



Repertoire of the Practice of the Security Council

17th Supplement

2010-2011

Department of Political Affairs - Security Council Affairs Division
Security Council Practices and Charter Research Branch

The situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question

Overview

During the period under review, the Security Council held 27 meetings in connection with the item entitled “The situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question” and adopted one presidential statement.¹ Briefings in 2010 focused mainly on the deteriorating humanitarian situation in Gaza. Following the Gaza flotilla incident on 31 May 2010, many Member States renewed their calls for an end to Israeli settlement activity in the occupied Palestinian territories. During 2011, the Council considered the start and suspension of direct negotiations between Israel and Palestine, the Palestinian bid for membership of the United Nations, and the overall political situation in the Middle East. Developments in the West Bank, Lebanon and the Syrian Arab Republic were also discussed during the period.

In 2011, the Council considered a draft resolution which, inter alia, condemned the continuation of settlement activities by Israel in the occupied Palestinian territories.² The draft resolution was not adopted due to the negative vote of a permanent member of the Council.

A table lists the meetings held in consideration of this item, as well as related information, including invitees and speakers.

27 January to 18 May 2010: briefings and debates on the Israel-Palestine peace process and the situation in the occupied Palestinian territories

On 27 January 2010, the Assistant Secretary-General for Political Affairs reported that despite the impasse in negotiations between Israel and Palestine, the

¹ [S/PRST/2010/9](#).

² [S/2011/24](#).

Palestinian Authority continued its efforts to advance its state-building agenda and had continued to make progress in the areas of law and order and combating terrorism, in accordance with the Road Map. He reported that the partial temporary restraint of settlements in the West Bank continued, but there had been announcements of construction in East Jerusalem. He stressed that the settlement activity in the occupied territories was illegal and contrary to the Road Map, and urged Israel to fully implement its obligations to freeze such activities and dismantle outposts erected since 2001. He also expressed concern regarding the substantial increase in Israeli military operations, as well as the violent incidents between Israeli settlers and Palestinians. Regarding Gaza, he reported that there had been a notable increase in the number of projectiles fired by militant groups, which had been met by Israeli incursions and air strikes. Meanwhile, due to the blockade of Gaza by Israel, although there were some increases in certain types of goods imported, shortages remained, especially fuel. Regarding Lebanon, he noted that progress in relations between Lebanon and the Syrian Arab Republic was highlighted by the first visit of the Prime Minister of Lebanon to Damascus in December 2009, where he met the President of the Syrian Arab Republic for extensive talks. He also noted that the situation in the area of operations of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) remained quiet but fragile.³

In the debate that followed, the Permanent Observer of Palestine stated that peace negotiations could not resume with Israeli settlement activities continuing, while emphasizing that the call for the cessation of settlements was not a “pre-condition” towards resuming negotiations. He stated that serious practical measures were necessary to compel Israel to cease its colonization of Palestinian territory and stressed that it was imperative for the Council to effectively shoulder its responsibilities in that regard.⁴ The representative of Israel stated that it had instituted a policy of restraint throughout the settlements in the West Bank, which was a demonstration that his Government was prepared to immediately commence direct peace negotiations. He emphasized that the international community should confront the real challenges to peace and security, such as extremism, nuclear proliferation, weapons smuggling and terrorism. He pointed to the smuggling of weapons into Gaza by Hamas and the continued supply of arms to Hizbullah across the border between Lebanon and the Syrian Arab Republic as examples

³ [S/PV.6265](#), pp. 3-7.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 9-10.

of gross violations of Council resolutions.⁵ The representative of the United States underlined that the immediate resumption of negotiations towards a two-State solution was the only realistic way forward. He stated that his Government disagreed with some Israeli actions in Jerusalem, such as the continuing pattern of evictions and demolitions of Palestinian homes. He also expressed concern over the interference by Hamas with international efforts to deliver humanitarian assistance to Gaza, as well as the continued smuggling of arms and rocket attacks against Israel.⁶ Most speakers expressed their concern regarding the deadlock in the peace process and their grave concern at the humanitarian situation in Gaza, and called for full implementation of Council [resolution 1860 \(2009\)](#).⁷ Many speakers recognized the continuation of the moratorium on settlement expansion by Israel, but called for the permanent ending of illegal settlement activities. Several speakers also stressed the need to resolve the status of Jerusalem as the future capital of the two States.⁸ Several speakers called for the immediate release of an Israeli soldier who had been held captive in Gaza since 2006.⁹

On 18 February 2010, the Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs reported that the Governments of Israel and Palestine were seriously considering a proposal by the United States for the parties to begin indirect talks. Regarding the West Bank, he noted that while the partial restraint orders on settlement construction remained in effect, numerous violations had been identified, and in this regard urged the Government to take additional measures to enforce the restraint orders. Regarding Gaza, he further stated that the Israeli closure, which remained in place, was a counterproductive policy that empowered smugglers and militants, while causing unacceptable hardship for the civilian population.¹⁰

On 24 March 2010, the Secretary-General briefed the Council on his recent visit to Israel and the occupied Palestinian territories, which had included meetings with the leaders of both Governments. Regarding Gaza, he highlighted the humanitarian

⁵ Ibid., pp. 10-11.

⁶ Ibid., p. 19.

⁷ By [resolution 1860 \(2009\)](#), the Council, inter alia, called for the withdrawal of Israeli forces from Gaza, and the unimpeded provision and distribution of humanitarian assistance, including of food, fuel and medical treatment.

⁸ [S/PV.6265](#), p. 13 (United Kingdom); p. 15 (France); p. 16 (Turkey); p. 23 (Austria); and p. 29 (European Union).

⁹ Ibid., p. 11 (Israel); p. 14 (United Kingdom); p. 15 (France); p. 19 (United States); and p. 30 (European Union).

