Diversity, and also conflict, is the lifeblood of cities in general. Barriers between ethnic neighbourhoods offer a tempting solution in times of violent conflict but they create greater alienation and more extreme conflict down the road. Shared public spaces should be considered essential to a viable city. Indonesia’s experience as an amalgam of pluralism, inclusiveness and religious harmony can be drawn upon. It is important to mainstream the moderates on both sides and promote dialogue within the Palestinian and Israeli communities first and then between them. A participant questioned whether given the patchwork of settlements the city could be re-divided without violent upheavals and proposed an open city for all residents, with the political capitals removed to Tel Aviv and Ramallah. The representative of Palestine however said statements that Jerusalem could not be divided did not stand the test of reality.

11. In closing remarks, Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs of Indonesia, Ambassador Hasan Kleib underlined the importance of protection of Jerusalem and access for people of all faiths, and peaceful coexistence as a way forward towards a sustainable future for Jerusalem. However, Israeli illegal actions to alter the status and demographic composition of the city are obstacles. Condemnations, however are not a policy, he stressed. The International Community should

exercise its utmost efforts in mainstreaming the issue back again into the global arena. The members of the Palestinian Rights Committee must play a stronger role to confront these violations. The conference had been successful in putting the Palestine issue back on the international radar, he said. Indonesia will continue its unwavering and unconditional support until the freedom of Palestine prevails.

12. The Permanent Observer of the State of Palestine to the UN said it was significant that the conference was convened in Indonesia, a large democracy with the biggest Muslim population in the world. Jerusalem was the heart of the State of Palestine and the issue of Jerusalem should be addressed within the framework of occupation. While Palestinians accepted three major religions having spiritual bonds with Jerusalem, this cannot be translated into a justification for a connection with a single State.

13. The Committee Vice-Chair acknowledged the fruitful exchanges during the conference. While Jerusalem was the most difficult of the final status issues, and it was fraught with religious significance, he reiterated that this conflict was not about religion. Any attempt to portray it in these terms would only serve those who want to present the Palestinian cause as an extremist and intractable issue, justifying a strong security response appealing to the fears of the international community, and thus perpetuating the occupation.

Annex II
List of participants

Speakers

Geoffrey Aronson	Former Director of Research and Publications Foundation for Middle East Peace Former Editor of the Foundation's bimonthly <i>Report on Israeli Settlements in the Occupied Territories</i> Washington, D.C.
Azyumardi Azra	Eighth Rector of Syarif Hidayatullah State Islamic University Jakarta
Shawan Jabarin	General Director Al-Haq Ramallah
Victor Kattan	Senior Research Fellow, Middle East Institute, National University of Singapore Singapore
Menachem Klein	University professor and author of several books, including <i>Lives in Common: Arabs and Jews in Jerusalem, Jaffa and Hebron</i> Ramat Gan
Trias Kuncahyono	Senior journalist, <i>Kompas</i> newspaper Jakarta
Tova Norlen	Visiting Fellow Johns Hopkins University School of Advanced International Studies Washington, D.C.
Wendy Pullan	Head of the Department of Architecture Cambridge University Cambridge
Makarim Wibisono	United Nations Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Palestinian territories occupied since 1967 Jakarta

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

Desra Percaya	Permanent Representative of Indonesia to the United Nations Vice-Chair of the Committee
Christopher Grima	Permanent Representative of Malta to the United Nations Rapporteur of the Committee
Riyad Mansour	Permanent Observer of the State of Palestine to the United Nations

Representative of the Secretary-General

Douglas Broderick	Resident Coordinator of the United Nations in Indonesia
-------------------	---

Governments

Afghanistan	Amanullah Saleem, Chargé d'Affaires Embassy in Jakarta
Algeria	Abdelkader Aziria, Ambassador Hicheme Mostefaoui, Second Secretary Fadia Benbouza, Diplomatic Attaché Embassy in Jakarta
Argentina	Ricardo Bocalandro, Ambassador Embassy in Jakarta
Armenia	Anna Aghadjanian, Ambassador Embassy in Jakarta
Azerbaijan	Tamerlan Garayev, Ambassador Ruslan Nasibov, Counsellor Embassy in Jakarta
Bahrain	Ahmed Alhajri, First Secretary Embassy in Jakarta
Bangladesh	Md. Nazmul Quaunine, Ambassador Anirban Neogi, Third Secretary Embassy in Jakarta

