



The Center For Democracy
& Community Development
مركز الديمقراطية وتنمية المجتمع

Al-Quds University
جامعة القدس



**A CONFERENCE OF LOCAL AND INTERNATIONAL EXPERTS
REVIEWING THE PEACE PROCESS: TOWARDS A
SUSTAINABLE PEACEFUL SOLUTION**

26 -27 November 2008, Jerusalem

Book of Abstracts

Center for Democracy & Community Development

Ibn Batuta St. Kamal Bldg. 2nd Fl.

Tel: 02-6281151

02-6283351

E-mail: cd@cd-cd.org

Web site: www.cd-cd.org

www.bringpeacetgether.org

**A CONFERENCE OF LOCAL AND INTERNATIONAL EXPERTS REVIEWING THE PEACE
PROCESS: TOWARDS A SUSTAINABLE PEACEFUL SOLUTION**

26 -27 November 2008, Jerusalem

ALI ABUSHAHLA

Profession: Consulting Engineer

Board Member - The Center for Democracy and Community Development

Vice Chairman - Palestine Forum

Vice Chairman - Al-Aqsa University Board of Trustees - Gaza

Non-Violent Ways Out of the Impasse

- Introduction
- Calmness Agreement in Gaza only
- West Bank / Jerusalem in light of Calmness
- Israeli/Palestinian Security Cooperation
- Calmness Agreement :
Crossings opening
Security Situation
- Human Rights & Human Security
- Palestinian Internal dialogue and reconciliation
- Freedom of Expression and movement
- Hamas & Presidential elections
- Rafah border crossing
- Exchange of prisoners process
- Calmness & Economic/Health/Education
Economic Status
Health Status
Education Status
- Israel & Calmness - Peace Process
- Israeli Calmness Agreement Violations
- Palestinian-Hamas & Arab/International relations
- Conclusions

Center for Democracy & Community Development

Tel: 02-6281151 | E-mail: cd@cd-cd.org | Web site: www.cd-cd.org

A CONFERENCE OF LOCAL AND INTERNATIONAL EXPERTS REVIEWING THE PEACE PROCESS: TOWARDS A SUSTAINABLE PEACEFUL SOLUTION

26 -27 November 2008, Jerusalem

DAN JACOBSON

Dan Jacobson is a professor of organizational behavior formerly at Tel-Aviv University and presently at the Management College. One of his main areas of academic expertise is coping with insecurity in crisis situations. He has been active in Peace Now and is a member of the Meretz party executive committee and of the Israeli-Palestinian Bringing Peace Together (BPT) NGO.

Is UNTAP (United Nations Transitional Administration in Palestine) an option?

Given the total lack of trust between Israelis and Palestinians and Israelis, it is proposed that an initiative to establish UNTAP (United Nations Transitional Administration in Palestine) should be considered. Accordingly, as in the relatively successful East Timor (UNTAET) precedent, a UN Security Council mandated, and Arab League endorsed, trusteeship will be established in the Occupied Palestinian Territories for a pre-determined transitional period. It will consist of a multinational force large enough to take effective control and replace the Israeli army. US or NATO leadership of the force is usually seen as a requirement for its success. European EU participation may provide a much needed perception of impartiality to the effort. Arab and Moslem participation in the force would provide legitimacy particularly if units from countries with open channels to both Israelis and Palestinians are included such as Egypt, Jordan, Turkey, Morocco and the Gulf states are included under a consensual Arab League umbrella. Arab participation in the multinational force is of utmost importance to prevent its being construed so as yet another neo-colonialist exercise in the region.

The security component of the trusteeship must be linked to a wide-ranging humanitarian, economic and state building effort backed by the international community. The objective of that effort will be to develop the social, economic and institutional infrastructure for a viable Palestinian state. For the proposed UNTAP to have any prospect of success, it cannot be imposed neither on the Palestinians, nor on the Israelis. It needs to be credible and acceptable to both sides and to be supported by the majorities of their respective publics. Given the weakness of the political leaderships of both parties, civil societies and peace NGOs in Israel and Palestine working together could have a critical role in mobilizing such support. Finally, UNTAP's role should not be confined to the need to facilitate Israeli withdrawal from the West Bank. Nor should it be viewed as a substitute for an on-going political process. It should serve as a catalyst for bringing about a fundamental change in the overall conflict environment by preparing the ground for the establishment of a viable Palestinian state alongside a secure Israel in the framework of the two-state solution.

Center for Democracy & Community Development

Tel: 02-6281151 | E-mail: cd@cd-cd.org | Web site: www.cd-cd.org

**A CONFERENCE OF LOCAL AND INTERNATIONAL EXPERTS REVIEWING THE PEACE
PROCESS: TOWARDS A SUSTAINABLE PEACEFUL SOLUTION**

26 -27 November 2008, Jerusalem

Prof. DAVID NEWMAN

Prof. David Newman is professor of political geography in the Department of politics and Government at Ben Gurion University and editor of the International Journal of Geopolitics. He has published widely on territorial dimensions of the Arab-Israel conflict, with a focus on the issue of settlements and the Green Line boundary