¹⁰ [S/PV.6273](#), pp. 2-4.

situation and difficulties faced by the population, and stressed that restrictions on land use for housing, agriculture and other needs prevented economic and social development. He recognized the legitimate security concerns of Israel regarding Hizbullah and the importance of addressing them. He emphasized that there was no alternative to negotiations between the parties, and they should not be disrupted by provocations.¹¹

On 14 April 2010, the Under Secretary-General for Political Affairs reported that efforts by the United States and the Quartet aimed at bringing about the conditions for a resumption of Israeli-Palestinian talks had continued. Regarding the West Bank, he reported there were almost daily clashes between settlers and Palestinians. 58 Israeli incursions were carried out, resulting in casualties. Regarding Gaza, he stated that the security situation was again volatile, with clashes occurring between Israeli security forces and Palestinian militants. Regarding Lebanon, he reported that the President had reconvened the Committee of National Dialogue for the first time since the parliamentary elections in June 2009.¹²

The representative of Palestine stated that the situation on the ground in the occupied Palestinian territories had deteriorated due to continuing Israeli acts of aggression, colonization, provocation and incitement against the Palestinian people. He further asserted that as long as Israel continued to violate international law through its policies, in particular its settlement activities, Palestine could not proceed with negotiations, including proximity talks.¹³ The representative of Israel stated that Hamas maintained Gaza as an “epicentre” of terrorism, and posed a serious threat to the civilian population of southern Israel. Therefore, Israel would exercise its right of self defence. He emphasized that while the Government of Israel continued to provide humanitarian aid to the people of Gaza, the complicated situation there was a direct result of the occupation by Hamas and its rejection of its obligations, including recognition of Israel and a renunciation of violence.¹⁴ Speakers generally agreed that there was no alternative to achieving a solution other than through negotiations. Many speakers supported the Quartet statement of 19 March 2010 which stated that peace talks should lead to the establishment of an independent Palestinian state by March 2012. Several speakers

¹¹ [S/PV.6292](#), pp. 2-5.

¹² [S/PV.6298](#), pp. 2-6.

¹³ *Ibid.*, pp. 6-8.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 10-11.

expressed their concern regarding the humanitarian situation in Gaza.¹⁵ Some speakers emphasized the importance of conducting investigations into serious violations of international humanitarian and human rights law as reported by the United Nations Fact-Finding Mission on the Gaza Conflict (the Goldstone report).¹⁶

On 18 May 2010, the Special Coordinator for the Middle East Peace Process and Personal Representative of the Secretary-General reported that Israeli-Palestinian proximity talks mediated by the United States had commenced and that their goal, as stated by the Quartet in its statement of 19 March 2010, was the resolution of all core issues, an end to the 1967 occupation, and two States living side by side in peace and security. He stated that the negotiation process needed to address the core issues and could not be allowed to stagnate, and also be sustained by positive actions on the ground. Regarding Gaza, he stressed the scale of the unmet needs of Gaza's civilian population, specifically in the areas of water and sanitation, education and construction, and urged an end to the Israeli closure of the Gaza Strip.¹⁷

31 May to 15 June 2010: Council response to the Gaza flotilla incident

On 31 May 2010, the Assistant Secretary-General for Political Affairs reported that Israeli forces had intercepted and boarded a six-ship convoy that was en route to Gaza earlier the same day. The convoy had been attempting to deliver humanitarian aid to Gaza by breaking the Israeli blockade. He reported that there had been at least 10 civilian deaths and 30 injuries, as well as six Israeli military personnel injured in the incident. Noting that it was not possible to state definitively the sequence or details of what had happened, he underscored the importance of a full investigation into the incident. He further stressed that the developments came at a time when efforts should be focused on the need to build trust and advance Israeli-Palestinian negotiations, and in this regard it was vital that proximity talks should continue. He stated that the incident could have been avoided if repeated calls on Israel to end the “counterproductive and unacceptable” blockade of Gaza had been heeded.¹⁸

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 16 (Mexico); p. 23 (Uganda); and p. 34 (European Union); and [S/PV.6298 \(Resumption 1\)](#), p. 8 (Cuba); p. 9 (Malaysia); p. 11 (Nicaragua); and p. 17 (Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)).

¹⁶ [S/PV.6298](#), p. 29 (Egypt); and [S/PV.6298 \(Resumption 1\)](#), p. 9 (Malaysia).

¹⁷ [S/PV.6315](#), pp. 2-5.

¹⁸ [S/PV.6325](#), pp. 2-4.

The Minister for Foreign Affairs of Turkey stated that the actions by Israel against a multinational civilian endeavour carrying humanitarian aid in international waters constituted a breach of international law tantamount to “banditry and piracy.” He emphasized that Israel must be prepared to face the consequences and be held accountable for its crimes, and in this regard stressed the need for the Council to react strongly and adopt a presidential statement demanding an urgent inquiry into the incident and calling for the punishment of all responsible authorities and persons.¹⁹

The representative of Palestine emphasized that the international community must condemn the crime, which ran counter to international humanitarian and human rights norms, and called for an independent, impartial investigation in order to punish the perpetrators. He further stated that it was the responsibility of the Council to take the necessary measures to maintain international peace and security and to put an end to the occupation of Palestinian territories by Israel.²⁰

The representative of Israel stated that the flotilla was not a genuine humanitarian-only mission, since its organizers had not accepted the offer by Israel to transfer the aid to Gaza via existing overland crossings in accordance with established procedures. He suggested that the organizers of the flotilla were using the guise of humanitarian aid to send a message of hate and to implement violence. He also emphasized that a maritime blockade was a legitimate and recognized measure under international law. Israeli navy personnel had boarded the vessels when it became clear that the protest flotilla intended to violate the blockade despite repeated warnings. However, soldiers boarding one of the ships had been attacked violently with life-threatening means. In this regard he stressed that the soldiers had acted in self-defence.²¹

The representative of the United States stated that it was deeply disturbed by the incident and stressed the need for a credible and transparent investigation. He further noted that mechanisms existed for the transfer of humanitarian assistance to Gaza, and that direct delivery of humanitarian aid by sea was neither appropriate nor responsible. He also stated that the interference of Hamas with international assistance shipments and the work of non-governmental organizations, its continued arms smuggling and its

¹⁹ Ibid., pp. 4-5.

²⁰ Ibid., p. 13.

²¹ Ibid., pp. 13-15.

commitment to terrorism, complicated efforts in Gaza and undermined security and prosperity for Palestinians and Israelis alike.²²

Most speakers stressed the need for a full investigation into the incident. Many speakers emphasized the importance of all parties fully complying with [resolution 1860 \(2009\)](#) and for Israel's restrictions on access to Gaza be lifted.²³ Some speakers stressed the importance of continuing the proximity talks between Israel and Palestine.²⁴ Other speakers warned that the incident could create great unrest and grave consequences for peace in the Middle East.²⁵

On 1 June 2010, the Council adopted a presidential statement²⁶ by which it requested, *inter alia*, the immediate release of the ships and civilians held by Israel since the incident of 31 May 2010, and took note of the need to have a full and impartial investigation into the incident. Furthermore, it underscored that the only viable solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict was an agreement negotiated between the parties, re-emphasizing that only a two-States solution would bring peace to the region.²⁷

On 15 June 2010, the Special Coordinator for the Middle East Peace Process outlined the proposal of the Secretary-General to establish an international panel, under the aegis of a third party, to investigate the flotilla incident. The Special Coordinator stated that the panel, together with the public commission announced by Israel, would fully meet the international community's expectation for a credible and impartial investigation. He further reported that the United Nations had obtained the consent of the cargo owners to take possession of the entire cargo and ensure its timely distribution in Gaza for humanitarian purposes, as called for in the Presidential Statement²⁸ adopted by the Council on 1 June 2010. He emphasized that in principle, all goods should be allowed into Gaza unless there was a specific and legitimate security reason.²⁹

21 July 2010 to 19 January 2011: briefings and debates on the resumption and subsequent suspension of direct negotiations between Israel and Palestine

²² *Ibid.*, p. 9.

