

Civil

Monitoring-Project

Conflict Resolution ·
Violence and War prevention



Dossier III

The Israel- Palestine-Conflict

Imprint

Editor

Kooperation für den Frieden
Römerstraße 88 · 53111 Bonn
phone +49/2 28 / 69 29 04 · fax +49/2 28 / 69 29 06
info@koop-frieden.de
www.koop-frieden.de
with collaboration of Förderverein Frieden e.V.
English version is sponsored by zivik (Berlin)

Donation account: Förderverein Frieden e.V.
Account number 33 0 35
Sparkasse KölnBonn, bank code 370 500 98
IBAN DE20 3705 0198 000 0330 35
BIC COLSEDE33XXX
Reference: Monitoring-Projekt

Monitoring Project: Civil Conflict Resolution
Violence and War prevention.

Dossier III: The Israel-Palestine Conflict

Graphics & art work: www.kipconcept.de
all photos: www.version-foto.de

1. edition December 2007 (German)
English version April 2009

Text and V.i.S.d.P.:

Andreas Buro, Clemens Ronnefeldt
c/o Kooperation für den Frieden
Translation: Liz Crossley (p.4-27),
Ingmar Kreisl & Julia Wisniewski (p.28-39)

Co-operators of the Kooperation für den Frieden

Aachener Friedenspreis e.V.; Aktionsgemeinschaft Dienst für den Frieden (AGDF); Aktionsgemeinschaft Friedenswoche Minden; Arbeitsstelle Frieden und Abrüstung e.V. (asfrab); Bildungs- und Begegnungsstätte für gewaltfreie Aktion KURVE Wustrow; Braunschweiger Bündnis für den Frieden; Bremer Aktion für Kinder (BAKI); Bund demokratischer WissenschaftlerInnen (BdWi); Bund für Soziale Verteidigung (BSV); Bundesverband Bürgerinitiativen Umweltschutz (BBU); Christen für gerechte Wirtschaftsordnung (CGW); Deutsche Friedensgesellschaft – Vereinigte KriegsdienstgegnerInnen (DFG-VK); EUCommUnity; Evangelische Arbeitsgemeinschaft zur Betreuung von Kriegsdienstverweigerern (EAK); Evangelisch-methodistische Kirche in Deutschland – Friedensausschüsse; Forum Ziviler Friedensdienst (forumZFD); Frauen in Schwarz Hamburg; Frauen in Schwarz, Köln; Frauennetzwerk für Frieden e.V.; Friedensforum Münster; Friedensgruppe Altenholz; Friedensinitiative Nottuln e.V.; Friedensrat Müllheim; Gewerkschaft Erziehung und Wissenschaft (GEW), Hauptvorstand; IFIAS; Internationale JuristInnen gegen ABC-Waffen (IALANA); Infostelle für Friedensarbeit, Meckenheim; IPPNW, Deutsche Sektion der internationalen Ärzte zur Verhütung des Atomkrieges / Ärzte in sozialer Verantwortung; Internationale Frauenliga für Frieden und Freiheit; Internationaler Versöhnungsbund – deutscher Zweig; Komitee für Grundrechte und Demokratie; Koordinierungsausschuss der Friedensbewegung in der Region Ingolstadt; Lebenshaus Schwäbische Alb - Gemeinschaft für soziale Gerechtigkeit, Frieden und Ökologie e.V.; Leserinitiative Publik e.V.; Menschen für den Frieden, Anti-Kriegsbündnis Düsseldorf; Mönchengladbacher Friedensforum; NaturwissenschaftlerInnen-Initiative „Verantwortung für Frieden und Zukunftsfähigkeit“; Netzwerk Friedenskooperative; Netzwerk Friedenssteuer; Ökumenisches Friedensnetz Düsseldorf/er Christinnen und Christen; Ökumenisches Zentrum für Umwelt-, Friedens- und Eine-Welt-Arbeit, Berlin; Pädagoginnen und Pädagogen für den Frieden (PPF); pax christi – Deutsche Sektion; Rhöner Friedenswerkstatt im UNESCO Biosphärenreservat, Künzell; Sichelschmiede, Werkstatt für Friedensarbeit in der Kyritz-Ruppiner Heide; Ver.di-Jugend; Werkstatt für Gewaltfreie Aktion, Baden; Würselener Initiative für den Frieden (update: September 2008)

Kooperation für den Frieden

- Co-operation for Peace -

(www.koop-frieden.de)

is a group of active peace-political organizations and initiatives in the Federal Republic of Germany.

Co-operation for Peace

- Organises discussions and advisory processes in the peace movement
- Furthers the exchange of information and assessment between organisations and groups
- Supports or initiates events and campaigns
- Publishes the positions which come out of these processes
- Spreads suggestions for action for peace work
- Makes personal contact possible between activists, for example by work on the co-operations board or at annual conferences.



Editorial

We are happy to present the third Dossier of the Monitoring-Line. Firstly, a citizen's information outlines the idea of the monitoring project: Alongside an analysis of the situation, further possibilities of civilian handling of acute international crisis and conflicts are being presented and "reminded" (Monitum = admonition)

The first dossier addresses the Iran conflict, the second the Turkish-Kurdish conflict, and in the third, new ideas about civil conflict management in Israel and Palestine are being formulated. These proposals can be seen as a benchmark for analysing the policies of governments and civil society organisations.

All Monitoring booklets have a remarkable process of formation, as a preliminary draft has been put up for discussion and many committed people have made contributions which have been incorporated, if possible. This dossier has been written by both authors from their own perspectives and has also undergone this participative process. The 'complex work of integration', meaning dealing with extensive suggestions for modification and if applicable their integration has become a special feature of quality.

Given the complex set of problems of the Middle East conflict, which is closely linked to the German history and present, the dossier "The Israeli-Palestinian Conflict" can naturally not represent the special points of view of all members of "Cooperation for Peace".

However, it can be an important contribution for a constructive discussion beyond despair, resignation, helplessness or one-sided solidarity.

*For the "speakers circle"
Susanne Grabenhorst*

The Israel-Palestine Conflict

The Israel-Palestine conflict is of great importance for peace in the Greater Middle East

All the violence which has been exercised in the Israel-Palestine conflict in this region, has so far brought no peaceful solutions and certainly no reconciliation, but rather calamity, displacement, death, fear and enmity. The conflict influences the Greater Middle East, the Arab and Muslim societies and its effects reach far into international politics as practised by the world powers. After 40 years of occupation of the remaining Palestinian areas, it is clear that a violent solution is no peaceful perspective. Whether the resolutions of the Greater Middle East conference in Annapolis will bring the peace process closer to a two state solution, seems doubtful at the present moment.

That is why every effort must be exerted in the direction of a civil solution to the conflict. To avoid any misunderstanding, we emphasise that we regard methods of non-violent resistance as legitimate, but not violent courses of action. That is why, within the framework of “Civil Conflict Solution, Violence and the Prevention of War” we formulate within this dossier, the requirements for those involved in the conflict and the international community, which, if fulfilled, could bring a peaceful solution to the conflict nearer. The sum of these requirements forms the outline of a politics of civil conflict solution, which can be held by those, in whatever relation, who stand up for peace and security for Israel as well as Palestine. We hope to be able to give a guideline for the varied endeavours in this conflict, which is independent of the prevailing, quickly varying positions and constellations of those involved in the conflict, because we are dealing with basic ways of behaving. Our starting point is 1967, the year in which Israel, in the Six Day War, occupied the Palestinian areas (West Bank, Gaza and East Jerusalem) and which it has continued to occupy despite resolutions of the United Nations. Our criterion is that of international law and human rights, which should apply for all parties in the conflict.

We feel encouraged in this difficult task by the “Berlin Statement of Jewish Citizens, Shalom 5767”. Which says:

“For decades the Israeli and Palestinian people have lived as neighbours. There are many possibilities for cooperation and mutual development. Instead of which, their lives are poisoned by war and violence, by threats and terror, by mutual hate, contempt and lack of respect.

The root of all-evil is the continued Israeli occupation of the Palestinian areas, which started in 1967. This cripples their economic, political and social life. In addition, this injustice, which is ex-

perienced on a daily basis, prevents a peaceful balancing out of this injustice, which was perpetrated on the Palestinians with the 1948 expulsion. All this drives the spiral of violence on. It is time to break this spiral and prepare the way for a lasting peace, which

- ▶ *makes a life of self-determination possible for the Palestinian people*
- ▶ *ensures both nations of an existence within internationally accepted borders*
- ▶ *makes the whole region peaceful and in so doing, makes the world a more peaceful and secure place.*

In both, the Israeli and the Palestinian societies, there have long been voices of accommodation.” (www.schalom5767.de)

We want to strengthen these voices, groups and energies, also in the international area. We hope to give an impetus for a process of re-thinking, which leads to further elaboration and implementation of strategies of civil conflict solution.

The dossier starts with theses characterising the present situation and an overview of the fears, hopes and legitimate interests of those concerned and proceeds to the “suggestions”. A very short breakdown of the historical background is to be found in appendix 1. Appendix 2 lists the addresses of peace organisations in the Greater Middle East. In Appendix 3 a list of organisations in Germany, which support the peace movement in the Greater Middle East is to be found, with short descriptions of their fields of activity. Although the literature relating to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict can hardly be assessed, with its very controversial presentations and interpretations, we have given a list of contemporary literature, which, according to our view, gives some orientation in the present conflict. This is appendix 4.

We would like to thank all those who have been part of the process of creating this dossier.

