

## **Strategic Dialogue: An Urgent Necessity.**

The 21st Century harbors global changes that entail both hopes and threats to world peace. More than thirty armed conflicts still exist today. Religious fundamentalism and international terrorism are on the rise. The global situation is dangerous and unstable. Stabilizing these conflicts is the most pressing challenge of our time.

More than ever before, national policy makers sorely require practical dialogue with experienced, time-tested Heads of State and experts. Today's world leadership is challenged in finding a way to transform theoretical research into solution-oriented policies and actions.

Responding to this challenge, former Heads of State, heads of security services, academic specialists, and members of the international business community have joined forces to establish an Intern Center of Strategic Dialogue.

### **Members of the Center's Board of Governors:**

H.E. Mikhail Gorbachev, former President of the USSR

H.E. Ehud Barak, former Prime Minister of Israel

H.E. Prince Hassan Bin Tallal of Jordan

H.E. Abdurrahman Wahid, former President of Indonesia

H.E. Carl Bildt, former Prime Minister of Sweden

H.E. Frederick W.de Klerk, former President of South Africa

H.E. Sergei Stepashin, former Prime Minister of Russia

H.E. Dr. Mustafa Khalil, former Prime Minister of Egypt

Louis Freeh, former Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigations (FBI); Dan Meridor, former Minister; Assaf Hefetz, former Israeli Police Commissioner; Maj. Gen. (ret.) Mansour Abu Rashid, former Director of the Jordanian Army Dept. of Foreign Relations; Giulio Andreotti, former Prime Minister of Italy; Berndt Schmidtbauer, former German Minister of Intelligence; James Woolsey, former Director of the Central Intelligence Agency; Professor Zvi Arad, President Netanya College; Professor Bernhard Pinchuk, Rector Netanya College; Professor Sinai Deutsch, Dean of Law, Netanya College; Professor Gabi Ben Dor, Haifa University; Professor Joseph Ginat, former advis to the Israeli Prime Minister on Arab Affairs; Ambassador Edward J. Perkins, PhD., University of Oklahoma; Professor William Gameson, Boston College; Professor Peter Valenstein, Uppsala University, Sweden; Yossi Ackerman, President of Elbit, Tel Aviv; Jerry Feldman, CEO, GP Strategies, New York

### **SDC Steering Committee:**

M.K. maj. gen. (ret.) Danny Yatom - Co-Chairman

Mr. Trevor Spiro - Co-Chairman

Dr. Moshe Amirav - Director

Prof. Zvi Arad - President, Netanya Academic College

David Altman - Vice President for Development, Netanya Academic College

Dr. Samuel Peleg - Academic Director

Ms Aviva Palter - Conference Director - Head of International Activities

Netanya College, No. 1 University st., Kiriat Yitzchak Rabin, Netanya 42365

Tel: 972-9-860-7785 Fax: 972-9-860-7701

e-mail: SDC@Netanya.ac.il / paltera@netanya.ac.il

website: [www.icsda.com](http://www.icsda.com)

[www.netanya.ac.il](http://www.netanya.ac.il)



**STRATEGIC DIALOGUE CENTER  
THE NETANYA ACADEMIC COLLEGE**

**“After the Iraq War –  
Prior to the Road Map –  
Chances and Risks”**

**23 June 2003**

All rights reserved – 2003



**Professor ZVI ARAD**  
**President Netanya College**

I take pride in addressing you at the opening of this International Conference held by the Strategic Dialogue Center on the issue of "After the War in Iraq and Prior to the Road Map – Opportunities and Risks". This conference is one of the welcome results of international cooperation that involves notable figures, former Heads of State and heads of security services.

The Netanya Academic College offers a neutral academic platform for conferences held throughout the world as well as in Israel, which will attempt to convert the theoretical know-how of experts, of Heads of State, of the academics and security experts, into effective applicable tools at the service of the policy shapers all over the world. The Center was established this year and commenced its activities with the conference held in New York in April and dedicated to the issue of global terror. A book of the New York conference is being printed as we speak and will be sent as an SDC document to all interested parties as well as to the world's Heads of State and policy makers. It will also be sent to highly influential persons overseas and we hope that they will make use of the important ideas contained in it. The authors of this

book are the Heads of State who are attending today's conference, former directors of the CIA, the FBI, and the MOSSAD, and include the world's top-ranking experts on terror.

The board of governors met last night to determine the policy lines of the Center's future operations. I should like, from this platform, to thank all those who helped us make this conference happen: the lecturers, the organizers, and the financial supporters of the Center. I thank the Heads of State who have come here especially for the conference, H. E. Mikhail Gorbachev, H. E. Abdurrahman Wahid, H. E. Frederick De Klerk and H. E. Ehud Barak. I thank the speakers who have come from afar: the Japanese Deputy Foreign Minister, Mr. Toshimitsu Motegi, former German Intelligence Minister, Mr. Brendt Schmidtbauer. I thank Foreign Minister Silvan Shalom, who has found the time to address this important conference. My warm thanks go to the conference lecturers. On behalf of all that are present, I send our sincere condolences to U.S. Ambassador, Dan Kurtzer, who will be addressing the conference in due course. Ambassador Kurtzer's cousin Anna Orgel was murdered in the attack on a Jerusalem bus ten

days ago. I express my gratitude to Prof. Sari Nuseybah, who will speak to us on the Palestinian aspect of the bloody conflict which, we all pray, will come to an end after 100 years of struggle.

On this occasion I would also like to thank the people whose financial support has enabled us to advance and promote the Netanya Academic College and the Strategic Dialogue Center, in particular we would like to thank Mr. Trevor Spiro from London, without his support this conference could not have taken place. I would also like to inform you that Mr. Yitzhak Tesuhva is building us an International Congress Center, so that we will be able to hold conferences in better conditions.

This evening we are conferring Honoris Causa degrees upon His Excellency Abdurrahman Wahid, former President of Indonesia, His Excellency Fredrick De Klerk, former President of South Africa, Mr. Gideon Hamburger and Mr. Yair Hamburger, after whose parents Ernst and Margot Hamburger we have named our School of Business Administration and Insurance. The Presidential Award will be conferred on H. E. Mikhail Gorbachev.



**Mr. Ehud Barak, former  
Prime Minister of Israel**

I wish everyone a fruitful conference. May its discussion be heard in the world and influence the peace processes; may it bring about the words of the Prophet Isaiah: "Nation shall not lift up sword against nation neither shall they learn war any more". God bless you all.

I am proud to stand beside former President Mikhail Gorbachev and Prince Hassan of Jordan as Chairmen of the Board of Governors of the Strategic Dialogue Center at the Netanya College. I believe that this conference expresses one of the unique aspects of this center: It involves not only those who have researched, written about and interpreted the historic events – but also those who play a direct and active role in shaping our reality. There can be no better example than the leaders who are with us this morning.

Seated among us is President Mikhail Gorbachev. Few men in the 20th century brought about such a profound upheaval in the history of mankind as did Mikhail Gorbachev. For a period of 72 years, since Lenin, and even more sharply emphasized after World War II, the reality of mankind and, in a certain sense, the dangers to human existence, were overshadowed by the struggle between the Soviet Union and the free world; and then, a man stands up, to all intents and purposes, alone against all odds, with very little room to maneuver, and he takes steps to change the prevailing reality and to open up the Soviet Union. A man who realized that individuals do not

serve society, but society serves the individual, and the essence, the meaning of leadership is to create a better reality.

During my first visit to South Africa 20 years ago, I was troubled by the feeling that the country was facing tragedy which could deteriorate into disaster. The writing was on the wall. And one day a man stood up – Frederick De Klerk -- bravely, resolutely, not deterred by the possible results or by the personal and overall conclusions. He stood up and set out to resolve the problem and change the reality there and he succeeded against all odds.

During my first visit to Indonesia 15 years ago, I was impressed with this fascinating, incredibly complex human mosaic comprising many tens of thousands of people in an area far larger than Europe; similar in size, perhaps, to Australia or the United States, with heritage and birthrights from all corners of the world, beset by troubling historic experience and enormous domestic tensions which made it extremely difficult to advance towards an open society and democracy. And once again, a man stood up – H. E. President Abdurrahman Wahid - and in the face of the difficulties



and the limitations which it seemed his Creator had laid upon him, he stood erect in spirit and courage, never stumbling, and guided his torn and split people on their first steps to democratization and openness. I feel that this combination of leaders, whom are present here at this Center, is very special indeed.

We live in an extremely complex world, which reminds me of the ancient Chinese saying: "May you have an interesting life". We live in a very complex environment, a global village. The result of globalization is a world that is profoundly dependent on its parts; such a dependence has numerous assets, ranging from combined capital markets and international trade to the development of telecommunication, transportation and technology. But there is also a very troubling paradox: the difficulties, the power possessed by a few, the ability of defiant groups and regimes to exploit the rules and the reality created by globalization for their own ends and damage the fundamental actions of everyone else. What we saw in the 1990's as the blessed fruits of globalization, have now, at the beginning of the 21st century, become grapes that have rotted on the vine: terror, proliferation of unconventional

weapons, and the problem of creating a stable world order in the face of despotic regimes.

The paradox of this world is far from simple. President Gorbachev mentioned yesterday that one half of the world's population subsists on less than three dollars a day. At the previous conference in New York, the former Prime Minister of Sweden reminded us that those three dollars a day is the annual subsidy allotted by the European Union to every cow. One half of the world inhabitants live on fewer resources per day than the EU allots to every single cow in its herds. We live in a paradox: a world with such a reality, a world where a stained mass of hundreds of thousands of square kilometers of polluted air hovers over India and China, caused by the excess burning of palm trees and other volatile materials -- and in Antarctica, icebergs pull loose that are often the size of one quarter of the State of Israel. A paradox which, in the short term, could be seen as altruism, as a groundless contribution founded only on the free world's desire to nurture and advance the poor sector, but which in the long term is in fact purely one of self-interest. None of us stand a chance of living in a stable world order in 50 years' time, unless

we open our eyes to the reality of those parts of the world where no one lifts a finger to create a genuine community of nations who truly have each other's interest at heart.

The US victory in Iraq was a sad occasion. On the one hand, it was a brilliant military victory, albeit an expected victory, technically speaking. The only question is: how long before the body bags of more American soldiers are shipped home. There was never any doubt, given this balance of power, as to who would win, but the brilliant military victory led to mighty expectations, and these expectations create a considerable challenge as to who should now rebuild and rehabilitate the new Iraq. The challenges of building a new Iraq are enormous: restoring the public order, restoring the basic services, providing the renewed flow of oil that is in the process as we speak, and establishing a government of Iraqis, but also a temporary government that will represent not only the US occupying rule but the wishes of the Iraqi people too.

These challenges are extremely difficult. There is no certainty whatsoever that even the most gifted and able people, with the best will in the world, will succeed in putting Iraq

back on its feet. Still, the challenge is immensely important, because a great deal of what happens in the world as a whole and in our particular corner depends on the success of Iraq's rehabilitation. In my opinion, the US needs to bring in everyone who is capable of helping; not just the Iraqis themselves, but people from the international organizations, from the UN agencies, from Europe and Russia, from all corners of the earth. Everyone prepared to assist this effort in Iraq deserves our blessing.

On the agenda now are the following: if a positive spiral develops in Iraq, a spiral of development and growth, it will reflect positively on the Arab rulers, resulting in a readiness to move towards democratization, albeit extremely graduated and phased, similar to the kind of openness now displayed by Jordan and by some of the emirates. We will see this in other parts of the Arab world. A window of opportunity will open up for renewal of Israeli-Palestinian negotiations, but it will also influence the acceleration of the internal processes in Iran, slowing down or helping to shape a coalition to slow down Iran's nuclear race; chances of diplomatically curbing North Korea's Kim Jong-Il; even

exerting a stabilizing influence on the situation in Afghanistan and on the conflict over Kashmir waged by Pakistan and India.

But if the reverse is true, and we will not succeed, or rather the free world, led by the US, will not succeed, in rehabilitating Iraq, a negative spiral will develop; we will see chaos in Iraq, as well as in the Middle East and in the world as a whole – the kind of chaos that will be very difficult to control. Within Iraq itself, we will witness political murders, and far greater and more massive terror attacks against the Americans. We will see Iranian agents entering Iraq to incite the Shiite public. We will see Turkey active in Iraq's northern Kurdish sector. We will witness Arab rulers waver and hesitate whether to follow in American's footsteps or to call on the people at every street corner to remove the American occupation. The U.S. occupation will be perceived as a paper tiger and this will have impact on the whole world, from the ayatollahs in Iran to North Korea and the stability of Pakistan.

How is that linked to us? Our Road Map contains a tow-away link to the situation in Iraq. At the present stage, President Bush needs the Road

Map, or its successful launching, to advance the creation of a positive spiral in Iraq. A few months later, however, Iraq's success will become a precondition for the ability to advance or affect a breakthrough in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

Basically, the Road Map is an attempt to translate Bush's vision as reflected in his speech last June into a practical plan, centering on three reforms to be made by the Palestinians: Moving Arafat to a symbolic post lacking any executive authority; concentrating all security services under one umbrella and breaking down HAMAS, the Islamic Jihad and the terror organizations, including those of Fatah itself; building transparent and accountable institutions appropriate for use by the taxpayers of the free world. In return for carrying out these three reforms, the Palestinians, according to Bush's vision, will be accorded a temporary Palestinian State along with discussions on the permanent arrangement within three years.

What has happened here is that this program of the Road Map which is extremely important has its own interpretation of the practical measures. It is vital that the whole world supports it and that Israel

does its utmost to help launch this part of the Road Map. The demands required from us focus on the following: Firstly to dismantle illegal outposts which we owe not only to the Palestinians but to ourselves. When I was Prime Minister the Army had a standing order: As soon as an illegal outpost goes up, it must quite simply be dismantled by morning without the need for prior reporting. Should it happen on the Sabbath, wait until the Sabbath is over, and dismantle it that same evening. We, as a law-abiding country, owe this to ourselves. Secondly, the need to ease the pressures of the daily lives of the Palestinians as far as possible.

However, important as it is to launch this program, we may see another stage raised after Aqaba, perhaps at a Madrid-2 meeting with the Russians, the Quartet or the UN. Moreover, the sooner the program is launched and we can speak of meaning and significance, the reality becomes more complex and we would be wise to look at it with our eyes wide open. The meaning, the significance, begins with the dismantling of the terror organizations by the PA. After all we have gone through, from Oslo through Camp David and after September 11, if the Palestinian leadership is not capable of dismantling HAMAS, the Islamic Jihad, the Tanzim and the Al-Aqsa Brigades – then it has no historic value. I do not envy the present Palestinian leadership under Abu-Mazen. Not everyone supports it. Arafat heads those who withhold their help. It is in Arafat's supreme interest to see the arrangement end in failure. Should Abu-Mazen, Fa'iad and Dahlan manage to end the terror and reach a settlement with Israel, some very difficult questions will

be raised regarding Arafat: Why is it that Arafat failed to achieve that very same settlement? Why did thousands of Palestinians have to die, and why was Arafat unable to achieve this three years or eight years earlier?

Nor should the Europeans totally be spared. So long as Arafat notices even the tiniest of cracks between the US and the EU he will entrench himself in it and torpedo the agreement. The Europeans, unintentionally and quite unaware, find themselves in the situation of attempting to rescue Arafat and I must say this again: If Arafat is in power and has the practical clout to determine its meaning and direction, then – to the best of my knowledge and understanding – there will be no agreement.

At the same time, we must understand that this Road Map program contains a certain irony. Unless the Palestinians carry out the reforms and crush terror, I feel that Israel will have no choice but to stand firm and not move by so much as an inch. On the other hand, should they crush the terror activities and execute the reforms inherent in Bush's vision, there is no reason for Israel to wait a few more years. There is no reason to provide the extremists on either side with the opportunity to blow the entire agreement sky-high; there is no reason not to hold an immediate and meaningful discussion on the issues that were on the agenda three year ago. In a certain sense, all three sides are ripe for that. The Palestinians realize that Israel cannot be defeated by the suicide terror. Israel now sees the limitations of force more clearly. The Americans have discovered that this problem cannot be dealt with by

remote control, and that the issue needs a hand-on treatment.

Israel is now paying a heavy price for not having built the unilateral separation fence as an almost-emergency measure as soon as the Intifada broke out. Today we are paying the price for not having worked out a policy plan of our own in the last two and a half years, for not having a plan, accepted by the world, on the table, and the fact that, as a result, worse plans – the Saudi proposal and even the inherent elements of the Road Map – have been sucked into this vacuum. The problem of this element of the Road Map is the fact that a temporary Palestinian State is still a state. The term "Temporary State" does not exist in international law. A state is a state; it has rights, claims, it does not ask – it takes. You cannot move into the principal towns of a neighboring state in the wake of some terror attack.

Therefore, where Israel is concerned, if the reforms are indeed carried out, the time is right to set about reaching a settlement, based on those same principles that were ultimately on the table at Camp David. If there is no partner and as long as no partner exists, even if the whole world objects, we need to effect the separation as well as the security border and make a start on a practical border that will enclose a solid Jewish majority for generations, to defend our identity and future. This cannot be done unless we uphold the third factor, namely: at all times to keep the door open to resumption of the negotiations, without any prior conditions other than the total absence of violence, and to maintain the reforms envisioned by President Bush. Today, a window



**Mr. Mikhail Gorbachev, former  
President of the Soviet Union**

of opportunity exists, entailing very sizeable opportunities as well as quite a few risks, accompanied by the heavy burden of what both sides experienced until reaching these decisions.

As the head of the Board of Governors, I would like to say a few words regarding the establishment of our forum – “Strategic Dialogue Center”. I agreed to be a part of the Board of Governors and took upon myself certain obligations, since I believe that this is part of a step in the right direction. This Strategic Dialogue Center has been established in this region, where not only the fate of Middle Eastern countries is being played out, but also the fate of global politics. The future character of global politics is now at stake. Another issue is how the relationships between countries and peoples should be built in the global age, a world in which we already live, but in which we find ourselves unprepared to act upon the challenges that it presents. After leaving my position as president, my interest in politics did not stop and I now participate in the discussion of these problems in a new way, through civil and global society institutions.

The world now is in a state of enormous unrest. No one has answered that question and I think that this is precisely the problem of global politics. It slides along with momentary needs and is not adequate to the rapid changes

of the world. In short, it needs an intellectual rigging. This political ‘lag’ could eventually lead to very grave consequences, some of which have already been seen, and that will for a long time affect the state of the world. We can no longer avoid uniting the efforts of nations and peoples within the framework of existing international structures, by which I mean primarily the UN as well as other international organizations, in order to create a flexible and complex, but at the same time effective and adequate system for maintaining world stability.

We hear of chaos in the world today, and instead of a new world order we have instead a new world ‘disorder’. One prominent person said that politics is such a serious matter that it cannot be entrusted merely to politicians. Today its truth rings loud. The world is going through a formative phase; we are seeking orientation, ways of cooperation, modes of government, ways of maintaining security. It is vital that a dialogue goes on inside political echelons, and more importantly between political and civil societies. This is important in regards to national frameworks, regional matters and, of course, most importantly, in global matters. We must join efforts in



order to answer the question “what is the character of security in the global age, whereby we are all interdependent and concerned with what goes on all around the world?”

Sometimes the fate of a nation is decided in the course of a few days. We remember the story when Indonesia, which was developing successfully and was an example to other countries still in a transitional phase, fell to its knees in the space of three days. The national currency had depreciated threefold, when all that one earned a day earlier lost three times its value. It was a shock to a big nation that felt secure and was moving forward. Therefore, in the global world we cannot dispense with governments and with taking into consideration all interests, primarily the interests of small and middle-sized countries.

Today we are dealing with international terrorism, and this is a sign that has made us all consider what kind of a world we live in, and how we should act. Until now we had prepared ourselves for missile wars, but we found ourselves completely unprepared to cope with terrorism, which can now attack any country or region. We must also think how to maintain ecological security,

considering that we are now facing a global ecological threat. We, those that aspire to leadership, in all the major world powers, are unable even to agree on how to treat the framework of the Kyoto Protocol, or how to deal with the problem of sweet water. Ten years ago in Rio de Janeiro, the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development took place, but when we began to draw conclusions in Johannesburg it turned out that almost nothing could be placed on the positive side of the scales. No political will existed, nothing went any further than talk, and there were no mechanisms approached to solve these problems. This challenge still exists.

Finally the most important matter: the threat of migration. One can say that in many countries there is a nourishing environment for terrorism, and that from there it draws its powers. All this is true, but tell me, if half of the world's population lives in poverty, and if billions of people do not have access to education, can our world be peaceful? Do you think that we can shield ourselves from this with missiles and super-weapons? I am convinced, and persist in my opinion that this is a naïve point of view. To put stakes in weapons and

violence will not solve problems. I believe that we must take all of this into consideration, when we begin the dialogue within the framework of the established center.

The President of the College said that we provide a neutral ground for the participants. We welcome cooperation. I said: “It is good that you have reached this conclusion yourselves. We accept this invitation and are ready to cooperate, and you can expect that it is going to be a serious cooperation”. This was also a hard process, but we came to Madrid and initiated the International Conference on the Middle East Settlement. All that came after everything had developed, for the most part, positively, but at a certain moment we witnessed again how the hands of partners from Israel and Palestine are lying firmly on the shoulders of the President of the United States. All others were again left aside. There is an obsession to be in control of everything, to have everything connected only with the United States, so that everyone will comply with its needs. We must rid ourselves of this obsession. It does not concern only the United States, but today it is important to inform them of this, because if we take this approach and a country monopolizes

any particular problem, we will not have any negotiation process, nor any reliability on the decisions made, and we will not have those guarantees that Israel and Palestine are looking for.

