THE FAILURE OF PEACE PROCESSES IN THE PALESTINIAN-ISRAELI
CONFLICT: THE CLASH OF ARAB NATIONALISM AND ZIONISM

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO

THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

OF

MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

İPEK DEMİREL

IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS

FOR

THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE

IN

THE MIDDLE EAST STUDIES

DECEMBER 2006

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

—————————————

Prof. Dr. Sencer Ayata

Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts.

—————————————————

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Recep Boztemur

Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts.

—————————————————

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Recep Boztemur

Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Assist. Prof. Dr. Aykan Erdemir	(METU,SOC)	———————
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Recep Boztemur	(METU,HIST)	———————
Assist. Prof. Dr. Mustafa Şen	(METU,SOC)	———————

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Last name : İpek Demirel

Signature   :

ABSTRACT

THE FAILURE OF PEACE PROCESSES

IN THE PALESTINIAN-ISRAELI CONFLICT:

THE CLASH OF ARAB NATIONALISM AND ZIONISM

Demirel, İpek

MA, Department of Middle East Studies

Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Recep Boztemur

December 2006, 157 pages

This thesis aims at analyzing the reasons for the insoluble nature of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict. The reasons behind the continuation of the conflict are various. However, this thesis mainly concentrated on the ones stemmed from the clash of Arab nationalism and Zionism. This clash basically represents the failure of both sides in making any concession from their territorial attachments which resulted from Arab nationalism and Zionism. Though both nationalisms were constructed on the same founding factors such as religion, territory and culture, Arab nationalists and Zionists gained different positions during the conflict. These positions determined the future of all of the peace processes in the near past.

All peace processes that had focused on the solution of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict displayed that any formulation for a last settlement to the conflict should take into consideration the inability of the parties to agree on a territorial compromise and the adoption by both sides of the continuation of the conflict as a political instrument.

Keywords: Territorial nationalism, Arab Nationalism, Zionism, Continuation of the Palestinian-Israeli Conflict, TerritorialCompromise.

ÖZ

FİLİSTİN-İSRAİL ÇATIŞMASINDA

TÜM BARIŞ SÜREÇLERİNİN BAŞARISIZLIĞI:

ARAP MİLLİYETÇİLİĞİ VE SİYONİZM ARASINDAKİ UYUŞMAZLIK

Demirel, İpek

Yüksek Lisans, Ortadoğu Çalışmaları

Tez Yöneticisi: Doç. Dr. Recep Boztemur

Aralık 2006, 157 sayfa

Bu tez, Filistin-İsrail çatışmasının çözülemeyen karakterini incelemeyi amaçlamaktadır. Çatışmanın devamlılığının arkasında birçok neden yatmaktadır. Ancak bu tez esas olarak Arap milliyetçiliği ve Siyonizm arasındaki uyuşmazlıktan kaynaklanan sebeplere odaklanmıştır. Bu uyuşmazlık, temel olarak çatışmanın taraflarının, Arap milliyetçiliği ve Siyonizm'den kaynaklanan toprağa bağlılıklarından herhangi bir ödün vermek konusundaki başarısızlıklarını temsil etmektedir. Her iki milliyetçilik de din, toprak ve kültür gibi benzer kurucu unsurlar üzerine inşa edilmiş olsalar da, Arap milliyetçileri ve Siyonistler çatışma boyunca farklı konumlar elde etmişlerdir. Bu konumlar, yakın geçmişteki tüm barış süreçlerinin geleceğini etkilemiştir.

Filistin-İsrail çatışmasını çözmeye odaklanmış tüm barış süreçleri göstermiştir ki; çatışmaya kalıcı bir çözüm getirecek herhangi bir düzenleme, tarafların toprak konusundaki uyuşmazlığını ve çatışmanın devamlılığını bir siyasi araç olarak benimsemiş olmalarını dikkate almalıdır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Toprak milliyetçiliği, Arap Milliyetçiliği, Siyonizm, Çatıçmanın Devamlılığı, Toprağa İlişkin Uzlaşma.

To Sadık DEMİREL, Melek DEMİREL, Emre DEMİREL

and

CAN YOLDAŞ

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my gratitude to my supervisor Assoc. Prof. Dr. Recep Boztemur for his guidance throughout the research. His kind support to my research question encouraged me in confronting all the challenges while I was writing my thesis.

I would also like to express my deepest gratitude to Assist. Prof. Dr. Aykan Erdemir for his great contribution to my vision on academic writing. With his help, my thesis reached at a level that made me feel satisfied and proud. I sincerely thank him for his attention to time and details. His polite attitude helped me feel confident while expressing myself. I learned from him that writing short but meaningful is of great importance.

I should also thank Assist Prof. Dr. Nesim Şeker for his friendly attitude and contructive criticisms to my thesis. I overcame the most difficult time by his suggestion to me that I should think in a simple way. I also would like to thank Assist. Prof. Dr. Mustafa Şen for his sincere attitude and final suggestions and comments to my thesis.

I would like to express endless thanks to my friends for their friendship, patience and positive energy: Oya Gözel, Özden Erdoğan and Agah Hazır. Without the coffee breaks when they patiently listened to me, it would be impossible for me to finish this thesis.

Finally, I would like to thank Can Yoldaş for his great support in every second of my effort while writing this thesis though thanking him is not sufficient.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER -1-

INTRODUCTION

1.1 THE CONTEXT OF THE THESIS

The Arab-Israeli conflict has appeared to be the one of the main pillars of the instability in the Middle East. The failure of the international community and the sides of the conflict in putting forward a lasting solution to the conflict resulted in the continuation of the conflict up to now. Many studies on the Arab-Israeli conflict analyzed the sole question of how the clash of nationalisms resulted in conflict, but they did not focus on how this clash emerged. The basic difference of this thesis from previous works will be to seek the origins of the conflict in territorial claims as the basis of national construction of both sides. Moreover, the study aims at putting forward that the deadlock in sharing the same land constitutes the most important reason among the others of the continuation of the conflict.

This study tries to contribute to the studies regarding the conflict with bringing forward different points of view. All the studies on this conflict are based on the possibility of reaching a settlement to the Arab-Israeli conflict one day. This thesis tries to focus on the conflict from another perspective and strives for reflecting that both sides have interest in the continuation of conflict as their national aspirations over the same territory require. This makes, as this thesis asserts, the chances for having a lasting solution to the conflict to disappear.

Besides the main issues rendering the conflict insoluble such as the policies of the Arab states around Palestine, and divergent attitudes of Britain and the U.S towards the each side of the conflict, this study focused on the inability of the Palestinian Arabs and the Israeli Jews, who are the indigenous residents of Palestine, to agree on territorial compromise and the adoption of the continuation of conflict by both sides as an instrument in order to maintain the conflicting

positions that they had gained during the conflict. These factors entails to underline the meaning of the territory to both sides within the framework of peculiar construction of Jewish and Arab nationalism and the development of the uncompromising attitude of the parties and moreover their desire to continue to conflict. Thereby, this study firstly puts emphasis on the evolution of two nationalisms to understand the meaning of territory, secondly scrutinizes the clash of two nationalisms resulted in the failure of both sides to agree on a territorial compromise and thirdly evaluates the reflections of this clash on how both sides perceive the peace process.

The conclusion that this study has reached is the Arab-Israeli conflict possesses particular internal dynamics stemming from the national construction of the parties and different perceptions on the peace process. Therefore this study proposes the Arab and Israeli territorial claims and the political instrumentality of these claims raise the insoluble nature of the conflict. The thesis of the study seeks an answer to the following questions: "Is it possible to solve the Arab-Israeli conflict without any territorial compromise?" and "How do the conflicting positions and the adoption of the continuation of the conflict by both sides as a common approach effect the peace process?" Surely, there are many answers can be given to these questions as mentioned above. Yet, this study aims to underline the lack of territorial compromise between the Palestinian Arabs and the Israeli Jews resulted from the clashing territorial aspirations of Arab nationalism and Jewish nationalism. By doing so, this study will try to display that other alternatives such as the continuation of conflict or regulating peace efforts overlooking these aspirations did not work in the way of bringing forward a lasting settlement to the Arab-Israeli conflict.

The research question of the thesis, the territorial claims and their instrumental use by both sides, produce the following questions: Why did the Palestinian Arabs and the Israeli Jews fail in agreeing on achieving territorial conciliation? What are the territorial aspirations of both sides? How do Arab nationalism and Jewish nationalism explain these aspirations? How did both nationalist movements construct theirnationalism on territoriality? Why did

both sides adopt the continuation of the conflict? What are the benefits acquired by both sides during the conflict? What are the positions of both sides providing both sides with these achievements? How did these positions transform during the conflict? How did they affect the approaches of the sides to the conflict? How did these approaches affect the peace initiatives? Why all of the peace initiatives failed in stipulating a solution to the conflict? What is the common point of the peace efforts up to date? What is the meaning of the continuation of the conflict for both sides?

This study will try to explain these questions in order to shed light on the reasons for the lack of territorial compromise due to the clashing national aspirations of both sides. Owing to the inability of the Palestinian Arabs and the Israeli Jews to share the same territory, they adopted the continuation of the conflict in order to maintain the opportunities gained by both sides during the every phase of the conflict, serving to preserve their existence on the Palestinian territories. In order to strengthen this hypothesis, this study firstly focused on the national construction of both sides in terms of territorial nationalism so as to prove that each is the real possessor of the Palestinian territory. The clashing territorial aspirations of both nationalisms prevented the sides from accepting territorial compromise. Secondly, the thesis gives a summary of the emergence and development of the conflict until the beginning of peace processes in order to demonstrate clashing positions of both sides. The parties seeking for an alternative to sharing the territory conceived territorial compromise as a betrayal to their national developments constituting the basis of their raison d'etre in Palestine.

Territory has divergent meanings for both sides. The most important one is that territory constitutes the founding factor for their nation-state supporting their existence in Palestine. Both of them constructed their nationalism in order to prove that they are the real possessors of the same territory. Their failure to share the same territory has raised the conflict between the Arabs and the Jews. When the relevant literature is reviewed, there are many studies asserting that Palestinian territory is Jewish or Arab in origin.According to David Waines, Palestine

as a fertile bridge between Asia and Africa at the crossroads of three religion was Arab in character influenced by the long Muslim rule.[1] Moreover, Martin Sicker states that the Arabs' view of the world and the part they sought to play in it were the products of a historical situation molded in the previous century both by forces within the Arab community and by the broader cultural encounter with the West. These factors conditioned the Arabs' reaction to post-war developments (World War I) and to Zionist aims."[2]

In contrary with these contemplations advocating the Arab nature of Palestine, Randall Price states that the Jewish people settled and developed Palestine and have maintained a continuous existence in (as well as a historic tie with) the land for the past 3500 years while the Arabs were putting forward their ancestry in Palestine.[3] As it is seen in a short literature review, there are studies supporting Jewish or Arab claims on Palestine.

Trying to standing aloof from these tendentious considerations, this study intends to display that Arab and Jewish nationalisms are different from the generally-accepted formation of nationalism. Territoriality is of the utmost importance for both nationalisms. The study strives for reflecting how both sides based their national aspirations on territoriality with a view to guaranteeing the foundation of their nation-state on Palestinian territory. Indeed, nationalism for the Arabs and the Jews is a construction rather than a formation. The Arabs and the Jews constructed their nationalisms on the same territory in order to strengthen their claims that are the main subject of the conflict between the Arabs and the Jews. This construction rendered their territorial aspirations incompatible because these aspirations are related to same territory. The national and surely political domination on the territory would determine the future of their existence in

---

[1] David Waines, *The Unholy War: Israel and Palestine 1897-1971, Montreal/New York: Chateau Books Limited, 1971*, p. 50.

[2] Martin Sicker, *Judaism, Nationalism and the Land of Israel,* Boulder, San Francisco and Oxford: Westview Press,1992, p. 11.

[3] Randall Price, *Fast Facts on the Middle East Conflict,* Eugene, Oregon: Harvest House Publishers, 2003, p. 23.

Palestine. To guarantee the possibility of their control over the same territory, they adopted the continuity of the conflict so as to ensure their deep-rooted advantageous positions that they had gained during the development of the conflict.

In order to demonstrate sufficiently the nature of the conflict and the point of views of both sides, this study scrutinizes the development of the clash between two nationalisms and the changing positions of both sides. These positions are evaluated by this study with a view to trying to explain why both sides have adopted the continuation of the conflict during the peace process. These positions culminated in different gains of both sides from every phases of the conflict. As elaborated further in the thesis, the Jews settled in Palestine succeeded in establishing a state and expanding its borders. On the other hand, the Palestinian Arabs achieved unity and proved the legitimacy of their national cause before the international community through Intifada.

These achievements were stemmed from different positions of both sides and encouraged them to maintain their existence by adopting the continuation of the conflict. Both sides adopted the continuation of conflict as an instrument to maintain their different positions and benefits reaped by both sides as a result of the transforming character of the conflict. The phases of the conflict and peace attempts examined by this study prove that the conflict is destined to be difficult to solve unless territorial compromise is achieved.

The above mentioned positions determined the destiny of the peace processes. The parties of the conflict preferred to preserve the idea of the continuation of the conflict as an instrument for insisting on their national demands. This culminated in a deadlock in the peace efforts mainly failed in bringing forward the offers of peaceful solutions regarding sharing the same territory The ambition of the Jews to settle on the strategic parts of Palestine and ensure its borders, and the Palestinians' efforts to regain their territories from the Israelis led to the failure in achieving territorial compromise in every peace effort. This thesis, therefore, tries to explain the failure of a lasting peace in the Arab-Israeli conflict by analyzing thepeace initiatives in terms of the role of

the issues dealing with territorial compromise. The failure of every peace effort is emphasized by this thesis in order to prove the importance of territorial compromise once again for the settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict.

Therefore, this study asserted that incompatibility of territorial claims of the parties stemmed from conflicting nationalisms and the use of the conflict as an instrument in breaking up the peace process in order to gain more advantageous position in the conflict are the main factors that are effective in the insoluble nature of the conflict. In other words, territorial claims of both sides and the use of the conflict to further their domestic political aims are the basic reasons for the continuation of the Arab-Israeli conflict.

1.2 METHODOLOGY

In search for answers to the research question and the assertions of the thesis, the study adopts a descriptive and historical analysis. In order to draw an accurate profile of events, persons or objects[4], the thesis will describe the emergence, development and positions of both nationalistic territorial claims within the context of descriptive analysis. Incorporating the method, the initial stage has been the source scanning. The investigation to reach the appropriate sources helping to an objective interpretation has mainly included the search among the library and the internet queries. Secondary sources, books and articles, dealing with Israeli and Palestinian territorial nationalism are generally used in the research to produce meaningful answers to the research question.

The process of the historical analysis involves investigation and analysis of controversial ideas and facts, and aims at assessing the meanings and reading the messages of the happenings while asking the questions of "what happened" and "why or how it happened."[5] The study also is based on the methodology of comparing and contrasting different sets of ideas and values of the Arabs and the Jews.

---

[4] Gerald R. Adams and Jay D. Schavaneveldt, *Understanding Research Methods*, (New York & London: Longman, 1985), p. 106.

[5] Paul D. Leedy, *Practical Research: Planning and Design*, (New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc. and London: Collier Macmillan Publishers), p. 71.

Especially in the second, third and fourth chapter, the study tries to reflect and compare differing values imposed by the Arabs and the Jews on Palestinian territory. Moreover, the Arab nationalism and Zionism are analyzed in order to consider multiple perspectives, motives and interests of Arab nationalists and Zionists in terms of territorial nationalism. Therefore, the study intends to put forward the relationship between the conflicting positions of the Arabs and the Jews, and the peace process.

Holding interpretations of history is used in this study with a view to demonstrate how the sides of the conflict interpret the history of the conflict. In this regard, hypothesizing the influence of the past is executed in this study to display deeply the effect of different evolvement of the positions of the Arabs and the Jews in the conflict. Additionally, evaluating the influence of Jewish and Arab interests and beliefs during the conflict proves to be beneficial in elaborating the approach of the Arabs and the Jews to the continuation of the conflict. Given the fact that modern historical analysis usually draws upon most of the other social sciences, in order to ensure these narratives are thorough, the study has availed of the accommodation of international relations. The study will also use the interpretation of the other's working on the conflict. As a result of library investigation composed of scanning the secondary sources, this study also gets the opportunity of observing and comparing tendentious sources written about the Arab-Israeli conflict. Trying to stand in an equal distance to the arguments of both Arab nationalist and Zionist narratives, scanning the secondary sources is utilized in order to see the perspectives of both sides of the conflict.

Applying the method, the thesis has mainly taken the explanatory research as the tool to put under scrutiny what it attempts to shed a light upon. Accommodating the explanatory research, the study has sought to ask "what?" and "why?" questions, trying to examine the cause/effect relationships between the developments[6]. The thesis has asked questions and collected data about the subsequent stages of historical improvement of the Arab-Israeli dispute, factors of profound decompositions of the two sides, the consecutive crises and

---

[6] Gina Wisker, *The Postgraduate Research Handbook*, (New York: Palgrave, 2001), p. 120.

diplomatic efforts following each military conflict, as well as the reasons of the failure in achieving peace and the meaning of the conflict for both sides. Thus, the study has tried to set forth intricate components about the special features of the problem.

As a consequence of conducting these methods, the findings and results achieved at the end of research and elaboration of the datum, concentrated on the impossibility of achieving a lasting settlement to the Arab-Israeli conflict as long as the sides reaped the benefit from the continuation of the conflict which should be ceased by territorial compromise needed for a real settlement.

1.3 LIMITATIONS

While trying to prove this hypothesis, this thesis will not try to put forward possible solutions to the abovementioned core issues. Instead, the focusing points will be the reasons that are responsible for the continuation of the conflict emanated from the clash of two nationalisms and led to the failure in the peace processes. While not giving a definition of the nationalisms of both sides, this study explains how they construct their nationalisms in terms of territoriality. Furthermore, the assessment of both nationalisms is not reflected in the same order of the founding factors of nationalism. In Arab nationalism, religion is elaborated firstly because the founding factor of Arab nationalism is religion constituting unity among the Arabs living on the territory. In Zionism, the longing of the Jews to a territory convenient for establishing their homeland was the basic urgent need for the Jews. After determining Palestine as the appropriate place, Zionists used religion and culture as a pulling effect to the territory.

The study will concentrate on the basic developments that set up the fundamentals of the conflict rather than bringing forward a detailed historical chronology of the various events that have taken place in different stages of the conflict. This study will not be a in depth observation of nationalist movements of both sides, that is, it will focus on the mere evaluation of the rapprochements of them to the Land of Palestine.

There are additionally two issues that put some limitations to the study. The first is theoretical and the second is historical. The theoretical one is related to what kind of nationalism it is that this thesis deals with. There are various nationalisms in the literature. It is generally discussed in the literature of nationalism that nationalism depended on loyalty to a state.[7] As we can see in any other examples of commitment to territory in various territorial conflicts such as the clash between Greek and Turkish Cypriots concerning the territories of Cyprus until 1974, the territorial dispute between Nagorno-Karabakh Republic and Azerbaijan, and the conflict between and Republic of Abkhazia and Georgia, neither the Palestinians nor the Israelis identify their nationalisms with loyalty to a state. As it is clear to see in the Cyprus issue, Turkish Cypriots and Greek Cypriots failed in sharing the same territory to which each side had claimed its territorial attachment. Until 1974, the lack of territorial compromise, exclusion of the other on the same territory led to bloody conflict between the Turkish Cypriots and Greek Cypriots. The territorial aspirations of the Turkish Cypriots stemming from their existence on the land since the Ottoman Empire and the Greek Cypriots' insistence on their claims as an extension of 'Megali Idea' resulted in the inability of the sides to agree on a territorial compromise.

Though there are both similarities and differences between the abovementioned Cyprus issue and Palestinian case, the study has generally concentrated on how the clash between nationalisms resulted in the conflict of Arab and Jewish nationalists. Their nationalisms were built on their commitment to a territory: the land of Palestine. All of the other founding factors of nationalism such as history, culture and religion are given for both sides. This study analyses their nationalisms as bearing these given facts in mind.

The historical concern is the time limitation of the study. Firstly, this study focused on the developments in the early 20th century with a view to evaluating the historical, cultural and religious claims of the Palestinian and Jewish

---

[7] Anthony D. Smith, *Nationalism*, (Cambridge: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.,), Montserrat Gibernau, *Nationalism: The Nation-State and Nationalism in the Twentieth Century*, (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1996), Carlton J.H. Hayes, *Essays on Nationalism*, (New York: Russel & Russel, 1966).

nationalisms. Secondly, the thesis elaborates the period from late 19th century to Israeli elections in 2005. Though the recent developments concerns this thesis, they are not included within this study because understanding the recent political rapprochements of both sides seem to require some time in order to put forward detailed interpretations.

1.4 CHAPTERS

Within this context the main outline of the study is as follows;

The second chapter will explain how the Arabs and the Jews depict their national construction on the basis of their territorial affiliations. As referring to the literature of nationalism in terms of national identity, nationalism and territoriality, this chapter aimed at displaying how the Arabs and the Jews defined their nationalisms within the context of the importance of territory for them. Territory proved to be the main founding factor of their nationalisms. The Arabs and the Jews constructed their nationalisms on the basis of their historical, religious and cultural attachments to the Palestinian territory so as to create legitimacy for their existence and survival in Palestine.

The third chapter will try to put forward how the Arab nationalists generally define their nationalism. In this study Arab nationalism is evaluated by order of religion, language and culture, and territory because Arabs construct their nationalism on the emotion of loyalty to territory by the means of the proliferation of their religion and language among the people residing over territory. Firstly religion then language proved to be the founding factors of Arab nationalism consolidating the meaning of territory for their national identity. A general observation of Arab nationalism is needed in order to understand the deep attachment of Palestinian Arabs to Palestine. Owing to the fact that the Palestinians considered themselves as a part of the Ottoman Empire until the establishment of the British mandate, their Arab identity was superior to their Palestinian identity. In the beginning of the conflict, the Arabs adopted united action against the Jewish existence. In this sense, the elaboration of Arab nationalism is needed for understanding the concerted effort of the Arabs, the

factors uniting them against the Jews and finally the reflections of Arab nationalism in Palestine.

The fourth chapter will analyze the development of Zionism within the same context of how the Jews formed their nationalism. In contrary to the order of religion, language and territory that was used in the evaluation of Arab nationalism, Zionism is analyzed by the order of religion, territory, and culture. The longing to reach 'the promised land' seems to be the first stimulus in the formation of Jewish identity. This aspiration transformed to establish a Jewish homeland and then a state in time. Jewish people scattered around the world protected their national identity in terms of religion in order to arise one day a state founded on their nationalism. In this regard, religion and territory are interconnected in their nationalist ideology. Culture is the last founding factor that should be preserved for the continuation of their existence in Palestine. In this chapter, the transformation of the meaning of territory from promised land to a Jewish homeland in terms of religion, territory and culture. These founding factors of Jewish nationalism try to explain the development of Zionism. Especially religious commitment of the Jews to Palestine will be evaluated with a view to reflect appropriately the logic of Jewish immigrations to be told in the following chapter.

After elaborating the construction of Arab nationalism and Zionism, the fifth chapter will focus on how the clash of Palestinian Arab nationalism and Zionism over Palestine emerged. Beginning with the explaining the triggering effect of Jewish settlements in Palestine on the reactions of the Palestinian Arabs, this chapter will underline the importance of the policies of British mandate rule in the development of conflict. Encompassing the incidents until the establishment of state of Israel in 1948, the chapter will try to demonstrate the reasons of the strong position of the Jews and the weak position of the Arabs in parallel with the political factions among the Jews and the Arabs.

This chapter will also try to display different and conflicting attitudes of the sides to the conflict while focusing on the wars having emanated from the conflicting nationalisms. While trying toreflect the benefits acquired by both

sides with keeping the conflict, the chapter will try to put forward the reasons of reluctance of the sides from territorial compromise. The chapter will also give the details of Intifada and the 1967 war especially which are the incidents has changed the nature of the conflict and influenced deeply the future of the peace process. The chapter aimed at giving a short summary of the wars in order to demonstrate the results of the clash between two nationalisms.

The sixth chapter consists of two sections. The first part gives a short history of peace process following the war years. In spite of several peace efforts, a compromise could not be achieved and particularly the issues pertaining to territory were left unresolved. At the end of the first part, the reasons of this failure are to be emphasized. In the second part, the study puts forward the meaning of the continuation of the conflict and contends that conflict considered by both sides as a tool for abandoning territorial compromise vitally needed for a lasting peace, which tantamount to renounce the deep national attachments to Palestine for the parties.

CHAPTER -2-

THE JEWISH AND ARAB NATIONAL CONSTRUCTION

IN TERMS OF TERRITORIAL NATIONALISM

Although the Jews and the Arabs contend that the formation of their nationalism started in the ancient times and continued until now, the Jewish and Arab nationalism revealed as the modern conceptions. The definition of Arab and Jewish nationalism appears as a different formation from the one that we have generally accepted. Firstly this chapter puts forward the generally accepted definitions of nation, national identity and territorial nationalism. Then, it tries to display how the Jewish and Arab people interpreted these definitions and 'constructs' their nationalisms. The construction of their nationalisms appeared in 19th century as a result of reciprocal conflicting contentions in order to possess Palestinian territory. Taking the territory as a focal point, this chapter tries to underline the construction of nationalism on the national attachments to territory by the Arab and the Jews. Elaborating the construction will try to help the reader understand the conflicting claims over territory in terms of territorial nationalism during the development of the Arab-Israeli conflict.

2.1. GENERAL ASSESMENT OF NATION, NATIONALISM AND TERRITORIALITY

Putting forward a concrete definition of nation is always a hard work for the ones studying nationalism. Nation can be defined as a group of people sharing the common language, religion, history and culture as well as a group of people living in the same territory under a single, independent authority depended on common social and economic interests. Anthony Smith identifies the nation as a named human community occupying a homeland and having myths and a shared history, a common public culture, a single economy and common rights and duties for all members.[1] The main determining factor in defining the nation is the

---

[1] Anthony D. Smith, *Nationalism*, (Cambridge: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.,), p. 13.

emotion of belonging to the group shared by every member of the group. While the member identifies himself with the characteristics of this group, he excludes the other who does not share the common features with him and his group.

These features can emanate from the common history, culture, language and religion that evoke the strong emotion of belonging. These founding factors bring the people together around the aim of strengthening their identity. Gibernau conceives that

> identity is the definition and interpretation of the self in social and psychological terms. Identity explains which community the self belongs to. The nation represents one of these communities, and national identity is the product of the nation.[2]

The national identity appears to be meaningful in an autonomous entity. This entity is generally described as a nation-state. Nation-state is the product of nationalism that can be defined as a loyalty and a devotion to a nation putting emphasis on the interests, cultural and social values, or religion of one group above all others.

Among the various definitions of nationalism, Anthony D. Smith explains nationalism as "an ideological movement for attaining and maintaining autonomy, unity and identity for a population which some of its members deem to constitute an actual or potential 'nation'".[3] The establishment of autonomy and unity of the basis of common cultural society necessitates the ongoing emphasis of national identity. Eric Hobsbawm describes this process as a 'social engineering'[4]. He states that nationalism, the nation state, national symbols depend on exercises in social engineering that are always innovative. The formation of a community as a nation emerged as a response of ruling elites to a rapid political mobilization of masses that could threaten the stability of the old

---

[2] Montserrat Gibernau, *Nationalism: The Nation-State and Nationalism in the Twentieth Century*, (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1996), p. 72.

[3] Anthony D. Smith, *op.cit.*, p. 9.

[4] Montserrat Guibernau, John Hutchinson and Walker Connor, ed., *Understanding Nationalism,* Cambridge: Polity Press, 2001, p. 76.

orders. Within this context, nationalism was based on 'invented traditions'[5] and the masses oriented towards adopted these invented traditions in each to provide a social cohesion. This cohesion stems from ideological and emotional belongings of every member of nation because nationalism proves to be both an emotion and an ideology. It is an ideology that standardizes the people and constitutes national solidarity within the political and national borders. It is an emotion that makes the members of the group feel loyalty to the same political authority.

The emotion of loyalty and national solidarity depends on the same religion, language and culture separating them from the others living across their national borders. The borders of their state refer to the territory presently or anciently shared by them. Knight states that

> a past belonging might tie a group to a specific territory, be it presently occupied or not. In case the nation does not have its own territory, it may be desired again, and conflict with the current settlers emerged.[6]

In this regard, territoriality reveals as one of the important factor that consolidates national identity and nationalism.

Territory can be depicted as a shell under which the nation flourishes the common identity founded on the same culture, religion and language. Territoriality merges the members sharing the same national identity and distinguishes them from the others. Nationalism identifies the individuals as a nation according to their belonging to a certain country and culture. Nationalism considers the nation as an integrated group living on the same territory.[7] Territory principally represents the membership of every member of a community derives from his residence within borders. The members feel loyalty to supreme authority within a territory. Anthony Giddens states that "a nation only exists when a state has a unified administrative reach over the territory over which its sovereignty is

---

[5] ***Ibid.***

[6] David B.Knight, "Identity and Territory: Geographical Perspectives on Nationalism and Regionalism", *Annals of the Association of American Geographies*, 72(4), 1982, p. 521.

[7] Recep Boztemur, "Tarihsel Açıdan Millet ve Milliyetçilik: Ulus-Devletin Kapitalist Üretim Tarzıyla Birlikte Gelişimi", *Doğu Batı,* 38, Ağustos, Eylül, Ekim 2006, p. 166.

claimed."[8] The administrative power, which unites the people around common cultural characteristics on a specific territory, always tries to protect the elements of the identity to which the nation feel belonging. Therefore, homeland has much more meaning than being only a territory. Territory represents the sovereignty of the national identity separating the nation from the others. Anthony Smith states that territorial nationalist is obliged to perceive the existing other as alien and take over political domination over the territory.[9]

When these theoretical contemplations are taken into consideration in terms of Arab and Jewish nationalisms, they may seem to be similar with other nationalisms. However, territoriality changes their nature. When the meaning of the territoriality for both nationalisms, it is understood that both of them are not the product of a formation but a construction of a national identity in order to gain superiority on the same territory. Especially after the World War I, Arab nationalism and Zionism that had developed on the feeling of loyalty to the same territory in 19th century, proved to be special national constructions that raise territorial claims over Palestine. This unveils the clash of two nationalisms in Palestine. To understand the clash of these two nationalisms, it is appropriate to analyze the meaning of nation, nationalism and territoriality for the Jews and the Arabs.

2.2 THE MEANING OF NATIONAL CONSTRUCTION FOR THE ARABS AND THE JEWS IN TERMS OF TERRITORIALITY

Anthony Smith states that "post-modern perspective considers ethnies and nations as simply cultural artifacts and constructs of cultural engineers who tailor pre-existing mythologies, symbols and history for their ends. The main goal of the nationalist is to gain and maintain the nationhood of his chosen group."[10] Within the context of post-modern perspective, Arab nationalists and the Jewish

---

[8] John Hutchinson and Anthony D. Smith, ed., *Nationalism*, (Oxford-New York: Oxford University Press, 1994), p. 34.

[9] Anthony D. Smith, *Theories of Nationalism*, (New York: Holmes & Meier Publishers, 1983), p. 217.

[10] Anthony D.Smith, *Myths and Memories of the Nation*, (Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), p. 164.

nationalists conceive nationalism as a 'force not only an idea'[11] that forms the nations as artifacts. The national construction as a political action of the nationalists' crystallized national identities through protracted warfare and territorialization. As Smith identifies nation as artifacts within postmodern perspective

> the Arabs and the Jews proved to be nations formed by purification of their culture, the universalization of their chosen character and the territorialization of their memory. The universalization of chosen character was used by the Jews in the definition of their culture as a sacred mission to bring their culture to less fortunate neighbors [12],

This implied both expansion of the Jews and the exclusion of the other. Moreover, the so-called chosen character of the Jews to form territorial claims over Palestine and legitimize their claims. With the territorialization of memory in the 19th century, the Jews and the Arabs attached their shared memories to a particular territory, Palestine. For these memories are important for the development of their community, territory as an historic homeland proved to be the basic factor determining the success of state formation. All historical, religious and cultural commitments forging the nation became meaningful with the development of community on their historical homeland.

All of these trends explain the measures used in the national construction of both sides. The Jews and the Arabs attached themselves to genuineness in order to preserve their identity in Palestine. Arab nationalism and Jewish nationalism did not come into being to resume old order; however, they could be regarded as dependent on invented traditions to maintain social cohesion. Given the scattered nature of the Jewish people around the world and various rivalries among the Arabs, social cohesion was constituted by national construction against the other nationalism. When this construction is observed, it is understood that the Jews and the Arabs interpreted their historical, religious and cultural attachments to territory so as to serve their nationalisms.

---

[11] David B.Knight, *Ibid..*

[12] Anthony D.Smith, *Myths and Memories of the Nation, **Ibid**..*

17

Territory has not national meaning for the Jews until 1948. Palestine as a promised land has religious meaning. For the Zionists any place like Uganda, Madagascar or Argentina appeared to be the options that was appropriate to solve the Jewish problem. Their priority was to establish a homeland for the Jews. However, creating a homeland was not sufficient for the settlement of the Jewish problem. They should transfer the Jewish identity developed in ghettos in the European countries to the homeland to guarantee the survival of this homeland. That was only possible with settling the Jews on a territory to which the future Jewish generations feel loyalty. In this vain, they founded their national identity on the cultural and religious attachments. Jewish nationalism firstly appeared to be an ideology to ensure their existence in Palestine.

For the Arabs, the formation of national identity is parallel with the generally-accepted definition of nation referring to a group of people sharing common cultural characteristics on the same territory. The Arabs conceived nationalism an emotion in the first sight. Their belonging to culture and territory became an ideology when they had to face the threat of Jewish existence.