Andreas Buro and Clemens Ronnefeldt

Elements of the present conflict

At the end of 2007 the following elements characterise the situation in Israel-Palestine:

1. The „Road Map for Peace“, which was agreed upon in 2003, did not lead to a peaceful solution. In spite of protests from many quarters, Israel built a wall, in some cases a fence to mark the border to West Jordan, which is mostly on Palestinian territory and in some cases cuts deeply into it.
2. The attempts of the Israeli government to annex parts of the Palestinian areas through its systematic settlement policy, as well as the abasing conditions for Palestinians lead again and again to an escalation of violence from both sides. In this way, radical elements on both sides are mobilised.
3. The elections in Palestine in 2006 led to a defeat for Fatah and a parliamentary majority for Hamas. However, Israel, the USA and the EU did not accept the result of the election. Their demands for Israel's right to existence, without defined borders and the acceptance of the treaties previously made with them, as well as the basic abstinence from violent action, were not accepted by Hamas, especially as the USA and the EU did not demand that Israel resist from using violence, keep to existing treaties or recognise a Palestinian state.
4. The Lebanon War in summer 2006 showed, in a drastic and deadly way how great the violent potential in this conflict was. Regardless of its military supremacy and being able to do a great deal of damage in Lebanon, Israel could not overcome Hezbollah there. The war showed once again how much the Israeli-Palestinian conflict is embedded in the regional conflict, in which Iran, Syria and Iraq and other neighbouring states play an important role.
5. The Arabian states, under the leadership of Saudi Arabia renewed their offer of 2002, to recognise Israel within the borders of 1967, if it would stop the occupation. It is still not clear whether Israel is willing to accept this offer.
6. The “West” one-sidedly supports President Abbas of Fatah financially and with weapons and this is probably seen by Hamas as a preparation for an inner Palestinian civil war.
7. In March 2007, Saudi-Arabia brokered an agreement between Hamas and Fatah, which was to lead to a reform of the PLO, so that Hamas would be able to join, making a united government possible.
8. The latter soon broke down, as the West maintained its sanctions.
9. President Abbas dismissed the Hamas led unity government and appointed an emergency government.
10. Following this, in June 2007 Hamas took power by force in the Gaza Strip, from which Israel had withdrawn its settlers and military. In so doing a de facto division of the Palestinian territories took place.
11. The Palestinians are further than ever from speaking with one voice.
12. In 2007 Israel declared the Gaza Strip to be “enemy territory”. The Gaza Strip, which is a piece of land of 10 km by



40 km and 1,5 million people, is totally dependent on Israel. Restriction on supplies for the population and attacks by the Israeli military lead to destabilisation and rocket attacks on Israeli civilians. In this way enmity is strengthened. An EU action plan for the development of the economy only applies to West Jordan. The strategy and potential influence of the latest special negotiator named by the Greater Middle East Quartet, the former British Prime Minister Tony Blair, is apparently to deal with such issues.

13. Considering the fighting between the parties in Israel, one can scarcely expect government decisions with a wide reach. Prime Minister Olmert let the Israeli opposition know that there would be no ultimate solution “in the next 20 to 30 years” (TAZ, 25.9.2007)
14. Should the US government and possibly Israel attack Iran, the chances of a peace-

ful solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict would sink even further.

15. A possible withdrawal of the UN from the Greater Middle East Quartet is being considered, as this body has had no success in dealing with offences against international law and human rights.
16. In November 2007 the USA set up a Greater Middle East conference in Annapolis. Most of the Arab states, as well as Syria took part. At this conference, Israelis and Palestinians agreed to take up peace negotiations again in December 2007. This was to lead to a peace agreement on the two state solution by the end of 2008. There were no guidelines as regards content on the central conflict themes. Bearing in mind the many historical peace deadlines, which have not been kept, as well as the weak Israeli government, the ending of the period in power for the president of the USA and the lack of unity

among Palestinians, there is not much to be hoped for from these agreements. There is speculation that the US administration is much more interested in uniting the Sunni Arabs against the Shiites, especially against Teheran.

17. In Israel and in Palestine, but also in many countries outside these areas, there are voices and many attempts at a politics of understanding and reconciliation.
18. At least they start from the position that this conflict cannot be solved by military force. In comparison with the ruling political bodies and bearing in mind the decades of enmity and violence towards each other, these powers are not very strong.

These elements of the present conflict situation, which have been listed in short form here, show that a short-term solution is not to be expected.

What are the fears, hopes and legitimate interest of the various parties?

What do those who are directly involved need?

The Israeli population needs secure living conditions, in which they have no need to fear rocket attacks and suicide bombings. Their situation would be alleviated if neighbourly relations between the surrounding states and cooperation in many areas could be established. The reduction of costs for armaments, maintaining occupation forces and building of settlements would make investment in the development of the country possible.

The Palestinians require better living conditions in all respects, to be safe from rocket attacks, targeted killings and arbitrary arrests by the Israeli forces, autonomous and state independence in West Jordan, East Jerusalem and the Gaza Strip, legal security in public life and protection from dispossession.

They want to be able to move freely in their territory, free of controls and prohibitions and be able to travel freely abroad. They need water, which is presently being used by Israeli settlers or which they have been deprived of by the rerouting of the water pipes. It is urgent that others no longer control jobs, places of training, social and medical services and access to import and export.

Both parties wish not to be threatened by violence from the others.

What are the legitimate interests of the states?

For Israel the security of its borders of 1967, the ending of violent attacks on its citizens and territory and the acceptance as a state by Arab and Islamic states, resulting in acceptance of diplomatic relations.

For Palestine it is a legitimate interest to establish its own state within the borders of 1967 and the sovereignty of that state with respect to the Israeli settled areas. It is legitimate to want to be accepted by other states and to be able to enter into diplomatic relations, as well as to become a member of international organisations, like, for example, the United Nations. It is also legitimate to want to organise a free passage between West Jordan and the Gaza Strip, as well as to be able to travel and do international business without the control of Israel. It is also legitimate to attempt to find a suitable solution for the right to return of Palestinian refugees, who are still living in refugee camps.

An international fund is to be established and centrally administered, which would give those who have a right to benefit, various choices for a permanent place to stay and for individual compensation payments, as well as collective assistance.

What is important for the international political environment?

- ▶ a quick ending of the conflict, which has hindered cooperative development in the region for decades and which constantly exacerbates the difference between the Arab and Islamic world on the one hand and the “West” on the other.

- ▶ The securing of the existence of Israel and an independent state for the Palestinians and in so doing, requiring a normalisation of relations to the Arab-Islamic states
- ▶ This is only possible through a peaceful, civil solution, not through the escalation of violence, as the latest Lebanon war once again has shown.
- ▶ That the considerable finances, which flow into the region, are not used for further armament and the destabilisation of the region, but to raise the living standards of the people in those states.

The aims of conflict resolution

It is necessary to break down enmity and build up trust, so that both sides work towards good neighbourly relations, initially in two separate states.

For this a de-escalation of violence is necessary, so that the mutual feelings of being threatened by each other can be overcome. It is also important to break down structural barriers, particularly in respect to the Palestinians whose daily life is so confined by them. This includes the border fence, which is against international law and the building of the wall on Palestinian territory, as well as all checkpoints. In addition to an Israeli-Palestinian dialog, the working through of concepts of the enemy within each society is essential. The aim of civil conflict resolution is also the reformation of the behaviour of the representatives, who with their own interests and ways of behaving seldom manage to get to a solution.

on of the conflict. In fact, they often exacerbate it. This applies to the so-called Greater Middle East Quartet, which consists of the USA, EU, Russia and the UN, as well as Arab representatives and those from Iran.

Bearing in mind the experience till now, it is not sufficient to start an open-solution process. That is why, parallel to trust-building measures, the aim of conflict resolution should be clearly and precisely defined, without either the one side or the other making provisos.

Any disturbing events that take place should not be seen as legitimating giving up the aim.

All those who are interested in constructive advances, should work on those involved in the conflict resolution to the best of their ability and make direct demands regarding their contribution to the process:

The Israeli political bodies and the society

1. May Israel declare itself to be principally in agreement with the establishment of a sovereign Palestinian state on the West Bank, including East Jerusalem and Gaza. The details of the steps leading to the ending of the occupation must be written down in binding agreements, whereby changes in the border on the “green line” would need the agreement of both parties. Israel removes all limitations on the Gaza strip and declares it to be enemy territory no longer.
2. May Israel definitively desist from all settlement and building in the Palestinian areas, as well as all processes of occupati-

on, which are against international law and human rights.

3. As acts of violence are to be expected from groups outside the control of the state institutions in the transition phase, the formation of a permanent paratactic Israeli-Palestinian crisis committee would be helpful. The job of the crisis committee would be to prevent violence and reaction to violence of any kind, so that the process of reconciliation not be disturbed. Israel abstains from all forms of illegal violence in the occupied areas.
4. Israel accepts principally the right of return of all refugees and declares itself willing, within the framework of the agreement to create an international fund, to make possible a contingent for naturalisation and to give this fund reasonable financial support.
5. May Israel reduce its checkpoints in West Jordan to nil and make it possible for Palestinians to move freely throughout the whole traffic system in the occupied areas..
6. May Israel extend the responsibilities of the Palestinian National Authority. All funds held back should be repaid to the Palestinians.
7. Should Israel still feel it necessary to have a wall, this should be built on its own territory, according to the International Court in The Hague, 9.7.2004.
7. In order to get images of Palestinians as the enemy out of people’s heads, an inter-societal, historical process of working through the mutual relationship should be started and publicised in texts, public dialog and seminars with a long-term perspective.

9. Israel shall declare itself to be willing to return to negotiations on the Saudi Arabian proposal of 2002, which was renewed in 2006. This proposal sees it as a basic principal that if Israel allows the formation of a Palestinian state in Gaza, the West Bank and East Jerusalem, within the borders of 1967, then the state of Israel would be recognised by the Arab states.
10. Political prisoners shall be released, starting with ministers and members of parliament, the so-called “administrative prisoners”, who can not be accused of any crime, as well as minors and women, so as to express Israel’s willingness to accommodate.
11. Israel shall offer Syria and Lebanon talks on the willingness to negotiate on the Golan Heights, which they have occupied and the Shebaa Farms in the triangle between Lebanon, Syria and Israel.
12. After the clearance of the settlements an Israeli early warning station could remain, the Syrian government could guarantee Israel a certain amount of water from the lake of Nazareth. The controversial East Bank of the lake of Nazareth could become a bi-national Syrian-Israeli nature reserve.
13. It should be demanded of the Israeli government that it officially declares that it will not be the first to use nuclear weapons. In the constitution, wars of aggression should be forbidden. Israel becomes a member of the International Atomic Energy Organisation (IAEO) in Vienna and accepts UN control, which also provides for nuclear disarmament. The aim of these steps is to build confidence within the area.
14. May the Israeli government declare willingness to take part in a “Conference for Security and Co-operation” in the Greater Middle East on an equal basis.