Belarus	Mikalai Dzivaku, First Secretary Embassy in Jakarta
Belgium	Patrick Herman, Ambassador Embassy in Jakarta
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Almijana Rudic, Counsellor Embassy in Jakarta
Brazil	Leonardo Carvalho Monteiro, Chargé d'Affaires Windy Widiati Embassy in Jakarta
Brunei Darussalam	Ardina Agus Din, First Secretary Embassy in Jakarta
China	Hangtian Xu, Political Counsellor Ronghai Pan, Attaché Embassy in Jakarta
Colombia	Claudia Liliana López, Counsellor Ana Laura Acosta, First Secretary Embassy in Jakarta
Croatia	Dražen Margeta, Ambassador Anja Čuček, First Secretary Embassy in Jakarta
Ecuador	Rodrigo Riofrio, Ambassador Gonzalo M. Vega, Counsellor Embassy in Jakarta
Egypt	Bahaa Dessouki, Ambassador Ahmed Eid, Counsellor Embassy in Jakarta
India	Shri Manish, Deputy Chief of Mission K. Gildiyal, First Secretary Shalia Shah, Third Secretary Embassy in Jakarta
Indonesia	Retno Lestari Priansari Marsudi, Minister for Foreign Affairs Hassan Kleib, Director General for Multilateral Cooperation Kemal Haripurwanto, Assistant Deputy for Multilateral Relations

Moh. Hanifa, Head of Mideast Division
 Ismail Fahmi, Directorate of Asia-Pacific and African Affairs,
 Directorate General of Asia-Pacific and African Affairs

Dedy Eka Januardi, Assistant Deputy Director for OIC Political Affairs

Nico Adam
 Rizai Adri M
 Mutiara Anggun
 Directorate KST Kemla

Kemel Hadiputranto, Assistant Deputy of Multilateral Affairs,
 Coordinating Minister for Politics, Law and Security

K.H. Hasyim Muzadi, Member of Presidential Advisory Council

Romo Franz Magnis Suseno, Chair of STF
 Driyarkara, Academician

Teguh Wardoyo, Ambassador
 Embassy in Amman

Nurus Syamsi
 Embassy in Amman

Iran (Islamic Republic of) Valiollah Mohammadi, Ambassador
 Embassy in Jakarta

Ireland Kyle O’Sullivan, Ambassador
 Embassy in Jakarta

Japan Ryo Nokamura, Head of Political Affairs
 Embassy in Jakarta

Jordan Walid Al Hadid, Ambassador
 Embassy in Jakarta

Kazakhstan Mursal-Nabi Tuyakbay, Minister-Counsellor
 Embassy in Jakarta

Kuwait Faisal Aljeeran, Counsellor
 Awalhuddin A., Translator
 Embassy in Jakarta

Lao People’s Democratic Republic Phomma Boutthavong, Minister Counsellor
 Embassy in Jakarta

Lebanon	Joanna Azzi, Chargé d'Affaires Embassy in Jakarta
Mexico	Federico Salas, Ambassador Atzimba Luna, Cultural Attaché Embassy in Jakarta
Morocco	Mohamed Majdi, Ambassador Zakaria Rifki Embassy in Jakarta
Netherlands	Felix Sharief, Foreign Policy/ASEAN Officer Political Department Embassy in Jakarta
Nigeria	Muhammad L. Sulaiman, Ambassador Embassy in Jakarta
Pakistan	Syed Zahid Raza, Deputy Head of Mission/Counsellor Shazia Muneer, Third Secretary Embassy in Jakarta
Philippines	Roberto G. Manalo, Deputy Chief of Mission Embassy in Jakarta
Poland	Tadeusz Szumowski, Ambassador Embassy in Jakarta
Qatar	Mohammed Khater Al-Khater, Ambassador Safril, Translator Embassy in Jakarta
Russian Federation	Mikhail Yu. Galuzin, Ambassador Alexander A. Shilin, Minister-Counselor, Deputy Chief of Mission Yulia R. Gromyko, Second Secretary Embassy in Jakarta
Saudi Arabia	Moustafa Ibrahim A.A. Mubarak, Ambassador Embassy in Jakarta
Serbia	Vukasin Todorovic, Chargé d'Affaires/Counsellor Embassy in Jakarta
Slovakia	Veronika Pristasova, Deputy Head of Mission Embassy in Jakarta