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 6 (United Kingdom); p. 7 (Mexico); p. 7 (Brazil); p. 8 (Austria); p. 10 (Uganda); p. 10 (China); p. 10 (France); p. 11 (Gabon); p. 11 (Bosnia and Herzegovina); and p. 12 (Lebanon).

²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 6 (United Kingdom); and p. 7 (Mexico).

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 8 (Nigeria); and p. 10 (Uganda).

²⁶ [S/PRST/2010/9](#).

²⁷ [S/PV.6326](#), pp. 2-3.

²⁸ [S/PRST/2010/9](#).

²⁹ [S/PV.6340](#), pp. 2-6.

On 21 July 2010, the Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs reported that six rounds of proximity talks between Israel and Palestine had been facilitated by the United States, and stressed the need for the parties to not miss the opportunity and re-establish direct negotiations. He noted several steps taken by the Government of Israel, including the announcement of measures aimed at easing the blockade on Gaza, new guidelines for the entry of goods into Gaza, and approval given for a number of additional United Nations projects in the area of education and health. He further reported that the Government of Israel had initiated investigations into the flotilla incident of 31 May 2010, while the Secretary-General was in contact with the parties involved to gain agreement for his proposal for an international panel of inquiry. Regarding the West Bank, he reported that although the 10-month moratorium on West Bank settlement construction was largely being observed, it was set to expire on 26 September 2010. In this regard, he called for its extension as well as its expansion to cover all settlement activity throughout the occupied Palestinian territories.³⁰

The representative of Palestine stated that although his Government had engaged in the proximity talks in good faith, the same could not be said for Israel, which was sabotaging the peace process through illegal and reckless actions, such as continued settlement activity and wall construction in the occupied Palestinian territories.³¹

The representative of Israel called for direct negotiations with Palestine without any preconditions or delays. He noted that despite important progress towards direct negotiations, there existed a dangerous phenomenon where so-called activists were supporting terrorist forces in Gaza under the guise of humanitarian aid. Noting reports that another flotilla was departing Lebanon for Gaza, he called upon the international community to exert its influence on the organizers of these actions, and upon the Government of Lebanon to prevent it from happening.³²

Most speakers recognized the progress in the proximity talks between Israel and Palestine, but emphasized the need for the parties to proceed to direct negotiations. Reflecting on the flotilla incident, many speakers suggested measures such as the complete lifting of restrictions on access of goods to Gaza. Some speakers stressed that the delivery of humanitarian assistance to Gaza should be done exclusively through

³⁰ [S/PV.6363](#), pp. 2-5.

³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 6.

³² *Ibid.*, p. 9.

established channels.³³ Many speakers noted that the moratorium on settlement activity was due to end shortly and called for its extension and expansion. Several speakers expressed concern regarding Hamas for its interference with international assistance, which continued to complicate efforts in Gaza.³⁴

On 17 August and 17 September 2010, the Assistant Secretary-General for Political Affairs and the Special Coordinator of the Secretary-General for the Middle East Peace Process, respectively, briefed the Council on the significant developments in the region. It was reported that following several rounds of proximity talks to map out areas of mutual interest and outlining their respective issues of priority, Israel and Palestine had launched direct negotiations under the auspices of the United States. The leaders of both Governments had agreed to seek a two-State solution, to be completed within one year, aiming to resolve issues concerning borders, security, refugees, and the question of Jerusalem among all other core issues. Regarding Gaza, Palestinian militant groups had fired rockets and mortars into Israel, to which Israel had responded with air strikes and incursions. Regarding the 31 May flotilla incident, the Secretary-General's Panel of Inquiry had commenced its work, meeting twice in August 2010. Regarding the West Bank, the partial moratorium on settlement construction was due to end on 26 September 2010, and should be extended beyond that date. Regarding Lebanon, there was increased political tension in the country, linked to speculation that the Special Tribunal for Lebanon might issue indictments.³⁵

On 18 October 2010, the Assistant Secretary-General for Political Affairs reported that direct Israeli-Palestinian negotiations were at an impasse six weeks after commencing, and the parties had not met since 15 September. The partial settlement moratorium by Israel that had expired on 26 September 2010 had not been renewed, resulting in the resumption of previously frozen settlement construction. In response, Palestine had indicated it would not continue the negotiations unless Israel froze all settlement activity. He further noted that intensive diplomatic efforts led by the United States were ongoing to create conditions conducive to the continuation of negotiations. Regarding the West Bank, he reported that there were 44 violent incidents between local Palestinians and Israeli settlers, resulting in injuries and damage. During the period,

³³ Ibid., p. 10 (United States); and p. 14 (Mexico).

³⁴ Ibid., p. 10 (United States); p. 12 (Bosnia and Herzegovina); and p. 18 (United Kingdom).

³⁵ [S/PV.6372](#), pp. 2-6; [S/PV.6388](#), pp. 2-6.

Israeli security forces also carried out 353 operations, resulting in two deaths and 157 injuries. Regarding Lebanon, he reported that tensions generated by speculation and allegations related to the potential indictments by the Special Tribunal for Lebanon had grown steadily in recent weeks, raising fears of sectarian violence.³⁶

The representative of Palestine stressed that the failure of the proximity talks was due to Israel's intransigence and refusal to comply with its legal obligations and the Road Map requirement for it to cease all settlement activities. He expressed regret that Israel had not extended its moratorium to freeze settlement activities in the West Bank, as well as in East Jerusalem. He asserted that Israel was responsible for the critical situation on the ground and for undermining the peace negotiations.³⁷ The representative of Israel emphasized that his country faced diverse and dangerous threats, such as the continued build up of military capabilities and armaments by Hizbullah in Lebanon and Hamas in Gaza, with support from the Islamic Republic of Iran and the Syrian Arab Republic.³⁸ The representative of the United States reiterated its call to Israel to extend the settlement moratorium, and called upon the President of the Palestinian Authority to resume negotiations with Israel. Regarding Lebanon, she emphasized that efforts to discredit, hinder or delay the work of the Special Tribunal should not be tolerated.³⁹

Most speakers called upon both Israel and Palestine to return to the negotiating table and to make the necessary compromises to agree on a two-State solution. Many speakers also called upon Israel to renew its moratorium on settlement activity. Regarding Lebanon, they expressed support for the independence of the Special Tribunal and stressed the important role it played towards ending impunity.