Naturally, territory has the utmost importance for two nationalisms. Territory ensures the continuation of the national identity. Each party defines its national identity with the superiority over the territory. This creates the clash of two nationalisms.

The Jews and the Arabs strived for years to gain and maintain the nationhood of their chosen group in order to display that they are the real possessors of Palestinian territories. Since the outbreak of Arab resistance to the Jewish immigrations in 1800s and to British policies in 1900s, this goal urged them to invent their nationalisms. Therefore, this study explains the nationalist developments of both sides as national construction especially after the establishment of state of Israel in 1948. To convince the others that their group is in fact a nation, the Jews or the Arabs put emphasis on distinctiveness of their group. This feature derived from some persuasive sociological evidences that make their group a unique nation with a common language, religion, its territory of national frontiers. The last phase tomaintain their nationhood is gaining

independence and protecting it. In this regard, the last aim would be building a state on the national boundaries.[13]

Within these considerations in mind, national construction processes of both sides were exposed to similar phases. All of their historical, religious and cultural claims appeared as concrete sociological evidences so as to prove their nationhood. Moreover, these claims legitimized their vital objective to gain their independence on the national borders. Both sides could not draw their cultural and national borders because they constructed their nationhood and demanded the last goal of independence over the same land. They had no other boundaries. In this regard, the Palestinians and Israelis could be classified as territorial nationalists.

Both Arab and Jewish national movements aimed at constituting an actual nation in Palestine in order to maintain their autonomy on the same territory. In this sense, Palestinian and Jewish nations are the result of the national construction of both movements that granted an identity to the people coexisting in Palestine. For the Arabs and the Jews, this product derived from the complex of founding factors of nationalism was based on their conflicting demands on the same territory. Jewish and Arab nationalist movements used these founding factors to legitimize their national construction on the same territory that is called by both sides as 'homeland'. Indeed, both the Jews and the Arabs built their national construction on achieving these elements that are needed to be a nation. For the Jews and the Arabs territory proved to be the main factor on which these needed elements could be constituted. For them, history, culture and religion could be meaningful in terms of nationalism if a homeland existed.

The conflicting territorial and national aspirations over the same territory made the separation between the two nationalisms strict. In this sense, both nationalisms proved to be territorial as the ideological movements of both sides were providing the communities with national identities in parallel with their territorial aspirations. The Jews and the Palestinian Arabs perceived their national construction completed when they constitute their sovereign state on their

---

[13] Anthony D. Smith, *Theories of Nationalism*, **op.cit.,** p. 215.

homeland, otherwise they would be destined to be scattered even though they carry all the features of being a nation.

The Jews constituted their nationalism on a territory in which they exclude the existence of the other. This is same for Arab nationalism. In the face of the Jewish claim to be superior nation in Palestine, the Arabs intended to prove the genuine nature of their nationalism. For both nationalist movements, the idea of land is of significance in shaping national identity aimed at gaining or regaining sovereignty over the land.

The goal of achieving sovereignty emanates from the tie between people and territory that constitutes collective memory and shape the identity of the community. Though they do not establish sovereignty over territory, the national group preserves these ties in their cultural memory. The land thus became idealized in the Jews' and the Arabs' memory for years.

The conflict on Palestine was inevitable because the Jews scattered around Eastern Europe adopted the ideology of returning to their homeland and building their nationalism to serve this ideology that would help them establish their sovereignty in Palestine. By doing so, their nationalist aspirations always overlooked the others' existence. Furthermore, conflict continues since this process succeeded and its continuation has been preserved. By the same token, the Arabs waiting for Britain to realize its promise on allowing establishing an independent Arab state also founded their nationalisms on the same logic. In order to prevent their evacuation from their homeland and return to their homeland, they should have put forward their bound to territory in terms of nationalism. As a result of the similar development of two nationalisms resulted in the clash of both nationalisms that served to regain the territory and exclude the other towards this end.

The Israeli-Palestinian dispute comprises the struggle of two nationalisms for the control of the same territory. The two nationalist movements constructed on the basis of territoriality put forward clashing claims over the land. The Jews and the Arabs consider Palestine to be exclusively theirs. Both claims depended

on disregarding the other's right to exist on the territory. The Jews transformed from a separate group in inequality with European societies to a nation when they espoused a nationalist ideology to form a state. The emergence of the idea of establishing a state and the subsequent national building towards this end became the hard-core of self-identity of the Jews as a nation. In this regard, territory was the main founding factor of the Jewish nationalism. There is no other alternative to unite the Jews other than the state. For the Jews the state is supposed to represent the interests of the nation and defend them from the dangers outside the boundaries, in which they will enjoy the superior position. On the other hand, the Arabs were the people who established their identity on their loyalty to the territory in which Israelis and the Arabs are destined to live in proximity.

Given the reasons of the conflict, the exclusion of the other emanates from that there is no alternative to this option. Both sides constituted their nationalisms on territoriality and unfortunately Palestine is a territory that should be shared and could not be divided. It seems impossible to divide the territory between two nationalist movements because claims of these movements over territory separately require the exclusion of the other. The nature of territoriality also urges the sides to compete for political control over territory. Sack stated that territoriality is the attempt by a group to effect, influence or control people by delimiting and asserting control over a geographical area. The claim over territory is the exercise of territoriality and undisputed tribal right of occupancy strengthens this claim.[14]

The Jews settling in Palestine was aware of that the Palestinian territory had not been inhabited. The Arabs also noticed as a result of growing immigrations that they would be expelled from their homeland. For these reasons both sides constructed their national movements within the framework of territoriality. Within these considerations in mind, the national construction of the parties seems as a foundation to legitimize their claims over the territory.

---

[14] Michael Chisholm and David M. Smith, *Shared Space: Divided Space*, ed., (Boston, Sydney, Wellington: Unwin Hyman Inc., 1995), p. 3.

The Zionist movement not only represented the Jews, but also succeeded in identifying itself with them. This led to a cohesive and united nationalist movement. On the other side, the previously failed political organizations until the establishment of the PLO make the Palestinian Nationalist Movement very disadvantageous.

The weak standpoint of the Palestinian Arabs displayed that national construction emphasizing their loyalty to territory was not sufficient for the success of their national movement in changing their disadvantageous position. By its failure to protest its territory from the other, the Palestinian Nationalists understood that defining their national identity by their language, culture and religion was meaningless unless they realize their claims over territory on which they aspired to maintain their nationalism. The wars between the Arabs and the Israelis proved this consideration. If territory was lost to the other because of the inefficiency of political organization, the achievement of the construction of national identity seemed impossible. Thus, taking control of territory meant the continuity of both nationalisms.

In consequence, Arab nationalism and Zionism emerged as the nationalist movements that founded their ideological elements in terms of predominating the territory on which they settled or the territory on which they anticipated to settle. In spite of different nationalist aspirations over Palestine, the Palestinian Arabs and the Jews came to the threshold of conflict because of their inability to share the same land. Therefore, they put forward contradictory claims over Palestine. They constructed their nationalism so as to display themselves as the real possessor of Palestine. The founding factors of nationalism generally explained above were used so as to recreate their nationalism in order to legitimize their existence and the necessity of their survival on the land of Palestine. Therefore, this study will attempt at critically evaluating Arab nationalism and Palestinian nationalism, and Zionism from the point of views of the Arabs and Zionism in order to clearly reflect how they constitute their conflicting national claims over Palestine and how the Arab-Israeli conflict emerged and evolved.

CHAPTER -3-

ARAB NATIONALISM

The Arab land, known as the Arab peninsula, is a land on which the Arabs have maintained the Arab civilization. On this territory, Islam as a common religion constituted the strongest unifying factor and a pillar of Arab nationalism for the Arabs. On the part of common history, the Arabs are equally proud of their past. They had common experiences coming from the common history giving birth to their identical sentiments.

Within the acknowledgements abovementioned concerning the territorial nationalism, the Arabs based their national construction on their religious, historical and cultural commitments to the Arab peninsula. Therefore, they founded their claims over the land of Palestine as a result of their national construction. Each claim of the Arabs over 'territory', whether it is religious, historical or cultural, intended to prove that the Arabs had been the real possessors of the land and the Jews in Palestine with Zionist aspirations came later and tried to take the control of political authority from their lands. In this regard, they put forward that the Arab national movement had constituted the social basis of political authority.

Gogoi and Abdulghafour states that "the essence of nationalism is a belief about the social basis of political authority."[1] The Arabs believe that language, culture, ethnicity and religion constitute the social bases of Arab nationalism and they were devoted to realize the Arab unity. As a result of the unifying effects of these factors, national consciousness prevailed in Arab countries, culminated in local nationalisms. Constructing their nationalism, the Arabs considered that the roots of Arab nationalism would meet the ideological need of Arabs that they seek for. They desired to create a nation state based on the Arab unity over the

---

[1] Aparajita Gogoi, and Gazi Ibdewi Abdulghafour, *Arab Nationalism: Birth, Evolution and The Present Dilemma,* (New Delhi: Lancers Books, 1994), p. 2.

whole area of the Arab people. The fundamental idea was that all Arabs constituted one single nation, a single political entity with a common culture and language that predominates in the Arab peninsula. Not excluding religion from nationalism, the Arabs adopted Islam with its Arab character as an intrinsic part of Arab nationalism. The basic characteristics of Arab nationalism appear as the same geographical land creating feeling of homogenous entity, common religion tying the Arab people, common history forging the sense of belonging to a part of group and common language as a moral link.

When the founding factors of Arab national construction are evaluated, the contribution of common language, religion and history to the development of Arab identity cannot be overlooked. However, their capability to legitimate their territorial claims of the Arabs is debatable. For the reason that some scholars like A.A.Duri express that Arab nationalism emerged out of the impact of the Western world as a defensive nationalism against the Western influence over the Arab world.[2] This expression underestimates the internal dynamics of the national building of the Arabs. Surely, the Western effects on Arab national development were apparent. Nevertheless, it was not forgotten that the tribal groups and Bedouins on agricultural lands served to create common and stable bonds of loyalty to their territory. This loyalty was provided by the commitment of the Arabs to the same religion, culture and history. This loyalty constituted the loyalty of the Arabs to the territory intensely inhabited by the Arabs established the basis of the Arab identity and their demands over the land.

3.1 THE EVALUATION OF ARAB NATIONALISM AS TO THE FOUNDING FACTORS OF THE ARAB NATIONAL CONSTRUCTION

3.1.1 RELIGION

Islam emerged not only as a religion of universal character but also as an area of civilization and culture. The contributions of Islam to Arab nationalism

---

[2] A. A. Duri, *The Historical Formation of Arab Nationalism: A Study in Identity and Consciousness*, (London, New York, Sydney: Croom Helm, 1987), p. 29.

are of significant importance. First of all, Islam oriented this Arab tribal communities towards a national consciousness based on cultural affiliation. Islam and Arabic become the basic foundations of this cultural entity. Islam settled down the Arabs in the sedentary and urban areas with a literary life thus laid the foundations of cultural developments. The Arabs believed that the dissemination of Islam through the Arabic language resulted in the presentation of Arab civilization in the Middle East and North Africa. Moreover, the spread of the revelations of the Qur'an which came in clear Arabic consolidated the Arab identity to the speakers of Arabic. However, the role of language of the religion in the national construction of the Arabs was debatable.

Because of the divergent Arabic, the presence of a sole Arabic civilization is under discussion. Yet, the first and foremost achievement of the Islamic movement was the unification of the Arabs for the first time in their history. Islam united the Arabs, by bringing the opportunity to the Arabs for setting an organized state. It bound the Arabs together around a single cause to carry the message of Islam beyond their lands. In this regard, Islam imbued the Arabs with a sense of mission. Moreover, being devoted to the memory of hijra to Medina, the Arabs spread their civilization while founding new centers and cities in the Islamic world. Lastly, Islam emerged as a great gift to the Arabs for the creation of a community and the establishment of a state.

Duri articulates that the emergence of Islam contributed to the increase of the Arab features within the communities that adopted Islam.[3] The holy book of Islam, Quran, was Arabic, the prophet of Islam, Muhammad, was an Arab and the people who received the message of God by Muhammad were the Arabs. Moreover, they needed a new social structure in order to repair the degradation of society in the Jahiliyyah. In the early Islamic period, Islam created a feeling of a common destiny and of a distinguished historical role. The Arabs, he said, raised the banner of Islam by the compounds of conquest and founded a state which themselves ruled. The Islamic community so created was at that time essentially Arab, and its language was Arabic. The sense of pride in their Arab descent and a

---

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 45.

feeling of superiority over other peoples helped the Arabs to end the stagnation period and encouraged them to launch a modern era. [4]

Within Duri's considerations in mind, it is understood that Islam gave a new social formation providing united society with a single faith. With the coming of this new social structure, it was seen that politics and religion were intertwined within Islam. As Muhammad transmitted God's will for social justice, he created a political entity. As a major part of Arab civilization, Islam became the most influential effective element of Arab nationalism for the Arabs. For the reason that Islam was born in the Arab peninsula, firstly adopted by majority of the Arabs and, then spread over the borders of Arabia, it proved to be a religion and a national cause for the Arabs at the same time. Moreover, it was dear to the Arabs for it revealed in their language. Furthermore, the language of the Qur'an united the Arabs because it had abolished the linguistic differences among the Arabs.

Even in the early years of twentieth century, the Muslim Arabs put forward the nucleus of Arab nationalist view. According to Islamic revivalists such as Abduh, Rashid Rida and Abd al-Rahman al Kawakibi, the new Arabism after sometime appeared as the successor of Islamic modernism and revivalism. For them humiliation and abasement of the Muslims could be cured by returning to the true Islam of their ancestors who were Arab. Hazem Zaki Nuseibeh states that this meant the revival of Arabism and the Arab culture.[5] To the Arabs, this idea of return started the Arab national awakening. The reference to religion that claimed to be universal strengthened the position of Arabs among other Muslims. This also strengthened their solidarity against the growing influence of the West.

All in all, the major historical memory of the Arabs was the legacy of Islam that was always remembered with pride. According to Nuseibeh, the Arabs received a preeminent position owing to their dependence on Islam.[6] This pre-

---

[4] Rashid Khalidi and Lisa Anderson, Muhammad Muslih, Simon S. Reeva, eds. *The Origins of Arab Nationalism,* (New York: Columbia University Pres, New York, Chichester, 1991), p. 9.

[5] Hazem Zaki Nuseibeh , *The Ideas of Arab Nationalism,* 2nd edition, (New York: Cornell University Press, Ithaca, 1959), p. 25.

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 69.

eminence presented Arabs key positions in the social, economic, political and military services. In this sense, an Arab nationalist considers the legacy of Islam as his heritage for it was expressed in Arabic and reveal in an Arab territory. The Arab-Islamic legacy helped the Arabs discover their own essence and its possession served a vital national purpose for the Arabs.

Nevertheless, all Arabs were not Muslim. Additionally, Christian Arabs considered Islam within the framework of a common culture. The language and culture emerged as the link that bound the Christian Arabs with the other Muslim Arabs.

3.1.2   LANGUAGE[7] AND CULTURAL ARABISM

Considering uniform consciousness and behavior of which a nation is made, the Arab nationalists set language in the first place among the constituting factors of the Arab nation. The social communication in the Arabic language had effective role in forming an Arab nation. Within this context, language namely the language of Quran prevails as a mobilizing element in national consolidation. The Arabs considered language as unifying factor lifting all boundaries, used in creating an Arab-speaking world.

The distinguished role of Arabic in Arab nationalism derived from the claims of Islam to be universal. To expand beyond the borders, Islam resorted to the Arabic language in which the revelations of Qur'an were written. Yet, the comprehensive nature of the language had more effective role in the development of Arab nationalism. Many Arab nationalists were inspired by the idea of uniting all Arab speaking people not only Muslims into a single state. When the role of the Christian Arabs in the national awakening is contemplated, the common culture and language seemed more crucial in gathering all Arabs around a national cause.

The role of Christian Arabs became more important in the 20th century. Christian Arabs supported the idea of a separate Arab entity independent of the Ottomans because eligible Syrian notables were not given a place in the

---

[7] The Arab language of Quran is meant.

27

administration. As Muslim Arabs, they also demanded executive concessions from the central administration. When they failed to achieve prominent places in the state organization, they contributed to the development of the national awakening. Thus, the Arab-speaking people became the natural progenitor of Arab consciousness. For them, nationalism was the only way to break out of their ghettos constituted by the Empire. In this regard, the cultural revival in the second quarter of the nineteenth century spread to Syria, Egypt and Iraq by 1914 put forward the origins of general Arab awakening in the Arab East. [8] The cohesion of Islam, language and culture prove to be inseparable factors in Arab nationalism.

To the Arabs, culture became the foundation for Arab identity with the expansion of Arabic language Entrance into the Islamic faith encouraged learning Arabic and participating in Arabic culture in order to understand the references made in the Qur'an. Some considered conversion to Islam as tantamount to becoming Arab. But also for the Christians, language united all Arabs whether Muslim or Christian in contriving to form national consciousness. Their emphasis on Arab elements such as the Arab language, Arab culture and history in addition to Islam would end their marginal position in an Islamic state.

As Nuseibeh states Arabic as a lingua franca over a large area and having a great chance to spread along with a religion, consolidated 'like-mindness and a Arab culture and identity developed.'[9] In this sense, cultural Arabism reaped the benefit from emphasizing the role of language.

For the leaders[10] of cultural Arabism who were the founding fathers of Arab nationalism, the application of their 'twin-track policy'[11], which means praising

---

[8] Duri, *op.cit.*, p. 46.

[9] Nuseibeh, **op.cit**., p. 12.

[10] 1) Religious scholars and prominent leaders who claimed descent from the Prophet Muhammad,
   2) Christian intelligentsia in Syria and Lebanon,
   3) Urban notables and landowners who entered the new institutions of a reformed Ottoman state as representatives of their local communities.

[11] Youssef M. Choueiri, *Arab Nationalism: A History*, (Massachusettes: Blackwell Publishers, 2000), p. 66-68.

Arab historical achievements while demonstrating the compatibility of Arab cultural values with modern institutions, became able to encompass all-Arab speaking communities.

The capability of Arabic culture and civilization to reach the masses through widespread language of Quran strengthened the development of Arab nationalism and its resistance against the external threats. As we witnessed in the Arab-Israeli conflict, the conflict is not the problem of Palestinian Arabs alone anymore. All the Arabs react to the Zionist cause as a whole. Within this context, cultural affinities in the Arab world that arose basically from the common language, has rendered the Arab nationalist movement deep-rooted. Arab nationalists considered the one who speaks Arabic as Arab. For the Arab nationalists, this consideration led to guarantee of a unified power against a threat towards the Arab world. Nevertheless, all Arabs did not speak the same Arabic. There were different kinds of Arabic among the Arabs. Therefore, the unifying effect of the language is not clear. However, the Arabic language of Quran, could be conceived as a factor that gathered the Arab people together by the spread of Islam. The Arabs asserted that the language of Quran brought the Arabs together on the Arabian Peninsula on which they believed in the same religion and the same holy book in the same language. In this vain, territory started to represent their unity based on common religion and culture.

3.1.3   TERRITORY

The Arab geography determined to a large extent the distribution of its inhabitants and their way of life. Stretching along trade routes between the Mediterranean and the Indian subcontinent, it witnessed the birth of an active merchant class both in Yemen and the southwest regions, such as Mecca.

The emergence of Mecca as the center of Arabic culture and economic power, coupled with the establishment of an inter-tribal alliance under the leadership of Quraysh, encouraged a sense of solidarity among the Arabs. This solidarity derived from the idea of loving the fatherland. The settlement of this term into the Arab nationalist perspective came into being "with the adaptation to

Near Eastern conditions of the European concept of patria and patriotism." [12]

Within the period of the Tanzimat (1839), the idea of loving one's fatherland gained currency so that the concept of fatherland become an intrinsic part of the Arab world. The national identity started to be described as an entity growing out of a common history of a particular fatherland sharing common Arab cultural values. Consequently, having a sense of particular national history on the one hand, the Arabs reclaimed for the local culture its own language, on the other. With the integration of the concept of the fatherland that became associated with independence into Arabism, Arab nationalism acquired political character.

Gogoi and Abdulghafour state that "watan refers to a 'place' where one would settle down or live permanently. In the nationalist model, the term watan meant a geographical area that constitutes the homeland of citizens bound to each other by legal and emotional ties, and who belongs to a sovereign state or to a state which is struggling to recover its sovereignty."[13] Within this context, the Arabian Peninsula represents the territory on which the religion of the Arabs, Islam, emerged, the language of Quran, Arabic, is spoken, their history continues and their culture spreads. All the founding factors of Arab nationalism emanated from this territory and they served to protect this territory. The basic political loyalty of the Arabs was based on territorial dimensions within the nationalist movement. Especially Arab people are proud of Islamic empire in which Arab language and civilization disseminated. The common living memory of the Arab nation, namely their history on their territories constituted one of the basic tenets of Arab nationalism.

To Nuseibeh, the unity of Arab history generates uniform sympathies and inclinations; it leads to a sharing of pride in the glories of the past and collective sorrow over past misfortunes that creates identity of aspirations for the future.[14] In short, the Arabs constructed their nationalism on their pride in the glories of the

---

[12] Rashid Khalidi, *op.cit.*, p. 4.

[13] Gogoi and Abdulghafour, *op.cit.*, p. 82.

[14] Nuseibeh, *op.cit.*, p. 77 from Sati Husari, *Aarawa Ahadith fi al – Wataniyah wa al – awmiyah (Opinions and Talks on Patriotism and Nationalism)*, (Cairo,1944), p. 20.

past and collective sorrow. After emphasizing the Arabs' commitments to the Arabian Peninsula including their religious and cultural affiliations, the common history of glories and sorrows is worthy to elaborate how they interpret their history so as to product their nation. The western influence and the transformation of Arab identity from Ottomanism to Arabism appeared to be the determining factors within this history. These two elements are more explanatory to understand the nature of the conflict between two parties dependent on two conflicting national identities.

3.1.4 THE WESTERN INFLUENCE AND THE REACTION OF ARAB WORLD: ISLAMIC REFORMISM & ISLAMISM

The emergence of a feeling to form a community stemmed from the sense of loyalty to locality and tribe resulted in patriotism among the Arab people. Therefore, they could gather around a civilization that they could cherish and to which they could look for inspiration and guidance. Whereas the pre-Islamic period had witnessed the emergence of an Arab identity, the Islamic period varied the Arabs forward the development of a full-fledged national consciousness. The developments such as the opening of the Middle East to the West, Islamism and transition from Ottomanism to Arabism, which resulted in abovementioned consequences contributed to the formation of modern Arab nationalism

The impact of the European expansion began with Napoleon's invasion of Egypt in 1798 resulted in the total opening of the Arab world to the European influence. Bassam Tibi states that Napoleon claimed to wish to spread the spirit of French Revolution and challenge the Islamic theocratic despotism of the Ottomans and Mamelukes with the principles of liberty and equality.[15] Considering the desire of France to block the Indian route of Britain, this claim appeared unrealistic. This invasion was shortly the beginning of an interaction between East and West. As a result of this interaction, Western-educated Arab intellectuals expressing the desire of the Arabs for liberation from foreign rule emerged in the Middle East as the first adherents of a national movement.

---

[15] Bassam Tibi *Arab Nationalism,* 3rd edition, (New York St. Martin's Press, 1997), p. 93.

Moreover, the results of Napoleon's invasion of Egypt came into being as "general Arab awakening, introduction of the printing press: revival of Arab classics and culture and hence to national consciousness and lastly the introduction of the European ideas of nationality"[16] inspired by the French Revolution.

With the impact of the French Revolution and the technological innovations brought by the West to the region, the idea of liberty and equality permeated the region. The Arabs, in order to reinvigorate their position against the increasing development of the Western World, launched their modernization period. The ideological, technological and political intervention of Europe into the Arab region brought forward positive and negative dimensions to the refom movement. Positive motivations comprised of the introduction of modern ideas like self-determination, the rule of law and constitutionalism, the spread of these ideas through technological instruments and the Western educated intellectuals. Negative motivations such as economic and political interventions resulted from Western colonialism created reaction in the Arab world. Remembering their 'superior' civilization strengthened by the emergence of Islam, the Arabs believed that their might should have been revitalized. The impact of West awakened the sense of pride in their past heritage and brought about the modern revival of Arab-speaking world after the stagnation period.

The Arabs saw that British colonialism of 1882 interrupts their renaissance. The Islamists counseled that return to the orthodox Islam could only save the Arabs from negative impacts of colonialism. Far from being exercising power over weak, colonialism concerted effort to establish a division between the civilized and savage. In this sense, 'civilizing mission' of France or 'the white man's burden' of Britain were introduced to the Arabs as a gift to be shared in order to rule them which was not in conformity with the reformist Arab's demands. They believed that the import of inner content of forms of European

---

[16] Nuseibeh, *op.cit.*, p. 35.

society would undermine the basic foundations of their civilization. The motivation of them was restoring the power of the Arab world again.

The Arabs recognized that their weakness rendered them vulnerable to foreign domination that was taking shape within the context of the imperial designs of France, Britain and other European states. Though the Islamists claimed that the Arabs would selectively borrow from Europe, it was very difficult to prevent imported ideas about technology and administration from influencing their social and cultural norms. This deepened and led to European's interest and involvement in the Arab world. As a consequence the Arab world failed to become strong enough with modernization process to resist European domination. In this regard, they focused their attention on the definition of their character within the context of returning to Islam and adaptation of their civilization to the Western values.

Islamic revival consists of two movements; the Wahhabi movement led by Muhammad Abd al-Wahhab (1703-19) and Islamic modernism (Islamism) led by Jamal Al-Din Al-Afghani and Muhammad Abduh. Wahhabism stipulated that deviations from true Islam resulted in corruption and distortion in the Arab regions and the Muslims should return to the beginnings of Islam. According to them, the Arabs as the generation of the Prophet, and therefore the real representatives of Islam could alleviate the deteriorating conditions of the Muslim world with mobilizing the Muslims towards Islam. So that Wahhabis unified scattered local tribes for the resurgence of Arab vitality. This let Islam takes an important role as a unifying factor for the emergence of Arab nationalism.

The other form of Islamic revival was Islamic modernism. Though it shared the idea of 'revitalization of Islam' with the Wahhabi movement, its method to achieve this goal differed. Instead of turning to the archaic times of Islam, it contended the survival of Islam in modern world along with the elements of European science without allowing it to attack on the roots of Islamic civilization.

The Islamic reformist movement preceded Arab nationalism. It was a defensive reform movement against the West. Islamic reformism emerged as a

reaction also to the Western models adopted by the Tanzimat. In this sense, a revitalization of Islam was sought to prevent the penetration of the European influence and the erosion of the Ottoman Islamic system. The leaders of this movement, Jamal Al-Din Al-Afghani (1838-97) and Muhammad Abduh (1849-1905), tried to make principles of Islam compatible with the contemporary needs for change. Within this context, Islamic reform movement undertook an important role in the early formulations of Arab nationalism.

Islamist intellectuals, who envisaged that return to Islam would address the question of the underdevelopment nature of the Arab world, supported Islamic revival. By 1870 Rifa'a Tahtawi (Egypt) and Khayr ad-Din (Tunisia) started to transmit Western ideas into the Arab world. Jamal al- Din al-Afghani (1838-1897) transformed Islam into an ideology of nationalism. According to him, Islam proved to be a unifying force to bind Arab tribal communities on the basis of national consciousness and a source of their solidarity needed to resist the European expansion. Therefore, Tibi states that the Arabs would be able to take collective action and reconstruct their national independence.[17]

Muhammad Abduh (1849-1905) like Al-Afghani referred to matters of religion in the way of revitalization. His successors like Rashid Rida carried forward more liberal vision which was the legacy of early modernists like Rifaa Rafi al-Tahtawi insisting that the well being of the Arabs required fundamental social and cultural changes to restore Islam's original vigor through revising the prevailing view of ijtihad. Surely he was criticized by the conservative Ulama.

Both the Wahhabi movement and Islamic modernism directed against the foreign domination emphasized the Arab origins of Islam. Both the movements tried to create a single nation including all Muslims. Despite the fact that Islamists endeavored to protect the Arab identity in the face of the Western ideas, they could not prevent the Arabs from being influenced from these ideas such as nationalism, freedom and equality. In response, the Arabs focused on the characteristics of their identity by underlining 'the Arab origins of Islam' as a result of Islamic revivalism. The focus point revealed more apparent during the

---

[17] Tibi, *op.cit.*, p. 94.

rule of the Ottoman Empire. Though they did not identify themselves as a separate identity within the borders of the Empire, the Arabs expected from the Ottoman administration to give prominent positions in the ruling class.

Under the centralized rule of the Ottoman Empire, the Arabs were more unified than they were at any time. However, the failure of the central government to preserve the Arabs from European encroachments gave rise to decentralization. The Arab awakening under the influence of Western ideas firstly appeared in the Arab provinces of the Ottoman Empire in the middle of the nineteenth century. Arabism emerged as a measure to help them benefiting from the decentralization period and gaining more concessions from the Ottoman administration. Mehmed Ali Pasha's modernization efforts in addition to Islamist Arab's Islamic revivalism contributed to this anticipation of the Arabs.

Mehmed Ali Pasha's conscription of local soldiers within the Arab provinces created a basis of local solidarity on a common homeland. Under the influence of the French Revolution, Ali's educational reforms urged young students to be interested in the Arab language and the common heritage of the society. This chain of developments culminated in the occurrence of a growing self-awareness that acted as a spurring factor in search for a self-identity. Under the influence of Mehmed Ali's attempts to develop the Egyptian economy and modernize the social structure of Egypt in order to constitute sovereign administration, Ibrahim Pasha also attaches importance to the idea of the nation.

The gradual emergence of self-awareness among the Arabs along with their emphasizing their identity urged them to transform their ideological framework from Ottomanism to Arabism. The Arabs supported their separation from the idea of Ottomanism for only gaining some benefits from the decentralization period within the Empire. However, the transformation from Ottomanism to Arabism consolidated their national construction.

3.1.5 FROM OTTOMANISM TO ARABISM

When the Arab literature was examined, it is seen that two developments had effects on the evolvement of Arab nationalism. First is the Arab reaction to the Western influence. Second was the effect of the Ottoman reform movement. With the emergence of different nationalist demands among the Ottoman entities, the aspirations of the Arabs came to the threshold. While every entity intended to reap the benefit from the decentralization period of the Ottoman Empire, the Arabs also supported this movement desiring more liberality from the Empire. Therefore, they would be able to obtain more prominent and beneficial positions in the administration. When Tanzimat and 1908 Revolution failed to give a new dimension to the state affairs and expected positions to the Arabs, the Arabs concentrated on transpiring as one of the advantageous elements of the Ottoman Empire.

The reform movement within the Ottoman Empire included military and administrative reforms. This movement led to the emergence of a new middle class who cultivated for international market. As a result, Muslim merchants were urged to concentrate on local trading activities and they developed a sense of their own collective interests. Within this context, the wealthy groups were to constitute the bourgeoisie class among the Arabs started to display their aspirations for not independence but self-autonomy.

According to Choueiri, the main goal of the followers of this movement to turn the empire into a modern state ruling all its subjects with equality, and irrespective of race, religion or nationality[18] during the Ottoman reform movement led by Tanzimat. However, events like the Balkan revolts indicated that the union could be applied only to the Muslim people of Empire. The opening of new markets throughout the world as a result of French and Industrial revolutions entailed new links to the Western world to sell their production surplus derived from technological developments. Therefore, the expansion policy of the West undermined the traditional way of life in the Ottoman Empire and triggered the different ethnically-based elements to seek their separation from

---

[18] Choueiri, *op.cit.*, p. 45.

the empire with the idea of reestablishing national polity in control of all vital instruments of government and domination: To inhibit these efforts of dissolving the empire, the Ottoman government adopted the idea of modernizing itself.

In this sense, the Tanzimat period appeared as a continuation of the reforms. However, the reform period began with 1839 Tanzimat until the break up of World War I was the rapid progress towards the centralization of state power. The hopes for decentralization in which the Arab would pursue their own culture and political development and design their self-government became the main themes of Arab nationalism. The cooperation between Turks and the Arabs was destroyed with these demands, and finally with the Arab revolt in 1916.

The Tanzimat period produced the Young Turk movement and subsequently the Committee of Union and Progress consisted of Westernized military officers, trying to reinvigorate the structure of the Ottoman Empire in reference to the achievements of contemporary Europe. The Young Turks seized power in 1908 and adopted the idea of Ottomanism as a multi-national constitutional monarchy. Ottomanism represented an attempt to embrace all the people of the multi-national Empire. The Revolution of 1908 was a hallmark for the development of Arab nationalism. When Committee of Union and Progress overthrew the Ottoman ruler, Abdul Hamid, the Arabs cooperated with the members of C.U.P. Arab nationalists hoped for equality. The constitution of 1908 aimed to uniting all Ottoman elements without any distinction.

As the result of the revival of the modern ideas in Balkans, however, the seemingly liberal government of C.U.P evolved to an authoritarian Turkish nationalism. The strict policy of centralization and preceding Turkification restricted the demands of Arab people on a national cultural autonomy within the Ottoman Empire. This policy also urged the Arab officers to join in the Young Turk Revolution.

Modern Arab nationalism seems to emerge as a reaction to the government of C.U.P. Though they attacked the Young Turk Movement with specific charges such as the support to Zionism or policy of Turkification, Arabic ideology was

formulated long before the 1908 Revolution. Gogoi and Abdulghafour state that "the aims of Arab nationalism did not differ radically from those of Ottomanism. It is a fact that the initial adherents to this nationalism did not seek the separation of the Arab territories from the Empire nor the creation of a distinct Arab nation with defined territorial boundaries. What they actually demanded were those concessions which concerned the politically active members, the urban upper class etc."[19] Unless Ottoman rule met their demands, they did not refrain from identifying themselves as an Ottoman element within the borders of the Ottoman Empire. They adopted Arabism on the basis of their own language, culture and history.