I believe that now we are witness to something that I wholeheartedly welcome – the Road Map. Representatives from Israel and Palestine strive to achieve the renewal of the process and move towards a positive solution. Moreover, the Road Map is realistic in the sense that it suggests stages of this process and if we read them closely, we can see that they contain many suggestions to advance this process with confidence. Both in Israel and Palestine we can hear people saying that this project is not reliable, that it is doomed to failure and cannot lead anywhere. I believe that these are signs of panic and political impotence. People must understand that if we take this standpoint nothing will ever happen and that events will overwhelm us and produce an even more dangerous situation.

I must express my point of view that in this conflict, there can be no winners. If someone expects to crown himself with laurels or to make a fortune at the detriment of his partner, nothing will come from it. What is needed is a consensus, a dialogue that we can start here and that will continue in other places, in order to progress along this Road Map and to reach the ends that we hope for. The fact that today we have such a strong coalition supporting this project is, I believe, a guarantee of success.

However, both Israel and Palestine, and especially those who aim to destroy this process by means of terrorist acts, must understand that the alternative brings with it blood, disorder, ruin and self-destruction.

There is no alternative. Ultimately, all those who made efforts to develop and employ their authority and powers to aid the process of the Road Map can say: “If this is not to your liking, if you think yourselves smarter than the world community, if the National Security Council, who approved this Road Map, means nothing to you, then you can solve it for yourselves”, and what may come of that if someone takes this path? If someone believes that Palestine can be militarily defeated by Israel, and there is no doubt in that, but this is not the end, it is only the beginning of a completely new stage.

Therefore, I invite everybody to consider what we have to achieve from within the framework of this dialogue, in order to take this process forward. Prime Minister Ehud Barak raised some practical questions that have to be discussed in the framework of the Road Map, but this is what the negotiation process is for. However, I believe that if we take the standpoint of revision, we may make everything vapid again, and nothing will come from it. I am sure that the Arab world understands that there is a need to stop those who wish to spoil this process by means of terrorism. Some say that we should follow the laws of Hammurabi “tooth for tooth”, or the Chinese rule “edge on edge”. I must say that it has never justified itself, but today it may lead to the destruction of the work that

has already been done by major states and the Security Council in order to give a chance for the Middle East to face up to the challenge that we all face.

I believe that the people of Israel have shown their capacity, established a State, built the infrastructure of a country, and will have enough wisdom, patience and endurance to act responsibly, in spite of the fact that they have lived in a state of instability and tension for the last 50 years. The Palestinian government will surely have plenty to discuss in order to reach a unified standpoint, because the alternative seems to be suicide. It can no longer be tolerated. It would certainly be a shock for global politics, if we have reached a situation in which we find ourselves incapable of dealing with conflicts. If we are unable to solve this problem, we will not be able to deal with the later challenges of 21st century.

I welcome this dialogue, and I welcome the opinions that are going to be voiced here. All these opinions should be treated with respect, but I believe in one thing in particular – that in the framework of the Road Map lie consensus and compromise. If some politicians have not yet understood this, they must understand that without compromise, without making concessions and without reaching out, peace will not come to this region. The stakes are high, and it is in a matter of weeks or months that we should make the most of this opportunity. I wish you all the best.



**H. E. Mr. Abdurrahman Wahid,  
former President of Indonesia**

I do not want to talk about Iraq for two reasons: the first is that the issue of Iraq it is not yet finished. They have not yet captured Saddam Hussein. The second reason is that I studied in Iraq and so it is painful for me to talk about Iraq. One thing is clear, that eventually, as said by Prime Minister Barak and President Gorbachev, the U.S. has to negotiate for the election of new leaders in Iraq, for ways of developing Iraq and so forth. In this sense, negotiations will be the way that may resolve the situation.

In my view then, peaceful negotiations concerning Iraq should be related directly with a solution to the Israeli-Palestinian case, because in my view, as said by President Gorbachev, the situation between the two nations can only be solved by "an international conference", a consensus, otherwise everything will depend on not only two nations, but only on one nation and several Palestinians as they have no democracy per say. The decision of Arafat will bind all of us. The situation is complicated by the emergence of Abu-Mazzen as the Prime Minister of Palestine. Therefore, in this respect, there is a need for an international dialogue with the participation of both Yasser Arafat and Abu Mazzen.

It is not enough to talk to only one person there and because of this, I agree with President Gorbachev, only an international conference can settle the matter permanently.

One of the most important things about this is that we have to have the moral courage to identify reasons for the situation existing now. Many are of the view that the war against terrorism should be continued, that we have to stamp out terrorism if we want to have permanent peace worldwide; and so, in this respect, we have to develop moral courage in order to deal with terrorism. It is not easy. Islam has been misunderstood by many young people who lost the Islamic heritage and who do not understand the Islamic history, because they thought that Islam is threatened by developments everywhere. Samuel Huntington's view is that the clash of civilizations takes place between the Islam and the West. I think it is important to educate Muslim youth to understand that Islam loathes nothing.

Therefore, having an international settlement, Islamic culture shall be given priority more than Islamic institutions because we cannot use violence against anybody, yet if we talk about culture, Islamic culture is always

there. I was educated in an Islamic boarding school. When I was six years old, I learned Arabic, learned the Islamic Arabic books. Therefore my culture is Islam, although I wear a tie, I wear a jacket and so forth. Outwardly I am a Westerner, but internally, I am a Muslim. It is wishful thinking to hope that a Muslim can be westernized totally, as what was said by President Gorbachev. It is impossible to expect Mr. Gorbachev to think not in terms of the Russians because he has his own heritage, his own culture, and so forth. This is why it is important then, to have the moral courage to develop our identity by stressing our culture. This is an important point to be remembered always.

Besides this we have to stress our priority on the unilateral axis by the superpowers to combat poverty because we are faced with a problem of the world as a whole. Nowadays, we see hundreds of millions of people live in what we call poverty, which in my country is about a fourth of a nation of 204 million. This means more than fifty million people live under the poverty line. Yet all the other inhabitants are not too far up above the poverty line; a line that has been drawn by such delicate yardsticks that actually people who work less than half of

what he or she could work per week, are considered poor. Yet there are people who work full time and still live in poverty because they do not have enough income, and they are not considered poor. So we should develop the ability to use the right yardsticks for poverty lines.

We should also think about the relationships between developing countries. Prime Minister Thaksin Shinawatra of Thailand told me once that he opted for counter trade between developing countries. I mean we should exchange goods among the “developing countries” and settle the matter early on by paying with, what we call, hard currency. This is in order to save me, to save us, to save all the developing countries. We should do that in accordance with what the Europeans did after WWII. They traded between themselves and settled the matter of accounts by hard currency. So we should now

buy those goods from developing countries, which is very expensive but then we have no way of using our own yardsticks. Moral courage is needed to readdress this kind of imbalance in international trade relationships between countries.

In this respect, we should talk about globalization in the right manner, because with the lack of the right interpretation of globalization, we will have no peace in the world. Now, globalization means domination by big companies: Japanese, Western-Europeans, and American ones with other companies not participating in it, so we have to change the meaning of globalization, because originally globalization means making things global, owned by everybody, not only by certain countries or certain societies. Much has to be done about this. We have to develop moral courage to fight terrorism against the super-powers, among the developing nations.

Well, there is so much to be done and I think following President Gorbachev, that we should have more and more dialogues, not only between the people in the Middle East but everywhere in the world as events that happen in other corners of the world, influence the development of events in the Middle East. I think in this respect there is one thing to always remember; we have to reeducate ourselves. This is what I said in New York and I will say it again here. Education is the key word for our development, as now the meaning of development is already dictated by somebody else and not by all countries in the international arena. As a result of this I support what was said by President Gorbachev, that we should develop more dialogue among us and this is why I welcome the establishment of the Strategic Dialogue Center here in Netanya. Thank you very much.



**Mr. Fredrick de Klerk, former  
President of South Africa**

It is good to be back in Israel after a long period during which I did not have the privilege to visit here. I came here this time with a great sense of urgency. After the Berlin Wall came down and at the end of the cold war for which we have to such a great extent to thank President Gorbachev, there was a sense of euphoria in the world as if now through globalization we can move ahead and peace for the whole world is within reach. That has changed dramatically in the later part of the '90s and specifically, the 11th of September has shocked us all to a standstill. What has happened afterwards, the war on terrorism, which is so necessary, the escalation of terrorism, the dramatic events in Iraq, has brought us to a crossroad.

Maybe, most importantly for all of us here today, is the situation in the Middle East as focused here in Israel with regard to the Israeli-Palestinian crisis and situation. We, who have to rely on the newspapers see the daily deaths, the tragic events unfolding and we hold our hearts and we are concerned about what is happening here, not only because we reach out to the people of Israel and to the people of Palestine but because we have a direct interest in what happens here. This, more than

other of the present conflicts across the world, will decide whether at the crossroads where the world finds itself, we will move towards a greater peace, towards development, towards elevating the problems of the underdeveloped part of the world or whether we will fall back in escalating violence and tension and therefore conferences like these are timely, because time is of the essence in resolving the problem here in Israel and Palestine. As Mr. Barak has said, as has happened in Russia, as has happened in South Africa, we need to see a situation where the reality in the Middle East is changed.

I think it would be best to use the few minutes which I have to speak to you to just lift out some of our experiences in South Africa and the lessons which we have learned which might be of universal application. I will leave it to you to decide whether they are applicable. Obviously no two situations are the same. But I will try to limit myself to those which I firmly believe are of universal application.

We would not have succeeded in South Africa, if we did not reach a moment where we said to ourselves after taking a long hard look at ourselves that the time for

fundamental change has arrived. We would not have succeeded unless we recognized that we ourselves and history have painted us into certain corners and that to get out of those corners we had to think anew, we had to revise things which we had accepted as axioms in the past and say: if you want to change fundamentally, you must be prepared to look at the fundamentals and not just at the outside and at certain aspects of the situation. You must go to the roots of the situation. Because ladies and gentlemen, you cannot have fundamental change if those who embark on negotiations to achieve that change are not convinced that they will have to make sacrifices, that they will have to relinquish certain, long-held viewpoints, that they will have to really adapt, that they will have to create win-win situations.

President Gorbachev said, and it is so true, "if you negotiate, and from those negotiations, the one party on the one side of the table walks away and says 'I have a victory', and the other party has to go back and say 'I had to capitulate', you do not have an agreement which will withstand the test of time." Immediately the seeds for new violence, for new conflicts,

are sown there at the negotiation table. And it was only when we reached that stage and when the ANC representing the majority of black South Africans reached the stage of saying: we cannot resolve this conflict through the barrel of a gun, through the barrel of an AK-47, through the planting of bombs, through the use of terrorist methods, and the government of South Africa said: that we cannot resolve the conflict through the use of the might of the state to suppress. We can only resolve this problem if we go and sit and talk to each other with a commitment to achieve results.

The second lesson, which we have learnt, is that you cannot succeed in negotiations if you enter into these negotiations without knowing that your constituency is firmly behind you. If you have to constantly look over your shoulder and say, "Will I not be stabbed in the back by my own people?" then you are weak when you sit there and you negotiate. And therefore we spent as much time in consolidating our own power base, in ensuring that when we sit at that table, nobody can question that we have a mandate for what we are putting on the table and for what we are negotiating.

It is so important, therefore, I believe here in this situation, where you have accepted a framework, where you have accepted a basic vision within the framework of the Road Map that with the Israeli side and with the Palestinian side, there should be an inner consensus about the necessity for negotiations and about the sacrifices which have to be made and about the credibility of the negotiations. We in South Africa were highly irritated often by people coming from outside, telling us what to do. I do not want to make myself guilty of that but I do believe that the present negotiations by the Prime Minister of the Palestinian State with people in the resistance movements there is of fundamental importance. And I ask a question whether on the Israeli side too the position of those who will negotiate on behalf of Israel should not be strengthened by building a stronger consensus, by lifting this out of the typical party political arena within Israel and building a consensus which goes beyond the borders and the internal strife and fights between political parties.

We learned that it was important in our case for the government which had the power and the capacity to take initiatives which would create

a new platform, which would break down the old stereotypes which we had of each other, such an initiative as my announcements on February 2nd 1990. Everybody expected something about the release of President Mandela but nobody expected that we would un-ban all the organizations, which had been banned, accepting with that a tremendous risk but establishing through that, that we mean business. That we do not see negotiations just as a game, that we are committed to a negotiated settlement and that we are prepared to take risks in that regard. One sometimes has to make quantum leaps in order to get out of the corners in which you yourself and history have painted you. We learned in the process of negotiations how important inclusivity is.

Ladies and Gentlemen, in bringing an end to violent conflicts, one cannot choose your interlocutors. For a long time in South Africa my predecessors and my party tried to pick those amongst the black leaders with whom we would negotiate. We made the mistake of negotiating with very good people but who could not bring a majority of the blacks in South Africa into a negotiated agreement. And in the end, negotiations only succeeded because we negotiated



with those who had the capacity to mobilize the majority of black South Africans to accept the agreements which we reached. It is painful to have to sit and negotiate with people whom you know had maybe yesterday or the year before still acted in a way which was totally unacceptable, but somehow or another, an agreement which successfully ends a violent conflict must be between those who can deliver their constituency and bind them in to such peaceful agreements.

One of the biggest problems in our negotiations period was the problem of continued violence. It has been here in previous negotiations too. It is one of the biggest problems and it will be in your pursuance of the Road Map, one of your biggest problems. As the leaders in South Africa, we came together, President Mandela announced that the ANC would suspend the armed struggle and we reached agreements that illegal arms would be put into jointly controlled caches. We agreed that the violence will end. And as we walked out of the chamber, there came over the news, reports that somewhere political violence had nonetheless continued. As is happening here now, where even after tentative talks, suddenly there is a new bomb explosion, suddenly there is a new occurrence,

a happening, a dramatic event in which people are killed.

The challenge is not to allow those radicals who continue to do these things in contravention of interim agreements to upset the apple cart and to steer the negotiations process off its course. Twice in South Africa we had to deal with this in a very serious way and once the ANC deserted the negotiating table after an occasion in which a number of people were murdered in cold blood. The government was accused, a government agency was accused. In the end it came out that it was political opponents of the ANC, the IFP, who actually committed those atrocities. But they walked out of the negotiations and said "Now we will make South Africa ungovernable". We lost valuable time and for four months real negotiations came to a standstill. But it took another violent situation where in that process there were black-on-black killings, which resulted in a very big number of deaths to bring us back officially to the negotiations table.

But the lesson, if I now look back, that we have learned is that even though the ANC walked out, even though they said, "We will now make the country ungovernable", the

next day after they walked out we immediately established a channel of communications and continued talking between the main negotiators and there was continued interaction through representatives between me and President Mandela. We never really stopped talking. And therefore my prayer is that the leadership on all sides will find the strength to handle these things which will happen and not to allow radicals who are not really in favor of a negotiated settlement, who are undermining the efforts of the moderate leadership from all sides to end the conflict, not to allow them to prevent a negotiated settlement, not to play into their hands by suspending negotiations, by moving back to old positions, however difficult it might be. You will serve the best interests of the majority of all your people if you allow the moderate leadership, not withstanding such setbacks, to continue with their negotiations.

We learned, Ladies and Gentlemen, in conclusion, that in negotiating, there needs to be a sense of urgency. One can so easily negotiate in a way where really, you only win time and I think much of the negotiations in many conflict situations do not qualify as real negotiations because it is misused by the parties



to create time, to achieve other ulterior motives and agendas. It is therefore important to structure the negotiations and to have a structure which drives the negotiations and reports back regularly to the various power bases involved. To organize it, you need mechanisms, you need to give proper organizational structures in order to ensure that the negotiation

is undertaken with an energy and with a commitment and without the waste of time. Because once you allow things to just crawl along, once again you create opportunities for the activists and the radicals to find new ways to undermine.

The best way to deal with the radicals is to move so fast with

your negotiations that in the end you abort their initiative and that you withhold any opportunity for them to take their malicious bad initiatives, aimed at undermining a peace process. I wish both sides well in what I hope will be dynamic negotiations, which will start hopefully sooner rather than later. If tomorrow it can be the better.



**Mr. Toshimistu Motegi, Deputy  
Foreign Minister of Japan**

Japan and Israel have long nurtured close bilateral ties. Last year was the fifty year anniversary of the establishment of the formal relationship and we have since launched a new step for further development of the relationship. It is my pleasure to visit Israel for the first time at such an important timing. It is my greatest pleasure and honor to participate in this conference on the Road Map which is a guideline for peace and to listen to the opinions of the wisest and the most experienced world leaders on this vital issue.

The June summit at Aqaba was an important step towards resuming peace negotiations and promoting peace through commitment on implementing the Road Map. Furthermore, the moderate Arab countries, Egypt, Jordan and others, expressed their commitment in unison at the US-Arab Summit at Sharm Al Sheikh, which was also a significant event in mobilizing the region. The road toward peace, however, does not seem so smooth and I am deeply concerned that the continuation of terrorist attacks by the Palestinian extremists and counter-actions by the Israeli forces has darkened the prospect for peace. Japan welcomes and supports active effort led by the United States and

thinks that the momentum for peace created by the Road Map needs to be maintained. The basic position of Japan is to regard the issue of Middle East peace and tackle it on fair and unbiased grounds in terms of the region and past history. Therefore, Japan has tried to convey what it believes is good both to the Israeli and Palestinian sides in a candid manner, as a friend of both Israel and Palestine.

I would like to speak on Japan's basic policy and stands and what Japan would expect especially from our Israeli friends. First of all, let me convey my condolences to those who were killed in the recent suicide bombing and their bereaved family. Terrorism which claims many innocent lives can never be forgiven. Japan is determined to denounce it with the strongest possible voice. Japan has provided a large amount of humanitarian assistance to the Palestinian people and the effort for state building. Japan has persistently, and at every level, called upon the Palestinian leadership to exercise maximum effort in cracking down on the extremists. The Palestinian Authority must do their utmost to end violence. They are sparring for an independent Palestinian state. It is their responsibility to be able to

maintain security in their territories by their own hand.

At the same time, Israeli cooperation is indispensable in ending the cycle of violence. Acts of obliteration by the IDF, even if meant for counter-terrorism, victimizes ordinary citizens too, aggravates hotheads among the Palestinians and as a result, weakens the position of Prime Minister Abbas. Japan is truly aware that the Israeli people's security needs to be addressed as a priority. It could not be gained however without winning the Palestinians' support and cooperation of it. And in this sense, Japan believes that the security could be guaranteed only through peace.

Firstly, I encourage Israel to implement the items dictated in Phase-I of the Road Map. It would give the Road Map credibility. It would help Prime Minister Abbas's effort in carrying out the reform. It will render him the credibility necessary to do more among his own people and it would serve in neutralizing the terrorists and in marginalizing the opposition. From this viewpoint Japan praises the measures the Israeli government has recently taken, such measures as easing the restriction on movement of people,

releasing prisoners, accepting Palestinian labors and dismantling unauthorized posts.

Secondly, along with these immediate measures, various efforts are needed from a long-term viewpoint aiming at the coexistence of two states: Israel and Palestine. I want the Israeli people to remember the commitment made for peace at Aqaba Summit. Unless the Palestinians keep giving their support to reform, security capability of the Palestinian Authority will not improve and, as a result, will continue to threaten the security of Israelis. Unless the Palestinians fully appreciate the benefits of peace and believe in a brighter future, their trust in the path of the Road Map would be lost. It is time for Prime Minister Abbas, and I strongly hope that he will, to exercise strong leadership and overcome opposition from the extremists and from within. Japan sincerely hopes that Israeli people will support Prime Minister Abbas's reform efforts with patience and give him enough time to fully develop and exercise his ability.

Since 1993, Japan has provided more than 640 million dollars of assistance to the Palestinians. Based on the assistance, Japan has consistently called upon the

Palestinian Authority to make efforts for cracking down the terrorists. Since the break out of the Intifadah in September 2000, Japan has continued to provide the people with humanitarian assistance. And now that the Palestinians have started the effort to reform, we shall steadily implement the assistance package amounting to 22.5 million dollars announced by Foreign Minister Kawaguchi in April. Our assistance will be in three domains: confidence building, assistance for reforms and humanitarian aid.

Firstly, there should be a confidence-building attempt between the Israelis and the Palestinians. Japan can provide its help so they can talk to each other. Japan hosted a confidence building conference in Tokyo in May for promoting dialogue, inviting people of various social backgrounds. This conference revealed that the biggest obstacle in promoting peace was fear of the people and what was needed to eradicate this fear was to increase the number of people who share the same understanding on how two states; Israel and Palestine would co-exist. This event was only the first step and we shall continue these conferences and other such attempts.

In addition to such a conference,

confidence building could be gained through joint projects, by creating contact between both people in actual projects. Japan is assisting such an attempt with cooperation from the Israeli foreign Ministry and the IDF. Japan is assisting with a disposal project in Gaza and a medical waste disposal plant in Gaza and the West Bank. I am confident that though these projects may not be prominent in scale so far, they will significantly serve in promoting peace, and the benefit of cooperation between each other would be tangible.