On 23 November and 14 December 2010, the Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs and the Special Coordinator for the Middle East Process, respectively, briefed the Council on the significant developments in the region. It was reported that efforts by the United States to create an environment conducive to the resumption of direct talks were inconclusive, with the President of the Palestinian Authority reaffirming that he would not return to direct negotiations unless Israel froze its settlement activity. Regarding the West Bank, there was significant construction in a number of settlements

³⁶ [S/PV.6404](#), pp. 2-6.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 7-9.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 10-11.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 12-13.

since the expiry of the partial settlement moratorium, in addition to announcements of further construction by Israel. Palestinian security forces continued to make commendable efforts to maintain security in areas under their control. The number of Israeli troops in the West Bank was estimated to be at its lowest level since 2005, but tensions persisted, with a large number of incursions and operations carried out by Israeli forces, which cited security concerns. Regarding Gaza, rockets and mortars continued to be fired by militant groups from Gaza into Israel, while Israel responded with air strikes and incursions. Regarding Lebanon, it was reported that political activity in the country continued to be dominated by speculation over the Special Tribunal for Lebanon, with political differences causing the suspension of Cabinet meetings in the Government.⁴⁰

On 19 January 2011, the Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs reported that Israeli-Palestinian negotiations remained deadlocked, while tensions in the occupied Palestinian territory and in Lebanon had increased. Noting that the target dates set by the Quartet for reaching a framework agreement on permanent status and for completion of the Palestinian Authority's two-year state-building programme was approaching in eight to nine months, he expressed serious concern at the continuing lack of progress in the search for a negotiated settlement, stressing that the viability of the political process and the credibility of the Quartet were at stake. Regarding the West Bank, he noted that the sharp increase in Israeli settlement construction activity since the end of the settlement moratorium on 26 September 2010 had continued. During the period, Israeli security forces had carried out 486 search operations in the West Bank, resulting in 87 Palestinian injuries. He further noted that the Palestinian Authority continued to make strides in its state-building agenda and had continued its efforts to promote security in its area of control, despite mounting challenges. Regarding Gaza, he expressed concern over the increase in the number of rockets and mortars fired into Israel. Meanwhile, Israel had carried out 11 incursions and 26 air strikes. He emphasized that the fundamental goal of the United Nations continued to be the revitalization of the economy of Gaza and the search for an end to the Israeli closure policy within the framework of [resolution 1860 \(2009\)](#). Regarding Lebanon, he reported that the political crisis, which had been provoked by divergent views on the Special Tribunal for Lebanon, had continued to deepen. On 12 January 2011, the resignation of ten Cabinet ministers from the opposition

⁴⁰ [S/PV.6430](#), pp. 2-5; [S/PV.6448](#), pp. 2-5.

along with one minister from the bloc of President Sleiman had forced the collapse of the Government of national unity. He reiterated the Secretary-General's call for continuing dialogue among the parties, while emphasizing the importance of preserving calm. He further called upon all parties to refrain from attempts to interfere in, or influence, the work of the Special Tribunal, underlining that the independent judicial process should not be linked with any political debate and that it was important not to prejudge the outcome.⁴¹

The representative of Palestine noted that two years had passed since the Israeli attack on Gaza, and the Palestinian people were still being prevented from reconstructing and rehabilitating their communities and lives. He further noted that there had been no accountability for the crimes perpetrated by Israeli occupying forces and no justice for the victims. He reiterated his call for the immediate and full lifting of the Israeli blockade on Gaza and the sustained opening of its border crossings. He also drew attention to the situation in East Jerusalem, where he emphasized that an extremely aggressive campaign to illegally alter its demographic composition, status and character was taking place. He stated that after nearly two decades of the peace process, the demise of the two-State solution would become a reality if nothing was done to stop the unlawful and destructive settlement activity.⁴²

Many speakers called on Israel to halt all settlement activity, and emphasized the need for further steps to ease restrictions on the flow of goods and people in and out of Gaza while calling for intra-Palestinian reconciliation. Regarding Lebanon, speakers called on all parties to seek a negotiated political solution to the current situation, while expressing support for the independence of the Special Tribunal for Lebanon.

18 February 2011: vote on draft resolution reaffirming the illegality of Israeli settlement activity

On 18 February 2011, the Council met to consider a draft resolution⁴³ submitted by 79 Member States that, inter alia, reaffirmed that the Israeli settlements established in the occupied Palestinian territories were illegal; reiterated the demand that Israel immediately and completely cease all settlement activities, including in East

⁴¹ [S/PV.6470](#), pp. 2-5.

⁴² *Ibid.*, pp. 6-7.

⁴³ [S/2011/24](#).

Jerusalem; and called upon both parties to act on the basis of international law and their previous agreements and obligations.

Before the vote, the representative of Lebanon noted that since the end of the settlement moratorium in September 2010, Israeli settlement activity had doubled, and emphasized that the purpose of the draft resolution was to have the Council play its required role and choose the side of justice and righteousness.⁴⁴

The draft resolution was then put to the vote but was not adopted due to the negative vote of a permanent member of the Council.

Following the vote, the representative of the United States stated that the opposition of the United States to the draft resolution should not be misunderstood to mean that it supported settlement activity. She emphasized that, to the contrary, the United States rejected in the strongest terms the legitimacy of continued Israeli settlement activity. While the United States was in full agreement about the urgent need to resolve the conflict between Israel and Palestine on the basis of a two-state solution, she stressed that the only way to reach that common goal was through direct negotiations between the parties. The draft resolution risked hardening the positions of both sides, and could encourage the parties to either stay out of negotiations, and if they resumed negotiations, it could encourage them to return to the Council anytime they reached an impasse. She asserted that it was unwise for the Council to attempt to resolve the core issues that divided the parties, and therefore it had voted against the draft resolution.⁴⁵

Many speakers reiterated that the settlements were illegal under international law and were an obstacle to peace and a two-State solution, and advocated a prompt resumption of direct negotiations.⁴⁶

The representative of Palestine opined that the Council had failed to uphold its responsibilities to respond to the crisis. He emphasized that it was high time to send a clear and firm message to Israel that it must comply with its international legal obligations, in accordance with the relevant Council resolutions, and cease all violations and its obstruction of the peace process. Instead, the message sent by the Council through the failure to adopt the draft resolution was one that only encouraged further Israeli