Demarcating the Borders of Two States: is it Still Possible

For fifteen years, since Oslo, there have been numerous discussions concerning the demarcation of the future borders of a two-state solution. While the green Line is accepted as the default boundary, it is also accepted that under conditions of real bilateral negotiations, the boundary could be re-drawn in order to take into account the changing geographic realities which have taken place during the past forty years, along with the fact that even the original Green Line was a poorly drawn boundary reflecting the political and military realities of the time period within which it was demarcated at the Rhodes Armistice talks in 1948-49. Any new boundary would have to take into account potential land exchanges, land use patterns, road systems, water aquifers and perhaps even the impact of settlements and the Separation barrier. But although the rough course of the future boundary is clear to all, it is unclear whether any such line could actually be implemented on the landscape given the increasing complexity of the geographical change which has taken place, and continues to take place on an almost daily basis. The alternative, no physical border, would indicate another political solution-ranging from a single bi-national state to the continuation of occupation, with the common element in both of these being a single territory with no dividing border, despite the obvious different power configurations of each of these alternative solutions. Can a border still be imposed upon the landscape and if it can, what are the territorial and settlement compromises which will have to be made for this to take place? And if no bilateral re-drawing of the boundary is feasible, will it be possible to re-implement the Green Line with all of the economic dislocation that this implies?

Center for Democracy & Community Development

Tel: 02-6281151 | E-mail: cd@cd-cd.org | Web site: www.cd-cd.org

**A CONFERENCE OF LOCAL AND INTERNATIONAL EXPERTS REVIEWING THE PEACE
PROCESS: TOWARDS A SUSTAINABLE PEACEFUL SOLUTION**

26 -27 November 2008, Jerusalem

Dr. EFRAT ELRON

A senior fellow at the International Peace Institute in New York and a research fellow at the Hebrew University's Truman Institute for the Advancement of Peace.

**Peace and stability operations in the Israeli-Palestinian peace processes:
present and possible future roles in a lasting solution**

Mandates of peace operations in conflict areas around the globe are expanding on multiple horizons. Civilian, police and military peacekeepers are increasingly charged with state-building tasks that include economic rehabilitation, democratization, building civil institutions, and assistance in establishing effective police forces. Moreover, missions are increasingly being deployed also in settings considered particularly challenged in conflict resolution terms, making stabilization more difficult and obliging larger and more complicated security components. The Israeli-Palestinian peace processes may stand to benefit from the deployment of a multidimensional and peace operation that will include and coordinate existing third party interventions and the regional and global actors behind them. The talk will present existing models of peace operations and their possible implementation in ways that may assist the post-Annapolis peace-making and peace-building processes.

**A CONFERENCE OF LOCAL AND INTERNATIONAL EXPERTS REVIEWING THE PEACE
PROCESS: TOWARDS A SUSTAINABLE PEACEFUL SOLUTION**

26 -27 November 2008, Jerusalem

Prof. ELIE PODEH

Prof. Elie Podeh completed his Ph.D. at Tel-Aviv University in Middle East studies and post-Doctorate at Cornell University in the USA. His main fields of interests are inter-Arab relations, the Arab-Israeli conflict, and education and culture in the Middle East. For the last three years he has been chairing the Department of Islam and Middle East Studies at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. He is also the editor of The New East (Hamizrah Hehadash) – the Hebrew journal of the Middle East and Islamic Studies Association of Israel (MEISAI); and senior research fellow at the Harry S. Truman Institute for the advancement of Peace. Prof. Podeh published and edited several books, such as The Quest for Hegemony in the Arab World: The Struggle Over the Baghdad Pact (1995); The Decline of Arab Unity: The Rise and Fall of the United Arab Republic (1999); The Arab-Israeli Conflict in Israeli History Textbooks, 1948-2000 (2002; Arabic version, 2006); Rethinking Nasserism: Revolution and Historical Memory in Modern Egypt (edited with Onn Winckler, 2004); Arab-Jewish Relations: From Conflict to Resolution? Essays in Honor of Professor Moshe Ma'oz (edited with Asher Kaufman, 2006); and Britain and the Middle East: From Imperial Power to Junior Partner (edited with Zach Levey, 2007). He is also a frequent commentator in the Israeli daily Ha'aretz and various TV programs. His current research deals with the ways in which the Arab states celebrate and commemorate their national holidays.

Breaking the Political Deadlock: Pursuing the Multi-Bilateral Track

In light of the political stalemate between Israel and the Palestinians, it is necessary to involve the Arab states in the peace process. The idea is to combine between the bilateral and multilateral approaches, thus creating the multi-bilateral approach, based on the Arab Peace Initiative. Israel will declare its willingness to open a dialogue with the Arab League (AL), based on the 2002 Arab Peace Plan. Israel and the AL will then open negotiations. Consequently, the AL will call for the convening of a regional conference that will be divided into several tracks: Israeli-Palestinian; Israeli-Syrian; Israeli-Lebanese; and Israeli-Arab. The first three will discuss bilateral issues while the fourth will discuss all-Arab questions, such as Jerusalem, refugees, water, environment, regional security, etc. The US and EU will take an active part in the negotiations by sending a representative to each track. The lecture will discuss the reasons for the need to adopt such method as well as its advantages for the parties involved in the conflict.