To the Palestinian Political bodies and society

1. A Government of National Unity should be founded for both parts of the Palestinian areas (West Bank and Gaza). This body should see to it that the functions and departments are fairly distributed between Hamas and Fatah. Armed groups should be disbanded and, where possible, should be integrated in normal security organisations. This would prevent attacks on Israeli civilians, which constitute violation of the basic laws of the humanitarian International law.
2. May the government once again declare the goal of its political efforts to be the establishment of a sovereign state in Gaza, West Bank and East Jerusalem. Any changes of the border opposite the “Green Line” would require the agreement of both parties. In so doing the government would at one stroke affirm a two state solution and accept the borders of Israel as those prior to 1967.
3. The Palestinian government and its president should urge the most speedy negotiations on the formation of a Palestinian state, orientated according to the borders of 1967. In this process the questions of the status of East-Jerusalem, the Jewish settlements and the Palestinian refugees should be resolved.
4. The government supports the creation of an international fund for refugees. Those

entitled to benefit should have the following options: Immigration to the Palestinian state, to Israel or third states, within the framework of the quota solutions, as well as the option of staying in the present receiving country.

5. In order to overcome the political split between Hamas and Fatah, may President Abbas and his government call for a new election with the strict proviso that Hamas may also campaign in the West Bank, namely independently of the attitude of the “Greater Middle East Quartet” to the one who wins. In this context, the wish for inner Palestinian confidence building, co-operation and a united government is to be reiterated.
6. May Hamas, in the process of confidence building, lobby for the liberation of the kidnapped Israeli soldier, Gilad Schalit and call upon Hezbollah in the Lebanon to unconditionally release the two Israeli soldiers, Ehud Goldwasser und Eldad Regev, who were kidnapped in 2006. The confidence building that is therewith aspired to, could serve to shift the “ineffective, violent conflict towards de-escalation and move it to a political level of conflict management.
7. Fatah and Hamas should, as a matter of principle, abstain from answering the threat of Israel’s rockets with suicide attacks and should do whatever is necessary to prevent their being carried out. It is necessary that those who tend towards escalation, desist from constant vengeful responses to attacks from the other side and turn towards a form of civil conflict solution. This would also make international support easier.

8. In this sense both organisations declare their willingness to work on a crisis committee with Israel. This should prevent any further violent incidents from leading to renewed violent escalation.
9. The present and the next potential government declare their willingness to take part in a “Conference for Security and Co-operation in the Greater Middle East”.
10. Groups within civil society should start an inner societal dialog on the different politics of Fatah and Hamas. The aim is to gain more understanding of the motives of each and to draw out what they have in common.
11. In this connection it is necessary to clear the conflict between Israel, the Arab states and Palestine, and particularly to analyse critically the potentially violent behaviour of all parties. In the process, dialogs with Israeli groups, should be furthered at a social level

To the US Government

1. The US government should be urged from as many sides as possible, to give up its one-sided preferential treatment of Israel’s occupation politics, as well as its veto politics in this regard in the Security Council, in favour of a quick end to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict on the basis of a two state solution.
2. Not only on the grounds of pacifying the conflict, but also because the long-term security of Israel is linked to it.
3. Every form of acceptance, assistance or support for the constant violations of humanitarian International Law and human

rights, must be refused.

4. Washington must be called upon to accept whatever government is elected by the vote and not to call for any sanctions against it.
5. The US government shall strongly support the peace offer which was made by Prince Abdullah in the name of 22 Arab states in 2002 and renewed in 2006. It shall urge Israel to seize this offer in negotiations.
6. The US government shall advocate a “Conference for Security and Co-Operation in the Greater Middle East”. It shall thereby further a balancing of interests through dialog and the paths of diplomacy in the present, tense situation.
7. The US government is to be called upon to recall its aircraft carriers from the Gulf region as a confidence-building act and to desist from any form of threatening rhetoric.
8. The US government shall lobby for a “Marshall-Plan” in the Greater Middle East and announce its own generous contribution. These funds shall be used for the establishment of infrastructure in the broadest sense of the word, but also support the resettlement of Israeli settlers from West Jordan.
9. The US government declares itself willing, within the framework of an international fund, to take in a quota of Palestinians from the refugee camps and to support the fund.
10. Lebanon, Syria and Jordan will be offered the opportunity of taking part in the “Marshall Plan” if these states are willing to support a two-state solution, as put forward by the Arab League.

11. The US government shall urge the other members of the so-called Greater Middle East Quartet, as well as other states, to take part in the “Marshall Plan” by volunteering their own contributions.
12. The USA is urgently required - this applies to the Republicans as well as the Democrats – to recall the gigantic shipments of armaments it has promised for the Middle and Greater Middle East and also to desist from building up lines of confrontation between Sunni and Shiite powers and states.

Excursus:

What has German government politics to do with the conflict?

The European Union cannot keep out of the Israel-Palestine conflict. The history of Christian-European pogroms against Jewish people, as well as the English (better British?) and French colonial politics are fraught with consequences which obligate us.

In the light of the Shoah, with the “Final solution of the Jewish question” in the Third Reich, Germany particularly, has a heavy responsibility for Israel and in many respects has contributed to the development of a state, in which the Jewish people should feel secure.

But this security stood on shaky legs from the very beginning, as the Palestinian population resisted being made, unasked, into a pawn of international interests. Since then there have been wars and daily battles and innumerable victims on both sides. Israeli security is however only possible through negotiations with its neighbours and through solutions to the disputes, not through military supremacy and determent.

Standing-up for the right to existence of the State of Israel may not and must not be at the expense of the establishment of a viable State of Palestine.

Because of German history, there is a strong tendency to be reserved in criticising Israeli government politics, even if one holds them to be endangering peace. In autumn 2006, in “Manifesto 25”, with the title, “Friendship and Criticism”, which caused much consternation, German peace researchers pleaded for *“the development of a robust friendship, in which criticism of a supportive, not destructive nature had its place.”*

In the Israeli-Palestinian conflict it is important that *“the suffering and the injustice (violent methods of dealing with conflict) on both sides and the needs for security, human dignity and abiding by policies be recognised.”* (Archived under <http://www.uni-kassel.de/fb5/frieden/regionen/Israel/manifest.html>). A consequence of German history should be that we use universal human rights as a guide for civil conflict solution, understanding and co-operation in the Greater Middle East. Because, learn we must, that open, but also structural violence always leads to suppression, hate and in the worst case, mass murder.

Requirements for the EU and Germany

1. The European Union uses the European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP) towards a two state solution. Violations of humanitarian international law and human rights shall receive no acceptance, assistance or support.
2. The carrying out of the ENP action plan with the Palestinian authority shall be started with additional immediate help for the Palestinian people. In the case of giving humanitarian help, the State of Israel shall be expected to bear its responsibilities, as an occupying force, with effective control over the civil population of the West Bank and Gaza Strip. These concern particularly access to the Gaza Strip, as well as freedom of movement within the West Bank, including East Jerusalem.
3. The EU, as part of the so-called Near-East Quartet, lobbies for the concrete aims and steps towards building a Palestinian state within the borders of 1967.
4. The EU states declare themselves prepared, within the framework of the agreements for the creation of an international fund to make possible the naturalisation of Palestinian refugees and according to financial strength, to support the fund.
5. Shipments of arms to the Greater Middle East are to be stopped, so as not to put strain on the negotiations for a “Conference for Security and Co-operation” with new armament. This refers particularly to submarines, which are capable of being converted to nuclear power and Dingo troop carriers from Germany.
6. EU representatives in the Greater Middle East shall inform others about the proce-

dures and experience from the negotiations of the Conference for Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE, later OSCE) and offer services for the preparation of a CSCGME (Conference for Security and Co-operation in the Greater Middle East)

To the Iranian leadership

1. May the Iranian leadership give its support to the two state solution in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict within the borders of 1967.
2. The Iranian government is to be called upon, to declare its basic willingness to take part in a CSCGME without preconditions.
3. As a sign of its willingness to co-operate, may Teheran, in line with its repeatedly declared intention of peaceful use of nuclear energy, grant the International Atomic Energy Organisation all the rights of control to which it is entitled. Observation cameras, which have been dismantled, shall be reinstalled, and unannounced checks according to the additional protocol of the Non-Proliferation Treaty accepted

To the Syrian government

1. May it cease to offer any military support whatever to the violent struggle in the Greater Middle East conflict.
2. May it offer its services in mediating the conflict between Hamas und Fatah.
3. May it offer Israel new negotiations about the return and use of the Syrian areas occupied by Israel.

To all Arab states in the region

1. May they tenaciously continue to cling to its suggestion that Israel be accepted, as soon as it allows a sovereign Palestinian state within the 1967 borders.
2. May they declare their willingness to take part in a CSCGME and take initiative in this spirit.

Courses of action for peace movements, non-government organisations (NGOs) and civil society initiatives

Preliminary remarks: The basis of the work is the right to existence of both peoples within secure borders and a veto on all violent politics, regardless of which side it might come from. In both countries there are sections of the society, which want peace and are willing to work towards reconciliation. The “other Israel” and the “other Palestine” are the most important groups for the civil society’s initiatives to address.

1. The requirements laid out here, for those involved in the conflict (see above) shall be used as thematic material in events and campaigns. In their entirety, they create a concept of the civil conflict resolution. Their most important elements are unilateral peace political steps, confidence

building measures, willingness to dialog, no threat to the other and a fundamental renunciation of violence.

2. Due to the peace negotiations between Israel and Palestine starting in the Annapolis conference, the critical monitors will need to correct, in public, false accusations that the Palestinians were responsible for delays, as was done earlier.
3. The started peace negotiations between Israel and Palestine due to the Annapolis Conference has to be monitored closely, so that – and that has happened before – false accusations that the Palestinians were responsible for delays, can be corrected.
4. At present, all too often, the responsibility and the blame for the conflict are one-sidedly attributed to the Palestinians, as part of the ideological warfare. In view of the violent elements of the Israeli regime of occupation, this is highly problematic. In the Israeli-Palestinian conflict a people under occupation and a state militarily armed to the teeth, face each other. As an occupying force, Israel is required to see to it that the population is protected and secure. Its politics though, is marked by systematic infringements of international law and human rights abuses.
5. The experience of being without protection and rights creates a mobilization potential for violence in sections of Palestinian society. On both sides therefore one can specify elements of violent escalation, which do not spare civilians on the other side.
6. The conscious acceptance of civilian victims, with the aim of terrifying the population, is a mark of terrorist violence. There can be no justification for this unlawful form of political violence – neither from the point of view of security politics, nor from the religious aspect. It is only with a corresponding renouncement of violence on both sides that further victims on both sides can be avoided.
7. In the public presentation of the conflict, the “other Israel” and the “other Palestine” hardly get heard. It is though they, that to a great degree, represent the powers that espouse understanding and peaceful conflict solution. They are the important partners and their statements should therefore be spread widely in our society. This can best happen if the most important opinions of the Israeli and Palestinian peace movement in Germany are made known. This should be achieved by division of labour or be done by various financed peace groups, where information can be viewed, evaluated, translated and spread.
8. After so much suffering has been inflicted on each other, dialog and the overcoming of barriers is often difficult between individuals and groups of “the other Palestine” and the “other Israel”. In this case mediation from without can often be helpful. The “Committee for Basic Rights and Democracy”, within the framework of the action “Holiday from War” does this complicated work with 200 young people a year from Israel and Palestine in dialog seminars. “The International Alliance for Reconciliation” invites veterans from both sides to lecture tours of Europe, supports the Palestinian “Libraries on Wheels” by providing violence-free literature for the occupied areas, as well as the

Israeli committee against the destruction of houses (see appendix 3). Those and many other similar activities should be qualitatively and quantitatively developed and extended.

