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Mr. President, 64 years to date, 64 years to date. On the 29th of November 1947, this General Assembly adopted resolution 181 which partitioned Palestine to an Arab and a Jewish state and a separate entity for Jerusalem. That resolution was unfair for Arabs and Palestinians. Yes, that resolution was unfair, unjust for Arabs and Palestinians.

According to the last census conducted then by the mandate authorities, 1946, the Arab population in Palestine numbered 1,237,000 while the Jews stood at 608,000; i.e., the Arabs were double that of the Jews. The last data published by those authorities showed that 93% of the land of Palestine was owned by the Arabs, while the Jews only possessed 7% of the land. However, the partition resolution gave 55% of the historic Palestine to the Jewish state and 45% to the Arab state. Yes, 55% of the land to nearly one third of the people who only possessed 7% of that land.

Historically, therefore, it has been logical and understandable that Arabs would reject that resolution. However, as Arabs in general, and the Palestinian leadership in particular, following the 1973 war changed their discourse from calling for one state on the land of Palestine where Jews, Christians and Muslims coexist equal in rights and obligations to the acceptance of the two-state idea as the basis for a historic settlement in order to end the conflict.

It has been normal that the Palestinians would come back and accept resolution 181 as a reference point as set up -- set out rather in the 1988 Algeria declaration on the establishment of the Palestinian state. It was also normal that the two-state solution would be the cornerstone of the 2002 Arab peace initiative.

Today, the Palestinians, in order to achieve a settlement that ends the conflict and establish peace on the historic land of Palestine has accepted resolution 181, although it has not done justice to them when it was adopted. They have accepted to recognize the state of Israel, despite its responsibility for the Nakbah, especially when hundreds of thousands of them were displaced and expelled in 1948 and the subsequent occupation by Israel of 1967 of all that remained at that time of the historic land of Palestine, including East Jerusalem. They have accepted even to establish their state on 22% of where the historic land of Palestine -- as for the paradox, and what a paradox, is the fact that Israel continues to reject the legitimacy bestowed by the resolution 1981 on the Palestinians to establish the state of Palestine on a part of Palestine like the state of Israel, considering that such a state, if ever to be established, should only be the outcome of negotiations with Israel; i.e., as the result of its consent and according to its own conditions and not as a right enshrined in resolution 181.

In fact, the right of the Palestinians to establish their independent state is not only a right enshrined in resolution 181 alone. It is a right that is categorized within the category of the inalienable rights as reaffirmed by this General Assembly in its subsequent resolutions since 1974. Therefore, and as we have always reiterated, the establishment of the Palestinian state is not a negotiable right.

However, the negotiations as called for by the Palestinian leadership remains the required means to achieve a final settlement. Its object is not the establishment of the Palestinian people, for sure. Rather, the final status issues, namely refugees, Jerusalem, security, settlements, borders and water.

But how to achieve productive negotiations so long as the Israeli leadership reiterates every day that it will not stop settlements, not allow the return of refugees, not accept the 1967 borders as a reference point and not negotiate the status of Jerusalem. Nay, the Israeli leadership started to impose conditions on the Palestinians to recognize Israel as a Jewish state with all that includes and all the threats that this will ensue for the future of the Arab population in Israel and the right of Palestinian refugees to return pursuant to resolution 1940, or rather 194 adopted by this assembly.

The reply for the question how to achieve productive negotiations is that such negotiations should only be based on clear principles, which requires the international community to accept an unambiguous formula that emphasizes the well-known principles of negotiations, namely the Madrid peace process, land for peace, relevant Security Council resolutions, the Arab peace process. These are the principles and the foundations that call for a just solution to the question of refugees, the illegality of settlements, the legality of 1967 as a reference border and rejection of the annexation by Israel of East Jerusalem -- of occupied Eastern Jerusalem.

Sir, there are those who sum the negotiation crisis as the failure by Palestinians and Israelis to sit at the same negotiations table for more than a year, for more than a year -- namely, when Israel refused to continue its moratorium on its settlement activities. Although that moratorium was only partial to start with, such a discourse ignores the fact that the Palestinians and Israelis sat at the same negotiations table for more than 20 years without achieving the desired peace agreement.

We have to recall, as well, of all the deadlines that were not respected by Israel, it did not abide by the -- by completing the final status solution within five years as called for in the Oslo Agreement 20 years ago. It did not abide by the two-year deadline contained in the roadmap or the one-year period or deadline set out in the Annapolis agreement. Of course, it did not abide by the so-called -- the framework agreement called for by the Quartet and the deadline it fixed, which expired last September. In fact, neither emphasis placed on reference points or the importance of abiding by deadlines sufficed to achieve productive negotiations. What is required is active international intervention that brings back the balance that these negotiations lack, an intervention that will play the role of a true arbitrator that holds accountable the party that fails to abide by the international reference points or respects their fixed -- the deadlines. This is what the United Nations should do in order to be true to its mission, resolutions and their desired role. I thank you, sir.