Secondly, reform assistance: Japan will provide assistance to various projects, offering trading programs as a way to enhance administrative capabilities of the Palestinian Authority. Building the new Prime Minister's office is just an example. Japan will also assist what would best serve the sides for improving security capacity, which is an utmost urgent task to tackle and deliver. Japan will provide communications equipment for the security program is another example.

Thirdly, humanitarian assistance aid, especially since the violence began. Japan has provided more than 50 million dollars worth of emergency

aid to the Palestinian people in the shape of medicines, food and job-creation. We believe this helped ease the economic situation of the people, which could otherwise be a breeding ground for terrorism.

I would also like to mention our effort to mobilize the countries in the region towards peace and stability. Japan has talked with such countries as Iran and Syria through our channels of dialogue, requesting of them to play a constructive role for peace and stability in the region, including on the Palestinian issues. Japan has maintained close communications not only with Israel and the P. A., and with key-players in the international arena on the issue, but also with such regional players as Egypt and Jordan. Our latest enterprise is “Japan-Arab dialogue” which

was envisioned in Prime Minister Koizumi’s recent visit to Egypt and Saudi Arabia. In this forum regional issues and how to address them better would be discussed towards peace, stability and prosperity of the region. The Japanese side will be headed by ex- Prime Minister Hashimoto who regrets not being able to present himself here.

Now, the Middle-East peace process is at a turning point. The late Prime Minister Rabin said “There are enemies of peace who are trying to hurt us in order to torpedo the peace process. We should not render victory to the terrorist who aims at hindering the way and closing the door to peace.” As a friend of Israel, I can imagine the nightmare, daily situations in which Israeli citizens live. I can also imagine how difficult it

is to continue negotiations for peace amidst violence, as if it were never there. And yet, denying negotiations equals to rendering victory to the enemies of peace. The way to peace and security would be paved only with a strong will. While we overthrow terrorism we should not give them the upper hand. I firmly believe that in the long run, the only way for Israel to finally achieve peace and security and freedom from terrorism is to increase the number of believers in peace in and out of Israel and among the Palestinians. This confidence is a timely and invaluable opportunity in this context. I wish that the discussion today will continue to bring peace and security to the people who live in the region and have had too much violence and terrorism.

# Questions and Answers

## **Prof. Segal:**

This is directed to the former President of Indonesia. How do you explain, talking about the culture of Islam, Arab Islam, that there is an attitude of wanting to live together in equality of culture and religious peace?

If this is not a war between the Islam and the West, how do you account for the lack of cultural and religious interchange in the sense of “live and let live” between the two religious traditions? It took Christianity two thousand years to open up. Isn't there something between Islam and Judaism that is a major problem?

## **Mr. Wahid:**

I would like to tell a story. One day I was in front of five thousand people where the current Minister of Justice said that he was disappointed with me, because I am too close to the Jews and to the Christians, as the Koran says that a sign of a good Muslim is that he or she hates or has negative treatment of the infidels. So I said to him that when the Koran talks about infidels, that does not mean the Christians and the Jews. The Koran has an important title for them, which is the “people of the book”, of the holy books. If you are

not aware of these facts please do not give a speech. Islam, Judaism and Christianity came from the same stock. I also believe that according to other religions as well, the concept of god is that God is only one, but the conceptions of God are different from people to people. It is respect, we have to respect religions of other people. For a long time, the Jews, the Christians and the Muslims have lived in peace, have lived in understanding, they tried to understand each other. Maimonides was a hero of the Muslims as well. We learned from Judaic tradition. I believe that now, when everything is politicized we have to return back to the understanding of Islam, the right understanding of Islam, not the Islam that is in contrast to other religions. I think this is very important and that is the importance of reeducation, Thank you.

## **Mr. de Klerk:**

Firstly, those who say that they misunderstand the vision with which I led white South Africa into the negotiations. In 1986 we already did what I preached for you today. My party, which had a very clear majority of all South Africans defined a new vision and decided not to just change Apartheid and separate

development but to totally distance itself and to accept a new vision of one united south Africa, with one person, one vote. All forms of discrimination to be abolished but with effective protection of minorities, with effective checks and balances to prevent the misuse of power, with effective protection of basic cultural rights and the right of freedom of association, the right of various languages and education, etc. That we achieved in the negotiations. We did not enter the negotiations in an effort to continue white rule. Now in the case of Israel and Palestine, you are starting out with one big advantage and that is the whole world now supports the concept of partitioning, of the creation of two states or the acknowledgment of two states next to each other. So the world does not ask of you to do what circumstances required of us to do, to bring justice to all our people. The world is accepting that justice will be brought to you and the Palestinians if you follow the road of partitioning on a basis of ethnicity, which was the original, which apartheid had in mind, but in our case it could not work. In your case, if you negotiate it now it can work and I wish you all the best. Negotiating about securing the future of your own people in their own state is not capitulation in any

way whatsoever. But you cannot go and build the security of the Jewish people on the basis of injustice to the Palestinian people.

**Prof. Segal:**

They accuse lawyers of having a problem for every solution, so I would like to address questions to President de Klerk, President Gorbachev and the Prime Minister Ehud Barak who solved some problems. To what extent do you feel, maybe humbly enough, that things really depend on a certain personality, on a certain leader or are they more the outcome of a process? I mean to what extent is Arafat crucial now? To what extent were Mr. de Klerk and Mr. Mandela responsible, that otherwise the problem would not have been solved? Thank you.

**Mr. de Klerk:**

May I begin and then I would like to hand it over to Mr. Barak? Can I just say we learned that personalities are important, not just the personalities of the leaders in chief, if I can call it that way. The building of trust between me and Mandela was fundamentally important. Likewise were the personalities of the other people, who were heading some of the aspects of the negotiations. So that when a crisis came, you could pick up the telephone and say: "look, my people have caused the problem here," for instance. "I will look into it and I will try to rectify it, just give me time,"

That is the sort of relationship which is required. So, personal trust, you needn't like each other, you needn't be friends, you needn't kiss each other. But a basic trust and mutual respect in our case played a very important role. But that alone cannot bring the negotiations to a successful conclusion. You also need process, you also need structure, and you need a combination of the right personality in the right place within the framework of a well thought-through, well planned and well managed process. Do I sound like a typical lawyer?

**Mr. Barak**

There is nothing that can solve everything, neither in this sector nor in other sectors of life.

There is top priority for the inclusive circumstances, and even a readiness in regards to the existence of two peoples, but in the end the solutions to conflicts do not fall from grace by an angel. They are solved by people who make decisions and in this context there is a popular argument between historians whether it is reality that creates the leader or whether the leader creates reality. Probably both options are correct. A suitable reality creates or unfolds, or gives internal power or some internal enlightenment to people in regards to their roles and to the nonrecurring chance of the opportunity.

Yet, as we know, in life this does not always happen, and I do not want to go as far as South Africa

or to the former Soviet Union, or to Indonesia, but also in our case, when on the other side of the turf stands a man like Sadat or like King Hussein, (I mention them both as they were very bitter enemies on the battle field. In our graveyards thousands are buried, killed in wars against Sadat and against King Hussein); but when they decided that the time has come to reach a decision and to make peace, they made their move, they did not wait until all ends of their society agrees, they did not wait for the last of the extremists to come to terms with the decision. They led their people. At a time when such a leadership existed on their side, a man like Begin found strength; a man who his whole life did not really believe in returning lands captured by the IDF, even he, Begin, reached agreements with Sadat regarding not only the Egyptians but also regarding the Palestinians. And of course, Rabin found the strength to lead this same course with King Hussein.

I am convinced that a day will come, when a leader will step up on the other side, a leader with the same characteristics as Sadat and King Hussein, and we shall have peace with the Palestinians too. I am sad to say though, that the other side of the coin is applicable too; as long as there is no such leadership there will be no Peace.



**Maj General Amos Gilad:**

We are again engaged in serious contacts and efforts to move the wagon of peace further along its path. I will speak of what has changed and what has not. This will enable us to examine our future chances. So let us talk about change. A new Palestinian government has been formed, under the leadership of Abu-Mazen (Mahmud Abbas). Its members have been dealing with the peace process for many years. Now they have been appointed to govern, and they are convinced that the murderous terror waged against Israel has failed, and that a return to the negotiating table is preferable.

The rise to power of the body is a hopeful sign in itself, but we still need to say that two things have remained the same: Firstly, Arafat's huge shadow is still there, and, unfortunately, neither his doctrines nor his ways have changed. In my opinion, given the quarter century during which I have known him, so long as he holds a position of influence, any progress we make is bound to be difficult. Arafat's negative impact is driven from two inter-connected factors: his belief that any peace settlement must include the right of return. Combining that with the demographic trends, every peace process will, in a few

decades, inevitably lead to Israel's disappearance. This assessment was submitted to the government as an intelligence evaluation before the start of the Camp David summit. At such a sensitive time I still feel the need to note, with satisfaction, that the army accepted this. I am not sure whether the government or the Prime Minister did. What the then Prime Minister says today is what we had expected him to clearly and precisely state then. I apologize for speaking so frankly.

The other factor that has not changed is the burning, blind faith that Israel can be broken by the use of force. This was prompted by two elements: HAMAS and the Islamic Jihad. But nothing has changed. The P. A. released them from the Palestinian prisons. The prison gates were opened wide, perhaps for budgetary reasons, because there was no money to hold them in jail. The more likely assumption is that they wanted to use them in the streets in order to launch attacks aimed at murdering as many Israelis as possible, and there is the Tanzim too, the hard core of Al-Fatah.

I mention this because we are at present engaged in talks on security

issues, and I head the delegation of these talks. Do you think that my opposite numbers are important, skilled ministers? Important delegates? A government? No. They are merely a part of the Palestinian security system, because Arafat made sure in advance (and perhaps we were not as watchful as we should have been) that the Palestinian security system was divided into two bodies: the Palestinian army, known as their national security force which is commanded by Arafat, and the security service which is partially commanded by Dahlan. No matter what arrangement we reach, Arafat will always veto it. Prior to our recent meetings, all the Palestinian commanders went to pay their respect to Arafat. He may be in a generous mood right now, but we know all too well how he acted in the past and that he will continue to opt for terror. I have unfortunately come to the conclusion that he may be a historic leader, but his way is warped and twisted, leading only to violence and terror, until eventually what he is so sure of will happen, and there will be a so-called peace, as ostensibly envisaged by him, and it will comprise the right of return. There can be no peace without the official recognition of Israel's right to exist.



There is also something else that has not changed: the unending, terrible inflammatory incitement. I believe that most of you are familiar with this rabble-rousing. The Palestinian media broadcast it from morning till night. They call Israel non-legitimate, deserving to be treated with violence, as a country that is destined to disappear from the face of the earth. Their textbooks speak of the Jihad, the Holy War, and the right of return as the solution, or in other words, our disappearance. This is a position of Palestinian souls, beginning at a very early age and continuing incessantly. International elements were shocked recently when we showed them some of these texts, and they stopped their funding of this system. This incitement disseminates a lasting poison that is reminiscent of the dark ages. It trivializes our meaning here. No agreement can be reached unless it is stopped. This is not some academic issue to be resolved or not. It is pure rabble-rousing.

It is accompanied by something else: the people who mount attacks on Israelis, who murder Israelis, are considered heroes, and their task is to murder as many Israelis as possible. None of these murderers was ever surrendered to us, nor do

they plan to surrender them in the future. And all this has been entered into the national pantheon: posters applauding the killers hang on every wall, as well as in their universities. When we are in the P.A. we witness their wild attempts at agitation and the way they consecrate the names of those terrorists, those murderers. They and their families are also provided with a great deal of money; it is a profitable business, a national murder industry. I know of what I speak, and it must be stopped; otherwise any peace agreement reached will collapse like a sand castle.

The other outcome, which greatly disturbs me, is all the talk of hudna (truce). People are always talking of a Hudna and ask: will there be a Hudna or not? I would like to explain what this is about. It is an armistice seen through the eyes of HAMAS. They may accept it or not, but if they do, it will merely be in order to amass more power in the brief interim period, given the effectiveness of our attacks. It is inconceivable for the PA, or Israel or the United States to consent to a situation in which some HAMAS leader determines when and whether progress should be made. And no one has so much as

touched HAMAS on the contrary. As I see it, the Palestinians believe that a truce will cause an onslaught of terror, and they can then, in return, receive the political fruits they want from us. That is a simple solution, which would cost a great deal of bloodshed followed by retaliations and liquidations. Therefore, there has to be a meaningful change, as the former South African President stated and we may perhaps borrow his statement. At the height of the talks, we need to arrive at a change; and the basic handling of terror needs to be at the foundation of this change.

Has anything else changed to give us hope? Firstly, the tyrant and despot Saddam Hussein has fallen. I will not go into details on other issues at this time. They are the subjects of a separate lecture: namely, that Iraq, which was the symbol of the eastern front vis-à-vis us, has evidently crumbled. The conventional military threat against Israel has decreased dramatically, and the United States is in the saddle. I consider the ideologies and values that motivate the Americans, as well as the dedication of the US administration to peace, a valuable and important asset. The message sent out by the US is that the



time has come to reach a peace settlement, and that terror has no legitimacy. Arafat's leadership is also seen internationally as having no legitimacy, since it abides by terror. This combination of dedication to the peace process on the one hand and a total negative acceptance of terror on the other gives rise to a certain amount of hope, in light of the dramatic achievement in the Middle East.

A second factor allowing for a ray of hope is that Abu-Mazen's government is an authentic Palestinian government. It was not appointed to provide an advantage for Israel; it does not serve Israel's interest, nor is it a pro-Zionist government. This is a Palestinian government, headed by a leader and founding member and, as I said earlier, what has been concluded is that what is important is to sit down and negotiate, not to engage in terror. This is a highly important message. It contains a message of hope. When I analyze Abu-Mazen's statements, he was saying that we need a peace process, based on a war against terror.

Thirdly, there is widespread awareness of the suffering these terror attacks have caused to Palestinian people

too. No humanitarian crisis exists in the P.A. We are investing huge efforts in this respect. But there is definitely poverty and distress, along with terrible corruption. The people at the top, the fat-cats, are in my opinion totally indifferent to the Palestinian people. I speak from the heart, and it pains me, because I deal with the civilian population. From what I know and see, we care far more about the Palestinian civilians than they do. And reforms are badly needed in this sector. Laws need to be obeyed, as Abu-Mazen said. One rule, one authority, and this needs to be translated into deeds. It will also increase economic welfare. Peace will bring wellbeing to the Palestinian people. I have observed considerable awareness there of the need for change and reforms. Consider the Palestinians to be a very gifted and skilled people with impressive economic capability. I believe that, with mutual cooperation in times of peace and with waging a war on terror, we can make great progress together.

Another very important point on the positive side: while Arafat's departure may have been perceived in one manner or another, and every incident here was formerly regarded as a threat to those Arab regimes

that had signed a peace treaty with Israel – I now see this as proof of their stability. In my opinion, it is important to point out that practically nothing can now undermine the stability of the regime in Egypt or in Jordan. They continue to maintain peace with us, a cold peace, according to national statistics, but they have shown proof of an admirable ability to deal with very serious terror threats and, in effect, to halt the deranged Islamic terror, that calls itself Islamic. Only the people familiar with the details are in a position to evaluate the contribution made by these regimes to the relative stability prevailing in the Middle East – a reality of peace, accompanied by the effective handling of Islamic terror.

To sum up, I would like to let this be my message: Now, at the height of the attempts to advance the tired wagon of peace – and enormous efforts are indeed being made – the proposal put forward by us – transferring responsibility in the Gaza Strip to the Palestinians – will immediately provide free access from the south of the strip to its north. In return, the P.A. will be given full responsibility, in every sense of the term, meaning the war against terror. The P.A. will be required to make historic decisions; to translate

the proposal into decisions, and to shoulder responsibility for Bethlehem once Jericho has been handed over to the Palestinians. This will be a sign of the future, and is not without a chance of succeeding on the balance sheet I have laid out before you. But one could also say that it is the last chance. This specific constellation, with a government in power that wants peace, with a tyrant who was

toppled, with the US showing interest and urging towards peace, with both peoples realizing that we need to attain peace – some possibility exists to advance the peace process, on one condition: this insane terror, this national terror, must be dealt with thoroughly. I need to reiterate this over and over again, though treatment must be provided for the fundamental problems aimed at

doing away with violence as a basic condition, as is stated in the Road Map. Regardless of the Road Map, however, unless terror is dealt with properly and thoroughly, anything we attempt to build will collapse and crumble into dust. There is no other alternative – the world must start to take terror seriously and deal with it thoroughly and unconditionally. Thank you.



**Mr. Berndt Schmidtbauer,  
Former Minister In Charge Of Intelligence in Germany:**

I am very glad that this center has started what is going to enable us to lead this critical dialogue by having more conferences such as this in the coming years.

My memories that were triggered by meeting Michael Gorbachev here are very good examples of what it means to remove mistrust.

When I think about how this unbridgeable East-West conflict occurred in our country, and how Michael Gorbachev then spoke at the Party Congress of the previous GDR and said: "He Who comes too late is punished by life", which describes exactly the situation of many people that are involved in discussions, who are pessimistic, who see no light at the end of the tunnel. With such an attitude not much would have come out of these negotiations and of this trust between east and west at the negotiations. I admit that we did not have to deal with terrorism; I admit this is not the right analogy for this country, and for this region. But it does state one thing, the fact that people got together and through serious dialogue have built something that may have seemed like a vision at first, but soon turned into a reality. The environment was right, and that, Ladies and Gentlemen, may prove to be a major problem here in the Middle

East. I also recall my last flight to Tel Aviv, when it had been accomplished to transfer this country's dead soldiers from Lebanon. It took many negotiations as well as many direct talks with the Hezbollah in Lebanon, with other countries such as Iran, Syria, Jordan, Egypt and others. And eventually it worked, in spite of everybody's grim expectations. After 14 years we succeeded, and I would also like to remind you of the ceasefire that has lasted for a few days. This is not progress, but it is something to teach us of our ability to achieve, if there's a common will and if together we persistently move towards our goals.

I have very carefully noticed the question coming up at this auditorium – What about the negotiation partners that we are dealing with? Well, we cannot always choose our partners. But we can approach them in a way we have been taught before, that we do not necessarily have to like each other, that it does not necessarily have to be love at first sight. We should, however, create trust and not abandon dialogue, although it can certainly be interrupted by certain events. And to the question – Does this "Road Map", does this current situation lead to peace? – I would say that we have a good opportunity

of getting closer to peace. We have different situations in different countries, we have a different situation in this region and we should take advantage of this opportunity. We have had many ups and downs over the last 15 years, I myself have personally felt those ups and downs and I have seen the strong mistrust on both sides. I also remember, how good our results were and how small our steps were on the way to those results. We need honest negotiators and we need the dialogue with all the relevant groups.

I agree, however, with those who are pointing out that we must recognize that terror is the jeopardy for all peace efforts. That terror is the enemy of peace and that we are dealing with a modern terrorism, which is representing a major obstacle for the enhancement of the peace efforts. In the last years, especially during the 90's, we in Europe reassessed our position in concern of extremism and terrorism on our own soil. I can tell you, we were all shocked. Although we actually knew everything of the cells that are locally active, the militant groups functioning in Europe and the terror efforts prepared in backrooms under the cover of official organizations. We were not actually surprised by September 11th, as it



had already been pointed out in our publications, in our evaluations, what this new worldwide terrorism was. And we experienced such activities being prepared partly on our own soil, and we had to learn that we had become a target. Not only here, Ladies and Gentlemen, but in other locations as well, either in Kabul, where German soldiers were killed last week, or Serbia where tourists were killed, or Africa where citizens were killed in attacks.

So we have learned that we cannot confront this only theoretically, but that we must also develop strategies to fight international terrorism. Anyone who followed Powell's mission to the region could see it was accompanied with violence in order to distract, in order to prevent us from making progress. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is quite a crucial point at which we're standing. For me it is totally clear. If we do not manage to act together against worldwide terrorism, then we'll continue to live without peace, and we will stay vulnerable to extortion. And that goes for all regions. It is valid for Afghanistan, it is valid for Iraq; it is valid for the USA, for Europe and indeed for this region as well.

Theoretically, we have already

analyzed everything, and know exactly what we have to do. What failed was the level of international cooperation. We have forgotten that a country on its own cannot align anything. We have experienced this international insult, but we did not realize that we ourselves have put the full international cooperation of intelligence and politics in an opposite position. We actually made big progress at the first conference in Sharm al-Sheikh. U.S.A., the Europeans and the Arab countries had declared what must be done. The main declaration was – terrorism has got a face, terrorism has got a name, terrorism has got an address and terrorism has got a bank account number. Until now, financing streams could not be interrupted although that declaration was appropriate then. So now we must succeed over “terrorism has got a bank account number”. And Ladies and Gentlemen, President Bush is right, if we do not do it today, then our children will have to do it the day after tomorrow with much more difficult sacrifices than today. I do not want to get into the question of human rights – what is OK, what is not. In case we have not learned from the Iraq conflict that teamwork is necessary, and that judging differences of certain

measures to be taken at the Security Council, or theoretic preconditions for proceeding with our work keep us from walking together towards the future, in that case tomorrow we will not be free, and we will stay vulnerable to extortion. There are so many wrong ways to deal with it.