9. The impoverished Palestinian population, must, on peace political grounds get to feel that success can be achieved by peaceful means and that the world out there has not forgotten them.
10. Civil society groups should therefore make known the support from the humanitarian assistance fund, which works in the Gaza Strip and West Jordan.
11. "Medico International" for example runs such a fund. The "Committee for Basic Rights and Democracy" financed holiday activities for 50 children in 2002.
12. In 2003 there were already 200 children from Bethlehem, Nablus and Jenin. Since then hundreds of children from the refugee camp Dehaisha, from Qalqilia, which is totally surrounded by the wall and the Bedouins from the Negev desert, who are constantly displaced, have experienced a few untroubled weeks. This is an area where there is much varied peace work to do.
13. The peace movement and non-government organisations constantly and publicly urge that the path to a peaceful solution be followed. In this they should increasingly attempt to formulate statements and appeals with related groups from Israel, Palestine and the Islamic and Arab countries.
14. The network of groups from the national and international peace movement, which stand for a civil solution in the region of the Greater Middle East, as well as the formation of partnerships, could be helpful in this way.
15. Peace conferences, with international participation, in Israel and/or Palestine on the basis of the requirements outlined here, could strengthen the peace political opposition in both countries and put the spotlight on the urgency of the civil handling of the conflict.
16. In order to link the peace activities in this conflict, a campaign under the demand for "Security and Justice for Israel and Palestine - Now!" should be created in Germany. Perhaps the already existing "Down with the Wall in Palestine" could build the nucleus, if an agreement on the basis of civil conflict solution is possible.
17. A current issue for such a campaign should be the isolation of the Gaza Strip. The human rights of the Palestinians living there are being severely violated. In addition to Israel, the EU and the USA are responsible for this. Their politics has created hate and is irresponsible from a peace political standpoint.
18. An Israeli-Palestinian campaign on this issue is in process („Break the Siege on Gaza“).
19. A further current issue is the wall and the erection of a border fence, which Israel continues to erect mainly on Palestinian ground and which serves the illegal taking of land by the occupying force. Here they hope to create a fait accompli, which will stand in the path of a peaceful solution.



A civil solution of this conflict would be of importance beyond the region.

If the requirements listed here were to be taken up, the deep mistrust and negative images of each other could be dismantled. By not threatening each other and developing co-operation, the living conditions for those on both sides of the wall could be improved, so that a dynamic which furthers peace can grow.

The neighbouring countries, which are presently wasting a lot of that which they have generated in working on enmity, could gain from this as well. It is very possible that the will to a civil solution of the Israel-Palestine problem could become the impetus for a “Conference for Security and Co-operation in the Middle and Greater Middle East.” Then finally one would speak to each other about the problems in the region, instead of fighting against each other.

Appendix I

Short comments on the historic structures of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict

In the third millennium before Christ, Canaanites migrated to this part and called it Canaan. In the second millennium before Christ the Hebrews, known as the Israelites in the Bible followed. In the time around 1200 before Christ the seafaring Philistines came from the Aegean and gave the land the name, Palestine. The Jews lived there till the destruction of the Jewish state by the Romans, 70 years after Christ and a large wave of Jewish emigration followed. From the year 70 till now, Jews have lived uninterruptedly as a minority in Palestine.

The many and terrible pogroms against the Jews, particularly in Europe, not least those under the sign of Christianity and also under the influence of nationalism in Europe, lead to the development of the Zionistic idea of the formation of a national state in Palestine. Religious and historical myths were drawn upon as the grounds for the establishment of the right of the Jews to a home in Palestine.

The Zionistic project of founding a national state fell in the first half of the 20th century, in a time when the whole region was grappling with the struggle to free themselves from foreign and colonial rule (The Ottoman Empire, Great Britain and France). Independent national states were to be established. The Zionistic plan was seen by the Arab states as an attempt to achieve a new foreign rule and collided with their own national claims.

In the developing conflicts, terrorism against civilians was a common method used by both sides.

David Ben Gurion, who was later the first President of Israel, remarked on this internal discussion: *“Between us, we must look the truth in the face. Politically, namely, we are the aggressors, whereas they are defending themselves (...). The land belongs to them, because they live in it, whereas we come along and settle, and from their perspective, we want to take the land from them, even before we really arrive.”* The uprising *“is active resistance on the part of the Palestinians against that which they see as the usurping of their homeland by the Jews.”*

The Shoah, the destruction on European Jewry in the time of German National Socialism, strengthened international acceptance and support for the Zionist ambitions. Now it was additionally valid to create for European Jews, the perspective of a secure statehood and protection from persecution and extermination. The Zionist movement received enormous political and financial support from Jews all over the world, particularly from the USA.

After 1945 there was a basic shift. The old imperial powers, Great Britain and France lost their dominating influence in the region step by step. As one of their last acts, the victorious powers in the Second World War, the USA and the USSR, forced through the founding of the state of Israel in 1947. The UN

plenary meeting voted for the division of Palestine and the internationalisation of Jerusalem in 1947. 56% of the surface of Palestine should now belong to Israel, Jerusalem (1%) under UNO control should remain "neutral". The Palestinians were not asked whether they agreed to the division. The first of six Israeli-Arab wars started, all of which were won by Israel. In this first war the state proclaimed by Ben Gurion on 14th May 1948, annexed further territory, so that, instead of 56% it now controlled 77% of the territory. In the process Israeli forces put to flight, or alternatively, 750.000 Palestinians fled from their ancestral home regions. Many of the displaced people and their descendants are still living in refugee camps. Very recently a group from the Israeli opposition (Zochrot), has tried to find the destroyed places of the Nakba (Arabic-catastrophe) and to remind people of them.

In the course of history the neighbouring Arab states acted in the role of representatives for the dispersed Palestinians, but their often-questionable support is contradictory because of inner and outer political interests and is often broken.

The forced migration of Jews from all over the world to Israel furthered the heterogeneity and strongly fundamentalist religious tendencies. This group in particular calls for Greater Israel in the whole if the "Holy Land", the expulsion of the Arabs and a forced settlement policy. In contrast, there has always been a liberal minority, as represented by Martin Buber, who saw the home of the Jews in a secular state of Israel and who argued for establishing understanding with the Palestinians. In total six wars have been fought between the State of Israel and the

neighbouring states. In 1948 Egypt, Jordan, Syria, Lebanon and Iraq were the aggressors. In the case of the Suez-Sinai Campaign in 1956 Great Britain, France and Israel were the ones. In 1967 the Israeli army attacked Egypt, Syria and Jordan. In the October war of 1973, Egypt and Syria attacked Israel. The fifth war was carried out by Israel against Lebanon and Syria in 1982.

In May 2000, Israel withdrew its troops from South Lebanon. The sixth war, in 2006, between Israel and Lebanon will be looked at below. All the states involved were at one time or another aggressors and the attacked.

The third Six Day or June war, led, in 1967 to the occupation of West Jordan, East Jerusalem, the Gaza Strip, the Syrian Golan Heights and the Sinai peninsular. In West Jordan, today a part of Jordan, there was virtually no resistance to the Israeli invasion. The Israeli Premier, Menachem Begin: *"In June 1967 we had to choose again. The concentration of Egyptian troops on the Sinai did not prove that Nasser wanted to attack us. We must be honest with ourselves: We decided to attack."* (Speech 8.8.1982, quoted by N. Chomsky: *Open Wound the Greater Middle East*. Israel, the Palestinians and the US politics. Europe publishing house, Hamburg 2002)

Michael Ben Jair, General State Attorney in the government of Rabin recently wrote: *"but the seventh day of the war which broke on 12th June 1967, has continued till today and resulted from our own decision. We have, with enthusiasm, become a colonial society that ignores international agreements, confiscates property, moves settlers from Israel into the occupied territories, practices theft and somehow manages to find excuses for all this."* (Le Monde diplomatique, Dt. Ausgabe 4/2003, P. 13).



In its Resolution 242 in November 1967, the UN called for Israel to withdraw from the occupied areas and declared that all states in the region have the right “to live within secure and acknowledged borders in peace and freedom”. Israel never followed this UN Resolution. Only the Sinai Peninsular was given back to Egypt after a further war in 1973. The occupation since 1967 is the starting point for all the present attempts at finding a solution. It is bound up with a highly aggressive occupation politics, which is illegal according to International Law and incorporates illegitimate expropriation of land by the Israeli settlers and the breaking up of Palestinian areas. The Israeli occupation is characterised by almost unbroken violence. The Palestinian side sees the Israeli occupation as an attempt at colonising their land and sees its struggle as one of decolonisation.

The western and in particular, the US interest in the State of Israel in the East-West conflict and after 1989, in the control of the oil-rich area around the Caspian sea and to the Persian Gulf, resulted in government negotiations by the political class in Israel attaining

a special status with western powers. Thanks to the right to veto of the US, the Israeli leadership does not have to follow UN resolutions. It has been allowed to build up nuclear power and has acquired the most modern B and C weapons. The Israeli army counts as one of the strongest in the world. It was allowed to fight potential military competition and prevent an Arab-Islamic regional power in the Greater Middle East developing.

From the Israeli perspective, integration in western geopolitical interests is a safeguard for the existence of Israel.

It is only in this alliance that the integrity of the state of Israel is assured – face to face with the lager of Arab states, which has at times rejected the existence of the state of Israel. The example set for the integration of Israel in the power politics of the US American geo-strategy, was the Israeli bombing of the power station Osirak, that was being built in Iraq by the French in 1981.