The conflict arose from this competition among the Ottoman elites for office. Arab nationalists opposed to the system established before the Young Turks, which had not recognized their autonomy. After the Revolution of 1908, the Arab nationalists conceived that Islamic modernist Ottomanists would fail to address inferiority of the East to the West and meet their nationalist demands. The measures of C.U.P government within the framework of Turanism, intensified the Arab resentment and become an 'eye-opener for the Arab nationalists.'[20]

Arabism rose as a majority movement especially after the 1908 Revolution. Though the majority of Arab nationalists were loyal Ottomanists, relative increase in a significant campaign against the Unionists was seen particularly as a result of flourishing party activity and the restoration of Parliament in 1908.

The revolution of 1908 was motivated by C.U.P's devotion to the preservation of the Empire in the face of foreign ambition. Indeed, the Arabists argued that the Turkish nationalist and secular policies of C.U.P threatened the economic interests Arab rural and merchant classes.[21] Both of them sought best means to resist the external intervention into the entire Ottoman umma. They only differ in how to achieve this aim and how to maintain a balance of

---

[19] Gogoi and Abdulghafour, *op.cit.*, p. 84.

[20] *Ibid.*, p. 93.

[21] *Ibid.*, p. 63.

centralization versus decentralization. The Arabs displayed their demands for a decentralized administration and equality with the Turks within the Empire in the Arab National Congress of 1913. However, Young Turks did not recognize their right to self-determination.

With the break up of World War I in 1914, the Arab nationalists gave up their idea of local federalism and demanded total independence. Their aspirations for decentralization coalesced with the intentions of European powers to divide the Empire. In this regard, they supported separatism. Sharif Hussein of the Hashemite family to which Muhammad belonged led the brewing Arab revolt. He obtained the British promise to advocate the Arab cause and support Arab independence within the context of Hussein-Mc Mahon Agreement.

Finally, political changes triggered cultural revival of Arabs between 1908 and 1916; and they put forward their demands that expressed their sense of a separate community with a distinct character. The Imperial interests of Britain had important effects in the evolution this sense. The Ottoman allegiance with Germany in World War I threatened the British route to India through the Suez Canal. To ensure the support of the Arabs against the Ottoman forces, Britain tried to gain the support of Sharif Hussein in exchange of her promise to uphold the Arab's claim to independence. Britain ensured the Arab's claim to independence within the framework of the Husayn-McMahon correspondence of 1915-1916. Sharif Hussein declared the Arab Revolt in 1916 with the guarantee of Britain. The Arab Revolt proved to be a common fight towards a common goal, the independence of all Arab provinces and creation of a united Arab state. The Revolt failed but strengthened the national consciousness. The revolt in 1916 confirmed these demands and launched the Arab nation as a political entity.

In the post-World war period, the promises of independence were sacrificed to European claims in the region. The dreams of the Arabs were shattered by Sykes-Picot Agreement of 1916 and by the Balfour Declaration of 1917. Though European powers, in particular Britain reassured their promises to support the cause of Arabs, the Arabs found themselves divided into regional states.

Palestine was one of these states mostly populated by the Arabs that was taken under control by the mandate rule of Britain. While the Arabs were expecting for independence from the mandate rule, they confronted with a Jewish challenge that aspires to dominate the land of Palestine. Against Zionist claims over the land and British support to Zionism, Arab nationalism in Palestine in the first sight and then the Palestinian nationalism developed in order to gain their independence in Palestine.

CHAPTER -4-

ZIONISM

Zion is a term for expressing the yearning of the Jewish people for their homeland. All of the eras inherent in the Jewish history, which are basic elements of 'nationalism', explain us the efforts of the Jews to realize this goal: creating a Jewish homeland and a state. Within this context, the evaluation of historical, religious and cultural commitments of the Jews to Palestine is worthy in order to understand further clash between the Arabs and the Jews. This clash focused on territorial conflict between the Arabs and the Jews. As it is important to emphasize the importance of Palestine to the Arabs, it is also significant to underline what Palestine means to the Jews and their territorial claim based on the right to return to the Land. The right to return to the Land stemmed from fundamental elements of Jewish nationalism. A territory, a religion and a language, which bound the Jewish people to this land, were needed to legitimize the right to return claimed by the Jews.

4.1. THE ASSESMENT OF ZIONIST NATIOANAL CONSTRUCTION AS TO THE FOUNDING FACTORS OF NATIONALISM

The emancipation of the Jews was seen possible as long as they had own territory; otherwise they would be subjected to assimilation forever. The territorial commitments of the Jews mentioned below would try to explain the necessity of a land for the Jews. The religious and cultural commitments would intend to answer the question: "Why this land was Palestine?" Lastly, the history of the formation of Zionism would explain us the common memory of the Zionists who took part in the Arab-Israeli conflict. In this chapter, the main focal point is the elaboration of reasons and theoretical development of return to the Promised Land. Clinging to the history of Zionism, the cultural, religious and national background of the establishment of the state of Israel will beevaluated.

4.1.1 RELIGION: RETURN TO HOLY LAND

Orthodox Jews consider the Jewish national movement as a movement of the national community of believers. According to Orthodox Jews, they are bound up with their collective historical experience on the "Land of Israel" where they built their ancient kingdoms. Moreover, the believing Jews regard themselves as the chosen people because they received word of God and were assigned to proclaim his existence and transmit his commandments. Jewish doctrine claims that God granted "Eretz Israel" to them to build a commonwealth based on his Law. It is believed that God promised "Eretz Israel" to Abraham and his descendants, which proves a covenant between God and the Jews. Additionally, the Jews defined their identity on the basis of a belief that the destiny of the Jews is part of a larger Divine Plan especially after the People of Israel had been driven to exile.

The ancient Jewish history that was told by Torah and Talmud expressed the religious meaning of the territory to the Jews. According to Torah and Talmud, the Jews conquered and began to settle the Land of Canaan during the thirteenth century before the Christian era. Moses had provided them with political organization and brought them to the borders of the Promised Land. By the help of the military campaign, they succeeded in taking control of territory under Joshua. In the twelfth century B.C.E, during the period of the Judges, they established a home in Palestine. The first national institutions emerged during the period of monarchial rule under David and Solomon. They constituted the first kingdom with its expanded borders and unity under a monarchical power. After the death of Solomon, the kingdom of Jews split into two. Powerful neighbors, especially the Assyrians, conquered the Jewish kingdoms in Samaria and Judea. Lastly, the Babylonian conquest of Judah and with its destruction of the Temple in Jerusalem in A.D 70 closed the first chapter in the history of the Jewish people, bringing to an end the first Jewish commonwealth in Palestine. Despite the fact that a majority of the Jews remained in Palestine, the others were removed to Babylonia and Egypt. The Egyptians considered them as a threat to the integrity of the Egyptian state.

After Cyrus had incorporated the provinces of Babylon into his Persian Empire in 586-536 B.C.E, Jewish life revived in Palestine under the authority of Ezra. He rebuilt the Temple in Jerusalem 536-515 B.C.E and led to the reconstruction of Jewish society in Palestine. After Persia had fallen down to Alexander the Great in 332 B.C.E, the Hellenistic World regard the Jews as a national community deserving semi-independent status. Palestine, however, suffered from oppression of the subsequent foreign rulers. In 164 B.C.E, Maccabeans following the Jewish rebellion under the leadership of Judah Maccabee obtained the control of Jerusalem. In the following years, Judah consolidated the independent Jewish polity with the support of Rome. Therefore, even after the death of Judah, the independence of Judea was strengthened with the establishment of the Second Jewish Commonwealth in Palestine.

The independence of Judea came to an end in the aftermath of Rome's entry into Palestine that led to the defeat of Hasmonean state under the rule of Judah's brother Simon. Roman legions conquered Jerusalem and destroyed the Temple in 70 B.C.E. The destruction of the Temple in Jerusalem brought an end to all hope of reestablishing the 'Second Jewish Commonwealth' and thereafter- Jewish national life began to disintegrate. Interwoven with this experience in nationhood and these ties to the land of Palestine, territory is conceived by the religious Jews as given by God and as tangible sign of Jewish choseness as the delivery of ancient Israel into the Promised Land.[1]

Within this 'sacred' history that religious Jews believe, the Jews constituted a 'Commonwealth' on the lands of Palestine. Following the destruction of the 'Second Jewish Commonwealth' in Palestine and dispersion of the Jewish people, the believers contend that Jewish identity based itself on their chosenness in the absence of a political organization. Classical or traditional religious Zionism gave the Jews the opportunity of expressing their belief that God will provide an ingathering of exiles and help them in the reconstruction of Israel in the promised land. In sum, Classical Zionism proclaimed the Jews' continuing and their

---

[1] Mark Tessler, *A History of the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict,* (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1994), p. 13.

unbreakable tie to the Eretz Israel. The notions become, in fact, salient among the Diasporan Jews. As summarized by Don Peretz:

> Most aspects of Jewish life in the Diaspora were intimately linked with Palestine. Jewish rabbinical law favored the settler in the ancient homeland. Religious literature echoed with such sayings as: 'it is better to dwell in deserts of Palestine than in places abroad', 'Whoever lives in Palestine lives sinless', and 'The air of Palestine makes one wise'. There was no distinction between the spiritual and the physical Palestine in the minds of most Jews. Although separated from the Holy Land by thousands of miles, to most it seemed closer than the neighboring Christian communities, which were regarded with hostility and fear.[2]

Though these religious considerations seem as the foundations of the Jewish possession of Palestine, the Jewish claim based on their nature of being chosen is debatable. It does not seem appropriate to base the claims on Palestine on only religious texts. The religious commitments of the Jews to the land of Palestine could be true. However, the lands of Palestine are sacred for other religions. In short, religious commitments are not sufficient to provide concrete evidences to assert that the Jews are the real possessors of the land. The abovementioned Jewish law consisting of Torah and Talmud, could be central to the political consciousness of the Jews and provide a beneficial tool for establishing solidarity among Jewish people.

Taking these religious definitions into consideration, it should not be overlooked that the Jews are also a political community associated with nationhood. In fact, Jewish identity is predicated on a duality. It is best to describe the Jewish people within the context of inextricable bound between religion and polity. This bound rendered the Jewish people united even though they were scattered throughout the Diaspora.

According to Abba Hillel Silver, the Messianic beliefs include three recurring themes from which the political aspect of Zionism is derived: The first is 'the loss of national independence and the attendant deprivation', the second is 'the will to live dominantly and triumphantly as a rehabilitated people in its national home' and the third is 'the unfaltering faith in divine justice by whose national restoration

---

[2] Don Peretz,*The Government and Politics of Israel,* (Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press,1979), p. 13.

was infallibly prescribed. These themes include a lamentation of the Jewish people's exile from Palestine and the subsequent dispersion, an affirmation that the Jewish nation's unity and tie to the "Holy Land" cannot be destroyed, a faith that the restoration of Eretz Israel is God's plan. These facts explain us the bound between traditional religious Zionism and Jewish nationalist identity. In order to understand this conviction, it is useful to scrutinize the history of pre-modern era in the history of the Jews. Silver states that a preparation for the coming of the Messiah and the return to the Holy Land intensified the feeling of solidarity among the Jews This conviction was what made the Jews remain Jews.[3] Beside the belief of being chosen and promised, the idea of the Messiah returning also constituted a unifying factor among the Jewish people. The religious Jews believed that the Jewish people will be restored to the Promised Land and its rightful place of leadership among the nations with this coming.

In contrast with these classical Zionist conceptions, following generations of the Jewish people believed that they do not need to wait for the unfolding of the Divine plan but rather could fulfill their destiny with human activity not the coming of Messiah, for the reason that they were chosen by the Creator. This led to political Zionism which stemmed from the changes in the 18th century.

During the early years of 18th century, the Jewish life in Eastern Europe experienced the fear and anxiety produced by anti-Jewish violence. This experience made the Jewish people ask the question 'Is there another way to be a Jew or is more than one possibility before them until the Messiah came?' Jewish intellectuals sought the answers of these questions in the following years. Influenced by the French Revolution and its subsequent effects such as nationalism and liberalism, Jews tried to endure their surveillance in a new period.

With a change in the political and ideological climate in which the Jews lived in the early years of 18th century, the Jewish thought was also exposed to important changes. These changes brought about the emergence of modern

---

[3] Abba Hillel Silver, *A History of Messianic Speculation in Israel,* (New York – Macmillan,1987), p. 475.

political Zionism. The French Revolution granted the Jews a chance to get out of their ghettos and have equal rights and full citizenship.

The revolution removed the restrictions imposed on the Jewish people. The rights given to them, however, let the Jews participate in civil society as an individual not as a political community. "The formula pronounced before the French National Assembly in 1789 made this clear and explicit: "Aux Juifs comme nation nous ne donons rien; aux Juifs comme individus nous donnons tout"- nothing for the Jews as a nation, everything for the Jews as individuals."[4] In other words, the possibility of recognizing the Jews as a separate nation was abandoned while giving them an opportunity to behave like other citizens. However, sporadic and irregular character of the emancipation of the European Jewry paved the way for the failure in the implementation properly. In the beginning of 1800s, the setbacks to the Jewish life revealed again.

The modernist movement among the Jews is known as Haskalah or Jewish Enlightenment. It had a foundation that there should be a change in Jewish thought as a response to dissatisfactory condition of their people. Through assimilation and integration of the Jews into European society, the followers of Haskalah anticipated reaching an equal participation in the universal world culture with their non-Jew neighbors. This entailed a dramatic reduction of cultural differences between Jews and non-Jews. Within this context, some changes oriented Jews to modernize their religious and cultural traditions. Reform Judaism led by Moses Mendelssohn, aimed at removing the contradictions between religion and modern life. In addition to this, some Maskilims (the enlightened ones) put emphasis on reforming Jewish education and language in order to foster the Jews' cultural integration into the European society. Further, marriages to non-Jews and conversions to Christianity accelerated as a consequence of this modernizing effort. By doing so, the Maskilim hoped for the abandoning of the possibility of anti-Semitism and giving the Jews a life out of ghetto as a citizen like the non-Jew components of society.

---

[4] David Vital, *The Origins of Zionism,* (Oxford: Oxford University Press,1975), p. 44.

The Jewish people in Eastern Europe, however, remained loyal to their traditions in contrast to Western Jews. They were overwhelmingly located in a region known as the 'Pale of Settlement' under the Russian control. The Orthodox masses of pale paid little attention to the arguments advocated by Haskalah, concerning the religious and cultural changes. They convinced that these changes pose threat to Judaism. According to them, Reform Judaism was the destruction of bonds unifying the Jewish people. They claimed that this movement would lead to succeeding generations who give up seeking for a vivid Judaism and subordinate to their personal ambition rather than the destiny of the chosen people. For these reasons, Maskilim were accused of arrogance and selfishness by traditionalist Jews of Eastern Europe.

Besides the secular Jews like Theodor Herzl and his followers, the orthodox Jews viewed them as false messiahs. For the reason the religious Jews believe that God would restore them to the land when their punishment for their sins ends. On the contrary, secular nationalists were urging Jews to move to Palestine to establish a state in the Holy land with a secular motivation. However, some orthodox rabbis like Rabbi Abraham Isaac Kook supported the idea that Zionism is a part of a divine plan and embodied the necessary human preparation for the coming of the Messiah and the final redemption. Kook believed in that living in the Holy Land would restore the "organic holiness of Jewry". As a consequence the religious and secular dimensions of Zionism mixed to each other. While the secular Zionists were recognizing the longing for the return to Zion, the religious Zionists accepted that restoration of a nation-state was the only way in order to combat anti-Semitism. Though they have different point of views, the common denominator in their rapprochement to the statehood of the Jews was that Jews had no way to defend themselves and maintain their lives with a state of their own.

During the 19th century the debate between the Jews oriented toward assimilation and traditional religious Jews went forward. Judah Leib Gordon called this period as a 'period of Jewish reawakening.'[5] Meanwhile, the ideological precursors of modern political Zionism stressing the national and political views of

---

[5] Tessler, *op.cit.*, p. 36.

Jewish people appeared. Smolenskin and Krochmal were two of them; both emphasized the peoplehood and unity of the Jews. Krochmal argued that their existence as a nation would contribute universal values to the gentile nations of the world. In spite of the resistance of Orthodox and traditional Jews who insisted on the fulfillment of Jewish destiny of return to Zion by god not by man, Krochmal and Smolenskin called on Jews to constitute a nation in modern sense and saw the reconstruction of Jewish society in Palestine, towards only a response to the temporal problems and needs of the Jewish people not an intention to create an independent Jewish state, moreover not a fulfillment of Biblical prophecy. In order to constitute a Jewish nation, main tenets of nationalism such as common culture, history and territory are needed to bind all of the Jewish people around a common objective which is to establish a Jewish state Towards this aim, territory proved to be a determining factor to flourish their loyalty to a nation.

4.1.2   TERRITORY

Jewish national consciousness underwent certain transformations: Old messianism and its ideological and emotional appeal and Modern Idea firstly formed the basis of Jewish national identity. Yet, this identity was not sufficient to solve Jews' problems. They believed that their problems endure unless they settle in their own country. Considering that the nations (and states) had enormous changes in the 19th century, the Jews would not form a separate identity without having their own territory. Within this context, they set forth their return to their promised land: Palestine. They insisted on their existence in Palestine not anywhere else.

After the assassination of Tsar Alexander II in Russia, Alexander III prohibited the gradual reforms and brought an end to the freedoms granted to Jews in 1850s and 1860s. This anti-Jewish atmosphere revealed on the basis of economic and social degradation among the Russian people. In 1881, the Jews were regarded as the root of revolutionary socialist movement that was considered as the leading force to the assassination of leaders. Following this period, in 1882 the notorious 'May Laws' restricted the territory in which Jews could live. As a consequence of this fundamental changein the Russian attitude towards the Jews,

a widespread change also occurred in the Jewish intellectual life. Anti-Jewish pogroms in 1881 eradicated the hopes of some intellectuals such as Lilenblum and Pinsker advocating the possibility of Jewish integration into the European society.

Moses Leib Lilienblum (1843-1910) who was a follower of Hibbat Zion[6] that emerged in Eastern Europe at the beginning of the 1880s to foster Jewish colonization in Palestine, stated that the settlement of the Land of Israel by the Jewish people and the restoration of Israel as a sovereign nation on its own was the only way by which the next generations may attain a normal life without any persecution. Here, normalcy identifies the desire to be like the other nations. Jews sought to be like the others otherwise they could not endure their existence as a separate nation. Territory would grant them an approval from the others as a separate nation.

The precarious events of 1881 in Russia also affected negatively the Odessa physician, Leo Pinsker, who rejected firmly the passivity of traditional Jewish community in his pamphlet, entitled 'Auto-Emancipation: An Appeal to His People by a Russian Jew.' He underlined the importance of activist national movement. Pinsker stipulates that national sovereignty within a Jewish state is an obligatory for a satisfactory existence of the Jews in Diaspora.[7] According to Pinsker the world consists of nations, which dislike foreigners, so Jews had to cease being foreign by becoming a proper nation. The way to solve the Jewish problem was to remove the Jews from the situation of abnormality surrounded by hatred to a territory of their own where they would become a normal nation.[8] Further, making the first coherent and reasoned statement for the rebirth of Zion, Pinsker, in his booklet, embraced the idea of establishment of a Jewish home, preferably in Palestine, but elsewhere if necessary on the basis of Jewish nationalism.

---

[6] The Jewish organization established in Odessa against the anti-Semitism in Russia as a result of the Pogroms of 1881.

[7] Martin Sicker, *Judaism, Nationalism and the Land of Israel,* (Boulder, San Francisco and Oxford: Westview Pres,1992), p. 101.

[8] *Zionism*, (Jerusalem-Israel: Keter Boks), p. 22.

Pinsker stated that the real solution for the Jews was to emancipate them, to take control of their destiny. The proper and the only remedy would be the creation of Jewish nationality, of a people living upon its own home. For Pinsker, the establishment of Jewish autonomy takes precedence to the place of it. While a vague impulse for Jewish self-liberation was arising, the pogroms of 1880s gave an impetus to the search for solution to the 'Jewish Problem'. This intensified the urgency of Jewish nationalism. After the persecution of Jews in pogroms, Jewish migration to the United States and to Central and Western Europe was seen intensely. Palestine was not their first practical choice. Joseph Chamberlain, the British colonial secretary firstly suggested that Uganda could be appropriate for the establishment of a Jewish society. Russian Zionists and the supporters of Hovevei (Hibbat) Zion deeply opposed to this idea while declaring that there could be no separation between Zionism and Eretz Israel. They advocated that their state should be located in the land of their fathers according to the covenant between themselves and God. Herzl also stated in 1903 congress that he also support the idea that the solution for them lies only in Palestine. [9]

Thus, this choice was to be realized after an evolution period in Jewish thinking. According to Weizmann, the aspiration of the Jews to reach a self-liberation was saturated with Jewish tradition reminding them the most ancient memories of their fatherland. The effect of pogroms emerged as a pushing force compelling young Jews to think about the fate and fortune about their people.

Leo Pinsker put forward in his pamphlet, the first clear-cut appeal to Jewish nationalism:

> Nations live side by side in a state of relative peace, which is based chiefly on the fundamental equality between them. But it is different with the people of Israel. This people are not counted among the nations, because since it was exiled from its land, it has lacked the essential attributes of nationality, by which one nation is distinguished from another. True, we have not ceased even in the lands of our exile to be spiritually a distinct nation; but this spiritual nationality, so far is the very cause of their hatred for us as a people. Men are always terrified by a disembodied

---

[9] Sicker, *op.cit.,* p. 102.

spirit, a soul wandering about with no physical covering; and terror breeds hatred."[10]

Pinsker condemned the views of other nations that did not accept the Jews as a 'nation'. His words bring forward the question whether a territory is necessary for a community to be regarded as a nation. Following the years of pogroms, spiritual nationality cannot be able to answer modern national needs of 19th century. In this century, Jews noticed the importance of having a land. This land should represent common memories, common cultural heritages and common language to them. This land was which they pray for and has already existed. This land was the Palestine. At this juncture, some Russian Jews began to think about promoting Jewish migration to Palestine under the influence of Lilienblum and Pinsker's ideas. The initial response to this new approach came from student groups arguing passionately that Jewish national renaissance could only take place in Eretz Israel. Hovevei Zion (Lovers of Zion) or Hibbat Zion was established under the leadership of these student movements in 1881-1882. This movement was committed to the support of Jewish settlement and colonization in Palestine. This movement succeeded in establishing Jewish agricultural presence in Palestine. However, it was deprived of the inspiration and support of a large following. As a result of this, the focus of the movement shifted from the national revival in Palestine to preoccupation. The first Conference of Hibbat Zion took place on Nov 6, 1884, at Kattowitz. It was important for demonstrating the unity of Hibbat Zion and the Jewish people. Resolutions were about organizational methods and ways of supporting the settlements not the national revival or the great national goal.

The Bilu was also one of them. The Bilu was founded in 1881 initiated the first five waves of Jewish immigration to Palestine known as Aliyah. To produce and define modern political Zionism, Bilu manifesto issued in 1882 provisioned the reawakening of the Jewish people; as a result of the rejection of assimilation, as a concomitant reaffirmation of Jewish nationhood. [11]

---

[10] Howard Sachar, *A History of Israel from the Rise of Zionism to Our Time*, (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1998), p. 264.

[11] Mark Tessler, *op.cit.*, p. 43.

As mentioned above, the events of 1881 triggered the aspiration of the Jews to settle in their own country. Moreover, these events intensified the Jewish investigation for an appropriate land in which they would not urge to be assimilated. In this regard, the influence of pre-modern Jewish intellectuals could not be overlooked. Their thoughts having evolved from pre-modern era to Haskalah (The modernist movement among the Jews) underlined the religious bound of the Jews to the Land. For instance, Moses Hess (1812-1875), a prominent writer on politics and philosophy advocated that the persecution of Jews must evoke them to return to Judaism. He strived to elucidate the linkage between the traditional messianic idea and idealistic nationalism. He emphasized the spiritual meaning of nationality. He underlined the goal of Judaism that is the ultimate realization of social justice within the context of an organized and unified humanity. Furthermore, he stated that Judaism is organically related to Jewish nationalism. For Hess, the nation of Israel can only realize its historic mission through the restoration of its national independence in its ancient homeland. To Hess, the creation of a socialist Jewish commonwealth in Palestine would form an appealing factor for the poor Jews in Eastern Europe. Therefore, the Jews would be rescued from assimilation without a rejection of universal ideas. As a result of this pulling reason, Hess believed that Jews could immigrate to Palestine easily.[12] However, until the proclamation of the Balfour Declaration, there were some proposals taken seriously by some Zionist leaders for Jewish homelands in places other than Palestine. When the proposals are evaluated, it is seen that Palestine was not the only choice in order to solve the Jewish problem.

Many proposals came after the Theodor Herzl's argument for a Jewish state in Palestine as the ancestral homeland of the Jews or Argentina as the most fertile country in the world. Another offer for Jewish homeland was the British Uganda in other words today's Kenya. In 1903, the British cabinet ministers suggested the British Uganda Program to the Sixth Zionist Congress. Though Herzl considered this suggestion as a temporary measure for the Russian Jews suffered from 1903 Kishinev pogrom, the plan was rejected in the Seventh Zionist Congress in 1905.

---

[12] Sicker, *op.cit.,* p. 91.

The rejection of the plan led to a split in the Zionist movement.[13] Socialist Zionists such as Nachman Syrkin's Zionist Socialist Labor Party and Territorialist Organization led by Israel Zangwill split off from the Zionist movement. Especially the members of the Territorialist Organization and socialist Zionists who rejected religion claimed that a Jewish state can be founded in Uganda, Canada or Australia. For the territorialists, the creation of a Jewish territory should not be necessarily in the land of Israel. However, the Territorialist Organization was dissolved in 1925 after the Balfour Declaration in 1917. There was also another proposal came from Nazi Germany with a view to forcibly relocate the entire Jewish population of Europe to the French colony of Madagascar. This idea was supported by Nazi ideologues such as Joachim von Ribbentrop. The Madagascar plan due to British resistance against Germany during the World War II failed in the early 1940s.[14]

As many suggestions about the place on which a Jewish homeland to be settled, it is seen that all proposals stood as failed attempts and Palestine proved to be the final solution to the question of Jewish. Apart from one that had been put forward by Nazi Germany, the main reason of the decline in the other proposals for the Jewish settlements was the main motivation of the Zionists that they had desire to be not only a refuge from anti-Semitism but also to govern themselves as an independent nation. In this regard, the religious belief of the 'Promised Land' emerged as a unifying factor for the Jews to gather within national borders in order to conduct their independence and self-determination. The Jews opted for Palestine because the Jewish nationalists' choice of the land of Palestine was the only place as a homeland that would receive the support of cultural and political Zionism simultaneously. In order to realize their national aspirations, the Jews remembered the promise given to them and moreover they noticed that they could realize this promise on their own. Furthermore, their language and culture would enable them survive and settle on this land. Within these territorial, religious and cultural tenets in mind, the Zionists ignited Zionism with a view to forming a state for the Jews.

---

[13] Sachar, *op.cit.*, p. 277.

[14] *Ibid.*, p. 441.

4.1.3. CULTURE AND LANGUAGE

Focusing on being a people like all others, the Jews put forward their special properties to display their nationhood. To achieve this goal, cultural Zionism led by Ahad Ha'am supported the idea that the Jews should maintain their unique identity as embracing the opportunities of modern age. Ahad Ha'am concentrated on the spiritual and cultural dimensions of Jewish nationalism that constitutes a linkage between the Jewish homeland and the Jews of Diaspora. He claimed that national ethic should be preserved for the scattered Jews to endure their identity. Even though he insisted on the continuation of historic Jewish values, he did not take place among religious orthodoxy of the rabbis. He only argued that a Jewish state without authentic Jewish features is spurious.[15] Turning to the construction of a modern and spiritual Jewish culture, based on authentic Jewish values and the enduring moral genius of the Jewish people, Ahad Ha'am ultimately concluded that this was a task for the Zionist state.

Zionist Jews linked their political claims with religious tenets in order to get hold of an area of land, on which they could restore their identity as a nation including its own territory, culture, history and language. They motivated the crowds to return to the Holy land with this goal in consideration. These crowds would endure their language and religion on the territory on which they were to build their national identity. In this regard, Hebrew proved to be an important instrument to settle their tradition in Palestine and strengthen the national bound among the Jewish people. Moreover, the Jewish laws concerning that a child could only be a Jew provided that his mother is a Jew, guaranteed the survival of Hebrew as a mother language. Therefore, a Jew living out of Palestine could easily participate into the Jewish community in Palestine. Palestine would be his homeland even if he was not born in the Land.

In this sense, Hebrew writer, Eliezer Ben Yehudah (1858-1923) considered the revival of the Hebrew language critical to the survival of the Jews as a nation. He stated, in his article entitled 'An Important Question' in 1878, that to keep the language alive in the face of civic emancipation is only possible in a country

---

[15] Arthur Hertzberg, *The Zionist Idea*, (New York: A Temple Book, 1959), p. 52-53.

where the Hebrew inhabitants were the majority. According to Yehudah, "the Hebrew language can only live if they revive the nation and return it to its fatherland".[16] In his article the reconstitution of the nation in the ancient homeland seemed to be an instrument for the renaissance of the Hebrew language. Yehudah, however, mentioned another important point on the ways of reestablishing Jewish nation. He believes that Hebrew language can only survive if the Jews return to their fatherland. Hebrew language revealed as an emotional pulling factor in order to appeal Jewish attention to his homeland. Moreover, Smolenskin who is a Jewish intellectual contributed to the development of Zionist idea stressed the importance of Hebrew as an indissoluble link with their ancient roots. Hebrew constituted important factor for the Jewish nation building at the times when the Land of Israel was inaccessible to the Jewish nation. It is evident in his following argument:

> The heart of man is moved not by reason but by emotion. We may argue all day and cry aloud that we are a people, even though we are bereft of a homeland, but all this will be futile and meaningless. We can, however, appeal to people's feelings and address ourselves to the hearts of the Jews, saying: The land of our fathers is waiting for us; let us colonize it, and, by becoming its masters, we shall again be a people like all others.[17]

As Krochmal and Smolenskin underlined the important role of language in nation building, the Hebrew seems to present intrinsic part inherent the Jewish identity. Language proved to be an instrument that is to be used to bring all Jews throughout the world together around their national cause: to build a nation and a state.

As a consequence, the revival of Hebrew language and the protection of Jewish traditions made the Land an attraction center for the Jews abroad. Through these spiritual commitments in addition to the religious ones, the Jews paved the way for the constitution of Zionism.

With taking the impact of religion and language on Zionism into consideration, it is valuable to observe the common memory of Zionists especially in the 19th century. Within this context, the developments in the 19th century displayed the evolvement of the clash between the Arabs and the Israelis. To

---

[16] ***Ibid.,*** p. 165.

[17] Sicker, ***op.cit.,*** p. 99.

understand the viewpoint of the Israelis entailed to elaborate the Zionist perspective. In this sense the history of the Jewish people until the establishment of a Jewish state in 1948, will help us evaluate the similar development of these two nationalisms but the formation of different perceptions of both sides.

The Arab-Israeli conflict stemmed from the inability of the Palestinian Arabs and the Jews to share the lands resulted in the clash of Arab nationalism and Zionism over Palestine. Every peace effort intended to settle the Palestinian problem failed because of non-existence of territorial compromise and both sides' inclination to continue to conflict.

Palestinian territory, on which the Arabs and the Jews coexisted for decades, is of vital importance for both sides. Palestinian Arab nationalism and Zionism emerged out of deep attachments of both sides to Palestine. The Palestinians and the Jews defined and constructed their nationalism on these territorial attachments including historical, religious and cultural commitments of both sides to Palestine.

Palestinian Arabs considering themselves a part of Syria until the demise of the Ottoman Empire defined their territorial attachments within the framework of Arab nationalism. Arab nationalism emerged out of the territorial national construction of the Arabs on the basis of unifying effect of Islam, the language of Arabic and Arab culture. All of these founding elements consolidated Arab identity on Arab Peninsula that is the territory mostly populated by the Arabs.

Similarly, Jewish nationalism arose upon territorial attachments of the Jews living in Diaspora scattered around the world. The grievous experiences of the Jews concerning the Russian pogroms in 1881 urged the Jewish intellectuals to convince that the Jews would be only in security by the sole means of the establishment of their own state.

Following this concern, religion appeared as the main tool for the Jews in depicting their destiny towards founding their own State. The belief inherent in Judaism that Palestine had been promised by God to the Jews, prompted the Jews who intellectually led to the idea of forming a Jewish state in the "promised land" to encourage any member of their nationliving at any corner of the world to

immigrate to Palestine. Jewish nationalists and their followers within the Zionist movement aimed at establishing a Jewish state in Palestine. To which the Jews were bound by religious and cultural affiliations.

Though two nationalisms shared the same founding factors, the development of them and their achievements are different. Both nationalist movement aimed at having domination on the same land; Palestinian territory. Arab nationalists constructed their nationalism so as to prove that 'mostly populated Arab territory' should be under control of the Arabs, not under Western or Jewish control. Palestinian Arab nationalism emerged within the context of these general Arab nationalist goals. Jewish nationalists built Zionism on the idea that Palestine was their ancestral homeland and their right to control this land is legitimate. In this regard, both Arab nationalism and Jewish nationalism, namely Zionism, perceived nationalism in terms of territorial commitments. The Arabs and the Jews formed their nationalist movement in order to constitute legitimacy for establishing an independent state for their nations.