We recognize the circle of violence and we know that we must interrupt this circle, identify it in a most clear and obvious way passing all limits and using all means available. Then, terrorism will have no chance. That is the big challenge that has to be supported by politics. We need solutions, curtains have to be drawn, faces have to be exposed and addresses have to be located. That will help. We should also not close our eyes when faced with certain cases in which we find ourselves partly supporting bank accounts of international terrorism. That is the main point. Not to look away, especially at these important points, not to look away as we clearly see how the financing stream flows on, and then wonder as we experience new attacks on our countries with many victims, innocent victims. And eventually, in some scientific dispositions we wonder why this terrorism is supported by so many. The European Union has to



distinguish exactly how and where the money flows from. We have to see what is going on in Saudi Arabia, where those bank accounts are, that are leading the finance stream, and how we will be able to dry up this stream. I also do not believe that verbal power acts can help us against terrorism. I do believe we must fight terrorism and violence together. It must happen actively, by an international taskforce. You know, some of our countries still argue about competences of police and intelligence services, and discuss the right and wrong ways of handling the information streams. They had not yet understood that this is no longer a national mission, but that it is the mission of the USA, Europe and this area to confront whatever there

is to be confronted. It will become clear, as mentioned here before that terrorism is a dead-end street, that terrorism cannot be a strategy of accomplishing certain goals. It will lead to extermination. Whoever still believes that he can approach and obtain his political aim by terrorist actions, must see his mistake. And if he does not see it he must feel that this is wrong, that it is a dead-end street and that this cannot be a strategy in our world. Only if we manage to achieve this balance, and only then, will we have any chance.

We have chances to move a little forward with this pragmatic Road Map. We have chances to lead things one step at a time, but always remember – There is no

place for terrorism or such activities. Furthermore, it would be good for the Quartet to work together. Not to talk about reforms at the UN-Security Council, not to talk about what was legitimized and what was not, but for each one to recognize the mission, so that we have a balance, so we can reach compromises, so that at the end of this process we can say that it was worth it.

It will not work automatically. It will not work if there is mistrust. Waiting for the right negotiation partners to come will not work either. We have to root out terrorism, to take the opportunity to go actively against terrorism. This will be the chance for advance in this area as well as for a peaceful world. Thank you very much.



**Mr. James Woolsey,  
Former Director of the CIA:**

Reference was made earlier about globalization and the problems which the solutions we had hoped it would bring, and the problems which it has brought. Some of those problems occur naturally, and we must deal with them, Problems such as global warming. I am going to talk about a different type of problem which globalization has helped make more dangerous for us and those are problems caused by malevolence, by the evil rulers and indeed the evil terrorists of the world. I do not shrink from President Bush's word "evil". There is such a condition and there are such people and we need to call, as we say it, a spade, a spade.

I just came from a conference Brussels and one participant there lectured me about why we should not call what is taking place against the rogue states of the world and the terrorists of the world a war. I suggested to him that the world is better off because Europe, outside Belarus and essentially Ukraine, has become a continent of democracies, but the world is not a lesser-included case of Europe. Indeed Isaiah's vision of swords being beaten into plowshares and spears into pruning hooks and lion lying down with lambs is a beautiful vision and someday, it may come about. But, for the time

being, and particularly in the Middle East, the lambs will lie down with the lions only so long as there is an infinite supply of lambs.

I stood in the Rose Garden in 1993 and saw the famous handshake between Arafat and the great Prime Minister of Israel, Rabin. I too hoped that there could be some positive outcome and then we saw in late 2000 and early 2001, Arafat had rejected the dramatic offer put together by Prime Minister Barak and encouraged by the Clinton Administration. Alone, we are told by my friend Dennis Ross, on the Palestinian delegation he insisted on rejecting the offer and thereby changed the course of history in the Middle East and thereby giving every evidence that Bernard Lewis is correct. Asking Arafat to give up terror is like asking Tiger Woods to give up golf. Those Europeans who continue to deal with him do serious damage to the cause of peace.

The great German theologian and minister von Hefer joined the plot to assassinate A. Hitler, and was caught, tortured and killed by the Nazis in 1945. In a discussion in an American classroom a few years ago, the American theologian Paul Ramsey was asked: "Why shouldn't

we deal with our enemies the way Gandhi did? Why do we have to take up arms?" Ramsey said: "if your enemy has a conscience, emulate Gandhi. If your enemy has no conscience, emulate von Hefer." Now in the real world that exists today, dictatorships are working on weapons of mass-destruction and have ties to terrorist groups. And indeed, these three conditions: dictatorship, working on weapons of mass destruction, and ties with terrorist groups are the conditions which President Bush announced last September as being those of which the United States would consider moving preventively against such nations. We are not planning hostilities for example, against Burma, however ugly that regime may be. But, we also have to realize that in dealing with terror, weapons of mass destruction and dictatorships in countries such as Iran and North Korea, that meet all three criteria, we are in a race with time. This is the reason we did not stand by and wait for the 18th or 19th or 20th United Nations Security Council resolution, the reason we moved against Iraq after seventeen Security Council resolutions and twelve years.

The progress toward peace in this part of the world depends first



and foremost on those such as Arafat and others in the Palestinian structure and certainly those in the ruling circles of Iran and Lebanon and Syria and to some extent in Saudi Arabia, to give up on the notion of destroying the State of Israel. If they were truly committed to two side-by-side states, we would not be in the condition we are now. Once that is decided, once it is ascertained by the leaders of the entire Arab world and certainly by those in the Palestinian Authority, that there will be peace between the Jewish State and another Palestinian State, I believe we can begin to see progress. But, that will almost certainly depend upon the Palestinian entity, eventually a state, itself becoming a democracy. Now, when I say democracy here, I do not mean one election once in which Bin Laden wins. I mean a democracy like Israel and like Turkey, a place where there are not only regular elections, but there is the rule of law. And as time goes on, if we see that development among the Palestinians and we see that development in Iraq and elsewhere in the Middle East, we may begin to have some serious hope that things will work well in this part of the world.

We need to realize that this is not hopeless. 89 years ago, this coming

summer, the guns of August of 1914 ushered in WWI and the first of three world wars of the twentieth century, two hot, one cold. In August 1914 there were about 10 democracies in the world: United States, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Britain, France, Switzerland and a few countries in northern Europe. It was a world of empires, of colonies, of dictatorships, of kingdoms. Today, according to Freedom House, the oldest American human-rights organization, which I'm proud to be the chairman of; there are 121 democracies in the world. Eighty-nine of them free; that is regular elections and the rule of law. Another 32 partly free: regular elections, but problems of corruption and the like, such as Indonesia. But, that is an incredible transition in the lifetime of a single individual, from ten or twelve democracies to 121. That is 62% of the world's governments. All along the way as those democracies have developed in one way or another, there have been self-appointed experts who have said: "State 'X' will never be able to be a democracy." Fill in the blanks: Germany, Japan, Russia, Latin American countries, on and on and on. Each time those who so self-confidently said, "State 'X' will never be able to be a democracy," have been wrong.

It is not as if this has been easy, it is not as if there is not retreat and retrogression as in Venezuela today. But the overall strategic progress has been remarkable.

And the majority of the world's Muslims live in democracies: Indonesia, Bangladesh, India, Turkey, the Balkans, Mali, Senegal. It is, I think, important and realistic to point out that in the Middle East there are special problems and the introduction of democracy and the rule of law throughout the Middle East will be difficult, will be troubling and will take decades. But, I say there is only one word for those who say to you that the Arabs will never be able to operate democracies and that word is 'racist'. The Arabs want decent lives for themselves and freedom from dictatorship just like anyone else, they have had a terrible run of bad government and oppression and the anger is there throughout the Arab world. That means it will be hard and it will take time, it does not mean that it is impossible.

And as this struggle goes on, as we work together, all the democracies, the United States, Israel and our many friends in the world of democracy and the rule of law,



**Maj Gen. (ret.) Yossi Peled:**

a number of people will tell us that by working for this objective and the peace which it will bring with it, we are making them very nervous. Some members of the Saudi royal family, Mr. Bashar Al Assad, and a number of other people, will say, "You are making us very nervous." And our response should be, "Good. We want you nervous. We want you to realize that now for the fourth time in a hundred years the democracies are awake and we are on the march and we are on the side of those whom you most fear, your own people".

The issue before us today is "Chances and Risks – the Road Map after the Iraq War." I agree that there are chances and risks, but I consider this a very, very long and protracted process which in effect began in Madrid, continued in Oslo, and brought us to the Aqaba meeting. You may recall that, on the Israeli side at least, there were five partners, five Heads of Government involved in the process, beginning with Shamir and up to Sharon, and those who were in power in between. Beyond all the political disputes and the different world views, Israel perceives this process that is now called the Road Map as a process of "no alternative" – with no other options and with the limitations of what this entails. By limitations I mean that this is a process we need to exhaust fully, up to the limits of the risk a Jewish State can allow itself to take, without losing patience where time is concerned.

In my opinion, there are quite a few special things about Israel, including negotiations with our neighbors, with the Arab world, with Egypt and Jordan, and of course the negotiations at the heart of the Israel-Arab conflict, the confrontation between us and the Palestinians. The Israeli leaders, and all the rest of us, need to keep telling ourselves

over and over again that peace is not a goal – peace is a means. As a Jewish State, our goal is to survive and exist like all other nations. But if We become the one and only things that is important to us all, we could well create ourselves an impossible peace. That is why it is so important to keep telling ourselves that peace is a means, an important means, but it is not a goal.

The leadership that has made the important moves we have witnessed in recent years, and I refer to the attempts to reach a peace treaty between us and our neighbors, this leadership needs to realize when you make peace, it is for generations – not for a brief period of time. When you make peace you need to keep in mind the constant vision that you are making this peace for the future generations, to enable this country to continue and safeguard itself in times of crisis. To sign a peace treaty is a long term historic responsibility. Our own history and that of all other countries in the world has been such that we need to learn a great deal from it.

We also need to try and understand the world concept, mainly of extremist organizations such as the Islamic Jihad, or HAMAS. To some



extent their world view reminds me of those of the Hezbollah. They have internalized the concept that sometimes a situation needs calming down and attempts should be made to reach an interim agreement. But their aim, with such an interim agreement, is to gather strength and power enough to reach their ultimate goals. I believe that we need to remember that the conflict between us and the Palestinians is not just a conflict about two national identities in one strip of land. It is about two different cultures. If we understand this and its inherent significance, I think it can help prevent us from making a great many mistakes.

Not long ago I met with a very senior Palestinian source, and he said something very interesting to me, giving me a lot of food for thought. He told me that at one his meetings with Sheikh Yassin, the latter had spoken of forty-year cycles. When I asked the Palestinian what he meant by that, he said: "If we speak of 40-year historical cycles, then the Palestinian were struck by a major disaster in 1947, when the State of Israel was established. Forty years later, in 1987, the first Intifadah began – the one we call the Intifadah of Stones. Sheikh Yassin says: it took us forty years to realize that this was the way

to achieve our goals. The next 40-years cycle will close in 2027, forty years after 1987. This historic cycle, for which we are the platform, has shown us that a chance existed in 2002 that the Jewish State might no longer exist by the end of that second cycle. And we, the present generation, are the platform that must bring this about".

speak of this because we sometimes tend to feel the conflict is begin waged between two identities – which is true. But the conflict is also about two different cultures; if we forget that, we will make the wrong decisions.

In conclusion, my opinion on the Road Map is that I see a number of weak points, and would like, very briefly, to mention them. One of them – and I am pleased to say that it has since been rectified – was that no agreement was reached in Aqaba mentioning that, while these would be two states alongside one another, one of them was a Jewish State. I found it very difficult to understand why the fact that this, Us, a Jewish State was even in dispute. But that problem has been solved. The foreign minister was able to convince the Americans to state clearly that this was about a Jewish State

alongside a Palestinian State. The second issue: do we Israelis have a map of stipulations in addition to the Road Map? There has to be a map of stipulations, arising from the process that began in Oslo, showing all the violations that occurred and all the understanding that had been reached before we arrived at the critical point when reality blew up in our face. The map of stipulations, which I hope exists, needs to follow the process of implementing the Road Map, step by step. Unless the Israeli government has a map of stipulations, where do we stop if we fail to implement the Road Map step by step, one, two, three and so on, because in that case we will be right back to where we started, back to just a few years after Oslo. The Oslo agreement gave us a few very good years: things were calm, both from the security and the economic aspect, but when we reached the real issue, they blew up in our face.

One especially troubling aspect is that in every agreement reached, from Oslo up to the Road Map, when we get to what I believe is the net problem of Israel's existence as a Jewish State, the Palestinians' right of return – we take the most sensitive issue of all and we set it aside and say: "We will deal

with this when the time comes.” Neither Israel as a state, nor any Israeli leader has the moral right to discuss the return of refugees to Eretz Israel, because that would mean the end of our State. Some people will say: “No agreement can be reached unless we discuss this issue first.” I want to say to you that not everything is clearly black and white. As an Israeli, I would say that when the time comes, Israel would be prepared to make humanitarian gestures, and this term would give us almost unlimited room to maneuver. But for Israel to start mentioning numbers – incidentally, this did come up when Barak was at Camp David with Arafat, and the Israeli side said: “Forty, fifty, sixty thousand” – the other side will immediately translate them to mean two hundred thousand. We know that Israel cannot afford, demographically speaking, to take this upon itself. And if the only stipulations is Yes to the right of return or No to the right of return, then I say that the right of return is

not a subject for negotiations where Israel is concerned.

There are a few things I would like to mention: I cannot think of or visualize any Palestinian leader who would be prepared to go beyond the concessions and agreements made by Arafat. I do not see Abu-Mazen or any other Palestinian leader ready to go beyond what Arafat agreed to at the time. He did not agree to much, but the way I see things now, no Palestinian leader would agree to go any further than Arafat went; it could perhaps happen over time. I consider this attempt to reach a settlement between us and the Palestinians, to be a necessity where we are concerned, but it is a necessity within the limitations I have noted. And if we need to make a choice between survival and peace, I choose survival every time because peace will come once we learn to stand for our interest.

In conclusion, on the Road Map issue, I may not be able to explain this very

precisely, but it is possible that the whole manner of our behavior vis-à-vis the Palestinians, and their behavior towards us, could have its origins in an impossible encounter. Perhaps we should try and reach a solution in an entirely different way, or by setting out from other points of departure. I mean that we should perhaps attempt this by means of economic cooperation, free trade areas, creating very, very, basic economic interests important to both peoples; perhaps create areas of religious activity that are highly important to Christians, Muslims and Jews? Perhaps, when these things exist, create the right conditions and highly mutual interests, then the political solution will be relatively easier? I do not know whether this will or will not be the case, or if this is the right way to go about it, but I feel that after so long, throughout all the years in which we have constantly endeavored to begin with a political solution, perhaps we were wrong in our point of departure on how to reach an agreement with the Palestinians.



**Maj Gen. (ret.) Ya'akov Amidror:**

I would like to refer to international terror. The world is now paying the price for its “soft” reaction to the years of Palestinian terror and Shiite terror directed at Israel from Lebanon. The Muslim and Arab worlds have come to realize that they can achieve a great deal through the use of terror. Anyone who disagrees should look at Israel for proof. The Arab and Muslim worlds have come to realize that the world is prepared to condone terror, provide it is backed by what is ostensibly termed “justification”. Even the United States, which showed the greatest understanding where Israel was concerned, did not always dare to grasp the bull by the horns and combat terror as it is doing now.

Europe still has not learned its lesson, and therefore some European leaders continue to visit Mr. Arafat, even though they were advised by their experts that Arafat is directly and at times indirectly responsible for the terror attacks on Israel. We are still at a disadvantage because the Europeans have not sufficiently grasped this, and I very much hope that President Bush will be able to convince the world leaders to change their policy on this issue. I also hope that the Europeans come to realize what terror means. We need to bear

in mind that Mr. Arafat is not Nelson Mandela because he does not want to be; unfortunately Mr. Abu-Mazen is no Mr. Mandela either because he is not capable. And we have a more serious problem here inasmuch as there is no one that is comparable to Mr. Mandela – in good will as well as capability, and I am not sure that this is likely to change any time soon.

I would now like to move directly to the Road Map and to its security risks, and not deal with its broader aspects. Two qualities are essential for every Israeli who supports the Road Map: great courage and the ability to learn from the lessons history has taught us in the last few years. How is it that the agreements made in 1993, which were meant to lead to peace, wellbeing and calm in the Middle East, brought about a murderous wave of terror like no other in modern history instead? Numerous questions and arguments have arisen over these questions, given a society that praises the murderers of innocent people and calls them heroes. One thing is clear: during the critical stages of 1994-1995, the Palestinian security organizations took no action whatsoever against HAMAS or the Islamic Jihad. Some time ago I saw an advertisement in a newspaper,

blaming Peres for destroying the peace because he had ordered the liquidation process of Yihya Ayyash. Allow me to inform you that this order was issued by the late Yitzhak Rabin. In mid- 1995 it was obvious that Muhammad Dahlan and the security organizations in Gaza – where they ruled undisputedly – were taking no steps against HAMAS. Israel was obliged to liquidate Yihya Ayyash, as decided by the late Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin, because it realized that the Palestinian Administration was not taking any counter-terror action. This was patently obvious: from the moment they entered the region, throughout 1994 and 1995, they did not lift a finger against terror. Basically, this was the reason why the process collapsed.

When I say that the man who has to support the Road Map needs to be a brave man and ignore past history, I ask a simple question. Are we not going back to a repeat performance of the exact same process? Given the point of departure, there is no reason to believe that things will be any better now than they were in 1994 and 1995 – except for one point mentioned by Amos Gilad: The Palestinians are increasingly coming to realize that – contrary to their dreams and their expectations that



followed our unilateral withdrawal from Lebanon – Israel will not break under terror attacks. More Palestinians now realize that they are paying a very costly price, both globally and within their own society, for justifying terror. Are these two factors enough to make the Palestinians behave differently in 2003 than they did after 1993? That is indeed a difficult question. Therefore, whoever goes along with the Road Map needs to be a brave man, able to ignore the history of recent years.

From my personal experience, - and I have gained considerable behind-the-scenes and more overt experience – it is extremely difficult to take Palestinian promises to combat terror at face value. Partly, because they feel that it is the right way to fight Israel and partly, because even if they think this is the wrong way to fight Israel, they cannot say so openly, because it is the worldview of the society they live in. Also, even if they feel that to fight Israel is wrong, they are afraid to do anything about it. It is thus very difficult to rely on their promises. Such promises, therefore, need to be anchored and tied down. The important thing, where the Road Map is concerned, is to unequivocally anchor the manner

in which the Palestinians will in effect combat terror.

Five months before the Palestinians declared war last time or did not declare it but simply set out to fight – I took the IDF National Security College on a visit to Gaza and Nablus. Dahlan was our host in Gaza. We spent a lot of time with him and with Mr. Arekat, and after the embracing and kissing part was over he addressed the students, and said: “I want you to know that there will be no terror where we are concerned; no matter what happens, there will be no terror; it is excluded“. Now I ask myself, that same Muhammad Dahlan who heads the Palestinian security organizations – did he not know where things stood five months prior to the war? If he did not know, how can we be sure that he will know in the future? We also have a serious problem with the Palestinians’ will and ability. We need to surround ourselves with the means to guarantee that we will not be facing an even harsher war in a few years’ time. Why do I say a harsher war? Because, according to the Road Map, Israel will be flagging its greatest achievement, the fact that we can say that we may possibly be better equipped as a state, to deal with terror, we are

back in control of the ground. No patent on how to fight terror without controlling the ground has ever been invented. We took back that control less than 18 months ago, but we stand to lose that and we need to ask ourselves over again; are we losing that? Are we losing the ability to fight terror, in return for the other side’s understanding that they will be the ones to fight terror? Until this is guaranteed and ensured, the risk we will be taking is enormous.

There are two comments regarding our partners I would like to make: One concerns the American partner. If any hope exists in the Middle East, it undoubtedly relies entirely on Washington’s realization that changes will have to be made in the U.S. victory in Iraq. However, something has happened in Washington. While in June 2002 President Bush stated clearly, and I quote: “The U.S. Administration will not support the establishment of a Palestinian State until the Palestinian leaders are engaged in continued combat against terror and the uprooting of its infrastructure. An extraordinary effort will be required to rebuild the capability of the Palestinian security organizations and their security system must come under one command and under one



leader.” He was referring to Abu-Mazen in this particular case. But look at what happened as a result: In the situation we are in today there is no one sole organization for the various Palestinian security services: there are two. One reports to Arafat, and the other reports to Abu-Mazen via Dahlan. The Palestinian leadership has made no lasting and persistent effort against terror. The infrastructure of Palestinian terror has not been uprooted. Nonetheless, the Americans, whose president clearly said what he did in June 2002, now replies to us: “True, but...”