Somalia	Mohamud Olow Barow, Ambassador Embassy in Jakarta
Spain	José Viqueira Niel, Ambassador Embassy in Jakarta
Sri Lanka	Mahinda Kumar, Chargé d’Affaires Embassy in Jakarta
Sudan	Abd Alrahim Alsiddig M. Omer, Ambassador Embassy in Jakarta
Sweden	Autilia Arfwidsson, Political Section Embassy in Jakarta
Syrian Arab Republic	Bashar Samara, Chargé d’Affaires Embassy in Jakarta
Tunisia	Mourad Belhasseh, Ambassador Baghadi Dhahbi, First Secretary Embassy in Jakarta
Turkey	Zekeriya Akçam, Ambassador Faruk Deviz, Second Secretary Embassy in Jakarta
Ukraine	Volodymyr Pakhil, Ambassador Embassy in Jakarta
United Arab Emirates	Mustapha Luthfi, Information Officer Embassy in Jakarta
United States of America	Lukman Sukarson, Political Specialist Embassy in Jakarta
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	Gladys Urbaneja, Ambassador Luis Laya, First Secretary Embassy in Jakarta
Zimbabwe	Livit Mugejo, Counsellor Embassy in Jakarta

**Non-member States having received a standing invitation to participate as observers
in the sessions and the work of the General Assembly and maintaining
permanent observer missions at Headquarters**

Holy See	Monsignor Antonio Filipazzi, Apostolic Nuncio to Indonesia, Head of Delegation l'Abbé Fabio Salerno, Member Jakarta
State of Palestine	Riad Al-Malki, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the State of Palestine Ramallah Fariz Mehdawi, Ambassador Taher Hamad, Counsellor Moammar Milhelm, First Secretary Embassy in Jakarta

Intergovernmental organizations

Association of Southeast Asian Nations	Lee Yoong Yoong, Head of Executive Support Division, Office of the Secretary-General Jakarta
European Union	Florian Witt, Attaché, Political Adviser Jakarta
League of Arab States	Said Abu Ali, Assistant Secretary-General, Head of the Palestinian and the Arab Occupied Territories Sector Cairo
Organization of Islamic Cooperation	Iyad Ameen Madani, Secretary-General Samir Bakr, Assistant Secretary-General Halit Eren, Director General, Research Centre for Islamic History, Art and Culture Adel Salameh, Political Officer Aiman Aboush, Media Officer Moussa Hadji Farah Arraleh, Financial Officer Bilal Sasso, Chief of Protocol Khaled Alharbi, Protocol Officer Jeddah

United Nations organs, agencies and bodies

Office of the Resident Coordinator	Erland Haughten, Special Assistant Danielle Sall, Intern Jakarta
United Nations Development Programme	Sufian Mushasha, Senior Policy Adviser Programme of Assistance to the Palestinian People Jerusalem
United Nations Information Centre	Vlastimil Samek, Director Dahlia Sihombing, Reference Assistant Ira Rambu Jakarta,

Civil society organizations

Centre for Dialogue and Cooperation among Civilisations	Nur Djumadil Iman, Office Manager Jakarta
Dewan Masjid Indonesia	Ibrahim Hamdani Jakarta
Palestinian Cultural Organization-Malaysia	Muslim M.A. Abu-Uma, Chair Kuala Lumpur
Palestinian Return Centre	Tarek Hamoud, Director Arafet Boujemaa, Assistant Director London
Perdana Global Peace Foundation	Zulaiha Ismail, Executive Director Norian Mai, Tan Sri, Chair Pahamin A. Rajab, Trustee Kuala Lumpur
Perskutuan Gereja-gereja di Indonesia	Rev. Penrad Siagian, Executive Secretary for the Witness and Integrity of Creation Cluster Jakarta
United National Organization for Human Rights	Abdelnaim Ahmed, Chair Mohammed Abdelnaem, President Cairo

Zahir Khan Centre
Zahir Khan
Jakarta

Media

115AUC Radio
Patri Valentina, Journalist
Alhanida R., Journalist
Fienencia F., Journalist
Jakarta

Albalad.co
Faisal Assegaf, Journalist
Jakarta

Al-Jazeera Media Network
Sohaib Ali Jassim, Jakarta Bureau Chief
Jakarta

Antara
Yashinto Difa, Journalist
Jakarta

Cihan News Agency
Rilci, Journalist
Duri, Journalist
Jakarta

CNN Indonesia
Wan Hermawan, Correspondent
Helwinsyah Mara, Field Producer
Dwi Ari Prastantyo, Photojournalist
Jakarta