Center for Democracy & Community Development

Tel: 02-6281151 | E-mail: cd@cd-cd.org | Web site: www.cd-cd.org

**A CONFERENCE OF LOCAL AND INTERNATIONAL EXPERTS REVIEWING THE PEACE
PROCESS: TOWARDS A SUSTAINABLE PEACEFUL SOLUTION**

26 -27 November 2008, Jerusalem

ERIC EGGLESTON & DAVID KELLEN

Israel/Palestine Center for Research and Information

Eric Eggleston is a graduate student in the Joan B. Kroc Institute for International Peace Studies at the University of Notre Dame. He holds a BA in Sociology and Religious Studies from Nazareth College. He has also studied at Oxford University and the American University in Cairo. After receiving his degree, he was awarded a Fulbright Scholarship to study in New Delhi, India and worked for Citizen Action of New York before joining the Kroc Institute. Currently, he is interning in IPCRI's Strategic Affairs Unit.

*David Kellen is the Israeli Coordinator of IPCRI's Strategic Affairs Unit, co-editor of *The Transformation of the World of War and Peace Support Operations and Stabilizing the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict: Considerations for the Multinational Peace Support Operation*.*

Letting the Dough Rise: Resolving the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict in 2010

The following paper is an examination of strategic options for resolving the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, taking into consideration several aspects of the conflict at present that make an immediate resolution impossible. In fact, a resolution is only possible in 2010 or thereafter and in order to do so requires a series of strategic breakthroughs. The following paper outlines the window of opportunity that will arise in 2010, the strategic breakthroughs that must be reached before that window closes and the interrelation of those breakthroughs to the bilateral peace process. Issues addressed include the Hamas-Fatah split, the Syrian-Israeli track, Israeli and Palestinian domestic politics, and the Arab Peace Initiative.

Center for Democracy & Community Development

Tel: 02-6281151 | E-mail: cd@cd-cd.org | Web site: www.cd-cd.org

A CONFERENCE OF LOCAL AND INTERNATIONAL EXPERTS REVIEWING THE PEACE PROCESS: TOWARDS A SUSTAINABLE PEACEFUL SOLUTION

26 -27 November 2008, Jerusalem

ESTHER RILEY

Parity for Peace in Israel/Palestine: A Condominium Solution

One state or two? How about both? All the problems that have been vexing Palestinian and Israeli negotiators would be moot if Israel and Palestine became two states *on the same land*, with bilateral, 50-50 governance—a condominium solution.

According to Wikipedia, a condominium is “a political territory (state or border area) in or over which two or more sovereign powers formally agree to share equally *dominium* (in the sense of sovereignty) and exercise their rights jointly, without dividing it up into ‘national’ zones.”

Wikipedia gives examples of past and present condominiums, but for a condominium to consist of two entire states would be a first. Some might call such a condominium a binational state, but now that Israel already is a state and the Palestinians would like to have a state, why not use the term “condominium” and give each state representation in the United Nations? In fact, use of the term “state” helps to provide legitimacy for parity between nation-states with unequal populations, for that is how the United Nations General Assembly is set up.

Parity in governance would be essential for a condominium solution. That would give each nation enough power to protect its interests, but not enough to dominate the other. Israel could thus be assured of remaining Jewish and continuing to be a haven for Jews. (In fact, it could now be 100 percent Jewish, for Israeli Arabs would belong to Palestine.) Parity in governance would also ensure that the Palestinians were not dominated by the wealthier Jews.

Parity between individuals would be another essential element of a condominium solution. All individuals, whether Israeli or Palestinian, should have equal access to resources such as land, water, and government infrastructure.

So how would a condominium solution work? Here is how it is envisioned by Parity for Peace, a proposal that happens to be my own and is described in detail on www.parityforpeace.org. Like any other state, each state would have its own flag, song, national holidays, president, legislature, and representation in the United Nations. The state legislatures would be able to make laws for their nation in narrow areas, such as marriage, but for governance of the common territory, the two legislatures would come together as equals to make the laws. To ensure even application of the law, the executive and judicial branches of the government would be fully integrated, with positions of power rotated between the states, perhaps as often as every six months. Religious sites would be managed by the clerics involved.

Shared sovereignty with parity would enable Palestinian refugees to return without threatening Israel as a Jewish state; would enable religious fundamentalists on both sides to feel that they were reclaiming the land God had given them; and would surely result in greater security and prosperity for both peoples. Palestinians and Israelis could now jointly defend their common borders, and people not wishing to live in peace could be dealt with as they are in any other nation—by the police.

Center for Democracy & Community Development

Tel: 02-6281151 | E-mail: cd@cd-cd.org | Web site: www.cd-cd.org

A CONFERENCE OF LOCAL AND INTERNATIONAL EXPERTS REVIEWING THE PEACE PROCESS: TOWARDS A SUSTAINABLE PEACEFUL SOLUTION

26 -27 November 2008, Jerusalem

EYAL ERLICH

Businessman, and independent peace activist. Was the first to come with the idea of applying the traditional mechanism of the Hudna, on the Israeli – Palestinian conflict. In 2005, he published his book "Hudna – a political adventure".

Hudna as a powerful tool for promoting reconciliation in the Middle East

1. Amman, March 2000: The first time I learned about the term "Hudna", and about the traditional mechanism of solving blood feuds in the Arab society
2. Some words about the two very powerful traditions: The blood Revenge and the reconciliation mechanism:

Historical Review of the Blood revenge:

- In ancient times, the tradition of vendetta ("Tahar" in Arabic) was the only effective and logical way for a society to protect itself, and achieve **stability and security**. in an era of absence of the rule of law, no police, no courts, the solution of the tribes to gain security was the balance of terror. (or balance of fear). An eye for an eye. Blood will have blood.