In this connection Amos Gilad observed that one of our major mistakes after 1993 was our failure to firmly insist that the Palestinian rabble-rousing be stopped. We also made what I consider an equally bad mistake, by exclaiming at every stage: “What? Run the entire process for this?” On the first day that Arafat entered the territories, he had with him a terrorist whose entry had been prohibited by the late Yitzhak Rabin. Arafat sat on top of him as the car drove in, and we informed the Israeli leadership accordingly. And the Israeli leadership said: “What? Stop the process because of one terrorist?” What should have been done was this: Arafat should

been arrested at the border and told: “Sorry, Sir, you cannot enter; not until you comply with the full terms of the agreement, word for word.” Instead, we said: “Why halt an entire agreement, a historic process, over such a thing?” Later we knew that the Palestinians were amassing weapons, and we told our leaders: “For your information, the Palestinians are amassing weapons and Arafat is moving weapons into the territories in his car. Laboratories exist, and their location is known to the Palestinian intelligence services, which maintain contacts with the terrorists.” And our leaders said: “Yes, but should we stop the historic process that leads us to peace, just because the Palestinian side does not arrest him?” At every point, we were told that this process is too big to be stopped just because the other side is not fulfilling its part of the agreement.”

This, in my opinion, is one of the biggest historical mistakes made by us, and it could be repeated now unless we are meticulous in dotting the i's and crossing the t's. The Palestinians' right to insist on accuracy is by no means unilateral. We cannot and must not, repeat the mistakes we made in 1994-1995. I deliberately mention these dates, when our government was

headed by the late Yitzhak Rabin and subsequently by Shimon Peres – two men whose sincere desire to reach an agreement with the Palestinians was never in doubt. We knew, during those years, that the Palestinians were not upholding the agreements. We must not make that mistake again.

The other people involved in an agreement concerning the Road Map are the Europeans, who continue to support Arafat and who are not prepared to take the necessary measures to fight terror; nor are they prepared to take the kind of responsibility the United States took in pressuring the countries in the Middle East to change their attitudes. The French stand regarding the Iranian opposition, when it demonstrated against the Iranian government in Tehran, was no coincidence. Someone in the Quai d'Orsay bore that incident in mind. We here have a problem with the referees who, together with the Europeans, are supposed to award us grades. They have in no way internalized the need to combat terror and they do not understand that Israel's war against terror will ultimately strike at the European countries as well, because terror knows no boundaries.



In conclusion, where the Road Map is concerned, people talk to us of a Hudna (truce). Ladies and Gentlemen, Hudna is a honey trap that will culminate in murderous terror. Who is behind this Hudna? HAMAS may avow that it will take no action against Israel, say for six months. Let us not delude ourselves about this – the Palestinians will take no action against HAMAS during those six months. In that time, HAMAS will

purchase arms, train its people, and manufacture explosives. HAMAS will set up laboratory workshops inside Palestinian- controlled territory and no Palestinian will lift a finger against them. Israel will not be able to operate against HAMAS during the Hudna in any manner of form. Where we are concerned, it is a trap into which we cannot afford to fall. We need to reiterate President Bush's text of June 2002. We need to join the Palestinian

leadership that is actively fighting against terror. To us the Hudna is nothing but trouble; it will lead us into a far worse situation in six months or a year, with HAMAS, or someone else, including organizations, inside P.A. territory and under P.A. rule, deciding to exploit the power built up by HAMAS during the Hudna. That's all we need.



**Maj Gen. (ret.) David Ivry:**

I had expected most of the speakers to focus on the issue of Palestine and terror, which they did with the utmost efficacy. This reminds me of the story of a rabbi in a small town in Eastern Europe. The rabbi was always solving minor problems and squabbles arising among his neighbors. One morning, one of his neighbors came to complain about another neighbor. The rabbi said to him: You are right. On the following day the other man came to complain about the first, and to him, too, the rabbi said: You are quite right. The rabbi's wife peaks through the door and asked: How can both of them be right? And the rabbi said to her: You too are right. As I see it, this story has 3 morals: Firstly: if everyone is right – there is no solution. Secondly: If neighbors have problems, they need to work them out among themselves, without restoring to the rabbi or the UN or anyone else; the rabbi won't resolve their problem. Thirdly: it is always wise to listen to your wife; she is always right.

I have no magic solution to the Palestinian issue, and will not dwell on the developments that have occurred in the region in the wake of the Iraq war, because I feel that the Road Map is also an outcome of that war and of the U.S. victory. The war has totally

changed the strategic situation in the Middle East. The Americans won a military victory after the first Gulf War, but then they left the region. This time we have a world power with significant forces stationed in the area – an incredibly, meaningful change in a short term, and highly significant in the long term; the regional equation in the post facto in Iran, Iraq, and the bloc of Gulf States headed by Saudi Arabia. This time the equation is dominated by one large, important force. It provides the Americans with military control over the Persian Gulf. The significance of this is extraordinary; I don't think that we have quite grasped its meaning yet. Obviously no power in the Middle East is capable of standing up to the American force, which has clearly demonstrated its qualitative edge. This has inevitable implications on the world oil market – global implications. In part, the Persian Gulf might perhaps now be called the American Gulf.

The rehabilitation of Iraq will obviously bring in US-friendly companies to rebuild the country, but will also significantly change the nature of business in the area. The terror will require the Americans to stay on. They cannot lose or surrender to terror. As for the Palestinian people –

whom terror has punished more heavily than any other problem – they will not call it an Intifadah (in Iraq) but will come up with another name.

Iran's situation has also become highly significant, with the "great Satan's" forces deployed on its southern border and in control of the Gulf. The attentive ear of the United States is close by, receptive and sensitive to what is happening in Iran, which will make it extremely difficult for the Iranians to help and support terror in various locations. Organizations inside Iran will muster the daring to stage uprisings, on the assumption that their regime will be more cautious of them. Chances of changing the regime in Iran have increased, without the need for outside intervention. A regime change from the inside is always preferable to one from the outside. The Iranians are a sensible nation; they have been exposed to globalization and are anxious to attain a higher living standard. Such an opportunity would seem to be close.

For the first time, Syria is surrounded by non-friendly forces: American troops in the east; Turkish forces in the north; (the Turkish well remember previous points of friction, albeit the last three years have been more or



less calm. They still have issues of water security) Jordan and Israel in the south, and I would cautiously say that Jordan is not exactly Syria's greatest friend. Again, the American ear is close by and attentive where Syria is concerned, and in the event of a terror attack on the United States or on US forces, certain roots and directions points to Damascus. Such an incident would be impossible to gloss over, and would thus have its own implications, impacting on supplies for the Hezbollah, on the testing of non-conventional weapons or surface to missiles. I think that this is a strategic opportunity for an initiative vis-à-vis Syria. The present situation makes it worthwhile for Syria to come up with a peace initiative. The strategic state of affairs I mentioned earlier also has its difficulties, which I will not go into here, but Syria does face difficulties.

Turkey is very important to the region. It has gone through a certain period of crisis in its relations with the United States, but I think that this can be rectified and relations of trust can be built, as Turkey is very important to the Iraqi issue. The commitment to

preserve unity in Iraq may now have diminished somewhat since Turkey did not take part in this war.

The question, of course, is: Will the U.S. continue its military moves against additional countries in the region? That is the immediate question. At the moment the U.S. is encountering some difficulty: Bin-Laden still has not been found; we do not know what happened to Saddam Hussein and, of course, to the weapons of mass destruction in Iraq that have not yet been located, although I expected that they will be found. In my view, at any rate, it is the domestic situation inside the United States that will prove decisive: the Americans are moving toward elections in 2004. the U.S. approach will be dictated by the election year, and I believe that it has already begun. If the economic situation in the U.S. improves, chances are that America will not make any military moves and will give the economic situation an opportunity to bear fruit where the elections are concerned, instead of making any further military moves. In the event of a different economic

situation, terror activity in its various forms will need to be perceived accordingly: a large-scale terror attack, regardless of whether it occurs in America only – will impact heavily on any U.S. decision.

Great changes will also occur where Israel is concerned, extending beyond the Road Map. On the one hand, not only has the Iraqi threat become irrelevant; the American presence in the area means that Israel is not alone and that the Iraqi threat has been wiped out. Powers hostile to Israel need to take this into account. On the other hand, Israel is not as free to act as it was before American forces arrived in the region. Generally speaking, the situation is just beginning to take shape. I would say that the road map was the first and politically easiest move aimed at bringing in the international community. The situation I have described will have even greater influence on the moves to come, and I am not sure that the road map will be the principal and ruling factor in the Middle East in the near future. Other developments will be of more cardinal importance.



**Maj Gen. (ret.) MK  
Danny Yatom:**

I would like to make a few very brief comments, very brief, as I have no wish to go on at length. As we have all realized, security arrangements play a focal and essential part in any future Middle East agreement. We cannot reach an agreement without first determining the security arrangements. This was the case when we held negotiations and reached an agreement with Egypt, and it was also the case with Jordan. Great emphasis was placed on security issues in all our negotiations and dialogues with the Palestinians, the Lebanese and the Syrians. The region is sensitive where security issues are concerned, and these will of course need to be dealt with. While this may not be the most important point of all, we cannot reach any positive arrangement or attempt to end the conflict and bloodshed unless we reach an agreement on security issues.

Israel should, in my opinion, move along three main tracks: Firstly: We continue to fight terror; this is the Middle East after all, and we need to reach a point where we can cooperate with the Palestinian Authority, as we did before, in the war against terror. But we also need to persist in our fight against terror even when the P.A. is incapable of

doing so, cannot do so, and perhaps someone there does not want it to do so.

Secondly: The separation fence. We must make progress with the separation fence and regard it as a national project. My many years of experience over close on forty years of combating terror have taught me that wherever we erected a fence, it soon becomes a central component of the security forces' ability to curb terror in the Middle East. This was true along the border with Lebanon, and also along the Golan Heights border. It was also the case along the northern part, stretching for about 120 kilometers, and in the Jordan Valley along the border with Jordan, and now along the border of the Gaza Strip. Repeated attempts were made all along the Gaza Strip to mount terror attacks, and all of them failed.

Thirdly: the main factor on this track, even though it may sound somewhat naïve to some in the audience – I believe this was also mentioned by the former President of South Africa, Mr. De Klerk, who also extricated his country from a very complex situation of struggle and bloodshed – the main factor is dialogue. We cannot do otherwise. If we are to

put an end to terror, we need to talk. There can be no preconditions to the effect that first, the terror must stop, and only then can we begin to talk. This will not happen of itself. The terror will not stop of its own accord, and we need to encourage talks, perhaps by creating a special atmosphere in which the Palestinians will cooperate with us to fight terror. We may, without realizing, not have said so in public, but that in fact is what the Israeli government is doing now, in every sense of the term. It is conducting a dialogue which, when conducted between countries, is termed “negotiations”, and it is also fighting terror.

We could mention additional points. Had all the sides been sensible enough, the American proposals that were on the table in Camp David could have been adopted. Incidentally, in order to rectify a historic mistake, let me say that we did not agree at Camp David to discuss the return of Palestinian refugees to Israel. We did not talk of that. The subject subsequently came up in Taba towards the end of Barak's term in office, when none of the negotiators on the Israeli side were authorized to raise the right of return issue. I am certain that no Israeli Government, no matter



how leftist, will in any way agree to internalize or accept this Palestinian demand.

I believe that each of the two sides needs to internalize two points: I will begin in Israel, what the Israeli side needs to internalize is that not only

can the conflict not be resolved through force, by using no matter what powerful military means – it can be resolved solely by a combination of force used as and if required, and a dialogue between the two sides. I think that this has already been internalized by our present government headed

by Ariel Sharon. And the Palestinian side, for its part, must internalize the fact that the State of Israel will remain forever and ever a Jewish State, because we have no other country and we will do all we can to safeguard our country as a Jewish, Zionist, and democratic state.



**Foreign Minister,  
Mr. Silvan Shalom:**

The Middle East stands today at a new crossroad: We witness a regional change after the defeat of Saddam Hussein and the rise of a new Palestinian leadership. Israel today is seeking to move towards peace, at the same time that threats to ansecurity posed by those who reject peace, remain real and profound. We are determined to exploit to the maximum the opportunities presented by the new post-Saddam strategic reality. We believe in peace and we believe in the benefits it can bring, not only to our citizens, but also to all people of the region. A stable Middle East with working structures for trust, security and economic cooperation will clearly be a better place for us all. Translating the present opportunities into positive change will not be easy. The experience of the recent past teaches us that peace cannot be built on a vision alone, nor cannot it be built on the mix of shaky foundations and wishful thinking and romanticism so often put forward by well-meaning outsiders. As we work to bring security and peace to our people it is vital that we insure that the structure we are building has strong foundations that will not crumble at the first challenge.

In my comments today, I will focus on two key dimensions: the Israeli-

Palestinian conflict and the regional dimension. The government of Israel voted on May 25th to accept the steps laid out in the Road Map. In the wake of the Aqaba Summit, we have begun implementing our commitments including the release of prisoners and the dismantling of unauthorized outposts. These are not easy decisions or steps for Israel to take. We are taking them, because we are committed to exhausting every opportunity for peace with our Palestinian neighbors. The Palestinian government of Abu-Mazzen on the other hand has yet to make the strategic choice for peace, which is so necessary if our efforts are to be successful. It has so far failed to implement its commitments under the Road Map and I want to quote: "To begin a sustained, targeted and effective action to dismantle the terrorist organizations and their infrastructure and to end incitement." Since the Aqaba Summit, thirty Israelis have been killed in terrorist attacks launched from within the Palestinian Authority. This is the reality facing the government of Israel as we seek to address today's diplomatic and security challenges. The continued efforts of the terrorist organizations, operating from within the Palestinian Authority and with the active support of Syria, Iran and other

Arab elements, presents a grave challenge to the current drive for peace. Clearly, any peace strategy must include effective responses to these challenges, as well as the looming threat of weapons of mass destruction in the hands of Iran or other regional players.

Terror has been and unfortunately remains the greatest obstacle to peace between Israel and the Palestinians. The resort to terror has not only taken hundreds upon hundreds of innocent lives, and brought tragedy and pain to thousands of families. It has also undermined all efforts to bring about peaceful resolution of the conflict. The resort to terror reflects the profound failure of the Palestinian national movement to accept the legitimacy of the State of Israel and its Jewish character. The denial of our legitimate rights must end if we are to make any progress towards peace. This is not a demand Israel makes in order to impede the peace effort. On the contrary, as recent experience has shown, if these organizations are allowed to continue to thrive and flourish, the prospect of peace is the main victim. It is in this context





that I have expressed in recent days both in public and in my meetings with international leaders, including Secretary of State, Colin Powell, and yesterday with his majesty the King of Jordan and other Arab leaders, my view that Hudna is a ticking time bomb of great danger. Any compromise with Hamas is a recipe for disaster. Hamas and other terror organizations must be confronted and dismantled. There is no shortcut, there is no alternative. The government of Abu Mazzen must act immediately to end the terror. Only a strategic decision to do so will help us build upon the glimmer of hope that shone so brightly at Aqaba just two weeks ago. Unfortunately it looks like two years ago.

I am greatly encouraged that this view, which we have held for many years, is becoming accepted around the world. Just in recent days the European Union adopted an approach to Hamas far more consistent with the interests of peace than ever before. Now, for the first time, Europe has recognized what we have known all along, that Hamas are the enemies of peace and must be stopped if peace is to be possible. Israel, for its part, will continue to insist that the Palestinian obligation is fulfilled before moving to the next

stages of the Road Map. This is the only way that the later stages will have any chance of success. In the meanwhile, Israel will continue to fulfill its obligation to all its citizens to protect them from harm. Let nobody be mistaken, Israel will continue to fight the terrorists who threaten our citizens. Ultimately, peace between Israel and the Palestinians rests on the abilities of both peoples to live side by side.

Israel remains deeply concerned about the hatred towards Israel in the Palestinian Authority and Arab States rather than the cultivation of a culture of peace. A vast infrastructure of incitement and hatred glorifies violence and the sacrifice of human lives and undermines peace. The incitement, I want you to know, is organized and systematic. It continues to foster and encourage terrorism and the denial of Israel's right to exist. We see it in the educational system, textbooks, masks, and the media, including official organizations and in public statements. We need a new culture of peace to replace the climate of intolerance that has plagued our region. The Sharm and Aqaba summits symbolized the emerging consensus on the need to end the culture of hate. This summer, nearly

forty thousand Palestinian children will attend summer camps in the Palestinian Authority. In previous years, these camps conducted paramilitary training and fermented hate. One wonders what these children will be taught this summer? Will they learn tolerance and the acceptance of others? Will they learn to lead productive lives? Or will it be more of the same? These are important questions, which our future rests upon. Education that calls for violence is unacceptable. Instead of preaching intolerance, educators should emphasize engineering, sciences, computers and math. A culture of peace is one that offers real hope to the people of the Middle East. This includes economic growth, educational opportunities and regional cooperation. The development of sound and sensible economies that complement each other will enable the region to flourish and prosper, identification of common interests and projects will further the flow of re-trade, international investments and modern technologies.

We need to move forward and the time is now. We are now facing a new opportunity that we are determined to seize. We hope that both parties feel the same. We are



encouraged that the Palestinian Authority has taken upon itself to uproot the evil of incitement as Prime Minister Abu-Mazzen stated in Aqaba. The public recognition by both sides of the suffering of the other is an important step towards mutual understanding. Because we recognize the importance of building a culture of peace, Israel and the Palestinians have agreed to conduct a direct dialogue on incitement. This dialogue, though political by nature should focus on operational, educational aspects. The civil societies throughout the Middle East can and should be a partner in this effort. Unfortunately, the Arab states in our region contribute to the climate of intolerance. It is our hope that Arab leaders will rise to the occasion and commit in word and deed to the culture of peace. Boycotts, of any sort are unacceptable. Not only do they hamper dialogue and understanding, they also send a message of hatred and intolerance. I call on the leaders of the Arab world particularly those with official relations with Israel to send a message of peace to their peoples and to ours by sending their ambassadors back to Israel. I think it is the time for them to make serious choices and to take immediate action. By sending their ambassadors back to Israel, they will

send a positive signal to the people of Israel that they are willing to have peace with us and that they are willing to live with us here in the region. It is often said words kill. Incitement, I want you to know, is the cradle of death. It must end now.

As the efforts to implement the Road Map proceed it is clear that a broader, regional context must be addressed. The defeat of Saddam Hussein has removed a great danger to Israel and the region, and has opened up new possibilities for further regional change. This is a development of truly strategic importance for which the entire world owes the United States and its allies a great debt. At the same time, regional players continue to pose a real threat. Syria and Iran continue to threaten both Israel and the peace process, through their support of Hezbollah and the Palestinian terror organizations. Iran's pursuit of nuclear weapons also poses a grave threat, not only to Israel, but also to the stability of the entire region and the whole world. Concentrated and determined international efforts are needed to confront these countries. International consensus is critical if the new momentum is to be translated into genuine change for good. The new positions regarding

Hamas are a reflection of this growing international consensus. Its determined application will, we believe, have a positive impact on the ground. This has also been the case with the emergence in recent months of a new Palestinian leadership, to the disastrous blood-sucking leadership of Yasser Arafat. Faced finally with consensus regarding the international community's expectations of the Palestinians to abandon terror and end corruption and incitement, the Palestinian side has, for the first time, chosen a new leadership.

This renewed international coordination must not stop here. The decision of the IAEA of June 16th in Vienna that Iran has breached of its nuclear commitments is a positive development. Two weeks ago and yesterday once again, I met with my colleague, the Russian Foreign Minister Igor Ivanov, and I raised this issue with him as I continue to do in every meeting with foreign leaders. The IAEA decision was only reached as a result of the growing international consensus and must now be followed up by continued international pressure. In this broader, international context, it is impossible to overstate the significance of the courage and leadership that is



played by President George Bush. The United States determination to combat the threats the international community has been the linchpin of the international response to 9-11, to the global terror threat and the threat of weapons of mass destruction. Israel recognizes the significance of these efforts and is committed to working together with the United States to ensure their effective implementation, but U.S. determination alone is not sufficient. Only a joint effort by the entire international community will help remove the threats posed by Iran and Syria and pave the way for realizing our shared vision of peace.

The government of Israel is committed to the vision of peace as laid out by President Bush in his speech on June 24th. We have undertaken many measures to facilitate the realization of this vision and we are willing to fulfill our responsibilities. We are committed to a process with clear benchmarks for progress on the ground, first and foremost, the dismantling

of the terrorist infrastructure. We are committed to a process with clear red lines on issues such as the Palestinian claim of return. We were very encouraged by the statement that was given by President Bush in Aqaba that the United States is committed and the President is personally committed to the security of the State of Israel as a vibrant Jewish State. It was very encouraging, a very positive statement that will allow us to move forward, knowing that the United States is with us in our rejection of this claim of return. We are committed to a process, as I mentioned, with clear red lines on issues such as the Palestinians' claim of return.

Our strategy for peace is a sober one, which recognizes that without an end to Palestinian terror and incitement on the one hand, and the Palestinian recognition of Israel as a Jewish State on the other hand, nothing lasting can be achieved. Israel recognizes the importance of working together with the international community, under the leadership of the United

States, to promote this process. We have said more than once that the peace process should be led by the Americans and a monitoring group on security issues should be chaired by the Americans we are very glad and happy that this process and the monitoring group will be chaired and led by the Americans. We think that the Americans have more tools in order to bridge the gaps between the parties, between Israel and the Palestinians. Israel recognizes the importance of working together with the international community. We think that the Europeans as well have a key role to play in the region, but we are asking them what we are asking the United Nations and the Russians, to have a more balanced approach towards the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, towards the Israeli-Arab conflict. Only through such joint efforts will the Middle East be transformed from a region of conflict and bloodshed to one of stability, economic prosperity and opportunities for all.