⁴⁴ [S/PV.6484](#), pp. 3-4.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 4-5.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 3 (Lebanon); p. 5 (United Kingdom); p. 6 (Portugal); p. 7 (South Africa); p. 7 (Bosnia and Herzegovina); p. 8 (India); and p. 8 (Brazil).

intransigence and impunity.⁴⁷ The representative of Israel reiterated that direct negotiations between Israel and the Palestinians was the only way forward, and therefore the draft resolution should never have been submitted. Instead, the international community and the Security Council should have called upon the Palestinian leadership to immediately return to the negotiating table without preconditions in order to resolve the outstanding issues.⁴⁸

24 February to 25 August 2011: briefings and debates on developments in Palestine and Lebanon

On 24 February and 22 March 2011, the Special Coordinator for the Middle East Process and the Assistant-Secretary-General for Political Affairs, respectively, briefed the Council on the significant developments in the region. It was reported that the Quartet had met on 5 February and reiterated its commitment to the two-State solution and a conclusion of the talks by September 2011. Despite the continued construction of settlements in the occupied territories, the Palestinian Authority was forging ahead with its state-building agenda and now had established strong institutions representing the basis of a “state-in-waiting”. However, while efforts to restart the Israeli-Palestinian negotiations failed to produce any visible results, there was an increase in violent incidents and tensions on the ground. Regarding Gaza, the period was marked by an increase in violence, with an escalation of rocket attacks against Israel by militant groups, Israeli air raids and repeated confrontations in the border area. Hamas security forces also took forcible action against participants in large-scale demonstrations calling for an end to the Israeli occupation and the Palestinian division. The depressed economic situation in Gaza and the continuing impact of Israeli closure measures was also reported to be a point of concern. Regarding the West Bank, it was reported that the murder on 11 March of five members of an Israeli family in the settlement of Itamar prompted the Government of Israel to approve approximately 400 housing units in reaction to the incident, while search operations conducted by Israeli security forces in the West Bank resulted in a large number of injuries. Regarding Lebanon, the collapse of the

⁴⁷ Ibid., p. 10.

⁴⁸ Ibid., p. 11.

government on 12 January 2011 had led to an increase in the level of political tension in the country. Consultations continued on the formation of a new Government.⁴⁹

On 21 April 2011, the Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs expressed regret at the continued stalemate in negotiations between Israel and Palestine. He noted that according to the assessment of the United Nations, the governmental functions of the Palestinian Authority were now sufficient for a Government of a State in six areas: good governance; the rule of law and human rights; means of subsistence and productive sectors; education and culture; health; social protection; and infrastructure and water. Regarding Gaza, he reported that the period saw the highest levels of violence since Operation Cast Lead more than two years ago, and expressed alarm at the actions of Hamas in escalating the violence, endangering civilians on both sides and risking a deeper confrontation with Israel. Regarding the West Bank, he welcomed the decision of Israel on 6 April to systematically investigate all Palestinian casualties in the West Bank caused by Israeli fire among individuals not engaged in hostilities. Regarding Lebanon, he expressed concern that, several months after the nomination of the Prime Minister, a new Government had not yet been formed. While the overall situation in the area of operations of UNIFIL had remained generally stable, elsewhere in Lebanon there had been several security incidents, such as the kidnapping of seven foreign nationals, in an area close to the border with the Syrian Arab Republic.⁵⁰

The representative of Palestine emphasized that there had been renewed efforts to promote Palestinian reconciliation and unity, as well as “non-stop” work by the Palestinian leadership to implement the State-building plan launched nearly two years ago, which was rapidly advancing to completion by August 2011.⁵¹

The representative of Israel stated that since the beginning of March 2011, Hamas and other terrorist groups had launched numerous rockets against civilians throughout southern Israel, as part of what was the most serious escalation of attacks emanating from Gaza in more than two years. He asserted that the Council and the international community had not paid appropriate attention to the illegal smuggling of arms into Gaza, a critical aspect addressed in [resolution 1860 \(2009\)](#). Noting reports of a large flotilla being planned for May by a number of non-governmental organizations and

⁴⁹ [S/PV.6488](#), pp. 2-5; [S/PV.6501](#), pp. 2-5.

⁵⁰ [S/PV.6520](#), pp. 2-5.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p. 8.

other groups with “many ties to Hamas and other terrorist organizations”, he emphasized that it was clearly designed to serve purely as a political provocation without advancing any humanitarian goal.⁵²

The representative of the United States condemned the recent attacks on civilians and expressed concern at the escalation of rocket and mortar fire into southern Israel, as well as reports of increased use of advanced weaponry. She emphasized the need to work together to stop Hamas and other violent extremists from launching terrorist attacks. She also expressed deep concern regarding reports that groups were organizing another Gaza flotilla.⁵³

Many speakers expressed their concern over the planned Gaza flotilla, and stressed that it was critical for Israel and Palestine to restart negotiations. Many speakers condemned the recent attacks against Southern Israel that had resulted in the deaths of civilians, but urged both sides to show restraint. Several speakers commended and expressed support for the State-building efforts by the Palestinian authorities.⁵⁴

Several speakers referred to the situation in the Syrian Arab Republic, and called upon the Government to respect human rights and allow political protests.⁵⁵ The representative of the Syrian Arab Republic stated that his Government was taking steps towards reform, but emphasized that the principles of non-interference in the internal affairs must be respected. In this regard, he opined that the calls by some speakers for the overthrow of his government represented an irrational attempt to take advantage of the meeting, which was limited to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, and were a “misuse” of the agenda item.⁵⁶ The representative of the Russian Federation stated that any external interference in Syrian affairs or those of other States in the region was unacceptable.⁵⁷

On 19 May, 23 June and 25 August 2011, the Special Coordinator for the Middle East Peace Process and the Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs, respectively, briefed the Council on the significant developments in the region.

⁵² Ibid., pp. 9-10.

⁵³ Ibid., p. 12.

⁵⁴ Ibid., p. 24 (Brazil); p. 27 (India); and [S/PV.6520 \(Resumption 1\)](#), pp. 3-4 (Norway); p. 6 (Japan); p. 12 (Tajikistan); and p. 18 (Bangladesh).

⁵⁵ [S/PV.6520](#), p. 13 (United States); p. 15 (United Kingdom); p. 21 (France); and pp. 23-24 (Germany).

⁵⁶ [S/PV.6520 \(Resumption 1\)](#), pp. 14-15.

⁵⁷ [S/PV.6520](#), p. 27.