The Arab-Israeli conflict emanated from the conflicting national aspirations as a consequence of the clash of the Arab nationalism and Zionism in Palestine.The main national aspirations of the Jews was to establish a Jewish state in Palestine as the Palestinian Arabs were expecting to gain their independence from British mandate rule. Within these aspirations in mind, both sides came to face in Palestine when the Arabs perceived the Jewish immigrations as exclusion of themselves from Palestine. These immigrations were the result of the development of the Zionist idea with British support. For the Arabs these immigrations might be acceptable if they did not consider the coming of the Jews as an exclusion of their people out of their homes. However, the dual attitude of Britain towards the Arabs and the Jews during its mandate rule and the Balfour Declaration in 1917 consolidated this concern of the Arabs.

CHAPTER -5-

THE CLASH OF ZIONISM AND ARAB NATIONALISM

OVER PALESTINE

The Arab-Israeli conflict stemmed from the clash of the loyalty of both sides to the same land which is the Palestinian territories settled by both the Arabs and the Jews. This chapter will try to overview the development of the clash on the territory by elaborating the effects of Jewish immigration, the development of Zionist idea, the mandate period, political factions among both sides and the wars between the parties. Thus, the beginning of the conflict and the development of the conflict will be stressed in order to understand the conflicting positions of both sides. These positions aims at helping the reader understand more clearly the deadlock in the peace process.

The clash of Zionism and Arab nationalism resulted from two developments; the settlement of the Jews in Palestinian territory and the emergence of the Palestinian resistance against Zionism within the Palestine Liberation Organization. All of the founding elements of Arab nationalism, which is reflected from the Arab point of view in previous chapter, put emphasis on the loyalty of the Arab lands that they inhibited and to which Jewish masses gradually immigrated. They constructed their nationalism on religious, cultural and historical commitments to the land. This thesis firstly tried to put forward a general evaluation of Arab nationalism to reflect how the Arabs explain their nationalism.

Furthermore, the transfer of Arab nationalism to the Palestinian Arabs is needed to be expressed in order to understand the standpoints of the Palestinian Arabs in the face of Jewish coming, the British policy towards the Palestinian Arabs and the Zionists and the effect of rivalries between the Arab factions to the approach of the Palestinians to the conflict. The effect of all of these factors on

the development of Palestinian national movement displayed the formation of the territorial claims of the Arabs over Palestine.

Moreover, this thesis tried to demonstrate the triggering effect of the Zionist idea to urge the Jews scattered around the world to immigrate to Palestine, settle on the Palestinian territory and establish a Jewish state in Palestine. Surely, British policy affected Zionism as well as the development of Palestinian nationalism. When a Jewish state was established in 1948, the Palestinian Arabs stood on a weak point against the robust and united Jewish community. Supported by British mandate, Zionists succeeded in forming a Jewish community with its pre-state structures led by united political parties on the national cause beside the disorganized political factions of the Palestinian Arabs.

The involvement of Britain into the relations between the Arabs and the Jews was of crucial importance. The policies of Britain in Palestine unfortunately eradicated the possibility of coexistence among the Arabs and the Jews and, moreover, accelerated the hatred. The mandate rule in Palestine until 1947 also led to the separation developments of the similar nationalisms. At the end of the mandate, Zionism with its seemingly quasi-governmental institutions was more organized than the Arab national movement. Due to its disorganized structure because of the lack of unity among the Arabs, the Arab national movement proved to be deprived of any capability to express the inequity to which the Arabs were subjected.

The lack of international support and the disunity among the Arabs rendered the Arab national movement weak in the face of the rise of Zionism. They failed in voicing their national aspirations to the international community. Though they tried to display their reaction against the increasing Jewish settlements and the policies of Britain in 1936-39 revolts, they did not succeed because of the rivalries between the Arab factions. Contributed partly to the development of Palestinian nationalism, the leadership of notable families such as the Nashashibis and the Husaynis to the Palestinian national movement sacrificed the national development to the interests of their own families. Such separate evolvements of the two nationalmovements that are based on similar

commitments to Palestine, rendered the Jews powerful and the Arabs weak in the face of the other. Subsequently, the conflict appeared inevitable following the termination of the mandate rule in Palestine. Before the establishment of Israel, different political positions had also effect on the development of the Arab-Israeli conflict. Until the establishment of the state of Israel in 1948, the Palestinian political groups were in disunity as the Jewish political parties gathered together around the national cause. However, the developments after 1948 resulted in the establishment of the PLO and the Palestinian Arabs became united under the auspices of the PLO (Palestine Liberation Organization) for the first time. In the following years, the emergence of radical groups such as HAMAS contributed to the united action of the Palestinians in spite of its different policies with the PLO.

The change in the social structure of Palestine resulted in different formations in both the Jewish and the Arab community. The Jewish community, Yishuv, evolved into an organized, qualified state. With its institutions and parties, Arab community witnessed the development of national movement under the leadership of notable families within Palestine. While the Jewish community with its organized state institutions was appearing as the strong side of the conflict, the rivalries among the Palestinian political leaders consisting of notable families and their failure in their loyalty to the national movement weakened the claims of the Palestinians.

5.1 IMMIGRATION

According to M. E. Yapp, "Palestine was only a geographical expression to the Muslim population of Palestine. It also constituted an historical memory with religious significance to the Christians"[1] The region had been divided into districts allocated to the Ottoman officials. The British determined the borders of Palestine. For the reason Yapp's consideration appears true. Muslims in the region considered Palestine geographically as a part of Syria.

Before the British Mandate, Palestine was resided by Muslims at the four fifth of the region. The mandate apparently changed the size and population of

---

[1] M.E Yapp, *The Near East since the First World War: A History to 1995*, 2nd edition, (London: Pearson Education Limited), p. 116.

Palestine. Though a natural increase in Arab population was seen due to some immigration from Syria, Lebanon and Transjordan, Jewish immigration proved to have crucial role in the change of social structure in Palestine. Not only socially but also politically Jewish immigration affected the nature of Palestine because the Zionists perceived the Jewish immigration as the key factor to the construction of the Jewish state. Along with that the Arabs did not show very though reactions in the first sight, the gradual increase of the Jewish settlements urged the Arabs to think that their existence as indigenous inhabitants was threatened.

The Arab nature of Palestine was indebatable since the British mandate in 1922.[2] The early course of Arab nationalism in Palestine includes the reaction to British control and political demands of expanding Jewish community. Until the end of World War I, the Ottoman administration considered the local inhabitants of Palestine a part of Syria. This consideration was expressed in Palestine Conference in 1919 which supported the idea of the inclusion of Palestine in an independent Syria. Palestinian nationalism merely emerged against Zionist aspirations which were not shared by other Arab countries. During the British mandate, Jewish immigration and land purchase increased the demand of Palestinians to be governed by an Arab government. As a result, in a general strike in 1936, they called for suspension of Jewish immigration and tried to persuade the Jewish community that they formed a part of a predominantly Arab area.

In addition to the increase in Jewish settlements of Palestine, the divergent policies of the political factions among the Palestinian Arabs determined the character of Palestinian Nationalism. These two elements put forward the basic

---

[2] The establishment of mandates under the authority of the League of Nations following World War I was regulated so as the European mandatory powers to assist the mandated territories to obtain their independence. However, the conflicting promises of Britain to the Jews and Arabs in the name of preventing the discrimination among the Palestinian people led to the aggravating tension between both sides. The Mandate period fostered the development of a Jewish state while eradicating the Arab hopes to be independent. The immediate restrictions to the Zionist immigration following the Arab revolt in 1939 also resulted in Zionist resistance to the British control at the end of the mandate.

standpoints of the sides in the conflict. These points affected the struggle of the sides for legitimizing their commitments and territorial claims.

Zionism rejected the assimilation and the so long minority status of the Jews. The Jews saw Diaspora as an empty interlude between the origins of the Jews as a nation in the land of Israel and the return of the Jews to the land of origin. Goldscheider as Zionism's construction of peoplehood called encouraging the Jews to return to their origins with a view to creating a nation within Palestine. This construction resulted from systematic immigrations to Palestine. Goldscheider states that immigration tantamount to the renewal of Jewish control over their own national development within a state in Palestine in which Jews had not lived for almost 2000 years. Thus, the Zionist movement and the state of Israel have sought to gather in one country the multitude of populations around the world considering themselves Jewish by religion and ancestry. [3]

Increasing Jewish settlements and land sales in Palestine served to the main goal of Zionism that is creating a Jewish nation and establishing a Jewish state in Palestine. Nonetheless, the territories to which the Jews had been coming were not empty. Palestine was mostly populated by the Arabs and a small minority of the Jews lived together with them. However, the Jewish population in Palestine started to increase with the beginning of migrations from Russia as a result of the Pogroms of 1881. The Jews who had convened in Diaspora following the Pogroms urged a Jewish immigration from Russia to the other places of the world with a view to looking for a convenient land to establish a state for the Jews. As a consequence of the religious and historical commitment of the Jews to Palestine, the migrations intensely concentrated on the land of Palestine. Therefore, 35.000 Jewish people migrated to Palestine between 1840 and 1900. Between 1915 and 1920 the Jewish population became nearly 83.000. The Jewish population of estimated 35.000 tripled when World War I broke out.

Between 1918 and 1948, Jewish settlements increased so much and the Jewish population was not a minority anymore. It gradually became the majority. The

---

[3] Calvin Goldscheider, ed., *Population, ethnicity and Nation-Building*, (Boulder, San Francisco, Oxford: Westview Inc., 1995), p. 120-126.

waves of migration called Aliya shaped the infrastructure of the national movement. The Aliya consisted of mostly urban settlers wanting to get away from Russian pogroms, the Jews from Poland and Eastern and Central Europe who were the founders of the Yishuv's labor organizations and agricultural settlements (kibbutzim) and German and Austrian Jews coming after Hitler's rise to power.[4] Between 1948 and 1991, more four periods of Jewish immigration were seen in Palestine. In the three years after the establishment of the state of Israel, Jewish immigrants predominantly of European origin doubled the size of the Jewish population. Between 1955 and 1957 estimated 165.000 Jewish immigrants arrived in Palestine. Immigration wave that had began after the 1967 war included the Jews coming from Easter Europe (Soviet Union and Romania) and the U.S. Between 1972 and 1979 260.000 and lastly 370.000 Jews from the former Soviet Union between 1989 and 1991 arrived in Palestine. Consequently the Jewish population increased from 717.000 to almost four million.[5] Therefore, Arab population had been converted into a minority group.

The Jewish settlement in Palestine was consolidated by land sales. The territorial possession of the Jews emerged as the Jewish colonies. The first one was built in 1860, which was called Petah-Tikva.[6] The Jewish colonies were constituted through the land sales of the fellahin to the Jews financed by the rich supporters of Zionism. Though the Ottoman administration imposed some restrictions on the land sales to the migrated Jews, the Jews took the advantage some law vacuums in the land law of 1858. Until 1858, the land did not belong to those who worked it, but was Government-owned. With the publishing of land law in 1858, types of land such as mulk, miri, waqf, matruka and mawat were defined and granted ownership rights to land holders. The Ottoman government promulgated the land laws in order to register the lands in the names of their actual holders. When the tax on the registration, which was on a per dunam basis,

---

[4] Don Peretz, *The Arab-Israel Dispute*, (New York: Facts on File, 1996),p.21.

[5] Goldscheider, *op.cit.*, p. 127-130.

[6] Fahir Armaoğlu, *Filistin Meselesi ve Arap-İsrailSavaşları (1948-1988)*, (Ankara: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 1994), p. 25-28.

increased, landowners registered fewer dunams than they actually owned. This created the main dispute on the property between the Jews and the Arabs. The Arabs and the Jews started to dispute on who would be the real possessor of the land after numerous land sales. When the land began to lose its value as a source of income and became merchandise for sale due to the concentrations of large holdings, some Arab notable families tended to sell their lands to the Jews offering the highest price. Avneri states that the majority of these notable families took part in Arab national movement. The relatively high prices offered by the Jews were attractive to the fallaheen. Selling his not-so-valuable land, the Arabs would free himself from economic burden. The Jews subsequently rehabilitated these lands and converted these lands into valuable ones especially with opening waterways to these lands. During 1940s the Jews in Palestine constituted one-third of the population in Palestine and owned nearly 514.000 dunams of agricultural land. [7]

In the face of rising Jewish immigrations to Palestine, the Palestinian Arabs did not display a real reaction in the first sight. The real reason of the following Arab reaction was the increase in the landowning of the Jews. When the territories owned by the Jews increased more than the Jewish population, the Arabs started to demonstrate their resilience against the Jewish settlements. In the beginning of the 19th century, the Arabs also took the advantage of increasing Jewish settlements because of the land sales to the Jews. The Jews immigrated to Palestine and moreover settled on the valuable territories rich in sources needed for agriculture.

When the Jews started to be committed to territory and work the territory, a conflict between the Arabs and the Jews emerged. Therefore, the Arab-Israeli conflict came into being not only as a result of increasing Jewish population in Palestine but also the inability of both sides to share the same territory. Before the 1948 war, the most populated Jewish area was equally the most populated Arab

---

[7] Areh L.Avneri, *The Claim of Dispossessor*, (New Brunswick, London: Transaction Books, 1984) p .226.

area where the most prosperous towns, cities and regions were mixed.[8] Indeed, the conflict emerged as the dispute between Arab nationalism and Jewish nationalism over the same territory turned out to be the resistance of Arab nationalism against Zionism. Lastly, the uncompromise on the Palestinian territory, the clash of two nationalisms and the continuation of the conflict by both sides so as to gain more territory or secure the owned territory constituted the main pillars of the Arab-Israeli conflict.

As mentioned above, immigration had triggering effect on the emergence of the Arab-Israeli conflict. The Palestinian Arab nationalism emanated from the Arab resilience against the increasing territorial possessions of the Jews. Territory constituted the main issue of the conflict. Against the Jewish coming and settlement on their territories, the Arabs noticed that how important was their lands in terms of territorial nationalism. With the evolvement of Zionism in Palestine and the emergence of pre-state structures needed for a Jewish state, the Arabs started to reconstruct their nationalism conducive to prove that they were the real possessors of the land which had been previously sold by notable families who influenced the development of the Palestinian nationalism badly with their intention to serve only to their interests. Political factions emerged out of these notable families contributed partly to Arab nationalism in terms of political parties though their main concern is to realize their interests.

Until the second half of the nineteenth century, the hope for returning to the Promised Land one day proved to be the cement by which Jews were connected to each other. This basically religious Jewish interest in Palestine turned out to be a political one in the nineteenth century. As a result of the antidemocratic attitudes in Europe towards the Jews considering them an alien ethnic group, some Jews concluded that the Jews should attain their own national home in which they would determine their own destiny. As a response to the intensified anti-Semitism in Russia in the 1880s, the concept of Jewish nationalism led by Leo Pinsker and Theodor Herzl developed.

---

[8] Michael Saltman, ed., *Land and Territoriality*, (Oxford, New York: Berg, 2002), p. 41.

The common denominator shared by Herzl and Pinsker that the Jewish problem was not individual but national. According to Herzl, the Zionist movement had only one purpose: Transforming "a people without a land" to some "land without a people".[9] Similar to Lilienblum, he advocated the 'normalcy' of the Jewish people. He declared that he did not create a state based on a God-given mission and a Torah-dominated polity. In this vain, he had different views from Pinsker and other Zionists envisioned the creation of an authentic Jewish state addressing both the needs of Judaism and of the Jews. Jewish immigration to Palestine was encouraged by the Zionist leaders whose the main goal was establishing a Jewish state. In this regard, the development of Zionist idea explains the logic of Jewish coming to Palestine.

5.2 THE DEVELOPMENT OF ZIONIST IDEA

The Pogroms in Russia urged the Russian Jews to seek another place to live in security. This proved to be initial steps in the rise of Jewish nationalism. In the following years, economic disorder was regarded as a consequence of corrupt attempts of Jewish financers. Moreover, in France the Jews were seen as the scapegoat for economic and social disarray. These considerations in Europe led to a wave of anti-Semitism. Although being unaware of the ideas of Hess and Pinsker embracing Jewish nationalism and integrated into Christian culture, Herzl had come to the some conclusion with the other Jewish intellectuals that their dream of assimilation was not a appropriate response to anti-Semitism in France. The critical event that helped Herzl in his conversion to Zionism is the unjust trial of Captain Alfred Dreyfus. Herzl believed that the only viable solution of the problem of the Jews was the creation of a Jewish state in Palestine, so that he started to seek wealthy supporters to back his cause. He resorted to the Ottoman Empire but all his proposals concerning Palestine were rejected. To have sufficient support, he should have waited until the end of World War I.

Herzl fundamentally concentrated on building up the infrastructure of Zionism. In this regard, the establishment of the World Zionist Organization

---

[9] Abdelwahab M.Elmessiri, *The Land of Promise: A Critique of Political Zionism*, (New Brunswick, New Jersey: North American Inc., 1977), p. 127.

aimed at bringing together Jews oriented toward Modern Zionism and creating international support to Jewish colonization in Palestine. In the First Zionist Congress in Basel, Switzerland, which was convened in 1897, a resolution envisaging a "home in Palestine" for the Jewish people was adopted. The first Zionist Congress and Zionist Organization revealed as a testimony to the Jewish determination towards this end. Following years after 1897 showed us whether Jews had still been dreaming or realizing their dream.

The main objective of the Basel Programme adopted at the First Zionist Congress was the creation of a Jewish 'home' for the Jewish people protected by public law. Actually Herzl meant a 'state' for the Jews, but he did not want to attract reaction from the Arabs and furthermore he aimed at the strengthening of Jewish national feelings and consciousness by this objective.

The official programme was as follows[10]:

1.   The promotion of Jewish colonization of Palestine by Jewish agricultural and industrial workers.

2.   The establishment of an organization to bind the world Jewry by means of institutions in each country inhabited by the Jews.

3.   The strengthening of the Jewish national sentiment.

4.   The acquisition of government consent to the attainment of Zionist aims.

By virtue of finding a respond to the challenges of modern age against the Jewish people and implement this programme, Herzl started to seek international support to his cause. Herzl first exerted effort to get permission from the Ottoman government for the settlement of Jews in Palestine vis-a-vis providing foreign loans for the debts of the Ottomans.[11] The failure in his attempts led him to seek British aid. In spite of the slow spread of the Zionist movement to Western Europe and the United States as a result of the large-scale migration of Jews to

---

[10] Mark Tessler, *A History of the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict*, (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1994), p. 48.

[11] Walter Laquer, *A History of Zionism*, (New York: Schocken Books, 1989), p.100.

those areas, opposition to political Zionism remained there for years. For this reason, early Zionists considered Britain as a staunch ally in acquiring their homeland. At the moment, Herzl for instance, did not consider the future of Arab-Jewish relations. They believed that Arabs would not object to Jewish existence in Palestine since they benefit economically from the Jewish settlements.

While the amount of Jewish settlements in Palestine was in surge, Dr. Chaim Weizmann, who is a leading British Zionist deeply involved in the negotiations over the Balfour Declaration, pressed the British government for specific action to implement the Zionist program. Britain hoped that by placating the advocates of Zionism, she could encourage the Russian Jewish leaders to keep Russia in the war. After the United States entered the conflict, Britain was concerned about the continued apathy towards the war of a major section of American Jewry. When the German government began to solicit the support of the German and world Jewry, Britain felt the urgent need to outbid Germany and to sow internal disaffection among the Jews in the Central powers so as to weaken the enemy.[12]

Encouraged by Zionist arguments that a Jewish dominated Palestine would strengthen Britain's strategic position in the Middle, Britain hoped to use the Zionist support to help block the internationalization of Palestine, as required by the secret Sykes-Picot Agreement with France, and thereby to obtain Palestine for Britain alone.[13]

In the nineteenth century, the idea of establishing a new Jewish state became out of imagination. The Zionist Congress presented the determination of Jewish groups in the establishment of a Jewish home and realizes their long-lasting dream. This fact would be a response to the current waves of anti-Semitism. Many Jewish thinkers including Theodor Herzl took role in forming a territorial home in which a Jewish society inspired by Jewish traditions could live. In this

---

[12] The reasons of the suport of Britain to the Zionists can be seen in M.E Yapp, *The Near East since the First World War: A History to 1995*, 2nd edition, (London: Pearson Education Limited), p. 123-126 and p. 380-386.

[13] The concerning articles of the Sykes – Picot agreement can be seen in J.C. Hurewitz, *Diplomacy in the Near and Middle East, A Documentary Record: 1914-1956*, (Princeton, New Jersey: D.Van Nostrand Company, Inc. 1956), p. 19.

vein, Palestine was the only suitable place; 'for only Palestine was the Promised Land of the Jewish sacred literature: only immigration into Palestine could fulfill the ancient prophecies foretelling the Ingathering of the Exiles.'[14]

To establish a national home in Palestine, promoting emigration to the historic soil of the Promised Land was the major mean used by Zionists. In order to create self-sufficient nation state in Palestine, settled institutions are the main requirement. The migrating Jewish population would build up these institutions. Surely, the contribution of British mandate rule to the encouragement of these immigrations and subsequent settlement of the Jews in Palestine.

As a result of systematic Jewish immigrations, the emergence of Jewish landowners helping the Jews in settling in Palestine appeared. Therefore, Zionists succeeded in establishing a Jewish community in addition to a Jewish nation in Palestine. The British policy and the political organization of the settling Jewish community had tremendous effect on this success. The Zionist goal was encouraged by British mandate rule. Furthermore, united and organized nature of Jewish political parties beside the disorganized Arab political factions granted the Jewish side powerful position in the conflict.

5.3 THE MANDATE PERIOD

When World War I broke out, Palestine was under the Ottoman control. The Ottoman Empire joined the Central Powers and the largest Jewish community living in Czarist Russia took side with the Western powers. The Jewish alliance to the British troops in World War I, culminated in an attitude of Britain favoring the Jews.

When war erupted in 1914, Britain and Ottoman Empire found themselves on the opposite sides The British attempted to turn the non-Turkish inhabitants of the empire, many of whom had been at the edge of rebellion even before the war began, against the Ottoman rule.

During World War I, British foreign policy changed simultaneously with the Arabs' support to the British side in the war with Turkey. Within this context,

---

[14] L.F Rushbrook Williams, *The State of Israel*, (London: Faber and F. Ltd), p. 23.

Britain promised the Arab political independence in October 1915 out of a series of correspondence between Hussein ibn Ali, the Shariff of Mecca and Sir Henry McMahon from Britain. In order to acquire complete independence, the Arab nationalists supported the Allies in World War I. With a view to weakening the Turkish military and augmenting the Allied armies in the Near East, Britain took the advantage of Arab support. As a bulwark for her connection to India, an independent Arab state was considered as beneficial by Britain. After World War I, Arab demands and British concessions were contained in the negotiations of 1915 between Sir Henry McMahon, the British high commissioner of Egypt, and, Hussein, the Shariff of Mecca. Sir McMahon agreed to recognize and uphold the independence of the Arabs in all the regions with certain exceptions. Meanwhile, the secret Sykes-Picot Agreement (1916) divided many Arab-inhabited territories into French and British-administered areas as well as zones of influence. As an agreement conflicting with the McMahon promises to Hussein, provided for the internationalization of Palestine.[15]

Although Arabs disliked the growing Zionism, they believed in the promises made by Britain in the agreement (1915-16) between them to establish an Arab kingdom including Palestine in exchange for an Arab military revolt against the Ottomans and did not show harsh resistance. Thus, the British limited Jewish immigration as a response to the Arab pressure during the years between the two world wars.

After World War I, Arabs realized Britain's promises were ambiguous; furthermore Britain was in deal with both the Arabs and the Jews. This state of affairs accelerated the territorial dispute between the sides and rendered the conflict violent. While the Arabs were expecting from Britain to realize their pledge to give the Palestinian Arabs in the same way as Syria and Lebanon, they confronted 'a national home for the Jews in Palestine' with the Balfour Declaration in 1917. Even Britain did not mention the creation of an independent Jewish state of Palestine directly; its vague indications paved the way for an

---

[15] Fred J. Khouri, The Arab-Israeli Dilemma,(New York: Syracuse University Press, 1968), p. 5.

intense Jewish immigration into the country and a rise in the building of Jewish institutions needed for an independent state.

The Balfour Declaration issued on 2 November 1917 favored the establishment of a Jewish national home in Palestine, provided that the civil and religious rights of the non-Jews were not impaired.[16] By this way, British demanded to appeal to the U.S Jewish opinion, whose support for the allies was important. This declaration had been more meaningful for the Zionist groups. Their efforts for establishing their homeland were firstly supported by an international power in such a determination. Beyond this result, the declaration triggered Jewish fervor for Zionism. Hence it was strengthened corollary to the rising nationalism among all peoples in Europe.

Britain's contradictory attitudes towards Arabs were solidified with the proclamation of the Balfour Declaration in 1917. Though Arabs gained nominal independence in Iraq and Transjordan, they continued to claim that Palestine had also been included in the area promised to the Arabs. Britain's denial of the independence of Palestine as an Arab entity and the insurance of Zionists' national home in Palestine destroyed their faith in British pledges. The conflict between the indigenous Palestinian Arabs and immigrant Zionists is essentially the result of a clash between Palestinian nationalism and Zionism, both of which struggled for a nationhood in Palestine.

The Zionists interpreted the declaration as a pledge to establish a Jewish state in Palestine. Taking into account the possibility of becoming a minority in the country, the Arabs felt threatened from extensive immigration and land purchase. Consequently the nationalist movement of the Arabs in Palestine developed in the 1920s and 1930s as a reaction to the ambiguities of Britain and Jewish expansion.

In the peace arrangements following World War I, the Jews of Eastern and Central Europe were defined as a separate people. For the Zionists, this definition meant the possibility of struggling effectively within the Jewish national institutions to prepare the bases of the Jewish state. In 1920, the allocation of

---

[16] See Balfour Declaration in Don Peretz, The Arab-Israel Dispute, (New York: Facts on File, 1996), p. 238.

Palestine from the League of Nations as to a British Mandate within the framework of the regulations ushered in a new era for the Jewish history. Until this date, a national home for the Jewish society was theoretically established. Throughout the Jewish history, many scholars and intellectuals claimed that the necessity of establishing a separate, independent homeland, otherwise persecutions against the Jews would never end.

Although not all of their demands were met, Zionists put themselves in a strong position for achieving greater success when the Palestine Mandate was established in the Paris Peace Conference of 1919. Zionists' claims rested on British promises given to the Jews in the Balfour Declaration as well as their historic and religious contentions. The Paris Peace Conference, in writing Articles 20 and 22 of the League of Nations Covenant, further encouraged Arab hopes regarding Palestine. Especially Article 22, stipulated that certain communities taken from the Ottoman Empire would be ruled by a Mandatory and receives advice and assistance from this mandatory. After a while, they can be recognized as independent nations if it is believed that they were able to stand alone. With the approval of the Supreme Council at the Paris Peace Conference, the King-Crane Commission was appointed by the American President Wilson in 1919 to ascertain the political views and demands of the people of Syria, Palestine and Mesopotamia. When the commission came to Damascus, the Arab nationalists asserted their claim of Greater Syria and Palestine was the south part of Syria. Therefore, the Arabs objected any Jewish presence in the south part of Syria. Though the Commission had concluded that Zionist proposals would be unfair to the Arab majority, the Peace Conference ignored its report.[17] Therefore, the Conference's failure to consider the report deprived the Arabs of documentary evidence for their national cause before the international community. As a consequence, conflicting promises and policies of Britain escalated the strife between the Arabs and the Jews and hindered the Arabs' ability to compete with the political Zionists. As a result, they failed to defend their national cause in the field of international era.

---

[17] For the Commission Report, FRUS: http://www.state.gov/r/pa/ho/frus/ - (accessed on 22.02.2006)

According to Khouri, the Arabs could not present their case effectively at the Paris Peace Conference due to their lack of experience in Western diplomacy. However, their disorganized nature did not mean that they lack of ability of conducting diplomacy with Western powers. Given their relations with Britain from World War I to 1920s, it could not be argued that they did not know how to be involved in Western diplomacy. The agreement including McMahon promises seems the best evidence to confute this argument. Moroever, Amir Feisal's (the leader of the Arab delegation) sign in an agreement with Weizmann, welcoming the Jewish immigration, to use Zionist support against France displayed that the Arabs tended to maintain the balance among regional powers to receive the fulfillment of Britain's wartime pledges. [18]

The Mandatory Government[19] was able to maintain the balance between the Jews and Arabs as long as Jewish immigrants to Palestine remained in a small scale. To the Arabs, the mandate system would consolidate their cause and constitute a first step for fostering the principle of self-determination. By the way, Arabs founded their claims on their continuous occupation of Palestine from the seventh to the nineteenth century. They did not oppose the Jews as a religious entity or their immigration into Palestine as long as they came without political motives.

On the contrary, some Arab farmers continued to sell their land to the Jews in spite of Arab protests, demonstrations and guerilla fighting against British forces continued in the 1930s.

The major crisis occurred in 1933 when the balance was altered between two sides as a consequence of the persecution of German Jews by Hitler. The growing genocide conducted by the Nazis sharply increased the number of immigrants coming to Palestine. In 1936, the Arab revolt broke out in the face of large waves of Jewish immigrations, which was with some difficulty suppressed by British troops. Despite of British efforts to reassure the Arab states by imposing control

---

[18] Khouri, *op.*cit., p. 5.

[19] More information about British Mandate in Palestine can be seen in J.C. Hurewitz, *The Struggle for Palestine*, (New York: Greenwood Press, Publishers, 1968), p. 17 and p. 67.

over Jewish immigration, the Arab world did not give up thinking that the British policy was serving to the benefit of Jews.

In 1937, the Peel Commission recommended the partition of Palestine into a Jewish state and an Arab state. After 1937, Britain agreed in principle to accept Arabs' demand of an independent state under majority rule. Both parties rejected this proposal and the conflict started to escalate. The partition proposal was considered by Britain impractical in 1938.[20] Though Britain issued a White Paper (1939) intended to end the Jewish immigration, both sides rejected it. For this reason, Arabs refused to accept any Jewish majority rights. [21]

The mandate period in Palestine differs from the other mandate rules in Syria, Lebanon and Iraq. For these mandates, it was stipulated in the regulations of the U.N that the mandatory should work for setting up independence in these mandates. The British mandate facilitated the Zionist programme and ignored the rights of the Palestinian Arabs instead. The progress in the establishment of a Jewish national home in Palestine was backed by Britain as accepting the Balfour Declaration and giving support to the evolvement of a Jewish state on Palestinian territories. In the face of strengthening Zionist cause, Palestinian Arabs also sought for British support to their opposition to the Zionist settlements during 1920s. In the negotiations between the Palestinian Arabs led by Musa al-Kazim Husayni and the British rule, the Arabs demanded, a national government that is in unity with the other Arab states and the prevention of the Zionist affiliations.

The consequence of these negotiations with Britain was only the constitution of Arab Agency to represent Arab interests as the Jewish agency did the Jewish. They did not step back their commitment to the Zionist programme. The Arabs rejected this offer, and according to Yapp they lost a great opportunity that a legislative council would have placed them in a better position to form an effective alliance with sympathizers to the Arab cause in the administration and

---

[20] The Peel Commission Report can be seen in S.N Fisher, *The Middle East*, (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., 1960), p. 440.

[21] More information about The White Paper can be seen in S.N Fisher, *The Middle East*, (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., 1960), p. 437 and J.C. Hurewitz, *The Struggle for Palestine*, (New York: Greenwood Press, Publishers, 1968), p. 94-111.

the Colonial office.[22] The Palestinian Arabs hoped for better offers from new government in London and became encouraged by the examples of Iraq and Egypt that seemed to be closer to the independence.

The White Paper of June 1922 displayed once again that all British efforts for ensuring the rights of both Arabs and the Jews were debatable. The White Paper provisioned the regulation of Jewish settlements according to the economic capacity of the country. However, the economic absorptive capacity destined to be neglected by the Jewish immigrants. They believed that they would better the economy of Palestine with their future enterprises in Palestine.

The escalating tension between the Jewish immigrants and the Palestinian Arabs resulted in Wailing Wall riots of 1929 began in Jerusalem concerning the access of Jewish people to the western wall of the temple. The riots had important impacts on each side of the conflict. As a result of riots, the position of Hajj Amin al-Husayni was strengthened within the Arab community, the lack of confidence between the Jewish community and Arab community was developed and the British noticed the necessity to evaluate the mandate policy.

As a result of Wailing Wall riots, British government issued a new White Paper of 1930. It stipulated some restrictions on Jewish immigration and land purchases. This paper received deep critics from the Zionists inside and outside Britain. Due to pro-Zionist sentiment in the government and the possibility that a change in policy would have bad effect on Britain's interests, 1930 attempt failed in changing the general conditions in Palestine.

The period from 1931 to 1935 witnessed significant changes in Palestinian political life. The events during 1930's promoted the position of the Husaynis. With the rise of Islam in Palestinian politics, Muslim leader Hajj Amin Husayni gained prominence. The more self-conscious and organized nature of the Palestinian Arabs against the strong pre-state structure with its own institutions developed until 1933 culminated in the Arab revolt.

---

[22] Yapp, *op.***cit.,** p. 126.

The Arab states interfered in the events because of popular pressure and their willing to enhance their interests in the region. The Arab states such as Egypt, Syria and Saudi Arabia were unwilling to allow other Arab states to dominate the region. British rule supported the idea of the intervention of Arab states because it had believed that Arab states could succeed in ending the strike.

The Peel Commission Report of 1937 presented the causes of the 1936 events as the Arab hatred of Zionism and desire for independence. As a result of the unworkable nature of British mandate and the belief that the Jewish and Arab communities were irreconcilable, it recommended partition. While the Britain and Zionists were accepting the recommendation, the Arabs rejected. Subsequently, the Arab rebellion of 1937-39 broke out. The Arab revolt between 1937 and 1939 was led by the Arab Higher Committee as a coalition of party leaders to organize the strike. As a result of the events of 1936, the Arab states were involved in the Arab revolt.