Historical review of the reconciliation mechanism:

With the vendetta came hand in hand (arm in arm) the mechanism of conciliation. "SULUCH" in Arabic. This mechanism came to the world long before Muhammad was born before Islam, from the times of wandering tribes.

The Hudna is the first stage in the way to reconciliation: first of all, the most important task is to freeze the duty of blood revenge for limited time. "Time out". The second stage happens 3 days after the death: reaching an oral agreement for reconciliation which follows by an advanced partial compensation to the family of the victim. ("Atwe" in Arabic).

Usually, there is a fix price as compensation in case of death (no matter if it is a murder or car accident). The compensation (in Arabic: " Diya") is about 300,000 I.S. in a way, this mechanism is similar to life insurance in our society. It is common to pay about 15% of the total Diya as Atwe in the beginning of the hudna.

The third and very important part is the reconciliation party (Sulha). This is a symbolic ceremony, that bring an end to the conflict. The family of the killer is arriving with white flag, and they pay the remaining of the diya in front of the public.

3. My idea of implementing the Hudna Mechanism on the Israeli – Palestinian conflict. The start of the initiative, March 2001. The acceptance of the idea by the Israeli President, the meeting with Arafat on 14.12.2001. The acceptance of the idea by the Palestinian leadership. The refusal of Sharon.
4. Hudna agreements between Muslims and non-Muslims:
The Hudna between Spain and Morocco, as a role model.
5. My updated idea for applying a long term Hudna between Israel and the Palestinians:
It is a very tuff mission to reach a final peace agreement between two nations who fight for more than 100 years.

Center for Democracy & Community Development

Tel: 02-6281151|E-mail: cd@cd-cd.org| Web site: www.cd-cd.org

A CONFERENCE OF LOCAL AND INTERNATIONAL EXPERTS REVIEWING THE PEACE PROCESS: TOWARDS A SUSTAINABLE PEACEFUL SOLUTION

26 -27 November 2008, Jerusalem

This is a very slippery task. It is very easy to fail in this attempt, and break the head. This is what happened to Barak and Arafat in the peace talks on 2000. the result of the failure was the break of the intifada on September 2000. rivers of blood, thousands of victims from both nations.

So I think that the first lesson from this, is that any responsible leader must prepare a safety net for his people – for the very reasonable possibility that the peach talks will fail.

A long term Hudna, respected cease fire that assure reasonable life for both nations – should be the safety mattress. NO SERIOUS LEADER SHOULD DRAG HIS NATION FOR A PEACE SUMMIT – WITHOUT ARRANGING IN ADVANCE A RLIABLE AND STRONG SAFETY NET.

The reality in our region is very complicated, especially after the Hamas took over Gaza.

6. I suggest achieving 2 different Hudna agreements, for 30 years: the first one between Israel and the west bank (Abu Mazen government). The second, between Israel and Gaza (Hamas).

In the Arab tradition, in order to get a Hudna, we must have JAHAT SULUCH: the delegation of respected people, who are independent and sovereign. I suggest asking 7 winners of the Nobel peace Price in recent years to serve as the intermediates between the two nations.

The Hudna agreement between Israel and Abu Mazen, should serve as safety mattress. It should be prepared and ready – before the two sides will enter the last rounds of the peace talks. If the peace talks will fail, the Hudna will take place. This agreement will be the default option.

The Hudna agreement between Israel and Hamas, is the sole way to achieve a reasonable alternative for the current situation. This is not a final solution, but it is much better than another round of blood.

During 10 or even 30 years of Hudna, the international community will invest Billions of Dollars in building new cities in Palestine. Such a move can change the situation in Palestine.

**A CONFERENCE OF LOCAL AND INTERNATIONAL EXPERTS REVIEWING THE PEACE
PROCESS: TOWARDS A SUSTAINABLE PEACEFUL SOLUTION**

26 -27 November 2008, Jerusalem

Prof. GALIA GOLAN

*Professor Galia Golan, PhD
Academic Director, International Program and Program in Conflict Resolution
Lauder School of Government, Diplomacy & Strategy
Interdisciplinary Center, Herzliya*

The Evolution of the Israeli Position on Peace

The Israeli position regarding a settlement, in general and with regard to the core issues, has undergone significant changes of the years. Official Israeli policy positions today are in fact far closer than any time in the past to positions that might make an Israeli/Palestinian agreement possible. Despite negative tendencies that have developed in both Israeli and Palestinian societies, due primarily to the failures of past peace attempts but also to actions taken on the ground, there is reason to believe that a peace agreement would be accepted by the public. To a large degree this might be the result of the support available from the Arab world in the form of the Arab Peace Initiative – another element of change, due in part to the changes in the regional and global context that brings us closer to resolution of the conflict today.

**A CONFERENCE OF LOCAL AND INTERNATIONAL EXPERTS REVIEWING THE PEACE
PROCESS: TOWARDS A SUSTAINABLE PEACEFUL SOLUTION**

26 -27 November 2008, Jerusalem

IBRAHIM BISHARAT

No More Catch 22 Proposals To Solve The Israeli-Palestinian Conflict

The continuous interest and balance of powers based approach to resolving the Israeli-Palestinian conflict over the last one hundred years will not be mature and will not deliver sustainable and viable peace as long as it is within the boundaries of conflict management and mitigation theory. Therefore, for results- based approach conflict transformation and resolution, the current mechanisms and bases for the final settlement should be revisited to find a sustainable and just bases that are rights based, treat the fears and concerns of each and fulfill their ambitions as recognized nations, universally acknowledged and respected in the minds and the practices of the leaders and people.