The 1991 war against Iraq is to be seen in addition to the freeing of Kuwait among other things as a preventative against Arab regional power. In this conflict Baghdad tried

to mobilise the Palestinian population against Israel. The occupation of Iraq by the USA and Great Britain in 2003 changed this constellation. Having eliminated Iraq as a potential regional power, the government of the USA and Israel are now threatening Iran with military intervention. This is a further country with a regional claim to power, while anti-Israeli feelings are being activated in Teheran.

The multiple tensions between globalisation, which is being furthered by the „west“, and the Islamic world, which is in no way a harmonious block, find their focus in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

The very obvious injustice against the Palestinian people and the resulting suffering offer an ideal focus for projection of anti-western tendencies in the Islamic world. At the same time the use of suicide attacks and rocket attacks against civilians make it easier for “the west” to de-legitimise this struggle as being terrorist.

In the environment around about, the Israeli-Palestinian conflict is integrated in the conflict between Israel and the Lebanon with the Hezbollah, as well as with Syria and particularly with Iran. It led to an active war in July 2006 with a great deal of destruction in Lebanon and Israel.

Its most obvious cause was that Israel saw the growing military power of Hezbollah in the south of the Lebanon as a threat. It took the kidnapping of an Israeli soldier on the border as the provocation to destroy Hezbollah's military potential as a preventative measure. Perhaps a further motive can be imputed. Israel has always declared that it would not accept Iran as a nuclear power. By attacking Hezbollah this threat was to be given emphasis. Should Hezbollah be further

armed with rockets by Iran, the threat of injury and damage to Israel and therefore a certain degree of deterrence with regard to attacks on Iran would be achieved (cf. M. Massarat: FR, 23. 8. 2006). Thus, Israel wanted to demolish the foundations for this with its attack on the Lebanon. This would lie within the strategy development of the USA for preventative wars (Prompt Global Strike-Strategy). Syria, which supports Hezbollah, as another bone to pick with Israel, and that is and remains that Israel continues to occupy the Syrian Golan Heights.

So it is that “Rings of conflict” exist. The innermost ring is that between Israel and the Palestinians. The second ring has within it Lebanon, Iran and Syria. The third relates to the Arab states, including Iraq, which is occupied by the Americans and the British.

The fourth ring is closely connected. In this one the USA is primarily involved, but also the EU states. The whole creates a highly complex conflict system.

For a long time and to some extent till today, the Arab states have not recognised Israel. This attitude was broken by the negotiations in the 70's between Egypt and Israel on the Sinai.

A laborious process of relearning began. At least it was a clear example that it is possible to reach understanding. Menachem Begin und Anwar al-Sadat were awarded the Nobel prize for this achievement. In June 1974, the Palestinian Liberation Organisation, PLO showed the first signs of being willing to accept a partial-state solution for a future Palestinian state. In September 1982 the heads of the Arab states agreed on a peace plan for the Greater Middle East in Fez. This plan stipulated that the Israeli military should with-

draw from the occupied areas, clear the Jewish settlements and form a Palestinian state. An international guarantee of peace should be given for all states in the region, also for Israel. Israel did not take up this important Arab initiative, which de facto accepted the right of Israel to exist.

The first Intifada: In December 1987, the Palestinians started a mainly civilian rebellion against the Israeli occupation of their land. In so doing they achieved international publicity. On 31st July 1988, Jordan waived its sovereign right to West Jordan, so making it possible for the PLO in Exile to declare a State of Palestine, 15th November 1988. It accepted in so doing the 1948, UN agreed partition of Palestine into an Israeli and a Palestinian part. This "Declaration of Independence" was recognised by the UN General Assembly shortly afterwards. In 1996 the Palestinian National Assembly struck out of its Charta, the phrase that declared the only way to free Palestine to be that of armed struggle. (Blätter für deutsche und internationale Politik 5/2003, S. 577). There have been two potential places where political conflict resolution could have been practiced since the 90's, and in both cases in relationship with the interventional wars against Iraq in 1991 and 2003. In both cases the USA feared that a broad mobilisation against the US troops could come about and that Baghdad would use the military and political suppression of the Palestinian population by the Israeli occupying power to this end.

The Oslo Peace Process

After the Gulf War of 1991, US President, George Bush took the initiative in a solution for the Greater Middle East conflict. In the Arab-Muslim world, the double standards were no longer comprehensible. How could it be that Kuwait be militarily liberated with the legitimisation of a UN resolution after only four months, whereas the Palestinian areas remained occupied by Israel, despite any number of UN resolutions for the ending of occupation since 1967.

The first potential for a political solution, which led to the ending of the first Intifada, began with the Madrid Conference 30th October 1991 and led finally, after secret parallel negotiations to Yitzhak Rabin and Jassir Arafat signing the Declaration of Principles (DOP) (Oslo I) in the presence of Bill Clinton in Washington, 13.9.1993. Subsequently the Israeli government should step-by-step give back territory and political responsibilities to the Palestinian Authority, which was yet to be established.

The central questions of the status of Jerusalem, the future of the settlements, the border and so on, were to be cleared up after a five-year interim period, in "Permanent Agreement Negotiations".

According to the 1995 Interim Agreement on the West Bank and the Gaza Strip (also called Oslo 2), this process should be ended by 1999. In this time the Israeli government systematically continued building settlements in the Palestinian areas. In the interim period, the Palestinian Authority (PA) definitely managed to create the basic struc-

tures of state polity, although its authority was severely limited both geographically and legally. At the end of the interim period, the PA had sole competence for self-government, internal order and security in only 10% of West Jordan and 60% of the Gaza Strip. The massacre carried out by the Jewish physician, Dr. Baruch Goldstein in the packed Ibrahim-Mosque in Hebron in 1994, in which 29 Palestinians were killed, created great difficulties for the Oslo Process. The Israeli government bowed to the threats of the settlers and desisted from clearing the settlement at Hebron, from which Baruch Goldstein came. The massacre of Hebron led to the first suicide attacks of Hamas, after which the government of Rabin refused to comply with a Hamas ultimatum to evacuate four settlements.

After the murder of the Israeli Premier Yitzhak Rabin by an Israeli of the extreme right in November 1995, which showed up the tensions within Israeli society with regard to the peace process, and in the time in which Benjamin Netanyahu was in power, the agreed process stagnated due to Israeli delaying tactics.

This politics could however draw on ambivalences within the Palestinian organisations. Here the Oslo process was also not without controversy. In this time too the Israeli powers continued the building of settlements in the Palestinian areas systematically.

Parallel to this the Israeli Premier Ehud Barak from the Labour Party - successor to Benjamin Netanyahu - negotiated with Syria. The US Greater Middle East representative, Denis Ross commented: *"The Syrians showed themselves to be open to compromise, but Barak is not prepared to move at all."* Only in June 2000 did new negotiations about Pa-

lestine take place at Camp David, where Barak actually refused to meet Arafat. According to the media, Barak was prepared to make huge concessions. This has however been contested by critical observers. Arafat also did not demand the return of three million refugees to Israel, as was reported. Only several hundred to thousands were discussed. Israel never offered more than 91% of West Jordan and not the sovereignty over the Arab sector of Jerusalem. (All this information is from *Le Monde Diplomatique*, German edition, 7/2002, P. 18)

"Not only Arafat, but also other Palestinian leaders, saw no acceptable peace offer, in the territorial agenda of the Israeli Premier, Barak." He however, tried to put the blame for the failure of the negotiations on Arafat and the western media followed suit.

In following negotiations in Taba in Egypt, rapprochement was achieved on almost all the contentious issues. At this point, the Israeli Premier was already largely powerless – the elections that were about to take place brought Ariel Sharon to power.

In Palestinian public, disappointment and social adversity were great. In the year 2000 the income per head in West Jordan was 1.500\$ with unemployment at 40%; By comparison these figures were 18.900\$ and 9% in Israel. On 28.9.2000, in this tense situation Ariel Sharon – who had been the man responsible for Israeli settlement politics for some time – accompanied by a huge police escort, arrived at the East Jerusalem Temple Mount and before the assembled Islamic believers at the Al Aksa Mosque, which is steeped in tradition, claimed Israel's rights to it.

This pointed provocation, which Israeli members of parliament protested against, was

the trigger for the second Intifada. During the protests directly after the visit of the Israeli Premier to the Temple Mount, many Palestinians were killed.

The Intifada is usually depicted by the media as a revolt of the Palestinian people against Israel's government policy and the continuing unacceptable situation. That is one aspect, the other is that this protest is also defined by political forces, who openly declare that they can not see a peaceful way to be part of a solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

The longer it lasts, the greater is the strength of these forces.

To some extent the protest was also directed against the PLO leadership, which was perceived to be corrupt.

The Intifada began as a civilian protest, which was violently put down by Israel and then escalated to suicide attacks with horrific effect on the Israeli civilians.

International assessment of this as "terrorism" has won through, which qualifies a brutal military occupation force as "suppression of terrorism". The one-sided accusation of terrorism against the Palestinians, serves to put the blame for the conflict on the them. The Intifada is – like guerrilla war – an asymmetrical form of war fought by a militarily weaker party against a highly armed adversary. There are elements of violent escalation on both sides, which does not spare civilians. This conscious acceptance of civilian victims is, among others, distinguishes terrorist violence.

Uri Avnery, an elder of the Israeli peace movement, in his thoughts on co-existence between the two states, writes:

"After 1000 days, despite the killing and destruction, the Palestinian spirit of resistance was not broken (...). At the beginning of this Intifada there were a few volunteers for suicide attacks; at the end hundreds were prepared to do it. The Palestinians have not won either (...). They have managed to prevent the Palestinian question from being taken off the world's agenda. The Israeli economy is severely stricken (...). The Israelis, just like the Palestinians, are exhausted. This Intifada at this point in time has ended in a draw." (taz, 15.7.2003)

The suicide attacks have lent acceptance to the right wing conservative government. This was shown in the high degree of endorsement for the building of the wall, although this is against the law and cuts far into Palestinian areas, leading to fencing off and annexation of whole sections of Palestinian land.

Israel's military actions, as well as the carving-up of the Palestinian areas by fences, checkpoints, settlements and settler roads, have led to united outrage among Palestinians.

Never the less the Israeli-Palestinian conflict has also become a political conflict within both societies.

In the Palestinian part, this came to be expressed by the altercation on the suicide and rocket attacks.

On 22.6.2002, 55 Palestinian personalities, among them the prominent politician, Hanan Ashrawi, published a call against the suicide attacks in the East Jerusalem paper, "Al Quds".