Direct negotiations between Israel and Palestine did not take place during the period. Amidst continued Israeli settlement expansion, Palestine was reported to be preparing to approach the United Nations in September to seek recognition of a Palestinian state. A reconciliation agreement was signed by Fatah and Hamas under the auspices of Egypt on 27 April, stipulating that a Palestinian Government of technocrats was to be formed, which would then prepare for simultaneous elections for the Palestinian Legislative Council, the presidency and the Palestinian National Council. It was reported that the period was marked by serious confrontations between Israeli security forces and Palestinians in Syria, Lebanon and the occupied Palestinian territories. One incident occurred on 15 May 2011, as Palestinians demonstrated in large numbers marking “Nakba Day”, resulting in numerous deaths and injuries. Another incident occurred in the Golan Heights on 5 June 2011, when large crowds of demonstrators attempted to breach the ceasefire line and cross the technical fence, resulting in numerous deaths. Regarding Lebanon, after several months following the nomination of the Prime Minister, a new Government was formed on 13 June 2011. There were a number of security incidents of concern, including the 26 July 2011 attack on a UNIFIL convoy which injured five peacekeepers. On 9 August 2011, the Lebanese authorities notified the Special Tribunal that they were unable to arrest and transfer those accused in the assassination of the former Prime Minister. Subsequently, on 18 August 2011, the President of the Special Tribunal ordered the public advertisement of the indictment.⁵⁸

26 July to 20 December 2011: briefings and debates on the application of Palestine for membership of the United Nations, and developments relating to the Syrian Arab Republic

On 26 July 2011, the Special Coordinator for the Middle East Peace Process reported that the political process to resolve the Israeli-Palestinian conflict was in a profound and persistent deadlock, while efforts to find the necessary common ground for resumed negotiations had proven extremely difficult, given the differences and lack of trust between the parties. He stated that in the absence of a framework for meaningful talks, and with Israeli settlement activity continuing, Palestine was actively exploring approaching the United Nations to help preserve the two-State solution, while Israel

⁵⁸ [S/PV.6540](#), pp. 2-6; [S/PV.6562](#), pp. 2-5; [S/PV.6602](#), pp. 2-5.

opposed this course of action, believing that it would make negotiations towards such a solution more difficult to achieve.⁵⁹

The representative of Palestine stated that the failure of the Quartet to endorse the parameters for the solution to allow for the resumption of negotiations was a serious missed opportunity and a failure that was caused by Israel, which had refused to accept the legitimate basis for negotiations. He emphasized that the coming months would be critical, as September 2011 was the date set by the Quartet and endorsed by the international community for concluding a peace agreement. He stated that the Palestinian National Authority would shortly complete its implementation of the two-year State-building plan to build the foundations of the Palestinian state, end the occupation and achieve independence. He underlined that Palestinians had fulfilled their responsibilities and were now ready to govern themselves.⁶⁰

The representative of Israel stated that the Palestinian initiatives at the United Nations distracted from the true path to peace, which could only be achieved through bilateral negotiations. While recognizing that the Palestinian Authority had made progress over the past two years, he stated that it was clear that much more still needed to be done to create a functioning and peaceful State, as the Palestinian Authority did not maintain control over all of its territory nor did it hold a monopoly on the use of force, with Hamas maintaining control over Gaza. He further asserted that the Islamic Republic of Iran remained the centre of terrorism in the region, by transferring arms to Hamas, Hizbullah and other terrorist groups in violation of numerous Council resolutions.⁶¹

The representative of the United States emphasized that the only place where issues regarding the permanent status of Palestine could be resolved was in negotiations between the parties, not in international fora such as the United Nations, and that symbolic actions to isolate Israel at the upcoming General Assembly would not create an independent Palestinian state. She reiterated that the United States would not support any such unilateral campaigns.⁶²

Many speakers noted their disappointment at the continuing deadlock in the negotiations and asserted that Israel's settlement activities had directly caused the stalemate. Several speakers stressed that the issue of Palestinian statehood could no

⁵⁹ [S/PV.6590](#), pp. 2-5.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 7-8.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 9-10.

⁶² *Ibid.*, p. 11.

longer be delayed.⁶³ Some speakers explicitly expressed support for Palestine's application for membership to the United Nations.⁶⁴ Most speakers affirmed support for the newly formed government in Lebanon and expressed their hope that it would continue to uphold the country's international obligations, including preserving the work of the Special Tribunal. Several speakers referred to the situation in the Syrian Arab Republic and called upon the Government to stop the violence and allow peaceful protests and freedom of speech.⁶⁵ Other speakers urged all parties to exercise restraint.⁶⁶ The representative of the Syrian Arab Republic asserted that some speakers were seeking to engage the Council in its internal affairs on fragile and unfounded pretexts that had nothing to do with the Council's role or responsibilities. He further emphasized various reform initiatives that were being undertaken by his Government.⁶⁷

On 27 September 2011, the Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs reported that on 23 September, the President of the Palestinian Authority had submitted an application to the Secretary-General for membership in the United Nations. In accordance with the Charter and the rules of procedure, the Secretary-General had transmitted the application to the President of the Security Council on the same day and had sent a copy to the President of the General Assembly. The application was now before the Council for consideration. He further reported that the Quartet had noted this application, while calling for resumed negotiations between the parties. Regarding the Syrian Arab Republic, the Under-Secretary-General reported that the political and human rights crisis in the country had escalated, resulting in at least 2,700 deaths since March 2011. The polarization between the Syrian regime and the growing popular opposition continued to deepen. He also reported that the Human Rights Council had appointed experts to form an international commission of inquiry, and expressed hope that the Government extended full cooperation to the commission.⁶⁸

The Prime Minister of Lebanon voiced support for the application of Palestine for membership in the United Nations. He stated that continued settlement activities by

⁶³ [S/PV.6590 \(Resumption 1\)](#), p. 2 (Kyrgyzstan); and p. 6 (Uganda).

⁶⁴ [S/PV.6590](#), pp. 13-14 (Lebanon); p. 16 (South Africa); and pp. 20-21 (Brazil); [S/PV.6590 \(Resumption 1\)](#), p. 7 (Iceland); and p. 8 (Kuwait).

⁶⁵ [S/PV.6590](#), p. 12 (United States); and p. 18 (France).

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 13 (Nigeria); and p. 20 (Portugal).

⁶⁷ [S/PV.6590 \(Resumption 1\)](#), pp. 15-16.

⁶⁸ [S/PV.6623](#), pp. 3-5.