Therefore, a just and a sustainable solution cannot be based on the intertwining of UN Resolutions 242 and 194 because of the issue of refugees, the availability of the land area and the Jewish settlements. Accordingly, adopting UN resolutions 181 and 194 using the rights based approach mechanism can be the base for a final settlement that comply with the major aspirations of the two parties; identity, land and self-determination.

Center for Democracy & Community Development

Tel: 02-6281151|E-mail: cd@cd-cd.org| Web site: www.cd-cd.org

**A CONFERENCE OF LOCAL AND INTERNATIONAL EXPERTS REVIEWING THE PEACE
PROCESS: TOWARDS A SUSTAINABLE PEACEFUL SOLUTION**

26 -27 November 2008, Jerusalem

ILAI ALON, Ph.D.

Department of Philosophy, Tel Aviv University.

Studied Arabic Language and Literature at the Hebrew University and Oxford University. I have published in the area of mediaeval Arabic philosophy (on Socrates; on al-Farabi) and on Negotiations in Arabic-speaking Islam, a topic on which I am now writing a book. I am also engaged in a research project on the emotive lexicon of conflict and conflict management in Arabic and in Hebrew. I was a member of the Israeli team to the negotiations with Syria in 1999-2000.

The Arab Peace Initiative: Some Linguistics Comments

In order to understand and assess The Arab Peace Initiative of 2002, as phrased in the communication to the press, it ought to be analysed both politically and linguistically. In this paper I propose to do a sample of the latter by treating one sentence and four terms. The sentence is "The Arab leaders ask Israel to reconsider her policies, incline to peace, and declare that a just peace is its strategic option as well." The verbs "ask", "reconsider", and the expression "incline to peace" will be examined. The four words which are analyzed are "struggle" vs. "dispute", the reference to Jerusalem ("East"), the use of peace terms "peace", "just peace", "comprehensive peace", "just and comprehensive peace", "solution", and "settlement", and reference to the region of conflict. The proposed analysis takes into consideration the history and context of the language of official documents of the Arab League Summit Meetings since 1981.

My conclusion is that this particular document (with some reservations regarding other 2002 documents) conveys credibility of the Arab commitment to peace. Israeli traditional policy of taking Arab declarations at their face value when belligerent ought to be equally pursued when they are peaceful.

Center for Democracy & Community Development

Tel: 02-6281151 | E-mail: cd@cd-cd.org | Web site: www.cd-cd.org

**A CONFERENCE OF LOCAL AND INTERNATIONAL EXPERTS REVIEWING THE PEACE
PROCESS: TOWARDS A SUSTAINABLE PEACEFUL SOLUTION**

26 -27 November 2008, Jerusalem

IZHAK SCHNELL

Department of Geography, Tel-Aviv University

The Future of the Settlers in the Context of the Gaza experience

Any peaceful solution to the Palestinian-Israeli conflict will have to deal with the Jewish settlers in the west Bank. So far the assumption was that all the settlers that live in territories that will be included in the Palestinian state will have to be evacuated. I propose to consider an alternative policy, which will allow the settlers decide where they want to live. Fortunately several Palestinian leaders lately supported the idea. By making the argument I do not intend to legitimize the construction of the settlements but to suggest a more affective solution that is based on pragmatic considerations. Based on several surveys I predict that more than 70 percent of the settlers will choose to leave the Palestinian state and to immigrate Israel by their free choice. Israel will commit itself to compensate each settler for his/her property and this property will be transferred to the Palestinian state. This solution may help Israel to give up larger territories to the Palestinians, including larger towns like Ariel and Ma'aleh Edomim, which threaten to cut the continuity of the Palestinian territories. It will avoid the traumatic experiences that the settlers from Gaza still suffer from as the result of the forced evacuation and it will reduce opposition to the political solution among many Israelis. The solution also will renew the spirit of the U.N. partitioning plans for Palestine/Israel in which about 300,000 Palestinians were expected to become citizens of Israel and several dozens of Israelis were expected to become citizens of Palestine . In addition, I believe that both minorities have the potential to contribute to deepen economic and political relations between the two states in the future. The existence of a Jewish minority raises several challenges. First, the Palestinians will have to respect the right of the settlers who choose to stay in Palestine for their property even if the ownership has not been secured in accordance with the Palestinian law that will be implemented in Palestine . Second, the settlers will have to respect the Palestinian sovereignty over their home places. Third, both sides will have to reconsider citizenship, whether they will allow the settlers and Israeli Palestinians double citizenship or whether they will be forced to choose one citizenship. The idea of double citizenship may suggest an interesting experiment for gradual process of opening up boundaries between the two societies.

Center for Democracy & Community Development

Tel: 02-6281151|E-mail: cd@cd-cd.org| Web site: www.cd-cd.org

A CONFERENCE OF LOCAL AND INTERNATIONAL EXPERTS REVIEWING THE PEACE PROCESS: TOWARDS A SUSTAINABLE PEACEFUL SOLUTION

26 -27 November 2008, Jerusalem

MARTIJN DEKKER

Martijn Dekker has studied Social Anthropology at VU University Amsterdam and conducted research on community development and nonviolent resistance on the Palestinian West Bank. He is currently carrying out his PhD research project, in which he focuses on 'human security from below, i.e. civilian initiatives in war situations, specifically in Iraq and the Gaza Strip. His research interests include the (re-)emergence of social boundaries in times of conflict, human security in war situations, the formation and development of autonomous security zones, and the interaction between a local population and foreign troops.