The revolt had four main results; first, it caused a widespread breakdown of economic and social institutions. Second, it led to a temporary breakdown of government and a permanent blow to the administrative structured Britain had created. Third, the revolt strengthened the Yishuv's military position through the experience of revolt.[23]

Generally, the incidents between 1937 and 1939 culminated in change in British policy regarding Palestine. The prospect of war with Germany and Italy in Europe prevailed with the developments in 1930s. Near this prospect, other Arab states may establish their influence in the Near East, which would threaten Britain's imperial road. For this reason, it supported the Arab intervention to the affairs of Palestinians. The new policy was apparent in the White Paper of 1939. Britain envisaged strict control over immigration and land sales and also gradual independence of Palestine. These provisions were rejected both the Palestinian Arabs and the Jews. On the part of the Jews, all their hopes of a Jewish state would be vanished and for the Arabs regulations seemed ambiguous and curious.

---

[23] *Ibid.*, p. 132.

The circumstances before the World War II changed the nature of the Palestinian issue. As a result of Nazi onslaught of the Jews of Europe rendered the role of the United States important factor in the settlement of the problem. The Zionists in the United States adopted the idea of an unrestricted Jewish immigration and the American Zionist Biltmore Programme became the policy of American Jews. Another change was seen in the position of the Yishuv. Opposing to the British policy in Palestine as a result of the White Paper of 1939 and supporting it against Nazi Germany at the same time, the Yishuv gained military experience during the war. Britain seemed decisive to enlist the aid of the United States in the settlement of the problem. Nevertheless, the United States favored the admission of refugees to Palestine and a bi-national state under United Nations' trusteeship that was rejected by both sides. In 1947, Britain referred the Palestine issue to the United Nations.

The solution of the United Nations was partition. The Partition Plan of the United Nations recommended dividing Palestine into three elements; an Arab state, a Jewish state and an international zone including Jerusalem. The murders towards British officials by some Zionists and the damage to Britain's international reputation urged Britain to give an end to its mandate rule in Palestine in 1948. With the withdrawal of Britain from Palestine, the Jews and the Arabs became face to face in the fight for Palestine.

As a result of better-coordinated structure of the Yishuv and disorganized character of the Arab community, the Jews succeeded in keeping the territories allocated to them following the end of British rule. On the Arab side, different groups belonging to various notable families fought for the same cause without any cooperation. The needed organization and unity were supplied by not the Palestinian Arabs but the Arab states grouped in the Arab League. Owing to the economic changes and political rivalries, the notable families within the Palestinians lost their prominence in the Palestinian political life. Britain preferred to deal with the Arab states instead of Palestinian Arab Party of Husaynis. These different positions of the parties eventually culminated in the first war, 1948 war, between them. Thestrong and institutionalized nature of

Zionism and weak situation of the Arabs against the Zionist development rendered the Zionists successful in establishing a state for the Jews. The ongoing immigrations gained advantageous position during British mandate. After the withdrawal of Britain, Zionists took the advantage of the vacuum of power. The Arabs displayed a real and deep reaction to the rapid settlement of the Jews because they considered the establishment of a Jewish state unacceptable on their territory on which they constructed their nationalism.

5.4 POLITICAL FACTIONS

The different evolvement of political life within the framework of Arab nationalism and Zionism was different for. All political parties emerged in Palestine among the Jews adopted a common goal to establish a Jewish state in Israel. Even after the establishment of the state of Israel, political parties did not give up adopting Zionist idea. In spite of they had different policies on the nature of the state and the foreign policy of the state; they never renounce the basic idea of establishing a Jewish state in Palestine. The creation of needed institutions before the establishment of the state granted the state of Israel more power against the challenges to its existence on the Palestinian territory. Moreover, every government came to power in Israel concentrated on the continuation of existence of Israel on the Palestinian territories. On the part of the Palestinian Arabs, political factions led by the Palestinian nationalists did not focused merely on the national interest as much as their own interest. Because of the rivalries between notable families, every reaction to the increase of Jewish settlements in Palestine, which had been encouraged by the land sales of these families failed, and the Palestinians could not defend their national cause very strongly. Until the establishment of Palestine Liberation Organization, this failure led to the perception of the situation of the Palestinian Arabs a sole refugee problem.

5.4.1   POLITICAL PARTIES AND ZIONISM

When the development of statehood is considered, the political parties of Israel have enormous role in the diffusion of Zionism into the structure of state. The political parties emerged within the Jewish community, Yishuv, before the establishment of state. Regardless of their stance on the political spectrum, being religious, or, on the left or the right wing, all of them attempted to pursue the Zionist ideology in the direction of constituting a Jewish state in Palestine. Though each of them put forward different ways for building the state, they focused on the same objective that is the establishment of a Jewish State in Palestine.

In order to end the Arab opposition to the Jewish immigration, the Zionist leaders agreed in 1931 on the principle on "complete parity". According to this principle, the Arabs and the Jews would be represented equally but any demand for a limitation to the Jewish immigration was unacceptable.[24] This agreement did not mean that Zionists had abandoned the idea of establishing a Jewish state. Besides the economic and social requirements, Zionist theory focused on the establishment on the Jewish National Home due to the universal minority status of the Jews. Zionists stressed that the Jews would be vulnerable to the political, economic and social insecurity as long as they remained in minority status. This argument was called "the Jewish Problem". Moreover, Zionists argued that the national home established in Palestine called 'ancestral land' in which the Jews would be majority and masters of the state affairs could solve the Jewish problem. With this agreement, the Zionists intended to gain some experience in statecraft in order to manage their affairs. Within this context, Zionists created administrative machinery which was quasi-governmental.

The Yishuv, Jewish community, in the period between the two world wars laid the foundations of the future Jewish state in Palestine as transforming Zionist ideology to a concrete national movement with an economic base. The Yishuv was constituted under the British mandate. It has own government in the form of

---

[24] J.C. Hurewitz, *The Struggle for Palestine*, (New York: Greenwood Press, Publishers, 1968), p. 38.

the Jewish agency and national council. Through these bodies, it was able to function as government.

The community government came into being in 1920. The Palestine Government enacted the Jewish Community regulations in 1927. In these regulations, the government designated the Yishuv as a religious community. Indeed, the Jewish Community administration was national and secular. Until 1929, the Zionist Organization founded in Switzerland in 1897 was responsible for the administration of the national home in Palestine. In 1929, the Jewish Agency for Palestine was created. Both of them aimed at gaining the support of all the Jews, Zionist or non-Zionist, for the national home. In five years, the enlarged Jewish agency took over from the Zionist Organization responsibility for conducting the affairs of the national home. The Yishuv's National Council, the Zionist Organization and the Jewish Agency were the most important organs to realize the Jewish cause. However, the Jewish Agency was more effective as the elaborative machinery of Jewish quasi-government in Palestine. Especially, political department of the Agency affected the mandatory power towards contributing to the establishment of a Jewish national home through its negotiations with Great Britain and the League of Nations.

By the mid-1930s the Palestine Jews were valuably experienced in self-rule. The quasi-government was staffed with trained civil servants, which were residents of the Yishuv. Moreover, the Palestine Jews expanded their militia, called Haganah (defense) in order to defend Jewish settlements after the first anti-Jewish outbreaks in 1920. The majority of the Palestine Jews recognized the authority of the quasi- government.

In these circumstances, the Jews developed their political and communal organizations. The national council (Va'ad Leumi) established in 1920 to manage the day to day affairs such as health, education and social services was an example for these organizations which later became integral components of institutional life in the Jewish state. The other organizations were the Histadrut founded in 1920 (The Jewish Federation of Labor) and the Hagana founded in 1920 (The Jewish Self Defense Army). Italso   possessed   political   parties

representing different views in the Yishuv. The Labor party under the leadership of Ben Gurion dominated the political arena with its controlling force in the Histadrut and the Hagana. Besides the Labor supporters, there were bi-nationalists (Judah Magnes) and the Revisionists (Vladimir Jabotinsky) opposing to any compromise 'which would endanger the goal of establishing a Jewish state in the whole of Palestine.'[25]

The heterogeneity of the Palestine Jews fostered the political diversity. Every party in Palestine competed for capturing the control of the national wealth and negotiating with Palestinian and British governments for changes in mandatory legislation. Considering the communal structure of the parties, Hurewitz classified the parties according to their adherents. Thus, the East Europeans joined the leftist and rightist parties. Those from German and English speaking countries were involved in centrist groups. While the Sephardic Jews were participating in the European controlled parties, the Yemeni Jews opted for the labor parties. Wherever the Jews immigrated from and whatever their perspectives were, they gathered around the same goal that is establishing a Jewish state. Their different economic and social perspectives (Marxist, secular, ultra-religious) were represented by a variety of Zionist political parties. According to Hurewitz the parties consisted of four classes: Labor, Centrist, Clerical and Rightist. Among these four major trends divided the parties into labor, centrist, nationalist and orthodox religious, the dominant trend was labor controlling the national council, Histadrut, most kibbutzim and the Haganah, self-defense organization. The labor parties were identified with Histadrut. The largest of them was Mapai. Mapai espoused the socialist doctrines of the reformist or gradualist variety. Allied with Mapai as a labor bloc, the Young Watchman (ha-Shomer ha-Za'ir) Party called for the conversion of Palestine into an independent, bi-nationalist (Arab-Jewish) state, but otherwise endorsed the official Zionist principles of a Jewish majority and equal representation. The advocates of the Young Watchman Party believed that the Jewish National Home, as a politically

---

[25]Yapp, *op.cit.,* p. 119.

autonomous unit of a bi-nationalist state, would be capable of supporting itself and of absorbing most of the Jews throughout the world.

Concerning the parties of the center, any Zionist not already owing allegiance to a particular party automatically became a general Zionist. In the 1920s general Zionists dominated the Zionist administration. Its founding program stated that the union would be guided by only national rather than sectional (General Zionist A Party and General Zionist B Party) group or class interests.

The religious Zionist Party was ha-Mizrahi. Mizrahi champions believed that the Zionist mission was to solve not only the problems of the Jewish people but also those of its religion. More fundamentalist than the Mizrahi Party was the Agudat Israel (Society of Israel) World Organization. According to the Agudists, Zionism was a secular movement and it challenged the Agudists' theocratic conception of Jewish life. They convinced that Palestine could become a Jewish state when Messiah led to divine intervention to forgive their sins. The Shias is another ultra-Orthodox, non-Zionist religious party that was established in 1984. With its more moderate attitude on territorial issues such as the control of West Bank and Gaza than the other religious parties, Shias was more interested in religious legislation than political matters. Another ultra-Orthodox Party, the Ashkenazi dominated Degel Hatorah argues that a Jewish state should be based on Halakah (Jewish religious law). It is also non-Zionist and supports the possibility of territorial compromise concerning the West Bank and Gaza Strip.[26]

This classification of the parties by Hurewitz is debatable. Though they stipulate different aspects for the character of the state and their rapprochement to Zionism differs, all of them overlook the fact that they would survive in a state established on the lands of indigenous Arab people. Perhaps, it is more appropriate to classify the parties according to their views on the Arab-Israeli dispute, at least the rights of Palestinian Arabs. In this vain, grouping the parties as leftist, rightist or centrist did not change the nature of the conflict. The classification of Deborah Gerner seems to be more convenient if it is thought that the goal of all parties concerning the state was the same. Whether they were

---

[26] Hurewitz, *The Struggle for Palestine*, **op.cit.,** p. 39-48.

religious or non-religious, Zionist or non-Zionist, all of them focused on establishing a state based on Jewish majority. The way of foreign policy making of the parties could be used as a tool in classifying the parties.

According to Deborah Gerner, political parties are classified due to that whether they are annexationist, mainstream or Accomodationist. Annexationist parties were the ones endorsing the concept of Greater Israel and no withdrawal from the West Bank and Gaza. The parties belonged to mainstream were favoring some sort of 'land-for-peace' agreement but not complete withdrawal from the Occupied Territories or acceptance of a Palestinian state. The Accommodationists were supporting Palestinian self-determination and complete Israeli withdrawal from the West Bank and Gaza. Among the Accomodationist parties, smaller Zionist parties such as Mapam, Citizens' Right Movement (CRM) and Shinui aligned with the Labor party. All three parties were more willing than Labor to consider Israeli negotiations with the PLO, complete Israeli withdrawal from the West Bank and Gaza, and Palestinian self-determination. The Accomodationist political parties such as the Democratic Front for Peace and Equality (Hadash) and Progressive List for Peace (PLP) adopted the idea that there will be no freedom or security for Israeli people as long as Palestinians are denied freedom, security and self-determination.[27]

All of these groups and parties reflect different point of views regarding Israel's future borders and its relations with the Palestinian people. Though the parties could have conflicting visions for the future of the state, their foreign policies were the basic determinants in their classification. All of Israeli parties had a clearly defined national interest concerning the surveillance of the state.

Until the 1948 war, the determinant factors separating the parties were the nature of the state. After 1948, the future of the state became the main issue for the Jewish parties. It is more worthy to examine how they would realize their interest. Is it possible by compromise, bargaining, and negotiations or not?

---

[27] Deborah Gerner, *One Land, Two Peoples: The conflict over Palestine*, (San Francisco, Oxford: Westview Press, 1991), p. 107-111.

After the establishment of the state of Israel, the left dominated Mapai transformed in 1968 into the Labor party. It aligned with Herut founded in 1948 whose origins traced back to the old Revisionist party and the liberal General Zionists which was the forerunner of Likud (1973). From 1949 to 1977, Israeli governments were led by Mapai coalitions. Due to financial scandals and economic difficulties, Likud replaced the rise of left owing to its success in attracting more support for Zionist cause.

Until 1967 War, the Labor Party was more moderate than Likud in the Palestinian issue. After the June War (1967), it supported the Jewish settlements in the occupied territories. During the 1984-1990 Israeli government, Labor Party member Yitzhak Rabin was though in dealing with the Intifada. In the mid of 1990s, Labor supported the 'land for peace' formula involving withdrawing from parts of the West Bank and Gaza in exchange for a peace treaty with the Arab states. Yet, it never accepted the formation of an independent Palestinian state. There were constant disagreements between Likud and Labor regarding how Israel would deal with the Jewish settlements and peace negotiations with the Palestinians. Likud desired the increase of West Bank and Gaza Strip settlements.

The Likud coalition is the result of the 1973 merger of several political parties such as Begin's nationalist party whose roots date back to Jabotinsky's Revisionist movement and the right-of-center Liberal party. Likud is more conservative economically and religiously than Labor. It takes more a hard line stance on the Palestinian issue. It claims Jewish sovereignty over the West Bank, including East Jerusalem, the Golan Heights and the Gaza Strip. Likud sees these areas as a part of the inseparable 'Great Land of Israel'.[28]

From 1977 until 1984, Israel was governed by Likud coalitions. However, the Lebanese war and economic problems shed light over the success of Likud. In the aftermath of the 1988 elections, the coalition of Labor and Likud dominated the Israeli political life. While Labor was adopting the policy of forming Jewish settlement for security purposes, Likud accelerated the policy of independent settlement. Though it is said that Labor Party represented the center-left and The

---

[28] *Ibid.*

Likud coalition represented the centre-right, classifying them as rightist and leftist is meaningless. The view of the state over Palestinians, the code of conduct to be pursued towards the Arabs during the wars and the peace process determined the real classification of the parties. However, the Likud and Labor dominated the Israeli political life in recent years did not put forward totally different foreign policies.

Though in 1948 the Arabs still comprised Palestine's majority, the systematic domestic policies of the Israeli parties whether Zionist or non-Zionist and their success in gaining support for their national cause, settlement of their state resulted in well-organized Jewish community in Palestine and this position strengthened their status in the following clashes between the Palestinian Arabs and the Jews. The Jews believed that this clash was unavoidable. When Ben Gurion stated in 1919 "We as a nation want this country to be ours; the Arabs, as a nation, want this country to be theirs."[29], he did not respect the Arabs' view that they perceive the Jews as the ones who usurped their homeland. Perhaps they overlooked this point because they believe that the Jews would transport the superior European civilization to the cultures of Asia and Africa. At that time Zionists never accepted the authenticity of developing Palestinian nationalism and Arabs' goal of independence. They recognized Arab nationalism as a legitimate liberation movement but they argued that they lacked a separate identity and must reconcile themselves as a minority in a Jewish state.

This neglecting of the Jews the Palestinian Arabs as a separate entity emanated from the disorganized nature of the Palestine national movement. The rivalries between the notables in spite of their contribution to the development of nationalism in Palestine and disability of different political groups to unite around the national cause that is guaranteeing the Palestinian existence in Palestine rendered the Palestinian Arabs weak in the Arab-Israeli conflict.

---

[29] Khouri, *op.cit.,* p. 5.

5.4.2 POLITICAL FACTIONS AMONG THE PALESTINIAN ARABS

Political parties in Palestine came into being under the leadership of Husayni and Nashashibi families. The split between these influential families created by Britain in order to maintain her control over the Arabs rendered the national movement in Palestine difficult to be unified. Furthermore, the failure of the Palestinian Arabs to form a communal body because of their divided millet organs into two religions and the absence of a constitutional forum recognized by the British rulers to allow legitimate communication with them constituted an obstacle for the Palestinian Arabs to explain their national cause.

The core issue in the Arab-Israeli conflict was the conflicting claims to the same land made by the Israeli Jews and Palestinian Arabs. The Palestinians based their claims on their long-lasting presence on the land. In the period since 1948, these claims shifted from having all of Palestine accepting territorial partition and the establishment of a Palestinian state alongside Israel. Palestinians viewed this change as the only way to ensure their national survival and meet their basic political needs. During the 1950s, the Palestinians were attracted to pan Arabism asserting that regaining Palestine required Arab unity with a view to attain these goals, however, the Arab world was interested in Palestinian cause only when Palestinian priorities coincided with those of the Arab states. The disappointment with Arab regimes urged Palestinians to adopt their own measures rather than waiting help from Arab governments. Within this context, Al Fatah was founded by Yaser Arafat in 1959 and then evolved to the PLO in 1964. Despite the escalating attacks towards the Israelis, the growing discontent among the Palestinians continued. The Palestinians nonetheless remained insecure. They therefore yearned for a political home that would offer them diplomatic protection and economic security.

In spite of the reluctance of Arab regimes to tolerate an independent Palestinian movement and the perceptions of major international actors, a deep-rooted national identity revealed through autonomous political institutions emerged in thirty years since 1967.However, following the developments

in 1970s, they argued that if both peoples achieve their national aims, the contradiction would be removed. As a consequence, they concluded that the only feasible solution is a Palestinian state alongside Israel. Palestinians considered the restoration of refugees to their homes and the reconstitution of the entire land as a Palestinian state as way of sound solution.

The national movement appeared in Palestine at the end of World War I. Until the war, Palestinian national consciousness flourished within premature bodies. The members of Muslim-Christian Associations formed in the Arab towns to protest against the Jewish National Home were the first organized Arab nationalists in Palestine with the projection of Syrian nationalism. After the establishment of British administration, this national movement evolved from Syrian nationalism to Palestinian Arab nationalism. In 1930s the leaders clearly stated their claim on the conversion of Palestine into a sovereign Arab state. This required the termination of the British mandate and cessation of Jewish immigration and the purchase of Arab-owned lands by the Zionists. Since the leadership of the national movement to notable families and the lack of organized institutions committed to the national movement, early Palestinian national movement could not be effective.

The Husayni family and the Nashashibis rose to eminence in the nineteenth and the early twentieth century since they possessed considerable lands as a result of the 1858 Ottoman land law, which had recognized individual landownership, helped the urban notables to increase their domination of local administrative posts and this gave them a substantial role in the national movement. During the British Mandate, they had significant role in shaping the political life of the Palestinian Arab community.

The mufti of Jerusalem Al-Hajj Muhammad Amin Al-Husayni became prominent character during the British mandate. Al-Hajj Amin took full advantage of the absence of legal restriction on his authority as the Supreme

Muslim Council's[30] president and used the unlimited rights of appointment and dismissal to build up a personal, countrywide religio-political machine.[31]

The Nashashibis adopted a conciliatory attitude toward the government as a counterpoise to the Muslim-Christian associations led by Huseyni faction. The Palestine Arab Party founded in 1935 led by the Husaynis (calling for the repudiation of the Balfour Declaration, the end of mandate, the full spotage of Jewish immigration, the immediate establishment of Palestine as an independent Arab state) and the National Defense Party founded in 1934 led by Nashashibi faction were the primary actors of Palestinian political life.

Beside the conciliatory attitude of Nashashibis, Husaynis supported the idea of conducting the national development without giving any concession to neither Britain nor the Zionists. However, all the efforts of these notable families and their parties did not serve to national objectives. Their only concern was to manage their alliance with the influent landowning families and to obtain advantages in their rural interests. According to these interests various divergent political parties emerged. The Palestine Arab Party (1935) was the party of the Husaynis and the National Defence Party (1934) of the Nashashibis: the Reform Party (1935) was a party of lesser notables under Khalidi leadership, and the Istiqlal party was dominated by the 'Abd al-Hadis'.[32] With their different tactics and allies but the same objective of an independent Arab Palestine, all of these parties served to the ambitions of their leaders. The notables dominated Palestinian Arab politics in some organizations and events such as Arab Higher Committee formed in 1936 as a party leaders' coalition and the Arab rebellion of 1937-39.

These factions did not integrate with a common national cause, which would be realized through organized institutions placing national welfare ahead of personal interests and could not speak in the name of the majority of the

---

[30] An institution created by Britain in 1921 to be responsible for the affairs of Muslim community including Shari'a courts and waqfs.

[31] Hurewitz, *op.cit.*, p. 53.

[32] Yapp, *op.cit.*, p. 122.

Palestinian Arabs. For this reason Arab community was prevented from taking united action.

Promoting the rivalry between the Husaynis and the Nashashibis, Britain had succeeded in rendering the evolvement of Palestinian national movement weak. As a result of this, Palestinian Arab politics were based on the primary interests of notable families. These notables controlled the national organization, the Arab Executive, according to their benefits. During the 1930s the notable parties appeared with a modern style and ideological programs, however, represented the lack of cohesion in the realization of the national cause.

The notables had also significant role in the emergence of national consciousness in Palestine. Before 1918, all Arabs in Palestine considered themselves as a part of Ottoman Empire. Being aware of a common interest in opposing Zionist settlements, they did not have any other identification of themselves to replace their Ottoman identity. Palestinian Arabs always viewed themselves as southern part of Syria. By the fall of Faysal, this commitment was damaged.

A Palestinian identity under the leadership of Husaynis was accepted by the British mandate rule. This was also to serve Muslim-Christian cooperation. However, this identity was not adopted by masses. Islam proved to be stronger bond during the 1930s among the Palestinians.

Additionally, the rise of Pan-Arabism did not prevent the Arab families in Palestine from thinking themselves as the members of local families rather than Palestinians. However, the prominent families had tremendous impact on the development of national identity in Palestine until the end of the British mandate. The mandate allowed Palestinians to acquire their own institutions to help them depict their identity. The PLO and HAMAS emerged as the organizations to represent their identity.

5.4.3   THE PLO AND HAMAS

Some Arab regimes considered the Palestinian nationalism as a threat to their stability and security. Bringing thevarious   Palestinian   political   groups

under control became a goal for these regimes to prevent an unprepared war with Israel. For instance, Egypt has pledged to prevent the Palestinians from attacking from its territory in exchange for the Israeli withdrawal from Sınai and Gaza after the Suez crisis of 1956. In this respect, the Arab Summits in 1964 convened in order to take measures to inhibit the Jewish immigrations and let the Palestinians advocate their independence within a political organization under the auspices of the League of Arab states. Thus, the PLO (Palestine Liberation Organization) was established in 1964 as the representative of the Palestinian people. In the wake of the conversion of al-Fatah from a movement to an organization, its sole aim was securing the Arab unity. In the aftermath of Suez war, it espoused the idea that they should wage their own campaign for the liberation of Palestinian. The 1967 war defeated this opportunity to al-Fatah within the PLO.

The PLO gave an end to the idea of integrating with the Arab world in 1969. Augustus and Martin state that Fatah's diffuse nationalist ideology, its loose organization, the financial support that it received from the prosperous Palestinians and its ability to attract supporters helped it maintain its predominance.[33] With its rejection of any intervention or dependence on the Arab countries, it displayed its resolution to determine the future of Palestine on their own. The PLO under the leadership of Arafat was decisive to grant the Palestinians sovereignty over its land with executing the strategy of armed struggle.

The Charter of the PLO asserted that

the Palestinians were an integral part of the Arab nation and proposed the establishment of a united Palestinian state with the same boundaries as mandatory Palestine. It denied any national identity to Jews, condemned Zionism and accepted as Palestinians only those Jews who were present in Palestine before the beginning of the Zionist invasion.[34]

In addition to the PLO, a further Palestinian institution such as Palestinian National Council and Palestine Liberation Army was founded.

---

[33] Augustus Richard Norton and Martin H. Greenberg, ed., *The International Relations of the Palestine Liberation Organization*, (Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press, 1989), p.61.

[34] Yapp, *op.cit.*, p. 303.

As a response to the Zionists' claims that Palestine belonged to the Jewish descendants of the Hebrews, the PLO asserted that the Palestinians inhabited Palestine for years and they have inextricable ties with Palestine as their homeland. These two claims display that both sides tried to prove that it is the real possessor of Palestine. This effort appears debatable because the Jews and the Arabs had been living together before the Arab-Israeli conflict broke out. It is no doubt that both of them have historical and religious ties with Palestine. However, it is obvious that Zionists and the PLO overlooked this reality and shaped their political aspirations so as to deny the existence of the other.

Against the Zionist ideology based on legitimizing the Jewish settlement in Palestine, the PLO put forward the right of the Palestinians to exist in Palestine. The neglection of the Palestinians' aspiration to return to their homes after 1948 urged the PLO to defend the rights of the Palestinians and furthermore to advocate the Palestinian independence. With the transformation of demographic and political landscape of Palestine after 1948, the PLO emerged as the first organization to have concerted action against the Israelis. The emergence of the PLO proved to be needed political organization to realize the Palestinian nationalist ideology. The PLO was to maintain the independence and constitute a Palestinian state.

When the PLO started in the 1970s to pursue its goals through diplomatic ways near the armed conflict, the different approaches between these factions and the PLO created division as a threat to the unity of the Palestinians. The PLO's first aim was to obtain recognition of Arab states then international recognition as the sole legitimate representative of the Palestine people.[35] According to Yapp, achieving success in Palestine required that the PLO should modify its goal of a united Palestine and accept the existence of Israel.[36] In contrast, the factions different from the PLO insisted on keeping the armed conflict. For them, diplomatic measures would weaken their cause. While the position of the PLO

---

[35] The PLO achieved this goal first at the Algiers Summit in 1973 and confirmed at the Rabat meeting in 1974.

[36] Yapp, *op.cit.*, p. 307.

was weakening because of the different approaches on the strategy to be exposed against the Israelis, Islamic fundamentalism stroke a big blow to the PLO's predomination.

The radical Islamists like HAMAS criticized the choice of diplomatic measures by the PLO in 1987. It opposed to diplomatic measures because it considered that whole Palestine should be governed by a Sunni Muslim regime. As an alternative to the PLO, a small cadre within the Muslim Brethren organization founded Hamas in 1988. Hamas supported by Israel so as to outlaw the PLO had crucial role in Intifada. The basic claim of HAMAS is to be more representative of Palestinians in Intifada than the PLO. HAMAS put forward Islamism as a guarantee to secure political legitimacy. Its role in Intifada was coupled with Islamic Jihad. Intifada helped HAMAS to assume legitimacy within the Palestinians. Hamas ideologues recognized that nationalist discourse was inherently contradictory to underlying assumptions of Islamism. Though, Hamas did not refrain from asserting that nationalism is one of the circles around which the struggle for the liberation of Palestine settled, Hamas did not reconcile with the PLO because of secular attempts of the PLO.[37] It claimed that Islamic character of Palestine could not be overlooked. Hamas appeared as an alternative to the PLO when it rejected the PLO's compromise including the PLO's acceptance of a two-state solution in 1988.

The Jews and the Arabs were devoted to constitute a nation-state on Palestine. Though their aims were common, their way of achieving this goal was not same. The conditions of their societies were different. The Arab-Israeli conflict may seem to prevail due to different evolvement of these nationalisms.

In fact, due to different conditions they have transformed these two similar nationalisms. For instance, disorganized nature of political life of the Arabs and their failure to explain their cause in the international arena rendered the Jews strong in persuading the world states in the legitimacy of their state in Palestine and making them overlook their invasion to the Arab territories. In contrast, the

---

[37] Glenn E. Robinson, Building a Palestinian State: The incomplete Revolution, (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1997), p. 157.

Jewsih community was based on integration of political parties with their common goal and organized structure of its administration. Moreover, both sides built their claims on the continuity of conflict between them in the long term. This argument was clearly solidified when 1967 War and Intifada are elaborated. In these two events, each side reaped the benefit of being involved in this conflict.

The development of Zionism and Palestinian Nationalism culminated in series of wars between the Israelis and Palestinians. During the wars, main political concerns of both sides never changed. While Palestinians were exerting effort to restore their rights in Palestine and establish their independent state, the Jews tried to constitute legitimacy for the survival of the Israeli state. Despite of the contradictory demands, the tool of both sides was same: conflict. Conflict was needed to gain especially foreign support required for the realization of basic national claims on the territories. In this regard, the development of two nationalisms and the wars determining the foreign policies of both sides have great importance to understand the meaning of clash between the Arabs and the Jews.

5.5 WARS BETWEEN THE ARABS AND THE ISRAELIS

Garner states that War proved to be an inevitable method of settling disputes in the 20th century.[38] However, none of the wars between the Arabs and the Israelis settled the basic conflict between Zionists and Palestinians rather exacerbated Israel's security problem and increased the Palestinians' hostility toward Israel. All of the wars between the sides gave basic clues about their perspectives concerning the conflict. While the Arabs tried to rescue their existence in Palestine, the Jews aimed at extending its control over strategic points of the region in order to guarantee the surveillance of Israel. The wars between the Israelis and the Arabs are examined in this study within the framework of the effect of the wars on the Arab-Israeli conflict and of the strategic importance of territory to the sides. Evaluating the Israeli and the Arab

---

[38] Deborah Gerner, One Land, Two Peoples: The conflict over Palestine, (San Francisco, Oxford: Westview Press, 1991), p. 64.

93

positions during the wars, this chapter tries to bring forward how the territorial expansion of Israel influenced the Israeli approach to the conflict.

During the wars between the Arab world and Israel, each side adopted different approaches to the conflict. The common denominator of these approaches is that they prevented the sides from agreeing on territorial compromise. The lack of territorial compromise rendered the peace efforts up to date failed in realizing a permanent settlement. Territorial compromise seemed impossible because each side reaped the benefit from keeping the conflict and now renouncing this approach would mean making concessions from their strategically important territories.

Territory, namely Palestine, had utmost role in this conflict in terms of nationalism as mentioned in previous chapters. The wars between the parties display how the territorial acquisitions of both sides, especially Israel, oriented them towards the idea of the continuation of the conflict dominating the peace process. Given the expansion of Israel and the transformation of the Arab position in the conflict, the wars are studied so as to reflect the evolution of the Israeli and the Arab point of views while focusing on the importance of strategic territories for both sides.

Perry states that the Arabs considered the Israelis as a European settler state and an instrument of other Western states having interests in the Middle East. However, Israel saw itself as a restored ancient Middle Eastern nation. Getting support from some Western countries, Israel aimed at restore its ancient state through conquering lands and especially the lands of strategic importance to render its structure prosperous.[39] In the face of Israeli effort to conquere more land than it had settled or secure the existing ones, the Arabs strived for regain their lands through armed conflict. The wars until the declaration of Oslo Peace Process demonstrated the efforts of both sides to depict the borders of their lands in conformity with their national claims. While fighting for obtaining strategic territories in order to constitute superiority on the other, both sides noticed the

---

[39] Glenn E.Perry, "Victories and Setbacks", *The Middle East: Fourteen Islamic Centuries*, 3rd ed., (N.J: Prentice Hall, 1997), p. 244.

advantage of the continuation of conflict. Especially Israel reaped the benefit of the ongoing conflict when it declared the reasons of its fight as security reasons.

5.5.1 THE 1948 WAR

The years between the two world wars gave big opportunities to the Jewish people together with their unforgettable suffers. Reaping the benefit of war years and supplementing the weak points of the big powers in economic and military terms, they obtained support from international powers. At least, they made their demands being discussed on the international agenda. They, however, understood that establishing a national home would not solve the Jewish problem. The indigenous people of Palestine, especially Arabs, did not welcome their settlement in enormous numbers in Palestine. The conviction that the Jewish immigration will mean their exile started to take place in minds of Palestinian Arabs.

When the World War II started, the Palestinian nationalists led by Haj Amin al-Hussaini sided with Nazi Germany and the Axis powers. This choice meant the loss of an opportunity to reap the benefit from fighting on the Allies' side. By contrast, the Jews seized the opportunity and gained valuable experience with the war that they served it well later.