"Based on our feeling of national responsibility and in view of the dangers that the Palestinian people finds itself in, we, the signatories, wish that those who are behind the military operations against civilians in Israel, would cri-

tically analyse what they have achieved and stop goading our young people to take part in these operations. We wish this, because we see the only result of these attacks to be the consolidation of animosity, anger and hate and the deepening of the cleft between the two peoples. They destroy the possibility that the two neighbouring peoples may live side-by-side, in peace.” (Quote from: Blätter für deutsche und internationale Politik, 8/2002).

In Israel the supporters of an expansive settler policy were faced by those who stood for a peaceful life in two states, side-by-side, or even for a common state for equal citizens. Characteristic for this conflict was the call of 53 officers and soldiers from the combat units, which appeared in the Israeli papers 25.1.2002.

“The borders of 1967 fight to overcome, to drive out, to starve and to humiliate the population there. The orders we received destroyed all the values that we have internalised in this country. We understand today that the cost of occupation is the corruption of the entire Israeli society.” With the escalation of violence the conditions for democratic, political action were and are repressively constricted.

The Third Gulf War lead to the „Roadmap“

In April 2002, that is in the run up to the Third Gulf War, the “Greater Middle East Quartet”, UN, USA, EU and Russia, in its Madrid declaration, advocated a ceasefire, the withdrawal of the Israeli military, as well as the ending of Palestinian terror attacks. It spoke for a two state solution – Israel and Palestine – according to the UN resolution 1397.

Prior to this the Saudi-Arabian Crown Prince Abdullah had submitted a peace offer in the name of 22 Arab states: Mutual recognition in connection with the establishment of a State of Palestine within the borders of 1967. However, the slogan of the US government was: First Baghdad, then Palestine.

Accordingly the theme was only taken up again after the US-GB invasion of Iraq. The “Greater Middle East Quartet” put forward a „Roadmap for Peace“. According to this a State of Palestine should come into being in 2005. The Israeli government had however reserved the right to reject the whole process, should any of the 13 conditions not be fulfilled. In view of the escalating confrontation and the considerable lack of action on the part of the Quartet, many in Palestine asked themselves whether the “Roadmap” was not intended for the 2004/5 election, to cover the broadest possible expectations. At any rate the “Roadmap has not been put into practice. The hopes, that there would be a partial withdrawal of the Israeli military from the Gaza Strip in 2005, and the linked dismantling of the settlements there, were disappointed: The US government rewarded these unilateral

steps taken by Israel with agreement on the maintaining of the settler blocks in West Jordan.

The democratic elections in West Jordan and the Gaza Strip, which had been repeatedly called for from abroad, took place in 2006. There was no criticism of how they were carried out, but the victory of Hamas over Fatah was not accepted by either the USA or the EU states. Hamas was not prepared to officially recognise Israel and the previously agreed treaties, nor was it prepared to forswear violence on principle. (The murdered Sheik and founder of Hamas, Yasin, had however already in 1997, offered in a “Hudna” - a long-term ceasefire with Israel, which implied a de facto recognition of Israel. The West to a great degree withdrew its financial assistance.

However, the West, in particular the USA, one-sidedly gave financial support and weaponry to President Abbas of Fatah, which Hamas probably saw as the preparation for an inner-Palestinian civil war.

The latest Lebanon war of 2006 led to further hardening of the situation and enmity in the region and shows once again the mainly regional roots of this conflict.

A government of unity Hamas/Fatah, which was brokered by Saudi-Arabia in March 2007, which was to have led to a reform of the PLO, soon broke down. President Abbas discharged the Hamas-led government, and put in place a government of his own choosing. Thereupon, in June 2007, Hamas in a coup took over power in the Gaza Strip and created in so doing a de facto division of the Palestinian territories.

Reconciliation between Hamas and Fatah does not seem to be an option at the moment. Israel declared the Gaza Strip to be enemy ter-

ritory in September 2007. The Gaza Strip is totally dependent on Israel.

Whether the resuscitation of the Greater Middle East Quartet, which was announced in January 2007, will lead to an effective form of peace politics in the Greater Middle East, is uncertain, especially as Washington has not clearly turned its back on the building of further settlements in West Jordan. The large settlement blocks in West Jordan were actually accepted by the US government as Israeli state area – and this against many UN resolutions and International Law.



In 2007 a Greater Middle East Conference, where Arab states also participated, took place in Annapolis at the instigation of the US government. Israelis and Palestinians agreed in December to start peace negotiations, which should lead to a peace treaty on a two state solution by the end of 2008.

Appendix II-III

Appendix 2: Peace organizations in the Middle East

The following selection of contact addresses makes no claim to completeness. It would like to give some inspiration to get involved and to get to know and to support organizations on both sides of the conflict which agitate for a civil resolution.

The Alternative Information Centre (AIC)

www.alternativenews.org
bryan@alt-info.org

Anarchists against the wall

www.awalls.org
info@awalls.org

Arab Educational Institute

www.aeicenter.org
aci@p-ol.com

Bat Shalom

www.batshalom.org
info@batshalom.org

Bisan Center for Research and Development

www.bisan.org
bisand@palnet.com

Breaking the Silence

www.breakingthesilence.org.il
webmaster@shovrimstika.org

B'Tselem

www.btselem.org/English/
mail@btselem.org

Center for Conflict Resolution and Reconciliation (CCRR)

www.mideastweb.org/ccrr/
ccrr@palnet.com

ivat Haviva

www.dialogate.org.il givat_il@inter.net.il

The Grassroots Palestinian Anti-Apartheid Wall Campaign

www.stopthewall.org
mobilize@stopthewall.org

Gush Shalom

www.gush-shalom.org
info@gush-shalom.org

Hand in Hand - (Zentrum für jüdischarabische Erziehung in Israel)

www.handinhand12.org
info@handinhand.org.il

Health Work Committees

www.hwc-pal.org
uhwc@palnet.com

The International Center of Bethlehem - Dar Annadwa Adduwaliyya

www.annadwa.org/german.htm
info@annadwa.org

International Solidarity Movement

www.palsolidarity.org/
ism-germany@gmx.net

The Israeli Committee Against House Demolitions (ICAHD)

www.icahd.org
info@icahd.org

The Israel Interfaith Association

www.uni-Leipzig.de/~judaica/i-faith/index2.htm
webmaster@israel.interfaith.co.il

Jerusalem Center for Women

www.j-c-w.org
jcw@palnet.com

Latin Patriarchat of Jerusalem

www.lpj.org
latinpat@actcom.co.il

Library on Wheels

www.library.hhpl.on.ca
lownp@palnet.com

Machsomwatch

www.machsomwatch.org
machsomwatch@gmail.com

Neve Shalom/Wahat al-Salam

www.nswas.org
pr@nswas.com

**New profile Movement for
the Civilization of Israeli Society**

www.newprofile.org/
info@newprofile.org

Oz VeShalom

www.netivot-shalom.org.il
ozshalom@netvision.net.il

**Palestinian Agricultural Relief
Committees (PARC)**

www.pal-arc.org
parc@pal-arc.org / parc@parc.ps

**Palestinian Center for the Dissemination
of Democracy and Community
(Panorama)**

www.panoramacenter.org
panorama@panoramacenter.org

Parents Circle - Families Forum

www.theparentscircle.com
contact@theparentscircle.org

**Peace Research Institute
in the Middle East (PRIME)**

www.vispo.com/PRIME/
prime@planet.edu

**Physicians for
Human Rights Israel (PHR)**

www.phr.org.il/phr/, mail@phr.org.il

Rabbis for Human Rights (RHR)

www.rhr.israel.net/
info@rhr.israel.net

**Sabeel (Ökumenisches
Befreiungstheologie Center)**

www.sabeel.org
nazareth@sabeel.org

**Society of Saint Yves -
Catholic Human Rights Center for
Legal Resources und Development**

www.saint.yves.org
saintyve@012.net.il

Ta'ayush (Zusammen leben)

www.taayush.org/
info@taayush.org

**i'am (Palestine
Conflict Resolution Center)**

www.alaslah.org/
alaslah@planet.edu

Women in Black Jerusalem

www.coalitionofwomen.org/
home/english/
womeninblackjerusalem@
yahogroups.com

Zochrot - Learning-Center

www.zochrot.org
zochrot@netvision.net.il

Appendix 3: Organizations in Germany supporting the peace movement in the Middle East

The following list of German organizations being active in peace activities in Israel and Palestine does not claim to be exhaustive. It rather shows which activities already exist and which can be expanded in the future. The strengthening of local civil forces plays an important role in the Middle East conflict.

Aktion Sühnezeichen-Friedensdienste (ASF)

ASF is a voluntary organization founded by Christians who wanted to address the period of National Socialism in Germany. The recognition of German guilt for the outbreak of the second World War was the starting point for ASF in 1958. More than 20 volunteers per year are currently active in Israel. They work with elderly and disabled persons, handicapped children, on memorial places and institutes such as Yad Vashem and the LeoBaeck-Institute. The work with underprivileged minorities is an important pillar of the ASF reconciliation work. Therefore ASF collaborates with different projects of Jewish-Arab understanding. Furthermore ASF is supporting initiatives for the interreligious dialogue in Israel.

‘Aktion Sühnezeichen’ feels particularly close to groups which are looking for cooperative and civil ways to cope with the Middle East conflict. ASF runs an international centre in Jerusalem, the “Ben Yehuda House” and

organizes meetings and seminars on Jewish-Christian and Israeli-German relations.

Aktion Sühnezeichen Friedensdienste e.V.

Augustusstr. 80, 10117 Berlin

phone: +49 30 28395-184

fax: +49 30 28395-135

asf@asf-ev.de · www.asf-ev.de

Arbeitskreis Nahost Berlin (Working Group Middle East Berlin)

The AK Middle East arised from a Jewish group opposed to the Lebanon War of 1982. It is independent of all ethnic or religious affiliations and open to all interested people supporting the objectives of the AK. The AK supports Israeli and Palestinian groups advocating an end of West Bank’s occupation and are opposed to the annexation of East Jerusalem. The direct contact to the region is of particular importance. The AK Middle East in Berlin has been supporting the work of Taayush (<http://taayush.tripod.com>), the Freedom Theatre in Jerusalem (www.thefreedomtheater.org) for several years. It also cooperates for example with Machsom Watch, an Israeli women’s group which regularly observes the Israeli checkpoints in the occupied regions. The AK Middle East arranges events between NGOs and politicians working in human rights committees. Since June 2006 the AK has been calling to support a monthly



demonstration of solidarity for the village of Bilin. Bilin (www.bilin-village.org) is located in the West Bank and organizes a non-violent demonstration against the construction of the Israeli West Bank which blocks the way to the village's field and thus destroys the inhabitants' livelihoods on every Friday.