Lessons learnt from Kosovo and the Åland Islands - Abstract

In this paper we will discuss the influence of the international community on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Not in the form of an historical overview but as a proposed intervention model, based on earlier international interventions, specifically those in the Åland Islands crisis and in Kosovo. In both cases the international community, (the League of Nations, the United Nations and NATO), intervened in conflicts between Finland and Sweden, and Kosovo and Serbia respectively. Although the interventions presented both advantages as well as disadvantages to the parties involved, and, as such, were obviously not perfect, they did signal vital breakthroughs, and, at the very least, starting points for a stable and peaceful future.

Based on these earlier experiences we propose the following guidelines as part of a peaceful solution to the conflict between Israel and the Palestinians. (1) A selected committee of representatives from the UN, in name of the international community as a whole, should propose a solution to the conflict. Single countries should not be able to block or frustrate the implementation of the proposed solution, which means that approval of the Security Council is not needed; (2) Both adversaries should fully trust the judgement of representatives of this international body and, consequently, be willing to accept a proposal for the settlement of the conflict; (3) A peaceful settlement will be based on a two-state solution; (4) The borders between the two states will be based on those prior to 1967; (5) Despite the demarcation of official borders, there will be no forced resettlement of people; (6) As a consequence, Arab villages in Israel as well as Jewish settlements in Palestine will remain. However, as constituents of the (new) larger state; (7) Former Jewish settlements (now villages) in Palestine should be completely demilitarised and 'defortified'. Their security and well-being should be maintained by Palestinian security forces. Also, other military or guarded infrastructures, like by-pass roads, should be handed over to Palestine; (8) The minority rights in Israel and Palestine have to be guaranteed very well, not only in the form of providing physical security but, very importantly, also by ensuring people's right to preserve their own cultural heritage; (9) The implementation of the aforementioned arrangements are to be supervised and assisted by the international community; (10) This international supervisory body may entail both military (hard) and administrative (soft) support and will remain present as long as it is deemed necessary.

Center for Democracy & Community Development

Tel: 02-6281151 | E-mail: cd@cd-cd.org | Web site: www.cd-cd.org

**A CONFERENCE OF LOCAL AND INTERNATIONAL EXPERTS REVIEWING THE PEACE
PROCESS: TOWARDS A SUSTAINABLE PEACEFUL SOLUTION**

26 -27 November 2008, Jerusalem

MKHAIMAR ABUSADA, Ph.D.

Al-Azhar University, Gaza

Gaza - West Bank: How to Bridge the Divide?

It is well-known that Palestinians are divided into two major camps, Fatah and Hamas. Both Fatah and Hamas have agreed on the Prisoners Document on June 2006, but they differ fundamentally over strategy and tactics. The Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), dominated by Fatah, rules the West Bank, believes in negotiations with Israel on basis of Land for Peace, and sees the establishment of a Palestinian state on the lands occupied in 1967 as an end to the conflict. Hamas, on the other hand, controls Gaza and enjoys support among many Palestinians in the diaspora. It relies on armed resistance and says it would be willing to reach a long-term truce with Israel but that ultimately Palestinians must rule all of historic Palestine.

The planned meeting between Hamas and Fatah organized by Egypt was postponed indefinitely; the two factions blamed each other for the delay. Hamas reportedly decided to boycott the meeting unless Fatah released all Hamas political prisoners in the West Bank. Hamas decided to boycott the meeting believing that the Egyptian initiative does not satisfy their demands.

The purpose of this paper is to seek answers on how to put an end to the division between Gaza and West Bank and to identify new tools for future sustainable political partnership between Hamas and Fatah and all other Palestinian factions and groups.

**A CONFERENCE OF LOCAL AND INTERNATIONAL EXPERTS REVIEWING THE PEACE
PROCESS: TOWARDS A SUSTAINABLE PEACEFUL SOLUTION**

26 -27 November 2008, Jerusalem

Dr. MULI PELEG

Professor of political science and communication at the School of communication at Netanya College, Expert in conflict and conflict resolution processes and he is a research fellow at the Stanford Center for International Conflict resolution and negotiation (SCICN).

The Barriers Approach to the Palestinian-Israeli Peace Process

New developments in the field of conflict resolution since the 1990's have changed the traditional wisdom in meaningful ways. The transformation was instigated as an intellectual reaction to the sweeping changes in the world such as the collapse of the Soviet Union and the Eastern Bloc, the Iranian revolution and the rise of radical Islam and the spread of ravishing internal wars in the Balkans and Africa. The new understanding was expressed in four major themes:

- 1) Conflict resolution became contingent rather than normative and absolute: problem-solving might not be appropriate for every disagreement and in any stage of the negotiation process. Different phases of the conflict require disparate conflict resolution strategies.
- 2) Classic conflict resolution focused on the dispute itself, concentrating efforts to enter the confrontation, separate the belligerents and channel their disagreement to non violent paths. Contemporary conflict resolution chooses a broader perspective on the conflict, trying to comprehend the background, motivations, interests and objectives of each side.
- 3) While traditional conflict resolution emphasizes the external intervention by capable third parties, the new approaches highlight the internal forces on each side that can promote and uphold conflict resolution from within. Such internal processes intend to attain a change of attitude toward the other.
- 4) The new effort in conflict resolution strives beyond the rational "getting-to-yes" approach to understand what prevents the rivaling sides to reach an agreement despite the fact that everyone would be better-off with such an arrangement.