**Mr. Dan Meridor (Moderator)**

Our role now is to deal with the solutions of the political aspects. Let me make a comment on solutions and the academy. We are here in an academic environment, in the Netanya Academic College. What is the difference between the assessments in the academy and the assessments and decisions made by political people? In the first case, in the academy, you can take an option, discuss it and easily show how difficult it is, how many risks are involved, how dangerous it is to take this path and I suppose you are right.

If you discuss all the options that

Israel faces in the political decision-making process, it is an entirely different matter. It is not enough to say that this road is bad, the other is difficult, and the third is dangerous. You need to make a decision choosing between the very difficult, risky alternatives. It will not be enough to say "that's risky, leave it." All are risky. When can you refrain from taking decisions, choosing between alternatives? When you have a steady state, things continue the way they were for another ten years, twenty or thirty.

This month, 36 years ago, the six-day war changed the Middle East, in a very positive way from Israel's

perspective. Peace started only after that, with Jordan, with Egypt, and with other countries that were beginning this process. But it will be a dangerous illusion, to think that we can perpetuate what we have now. We cannot go on with things as they are. So when we speak of solutions, not in rhetoric, not in academic terms discussing a certain proposal; when one speaks of solutions, we should demand of the people who make decisions, whom we have elected to make decisions not to tell us why they are not to blame for the lack of change, or the lack of decisions, but what they mean to do to bring about a change and a solution.



**Mr. Dan Kurtzer,  
U.S. ambassador to Israel:**

Good afternoon, I want to congratulate the Strategic Dialogue Center of the Netanya Academic College for arranging this forum. I also want to express my sympathy to you, the audience. They have placed our session just after lunch and just before siesta, so it will be a bit of a challenge to keep awake, I hope we are up to the challenge here, and I ask for your sympathy, because I am a mere diplomat among statesmen and generals and academics. You know, the definition of a diplomat is a person who not being able to get a job back home, is sent abroad on condition that he does not return home, so you may have me here for a while.

What I thought I would do today, there is always a lot of talk about Inyaney De'Yoma (current topics), today's news, what happened yesterday, what's going to happen tomorrow, and what's the long term impact of what's happening today. What I would like to do though is to put into context – at least as regards American policy – what it is we are trying to accomplish by way of The Middle East.

We have four pillars on which our policy in The Middle East rests. I want to take a few minutes just to discuss each of those pillars,

and then to elaborate a little bit with respect to the Road Map and the prospects for peace between Israel and Palestinians.

The first pillar of our policy, of course, is the complete cessation of terrorism and violence. This is part of a global war on terrorism, which in some respects has been thrust upon the United States, but it is a policy and it is a challenge which President Bush and the Bush administration have taken up with alacrity. Certainly in the last two years, the United States has shown leadership in telling the world that terrorism must come to an end, and that if countries themselves are not able to change their policies and to root out terrorists within their midst, then the United States will lead a coalition against terrorists on behalf of freedom. As you know, in order to do this we maintain a living list of states sponsoring terrorism. This neighborhood, unfortunately, is the home to many of those countries, which support and actively encourage terrorism, and we also maintain a list of organizations which themselves engage in terrorism, whether or not they are under the hospices of states. In this region, Hamas, Hezbollah and others are prominent members of that list. As we maintain this war against

terrorism, in a complimentary fashion the president has also declared war against the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, against the spread of weapons such as nuclear, chemical and biological, and the United States, with many other international players, is in the lead of a major effort to stop the proliferation of such weapons. Sometimes we do it unilaterally, and as you heard earlier today, sometimes we do it through international organizations such as the IAEA – the International Atomic Energy Agency. So the first pillar of the Bush administration approach to this region is actually a pillar which is global in its reach, and that is, to root out terrorism and to stop the spread of weapons of mass destruction.

The second pillar of the Bush administration approach is to promote economic development and reform. As you heard President Bush say several weeks ago in an address in South Carolina, this is a region which is long overdue in terms of its economic development and reform. This is a region in which far too little trade takes place within this region, and far too much trade takes place outside the region, and it's a region where basic structural reforms are required for countries to realize their full economic potential.



The president, in the May 9th speech in South Carolina, said that it is a critical aspect of American policy to foster economic growth and development in The Middle East, and that is the second pillar of the administrations' approach.

The third pillar, announced also in that same speech, was to participate, to encourage, to act as a catalyst in a process of democratization and political reform. This is not necessarily our agenda alone. As some of you may know, several months ago about 40 Arab intellectuals came together under the auspices of the United Nations Development Program, and did a self-study of those factors within Arab societies that inhibit growth and that inhibit democratization. The Arab intellectuals found at least three major factors that required change; first of all, to reverse what they called The Freedom Deficit in the Arab world. In other words, too many people in the Arab world were not living in situations of freedom, either individually or in their societies. Secondly, they identified the lack of empowerment of women in societies, and said that unless Arab societies can find a way to empower women, they will also not be able to progress politically and economically,

and third, they denounced the lack of education and access to education in Arab societies. The president, in his speech in early May citing this Arab report, said it is time that the Middle East caught up: It is time to empower women, it is time to provide education, and it is time to fill the deficit of freedom, which now pervades this region. In order to do this, the President said, the United States would embark on what he called a 'Middle East Partnership Initiative'. This is an initiative that the congress is in the process of funding with substantial amounts of money, in order to try to help Arab societies that want to help themselves build up their education, expand their freedoms and give opportunities to women. That's the third pillar of our approach in the region.

The fourth pillar, of course, is the search for peace, something which has motivated the United States constantly for the last 35 years. As the president laid out in his speech exactly one year ago tomorrow, he believes that we can achieve a two-state solution to the Arab-Israel, to the Palestinian-Israeli conflict, in which a State of Palestine can live in peace and security next door to the State of Israel, and in order to do that, the president has asked

his officials to work with members of the international community from Russia, from the European Union and from the United Nations, to develop a Road Map: In other words, a way to get from where we are today to the realization of the vision that the President laid out. The Road Map lays out a series of mutual and reinforcing obligations for both of the parties. It starts out with an absolute requirement that terrorism and violence and incitement come to an end, and it lays out a series of steps that should be taken in parallel by the two sides, that will move them from where they are today towards peace. The end of this process will be a negotiation between Israel and the Palestinian Authority to create a Palestinian State, and to develop the kind of arrangements that will exist between Israel and Palestine living side by side in peace and security.

The good news, of course, is that both sides accepted the Road Map. The Palestinian Authority accepted the map with no reservations and the government of Israel accepted the map with 14 observations, in which its diplomats will seek to address in the course of the negotiations. The acceptance of the Road Map by both parties allowed the



United States and the international community to proceed forwards.

In the period ahead there are opportunities and there are limitations, or as the title of this conference indicates, 'opportunities and risks'. Some of the opportunities exist in the very nature of U.S. engagement, for the people of Israel who have come to know President Bush as a staunch and steady friend of Israel. He has stood with Israel during these past two and a half years of his presidency, and has defended absolutely Israel's right of self-defense. The President has made clear his understanding that Israel's fight against terrorism is part and parcel of the global war against terrorism, and there is no difference between terrorism here and terrorism elsewhere.

A second point of opportunity is that we have been able, as are two countries as friends and allies, to overcome the small differences that exist between us, and instead to build and to intensify the areas of strategic cooperation between us. I need only point to the incredible levels of cooperation that existed between our two countries during the Iraqi war, in which we took ten years of practice and ten years of

preparation, and developed a system of working together that worked perfectly well. Now, it is true that we were not tested during this war, rockets were not launched here from Iraq, and thank god terrorism did not increase, but we were ready because of our strategic cooperation, and that in itself represents one of the most important elements in what I call 'the opportunities that lie ahead'.

The third element in the opportunities, of course, is that the President has looked even beyond the Palestinian – Israeli dimension, to ensure that other aspects of concern in this region get their due attention. Secretary Powell traveled to Syria some weeks ago to make clear the deep level of dissatisfaction of the United States with many elements of Syrian behavior, not only relating to Iraq, but also relating to Syrian support of terrorism, of Syrian support of Hezbollah activities in Lebanon, and the development by Syria of weapons of mass destruction, and the President has directed that we maintain a very strong and intense dialogue with Syria, to try to affect change in Syrian policy and in Syrian behavior. In addition, the United States has been among the leaders of the international community in maintaining pressure on Iran as it

seeks to develop a nuclear weapons capability. The results of American activities, together with others in the international community, the IAEA this past week took the first of what we hope will be a number of steps, to curb the possible development by Iran of a nuclear weapons capability.

All of this represents an opportunity, because it tells the people of Israel that in the United States you have a steady, strong and determined ally, and in President Bush you have a leader who has shown the determination not only to work on the aspects of conflict between Israel and Palestinians, but also on other aspects of conflict in this region, including nuclear weapons and terrorism. If nothing else demonstrated that, then the President's personal involvement in the summit meetings in Sharm al Sheikh and Akaba should have proved it quite demonstrably. The president elicited strong and forward-looking statements from Palestinian and Israeli leaders that allowed us to jumpstart the Road Map process. This led to the immediate dispatch to this region of a senior State Department official, John Wolf, whose job it will be to monitor the performance and the performance of commitments of



the parties, as they implement the Road Map. On his heels came Secretary of State Colin Powell, who was here last weekend, and in the days and weeks ahead there will be many other senior-level American officials, including later this week Assistant Secretary of state William Burns, and perhaps others.

The reality, however, is that the Road Map is going to be hard to implement. For not withstanding the commitment and the determination of the United States, and not even withstanding the commitment and determination of the parties themselves, this is not an easy process through which both parties need to travel.

On the first hand, Palestinian institutions and Palestinian leadership are self-admittedly weak. There are two many security organizations within the Palestinian Authority, and not all of them are under the central authority of Prime Minister Mahmud Abas. In addition, Yasser Arafat continues to try to exercise leadership, creating tensions within leadership ranks in what is being

called a 'bifocal leadership', in which Palestinian officials do not know from whom to take instructions and from whom to take orders. In addition, despite the reports of efforts by Hamas, Islamic Jihad and other terrorist organizations, who profess to being interested in a ceasefire, they continue to carry out acts of terrorism, and as you heard from Foreign Minister Shalom, even since the Akaba Summit, 29 Israelis have been killed in acts of terrorism. Israel has begun to fulfill its commitments by releasing some prisoners and by dismantling some unauthorized outposts, but Israel faces strong opponents from within Israeli society, to the continuation of this process. One need only have seen the television pictures of Mitzpe Yitzhar, to understand how difficult it will be to maintain the commitment to carry out Road Map obligations. And while these two sides take on these heavy obligations and face difficulties even from within their own societies, the humanitarian situation among Palestinians continues to deteriorate. Palestinian

living conditions are abysmal, and in addition to all the other challenges that we, the international community must face up to, and that Israel must face up to, is an obligation to improve the way Palestinians live, and to ensure that Palestinian children have access to education, to healthcare and even to basic food stuff.

What I have tried to do in non-diplomatic style, is to explain a little bit the bases of American policy in this region, the four pillars on which American policy rests, and then to delve a little bit more deeply into the opportunities and risks that are presented by the current process of peacemaking. It is called a Road Map, but it is far more than a Road Map, for it may be for both sides a way out of fifty or a hundred years of conflict, and a way towards a solution in which two neighbors with differing societies and with differing approaches to the world can nonetheless live together side by side, in peace and security.



**Mr. Meridor (Moderator):**

We are in an era of change and that is what this conference tries to discuss, but if you speak about the Israeli political arena, I think a major change has happened in the recent twenty or thirty years. They say in all the newspapers that Israel moved rightwards. It is true if you speak of parties. The parties that are called right-winged are stronger. But think of this: about fifteen years ago there were elections in Israel, there was one small party called the communist party Rakah, who had a slogan. The slogan was: Two States for Two Peoples. They were the only ones.

Now there are very few who do not agree with his on the Israeli political map, including the Prime Minister of Israel, Mr. Sharon, who is not known to be the most dovish of all Israeli politicians ever. Does this mean that we moved rightwards, leftwards? Does this mean we have learned something from the changing reality? I think we have. And I believe that it will be interesting to hear from Professor Saeb Arikat whether a parallel concurrent change has taken place in the Palestinian society at the same time.



**Professor Sa'eb Arikat:**

Thank you very much for this kind invitation. I am honored to be among you this afternoon. Thanks to the Netanya Academic College for this kind invitation. And indeed, things have changed. I had never thought I would stand in Netanya and behind me a Palestinian flag along with the Israeli flag and other flags. Today, we are living in a different Middle East actually and when it comes to President George W. Bush, I do not know how to think of him, whether as the President of the United States of America or as the President of the Arab Republic of Iraq; and I believe the changes that we are going through are beyond our comprehension as normal politicians.

We are standing up to see such an opportunity as if gathering just to make points and score points and point fingers and decide who is right and who is wrong. As long as we continue to see Palestinians and Israelis, we are both wrong. I do not want to use this occasion to get back with finger pointing which I am very good at because last night I kissed my son and invested him towards the future. He is flying with his Israeli kids now, colleagues to a "Seeds of Peace Camp". I have heard some of the lecturers speak about our children and about our

education and about our culture. We are just as much as you are, normal people with fears, with emotions. We are easily scared and we worry a lot, we worry a lot about our children. I do not want my child to become a suicide bomber. I want him to be a doctor or a teacher or a painter or a physician and that is the honest truth. What do you think your sons are doing to him in Jericho and Hebron and Ramallah and Nablus? Are they giving him the opportunity and the hope to think that he will be a doctor or a physician or a painter?

I did not wake up one morning and feel my conscience was aching and that I wanted to recognize the State of Israel. And you know what? Ladies and Gentlemen, neither did you. We both realized that our conflict could not be played in accordance with a zero-sum game, the two losers that we have been for the last fifty years or two winners through a meaningful peace process that would allow me to live and let you live?

You are the occupiers and I listen to the statements being given here about the differentiations between negotiations and dictations. First of all, it is not up to the Palestinians anymore to choose their leaders



or to elect their leaders. We like this and we do not like that, as if the Palestinians now have to go through the story of Cromwell and the king. Ladies and Gentlemen, we have no Cromwell and no king. We have an elected Palestinian leader that is President Arafat, who appointed a Prime Minister, Abu Mazzen and this is a leadership that is trying to achieve implementation of its obligations emanating from the Road Map. Do not overload our wagon any further. We have so many complexities. We have an overloaded wagon in transition that we are going through as Palestinians whom did not realize that people here understood the extent of the difficulties we are facing, not as far as our relations with Israel. Amongst ourselves we are going through soul searching about our future.

Many things are changing on our side, leave us alone, let us determine who will rule us, who will be elected and we want everyone to help us go through the process of elections as soon as possible. That is what most Palestinians want. We want to establish a full-fledged democracy, not a democracy that will go to the polls every four years or six years, but democracy as a way of life. Today 99% of the Palestinian people,

your neighbors just next door, have reached the level of literacy rate, as high as you have. We do not like the current situation as much as you don't like it. Do understand that when I send Ali to school and I worry with my wife about him whether he is coming back or not, I am sure that many of you have the same feeling towards your children. We are alike and the solution is in our hands. I do not expect any American to be more caring about Ali or about Dan's sons or grandchild that is due next October, more than he does. That is the truth.

What is stopping us from reaching the historic deal? I did not speak after Camp David, I did not speak after Camp David with my colleague Gilead Sher, I did not speak after Taba or Bowling or any of these sessions, but historically speaking and mark my words, Mr. Barak, President Clinton and Mr. Arafat should have been congratulated on how far they had brought Palestinians and Israelis towards reaching a permanent status agreement. Eighty percent of the way was made by leaders turning the stones that have never been turned. And in the few months, since they decided to negotiate seriously after the failure of the Syrian track in April and I believe that was April 2000 till

January 2001, ten months. These ten months changed the course of the future of the Middle East. In these ten months the seeds of the future were planted. I do not believe in leaders who will tell you that we scrubbed everything that was on the table. No, we had a Palestinian leadership, headed by President Arafat that has recognized the State of Israel's right to exist on 78% of historic Palestine. That is the June 4th 1967 border. This recognition stands. The majority of the Palestinian people stand with this recognition and we want to establish a Palestinian State on the June 4th '67 lines, next to the State of Israel.

Regarding security, we achieved a lot, and I believe the concept of state with limited arms and the concept of third-party observers on the Palestinian State borders was reviewed and accepted. We reached agreements on the territorial aspects of swaps of land in size and value and on the issue of refugees and on all other issues. Petty politics compels the leaders to start scoring points, demonizing the other side and instead of preserving the achievement that was achieved that was of historic significance and telling Palestinians and Israelis that "yes, we were there, we were



in life after peace and it is doable on all issues: refugees, borders, settlements and yes, a Palestinian State will be established next to the State of Israel." I am not bringing out a different book or a different text. These are the realities of the negotiations. We have drafted certain chapters of the Permanent Status Treaties, three chapters I think. I agreed with Gilad Sher that we should take till April 30th 2001 to conclude all chapters of the Permanent Status Treaty between Israel and the state of Palestine.

Last year, President Clinton came to Tel-Aviv. I admire this man very much and he asked to see me. I went to him and I said to him, "Mr. President, why did you say that President Arafat and the Palestinians rejected your parameters? I was with Arafat and with you on January 2nd in the White House and he told you, Mr. President, I accept your parameters with the following clarifications," and that is the same answer given by the Israelis. He said, "I was told if I do not say this, there will not be a peace camp in Israel." That is my problem, if it is my word against the word of anybody in Israel. In congress or in the senate, I do not stand a chance. So the solution is in hand, not for the steps of tomorrow or the day

after tomorrow, I am talking about a genuine comprehensive solution that is in hand for the permanent status treaty between Palestinians and Israelis, it is doable. We know it is doable.

Regarding the solution of the Road Map, I believe the Road Map constitutes a good opportunity for Palestinians and Israelis, not because it was the reinvention of the wheel. It smartly compiled all obligations by both sides. And yes, we accepted the Road Map without reservations. We believe that the reservations introduced by the Israelis to the Americans, as far as we are concerned, as far as we were told by the Americans and the Europeans and the Russians and the UN, are null and void. We have only one text that has a first phase of fifteen Palestinian obligations versus twelve Israeli obligations.

Why have we not seen the introduction of the timeline, the mechanisms of limitation and the monitors to implement the Road Map, the first phase? Each one of the articles, whether it is a Palestinian obligation or whether it is an Israeli obligation were drafted and designed to be implemented, decision oriented obligations rather than negotiations-

oriented obligations. Palestinians must declare a total cessation of violence against Israelis anywhere, period. That does not need to be further negotiated. At the same hour, at the same minute, Israelis must declare a total cessation of violence against Palestinians anywhere. That is the obligation, it is not a gesture from Sharon's government, it is an obligation. At the same time Palestinians must produce a total package on reforms in the domains: financial, legal and so on. Israelis must declare a total cessation of settlement activities including natural growth. And they must reopen the closure office in east Jerusalem and they must lift the closures and the sieges and begin the gradual withdrawal to the positions held prior to September 28th 2000. These are verbatim obligations on us and you and we have to honor them. Honoring it requires the presence of a third party, and I say third party here, not because I want the Americans to negotiate on our behalf or to make the concessions required on our behalf. I say a third party because I know unfortunately today the trust level between Palestinians and Israelis is below zero. There is so much hate, so much anger, so much mistrust, so much lack of confidence and this is the problem of



Palestinians and Israelis. The angrier we get at each other, the more Israelis and Palestinians that will die. This is the truth.

The more we take it upon ourselves to take the moral grounds, the courage and the far-sightedness and reach out to each other and say that we are determined to reconcile and we are determined to achieve a permanent status treaty on all issues relating to reaching an end of conflict which is doable and we can do it. I know that the process is difficult and I know it is easy to score points and I know that is easy for leaders on your side and my side to start expressing fear as they speak to the lower levels of us and you and we are just as vulnerable as you are. We are scared stiff and we worry a lot. But I do not know of any other way to save lives of Israelis and Palestinians than a resumption of a meaningful peace process. I will say to the Americans: do not hesitate any more. We have heard of the coming of Mr. Powell, the coming of Mr. Burns, Mr. Wolf, and all the statements, the seriousness of the President. We appreciate this. Palestinians and Israelis do not want to use their ears

anymore. They do not want to listen to anybody. They want to use their eyes to see things implemented on the ground because that is the key to reviving hope in their minds and that is the truth whether on your side or my side.

In the region, so far as we take it that President Bush is the President of the Arab Republic of Iraq, and we have heard a lot about democracy and human rights and accountability; as an Arab and as a Muslim, I am sick and tired of the treatment we get from the western world. I am sick and tired of Saddam Hussein being a good dictator, fighting Iran for seven years, and then bad dictator in accordance with the same western standards when he goes into Kuwait. I am sick and tired of those politicians in the United States and other countries who stand up and speak about democracy and human rights and accountability and transparency. Yes, I agree one hundred percent that democracy needs to be introduced to the Arab world in order to maintain a meaningful peace in the future. Gentlemen, your allies in the Middle East are not the brothers of Montesque or the cousins of Voltaire—

wake up! Arabs demand democracy and of all the peoples of the Middle East, Palestinians are the most ready for full-fledged democracy.