During the World War II, the Zionist movement continued to gain support for the Jewish control over Palestine. The Biltmore Programme in 1942 of World Zionists Congress in Biltmore Hotel, New York, consolidated the establishment of a future Jewish state. This congress declared that "the word 'homeland' in the Balfour Declaration implied a nation and that a nation meant a state.'[40]

As the Nazis continued executed genocide to the Jewish people in Europe, the Zionist movement received tremendous support from the United States that has the largest Jewish community. Meanwhile, the rights of indigenous Arabs were ignored. In the face of the possible influx of the European Jews, the U.S Jews directed the European Jewish refugees into Palestine because they did not want loose their relative equality and status in the U.S. due to negative effect of

---

[40] Gerner, *opcit.,* p. 41.

the mass migrations of the Jews on their positions in the administration. The result of Britain's failure to solve the Palestine problem was the Morrison Grady Plan[41] which was the Britain's final attempt to achieve a settlement. This plan proposed transforming the mandate into a United Nations trusteeship and divided Palestine not into separate Jewish and Arab sovereignties, but provinces. Though the Jewish 'province' in this plan was smaller than provided by the proposal of the Peel Commission, the Plan was providing the entry of 100,000 Jewish refugees into Palestine within a year.[42] Consequently, Britain turned the whole matter to the United Nations in 1947.

In the aftermath of the World War II, 75.000 the United Nations adopted Resolution 181 in 1947, which recommended the partition of Palestine into an Arab state (Golan Heights to Syria, West Bank and eastern Jerusalem to Jordan, Gaza Strip to Egypt) and a Jewish state in the remainder, along with the internationalization of Jerusalem. The Palestinians and Arab states rejected partition; the Zionists accepted.[43]

As a result of the increase in the Jewish immigration to Palestine between 1945 and 1947, violence between the Jews and the Arabs accelerated. After Britain unilaterally terminated her Mandate over Palestine, on 14 May 1948, a Jewish state, the state of Israel was proclaimed. Immediately, Jews initiated their war of independence that triggered the hatred between the Jews and the Arabs. At the end of 1948 war, Israel has expanded its control over 77% per cent of Palestine, and thousands of Palestinian Arabs became displaced. By the establishment of a Jewish state, the Zionists accepted nothing less than a state and Palestinian Arabs exerted effort to inhibit the realization of the Zionist desire for a national home. Following the British withdrawal, 1948 war erupted between the state of Israel established in 1948 and the Arab states of Egypt, Iraq, Lebanon, Syria and Transjordan.

---

[41] More information about the Morrison Grady Plan can be seen J.C. Hurewitz, *The Struggle for Palestine*, (New York: Greenwood Press, Publishers, 1968), p. 257.

[42] Khatchadourian, *op cit.*, p. 35-36.

[43] Calvin Goldscheider, *Cultures in Conflict: The Arab-Israeli Conflict*, (Westport-Connecticut-London, 2002), p. 19.

At the end of 1948 war, Palestinian refugee problem emerged. While the refugees were expecting to return to their homes, Israel refused to admit more than a small number and denied paying compensation for the ex-properties of the refugees. Therefore, Israel seemed to deny the indigenous rights of ex-habitants of Palestine. How the Jews had claims over Palestine, the displaced Arabs had also claims over the land. However, the Jews did not tend to accept these claims after their complete settlement within a state. Moreover, Israel expected the Arab states to absorb the refugees. The United Nations Relief and Works Agency (UNRWA) gave the human and financial aid to the refugees in 1950.

In addition, the problems of Palestinian were seen as the only refugee problem between 1949 and 1964 as if they had not been indigenous residents of Palestine before the 1948 war. Though the self-identity was strengthened in the refugee camps among the Palestinians, they had no political institution of their own to announce their right to return and have their own state. After the dissolution of the Husayni government at the end of 1948, some notables like al-Haj Amin was urged to go exile. During this period, Palestinian political thinking was divided between the ones struggling alone for an Arab Palestine, and the others supporting a united Arab world.

The failure of the Arab states in concentrating on the rights of the Palestine rather than their regional interests rendered the Palestinian national movement vulnerable to external effects. Furthermore, the ambiguous policies of the notables regarding the national movement weakened the development of the Palestinian Nationalism. The first and foremost important element that the Palestinian nationalists needed is a robust, united and decisive action against Zionism. The two abovementioned factor prevented the Palestinian nationalists from forming a concerted action. In this regard, the emergence of the PLO and HAMAS appeared as an hope for revitalizing the Palestinian national movement. They constituted the main structures in which the national movement gathered.

Following the 1948 war, the positions of both sides were radically different. Their common search for national identity and self-determination resulted in diversified ends. The Jewsachieved   statehood   through   the

establishment of Israel. The self-determination right of the Palestinians was denied and they were forced to exile. In the subsequent years, these two divergent conditions of both sides would determine their rapprochements to the transformation of the conflict. As the Jews formulated their statehood, the Palestinian Arabs started to regulate their late national movement.

5.5.2. THE 1956 SUEZ / SINAI WAR

The fear of Israel against the Nasser's growing influence throughout the Arab world and the spread of militant Pan-Arabism were solidified in Israel's reaction to the Nasser's nationalization of the Suez Canal in 1956. In order to prosper the worsening Israeli economy suffered from heavy military expenditures, Israel needed to benefit from the commerce passing through the Suez Canal. Economic boycott and blockade imposed by Nasser, moreover, the closure of the Suez Canal put Israel in a hard situation.

In the face of the Western powers rejection to sell Nasser military equipment in order to keep a balance of power in the Middle East, Nasser refused to participate in the containment policy against the Soviet Union. After Nasser received the refusal of the West to give financial assistance to construction of the Aswan High Dam on the Nile River, he nationalized the Suez Canal and banned the access of Israeli ships through the Canal. Taking the military support from the Soviet Union, Nasser broke the Western arms monopoly in the Middle East and deviated from the policy of Western powers against the Soviet Union. His arising reputation among the other Arab states, the West a Soviet satellite considered Egypt as a regional power. Taking the support of the Soviet Union behind, Nasser inclined to take the revenge of the defeat in 1948 and the situation of the Arab refugees promoted the hostility to Israel in the Arab states refusing to negotiate with Israel.

The developments before the outbreak of the 1956 Suez/Sınai War demonstrated the competition of the sides to dominate the strategic land in order to consolidate their existence on thedebated territories. The Suez Canal

was one of them that is of significance for the Israeli economy.

As a consequence of the war, Egypt gained reputation among the Arab states with its defiance to the West in spite of its military defeat. Israel agreed to leave Egypt provided that UNEF guaranteed freedom of navigation in the Gulf Aqaba. British and French forces withdrew by the end of 1956. Israel attained free passage through the Gulf Aqaba. Egypt remained in total control of the Suez Canal. In short, both sides noticed that Western support granted them stronger standpoint in the conflict. In particular, the rivalry between the U.S and the Soviet Union, served to the interests of both sides concerning the consolidation of their power on the strategic points that would contribute to the development of the Israeli state and the Palestinian Arab national movement.

5.5.3. THE JUNE 1967 SIX DAY WAR

With the foundation of the PLO under the auspices of Nasser and Nasser's initiatives such as the 1964 Cairo summit to overcome inter-Arab rifts and convene all the Arab states around the goal of creating a unity against Israel, the tensions between Israel and the Arab states led to a new war.

The attempt of Israel to use Lake Tiberias, the demilitarized zone between Israel and Syria, to store water (Israel's Jordan River diversion project) was denied by the Arabs at the 1964 Cairo summit. Moreover, the initiatives launched by Syria and Lebanon to work on the project, stimulated the Israeli aggression. Moreover, Egypt's military pacts with Syria in 1966 and Jordan in 1967 intensified the Israel's feeling of encirclement. This feeling stemmed from the rise of Egypt among the Arab states and the support of the U.S to the neighbors of Israel threatening her.

During the decade following the Suez / Sinai War, the conditions in the Middle East changed deeply. First, revolutionary Egypt gained major impact on the political unrest, civil wars and revolutions in the other Arab states such as Jordan, Saudi Arabia, Lebanon and Iraq (1958). Second, both the Soviet Union and the U.S led escalating armament race. The United States supplied arms to the conservative regimes in Iran and SaudiArabia against the Soviet Union, the

major supplier of massive weapons to Iraq and Syria.

Yet, Israel intended to turn this challenge into an advantage. By triggering Nasser's hostility, Israel tried to render its aggressive attitude legitimate. The 1967 war created a justification to Israel for attack and realize its goal of increasing its territory and eliminating its difficult adversary; Egypt under the leadership of Nasser.

At the end of the 1967 June War, Israel had overturned the balance of power in the Middle East. Its principal Arab foes were militarily crushed and any hope of destroying Israel by force became out of question.[44] Israel enhanced its control over Gaza, all of Jerusalem and the West Bank and the Golan Heights.

After the June war, territorial Zionism came to the threshold in the Israeli politics. Though some parties such as the Arab Communists and the small left wing factions were willing to make territorial concessions in return for peace with the Arab state, Israel seemed to refrain from ceding the strategic territories that allowed the passage of Egypt's Sinai petroleum and the influx of tourists to Jerusalem.

The 1967 defeat was as disastrous as the 1948 war for the Arab world. Egypt, Jordan and Lebanon experienced an enormous economic damage as well as collapse of Arab morale and self-confidence. Moreover, the war created another group of Palestinian refugees.

The causes of the Arabs' failure in the 1967 war actually clarified the general lacks in the Arab attitude against Israel. Problems such as false calculation, wrong intelligence and inadequate communications restricted the Arabs' activities.

The Arabs' refusal of admitting the principle of compromise in the diplomatic field always facilitated the position of Israel. This approach stemmed from the lack of single entity. The Arab side had no unified political or military structure. Furthermore, conflicting decisions and intentions always damaged the

---

[44] Don Peretz,*The Government and Politics of Israel,* (Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press),1979, p. 64.

so-called unity of Arabs. Lastly, Israel ignoring all historical perspectives generally focused on only maintaining its status quo.

The Arabs' claim to restore Arab rights in Palestine restricted its maneuvers. Against Israel defining Palestinians as refugees and forgetting that Palestinian Arabs had been inhabitants of Palestine, it appears not logical to remind the historical rights of the Arabs. It was more useful to attach importance to the recent situation of the Arabs so as to refute their strategy to consider some issues in non-negotiable category.[45]

The Arab-Israeli conflict emerged as an instrument for the both sides' administrations to hide their incapability of constituting stability for their people. Both sides were able to achieve unity in spite of their internal rivalries by means of uniting around the goal of defeating the other side. In this sense, the Arab-Israeli conflict emerged as a tool for leaving internal clashes aside and focusing on main national aspirations. Intifada and the Six Day War proved to be important turning points in the developments of both national movements in spite of their grievous outcomes.

The 1967 war seemed a crucial step for Israel in the direction of its ancient aim of establishing 'Greater Israel'. However, its occupation of such a wide range territories had also negative ramifications. It obtained the territories whose control was desired by three Arab states; Egypt, Syria and Jordan. This meant that Israel would able to strengthen its claim that Palestinians had threatened its security so that it was obliged to pursue a defensive foreign policy. By the inclusion of these three states into the issue, Israel's perception of danger was widened. The more it demanded to conquer land, the more it escalated its attacks in the pretext of ensuring its security. Though Israel obtained the control of over a million Arabs in the occupied territories, the Arab side already rejected to have direct negotiations with Israel. The more increasing defeats intensified hatred, the more Arabs refused to accept the existence of the state of Israel. An Arab League Summit in Khartoum by 1967 proved this idea. It was declared in the summit

---

[45] Hisham Sharabi, *Palestine and Israel: The lethal dilemma*, (New York: Pegasus, 1969), p. 121-123.

meeting that there could be no peace with Israel and no recognition. The league called for Israel to adopt the UN's charter's principle of the 'inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by war.'

As a result of the efforts of the Soviet Union and the U.S, the United Nations Security Council adopted its famous Resolution 242[46] at the end of the war. It called for withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from occupied territories to the pre war borders and a just settlement of the refugee problem. Surely, Israel did not accept the resolution. In the subsequent years the resolution 242 became the basic condition for peace that should be executed by Israel.

As a consequence the June war aggravated the old problems such as the Palestinian refugees and created new ones such as the problems of Suez Canal and Jerusalem. The vicious cycle appeared between the Arabs and the Israelis. Aiming at eradicating the encirclement by the Arabs and expanding as soon as possible to strengthen their state, the Israelis exerted effort at the expense of the non-recognition of the UN Resolutions. The territories acquired by Israel such as Gaza, West Bank and the Golan Heights would become the main focus point of the conflict. Israel's possession of these territories rendered Israel economically and strategically powerful.

For the Israelis, control over these territories solidified its being as a state through the legitimacy of the existence of this state which is debatable. The more Israel conquered the most valuable points of Palestine the more its survival was guaranteed. The only challenge, which is the spread of the influence of the PLO to the other countries in the Middle East, should have been undermined in order to secure its new borders. Israel attained more powerful reason to continue to exist in Palestine, which is security of its borders, than the myth of 'Promised Land'. In this vain, the 1973 October War and the 1082 War served to the consolidation of the Israeli borders and Israel's resistance to the cross-border attacks of the PLO. Israel used these attacks for the legitimization of its non-recognition of withdrawing to pre-1967 borders. Therefore, the continuation of

---

[46] Gerner, *op.cit.*, p.74.

the conflict strengthened the settlement of the Israelis in Gaza, West Bank and the Golan Heights.

5.5.4   THE 1973 OCTOBER WAR

Throughout the early 1970s, the major focus point of Egypt, Jordan and Syria was persuading Israel to return to the 1949 armistice lines. Nevertheless, Israel declared that this was impossible for itself because of its security concerns. After Nasser's death, his successor Anwar Sadat tried to regain respect at home as well as before the world community. By restoring diplomatic relations with the U.S, he tried to have peace with Israel on the basis of Resolution 242. In the face of Israel's consistent resistance to withdraw to pre-1967 borders, Sadat started to prepare for a war against Israel with Syrian president Hafez al-Assad. Despite of the moderate approach of Sadat to the conflict, the war appeared to be inevitable due to the lack of confidence between both sides.

The most severe repercussion of the October War of 1973 was the OPEC's (Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries) petroleum embargo and the rise in the prices of oil. This attitude of the Arab states displayed that the high level support of the Western countries to Israel would have significant economic cost. Petroleum appeared as an important tool that was to redress the power imbalance between the Arab states and the West. This resulted in a change in the relationship between the Arab states and industrialized powers such as the U.S.

When the ceasefire was ordered on October 22, 1973, the United Nations Security Council passed the Resolution 338 that is a companion to 242 as the basis for future peace proposals. It called for immediate termination of all military activity, implementation of Resolution 242 and the start of negotiations aimed at establishing a just and durable peace in the Middle East. As a result of Henry Kissenger's 'step by step' approach to the conflict, first bilateral accord could be signed between Israel and Egypt since the 1949 armistice. Furthermore, the U.S persuaded Egypt to reduce its troops east of the Canal, to establish a buffer zone in Sinai patrolled by a U.N. Disengagement Observer Force (UNDOF) and to reopen the canal to non-Israeli shipping and Israel to withdraw

its forces the Sinai to some 20 miles east of the Suez Canal. A buffer zone patrolled by UNDOF was also established between Israeli and Syrian forces in the Golan Heights and President Assad agreed to prevent Palestinian guerillas from using Syria as base for attacks on Israel.[47]

These disengagements of Egypt and Syria against Israel renewed the diplomatic relations between the U.S and, Syria and Egypt. Egypt had the crucial role in the development of this diplomatic climax. Egypt's 1973 military accomplishments allowed Kissenger's shuttle diplomacy and Sadat to initiate peace negotiations in 1977. Despite Egypt bettered its relations with the West and Israel, its relations with Syria deteriorated.[48]. Assad feared that Egypt's relative compromise with Israel would undermine his efforts to regain the Golan. For this reason, he did not participate in further peacemaking efforts of Egypt and joined anti-Israel Rejectionist Front including Iraq, Algeria, Libya, South Yemen and the PLO.

Following the October war, Sadat initiated his new peace efforts. Expelling his Russian advisors from Egypt in 1972, Sadat opted for having direct negotiations with Israel. In this sense, his demand for address the Knesset and discuss peace surprised Israel, the Arab states and the United States. Sadat's visit to Jerusalem in 1977 broke the psychological barrier preventing the Arab side from discussing the issue face to face and implied the possibility of Egypt's recognition of Israel. This standpoint of Egypt concluded with agreement to begin peace negotiations but also urged the Arab states to exclude Egypt that was suspended from membership in the Arab League.

The Camp David Talks between Israel and Egypt culminated in two accords "Framework for Peace in the Middle East" and "Framework for the Conclusion of a Peace Treaty between Egypt and Israel."[49] The Egyptian Peace Treaty was signed in Washington in 1979. The peace treaty led to the opposition of Left

---

[47] Peretz, *op.cit.*, p. 75 .

[48] For the inter-Arab rifts see Glenn E. Perry, *The Middle East: Fourteen Islamic Centruies*, 3rd edition, (New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1997).

[49] For more information see Peretz, *op.cit.*, p. 78.

parties and Islamic fundamentalists and the alienation of pan-Arabists as a result of Egypt's isolation from the rest of the Arab world. For Israel, the October war raised the doubts about Israel's invincibility and undermined the belief that no territorial concessions were needed. The war consolidated Israel's dependence on its relations with the U.S. The 1973 war had also tremendous effect in the political life of Israel. The Likud opposing any territorial concession for peace as a result of 1977 elections replaced the Labor party supporting the idea of peace in exchange of territory. The prime minister, Likud leader Menachem Begin, with its coalition members favoring "Greater Israel" called for annexation of the territories.

5.5.5.   THE 1982 WAR IN LEBANON

In the pursuit of an activist foreign policy led by Begin, Israel invaded Lebanon in 1978 to dislodge the PLO from its bases. Following its invasion of Lebanon, it annexed East Jerusalem in 1980 and the Golan in 1981. As a reaction to the Israel's second invasion of Lebanon in 1982, militant nationalists and Islamic fundamentalists in Egypt came to the fore in the conflict with Israel. The increasing fear of Palestinians that the Likud government could annex the West Bank sparked the Palestinian resistance to the occupation. In the face of this resistance, Israel aimed at undermining the influence of the PLO.

Following the defeat of Palestinian forces in Jordan and their exodus to Lebanon during 1970-71, the PLO had established political headquarters in Beirut and organized military bases in south Lebanon. Palestinian commando groups supporting the pan-Arab factions against the Maronite Christian groups dominating the government during the Labanese civil war began in 1975 disturbed Israel and urged Israel to attack towards Palestinian groups. The 1978 Israeli invasion of Lebanon did not accomplish its goal of ridding the PLO out of Lebanon and eradicating the political and military infrastructure of the PLO. The second 1982 Israeli invasion of Lebanon aimed at achieving the same goals. In addition to this, Deborah Gerner claimed that the real agenda was to create an

atmosphere in Israel that might improve the immigration.[50] Taking these factors into account, Israel sought for triggering the PLO's aggression towards itself to achieve a justification for its own hostility.

After the elections of 1984, Israel withdrew from Lebanon in 1985. The 1982 invasion proved to be a political failure of Israel and its economic cost was tremendous for Israel. The international community also condemned the events caused by Israel following the cease-fire such as Sabra-Shattilla massacres. Though sporadic incursions of Israel continued to Lebanese borders, the PLO consolidated its power in the south Lebanon and national sentiment identified with the PLO in the West Bank and Gaza intensified.

Israel's policy was to refuse to recognize the existence of Palestinian Arabs. It constantly referred to them as 'Arab refugees.' According to Sharabi Israel must have an aggressive policy because of its lack of legitimacy. This position necessitates an offensive posture. Therefore, nationalist strategy was based on not resolving the conflict protracting it.[51]

The development of Palestinian nationalism and the wars between both sides displayed that Palestinians need 'unity' in order to gain international support for their national efforts against Israel's policies. The transition period Palestinians undertook showed that their weak position stemmed from their lack of solidarity. Even Palestinians adopted a united strategy; the conflict seemed to be unresolved because Israel had interest in the continuation of conflict. Claiming always its security concerns, it benefited from the aggression emanating from Palestinians. Sometimes, Israel triggered itself the hostility among Palestinians against Israel as it supported the development of Hamas against the PLO. By the same token, Palestine also reaped the benefit of tension between itself and Israel. Thanks to persisting conflict, Palestinian leaders could draw the attention of the international community by leading the firs united action of the Palestinian Arabs called Intifada.

---

[50] Gerner, *op.cit.,* p. 85.

[51] Sharabi, *op.cit.*, p. 115-116.

5.5.6   THE EFFECTS OF INTIFADA ON ARAB NATIONALISM

Intifada with its origins within the tension-fledged territories emerged as spontaneous and politically inspired uprising. These well-underground groups basically controlled organized civil resistance movement. The principle underground leadership group was the Unified National Command (UNC), with representatives from Fatah, the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine (PFLP), the Democratic Front for the Liberation of Palestine (DFLP) and the Palestine Communist Party (PCP). The others were Hamas and Islamic Jihad that played an active role in Intifada. They called for the destruction of Israel and totally opposed to have any negotiations with Israel[52]With its widespread character and long duration, Intifada expressed the Palestinians' suffer for years to the world. For the first time, different local groups including Muslim radicals, communists and secular nationalists integrated for the common national cause.

Moreover Yapp states that the Intifada was a serious blow to Israel's attempt to argue that Palestinian opposition was merely the result of PLO terrorism against those accepted Israeli rule.[53] Intifada, namely the shaking-off, broke out in 1987 as a widespread resistance encompassing the entire population. The outbreak of Intifada resulted from the development of political consciousness among the 'insiders' living in the occupied territories. Nassar states that the importance of the occupied territories for the Palestinian national movement is the admiration and respect accorded to the resistance there. The West Bank and Gaza constituted an important arena for the development of the political struggle and a strong social base.[54]

The development of political consciousness began with the Palestinian reaction to the Jewish immigration and it was crystallized with the founding of the Palestinian National Liberation Movement (Fatah) in 1957-58. Furthermore,

---

[52] Don Peretz,*The Government and Politics of Israel,* (Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press,1979), p. 90.

[53] Yapp, *op.cit.*, p. 308.

[54] Jamal R. Nassar and Roger Heacock, ed., *Intifada: Palestine at the Crossroads*, , (New York, Westport, Connecticut, London: Praeger, 1990), p. 57.

the PLO enforced the political consciousness with the consolidation of an independent Palestinian institutional infrastructure. These political organizations led to the political mobilization of the Palestinians inside or outside the occupied territories. The 1967 war had the most triggering effect on the flowering of the Palestinian resistance. After the 1967 war, the Palestinians could be mobilized towards the same end. The political factions emerged in the period until 1967 stood near the PLO in Intifada though they conducted divergent acts in the following phases of Intifada.

Fatah, the PFLP, the DFLP, the Palestinian Communist Party and the Islamic movement gathered under the auspices of United Leadership to control the uprising. In the first sight, Intifada proved to be a significant event that united all Palestinian factions in spite of their different approaches. In Intifada all sections of the Arab community in Palestine participated in the uprising. Palestinian Arabs were unified, as it had never been before. In the 1936-39 Arab revolts failed because of traditional clan rivalries. Internecine struggle among Palestinian factions was repressed in Intifada. However, these different positions did not last and revealed at the end of Intifada. Especially, Islamic fundamentalists rejected the PLO's diplomatic struggle. Before the proclamation of the state of Palestine in 1988, these diversified positions reduced the effect of Intifada. It displayed to the international community that the grievous situation of the Palestinians and they were not the aggressors as Israel asserted.

Despite of the divided approaches, Palestinians experienced great psychological change during Intifada. Inhabitants of Palestine decided to conduct their own state of affairs rather than waiting no longer for foreign assistance. This self-reliance and solidarity among Palestinians galvanized national consciousness in Palestinian society.

Moreover, the Palestinians noticed that they should count on only their own strength rather than the outside world. Intifada demonstrated the Palestinians their ability to stand robust against Israel in their fight against injustice.

Against the Palestinian resistance, Israel displayed a disproportionate reaction that will be traditionalized by Israel in its further reactions. This feature of the Israeli reaction emanates from the fear of the Israelis that even one person is of the vital importance for its survival on the Palestinian territories. Israel, as a state established as a result of systematic immigrations, occupied the other's territories and displaced them with a view to creating and maintaining a Jewish majority.

While the characteristic of the Israeli reaction was disturbing Israel's image, Intifada made the international community recognize the Palestinians as a party of the conflict and their right to defend themselves against the repressive Israeli occupation. This cordial approach towards the Palestinians encouraged the PLO to start a diplomatic offensive.

The Palestinian problem was not a sole refugee problem any more as the Israelis had contended until Intifada. The PLO started to stand on a historical turning point in the PLO's political direction concerning the recognition of Israel's right to exist and its opinion for a two state solution. Nonetheless, the inappropriate reaction of Israel, the divisions among the Palestinians and their terrorist attacks shadowing the soul of Intifada transformed Intifada from an unpopular uprising into a veritable urban guerilla war.[55]

At the end of the abovementioned wars, Israel conquered very strategic points which would be conceived as inalienable parts of the Israeli state. Territorial compromise on these points such as Gaza, West Bank and the Golan Heights meant to share the prosperity of the state of Israel that is unacceptable. Moreover, its control over Jerusalem was the main possession of Israel which gathers all the Israeli Jews together and maintains the support of the others around the world for their existence of Israel. Thus, withdrawal from these territories was meaningless for the Israelis. To cover its illegitimate existence and consolidate its future in the Middle East, these territories are the main insurance for the Israelis. The only way to keep on standing the Palestinian reactions is to

---

[55] Omar Masallha, *Towards of the Long-Promised Peace*, (London: Saqi Books, 1994), p. 202.

display the Palestinians as aggressors. In this concern, Israel is destined to continue to conflict.

On the other side, the loss of only valuable territories to Israel always rendered the Palestinians weak in economic terms. Moreover, political separations among the Arab states deprived the PLO of the support of the Arab world. The only way to stand strong against Israel was to attack Israel. Though these attacks displayed the PLO as aggressors until Intifada, the continuation of the conflict disguised their economic and political weakness.

Within these considerations in mind, the above-mentioned wars determined the policy of both sides in the following years of peace efforts. As a result of these wars, territory emerged as not only an instrument on which they establish their nationalisms but also as a tool for promoting their resistance. A chance of territorial compromise was abolished during these wars. These territories include vital elements such as water, sacred places for two religions. The one who possess these territories would guarantee his existence. Therefore, the Palestinians and the Israelis adopted the continuation of conflict in order to dominate these territories. While telling a summarized history of the wars until the beginning of the peace process, the study will observe the rapprochement of the parties to the conflict and will try to demonstrate whether their attitudes of are conciliatory or not. In order to prove the decisive commitment to the conflict of Palestinians and the Israelis, the study will scrutinize the deficiencies of the peace process that urged the communities to adopt the continuation of conflict. Underlining the main issues that should be settled for achieving a lasting peace, the importance of territorial compromise is reflected in the study. Lastly, the thesis argues that territorial compromise could not be obtained because both sides espoused the continuation of the conflict with a view to perpetuating their national claims to Palestinian territories.

The establishment of the State of Israel in 1948 constituted the turning point in the conflict. It represented the beginning point of incompatible policies between the sides. The establishment of their state by the Jews regardless of the rights of Palestinian Arabs urged Arabs toreact in the most feasible way: attack

on Israel in order to get back their right to exist in Palestine. For this reason, the Israelis always considered the Arabs as a threat to their secure environment in which they could maintain their survival that had also fallen in danger due to the Nazi genocide during the World War II. The Israelis were in urgent need of reinforcing the presence of their state, which was compulsory to their opinion. However, the realization of this urgent need was at stake. The Jews obliged to exile from Europe to another land had constituted a state by rendering the indigenous Arabs displaced. The positions of each side encompassed the exclusion of the other and acceleration of the hatred in search for gaining legitimacy for their existence.

The wars waged between the sides between 1948 and 1967 proved this idea. As Israel was seeking to protect security of its borders, the Arabs of Palestine were striving to obtain their rights to return. During this array of wars, the international conjuncture also affected the development of the conflict. After the foundation of the PLO as the first organized national institution of the Palestinian Arabs and their oil embargo in 1973, international powers, especially the U.S, started to endeavor for the construction of peace in the region as leaving aside their concerns inherited from the Cold War years.

During the wars, each side, particularly Israel, reaped the benefit from the conflict. The territorial achievements of Israel were valuable. In order to maintain these acquisitions such as the control of Gaza Strip, West Bank and Golan Heights, Israel put forward her security concerns as the pretext to attack the Palestinian Arabs. Against the attacks of Palestinians, she displayed the Palestinian Arabs as aggressors until Intifada to cover her disproportionate reactions to the Palestinians. Israel used the Palestinian attacks towards itself to legitimate its policy to refuse to withdraw from the occupied territories with bringing forward her security concerns. With the outbreak of Intifada, the Palestinian Arabs received support from the international community for the first time. The recognition of the Palestinian Arabs' right to exist is firstly and ironically recognized through stone throwing instead of negotiations. The national cause of the Palestinian Arabsgained legitimacy as a result of

conflict. Therefore, both sides viewed that the continuation of the conflict can be instrument in order to maintain their existence on the Palestinian territories.

Following the wars between the sides, peace arrangements failed in putting forward a lasting settlement to the conflict. Peace negotiations were ceased by violence at every turn. Given the peace initiatives until 2006, each peace effort appeared unsuccessful because of ongoing violent attacks of one side towards the other. This could be explained with the interests of both sides in the continuation of conflict. Otherwise, each side should have agreed on territorial compromise urgently needed to achieve a lasting peace.

However, territorial compromise would mean renounce all national commitments to the Palestinian territory for each side. It is obvious that none of them would like to share territory. They may agree on living in coexistence in the future. Yet, it seems impossible to share the Palestinian territory as long as Israel insisted on refusing to withdraw from the occupied territories of which the control is strategically important for Israel and HAMAS recognize the existence of Israel in Palestine. The developments from 1979 Camp David to 2006 attested the accuracy of these ideas.

CHAPTER -6-

PEACE PROCESS AND CONFLICT OF NATIONALISMS

Following the wars, the positions and approaches of both sides to the conflict gained clear nature. The short evaluation of the developments until the Oslo Process tries to underline that the lack of territorial compromise is the main need to persuade the parties to become closer to peaceful solution to the conflict. However the second part analyzing the contemporary developments since the Oslo process, the proposed solutions had underestimated the necessity of territorial compromise. The failure of peace proposals in conciliating the conflicting national aspirations gave way to the adoption of the continuation of the conflict by both parties in order to maintain their conflicting positions considered as beneficial by both sides. This state of affairs emerged the question of whether the adoption of the continuation of conflict is a tool for the parties who conceive the solution as loosing the advantageous positions gained by them during the conflict.

The self-determination right given at the end of the World War I to the mandates was not implemented for Palestine. The settlement provisioned for Palestine within the framework of the UN's regulations following the termination of the mandate rule was not the establishment of an independent Palestine but a divided Palestine within the context of the UN Resolution 181 Partition Plan, which stipulated an independent Arab state, an independent Jewish state and Jerusalem under international rule. The Jewish Agency accepted the Partition plan. However, the regulations within the plan concerning the issues of immigration and borders were not perceived sufficient. The Arab side totally rejected the plan.

Following the developments during the World War II, the idea that received support in the international arena was the establishment of state of Israel by the

Jewish minority though the Arabs constituted the majority in the region. After the establishment of the state of Israel, the expansionist attitude of Israeli government blocked the UN's attempts to mediate between the Israelis and the Arabs in order to secure the rights of Palestinian Arabs. Following the 1948 war, Israel insisted on maintaining its new borders including Gaza conquered in the war and Palestinians gave priority to the settlement of the refugee problem. As a result, UN as a sole 'refugee problem' between 1950 and 1967 perceived the Palestine problem.

With the 1956 Suez War, the instability in the Middle East came to the threshold on the world agenda. It was understood that the Palestine problem constituted the hard core of this instability. Considering this problem a threat to peace of the world, the super powers became determinant to intervene in the issue. On the other hand, the most important consequence of the Suez war was the emergence of united Palestinian action to struggle for secures their national interests. The establishment of the PLO appeared as a result of the development of this sentiment.

The effects of 1967 war on the development of national identity among Palestinian were of more significance. As a result of the Six Day war, the motto of that the liberation of Palestine is only possible thanks to Arab Unity transformed to the idea that the Arab Unity would only be possible thanks to the liberation of Palestinians[1]. The invasion of the lands of Syria and Egypt in addition to the Palestinians' proved the latter. The mass migration of Palestinians out of their homeland consolidated the national consciousness. The UN Resolution 242 endorsed after the Six Day war constituted a baseline principle in the negotiations regarding the sharing of the territories of Palestine.

Following these developments, the Palestine problem was not any more only a refugee problem during the 1970s and 1980s. It became the issue of providing Palestinians with their inalienable rights. In the Geneva Peace Conference subsequent to the 1973 war, the necessity of international mechanisms to focus directly on peace in the region prevailed. At the end of the October War 1973, the

---

[1] Bülent Aras, *Filistin-İsrail Barış Süreci ve Türkiye*, (İstanbul: Bağlam Yayınevi, 1997), p. 25.

PLO was recognized by the Arab world and the international community. According to the UN Resolution 3210 in 1974, the UN invited the PLO to the negotiations concerning the Palestine problem. Moreover, the Rabat Summit of Arab Heads of States in 1974, recognized the PLO the official representative of Palestinians. With the acceptance of Arafat in an observer status in the U.N, Palestinians become one of the sides of the future peace arrangements. Therefore, Arafat started to seek for having settlement for the issue through diplomacy and compromise in order to achieve their goal: an independent state of Palestine.

6.1 THE ROAD TO OSLO

In the aftermath of seven wars waged between Israel and Palestinians, the Arab world, the search for a settlement emerged as an urgency because of the escalating violence in the region. As a result of 1973 war, oil came to the being as a significant leverage over Western economies. Therefore, a general expectation emerged that there would be some progress for the Palestinians. The war had succeeded in restoring Arab pride and the oil weapon, which seemingly gave the Gulf States such leverage over western economies, had ostensibly mounted on the Palestinian's behalf.[2] In the wake of the peace process, Egypt's role is not neglectable. Following Nasser's strict policies against the development of Zionism, Anwar Sadat appeared as a determinant character for the peace process.