This paper relies on the new trends in conflict resolution but focuses mainly on the fourth one. It brings forth the Stanford school barriers approach to negotiation and reconciliation. The paper introduces the prospective barriers in the context of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict and specifies the merits of this perspective.

**A CONFERENCE OF LOCAL AND INTERNATIONAL EXPERTS REVIEWING THE PEACE
PROCESS: TOWARDS A SUSTAINABLE PEACEFUL SOLUTION**

26 -27 November 2008, Jerusalem

OFRA YESHUA-LYTH

*Ofra Yeshua-Lyth is an ex-journalist, presently a PR and strategic consultant, also active in several civil society groups. Her book *A State of Mind; Why Israel should become Secular and Democratic* was published in Hebrew version (2004 www.erezhbrith.com).*

Secularizing Israel as a necessary first step towards any solution of the conflict

A critical examination of the religious character of the state of Israel as a major factor in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict remains a taboo in most forums. The popular Two States solution deliberately ignores the fact that at least one of the would-be states is bound to continue to be internally unstable and externally belligerent, due to its peculiar religious character. No religion is recommended for the shaping of political considerations. Judaism is particularly ill adapted for this task. Our religion has for generations served as a system to preserve a minority group within non-Jewish populations, avoiding any risk of merger and assimilation through self-segregation.

Israel has adopted the self segregation decreed by the Jewish Orthodoxy. At the same time, Israel considers every relative increase of the non-Jewish population in the territory under its control as an existential-strategic threat.

Against this background the conflict over the occupied territories should be examined as a religious conflict. It is not likely to end with the termination of the occupation (presuming such termination is at all viable). Already tensions occasionally lead to violent confrontations between Israeli citizens, Jews and Arab, in proper Israel inside the green line.

The Israeli settlements in the occupied territories are islands of Jewish population separated and estranged from the non-Jewish hinterland. The mighty Israeli army is fully committed to the settlements welfare, at the expense of the non-Jewish population.

The Israeli Left calls for a retreat to the 1967 borders as the only hope to preserve the "Jewish Character" of the state of Israel. The Israeli Right openly toys with the idea of making Arab Palestinians leave the territories under Israeli sovereignty. Both are united in the vision of preserving the Jewish State based on a Jewish majority. All Israeli Jews support a massive immigration based solely on religious criteria, with severe social consequences. Uniting non-Jewish families has become almost impossible. Palestinians and Jews pay dearly for these outdated religious-political aspirations. It is about time that Israeli Peace activists get over the nostalgic vision of preserving ethnic and religious purity and take a stand for the separation of State and Church in Israel. Until then, one has no grounds to complain about Palestinians who wish to mirror the Jewish national-religious vision with the vision of an Islamic state.

Center for Democracy & Community Development

Tel: 02-6281151 | E-mail: cd@cd-cd.org | Web site: www.cd-cd.org

**A CONFERENCE OF LOCAL AND INTERNATIONAL EXPERTS REVIEWING THE PEACE
PROCESS: TOWARDS A SUSTAINABLE PEACEFUL SOLUTION**

26 -27 November 2008, Jerusalem

Dr. REINER BERNSTEIN

Munich/Germany

Email: reiner.bernstein@web.de

Homepage: www.reiner-bernstein.de

German and European Policies Concerning the Middle East

After a complete failure in 1970 European governments tried to consolidate cooperation in the areas of economic, political, and social affairs reached out to deal with the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, either. This took place with some unwillingness after the October War 1973, when the oil-producing Arab countries imposed some sort of a supply embargo. The new approach had to wait until the 1980 summit in Venice confirmed that the Palestinian people must have the chance to fulfil their national aspirations. But only in the 1990s the right to a Palestinian state was officially stipulated.

Nevertheless, primarily the Europeans focused their efforts to assist the Palestinian Authority with considerable amounts of financial support. At the same time they circumvented political initiatives of their own and were content to provide technical and organisational assistance to achieve crisis management results. This "modesty" was the answer to American claims to be the only potential Western power in the Middle East on the one hand and the inability of the European governments themselves to close ranks in front of the challenges in the region. Furthermore, some countries – among them Germany – preferred to display a rather crucial control of European peace-related decisions. This attitude was demonstrated once again when German Chancellor Angela Merkel addressed the Israeli parliament in March 2008.

The European reluctance may be surprising, since all governments are aware of what is going on in the Palestinian territories (West Bank, East Jerusalem, and Gaza) and the Israeli responsibilities thereof. Some observers explained the contradiction between ample knowledge and inappropriate consequences by entertaining the argument that Europe is trying to pay-off Palestinian national aspirations by contributions to a suitable level of Palestinian living-standards. To this political self-betrayal belongs the differentiation between "illegal outposts" and settlements encapsulated in the Roadmap.