**AK Nahost c/o Bildungswerk
der Heinrich Böll Stiftung**
Kottbusser Damm 72, 10967 Berlin
info@aknahost.org · www.aknahost.org

Bund für Soziale Verteidigung

Group "non-violent intervention ... in the Palestine conflict". Since the beginning in 2002 a group within the BSV has been working on the problem which activities could be

started in Germany in order to strengthen those forces among the Israelis and Palestinians vouching for a peaceful solution. After an investigation trip and a joint workshop with Israeli peace and human rights activists the following projects have been established:

1. support for conscientious objectors: The group informs in a monthly newsletter about Israeli conscientious objectors and supports them with letters and notes/letter of protest.
2. The BSV scholarship for civil conflict management. The BSV paid the four months lasting training in civil conflict management organized by the Forum Civil Peace Service for an Israeli and a Palestinian.
3. A lecture tour through schools in North Rhine Westphalia with teenagers from the group "Breaking Barriers". Breaking Barriers organizes joint meetings and workshops

for Israeli and Palestinian teenager. The objective of these workshops is to overcome foreignness by face to face meetings and the abolishment of stereotypes

A project by the Civil Peace Service at the Jahalin Bedouins in the West Bank close to Jerusalem. It sustanes the intensive voluntary work groups such as the Rabbis for Human Rights. The project aims not only at improving living conditions of the Bedouins. It also tries to contribute to the reduction of obstacles between the inhabitants of the Bedouin camps, the Palestinian society and the inhabitants of the close-by settlement of Maale Adumim.

Bund für Soziale Verteidigung e.V.

Schwarzer Weg 8, 32423 Minden

phone: +49 571 29456

soziale_verteidigung@t-online.de

www.soziale-verteidigung.de

Connection e.V.

The number of conscientious objectors is continuously increasing. More than 2.000 men and women, conscripts as well as reservists have publicly declared their conscientious objection. Some of them were sentenced to one year in jail. Their motives range from principal refusal of the military to refusal of the service in the occupied regions. Exactly through this different approaches, this movement can have an exceptional influence: for a peaceful and just solution. Connect e.V. supports this movement with an Email campaign, had published several brochures between 2004 and 2006 in which further peace activities in Israel and Palestine

have been presented. Additionally Connect e.V. keeps in touch with different groups and invited representatives from New Profile and Taayush to different events.

Connection e.V.

Gerberstr. 5, 63065 Offenbach

phone: +49 69 82375534

fax: +49 69 82375535

office@connection-ev.de

www.connection-ev.de

**Deutsch-israelischer Arbeitskreis
für Frieden im Nahen Osten (diAK) e.V.
(German-Israeli working group
for Peace in the Middle East)**

The diAK, founded in 1977, is convinced that the Israelis' and Palestinians' right of national self-determination has to be the basic principle for a peaceful solution of the conflict. The diAK therefore seeks contacts to especially those persons and organizations advocating actively a peaceful solution of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. The activities include among other things:

- Publishing the quarterly journal "israel & palästine"
- Publishing one or two volumes of a series
- Organization of an annual seminar with speakers from the region
- presentation of these activities, as well as a presentation of the developments in the region and its discussion in Germany on the diAK website
- Individual members and the directorate are conducting advisory and speaker activities

**Deutsch-Israelischer Arbeitsreis
für Frieden im Nahen Osten e.V.**

Geschäftsstelle, Zeiβstr. 51/1
22765 Hamburg,
phone: +49 40 395573
geschaeftsstelle@diak.org
www.diak.org

EAPPI / ÖFPI

Volunteers of the Ecumenical Accompaniment Programme in Palestine and Israel (EAPPI, German: ÖFPI) support Israeli and Palestinian peace activists in their efforts of finding a peaceful solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. For three months they with local people and work in international teams collaborating with churches, ecclesiastically institutions and NGOs. Where ever possible they try to deescalate in order to prevent violence against civilians and to diminish their humiliation. The supporting programme, the World Council of Churches has set up in 2002 within the Decade to Overcome Violence, aims at proving that non-violent efforts for peace and justice are possible. An important part of the volunteers' work is therefore the public relations work after their returning. Preconditions for participating are, among others, a minimum age of 25 years, very good English skills and experience in the development cooperation, human rights or solidarity work.

The German participation lies in the responsibility of the Association of Churches and Missions in South Western Germany, Association of Mission in Berlin (Berliner Missionswerk) and the Catholic peace movement

“pax Christi”. They are supported by the Church Development Service, Bread for the World, The Association of Protestant Churches and Missions in Germany and the Catholic Association for Development Cooperation and other ecclesiastically organizations. Since 2005 the network of former volunteers is also participating in this work.

Applications for the peace service can be submitted to three organisations:

- Association of Churches and Missions in South Western Germany,
Referent Andreas Maurer,
phone: +49 711 636 7837
maurer@ems-online.de
- Association of Mission in Berlin (Berliner Missionswerk)
Referent Almuth Nothnagle,
phone: +49 30 24344196
a.nothnagle@bmw.ebko.de
- pax christi, executive director
Christamaria Weber
phone: +49 6101 2073
c.weber@paxchristi.de

Further information at:
www.eappi-netzwerk.de
www.eappi.org
www.eed.de/eappi

**EED / Misereor
Common Initiative Humanitarian
International Law in the Middle East**

The Catholic development agency MISEREOR and the Protestant Church Development Service (EED) promote within the framework of their programme work Middle East

numerous Israeli and Palestinian partner organisations. Many of them are engaged in peace, non-violent conflict resolution and human rights. In order to support their efforts the two agencies agreed in early 2007 to complement their programme work in the Middle East with specific lobby and advocacy activities relating to the respect of international humanitarian law and human rights in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict within the 'Joint Initiative on International Humanitarian Law in the Middle East'.

In the centre of this ecumenical cooperation lies the call for consistent enforcement of compliance with international humanitarian law (IHL). Its relevance to development is obvious: In times of conflict and occupation, IHL protects the private and public life of the affected people and their chances to development. In doing that, IHL helps to keep the door open for a just peace. Together with other European relief organisations in different EU member states, the two agencies provide recommendations on how third states can more stringently fulfil their own obligations to ensure respect for international humanitarian law and human rights law in Israel and the Palestinian territories. This means that when implementing cooperation measures of the European Union with the conflict parties, it is to be safeguarded that there is no indirect recognition of or aid or assistance to unlawful measures.

Bernhard Schäfer, LL.M.

MISEREOEED

c/o EED, Ulrich-von-Hassell-Str. 76

53123 Bonn, Germany

Tel. +49 228 81012106

bernhard.schaefer@eed.de

www.eed.de/voelkerrecht-nahost

Forum Ziviler Friedensdienst - Department Middle East

Since 2000 forumZFD has been engaged in projects of the civil peace service in the Middle East. In 2005 a project concerning the education of students and members of youth facilities in non-violent communication had been finished by the forumZFD with the collaboration of the Willy Brandt-Center.

Currently, forumZFD together with its partner organizations (Willy Brandt-Center and Bund für Soziale Verteidigung) is running four programs in Palestine and Israel and one project in Palestine, Israel and Jordan. The last one is concerning trauma counseling and conflict resolution in the project country as well as identity. The project's objective is to qualify different political and social actors in Israel, Palestine and Jordan as peace alliances to collectively reflect the refugee question and the – to some extent – conflict stoking “remembrance figures” (remembrance figures as a key concept of the theory of cultural memory by Jan Assmann and Maurice Halbwachs) in both national communities. The target audience are Jewish and Arabian Israelis and Palestinians from the Palestinian territories as well as from Jordan, which are already integrated as young activist in efforts to assist social change in their communities.

Forum Ziviler Friedensdienst

Wesselstraße 12, 53113 Bonn

Tel. +49 228 9814515

Fax +49 228 9814517

kontakt@forumZFD.de, www.forumzfd.de

IPPNW

IPPNW's objective is the further strengthening of contacts to Israel-Palestine and to gather information on – regardless triggered by which side – the distress of the local population and human rights abuse. The contact to physicians for human rights is particularly important (PHR Israel) as well as a critical discussion with the Israeli Medical Association. In the last years the IPPNW delegates have been visiting Israel/Palestine. Since 2003 IPPNW has been broaching the issue of the construction of the Wall for example through the collaboration at the international conference “Stop the Wall” in 2004 and 2006 and the coordination circle which has emanated from it (www.stopptdiemauer.de). IPPNW-students from Germany and other western countries have been engaging since 2004 every year in four refugee camps of the West Bank in a project concerning psycho-social effects of war and violence on children and youths (Palestinian Refugee Project www.ippnw-students.org/ReCap/ReCap.html).

IPPNW Geschäftsstelle

Körtestr. 10, 10967 Berlin

Tel. +49 30 69807413

Fax +49 30 6938166

www.ippnw.de

Jewish-Palestinian Dialogue Group Munich

In 1985 Jewish and Palestinian men and women decided to found a Jewish-Palestinian Dialog Group. It has become obvious to them that even as in Germany living members of the group they could not segregate themselves from the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

Since then the group strives to analyze the history and problems of the two people confronting each other through research and discussions. Through study trips in Palestine (West Bank and Gaza Stripe) and Israel the group got an idea of the situation on the ground and holds talks with representatives of different Palestinian and Israeli organizations. The group also visited some refugee camps.

The dialogue group meets on a regular basis and discusses historical and actual aspects of the ongoing conflict. Thereby barriers of mistrust and ignorance could be overcome. The group supports initiatives in the Middle East and Europe. Furthermore it organizes from time to time events inviting Israeli and Palestinian guests in order to contribute to a better understanding of the conflict and a reduction of prejudices by informing the public.