Israel, its construction of the separation wall and changes to the geographic and demographic features of East Jerusalem were attempts to erase the Arab identity of Palestine. He called upon Israel to fully withdraw from the occupied Syrian Golan, as well as from occupied Lebanese territory, in particular the Shab'a farms, the Kfar Shuba hills and the northern part of Al-Ghajar village. He also reaffirmed the commitment of Lebanon to respect the Special Tribunal for Lebanon.⁶⁹

On 24 October 2011, the Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs reported that the application by Palestine for membership in the United Nations was being examined by the Council. In addition, the Palestinian request for membership in the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) was being reviewed. He stated that the Secretary-General was increasingly concerned about the ramifications of such a step for the United Nations as a whole, and asked all involved to act wisely in determining a course of action. He emphasized that regardless of the developments, a negotiated two-State solution must remain the highest priority. Regarding Gaza, he reported that on 18 October 2011, Israel and Hamas had implemented the first stage of a prisoner exchange agreement, with an Israeli soldier held in Gaza since 2006 released by Hamas in exchange for 427 Palestinian prisoners held by Israel. He noted that of the approximately 5,000 Palestinian prisoners still held by Israel, a further 550 were to be released within two months in the second phase of the exchange agreement. Regarding Lebanon, he noted that the country continued to be affected by developments in the neighbouring Syrian Arab Republic. Regarding the Syrian Arab Republic, he noted that political and human rights crisis continued, leading to the deaths of more than 3,000 people since March 2011. He stated that the face-off between the regime and the opposition would likely continue, with all of the negative consequences for Syria and the region. He called upon the Syrian leadership to take urgent action to stop the killing and emphasized the need for the international community to act in a coherent manner to prevent further bloodshed. He further noted that the League of Arab States had met on 16 October 2011 to discuss the situation, with a ministerial delegation to travel to Damascus on 26 October.⁷⁰

⁶⁹ Ibid., pp. 2-3.

⁷⁰ [S/PV.6636](#), pp. 2-5.

The representative of Palestine stated that to date, 130 countries had recognized the State of Palestine. Noting that the Council had been debating the application of Palestine for nearly a month, he stressed that it was time for it to shoulder its responsibilities, approve the application and make a positive recommendation to the General Assembly for Palestine's membership. He stated that Palestine's view was that negotiations should commence on the basis of the 4 June 1967 borders and that Israel was expected to meet its legal obligations, including those under the Road Map, to halt all settlement activities in the occupied Palestinian territory, including East Jerusalem. If the Quartet were to succeed in securing a commitment from the Israeli side on this basis, then the Palestinian side was willing to resume negotiations. He also emphasized that there was no contradiction between resuming negotiations in this framework and the Palestinian efforts to become a State Member of the United Nations.⁷¹

The representative of Israel stated that the unilateral action of Palestine at the United Nations was in breach of the Oslo Accords, the Interim Arrangements, the Paris Protocol and other bilateral agreements that formed the basis of Israeli-Palestinian cooperation. Furthermore, he asserted that the unilateral initiative would raise expectations that could not be met, and was a recipe for instability and potential violence. Rejecting Palestine's assertion that the primary obstacle to peace were Israel's settlements, he opined that this was instead a pretext for Palestine to avoid negotiations. He emphasized that the Palestinians were far from meeting the basic criteria for statehood, and that the President of the Palestinian Authority had "zero authority" in the Gaza Strip, which he had been unable to visit since 2007.⁷²

Many speakers expressed support for the application of Palestine for membership in the United Nations.⁷³ Several speakers, while not explicitly endorsing the application, noted the action.⁷⁴ Regarding the Syrian Arab Republic, many speakers expressed their concern regarding the continued violence, and welcomed the mediation efforts by the League of Arab States. The representative of the United Kingdom

⁷¹ Ibid., pp. 5-7.

⁷² Ibid., pp. 10-11.

⁷³ Ibid., p. 13 (India); p. 16 (China); p. 17 (Brazil); p. 18 (Russian Federation); p. 23 (South Africa); p. 26 (Lebanon); p. 32 (Jordan); p. 34 (Saudi Arabia); [S/PV.6636 \(Resumption 1\)](#), p. 4 (Turkey); p. 5 (Malaysia); p. 11 (Viet Nam); p. 12 (United Arab Emirates); p. 16 (Morocco); p. 18 (Cuba); p. 20 (Bangladesh); p. 21 (Iceland); p. 21 (Pakistan); p. 22 (Sri Lanka); p. 23 (Indonesia); p. 24 (Democratic People's Republic of Korea); p. 24 (Kazakhstan); p. 25 (Kuwait), p. 29 (Bahrain); p. 30 (Tunisia); p. 30 (Sudan); and p. 32 (Qatar).

⁷⁴ [S/PV.6636](#), p. 24 (Bosnia and Herzegovina); [S/PV.6636 \(Resumption 1\)](#), p. 7 (Japan); and p. 16 (Norway).

expressed his disappointment that the Security Council was incapable of appropriately censuring the Syrian regime, owing to the use of the veto by two permanent members of the Council,⁷⁵ but emphasized that the Council should still send a strong message in the form of a resolution.⁷⁶ The representative of the Russian Federation stated that the strategy of certain members of the international community, consisting of threats and pressure to impose sanctions, did not work.⁷⁷

On 21 November and 20 December 2011, the Special Coordinator for the Middle East Peace Process and the Assistant Secretary-General for Political Affairs, respectively, briefed the Council on the status of the application of Palestine for membership in the United Nations, as well as significant developments in the region. It was reported that the Palestinian application for membership in the United Nations remained before the Council. On 31 October, UNESCO's General Conference had voted in favour of membership for Palestine. It was noted that the Palestinian bid for membership in the United Nations was viewed negatively by Israel, and tax and customs revenue owed to the Palestinian Authority was initially withheld by the Government of Israel following the vote at UNESCO. Palestinian unity had not moved forward, though there was speculation about future developments. Regarding Gaza, it was reported that the period once again witnessed a dangerous escalation in violence, including rocket fire by militants into Israel, and Israeli strikes. Regarding Lebanon, the situation along Lebanon's border with the Syrian Arab Republic remained a concern. A number of incidents in the area of operations of UNIFIL had taken place, including a bomb attack targeting a UNIFIL patrol which had injured five peacekeepers and two Lebanese civilians. Regarding the Syrian Arab Republic, it was reported that popular protests had continued to be met with violent repression, resulting in numerous deaths, injuries and detentions. The League of Arab States had agreed to dispatch an Arab observer mission. The United Nations continued to monitor the influx of displaced Syrian nationals into northern Lebanon.⁷⁸

⁷⁵ For more information, see Part I, sect. 27, with regard to the situation in the Middle East.

⁷⁶ [S/PV.6636](#), p. 19.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 18.