We planned our elections for last January 20th of this year. We were unable to deliver these elections. Where I come from, leaders get legitimacy by two ways, either by going to the ballots and voting their leaders in or by getting machine guns and moving in to acquire legitimacy through arms. Let us have leaders who are elected. Let us facilitate the way for Palestinian elections. This is the key to stability and the key to peace. Let the people decide and let us choose our leaders as we wish to choose them through democratic means because at the end of the day you must respect my democratic choice as much as I respect your democratic choice. Today, we stand a good chance with the Road Map and I hope the Road Map will not be pushed in the direction of the archive to join the Tenet plan, the Mitchell report and other plans because someone forgot to put a benchmark, a timeline, mechanisms of limitations with monitors on the ground.



**Adv. Gilad Sher, Former Bureau Chief, Prime Minister's Office:**

**Mr. Meridor (Moderator):**

Professor Sa'eb Arekat is always vibrant, alive, never tired to say the things he believes in. Sometimes we agree, sometimes we do not.

Another participant at this conference and who was at Camp David three years ago too is sitting on this stage, Gilad Sher. Mr. Sher was the former head of the Prime Minister Bureau in Israel and policy coordinator and is one of the most prominent Israeli negotiators since the days of Yitzhak Rabin and negotiated in the days of Ehud Barak too. We want to hear what Gilad has to say about the Road Map. What happens if we can not get an agreement on the Road Map? Should we stay on the course we are on, waiting for something to happen? Should we take unilateral actions? What lies behind the Road Map, where does it take us all?

I see in the audience several people who know full well that I consider the artificial separation between a permanent agreement and a political agreement to be both mistaken and misleading. I would rather have each of my friends explain how he envisages an overall settlement and all its components because, as the saying goes, the goat usually hides in a neighbor's tent.

The U.S. Road Map adopted two important principles: one, an end to violence and terror and two, an end to the settlements; and, at the end of the road, meaningful negotiations that will lead to an unarmed Palestinian State, with sovereignty retained by a secure Israel. The bottom line is that the occupation and all its aspects will cease. Presumably, the principles that will guide the negotiations and detail the political agreement once it is genuinely resumed, will largely be based on the solutions that were the subject of the negotiations held 1999-2000 and, some say, until 2001. These principles constitute a fair, balanced and acceptable compromise between the respective interests of the two sides.

The appropriate legal basis for a renewal of negotiations happens

to be the Sharm al-Sheikh Memorandum of September 1999. This memorandum, and the required adjustments resulting partly from the Road Map and certainly from the last two and a half years that have elapsed, constitute a framework for political discussions between us and the Palestinians, and determine how the existing agreements are to be realized. Incidentally, neither side has cancelled even a single one of the Oslo accords, not the interim agreement, nor the other agreements – neither we nor the Palestinians have done so. But the Sharm al-Sheikh Memorandum, as does the Road Map albeit somewhat differently, defines the objective and the manner of attaining a lasting agreement. The point of departure for the negotiations, once they resume, is a combination of President Clinton's ideas of December 2000 and of the last draft agreement discussed in direct negotiations between the sides. In the wake of hundreds, perhaps thousands of negotiating hours, it is these two documents combined: President Clinton's ideas and the draft submitted at the direct negotiations between the sides, that constitute the semi-official, stable and objective basis to ensure Israel's long-term interests vis-à-vis the Palestinians, without discriminating



against the other side or against its legitimate aspirations and interests.

It would therefore not be out of place on this occasion to ascertain how the permanent state of affairs will appear, at least according to how I perceive it. First and foremost, it will bring an end to the historic conflict between Israel and the Palestinians. It will lead to a re-partitioning of the Mandatory Land of Israel between a sovereign Palestinian State and the State of Israel, based on the borders of 4 June 1967, with agreed modifications, including most of the Israeli settlers in Judea and Samaria and the main settlement blocs to be annexed to the State of Israel, for which compensation will be made. There will be no recognition in any manner or form of the Palestinian refugees' right of return to the State of Israel. The Palestinian refugees will be resettled in their countries of residence or in the Palestinian State once it is established, and in other countries prepared to take them in. The Jerusalem region will serve as two capitals; Jewish Jerusalem and the Palestinian Al Quds -- the two divided by a clearly defined sovereignty line. A special, possibly international, regime will be instated in the holy sites and in the Old City and its surroundings to ensure

freedom of access and worship for all religions. Security arrangements will be based on Palestine being a demilitarized state and on long-term international guarantees ensuring Israel's regional stability and security in this context. A process of education towards peaceful co-existence between the two peoples will also begin.

And now, let us return to the present before we dwell on the Road Map. A fundamentalist culture of death has pervaded Palestinian society and is no longer contingent on one or the other political achievement in the domain of bilateral relations. The acts perpetrated by some two hundred and sixty suicide bombers in the last decade, most of them in the last two years, committing suicide with the purpose of murdering Israelis has become a mass phenomenon, and the roots of Palestinian terror do not lie in the occupation. They go deeper than the occupation, they have become entwined with international Islamic terror. The terror of HAMAS, of the Islamic Jihad, the Al-Aqsa Martyrs' Brigades and of other groups has consolidated and organized under the aegis of the Palestine Authority, and this at a time when hopes of Palestinian independence and independent

Palestinian rule were at an all-time high. Even had it wanted to, with all its heart, Abu Mazen's present government is obviously incapable of exterminating terror. For the time being, therefore, it is up to Israel to strike at the terrorists, to hit their political, economic, ideological and educational infrastructure everywhere, at all times, and with all the means in its possession.

And yet, every operational success we obtain only serves to expand the vicious circle of hatred, making chances of an agreement even more remote and sowing the seeds of revenge in our neighbors' hearts. I believe that a wall to wall consensus exists on the Palestinian war of terror in Palestine – in Israel, at least – and a deeper understanding prevails between us and the United States on the need to frustrate the terror, on who should do it, in what way, and how much is required before we can say that we have passed this test. No consensus exists on the settlements, and under these circumstances a lasting agreement seems more distant than ever and, given the tragic reality in which we live, the road to that goal is long. On the other hand, as a man who has lived in this country for quite a few years, I believe that

– in the absence of an agreement -- a separation initiated by Israel to what will be a political security border and as an emergency plan vital to our existence. This recognition still has not managed to sufficiently penetrate the consciousness of the Israeli public.

So here we are, with the Road Map which, with all due respect, I consider a rather frail political document that represents the lowest possible common denominator needed to attain a minimal agreement between the sides. And again, with all due respect to Israel's 14 reservations, which I have here before me, I feel that these reservations are lukewarm and feeble and more in the nature of a commentary than practical and factual reservations. Speaking as an Israeli, I do not see how they can mitigate the flaws in this plan. This map is devoid of effective enforcement and control mechanisms. Past experience has taught us, from 1993 onwards, that when it came to the implementation and operative stage of the agreements, both sides failed. I am not saying that this side or the other side is more to blame. The timetables laid down in this Map are not realistic. It does not have a clear vision of a lasting agreement of the type I spoke of a few minutes

ago. It has no accurate definitions of the sides' obligations, and thereby opens up the way to endless crises and breakdowns, conflicts and controversies and so on. However, the Road Map is the only political tool we have today and which both sides presumably will have in the near future, capable of holding out any form of hope, of a possible return to sanity and normalcy after two and a half years of bloodshed, exhaustion and futility.

The only chance that the American or any other plan can succeed lies in increasing the involvement of a third party in its implementation. No one can lead such a supervision force with the consent of Israel and the Palestinians (and here I differ with Prof. Arekat as to the role of the Americans), other than the United States. An international, stabilizing force, headed by the United States, which will shoulder responsibility for the Palestinian territories, will enable us to pull out of there in relative safety, certainly to move out the population centers and possibly also from additional territories, even in the absence of an agreement – and such an agreement will take time. A further option now under consideration in certain serious and comprehensive world centers is to put in place, for

an intermediate or transition period, an international trusteeship over the Palestinian territories; and, in this context, to step up the international civilian and military presence in regions to be evacuated by Israel in accordance with the Road Map. A number of initiatives on this issue are being explored and need to be considered.

Where the settlements are concerned, to the best of my knowledge not a single reservation of those submitted by Israel regarding the Road Map pertains to the settlements. What does the U.S. text of the Road Map say? With your permission, I will begin by quoting the source in English:

“The government of Israel immediately dismantles settlement outposts erected since March 2001 and consistent with the Mitchell report; the government of Israel freezes all settlement activity, including natural growth of settlement.”

At the second phase, the transition phase, a Palestinian State is to be established with provisional borders. And again I quote from the Road Map in this respect:

“To enhance maximum territorial

continuity, including further action on the settlements.”

Where exactly and along which provisional borders will the Palestinian State be established? How many settlements will need to be evacuated? Why is an independent Palestinian State one of the decidedly permanent issues incidentally, along with Jerusalem and the refugees and the security arrangements, being established before the remaining controversies have been resolved, before the other permanent issues have been dealt with? I do not have the answer; the Road Map is silent and open to comment.

People under the illusion that most of the settlements will ultimately, at the end of the process, remain in place – are wrong, and they are misleading others. Tens of billions of dollars have so far been invested in the settlements and today, still, we see the turning of a blind eye and hear reassurances that everything will be all right, that time will do its bit. Yet usually, when time does its bit, it ends up working against us. Israel needs to move out of most of the Palestinian territories in a planned, initiated, considered and graduated manner. As I see it that is the only way we can be assured of a Jewish,

democratic, Zionist and moral State with increased national security and the chance to grow.

If someone were to ask me what are the elements of an Israeli political initiative that fits in with the Road Map but does not necessarily depend on it, I would suggest the following: Stabilizing the security situation, of course, and silencing the violence in accordance with the first phase of the Road Map, albeit, as noted earlier, with a far stronger force to supervise, observe and control than originally planned. I would say all this in the assumption that – in the first phase – we will succeed in surmounting the difficulties -- and we all know about the difficulties of implementing the first phase of the Road Map, which needs a genuine cooling-down period – something we have not quite managed to attain. Of course, there must be an effort to renew the dialogue with responsible Palestinian elements in Palestinian society, who are peace-loving and possess the will to reach, and to realize, a lasting agreement. We are speaking of chances and risks, and I believe that the chances of what I am proposing here are high, and the risks are low.

As regards the territorial issue, we

are speaking of a Palestinian State with provisional borders (PSPB) – not a provisional state; and there is a big difference between the two. Do not delude yourselves that reference is to a provisional state. This is a state with all the characteristics of a sovereign country. Therefore, territorially speaking, we need to effect an initiated, but agreed separation. We will move out of Gaza; we can consider Gaza as part of the overall initiated separation process. We will continue to aspire to implementing this under an agreement, and transfer not just responsibility for security, the most-discussed issue in recent days, but also political responsibility. We will prepare for an initiated separation from the Palestinians in Judea and Samaria. We will delineate a provisional border, accept the obstacle and the fence, and plan what I term the permanent settlements to house those that need to be dismantled, either inside Israel's original 1967 borders or in areas to be annexed to Israel; settlement blocs, only when all efforts to reach agreement through direct negotiations have failed; but we need to prepare this alternative in all its aspects. If anyone wants numbers, according to this course a unilateral evacuation will comprise 62 settlements housing some 28



thousand persons in Gaza, Judea and Samaria combined.

The provisional border is not merely a border, but a political, security and demographic line; with or without the Road Map, a political Israeli initiative, with the door wide open to genuine and frank negotiations with the Palestinians concerning a lasting agreement, without terror, could – within a number of years -- bring us to a totally different reality – a better, more secure, political and security reality, that will protect our long-term interests. This would constitute a resolute move, one that will release us from ruling over another people. We are in effect speaking of two states for two peoples, whether both peoples and not merely their leadership are ready

for it, or whether only one people is ready for a solution.

**Mr. Meridor (Moderator):**

Gilad Sher stressed again the need that was expressed very clearly by the Israeli Prime Ministers of today and of yesterday to aim for a situation of two states for two peoples because the alternative is one state for two peoples. There is no third alternative and in my view, people sometimes make the mistake of thinking this is the result of the security situation. Let me submit that is totally irrelevant. Suppose that tomorrow there is not one shot, no terror, no grenades, and no bombs and our partners the Palestinians say, “All right, you do not shoot, let us be one country,

let us vote.” Do we accept this? I suppose we do not.

I want to invite Professor Sari Nuseyibah, a man who had the courage to say things that were not always well received in his own community and did it with the risk of meeting an opposition, but to the relief of saying what he really thinks.

I can tell you a small, interesting story. Some months ago I had dinner at the residence of the American ambassador and we spoke for hours coming close to an agreement on those issues and one of the ladies there said, “if we leave you two alone, you’ll have an agreement in no time.” So I commented to that, “When two irrelevant people agree, there is no agreement.”



### **Professor Nuseybah:**

I would like to address some of the issues that have been talked about and perhaps say a few things further. I would like to say, first of all, concerning the negotiations between the Israelis and the Palestinians and the need or the necessity or the call for a third party, in this case the United States. However supportive I am of the involvement of third parties and thankful for the involvement specifically of the United States, I personally think, that in this particular conflict between Israelis and Palestinians, the only sure way to arrive at a settlement, a settlement that is lasting, a settlement that is genuine, a settlement that comes from the heart and therefore carries with it the commitment and the understanding which a settlement needs to have, in my opinion the only way to arrive at this, is to arrive at it directly between the Israeli people and the Palestinian people and no third parties. You are perhaps surprised, since, on the Israeli side, you feel that there is a need, as we heard just now, perhaps even for the presence of international officers or international observers to come and supervise a gradual separation between the two sides. On the Palestinian side you often hear, as we also heard just this afternoon, a demand, a call

for the intervention, for the presence of, the need and the necessity for a third party.

I personally believe, and this my first principle which I would like to convey to you, that a real settlement can only be arrived at if people on the Israeli side and on the Palestinian side sit face to face and get to the root of the problem, emotionally, intellectually, technically to try and come up with a solution. If they sit down and try to do that, with the concerns each side has, I believe they can succeed and third parties can join in order to endorse such an agreement and facilitate afterwards its evolution and success.

The second principle, which I believe is necessary, is the following: it is in fact to “take the bull by the horns” on both sides. In other words, Israel, on its part, has to look squarely in the face at what it takes to arrive at a settlement with the Palestinians. It has to be clear to the Israeli public what Israel has to give up. No ambiguities, no politicization, no attempt at trying to make things look better than they are and on the Palestinian side equally, the Palestinians have to “take the bull by the horns” and look squarely in the face exactly at what it takes

to reach an agreement with Israel. And this, Ladies and Gentlemen, in my opinion needs to be done before and prior to engaging in negotiations about how to bring about a final solution.

What I am saying is that the Road Map that we have heard about earlier stands little chance of success, unless it is connected clearly, unambiguously to a destination that has been agreed upon already by the two sides. The Road Map needs a destination map, without a destination, the Road Map will not necessarily lead us anywhere. My second principle is that the two sides have to somehow or another agree upon a destination defining where we want to reach once we start on this journey along the road to a settlement. We have often in the past, in Oslo and other attempts at negotiations, started a step in negotiations, but then faltered and the negotiations failed. They failed once and again and again, and in my opinion they will continue to fail until the two sides face squarely at what it takes to make a settlement and to make it clear and to agree upon it as a definition of a destination.

The third principle or point I would like to make is that until now in the



negotiations, in the peace process, the leaders were in one place on opposite sides and the people were in the other. You heard earlier what Sa'eb Arikat was telling us about the negotiations, for example. Perhaps this is the first time you hear what he has to say in evaluating the negotiations that took place. It was also the first time that I, a Palestinian citizen, heard what went on in those negotiations. The gap or the gulf between the negotiators, on the one hand, and the people of both sides, on the other, in my opinion, this is a gap that must be bridged in order for us to arrive at a conclusion of the peace process. The negotiations are not and should not be looked upon as an exercise in cleverness or technical know-how by one side or the other. The negotiations should be looked upon as an existential struggle by the leaderships of the two sides for the salvation of the peoples on both sides. The people on both sides have, therefore, an important, essential stake in making the negotiations succeed and therefore in any negotiations that are forthcoming, my observation is that the people must be involved in too. The negotiations must be as transparent as possible for making sure that these negotiations succeed.

The points of contention between the two sides are points having to do, as we heard, with the settlements, with Jerusalem, with borders and with refugees. Very clearly a destination map outlining exactly what needs to be done on those issues in advance of any negotiations must be made clear and be endorsed by the people on both sides for the negotiations to succeed. Jerusalem must be shared by the two peoples. It must be a capital for the two states. The basis of the borders between the two states must be the '67 borders. The Palestinian State must not have any settlers, any swaps in territory must be made on the basis of equality and the right of return of the Palestinian refugees must clearly be stated in advance as being a right to be exercised only within the confines of the Palestinian state.

Some of the principals or points I made are hard pills to swallow. Some are hard pills to swallow on the Israeli side and some are hard to swallow on the Palestinian side. But if we wish, the Israelis and the Palestinians, to save ourselves from what might become of us, I think these are pills we both have to swallow in order to arrive at an end to the conflict. Looked at from Mars or from somewhere up in space

at this very small region, between the river and the sea one can only see a system of apartheid: two peoples, Jews and Arabs, living on top of each other. The situation is not getting better, it is getting worse day the day. In my opinion, any attempt at negotiations including the Road Map that will not deal with the issue, that will not address the real issue, that will not take us exactly to the destination we much reach, will only help to reinforce the two-dimensional situation that the Jews and the Palestinians are living in between the river and the sea. If you travel around in the West Bank today, between the Palestinians cities, you will immediately discover the impact of what I am talking about, the impact of there being two realities crated one on top of the other.

Some Israelis before me have stated very clearly and I personally endorse this perception of theirs, that if things were to continue along this road, if we do not manage to deal with the root of the problems then what we will end up having in four or five years, is a situation of apartheid that can only be solved, if at all, not by a two state solution but by a single state solution in which each individual has an equal right in the same political

system. This is a conclusion that neither Zionism created Israel for nor the Palestinian National Liberation movement is struggling to achieve. This is a solution that will be contrary both to the Israeli, Jewish National Movement as well as to the Palestinian National Movement. This is a conclusion we are being pushed, driven into. This is a conclusion which we will find ourselves facing in a way which we cannot rid ourselves of if we are not brave enough and courageous enough to stand up and provide the

people with a real solution.

I say enough of going around in circles, enough of pretending to be clever with each other in negotiations, enough of trying to take what is not yours by right, to take it either de facto or take it by force. Enough of all of this, I say let us come back to our senses, come to make real peace. I think real peace between normal Israelis and Palestinians is possible and since it is possible I believe it is the duty, your duty and our duty to make it actual. Thank you very much.

**Mr. Meridor (Moderator):**

Professor Nuseybah touched upon the issue of Jerusalem, on the issue of borders and most importantly on the issue of refugees. He said these things here, let me add in a humoristic way, not when Sa'eb Arikat was present because Sa'eb would have risen and said, "Who gave you the authority to give up the right of return?"

The issue of refugees has always been a core issue. There were people in this region that became Israel in



**Professor Ginat:**

'48; they left or were deported, ran away or were expelled from this land, some of whom have since been kept in camps in Arab countries. The issue of the '48 refugees has been left unresolved. I would have thought that the idea of dividing the land is a must because of demography and numbers and this should apply as well to the return. That is to say, we say all the land is ours, but we should give up part of it because of reality. They say all the land is theirs, but they shall give up some of it because of reality. Jews who will want to return the land of Israel will have to return to that part of the land that it is going to be the State of Israel. Arabs who will want to return will have to return only to the part that is going to be Palestine. The idea of cross-border return which is still a demand made clearly by the Palestinian Authority is a non-starter which is why I think the words that we have heard from Professor Nuseybah are of great importance and come from great courage.

Speaking of refugees, I invite now, Professor Yossi Ginat, who has been advisor to Israeli Prime Ministers on Arab affairs, a man who knows a lot on the Arab-Israeli conflict and specifically on the issue of refugees.

When speaking of peace it is difficult to isolate one specific variable. One needs to take a number of links that form one chain. The central links pertain to the refugees, to Jerusalem, to the territories and to the settlements of course. There are other links that are no less important, but they are not central. I consider the refugee issue the hardest, and Jerusalem the easiest. All the other complex issues also have solutions, some more difficult than others. But before speaking of them, there is one central factor: the need to acknowledge each other's culture.

We are not familiar with the Arab culture, and the Arabs are not familiar with our culture. Both sides need to learn more about this. But perhaps we do not even want to familiarize ourselves with each other's culture. From my knowledge of the Arabs, I would say that they need to learn and realize that the temple was on the Temple Mount, not, as Arafat has stated, on Mount Grizim. There was a temple there, but it was a Samaritan temple. As for us, it behooves us, as a country in the Middle East, to study the culture of others in this region. When we engage in business transactions or negotiations with the Japanese or the Chinese, we know that physical contact is out of the

question. When we observe Arabs meeting one another we see them exchange kisses, once, twice, even three or four times. There is a kiss on the forehead, which has significance in the Arab world.