Judith Bernstein

Viktor-Scheffel-Str. 5, 80803 München

phone: +49 89 34019520

judith.bernstein@web.de

Jewish Voice for a just Peace in the Middle East

On November 9th 2003 the German section of the federation “European Jews for a just Peace” has been founded under the name “Jüdische Stimme für gerechten Frieden im Nahen Osten” in the rooms of the house of democracy and human rights. The Jewish Voice for a just Peace in the Middle East acts on the basis of the founding declaration of “European Jews for a just Peace” (EJJP) founded in

September 2002 by 18 Jewish organizations from 10 different European countries. As an associated member the group wants to inform about the necessity and possibilities of a just peace between Palestine and Israel. It considers its main objective to work towards influencing the German government to use its economic and foreign policy influence in the EU, the UN as well as in the Middle East to support the idea of a just peace. This means to support the establishment of a viable and independent state of Palestine having an integrated sovereign territory within secure borders. Furthermore the group demands the German government to actively support a permanent and just peace agreement for both nations .

**Jüdische Stimme für gerechten
Frieden in Nahost**
**c/o Internationale Liga für
Menschenrechte, Haus der Demokratie
und Menschenrechte**
Greifswalder Str. 4, 10405 Berlin
Fax: +49 30 396247
mail@juedische-stimme.de
www.juedische-stimme.de

**Komitee für Grundrechte und
Demokratie (Committee
for Basic Rights and Democracy)**
“Holidays from War”

During the last 14 years more than 20.000 children, teenagers and young adults from the antagonized groups from the Balkans, respectively the Middle East had met for common holidays organized by the action “Holidays from War”.

Most of the young adults from Israel and Palestine (West Bank) never had contact to people from the other side. Many of the 500 young Israelis came to Germany to meet “the terrorists” – even against the advice of their families. Many of the 500 Palestinians from the West Bank passed the checkpoints tricky or bypassed them in a dangerous manner to get to know the “occupying forces”.

On both sides these contacts could be denounced as “fraud” or “collaboration with the enemy” and entail social sanctions. The difficult dialogue process revolves around the threats and fears in every day life, but also around hopes and visions. The participants get to know the perspectives of the “others” concerning the roots of the conflict history as well as the political and economic interests of the warring parties. They have a real-life experience of the fact that the question of guilt cannot be resolved as easily as the domestic propaganda wants them to believe. Even when shocking news on the Israeli army’s terrorist bombing rail or Palestinian terrorist assassinations put a strain on the encounter, no violent dispute occurred. “We can live together – even under the same roof! This is a fantastic experience.!” – this is the resume of a Palestinian. Furthermore, there were holiday games financed for approximately 500 children from the Palestine refugee camps.

The peace political project of the “Committee for Basic Rights and Democracy” (Cologne, Germany) self-finances solely from donations and collections. (One “holiday sponsorship” amounts to 130 Euro)

Helga Dieter
Tel. +49 69 7892525
ubihedi@t-online.de
www.ferien-vom-krieg.de

Komitee für Grundrechte und Demokratie

Tel. +49 221 972620

info@grundrechtekomitee.de

www.grundrechtekomitee.de

KURVE Wustrow

KURVE Wustrow has been engaging in Palestine since 1994, initially in voluntary service in the meantime mainly in the civil peace service. The Commitment's objective in the region is the strengthening the local peace workers and to effectively incorporate civil, non-violent conflict transformation in the Palestinian civil society. Currently, one peace worker is engaging in the framework of the civil peace service (CPS) for the Union of Palestinian Women Committees (Ramallah), a partner organization of KURVE Wustrow, in building up a trainer network in the field of gender and non-violent conflict resolution. Palestinians from different partner organizations also participated as trainers or participants in the International Training and KURVE Wustrow's expert seminars to learn "bottom-up" conflict resolution.

Bildungs- und Begegnungsstätte für gewaltfreie Aktion

KURVE Wustrow e.V.

Kirchstraße 14,

29462 Wustrow - Germany

Tel. +49 5843 9871-0

Fax +49 5843 9871-11

Medico International

The Middle East – Israel and Palestine – is one of the regions medico international runs projects the longest. In 2003 medico in collaboration with intellectuals appealed for the solidarity fund "Zeichen paradoxer Hoffnung" (signs of paradox hope) for the support of civil initiatives in Israel and Palestine, which advocate – against borders and concepts of enemy – for cooperation and push for democracy and the respect for human rights.

Partners & Projects

1. Tel-Aviv-Ramallah-Gaza: Physicians for Human Rights PHR-Israel / Palestinian Medical Relief Society PMRS. Health is a human right for all people in Israel and the occupied territories, this is the message of PHR-Israel (physicians for human rights). Together with the Palestinian Medical Relief Society PMRS the Israeli physicians visit with mobile clinics the villages in the West Bank which lack trusted access to regular health care.

2. Jerusalem-Bethlehem: The Alternative Information Center (AIC). The AIC is a cooperating project between the Israeli and Palestinian Activists. The work of the Jewish office in Jerusalem and of the Palestinian one in Bethlehem is one of the few remaining Jewish-Arabic initiatives.

3. Nazareth: Women against Violence (WAV). The Arabic-Israeli association Women against Violence (WAV) is one of the oldest women's refuges for Arabic women in the Middle East. WAV supports Arabic women in their struggle for gender equality within a Arabic-Palestinian minority in Israel as well as face to face with the Jewish dominated majority society.

medico international e.V.

Burgstraße 106,
60389 Frankfurt/M. - Germany
Tel. +49 69 94438-0
Fax +49 69 436002
info@medico.de
www.medico.de

**Ohne Rüstung leben - ORL
(Living without armor)**

Living without armour informs about the conflict and activities of the local peace and human rights movement. Groups which are involved in the struggle against the militarization of the Israeli society and/or take a critical position to Israel's current policy out of the military, are of particular interest. Furthermore, ORL informs on armour exports into conflict regions especially Israel which is one of the biggest recipients of German armour delivery outside of NATO. Beyond ORL's commitment within the "Forum Ziviler Friedensdienst" (Forum Civil Peace Service) it also advocates for civil conflict resolution in this region.

**Ohne Rüstung Leben, Referat Grundsatz-
fragen - Zivile Konfliktbearbeitung**

Arndtstraße 31, 70197 Stuttgart
Tel. +49 711 608396
Fax +49 711 608357


Pax Christi - German section

Since the seventies Pax Christi has got involved with just peace between Israel and Palestine which gives security to these two populati-

ons. There are contacts to Israeli groups inter alia to Gush Shalom, the committee against house destruction (ICAHN), B'tselem and the Rabbis for human rights and to Palestinian organizations as House of Mercy in Haifa, the Arab Educational Institute (www.aeicenter), the Society of St. Yves or the international encounter centre in Bethlehem. Over and over again Pax Christi is inviting people sympathetic to the peace movement from Israel and Palestine to lecture tours and symposia in Germany, lastly Jeff Halper (ICAHN) from Jerusalem and Husam al Najar (ministry of planning) from Gaza to find them open ears in Germany. Pax Christi has started a project of the Ziviler Friedensdienst (ZFD) (civil peace service) concerning the inter-religious peace work in Jerusalem in 2007. Furthermore, this organization is co-responsible for the EAPPI-program of the world church council. The Pax Christi Middle East commission furthers the work with regard to content in union. It makes demands on politics, namely not supporting human rights and international law abusing policy any longer, it collaborates in the nationwide campaign "Stop the wall in Palestine - For a just peace in Palestine and Israel", it makes info material available and sells olive-wood works from a self-helping project in Bethlehem. A photo exhibition "Time for Palestine" with 40 laminated postcards in A3 format can be loaned from the Middle East Commission. There are Middle East study groups in: Aachen, Augsburg and Stuttgart.

Pax Christi

Post office box 1245
61103 Bad Vilbel - Germany
Tel. +49 6101 2073
www.paxchristi.de



**Versöhnungsbund e.V.
(Fellowship of Reconciliation)**

The German section of the International Fellowship of Reconciliation (IFOR) is concerned with the Israel-Palestine conflict in the framework of its Middle East commission. The members visit over and over again partner projects as the library on wheels of the Palestinian Nafez Assaily who drives through the West Bank with non-violent literature and hands it out to children and teenagers; or Amos Gvirtz from the Israeli committee against the destruction of houses. In 2005 the Fellowship of Reconciliation organized for these two representatives of the peace movement from both sides a lecture tour through Germany. In the last two years more consultant tours have been accomplished in Germany with Noah Saleme, the director of the "Center for conflict resolution" in Bethlehem as well as with a Israeli conscientious objector. At the Protestant church gathering and Catholic church day the Fellowship of Reconciliation

Middle East commission organized numerous events with guests from Israel/Palestine or for example with professor Rolf Verleger, member of the Central Consistory of Jews in Germany. Anna Schneider member of the Fellowship of Reconciliation steering committee attended at the ISM-volunteer service in the Gaza strip, Ilse Mühlstep supported the Christian Peace Maker Team (CPT) in 2007 in Hebron. The peace consultant of the Fellowship of Reconciliation and co-author of this dossier, Clemens Ronnefeldt, had visited repeatedly Israeli and Palestinian peace groups. He reports on his experiences and Analyses in nationwide lectures in which he also conveys contacts to peace organizations from both sides.

**Internationaler Versöhnungsbund -
German section**

Schwarzer Weg 8, 32423 Minden - Germany
Tel. +49 571 850875
Fax +49 571 8292387
vb@versoehnungsbund.de
www.versoehnungsbund.de



Friedensfahne
Shalom/Salaam

Spendenkonto

Förderverein Frieden e.V.
Konto-Nr. 3 30 35
Sparkasse Bonn (BLZ 380 500 00)
Stichwort: *Monitoring-Projekt*

Bestellung an

Kooperation für den Frieden
Römerstr. 88 · 53111 Bonn
Tel. 02 28/69 29 04 · Fax 02 28/69 29 06
info@koop-frieden.de

Organisation/Gruppe _____

Vorname, Name _____

Straße, Nr. _____

PLZ, Ort _____

eMail _____

Ich/wir bestellen Expl. der BürgerInnen-Information zum Monitoring-Projekt.

Ich/wir bestellen Expl. Dossier I: Der Iran-Konflikt

Ich/wir bestellen Expl. Dossier II: Der türkisch-kurdische Konflikt
jeweils: 1 Expl. à 1,- EUR; ab 5 Expl. à 0,50 EUR; ab 50 Expl. à 0,40 EUR

Ich/wir bestellen Expl. Dossier III: Der Israel-Palästina-Konflikt
Dossier III: 1 Expl. à 1,20 EUR; ab 5 Expl. à 1,00 EUR; ab 50 Expl. à 0,70 EUR

Ich/wir bestellen Expl. Friedensfahne „Shalom/Salaam“ (heb.arab.) à 10,00 EUR