Harian Nasional
Devy Lubis, Assistant Managing Editor
Pascal Saju, Journalist
Jakarta

Hopenet Media
Danny Krishna, Journalist
Jakarta

International Islamic News
Agency
Zayed Abdullah, Chief Editor
Jakarta

Jawa Pos TV
Monique Rijkers, Producer
Jakarta

Koran Sindo
Ananda Nararya, Journalist
Jakarta

Kuwait News Agency	Abdullah Bugis, Reporter/Editor Kuala Lumpur
Liputang.com	Andreas Gerry, Reporter Daffi, Cameraman Yunita Kristani, Editor Adanti Pradita, Journalist Wal Yadi, Cameraman Jakarta
Maghreb Arabe Presse	Abdelalem Dinia, Journalist Jakarta
Majalah Advocate	Jalaluddih Majalis, Journalist Jeanne Suara, Journalist Jakarta
Media Indonesia	Andhika Proselyo, Journalist Jakarta
Merdeka.com	Randit, Journalist Jakarta
Metro TV	Alfian, Journalist Sonya M, Journalist Nabila G, Journalist Jakarta
Mi'raj Islamic News Agency	Nidiya Fitriyah, Reporter Rina dari Mi'raj, Reporter Septia Eka Putri, Reporter Jakarta
Muslimah Media Centre	Nur Fadhilah, Journalist Vanadia Yogaswari, Journalist Jakarta
Nikkei Asian Review	Simon Roughneen, Asia Regional Correspondent Jakarta
Okezone.com	Silviana, Journalist Wikanto Arungbudoyo, Journalist Jakarta

Over Asia Sdn Bhd	Hamed Ahmed Ghaleb, Managing Director Kuala Lumpur
Pusat Information Palestine	Ahmad Jarmadli, Journalist Jakarta
RRI World Service	Viqran Shink Khan, Journalist Jakarta
Sindonews.com	Victor Maulang, Journalist Arin Fithriana, Journalist Jakarta
Tempo	Natalia Santi, Journalist Jabodetabek, Journalist Jakarta
TV3 Malaysia	Kevin William Timothy, Correspondent Jakarta
Viva.co.id	Rebecca, Journalist Jakarta

Public

Budi Luhur University Jakarta	Students: Ananda Muhammad Randy Andi Syafriadi Deanda Putri Rahmadanti Fandina Aroko Faradiba Fithriana Arin Iklima Tami Daraja Jeanie Annissa Laras Sirait Leo Farhan Lina Apriana Muhammad Nauval Prianto Ohiara Mowarni Reggy Hanna Alexandra Mentang Saisiya Dwiriani Sanisiya Danes Wayan Adhi Mahardilea Yayuk Hardiana Yehezkiel M.S.
----------------------------------	---

Christian University of Indonesia Jakarta	Imelda Sianipar, Student
Georgetown University Washington, D.C.	Francesca Albanese, Visiting researcher
Pertahanan Indonesia University Sentul	Students: Erwin Y. Sitorus Irvan E. Tarigan
PT Adani Global Jakarta	Dalesinaputra
P.T. Bourjoho Management Consultants Tangerang City	Syahalan Siregar
Sunan Gunung Djati University Bandung	Ajat Gunawan, Student
Syarif Hidayatullah State Islamic University Jakarta	Badrus Sholeh, Head of Department of International Relations Students: Abih Ade Hijul Akbar Aghita Fiscarina Akbar Averroes Sabil Ardiansyah A. Matondang Arrinda Fahri Arum Suci A. Dzikri Nurhabibi Eva Mushoffa Farah Ghasani Firman Santyabudi Hamka Hasan Innesyifa Haqiu Iqbal Maulana Jody Marcello Madinaru Ulfa Moulida Ayu Mutiarra Nur Arinta Nurul Hidayati Revy Auliya D

Rorien Novriana
Sarah Septarini
Saras Aprinita Nabillah
Shavita Lisdiany
Syifa Fatima
Zida Tiana

TOEFL
Jakarta

Salim Kahn, Student

University of Adelaide
Adelaide, Australia

Rui Samuel Sihombing, Student

University of Indonesia
Jakarta

H. Nur Munir, Coordinator of Politics and International Relations
Hanna Maulida, Student

University of Pancasila
Jakarta

Dian Purwaningrum Soemitro, Lecturer
Rury Octaviani, Faculty of Law

* * *