In the short time at my disposal I cannot go into additional examples of all the forms of, pardon me for the expression, blunders, that have been made. Let me just mention two: in 1966, one year prior to the Six-day War, Maj. Gen. Meir Amit, then head of the Mossad, was invited by an Egyptian general to visit Egypt, then ruled by Nasser. But Golda Meir said that this was a trap. As dictated by Arab culture, Meir Amit would obviously have been welcomed handsomely and would have returned safely, although the entire visit would have been made in total secrecy. When the late President Sadat came here, the late Motta Gur, who was the IDF chief of staff at the time, told Begin: "This is a trap". I met with Gur on numerous subsequent occasions and Gur invariably reproached himself and said: "How could I have thought such a thing?" It is all a matter of culture. When Taba was handed over to the Egyptians following the negotiations of the Arbitration Committee, I remember suggesting



to Shimon Peres earlier, in the middle of the negotiations, that he tells Shamir, who was Prime Minister at the time, to end the negotiations and hand over Taba, because the maps showed that it belongs to Egypt. "Let us hand Taba over to Mubarak on a silver platter" I said.

According to maps dated 1906, Taba is situated within an extension of the Egyptian border. I told Peres that President Mubarak, as an Arab leader, would have felt obliged to repay us for our gesture and that he would have said, 'The land is ours, but the hotel shall be yours'. Itshak Shamir who was Prime Minister at the time, did not agree to the proposal. Three years later I was in Egypt and checked this point out and found out that I was right.

I would like to add a few words on an issue that has been raised here: the 'Hudna'. I feel that neither the Prime Minister nor the Foreign Minister, who was here earlier, nor the handful of generals and pundits even understand the concept of what is meant by 'Hudna'. It means a cease-fire, but in Arab culture this is a special cease-fire; a truce made between Arabs. It happened eight times during the Middle Ages and, as we know, all the dates of the beginnings and ends of this

'Hudnas' are documented. Moving closer to our time, in 1847 there were three 'Hudnas' between Abd al-Kadr in Algeria and the French, Muslims and Christians, and they were strictly adhered to. In 1860 an agreement leading to peace was signed in Morocco between the Spaniards and the Moroccans. Our cease-fire agreements in 1949 were all called 'Hudnas' in the Arab press, in Egypt, Jordan, Syria and Lebanon.

Regarding a possible 'Hudna' here, now, why not give it a try? If we could somehow stop the bloodshed for a year and perhaps see to it in that year that the Palestinians study from unbiased schoolbooks, perhaps some investments will have been made during that year both in Israel and in the P.A., and tourists would come here. It could lead to good things. Why do we always look for traps? If we believe that HAMAS has become stronger do we not have a navy? We do not have to sleep with both eyes shut. One eye should always be open, looking towards the sea and the shore. We need to keep one on the border with Rafah in order to prevent the digging of tunnels. That would be a 'Hudna'; that would be an armistice, a truce, but, according to the newspapers, the Head of the Israeli Security

Service has already said that an armistice based on religion would last longer than an armistice based on civilian matters, on an ordinary basis. What do we have to lose by doing this? Nothing. We only stand to gain from it.

As for the refugee issue, firstly, let me say that I am a Palestinian refugee in Israel. I was born on the moshav of Atarot. At Ben Gurion's orders, we left Atarot on the middle of the night of May 14th, 1948, walked to Neve-Ya'akov with only the clothes on our backs, and from there to Jerusalem. Israel did not make us into refugees, it absorbed us. I mention this because the matter of the refugees has been learned mainly from documents and discussion. But in 1967, when your humble servant took off his reservist's uniforms as did everyone after the war, the first thing I did was to travel to all the refugee camps in the Gaza Strip and on the West Bank – not just once, but on many occasions. I did that for years. In 1982 I went to several camps; most of them were in Lebanon. I was not there as frequently as I visited the camps in the West Bank and the Gaza strip. When the peace treaty with Jordan was signed, before I visited the sites in Jarash and Petra, I first went to all the refugee camps there.



This is a phenomenon which we need to study properly, and not by means of political slogans. I spoke with hundreds of refugees in every camp. There is a third generation of them, born in the camps, a third generation that was married in the camps. These people did not marry refugees from their original village; they married girls from other refugee camps or from villages close by. Anyone who has studied Arab culture knows that they do not wish to cut themselves off from the family that lives close by. The families want to make ties and remain near their married daughters.

The Palestinian refugees have one dream and we cannot take that dream away from them. We held a conference on the subject and published a book – titled “Old Problem – New Solutions”, which was written by 25 researchers, 10 Arabs, 10 Israelis and 5 Americans, who came up with different suggestions. I would like to give you some examples: An Egyptian scholar, the Vice President of Bethlehem University, Hassian, speaks of the right of return. Where to? In effect, to the Palestinian State. Don Peretz and Manuel Max speak of

restitution. Donna Art, an outstanding scholar, notes that Israel has made its calculations in this respect but she arrived at a figure of 70,000 refugees, no more, whom Israel needs to absorb and the remainder need to rehabilitate themselves. Laura Drake, an American researcher has studied the refugee camps in Lebanon, and we know that those camps are Lebanon’s main problem. She contends that the refugees in Lebanon can be permanently resettled in Iraq. I do not agree with her, but that is her opinion. An Egyptian scholar has said that the problem needs to be resolved on a regional basis, not localized; if we make peace, it needs to be resolved on a regional basis. And, he notes, in that case, there are vast and fertile stretches of land in Sudan; with the help of Israeli and Egyptian instructors – Egypt is reclaiming from 4% to 20 % of its land – training and international funding, these lands could be settled. I do not agree with that suggestion either.

What, then, should be done to resolve the issue? A resolution needs to take the form of which I have spoken. A third generation has been

born in the camps and married in the camps. Wherever we take them – to Sudan, Iraq or anywhere else – we are uprooting them. We are making them into refugees for the second time. The first time was a terrible tragedy, and I do not have the time to discuss who fled the country and who was exiled; it is not relevant. The only solution today, without flying any political banners, is to turn the camps into flourishing towns and villages of the 21st century. They deserve it. With schools, kindergartens, computers, infirmaries, playgrounds, but also with industrial plants, making them an economic attraction, with an economic basis enabling their existence. I can also say that one half of the refugees are in Gaza and in the West Bank. If industrial concerns were brought into Lebanon, which is opposing taking in the refugees, and I have checked this out with Lebanese, Syrian and Iraqi friends, the Lebanese would change their mind and waive the claim that the refugees cannot settle in Lebanon. The refugees need to be accorded dual citizenship, of the country where they settle, and of the Palestinian State. That would be an appropriate solution.



**Dr. Moshe Amirav**

**Mr. Dan Meridor (moderator)**

I thank Professor Ginat for his expose and the solution that he has offered on the sore issue of the refugees.

Last of all will be Dr. Moshe Amirav. Although Moshe was born in Netanya, Jerusalem is his home. As Agnon wrote, "his cradle" was in Netanya but he was born in Jerusalem. He has spent a lot of time and many years of his life in Jerusalem. He was a member of the municipality of Jerusalem: he was in charge of planning and roads under Teddy Kollek in Jerusalem. He is an academic, studying the issue of Jerusalem, lecturing on the issue of Jerusalem and, for the last fifteen or sixteen years he has initiated and taken part in hundreds of meetings between Israelis and Palestinians.

I will try to be interesting from the aspect that I should perhaps tell you something you do not know about Jerusalem. Five years ago, following the municipal elections in Jerusalem, in an academic book that summed up these elections, I analyzed the campaign conducted in Jerusalem among minority and majority groups. Finally, I took the liberty of doing what academics do not usually do: make predictions. I wrote that the next mayor would be ultra-Orthodox. In response, I came under sharp criticism, not just in the academic but everywhere in Jerusalem: how is this possible, they asked. The ultra-Orthodox do not even want the mayorship of Jerusalem; they refuse the office. The ultra-Orthodox constitute only 30% of Jerusalem's population, they said, how can they have a mayor?

I can tell you (and I am taking a risk) that the next mayor of Jerusalem will be an Arab. Minority groups vote in large numbers while other groups abstain from voting altogether, as has happened in the last elections, therefore they can obtain a majority in the city council and can of course, appoint a mayor. Jerusalem's Arabs today constitute 33% of the city's population and number 228,000. Their (the population)

number increases by 3.5% annually, compared to our annual growth rate as Jerusalemites of 1.5%. In 25 years' time they will constitute an absolute majority. In 5 years, should they so desire, if they plan and organize this as the ultra-Orthodox are doing, they will be able to head the municipality.

But in fact, the story of Jerusalem is not all that complicated. Those familiar with it also know that the solution exists. I agree with Professor Ginat that the solution, where Jerusalem is concerned, is as simple as can be. How do I know? Gilad Sher will tell you that a solution for Jerusalem was found in Camp David. That is to say, it was a 90% solution; it contained certain elements that could not be wound up there, a few marginal elements that could have been concluded in another three or four meetings. In effect, at Camp David, with the agreement of both the Israeli and Palestinian delegations, Jerusalem was divided in a way that can be simply described as follows: the Arab quarters would be Palestinian and the Israeli quarters would constitute the Hebrew Jerusalem. That would be a good arrangement, because Jerusalem does not have any mixed quarters. They are either Jewish or Arab.



When we speak of Jerusalem, time is also a factor. I refer to Israel's policy, and I say this with regret, I mean regret as a Jerusalemite, as a Zionist, and even as a former paratrooper who fought in Jerusalem and stood at the Western Wall and thought to himself: lo and behold, Jerusalem has become one. And now, some years later, I say that not only has Jerusalem not become one – it is crumbling more and more as time goes on. I say that with sadness but I am also stating a fact. We see Jerusalem as split and divided when we compare it with other great cities. Scholars perceive Jerusalem as the most divided city in the world. This is a failure on Israel's part, an Israeli failure indicating a restriction, a limitation that needs to be resolved. Because there can be no solution and no Road Map without Jerusalem. What did the Road Map state with regard to Jerusalem? Very little. They are taking us back to the 1967 borders, which means a division of the city; we are familiar with that division.

The central problem at Camp David, and Gilad Sher has also mentioned this in his book, is the Temple Mount. A small place inside another small place, called the Old City, just one square kilometer, inside a city of 120 square kilometers for which they

found solutions. They divided the city but they did not reach a solution for that one kilometer. Within it is the place called Haram al-Sharif, known to us as the Temple Mount. They failed to find a solution for that place. They found no solution because of Arafat's stubbornness, because he wanted sovereignty over the Mount – he was not content with sovereignty at the top of the Mount while the Israelis retain the lower part, as was suggested by President Clinton. He wanted the whole mountain.

In a book on the Palestinians in Jerusalem, I noted that Arafat's scale of priorities on the conflict places the Temple Mount at the top of this scale, as the most important priority of all, given his Salah –a -Din-like vision of this holy site. Because, if he does not possess this holy site in its entirety, what has he got? What is Palestine without the Haram al-Sharif? Therefore, when we reach an agreement in due course, we will first of all need to find a solution for the Temple Mount; the remainder can be resolved more or less based on some form of division. Arik Sharon knows that.

Now, just one last word about the Temple Mount: those who study and read the history and the attitude

taken by the Zionist movement regarding the Temple Mount will perhaps be surprised, because the Temple Mount was never a supreme priority to the Zionist movement. On the contrary: beginning with Theodore Herzl – who was prepared to hand it over to whoever offered the lowest price; you can read about it in "Altneuland" – moving on to Ussishkin, and from there to the whole Zionist old guard up to Ben Gurion, they did not desire the Temple Mount. Not because they did not want it, but because they realized the problematic links to the Zionist priorities. The problem in that respect was to decide what was important and what was not. When the Zionist movement decided that the temple Mount was not important, it remained consistent on this point and waived the Temple Mount.

I would take this even further and say: Menahem Begin agreed to forgo the Temple Mount and he was not the only one. At Camp David, Begin was prepared to consider various ideas. President Carter asked him once: "Mr. Prime Minister, would you be prepared for the Vaticanization of the Temple Mount?" And Begin said: "Yes, we are prepared to consider this" as well as other ideas, all of which would entail losing sovereignty

over the Temple Mount, because Mr. Begin was a jurist, a man of jurisprudence. He knew that when we speak of Vaticanization, we are not referring to Italian sovereignty in the Vatican.

Many other members of the Zionist movement, with one exception, were ready to concede the Temple Mount in return for other things. These are facts and it is difficult to argue with facts. You find them in the ancient scriptures. The name of the one man who did not want to give up sovereignty over the Temple Mount, is Ehud Barak. In the Camp David talks, he insisted on obtaining sovereignty, at least over the lower part, and then agreeing to some sort of compromise. This did not meet with Arafat's consent. It was that issue – not only that but mainly that issue, that caused the tension in the

Israeli delegation. It was the reason why, to a considerable extent, various researchers, Gilad Sher included, have declared the Temple Mount to be what I would call the focal factor in our failure.

What could resolve the issue of the Temple Mount? The solution can only be one of partnership. The Palestinians will not accept any solution giving them less than full sovereignty over the Temple Mount. But it is equally inconceivable for Israel to agree to such a full sovereignty. To those among you who are well versed with the fine points of international law, I simply say that Israel does not have sovereignty over the Temple Mount. We think we do, not only in practice but also where the law is concerned but setting aside the juridical aspect, I say that the solution must be one invoking

partnership. A number of ideas were raised prior to Camp David and prior to Taba, about the division that would entail a partnership. I still maintain that it is the only way to resolve the Temple Mount problem. And, as I said earlier, time is not on our side where Jerusalem is concerned. The sooner we decide the better.

**Mr. Dan Meridor (moderator)**

Thank you very much, Moshe Amirav on your expose including the new things you said, some of them were indeed new. I must say in a somber mood that whether Moshe is right about an Arab mayor of Jerusalem or a "Haredi" mayor of Jerusalem, one thing is clear to him, a Zionist will not be the mayor of Jerusalem, Zion will not have a Zionist mayor, which is something quite troubling, I have to say.

# The Third Party Role in the Palestinian Peace Process Personal Reflections



**Gen. (ret.)  
Mansour Abu-Rashid**

Peace in the Middle East is not only possible but inevitable.

The guiding principles for peace in the Middle East are the implementation of United Nations Security Council Resolutions 242, 338 and 1397, and the Arab Peace Initiative (the "Saudi Initiative") adopted by the Arab League Summit in Beirut in March 2002, especially the principals of exchange of full Israeli withdrawal from the occupied Arab territories of 1967 for a full peace, normal relations and security arrangement not only between Israel and the adjacent states but with the Arab World. Comprehensive peace should lead to the transformation of the Middle East into a region free of all kinds of weapons of mass destruction and their delivery systems.

These aims can be realized only if violence gives way to dialogue which will then give birth to a two-state solution, Israel and the Independent State of Palestine, living side by side in peace and security.

Peace in the Middle East is inevitable. So much has been achieved in peace making between Arab and Israelis since the first Egyptian-Israeli Disengagement in January 1974. But there is a deep concern about the stalemate in the Israeli-Syrian,

Israeli-Lebanese tracks, about possible deadlocks in the Israeli-Palestinian negotiations, and about the eruption of violence that has led to the loss of Arab and Israeli lives.

Comprehensive peace must be the true goal of all political efforts from within and outside the region. Renewed efforts must be made to reach a peaceful settlement between Israel and Syria and Israel and Lebanon based on the land-for-peace formula and on UN resolution 242, 338 and 425. This settlement must include maximum benefits for the parties as well as normal relations between them.

The attainment of peace between the Israeli and the Palestinian peoples will resolve the core problem of the Arab- Israeli conflict. Concerned governments should act vigorously and speed up the full implementation of the Israeli- Palestinian agreement in letter and spirit, faithfully and honestly, and particularly to restore full normality to and improvement of lives of the Palestinians.

Nothing, however, could be developed on other tracks unless something happens on the Palestinian track. Only foreign factors can change the equation in favor of a more equitable

balance of power. The third party can play a vital role to guarantee each side's concerns over the Road Map. International community, the Quartet, and especially the United States should devote their utmost energies and resources to resolving the Palestinian- Israeli conflict.

One should emphasize the importance of having an active International role in solving the Arab- Israeli conflict.

The Road Map would clearly specify endgame, time frames for successive implementation stages, terms of reference and monitoring mechanisms.

Not underestimating the effort and role of other parties such as UN, EU, Russia and others, it is a conventional wisdom for many in the Arab world, and possibly elsewhere that only U.S. as superpower could boast the Roadmap if interested.

However, after its occupation of Iraq, the U.S. has to maintain the civil life in Iraq to make it model and convince the Arabic street about genuineness in its efforts in the region.

It cannot be in America's interest to see instability and growing

radicalism in a country or countries that border Israel.

Perhaps even more critical to the long-term interests of the U.S. and Jordan is the American re-engagement in the peace process. President George W. Bush should emulate his father's commitment to exercise U.S. diplomatic muscle and bring the parties together. After years of backsliding, it will take the U.S. leadership greater efforts to convince both the Israelis and the Palestinians that peace is, once again, an American priority.

There is still a long way to go before the true vision of peace will become reality, that the hope for the attainment of comprehensive peace leading to regional cooperation and a better life for all peoples of the Middle East may yet be shattered and that the peace process could yet be derailed with the shadow of war still engulfing the Middle East. Justice and equality are preconditions for peace.

On the other hand the Road Map would have a much better chance of success if founded on a concentrated effort to create and a model peace culture in the region.

A peace culture that would promote peaceful coexistence,

mutual respect, dignity and security among peoples of a region that is free of all kinds of violence, and to pursue avenues for harmony and reconciliation that match the global transformation in the post-cold war era.

The Palestinians and Israelis and their neighbors must each shoulder responsibilities if meaningful progress is to be made on ending decades of violence.

What is most needed right now is that all the international, civil organizations that are not directly involved in the conflict, will take a neutral position and stop the condemnations and instead, use their strength to put pressure on both sides in order to implement the different stages of the Road Map – the sooner the better.

There is a need to commit the concerned parties to implementing the Road Map to the Middle East.

The acceptance of the Road Map by Israel may be seen as a breakthrough in the sense that Israel accepted, for the first time, the creation of an independent Palestinian state.

The mere approval of the Road Map by the concerned parties is

not enough to achieve the Plan's goals and should be coupled with a strong commitment on the part of the Quartet to seeing it carried out. Accordingly, a set of criteria for implementing the initial stages of the Road Map should be adopted and this should include introducing fundamental changes to the daily lives of the Palestinian people and an immediate halt to Israeli settlement activity in the occupied territories.

Hopefully the concerned parties declared approval of the peace blueprint that would constitute a new correct start and that would re-launch the peace process on a solid basis that would culminate in ending Israel's occupation of Arab lands and the establishment of a Palestinian state by mid-2005.

Peace must come in tandem with an overall reorganization and restructuring of individual countries and of the region as a whole. Radical and courageous reforms must be implemented by each government at the political, economics, social and educational level. It will not be a Middle East of peace unless it is a new Middle East.

A Middle East in which economic potential are harnessed for the

prosperity of its inhabitants, and steps should be taken to achieve these goals.

**Mr. Dan Meridor (moderator)**

We have concluded the list of people who presented their views and their expertise to us, so Danny Yatom is invited to sum up this conference, please.

**Gen. (ret.) MK Danny Yatom**

This conference is nearing its end. We have touched upon a great many aspects of the Israel-Palestine, Israel-Arab conflict, but we have also dwelt on additional issues hinged upon globalization. Many question marks still remain. However, having taken part in all the rounds of negotiations between Israel and the Palestinians and the Syrians, and despite the many disappointments, I am convinced that a way will ultimately be found to resolve this bloody conflict between us and the Arab world.

We have heard from President Gorbachev, President De Klerk and President Aburrahman Wahid, that we need to seek a courageous leadership on both sides that is ready to undertake calculated risks, to understand the basic needs of the other side, in order to bridge the gaps. If this was feasible in Indonesia and in South Africa, and possible in the former Soviet Union, albeit under different circumstances and in other respects – then, in my opinion, it is also possible in the Middle East. What, after all, is it not that which we seek? One man to lead the Palestinians to peace. That is all that is needed. One man to lead us

to peace, and that these two men be able to speak to one another, that they be capable of maintaining a dialogue and understanding one another.

An opportunity was missed at Camp David. Our situation could have been altogether different now. But we must on no account, in no way, agree to the present situation in which good and innocent people lose their lives in matter of seconds, because of a conflict between two societies. And we must on no account give way to despair, or harbor the belief that no way exists to resolve the conflict. That is a luxury we cannot afford; the situation is far too important.

I would mention two further points: We will need to realize, to understand, that we cannot continue to rule another people. Today we rule over three and a half million Palestinians, and that number will grow to seven million within 12 years. The Palestinians, for their part, must come to realize that there is a Jewish people, that there is a Jewish state, the State of Israel, and that it is eternal. And that it will always remain Jewish, Zionist and democratic, as is stated in our Charter of Independence. (Two out of the three components appear in the Charter.)

In conclusion, I would like to thank everyone for their hard work, in front of and behind the scenes. Without the kind contribution of the world leaders who have honored us with their presence and their words; without the work put in by the Netanya College team, headed by David Altman and Professor Arad; without the enormous effort invested by the management of the Strategic Dialogue Center headed by Moshe Amirav – we would not have achieved this moment. Thank you, everyone.

And while it may take time, I firmly believe that peace will come