Anwar Sadat took over the seat as the successor of Nasser in Egypt. Sadat's rule redirected the economy and politics of the country. He sought to incorporate alternative ways for a more open economy, while formidable challenges took place in domestic politics.

Sadat's main goal was to change Egypt's traditional foreign policy. He aimed to set up closer relations with the USA. The loss of the Sinai Peninsula was his main motivation to re-arrange his relations with the West and the neighbors in the Middle East. Getting the Sinai back was an urgent aim to realize. In parallel to this, Syria also wanted to get the Golan Heights back from Israel. From this vantage point, Egypt and Syria organized an attack planned by Sadat on Israel

[2] T. G. Fraser, *The Arab-Israeli Conflict,*(Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire and London: MacMillan Press Ltd, 1995), p. 111.

that was the start of the Yom Kippur War. During the initial stages of the War, they occupied some territories. However, the continuation of the clash did not expose the same current. Israel got back the regions that she had initially lost.

As the conflict improved, the USSR started to threaten the USA. Hence, the intervention of the two superpowers ended the War. The main outcome of the War's was the UN Resolution No.338; which called for the parties to apply to the diplomatic efforts to end it in case of a friction.

As a result of the 1973 War, Arabs gained a victory, and both foreign and defense ministers of Israel resigned. After 1973, Sadat started his diplomatic efforts to get Sinai back. The sides did not achieve total agreements. Hence, not only the agreement between Egypt and Israel failed, but also the agreements between Syria and Palestine broke down. On the other hand, Syria got some territory. Sadat wanted to make peace with Israel after getting Sinai back.

The Egyptian Leader, Sadat sought to be involved in a diplomatic process in order to make Israel invulnerable to military attack. His aim was the acquisition of a mini state on the West Bank and Gaza with reference to the formula of the Twelfth Palestine National Council in 1974, allowing establishing sovereignty on a part of Palestine. Though Israel was totally opposed to negotiate on the conflict, especially its feeling of being left alone by the USA urged Israel to adopt some attitudes compatible with American foreign policy. Having realized the significance of the Arab control of oil, the United States initiated a shuttle diplomacy led by Henry Kissinger. Under the pressure of the USA, Israel accepted to have a deal with its Arab neighbors, but by no means the Palestinians. Neither had it adopted the existence of the Palestinian people nor the national aspirations of them. Therefore, Israel could continue its refusal of recognizing the United Nations resolution 242 calling for a return to the pre-1967 frontiers. Even though the PLO began to play a leading role on political siege after the war of 1973, Israel refused to consider it as a colloquial.

Following Sadat's flight to Israel and his speech in the Knesset in the need to break down the 'physiological barrier' between the Arabs and the Israelis, an

agreement was signed in 1979 between Egypt and Israel that led to exclusion of Egypt by the Arab world. The main provisions in the peace treaty were the complete withdrawal of Israel's armed forces from Egyptian territory occupied since 1967, their undertaking to recognize and respect each other's sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence, their undertaking to respect each other's right to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries.[3] The Camp David Accords especially emphasized "a self governing authority of Palestinians, and a withdrawal of Israeli forces to strategic areas, with negotiations over a transnational period to determine the nature of the Palestinians' eventual status."[4]

The Camp David accords were modeled after Prime Minister Begin's autonomy plan of December 1977. It stipulated the abolition of Israel's military authority in the West Bank and Gaza and its replacement by an administrative body that was to be elected by and from the Palestinian inhabitants of the West Bank and Gaza. The purpose of this body was to manage the basic aspects of the daily lives of the Palestinian inhabitants of the West Bank and Gaza during a five-year transition period of self-rule. Negotiations on the permanent status of the territories were to start no later than three years after the initiation of the transitional period.

The Camp David Accords proved to be a major step forward in the quest for a settlement. It became a basis for an overall settlement directing all parties' attention to the crucial issues depended on fundamental claims of both sides over the territories. Within this context, the significance of the origins of the conflict firstly came to the threshold and it was sensed by parties of the conflict that a failure in satisfying territorial and national aspirations of them meant a failure in the negotiations. Indeed, incompatible positions regarding the Palestinian autonomy and self determination, the establishment of Jewish settlements in the

---

[3] J. R. Gainsborough, *The Arab-Israeli Conflict,* (Vermont: Gower Publishing Company, 1986), p. 211.

[4] Robert Bowker, *Beyond Peace: The Search for Security in the Middle East,* (Boulder, London: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1996), p. 56.

West Bank and Gaza and the role of the PLO in the peace process[5] diminished the hopes for the possibility of progress toward solving the Palestinian problem.

The Arab governments considered Camp David as a satisfaction of Egypt's interests at the expense of the Arabs and Palestinians. All the Arab states except Oman and Sudan broke diplomatic relations with Egypt. On the other hand, Sadat's efforts to construct peace with Israel resulted in the acceleration in the construction of Jewish settlements on the West Bank and Gaza Strip.

6.1.1   PEACE INITIATIVES DURING the 1980s

The first European peace effort in the region is the Venice Declaration of 1980. The European Community called for the recognition of the inalienable rights of Palestinians and the PLO as a party in equal status of the peace negotiations, the withdrawal of Israel to the pre 1967 borders and the termination of expansionist policy of Israel. According to Europeans, the American mediation was a failure. The Venice declaration resulted from this belief and encouraged Arafat to seek ways of settlement to the issue by diplomatic means.

The Reagan Plan of 1982 stipulated the same provisions of Camp David. Additionally, it foresaw the implementation of the UN Resolution 242 in the West Bank and Gaza. One of the articles of the plan[6] envisaged the Palestinian administration in the West Bank and Gaza under the rule of Jordan. This provision implied the exclusion of the PLO and gave the initiative from the PLO to the moderate Arab state, Jordan.

The plan of Prince of Saudi Arabia, Fahd, supported the possibility for all states in the region to survive in peace. According to Aras, this call of Fahd connoted the ostensible recognition of Israel. [7] This attempt failed because it was limited by one state, Saudi Arabia. On the September 1982, the 12th Arab Summit convened in Fez, the capital city of Morocco. In this meeting, the Fez plan was

---

[5] Ann Mosely Lesch and Mark Tessler, *Israel, Egypt and the Palestinians (From Camp David to Intifada),* (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1989), p. 140.

[6] For the provisions of the Reagan Plan see George Lenezowski, *American Presidents and the Middle East*, (London: Duke University Pres, 1990), p. 264.

[7] Aras, *op.cit*., p. 38.

adopted. The plan emphasized the importance of the central leadership of the PLO and the U.N for the realization of peace. Within the context of the plan, the PLO left its 'all or nothing policy' and declared that it would recognize Israel. Moreover, the PLO adopted the Fez plan, in the meeting of Palestinian National Council in Algeria of 1983, as a basis for the political initiatives of the Arab states.

The common points of these peace initiatives are the adoption of the principle of "land for peace" on the basis of UN Resolution 242, support for the withdrawal of Israel to the pre-1967 war and the ostensible recognition of the existence of state of Israel. None of them could prevent the outbreak of Lebanon crisis.

As a consequence of the Lebanon crisis, the images of both Israel and the PLO were destroyed before the international community. As a result of its terrorist activities, the PLO was urged by international community to withdraw from Lebanon. Following the Sabra-Shatila massacres, the foreign policy of Ariel Sharon lost credit before the Israeli public. In addition to these developments, the Palestinians living in occupied territories adopted more pragmatic approaches concerning their national development.

Between 29 August and 7 September 1983, the Geneva Conference was convened under the supervision of the UN. The conference[8] tried to draw the attention of the world community to the inalienable rights of Palestinians and reminded the international responsibility for the Palestine issue.

The King of Jordan, Hussein and Yaser Arafat agreed on the Arab initiative of 1985 stipulating the establishment of Palestinian state within a confederation regime under the rule of Jordan. With this agreement, King Hussein tried to regain the West Bank without receiving any opposition of the Arab world. On the other side, Arafat demanded to achieve American support with the mediation of Jordan. However, accelerating violence broke the negotiations.

---

[8] For the articles adopted in the conference, see UN, *The Need for convening the International Peace Conference on the Middle East,* (New York, 1989), p. 11.

The unsuccessful peace efforts between 1970 and 1988 constituted a framework for the future arrangements. While Palestinians were replacing their 'all or nothing policy' with the recognition of Israel, Israel continued to insist on opposing the offers of withdrawal from its occupied territories within the context of 'land for peace' principle. Israel's adoption of expansionist policy consolidated its existence on the occupied territories. Especially the last two wars paved the way for Isarel to succeed in its expansionist policy. The more it continued to clash the more it gained territories.

6.1.2   EFFECTS OF INTIFADA ON PEACE PROCESS

The roots of Intifada traced back to the British mandate rule established at the end of the World War I. During the mandate, the national identity of Palestinians gained different dimensions from their Arab identity. The struggle with Zionism consolidated their Palestinian identity. Their national fight following the 1967 war appeared as a proof of this transformation. Their national identity gained more significance as a consequence of socio-economic conditions stemmed from the occupation and terrorism. The economic and social conditions possessed by Palestinians and occupation and terrorism executed towards the Palestinians motivated Palestinians towards the goal of being sufficient on their own. In economic terms, enormous part of the Palestinian population was employed in Israel. As a result of the weak industrial development, the needs of Palestinians were mostly obtained from Israel. This economic condition created the dependency of Palestinian people on Israel. The divided nature of Palestinian community, the economic needs, and the expansionist and discrimination policies of Israel urged Palestinians to bolster their national movement on their own.

Intifada proved to be different from the Arab revolt between 1936 and 1939 because the Arab unity was not destroyed by the internal conflict among the different Palestinian groups. Drawing the attention of the world community, Intifada displayed that maintaining the status quo was not acceptable. Intifada alerted the international community to the gravity of the situation in the Middle East and triggered the contemplation of prospective negotiating processes conducive to a just and lasting settlementto   the   conflict.   The   international

community understood that political or religious extremists would deteriorate the situation unless they encouraged the sides to agree on a solution.

Besides the encouragement of the international community, Israel also seemed to be close to agreeing on negotiating with the Palestinian Arabs. As a consequence of growing economic burden and its worsening image before the world community, the supporters of peace in Israel increased and the idea that military measures of Israel was not sufficient any more for the settlement of the issue prevailed. Three options for Israel emerged following Intifada. First was the sustention of the pressure on Palestinians, the second was exiling Palestinians and the third was allowing the establishment of a disarmed Palestinian state in the West Bank and Gaza.[9] As a result of Intifada, it was understood that both sides should recognize their right to exist. All these consequences of Intifada affected the subsequent peace process because they created the convenient atmosphere for the recognition of the PLO by the U.S and the establishment of the Palestine state.

6.1.3   PEACE EFFORTS FOLLOWING INTIFADA

During the second half of the 1980s, Palestinians in the occupied territories and the PLO supported the dialogue with Israel under the condition of its adoption the principle of land for peace and the UN Resolutions 242 and 338. The change in the policy of the PLO stemmed from the initiatives of the U.S, the self-confidence gained after Intifada and the acceptance of Yaser Arafat as the representative of the Palestinians.

The Prime Minister of Egypt, as the only state discussing the developments with Israel because it was in peace with Israel since 1979, Husnu Mubarek under took the mediation role between Palestinians and Israel in 1988. The opposition front of the Likud party dominating the Israeli government promoted the failure of the Mubarek Plan.[10]

---

[9] Aras, *op.cit.,* p. 59.

[10] For the provisions of the plan see Bülent Aras, *op.cit.*, p. 59.

The Schultz initiative of 1988 proved to be the most important American initiative after the Reagan plan. The Schultz plan envisaged the review of the conception of secure borders. The failure of the Schultz plan depended on the lack of the plan to meet the Palestinians demands concerning the termination of Israeli expansion and the support for the Palestinians to establish their government displayed by Intifada.[11] Following the failure of the plan, King Hussein withdrew from the West Bank in favor of the PLO, Palestinian National Council declared the establishment of independent Palestine state and recognized Israel implicitly in 1988.

In the aftermath of the establishment of Palestine, the prime minister of Israel, Shamir made a new attempt during his visit to the U.S. His initiative included the determination of representatives for the negotiations on restricted autonomy.[12] Palestinians did not accept this regulation that did not recognize the PLO and foresaw a Palestinian autonomy of which the realization time was uncertain. According to Palestinians Israel still considered the Palestine problem as a refugee problem and did not have the intention to recognize the PLO. Following the Shamir plan, the foreign minister of Sweden, Sten Andersson resorted to the support of American Jews in order to commence the dialogue between Israel and Palestinians.

As the PNC was declaring the establishment of Palestinian state on the basis of the U.N Resolution 181 regulating the Partition Plan, it accepted the two-state solution. Subsequently, it declared that it adopted diplomacy instead of armed conflict. In order to reduce the American concerns on terrorism, Arafat expressed the PLO's commitment to the peace, stated that it had recognized Israel's right to exist and underlined the importance of the UN Resolution 242 in the Geneva meeting in 1988. Therefore, the U.S launched the dialogue with the PLO following the rejection of the PLO terrorism. Arafat put forth the PLO's

---

[11] For the provisions of the Schultz plan see William B. Quandt, *Peace Process: American Diplomacy and the Arab-Israeli conflict since 1967*, (Washington: Brooking Institution, 1993), p. 486-487.

[12] Aras, *op.cit.*, p. 61.

constructive manner with his plan declared in 13 December 1988.[13] At the heart of this plan lied the call for the sides to meet in an international meeting under the supervision of the U.N. As an answer to this call, Madrid Conference in 1989 convened under the leadership of the European Community, but it failed because the U.S and Israel did not accept to negotiate with the PLO on the same table and the lack of confidence between the U.S and Israel, and Israel and the PLO resulted in failure.

The changing world conjuncture was the one of the main reasons for the failures of all these peace initiatives. During the 1980s, Israel was the part of the Middle East strategy of the U.S. after the demise of the Soviet Union, Israel lost its prominent role for the U.S against the Soviet Union. The decrease in the effect of Soviet Union in the region, the opposing attitude of the Likud party towards the American peace initiatives destroyed the Israel's image before American public. On the other hand, American undertaking the conciliatory role was perceived by Israel as a support to the Arabs.

After the dissolution of the Union, Soviets started to give support to Israel in order to improve its image in the West. Gorbachev made attempts in order to develop diplomatic relations with Israel broken in 1967. Against the support of the Soviet Union to the mass immigration of the Soviet Jews to Israel, the UN and the U.S intensified their peace efforts. They tried to prevent the acceleration of terror in the Middle East. The diminishing effect of the Soviet Union in the region had important influences on both sides. The decrease in the role of the Soviet Union in the region weakened the Arab resistance and rendered Palestinians vulnerable to the outside effects, in particular the U.S. The mass migration also affected the internal dynamics in Israel. Soviet Jews migrated to Israel not because of Zionist intentions but the deteriorating economic conditions in the Soviet Union and a possible danger of a new anti-Semitic wave. Zionism was badly affected from this standpoint of the Soviet Jews.

---

[13] For the provisions of the plan see UN, DFPR, *Special Bulletin on the Commemoration of the International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian People*, 1989, p. 10.

As a consequence of these internal and external dynamics, some Israelis become the defenders of peace. One of these was the Labor party during the 1990s. Two wings occurred in the Israeli political life concerning the settlement of the Palestine problem. One of them, Labor party, supported the principle of 'land for peace' and the other, the Likud party and religious right parties, adopted the hawkish ideology. Labor party accepted the principle of land for peace because it believed that the policy of the Arabs to eradicate Israel became invalid in the aftermath of the Cold War. As a result, the supporters of Labor party believed that the Israelis would not perceive any danger from Palestinians any more because the Arabs recognized Israel as a reality in the Middle East. [14]

6.1.4 THE GULF WAR AND ITS EFFECTS ON THE PEACE PROCESS

The disagreement between Iraq and Kuwait on the oil prices resulted in Iraqi invasion of Kuwait in 1990. The United States reciprocated the Iraqi invasion with its support to Saudi Arabia. Paralyzing Iraq, the coalition forces helped Kuwait gain its independency. The Gulf crisis brought out the division among the Arabs. The PLO lost credence before the other Arab states.

After the failure of his plan in 1988, Arafat turned his face to Iraq, Saddam Hussein, in order to persuade Israel in peace by the means of Saddam's power in the region. Moreover, he intended to regain the confidence of radical Palestinians and Arabs opposing to his diplomatic initiatives. He tried to repair his loss of domestic support among Palestinians. The populist concerns of Arafat proved to be important trump for Saddam in using the Palestine problem to constitute the Arab unity and realize his demands in the Middle East.

Saddam conditioned his withdrawal from Kuwait with the withdrawal of Israel from the occupied territories. This attitude encouraged Palestinians in the face of Israel's insistence on settling in the occupied lands. Palestinians interpreted the increase in the military power of Iraq as the rise of deterring power of the Arabs against the Israelis. On the other hand, the military

---

[14] Deborah Gerner, *One Land, Two Peoples: The conflict over Palestine*, (San Francisco, Oxford: Westview Press, 1991), p. 110.

intervention of the West in Iraq was considered by the Arab World as not a necessity for international security but interference to the domestic politics of the Arab world. Relying on Saddam's power, the PLO tried to disguise the disorganized nature of the PLO. Syria's recognition of Israel's existence following the Gulf crisis directed the Israelis towards achieving its goal; a secure state in their 'ancestral homeland'.

With its support to Saddam, the PLO lost its sympathy before the West and the Arab world. The Arab world disappointed in the face of the PLO's support to the expansionist policy of Saddam. Thus, Palestinians conceived that Hamas could be an alternative of the PLO in the way of realizing their national cause. In addition to its terrorist activities, the PLO lost the confidence of the West. The PLO struggling for decades to inhibit the expansionist attitude of Israel supported the expansionist attempt of another country in the region. This approach shadowed the legitimacy of the PLO's resistance against Israel and constituted controversy before the international community. The PLO lost his chance that it had obtained by Intifada to determine its future on its own. The decline of Israel's role in the region owing to the developments after the Cold War and the failure of the PLO in the Gulf war rendered both sides open to external intervention. The possibility for them to depict a peace agreement on their own was eradicated. They became the subjects of indirect negotiations conducted by external powers.

Peretz asserted that the end of Soviet anti-Western instigation, the deep divisions within the Arab world, and the establishment of U.S hegemony created an environment conducive to new initiatives in U.S policy on the Middle East.[15] The Gulf War against Iraq had divided the Arab world into allies of United States (Egypt, Syria, Kuwait and Saudi Arabia) and those sympathetic to Iraq (Yemen, Libya, Sudan and Jordan). This division facilitated the U.S's individual negotiations. The response of the US against Iraq's invasion of Kuwait drew the reactions of the latter. They blamed the US of executing double standard that they organized a massive international coalition condemning Iraq's occupation of

---

[15] Don Peretz, "U.S Middle East Policy in the 1990s" from Robert O. Freedman, (ed.), *The Middle East and the Peace Process: The Impact of the Oslo Accords"*, (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 1998), p. 349.

Kuwait while accepting Israel's occupation of Arab lands. In 1991, the Arab-Israeli issue once again came to the agenda when Iraq launched missile attacks against Iraq. Therefore, the US assumed the leading role in the international operation to call for comprehensive negotiations between Israel and Arab states. That led to the Madrid Peace Conference in 1991.

6.1.5   THE MADRID CONFERENCE

The changes in both sides' positions emerged in the aftermath of the Cold War and the Gulf War, persuaded all sides of the conflict that military settlement would not be sufficient. The Gulf war brought the mediator role of the U.S on the world agenda for the peace talks. Moreover, the U.S gained the respect of the Arab states such as Egypt, Syria and Saudi Arabia undertaking the major role for peace talks. Using the support of the Arab world, the U.S succeeded in persuading Syria to have peace dialogue with Israel. The only condition envisaged by Syria to have dialogue with Israel was the withdrawal of Israel from the Golan Heights. The pressure of the U.S had effective role on the moderate attitude of the Prime Minister of Israel, Shamir. Shamir adopted this attitude because it was the easiest way for the recognition of the legitimacy of state of Israel. Shamir accepted having peace with Palestinians, but he insisted on not accepting the PLO as the representative of Palestinians. Ross envisioned that sitting with the PLO would signal that Israel accepted the PLO agenda of independence and statehood. So the Israelis did not want to deal with the Palestinians.[16] The solution of the U.S to this dilemma was the exclusion of the PLO from the peace negotiations. Nevertheless, this implied that the U.S overlooked some realities of the conflict. Because of the less support behind the moderate parties to the conflict, the participation of the PLO was needed in the peace talks. The American administration demanded to constitute an order in the region which would entail its least intervention and expenditure following the developments during the Gulf War.

---

[16] Dennis Ross, ,*The Missing Peace: The Inside Story of the Fight for Middle East Peace*, (NewYork: Sraus&Giroux,2004), p. 47.

Within this context, three points was focused on before the Madrid Conference in 1991. The sensitivities of both sides regarding security, the need for exerting effort to achieve the regional economic equilibrium for the long term stability and a sustainable process of compromise able to solve its problems were the issues that should be taken into consideration before the conference. The issues of territory, peace and security were the main subjects that were discussed during the conference. During the conference, the Arabs appeared the weakest side owing to the internal divisions inherent in their group. Palestinians came to the conference as a part of a common delegation with Jordan. The Conference included the bilateral and multilateral talks. In the bilateral talks, the sides discussed their problems emanated from the past. The multilateral talks included five working groups concerning the issues of water, environment, refugees, the control of armament and security. [17]

Palestinians were not satisfied in the meetings because the important issues were left aside and regional matters were discussed in the conference. In all offers of Israel, Israel proposed a limited authority for Palestinians under occupation. Israel rejected the initiatives of Palestinians regarding the establishment of an independent Palestine state. As a result, the main disagreement between the sides was the recognition of independence of Palestine.

In the first instance, the bilateral talks got into a stalemate. Firstly, Israel did not accept to relinquish any land. Moreover, Israel refused to deal with PLO that was supported by the Arab states. However, the Israelis and the PLO agreed on recognizing each other's legitimacy at the end. Within the context of limited extent of Palestinian self-rule within the West Bank and Gaza Strip, Palestinians elected Arafat as president. Many groups hoping for more extensive power such as Hamas and Islamic Jihad tried to derail the accords and resorted to terrorism.

As a result of the breakthrough in Israel-PLO relations, Jordan (firstly) and the other Arab regimes started to contact with Israel. In contrast, they failed to reach a complete agreement on the terms of peace treaty.

---

[17] Aras, *op.cit.*, p. 94.

6.2 OSLO ACCORDS

Within the context of Oslo peace process, the Principles of Interim Self-Government Arrangements with the official name of the Gaza-Jericho Plan was declared. It envisaged the Palestine self-rule in the Gaza Strip and the West Bank. It was declared on September 13, 1993. The Declaration of Principles[18] stipulated a two-phased solution:

1.   Five year period for the solution of Palestinian problem

2.   The implementation of permanent arrangements that are to be negotiated no later than the beginning of the third year of the interim period, such as the status of Jerusalem and the refugee problem.

Basically, these provisions led to the failure of Oslo peace process. Although the Gaza-Jericho plan emerged as a first considerable attempt towards implementation of Palestinian self rule, it also put forward an ambiguity on the future of Palestinians' hope for the realization of their political aims in the region. Overlooking the external and particularly internal factors surrounding the Arab and Israeli positions, a concrete and deep-rooted solution to the conflict seemed to be impossible. Indeed, domestic reactions within both sides blocked the progress that Israel and the PLO had made in negotiation process. As a result, it was understood that even external conditions were appropriate to produce a breakthrough; peace process would always be restrained with meeting the domestic considerations and the conflict would be destined to continue.

The Oslo Accords appeared as an interlude in which both sides seized the opportunity to display their effort to develop a sense of mutuality and respect among them. Within this context, it constituted a new beginning and surely a success in the peace process. Nonetheless, it was experienced that without agreement on core issues regarding sharing the same territory, Israel and Palestine would remain an enemy state amidst their people. This experience stood as a harbinger for the future practical arrangements. Palestinian statehood, sovereignty over Jerusalem, the future of Jewish settlements, and the right of

---

[18] John King, *Handshake in Washington*,(Berkshire: Ithaca Press), 1994, p. 2.

Palestinian refugees to return or to be compensated have always been the hard-core issues of the following practical arrangements. These insoluble problems stemming from each sides' clashing political and historical claims to the land of Palestine. If the recent impasse between the parties is to be unblocked, these claims and the origins of them should be taken into account. It should not be forgotten that a progressive peace process depends on the clash of Zionism and Arab nationalism since the origins of their conflicting emanated from this clash. Without bearing in mind these claims, it will be hard to achieve a concrete, lasting and objective settlement for the Arab-Israeli conflict. Otherwise, the region will always be subjected to violence, moreover, terrorism. In this respect, the Oslo Accords constituted the first and the most unique example of this observation. Though the Oslo Accords seemed to persuade both sides to recognize the peace, it overlooked the importance of the immediate settlement of the core issues. The failure of the Oslo peace process displayed that conflict would continue unless the abovementioned issues reached any solution.

Moreover, internal opposition within both the PLO and Israel hampered the progress of the Oslo peace process. For the PLO opponents such as Hamas and the less radical ones, it seemed hard to reconcile the aim of Palestinian nationalism which was the regaining of the land lost in 1967 and a recognition of Palestinian moral rights[19] On the part of Israel, the opponents of Yitzhak Rabin were afraid of his full compliance with UN Resolutions envisaging the return to the pre-1967 frontiers.

Though the process seemed to be fragile and complex, the Palestinians for the first time accepted the notion of shared land and the hope of mutual prosperity. They, furthermore, accepted the legitimacy of Jewish settlement in Palestine. The Israelis, for their part, agreed on the establishment of an autonomous Palestine while recognizing the existence of the Palestinian people and national rights. By reconciling the competing rights to the land of two nations, the Oslo process ushered a new era for peace.

---

[19] King, *op cit.,* p. 42.

The reason for the Israelis to recognize the PLO is to demonstrate its willingness to break the deadlock in the negotiations. Moreover, intensified anti-Israeli violence led by Hamas in the West Bank and Gaza alarmed Israel to take side at least near the PLO and try to solve problems by series of negotiations. The main reasons for the PLO to negotiate with Israel stemmed from the consequence of Gulf War. Following the War, the PLO found itself in the Arab world weaker than ever before. Moreover, Arafat's support of Saddam during the Gulf War combined with Saddam's defeat not only delegitimized the PLO's role in the peace process but also reduced overall Arab support for the Palestinian cause.[20]

Within this atmosphere of hope, the implementations concerning sensitive issues left to the negotiations on a final stage such as final status of the occupied territories, refugees, Jerusalem would determine the possibility of a real peace. The Washington Agreement incorporated the establishment of territorial autonomy whereas the Camp David Accords had only spoken of the autonomy of people. The Palestinians hoped that they would achieve self-determination after a transitional phase. However, the Israelis did not seem to accept this process totally, they conceded a limited autonomy not self-determination. Both parties had different point of views concerning the principles of the Washington. They knew that trying to solve all problems and signing an agreement would result in deadlock. However, they preferred to display their goodwill required to tackle the problems first and then try to overcome obstacles. This rapprochement adopted by both sides brought forward the negligence of the origins of the conflict and moreover the firm commitment of the peoples of both sides to their claims over the land of Palestine.

In this sense, Omar Massalha states that the Palestinians would require true independence and political neutrality, if they were to help to establish, maintain and consolidated peace in the region where the Israelis sought real security. Namely, Israel and the Palestinians should have immediately negotiated on the real problems instead of agreeing on five years long period of slow and stagnant progress. First, the Jerusalem taboo had to be broken. They could have tried to

---

[20] *Ibid.,* p. 96-99.

resolve this problem within the context of their agreement on sharing the land. The question of the Israeli settlements in the occupied territories also needed to be addressed. Moreover, he states that Israel and the PLO should agree on a way to solve the problem that met the requirements of justice and legality without triggering a civil war or, worse, open conflict between Israel and an independent Palestine.[21] Nevertheless, trust building process never ended. This would mean leaving the policy of both sides' of excluding the other and advocating their national aspiration through conflict. In this regard, conflict emerged as a useful mean in their effort of proving the legitimacy of their existence.

By contrast, Bowker says that a period of trust building must be a precursor to final-status negotiations across all of the outstanding issues such as Jerusalem and settlements, it would be immensely counterproductive at present to address the core issues separating the two sides.[22]

Tony Klug underlines that "incremental progress" in the context is a contradiction in terms as it is open invitation to militant factors on both sides to sabotage a process and an outcome they vehemently oppose.[23] Indeed, the incremental process oriented the sides to opt for the easy way. They did not have a common perception of peace and the only common point of them is excluding the other. The incremental nature of the process let the sides continue this exclusion.

William Zartman has suggested that "the resolution of conflict requires that the interests of the parties be shaped through discussion and negotiation into a common understanding of the problem, with a solution arrived after eliminating possible alternatives. He emphasizes that agreement between the parties is not enough; moreover, a resolving formula must satisfy the demands of the conflict.[24]

---

[21] Omar Massalha, *Towards The Long-Promised Peace,*(London: Saqi Books, 1994), p. 18-19.

[22] Bowker, *op cit.,* p. 70.

[23] Tony Klug,. *"Imagine No Excuses, Palestine-Israel Journal of Politics"*, *Economics and Culture* , vol. 11 Issue 2, (2004), p. 59.

[24] Bowker, *op cit*., p. 65.

While the Oslo peace process highlighted the prospects for peace, the fundamental incompatibility of the political and social realities between Israel and the Palestinians eradicated these prospects. The Oslo Accords failed because the Palestinians and the Israelis still have national goals that are incompatible with each other's existence as free peoples, and are accepted by a large national consensus on each side. For the Palestinians, the popular consensus solidified around an independent state, the 'right of return', the recapture of East Jerusalem and the removal of all settlements in the Occupied Territories. For the Israelis, the consensus was against the return of refugees and the division of Jerusalem.[25]

The leaders of both sides around these national goals also rallied the two peoples, and little was done to prepare them for peace. For instance Newt Gingrich in his article in the Middle East Quarterly binds the reasons of the failure of the Oslo Accords to the failure of diplomacy. He says it was natural that Arafat's declarations in Oslo concerning that he was tired of conflict and wanted to end terrorism in the aftermath of the collapse of Soviet Union. Gingrich asserted that the developments after the Oslo Accords displayed that the words of Arafat were simply tactics designed to weaken Israel.[26] The subsequent terrorist actions by both sides displayed that the focus on Israeli-Palestinian diplomacy should depend on real commitment of leaders to their words during the peace processes. However, this was impossible for the both sides that constituted their national actions on the continuing conflict.

The lesson drawn from the Oslo peace process was peace efforts should be in parallel with national goals of both sides otherwise peace seems impossible in the region. However, A. Baklanov suggests alternative attempts with a view to creating a compromise. He states that the establishment of a common responsible 'security framework' boost confidence in relations both sides in order to settle the problems concerning the territorial issues, internal security and stability,

---

[25] Andy Tay, "The Israeli – Palestinian conflict: is there an end sight?", *Defence Studies*, , vol. 2 Issue 2 (Summer 2004), p. 275

[26] Newt Gingrich, "Defeat of Terror, Not Roadmap Diplomacy, Will Bring Peace", *Middle East Quarterly*, (Summer 2005), p. 4.

economic matters and finance, the refugees, question of defense and international relations, and Jerusalem.[27]

All peace efforts after the Camp David Accords in 1979, the Madrid Conference in 1991 and the subsequent Oslo Accords in 1993, hopes raised for improvements in security were vanished by the escalation of violence stemming from the popular insufficiency of the people. The eruption of Intifada following the tripartite Camp David in 2000 and the Taba talks in 2001 constitute the examples of this observation. According to Mamdouh Nofal, the Palestinian-Israel negotiations and arrangements had not engendered durable principles for establishing a peaceful relationship. On both sides, there remained people had not drawn lessons from the past and still believed that the conflict could be resolved through force.[28] These people constituted the majority who had not believed in the possibility of peace. Therefore, they supported the continuation of conflict.

Following the Oslo Peace Process, security views of Rabin dramatically changed. His approach evolved into a restraining vision of preserving security only by ridding out of these territories. In the meantime, he resigned himself to the idea of direct negotiations.

Concluding, the Oslo Process highlights the attempts of Rabin and other partisans of the peace process to incorporate a Zionist and liberal Israeli national identity, which, they thought, would draw a frame for peace and prosperity by reaching a territorial compromise with the Palestinians.

However, the 1996 elections exacerbated Israel's identity crisis. The backlash by the religious and nationalist right against the Oslo Accords and the secular practices of the Rabin government and the electoral reform that re-arranged the methods to get elected caused the loss of power by Labor and Likud to smaller parties. Thus, collapse of the common denominator followed by the emergence of cultural commitments introduced the Israeli politics with a Jewish

---

[27] Andrei Baklanov, "Middle Eastern Knot of Contradictions",:*A Russian Journal of World Politics, Diplomacy & International Relations*, Vol.50, Issue 3 (2004), p. 30.

[28] Mamdouh Nofal, "The Centrality of the Palestinian-Israeli Conflict for Middle East Peace", *Paletsine-Israel Journal of Politics, Economics & Culture,* Vol 11, Issue 1 (2004,), p. 23.

and ultranationalist Israeli identity led by the approach of Netanyahu's right wing government. This policy was dependent on politicians who valued "Greater Israel", hence, stressing on the necessity to retain control over territories.