Yet, it has become clear that such postures destroy political credibility completely, since they run continuously behind developments at the shores of the Mediterranean. In other words: In the meantime European governments – let alone public opinion which by a majority is not interested in domestic Palestinian affairs in a significant way – understand that it is of no avail to stay put until other forces present their views with detrimental effects to peace. This process of self-inspection is underway. Beyond the Atlantic the incoming administration of President-elect Barack Obama seems to be more open to a meaningful US-European dialogue, before strategic decisions are made. Since the new Administration may include Jewish foreign relations advisors like Dennis Ross, Daniel C.

Center for Democracy & Community Development

Tel: 02-6281151 | E-mail: cd@cd-cd.org | Web site: www.cd-cd.org

**A CONFERENCE OF LOCAL AND INTERNATIONAL EXPERTS REVIEWING THE PEACE
PROCESS: TOWARDS A SUSTAINABLE PEACEFUL SOLUTION**

26 -27 November 2008, Jerusalem

Kurtzer, Robert Malley, and Aaron David Miller, especially German legislators hopefully are going to display more courage not to capitulate to suspicions that their responsible approach to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict is the outcome of deep-rooted anti-Semitic predispositions. To promote and to support members of the Bundestag to re-evaluate the chances of peace by expanding their discourse and experience with representatives of the Palestinian and Israeli peace camps is the message which has to be distributed and strengthened by all those who are familiar with building bridges over the Israeli-Palestinian abyss.

Center for Democracy & Community Development

Tel: 02-6281151 | E-mail: cd@cd-cd.org | Web site: www.cd-cd.org

**A CONFERENCE OF LOCAL AND INTERNATIONAL EXPERTS REVIEWING THE PEACE
PROCESS: TOWARDS A SUSTAINABLE PEACEFUL SOLUTION**

26 -27 November 2008, Jerusalem

Dr. TONY KLUG

Writer in Arab- Israeli Conflict for 40 years, advisor on the Middle East to the Oxford Research, Group and vice chair of the Arab-Jewish Forum (UK).

A Peace-Building Ladder for the Middle East

The peace-building ladder - comprising a dynamic sequence of plausible, if imagined, gestures - rests on the premise that the declared positions of virtually all the main parties to the Arab-Israeli-Palestinian conflict are on paper more closely aligned today than ever before. But the political and psychological climate is not conducive to a negotiated agreement. So first the mood needs to change. The key is momentum.

The paper – extracted from the author’s acclaimed Fabian pamphlet ‘How peace broke out in the Middle East’ – shows how a seemingly intractable situation could suddenly shift through a few brave acts, none of them extending much beyond moves the key players have already publicly countenanced. As necessary, a third party may need to guide the process in a spirit of ‘orchestrated spontaneity’.

The paper outlines 55 steps (including the inevitable violent setbacks) but the opening gambits are the most vital as they address the most pressing issues for both sides and spark off the initial chain reaction that eventually builds, through its own logic, into a self-generating momentum. The Israeli Prime Minister opens by affirming that if full, comprehensive peace and normal relations were truly obtainable with the whole Arab world, Israel would in principle be willing to withdraw fully from the West Bank (and the Golan Heights too), subject to agreed, equitable land exchanges. Suddenly, the prospect of a viable, contiguous Palestinian state is back on the table.

The Palestinian President responds by inviting the settlers to stay, as Palestinian residents or citizens, and help build the new Palestinian state, instantly taking the wind out of their protests about being forcefully evacuated from their homes, and injecting a new political current into the settler movement.

Reports are broadcast that the Saudi King, together with the Emir of Qatar and the UAE President, will respond positively to an invitation to visit Jerusalem and pray at the Mosque. The announcement – and the visits shortly thereafter to the Knesset and Palestinian Assembly - have an electrifying effect on Israeli and Palestinian public opinion, swinging it behind the Arab Peace Initiative and helping revive belief in the whole idea of peace in the region.

The Syrian President offers to host bilateral peace talks with Israel in Damascus, suggesting that the Israeli delegation drive to the Syrian capital "to show how easy it would be for ordinary Israelis and Syrians to visit each other's countries in the future".

**A CONFERENCE OF LOCAL AND INTERNATIONAL EXPERTS REVIEWING THE PEACE
PROCESS: TOWARDS A SUSTAINABLE PEACEFUL SOLUTION**

26 -27 November 2008, Jerusalem

Events now move swiftly at every level, taking in an Arab-Israeli summit in Riyadh - that adopts seven 'irrevocable declarations of principle' - and culminating in direct Israeli-Palestinian 'final-basket' negotiations. The developing mood conduces a long-term ceasefire, an exchange of prisoners and a genuine settlements' freeze.

As the permanent-status talks get under way under the joint auspices of the Quartet and the 'Arab Quartet', the imagined scenario fades from the picture. But the atmosphere has been transformed, so that when the parties re-engage in direct negotiations there is a new expectancy that augurs well for their outcome and contrasts sharply with the mistrust and acrimony that marked the previous attempts which had resolutely been leading nowhere.

Center for Democracy & Community Development

Tel: 02-6281151 | E-mail: cd@cd-cd.org | Web site: www.cd-cd.org

**A CONFERENCE OF LOCAL AND INTERNATIONAL EXPERTS REVIEWING THE PEACE
PROCESS: TOWARDS A SUSTAINABLE PEACEFUL SOLUTION**

26 -27 November 2008, Jerusalem

Center for Democracy & Community Development

Tel: 02-6281151 | E-mail: cd@cd-cd.org | Web site: www.cd-cd.org