⁷⁸ [S/PV.6662](#), pp. 2-5; [S/PV.6692](#), pp. 2-5.

Meetings: the situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question

<i>Meeting and date</i>	<i>Sub-item</i>	<i>Other documents</i>	<i>Rule 37 invitations</i>	<i>Rule 39 and other invitations</i>	<i>Speakers</i>	<i>Decision and vote (for-against-abstaining)</i>
6265 27 January 2010			23 Member States ^a	Secretary-General, Permanent Observer of Palestine, Assistant Secretary-General for Political Affairs, European Union, Chair of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, Permanent Observer of the League of Arab States	All Council members and all invitees	
6273 18 February 2010				Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs	All invitees	
6292 24 March 2010				Secretary-General, Special Coordinator for the Middle East Peace Process and Personal Representative of the Secretary-General	Secretary-General	
6298 14 April 2010			17 Member States ^b	Palestine, Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs, Vice-Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, Acting Head of the delegation of the European Union to the United Nations	All Council members and all invitees	
6315 18 May 2010				Special Coordinator for the Middle East Peace Process	Special Coordinator for the Middle East Peace Process	
6325 31 May 2010	Letter dated 31 May 2010 from the Permanent Representative of Turkey to the President of the Security Council (S/2010/266)		Israel	Assistant-Secretary-General for Political Affairs, Palestine	All Council members and all invitees	

<i>Meeting and date</i>	<i>Sub-item</i>	<i>Other documents</i>	<i>Rule 37 invitations</i>	<i>Rule 39 and other invitations</i>	<i>Speakers</i>	<i>Decision and vote (for-against-abstaining)</i>
	Letter dated 31 May 2010 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the President of the Security Council (S/2010/267)					
6326 1 June 2010	Letter dated 31 May 2010 from the Permanent Representative of Turkey to the President of the Security Council (S/2010/266)					S/PRST/2010/9
	Letter dated 31 May 2010 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the President of the Security Council (S/2010/267)					
6340 15 June 2010				Special Coordinator for the Middle East Peace Process	Special Coordinator for the Middle East Peace Process	
6363 21 July 2010			19 Member States ^c	Palestine, Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs, Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, Acting Head of the delegation of the European Union to the United Nations	All Council members and all invitees	
6372 17 August 2010				Assistant Secretary-General for Political Affairs	Assistant Secretary-General for Political Affairs	
6388				Special Coordinator for the Middle	Special Coordinator	

<i>Meeting and date</i>	<i>Sub-item</i>	<i>Other documents</i>	<i>Rule 37 invitations</i>	<i>Rule 39 and other invitations</i>	<i>Speakers</i>	<i>Decision and vote (for-against-abstaining)</i>
17 September 2010				East Peace Process	for the Middle East Peace Process	
6404 18 October 2010			23 Member States ^d	Palestine, Assistant Secretary-General for Political Affairs	All Council members and all invitees	
6430 23 November 2010				Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs	Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs	
6448 14 December 2010				Special Coordinator for the Middle East Peace Process	Special Coordinator for the Middle East Peace Process	
6470 19 January 2011			23 Member States ^e	Palestine, Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs, Chair of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, Chair of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People	All Council members and all invitees	
6484 18 February 2011		Draft resolution submitted by 79 States ^f (S/2011/24)	73 Member States ^g	Palestine	Palestine, 14 Member States ^h	Draft resolution not adopted (S/2011/24) 14-1-0 ⁱ
6488 24 February 2011				Special Coordinator for the Middle East Peace Process	Special Coordinator for the Middle East Peace Process	
6501 22 March 2011				Assistant Secretary-General for Political Affairs	Assistant Secretary-General for Political Affairs	
6520 21 April 2011			24 Member States ^j	Palestine, Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs, Chair of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, Acting Head of the delegation of the European Union to the United Nations	All Council members and all invitees	

<i>Meeting and date</i>	<i>Sub-item</i>	<i>Other documents</i>	<i>Rule 37 invitations</i>	<i>Rule 39 and other invitations</i>	<i>Speakers</i>	<i>Decision and vote (for-against-abstaining)</i>
6540 19 May 2011				Special Coordinator for the Middle East Peace Process	Special Coordinator for the Middle East Peace Process	
6562 23 June 2011				Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs	Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs	
6590 26 July 2011			21 Member States ^k	Palestine, Special Coordinator for the Middle East Peace Process, Acting Head of the Delegation of the European Union to the United Nations, Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People	All Council members and all invitees	
6602 25 August 2011				Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs	Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs	
6623 27 September 2011				Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs	Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs	
6636 24 October 2011			31 Member States ^l	Palestine, Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs, Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, Head of the Delegation of the European Union to the United Nations	All Council members and all invitees	
6662 21 November 2011				Special Coordinator for the Middle East Peace Process	Special Coordinator for the Middle East Peace Process	
6692 20 December 2011				Assistant Secretary-General for Political Affairs	Assistant Secretary-General for Political Affairs	

Footnotes to the table

^a Algeria, Argentina, Cuba, Egypt, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Jordan, Malaysia, Morocco, Nicaragua, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Viet Nam.

^b Botswana, Cuba, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Jordan, Kuwait, Malaysia, Morocco, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of).

^c Bangladesh, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, Iceland, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Jordan, Malaysia, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Philippines, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of).

^d Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Costa Rica, Ecuador, Egypt, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Jordan, Mauritania, Morocco, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Tunisia and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of).

^e Algeria, Australia, Bangladesh, Chile, Cuba, Egypt, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Japan, Jordan, Malaysia, Morocco, Norway, Pakistan, Philippines, Sudan, Tajikistan, Tunisia, Turkey, Saudi Arabia, Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of).

^f Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Chile, Comoros, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Finland, Gabon, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Jordan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Namibia, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Slovenia, Somalia, South Africa, the Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen and Zimbabwe.

^g Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Chile, Comoros, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Finland, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Jordan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Namibia, Nicaragua, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Slovenia, Somalia, Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen and Zimbabwe.

^h Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, China, Colombia, Gabon, India, Israel, Lebanon, Nigeria, Portugal, Russian Federation, South Africa, United Kingdom and United States.

ⁱ For: Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, China, Colombia, France, Gabon, Germany, India, Lebanon, Nigeria, Portugal, Russian Federation, South Africa, United Kingdom; against: United States.

^j Australia, Bangladesh, Cuba, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Japan, Jordan, Malaysia, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Namibia, Norway, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of).

^k Bangladesh, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Malaysia, Morocco, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey, Uganda and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of).

^l Bahrain, Bangladesh, Cuba, Ecuador, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Maldives, Malaysia, Morocco, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Tunisia, Turkey, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Viet Nam.