Nofal expresses that the great importance of the Oslo Connection is that it demonstrated the true fate of a peace process rests in the hands of the protagonists rather than in the hands of the intermediaries.[29] It became apparent that third party mediation can be instrumental but the protagonists should be the main actors to conclude peace with one another. Therefore, the reciprocal recognition prevailed firstly in Oslo was of significance towards achieving an agreement.

Surely, Israel and the Palestinians did not become friends immediately after the handshake of Yitzhak Rabin and Yasser Arafat. Though they agreed to discuss their clashing views, much difference continued to exist over fundamental issues. As Palestinians were willing to gain its sovereignty in a state of their own, the Israelis seemed to be resolute to reject this goal in their interests on security.

It might be asked that why Israel and the PLO did decide to end this conflict tracing back to the nineteenth century? On the one hand, global changes, escalating violence and the desire of leaders to see themselves peacemakers could be reasons, on the other hand, the shape of fundamental demands of societies could change but the basic territorial claims never change.

Without persuading both societies to make concessions from their claims to the land of Palestine, it seemed inevitable to reach a complete settlement. Thus, tensions following the signing of agreement in Oslo proved that imposing peace on both sides from above means useless efforts.

John King says that what was achieved at the White House in September 1993 was the decision by two parties to turn their backs on a history of deep-seated antagonism[30]. While assessing the Oslo Process, it should be borne in mind whether the ideological commitments and obsessions of its participants were really met by Oslo and the following efforts for peace. The answer of this

---

[29] *Ibid..*

[30] King, *op.cit.*, p. 17.

question helps us understand why the Arab-Israeli conflict has been so hard to end.

The novelties put forward by the Oslo talks between Israel and the Palestinians are that the Israelis met the Palestinians face to face and an atmosphere of optimism stemming from the willingness of the leaders to seize the chance for real peace. In spite of intensified efforts of both sides, the end of 1993 saw a period of disappointment. Renewed talks in Norway to recover the spirit of Oslo talks emerged as unsuccessful meetings. The inability of the mediators to agree on the issues of security and boundaries caused slow progress of the talks. The recent developments until 2006 demonstrated again that every peace effort is destined to be ceased by violence. The longstanding nature of the Arab-Israeli conflict brings in the minds the question of whether they really tend to be the subjects of a real peace or they aspired to take more advantages from the continuation of the conflict.

6.3 CONTEMPORARY DEVELOPMENTS FOLLOWING THE OSLO PEACE AGREEMENT[31]

Following the declaration of the Oslo Principles, murders committed between both sides. Until 2000 violence was tangible as a result of both sides' attacks against each other. The two sides became together in Camp David in July, while the wave of violence under the May 2000 outburst was still active. The negotiations once more ended in deadlock. The root cause of the deadlock were mainly the contention over the insistence of the Palestinian side to make Israel accept the right of the Palestinian refugees to return to Israel, as well as the insistence of Israel to continue the annexation of prominent amount of land from Palestine, which was trying to be rendered appealing with a limited form of Palestinian statehood. As time was running out, President Clinton intensified his efforts for a solution before his term of office was completed. President Clinton requested the compromise of both sides over his Bridging Proposals by December 27, 2000. The chain of negotiations went on with the Taba meeting by

---

[31] This section which is an encapsulation of the latest developments in Palestine is organised on the up-to-date knowledge extracted from the media internet website *www.mideastweb.org.-* (accessed on 22.07.2006)

late January 2001 that was led by the EU and Egypt. In 2001 and 2002 violence went on and the September 11 attacks on the World Trade Center in New York paved the way for wider latitude provided by the USA and the EU to Israel for action against the Palestinians, with the added impact of increasing evidence in the direction of tangibly established links by some Palestinian groups with Al-Qaeda. Violence maintained as the efforts of the international community got intensified. A series of diplomatic efforts in 2002 helped international community better envision new initiatives towards the creation of a quieter environment in the two countries. Among the initiatives, the consultations run by the US government with a group of diplomats called the "Quartet". The roadmap of the Quartet stipulated Israeli withdrawal from the occupied territories and the establishment of a Palestinian state.

The year 2003 came with the US-led intervention to the Saddam Hussein regime in Iraq. The military invasion made two different effects on Arab geography. It prompted a hurried gesture of conciliatory talk of democracy, while simultaneously generating a great deal of resentment. By late April, Mahmoud Abbas was elected the Palestinian Prime Minister. The updated roadmap was welcomed both by Sharon and Abbas, both of whom pledged to fulfill the conditions of the document. However, the ongoing violence and the unattained compromise between the Palestinian authorities and the international community over the issue of the terms of the dissolution of attacks concluded in the leaving out of office of Mahmoud Abbas, replacing with Ahmad Qureia who was an Arafat supporter, on September 6. Among the new steps that came out with the year 2003 was the Security Barrier.

The year 2004 witnessed a more densely chain of attacks towards such armed leaders. Yaser Arafat's death in November 2004 heralded the commencement of a new era in Arab-Israeli relations and the Palestinian problem. The main step forward appeared as the coming into power of Mahmoud Abbas as the President of the PNA on January 9. The international community largely welcomed the victory of Abbas. The agenda of the summer of 2005 was intensely fulfilled with

the implementation of the disengagement plan. Israeli evacuation began on 15 August and continued until the 24 August.

After Ariel Sharon's massive stroke, the year 2006 came with a new page opened in the history of the conflict. On January 4th, he left the leadership of Israel and his Kadima Party to Ehud Olmert. In the aftermath of the change in possession of power in Tel Aviv, the elections held in Palestine on the 26th of January granted victory to Hamas. To date, Hamas leaders have shown clues of signals, however, have woved not to recognize Israel, nor to abandon their claim over the entire territory of Palestine. The government established by Hamas was sworn in on March 29, 2006. On the Israeli side, elections were held on March 28, 2006, which introduced the Kadima Party led by Ehud Olmert as the first party of Israel with 29 seats in the Knesset.

Once all peace process is evaluated, the basic shortcoming came to the forefront: territorial compromise. With reference to the Oslo case, it is evident that the basic commitments of both sides to the land, which were tried to be evaluated in the beginning of this study, should be taken into consideration by the future generations demanding 'compromise' rather than 'violence'.

All the wars between the Palestinians and the Israelis demonstrated for numerous times the necessity of giving opportunity to peace. Lastly, the 1982 war taught both sides, the Israelis and Palestinians that armed conflict was not sufficient for achieving political goals. The repeated wars weakened them and proved that military victories created more problems than solutions. Furthermore, escalating violence persuaded international participants to the conflict for the urgency of peace which could lead to a secure environment for their interests in the region.

Within this framework, the Camp David (1979) and Oslo Agreements (1993) emerged as the first attempts in order to catch a chance to deploy a lasting peace in the region. Though they were significant developments in the name of creating mutual recognition, they also were the starting point of a failure of decades long in adopting both sides' claims to the land of Palestine. In this sense, the

elaboration of the Oslo process in particular proved to be valuable with a view to understanding the failures in the following peace efforts.

Until the end of the Cold War, any global change enabled the Arabs and the Israelis to negotiate peace with one another. Despite the improved relations between the super powers in the late 1980s, the end of the Cold War in 1989, the Gulf War in 1991, prompted the Arabs and the Israelis to change their points of view on peace, domestic conditions always stood as an indicator for the necessity of sustainable peace in the region. While the leaders of both sides were negotiating the possible concessions to be made, the arrangements during the peace initiatives failed to realize the basic expectations of the Arabs and Israelis.

The different rapprochements to the Palestinian entity in the region separated the Palestinians and the Israelis on the future regulations. As Palestinians intended to create an independent state of their own, Israel could deal with a Palestinian entity within a political and economic framework including Israel and Jordan, which would not mean a state. Mutual trust is the main requirement for peace. Without mutual trust between the new Palestinian authority and Israel, peace cannot be guaranteed. John King articulates that Security means that both Israel and the Palestinian entity must have authority and the means of enforcing their will, as well a clear division of responsibilities.[32]

What therefore had to be settled, in principle at least, by Israel and the Palestinians before the question of peace was the question of "how to resolve this longstanding and entrenched ideological hostility between Zionism and Arab nationalism?" The participants in the Oslo discussions said that they realized from the beginning that the only way to achieve progress in the peace process to refuse thinking about the past, or to recriminate about grievances, but rather only to the future. The old hostilities were simply set on one side and with them the ideas of the established ideologies. However, forgetting past was impossible for both sides. Their memory constituted their national identity mostly on the past sufferings caused from the conflict. Though divergent perceptions exist inherent

---

[32] King, *op.cit.*, p. 14.

in both communities, the consolidation of both national movements is committed to the conflict.

As John King points out if the Israelis can forgo the ideal of occupying 'Eretz Israel' and abandon their belief that they have been allocated rights by God, there will be some hope of success. The Arabs must likewise limit their political ambition to recover the whole territory of Palestine, while those who believe they have a religious mission must also relinquish their contention that Palestine cannot be other than a Muslim state. Then, when each side allows politics and realism to govern aspirations and realism to govern its politics, a new Palestine in which the state of Israel can exist alongside an Arab political entity will be able to emerge. In the process of negotiation in Oslo, the delegates soon discovered that the only way of making progress was to resolve always to look forward, and never back.[33]

The main problem at Camp David was Israel's reluctance to talk directly to the Palestinians. For instance, Israel tried to resolve the problems concerning the status of Arab inhabitants of the Occupied Territories. Both Israel and Egypt conceived that their efforts for peace brought forward no settlement. Condemning the PLO as a terrorist organization, Israel equated the recognition of the Palestinians with the diminution of its own sovereignty. Israel had hitherto adopted a stance towards the Palestinians as if they never existed. Otherwise, they believed that they would betray their historical commitments. Nevertheless, the violent developments came into being in the region; the American pressure on Israel and the governmental changes within Israel urged her to sit down to talk about the details of a Palestinian autonomy.

The main problem in these arrangements was setting the conflicting issues stemming from historical, political and territorial rights of both sides in a vague-uncertain timetable. As the origins of conflict, the demands of political Zionism and Arab nationalism were never estimated by these arrangements. The highly contested and complex issues that should be resolved for a lasting peace are the future status of Jerusalem, borders, Israeli settlements in the occupied territories,

---

[33] *Ibid.,* p. 37.

Palestinian state and the right of return of the Palestine refugees. These were the common deadlocks of all peace efforts.

The peace efforts tried to present different ways to reach final settlement of these issues. However, incompatibility of these issues prevented the sides from achieving reconciliation. Since these issues referred to basic national aspirations of the Palestinians and the Israelis, though colliding sides seemed to have opted for diplomacy, conflict always continued. The sides never believed in the normalization of their perception of the other side. For the reason that their reason d'etre is maintaining their national claims and the exclusion of the other, so that sustainable conflict proved to be the most useful and easiest way to legitimize their existence on Palestine of which the territory is impossible to be shared between Palestinians and the Israelis.

6.4 THE MEANING OF THE CONTINUATON OF THE CONFLICT

Regional and global dynamics urged the Palestinians to be included in peace talks with Israel. The common denominator of these dynamics was the Arab weakness against the Israelis' efforts towards maintaining the legitimacy of their occupation of some land of Palestine. Following the wars, the Palestinians started to loose the support of the Arab world. The Arab political elite realized the futility of attempting to eradicate Israel by force during the 1970s. With the peace treaty between Israel and Egypt, the Arabs lost their ability to wage a two-front assault on Israel. In the face of Israel's military superiority, the Arabs remained weak. Moreover, the change in the foreign policy orientation of the Arabs contributed to the Arabs' positive attitude towards peace. As Inbar stressed out, for Arab countries, Pan-Arab ideology became less appealing that it had constituted a constraint in the open pursuit of each country's own narrow statist interests.[34] All these developments in the Arab world compelled the Palestinians to terminate the armed conflict. However, giving an end to armed conflict did not render Palestinians' national movement more powerful and they opted for supporting a more radical group, Hamas, in order to achieve their national goal.

---

[34] Efraim Inbar, "Arab-Israeli Coexistence: The Causes, Achievements and Limitations". *Israel Affairs*; Vol. 6 Issue ¾, (Spring/Summer2000), p. 258.

The rise of Hamas and directly the rise of conflict again actually resulted from wrong policies of the PLO.

The PLO's support to Saddam during the Gulf crisis angered the U.S and cost the PLO the diplomatic and financial support of the U.S. Within this context, the PLO's participated in the Oslo process as a result of its willingness to repair its relations with the U.S not Palestinians' desire for peace. However, the enormous difference between the level of development of Israel and Palestine urged the PLO to be allied with the U.S demands. For the reason every aspect of governmental, administrative and economic development entailed the others' assistance. For the PLO, the continuation of the conflict was deemed as a way of legitimizing its national cause before the international community but in order to obtain international aid to meet the Palestinians' economic needs it accompanied to the peace initiatives of the U.S. This dilemma resulted in the victory of Hamas in 2006. This victory after the democratic elections in Palestine displayed that conflict is still deemed as the way of liberation of Palestine.

During the peace process from Oslo until Camp David in 2000, the main problem was the same, which is the exclusion of national interests to satisfy the publics of both sides as the hopes of achieving peace were at peak. For that reason the peace process and national expectation of both societies were not intertwined. The repeated failures in the peace process paved the way for the consideration that both sides could maintain their surveillance as long as the Arab-Israeli conflict continues. The question of why both Oslo and Camp David 2000 failed in creating peace is important. Palestine's intransigence over the Israeli opposition to the withdrawal from the occupied territories and Israel's rejection of 'right of return' and the self-determination right of Palestine proved to be main issues seemed to be impossible to settle. Andy Tay expresses that "the peace process merely provided an interim framework to mask the incompatibility of each side's true long term aspirations."[35] Taking this idea into consideration, it is understood that one reason of the continuation of the conflict was the peace

---

[35] Andy Tay, "The Israeli – Palestinian Conflict: Is There An End in Sight?", *Defence Studies*, Vol. 4, No. 2, (Summer 2004), p. 269.

process itself. Additionally the realities of the international conjuncture served the continuation of conflict. Despite of the continuously changing dynamics in the region, power politics remained unchanged. Though superpower competition in the area disappeared, the hegemony of power politics led by the U.S brought forward Palestinians' and Israel's conciliation with American attempts because of its dependency on the U.S support. The use of force is still considered a useful tool of foreign policy. Armaments of both sides continue in spite of the tendency to peace.

According to Efraim Inbar, "the best we can expect in the region is an armed peace."[36] The failure of peace talks in reaching a final settlement culminated in the continuation of adversarial behaviors of the Israelis and the Palestinians in a vicious cycle. Neither any side has exerted real effort towards peace nor prepared its people for conciliation. Both sides were concerned about creating tension between their constituents and themselves. It is an undeniable fact that pursuing sound and constructive foreign policy is impossible without securing stability in domestic affairs. Both governments could not prohibit violence because of populist concerns while defending peace on the negotiation table. The founding reason for this dilemma was the common lack of both sides: the exclusion of national interests and espousing pragmatic foreign policies.

Both sides intended to transform their sufferings of violence to the wounds of the victimhood. This increases the distance between the Israelis and the Palestinians. Moreover, it inhibits the recognition of the suffering of the other. As long as the peoples consider themselves victims, conflict is destined to continue. Governments bolster the victimhood because they could conceal their failures in domestic affairs and draw the attention of their peoples from domestic problems to the external threats.

Being tired of terrorism lasted for decades and frustrated from instability within their states, Israel and the Palestinians tried to legitimize and voice their national aspirations through keeping the conflict alive. Both sides refrain from making concessions on core issues because any concession made to other side

---

[36] Inbar, *op.cit.,* p. 265.

can cause their exile from the territories that they claimed to be the real possessors. The reason of the crucial importance for the sides of the continuation of conflict is lying on the main disagreement on territory and borders. Harvey Starr and G. Dale Thomas state that "territorial contiguity is a major determinant of whether or not states enter conflicts, and whether those conflicts escalate to war."[37] Each side identifies their nationalism with their commitment to the territories of Palestine that legitimizes their existence. This natural linkage to the territory inhibits the reconciliation of the expansionist policies of Israel and insistence of Palestine on its right to return and the withdrawal of Israel from occupied territories. Each desire to get control over Palestine that was 'their ancestral homeland.'

Dore Gold put forward that "the reason of the insistence of Palestine on Israel's withdrawal from the occupied territories was that presenting Israel as a foreign occupier helps advocates of Palestinian delegitimize the Jewish historical attachment to Israel."[38] Whether this argument is true or false, it is ultimately true that Israel rejects total withdrawal from the territories to which its historical attachment provides the legitimacy of its existence. It did not want to loose territories that are advantageous to the sustainability of its existence. With involving in the conflict with Palestine, it tries to display Palestinians as aggressors threatening its security. On the other hand, Palestine also tries to maintain the legitimacy of its attacks against Israel cause gained by Intifada with continuing its attacks because it has no other chance to compel international community to agree on the validity of its national cause. Indeed, Israel also utilized the attacks of the Palestinians. Because Israel was a state formed as a result of the evacuation of Palestinians from their homes. Israel could draw international community's attention from its unjust settlement on Palestine to the attack of Palestinians. Its support to Hamas in the past under the pretext of creating an alternative to the PLO, thus, the radical actions towards its borders

---

[37] Harvey Starr, and G. Dale Thomas, "The Nature of Borders and International Conflict: Revisiting Hypotheses on Territory", *International Studies Quarterly*, (2005) 49, p. 125.
[38] Dore Gold, "From 'Occupied Territories' to 'Disputed Territories'", *American Foreign Policy Interests*, Vol.24, (2002), p. 207.

were used by Israel to carrying on rejecting to the withdrawal from occupied territories. It triggered the violence because as long as it continues, its claim of defensible borders would be valid and it could carry on settling in the occupied territories. For this reason Israel supported the conversion of the 'land for peace' formula in Resolution 242 into land for security by the Interim Agreement of October 1998, the Wye River Agreement.

Michael Humphrey says that while the Palestinians have continued to see peace in terms of a two state solution based on regaining occupied territory, the Israelis have increasingly seen it in terms of security guarantees and political limits on Palestinian independence.[39] As the Israeli government shifted the focus of the peace process to the issue of security, this provided Israel with exclusivity and non-interaction. For this reason the continuation of the conflict brings the continuation of its claim of security. Therefore, it can carry on settling in the occupied territories that render Israel powerful with their resources.

For Palestinians, Israel is a state founded as a consequence of the creation of illegitimate Jewish majority with illegal immigrations. However, Palestinians were expelled to recognize Israel within the context of power policy. On the one hand, Israel as a state reaped the benefit of wars such as the 1967 War. As a consequence of Six Day war, it became closer to its goal of 'Greater Israel'. On the other hand, Palestinians gained international support thanks to Intifada. Before Intifada the Palestinians could not defend their national cause successfully because of their lack of united action. The Israelis realized their national aspirations through wars and Palestinians could bolster their national consciousness and sustain their national development by the means of war. Having suffered from violence and wars, both sides also took the advantage of the continuation of conflict.

For each side, mutual national survival encompasses conflicting national goals which are incompatible with the prospect of long term peace. They supposed that their national goals accepted by a large national consensus on each side were

---

[39] Michael Humphrey, "Defended or Reconciled Peace in Israel and Palestine", Australian Journal of International Affairs, Vol. 54, No.3,(2000), p. 326.

incompatible.[40] The certain separation of the Palestinian Arabs and Israeli Jews was impossible because it is very difficult to draw a boundary between the two sides due to that Jews and Arabs are ethnically mixed. The peaceful coexistence is not also possible because of the historical experiences of both sides. If the perceptions of both sides are not normalized, conflict seems to be inevitable. To succeed in the normalization of relations also appears not quiet likely because all perceptions of both sides are founded on the exclusion of the other.

---

[40] These perceptions are an independent state, the right of return, the recapture of East Jerusalem and the removal of all settlements in the occupied territories for Palestinians, and the rejection of return of refugees and the division of Jerusalem for the Israelis.

CHAPTER -7-

CONCLUSION

The most noteworthy element in the Arab-Israeli conflict is the national attachment to Palestinian territory of the Jews scattered around intensely around Europe and the Arabs that disseminated in Arab peninsula. The main reason of the conflict is beyond the distrust between the Jews and the Arabs that have conflicted for years. The main reason of the constant insoluble nature of the conflict is the insistence of both sides not to make any concession from their territorial aspirations on Palestine. The determinant attitude of the Arabs and the Jews stemmed from the way of their national construction.

Both the Arabs and the Jews constructed their nationalism with a view to prove that they are the real and ancient possessors of Palestine. For the Jews, Palestine is their 'promised land'. When Zionism is elaborated, it can be understood that Zionists reaped the benefit of this religious belief in order to solve the Jewish problem by establishing a Jewish state in Palestine. For the Arabs, Palestine is the land on which Arab majority had been surviving the Arab identity since ancient times. The Arabs contend that the Jews had come, settled and tried to eradicate the Arab existence in Palestine. For the Jews, Palestine is the homeland for the Jews who do not desire to turn back to the Diaspora days. For the Arabs, Palestine is an Arab land which was conquered by Zionists.

The Arab nationalism and Zionism constructed nationalism on the basis of these approaches so as to exclude the other and ensure the control over Palestinian territory. This study has tried to display the formation of these approaches by reflecting the both national constructions and the deep-rooted national attachment to Palestinian territory. This evaluation demonstrated that the attachment of the Jews and the Arabs to Palestine is unbreakable because territory constitutes the basis of the Jewish and Arab nationalism. This thesis argues that the conflicting national attachment of theArabs and the Jews to territory had

146

also determined the development of the conflict in time.

The study tries to reflect that Arab nationalists and Zionists did not have equal positions. These positions widened the distrust between the sides of the conflict stemmed from developing national constructions on the same territory. However, the accelerating hostility was not the sole consequence of ongoing clash over Palestine. Zionist nationalist movement appeared as an organized and qualified current capable of drawing international support of international community through its relations with Britain. In contrast, Palestinian Arab nationalist movement was divided, disorganized and deprived of the capability to express its ideology in the international arena.

Though Arab nationalism and Palestinian nationalism seem to be intertwined, it can be seen that Palestinian nationalism does not precisely overlap with Arab nationalism. There are some intersection points and divisions between the Arab nationalism and Palestinian nationalism. During the wars that broke out since 1948, the Arab states around Palestine such as Syria, Egypt and Saudi Arabia had participated in the wars in order to help the Palestinian people to defend their cause. However, the lingering and wearisome wars urged the Arabs near the Palestinian Arabs to concentrate on their own interests. The Arabs out of Palestine believed that they could not succeed in gaining victory against Israel in spite of so-called Arab unity. Therefore, Palestinian Arabs understood that they should continue to realize their future in Palestine alone.

Although Syria and Egypt as the leaders of Arab nationalism did not attend to Palestinian cause, Palestinian conflict lasted to be one of the unifying factors for the Arabs in terms of Arab nationalism. For instance Hamas used the unifying effect of Islam among the Arabs as an instrument of war against Israel.

Arab nationalist movement is not the only element that determines the Palestinian nationalism. International and regional developments, and the interests of the Arab states also influenced the emergence of Palestinian nationalism. Beyond the external reasons of the weakness of Arab nationalist movement against the policies of Israel, the lack of a strong military bureaucracy

also made the Palestinians failed in defending their territory which is of utmost importance for the Palestinian nationalism.

Though the Arabs and Zionists founded their own national consciousness on the same bases with that of the other, Zionism succeeded in realizing its ideology before the Arab nationalism did. Beside the disunited nature of the Arab nationalism, Zionists with their institutionalized control mechanisms, which were formed before the establishment of the state of Israel. The division of aims and rapprochements between the two nationalisms concerning the same territory led to different development of the positions of the Jews and the Arabs during the conflict.

After analyzing the development of the conflict, the establishment of state of Israel appears to be a main turning point. The Arab-Israeli conflict had been generally in minds until this date. Apart from the Arab rebellions against the Jewish existence in Palestine, both sides clearly and practically displayed their territorial aspirations over Palestine in the wars between the Arabs and the Jews. The wars from 1948 to 1987, revealed the results of the differently evolved positions of the Jews and the Arabs. The Jews gained a strong and unified position with international support and the Arabs left behind the power of the Jews in the conflict until Intifada in 1987.

The developments following the establishment of the State of Israel in 1948 proved that neither the claims of Israel to ensure its secure borders nor the international support to Palestine made any point in the absence of an armed conflict. If the clash is removed, the legitimacy of the State of Israel may become debatable in a way to create a possibility of being obliged to withdraw from the occupied territories. Likewise, Palestine may fall deprived of the international aid so as to lose ability to conceal its lack of stability. With asserting its security concern, Israel, in the current situation of the dispute, can inhibit any debate about its existence as a state that was initially forged by displacing the Arabs. On the other hand, Palestinian political leaders can meet populist demands by putting steady emphasis on the occupier status of Israel. The imbalance among the conflicting sides determined the future ofpeace process because each side gained

148

also some advantages during the wars. The territorial gains of the Jews from 1967 war and advantageous image of the Arabs in Intifada made the conflict an important instrument for both sides to insist on their national claims and making no concession from them.

Peace efforts following the wars seem as the continuation of the conflict of nationalisms on a diplomacy table. Oslo Accords and the developments hitherto displayed that the failure in peace process will be current unless the hardcore issues concerning territorial compromise are settled. All of these issues stemmed from the clash of nationalisms based on territorial attachments of both sides. Indeed, both sides reaped the benefit from the continuation of the conflict as suffering from continuous violence. For instance, Israel could implement its expansionist policies during the wars between 1948 and 1983 as putting forward its security concerns emanating from the attacks of the Arabs. By the same token, the Palestinian Arabs could draw attention of international community by means of Intifada. Each excuse brought forward by either side to attack on the other has evolvingly become the basic tool for neglecting the rights of the other in Palestine.

Given that both sides could not break the psychological barrier between them stemming from their national consciousness and the memories of the conflict, they adopted the continuation of the conflict as the major instrument to strengthen the legitimacy of their actions towards each other. As long as this belief exists, all peace efforts will be destined to failure in the future.

The main reason of the failure of the peace process was in fact the inability of the sides to make mutual concessions from their territorial attachment to Palestine on which they had constructed their nationalisms. As a matter of fact, the insistence by Israel of refusing to withdraw to the pre-1967 borders within the framework of the UNSC Resolution No. 242 and in the meantime, the simultaneous support by the Palestinians' to radical policies proved the magnitude of the psychological obstruct to hamper the progress of the peace process. The huge gap of distrust between the sides of the conflict stemmed from conflicting national claims to Palestine.This thesis argued that, unless both

149

sides accept to share the territory to which, each has deep national attachments, and thus leave aside rejecting the recognition of the existence of the other peace may not seem closer.

To conclude, the main issue to be taken into consideration is that the lack of mutual trust needed for territorial compromise is inevitable in the Arab-Israeli conflict. For the reason that both Palestinian Arab nationalism and Zionism are based on the national demands over Palestine. To have legitimate control over the Palestinian territory is the hardcore element of both nationalist movements. The followers of these movements believed that concession to be made from this element would undermine the raison d'etre of their nations. Therefore, the continuation of the conflict is to the advantage of both sides. This results in failure of every peace effort. For the Arabs and the Jews, it seems impossible to return to the days when they had lived in coexistence.

As the parties keep the conflict in order to refrain from accepting the other, instead of contemplating on how the national ideologies will be aligned so as to adopt the vision of co-existence with the legitimate other, in each other's minds, the vicious cycle can not be broken. The unconditional acceptance of the UNSC Resolutions No: 242 and No: 338 by the sides may both eradicate the concerns of Israel over security and provide Palestinians with their basic right to return. While reiterating the main argument of this study, it is wise to state the fact that, this mutual mistrust can be alleviated by the abrogation of claims which urged either side to continue to the conflict. First and foremost, they should opt for peace to be based on the compatibility of the national demands over territory.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS AND ARTICLES

Aras, Bülent, *Filistin-İsrail Barış Süreci ve Türkiye*, İstanbul: Bağlam Yayınevi, 1997.

Armaoğlu,Fahir, *Filistin Meselesi ve Arap-İsrailSavaşları (1948-1988)*, Ankara: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 1994.

Avneri, Areh L., *The Claim of Dispossessor*, New Brunswick, London: Transaction Books, 1984.

Baklanov, Andrei, "Middle Eastern Knot of Contradictions", *Russian Journal of World Politics, Diplomacy & International Relations*, Vol.50, Issue 3, 2004.

Bowker, Robert, *Beyond Peace: The Search for Security in the Middle East*, Boulder, London: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1996.

Boztemur, Recep, "Tarihsel Açıdan Millet ve Milliyetçilik: Ulus-Devletin Kapitalist Üretim Tarzıyla Birlikte Gelişimi", *Doğu Batı, 38*, Ağustos, Eylül, Ekim 2006.

Brass, Paul *Ethnicity and Nationalism: Theory and Comparision*, New Delhi, Newbury Park, London: Sage Publications, 1991.

Chisholm, Michael and David M. Smith, ed., *Shared Space: Divided Space*, Boston, Sydney, Wellington: Unwin Hyman Inc.,1995.

Choueiri, Youssef M., *Arab Nationalism: A History*, Massachusettes: Blackwell Publishers, 2000.

Duri, A. A., *The Historical Formation of Arab Nationalism: A Study in Identity and Consciousness*, Croom Helm, London, New York, Sydney, 1987.

Elmessiri, Abdelwahab M., *The Land of Promise: A Critique of Political Zionism*, New Brunswick, New Jersey: North American Inc., 1977.

Fisher S.N, *The Middle East*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd.,1960.

Fraser T. G., *The Arab-Israeli Conflict*, Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire and London: MacMillan Press Ltd, 1995.

Freedman, Robert O., ed., *The Middle East and the Peace Process: The Impact of the Oslo Accords*, Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 1998.

Gainsborough, J. R., *The Arab-Israeli Conflict*, Vermont: Gower Publishing Company, 1986.

Gerner, Deborah, *One Land, Two Peoples: The conflict over Palestine*, San Francisco, Oxford: Westview Press, 1991.

Gibernau, Montserrat *Nationalism: The Nation-State and Nationalism in the Twentieth Century*, Cambridge: Polity Press, 1996.

Wisker, Gina, *The Postgraduate Research Handbook*, New York: Palgrave, 2001.

Gingrich Newt, "Defeat of Terror, Not Roadmap Diplomacy, Will Bring Peace", *Middle East Quarterly*, Summer 2005.

Gogoi, Aparajita, and Abdulghafour Gazi Ibdewi, *Arab Nationalism: Birth, Evolution and The Present Dilemma*, New Delhi: Lancers Books, 1994.

Gold, Dore, "From 'Occupied Territories' to 'Disputed Territories'", *American Foreign Policy Interests*, Vol.24, 2002.

Goldscheider, Calvin, *Cultures in Conflict: The Arab-Israeli Conflict*, Westport-Connecticut-London, 2002.

Goldscheider, Calvin, ed., *Population, ethnicity and Nation-Building*, Boulder, San Francisco, Oxford: Westview Inc., 1995.

Guibernau, Montserrat and John Hutchinson, Walker Connor, ed., *Understanding Nationalism,* Cambridge: Polity Press, 2001.

Hayes, Carlton J.H. *Essays on Nationalism*, New York: Russel & Russel, 1966.

Hertzberg, Arthur, *The Zionist Idea*, New York: A Temple Book, 1959.

Humphrey, Michael, "Defended or Reconciled Peace in Israel and Palestine", *Australian Journal of International Affairs*, Vol. 54, No.3, 2000.

Hurewitz, J.C., *Diplomacy in the Near and Middle East, A Documentary Record: 1914-1956*, Princeton, New Jersey: D.Van Nostrand Company, Inc. 1956.

Hurewitz J.C., *The Struggle for Palestine*, New York: Greenwood Press, Publishers, 1968.

Hutchinson, John and Anthony D. Smith, *Nationalism*, Oxford-New York: Oxford University Press, 1994.

Inbar, Efraim, "Arab--Israeli Coexistence: The Causes, Achievements and Limitations", *Israel Affairs,* Vol. 6 Issue ¾, Spring/Summer2000.

Khalidi, Rashid and Lisa Anderson, Muhammad Muslih, Simon S. Reeva, eds. *The Origins of Arab Nationalism*, New York: Columbia University Pres, New York, Chichester, 1991.

Khatchadourian, Haig, *The quest for peace between Israel and the Palestinians*, New York: Peter Lang Publishing, 2000.

Khouri, J., *The Arab-Israeli Dilemma*, New York: Syracuse University Press, 1968.

King, John, *Handshake in Washington*, Berkshire: Ithaca Press, 1994.

Klug, Tony, "Imagine No Excuses, Palestine-Israel Journal of Politics", *Economics and Culture* , vol. 11 Issue 2, 2004.

Knight, David B., "Identity and Territory: Geographical Perspectives on Nationalism and Regionalism", *Annals of the Association of American Geographies*, 72(4), 1982.

Laquer, Walter, *A History of Zionism*, New York: Schocken Books, 1989.

Lenezowski, George, *American Presidents and the Middle East*, London: Duke University Pres, 1990.

Lesch, Ann Mosely and Mark Tessler, *Israel, Egypt and the Palestinians (From Camp David to Intifada)*, Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1989.

Massalha, Omar, *Towards The Long-Promised Peace*, London: Saqi Books, 1994.

Nassar, Jamal R. and Roger Heacock, ed., *Intifada: Palestine at the Crossroads*, New York, Westport, Connecticut, London: Praeger, 1990.

Nofal Mamdouh, "The Centrality of the Palestinian-Israeli Conflict for Middle East Peace", *Palestine-Israel Journal of Politics, Economics & Culture*, Vol. 11, Issue 1 2004.

Norton, Augustus Richard and Martin H. Greenberg, ed., *The International Relations of the Palestine Liberation Organization*, Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press, 1989.

Nuseibeh, Hazem Zaki , *The Ideas of Arab Nationalism*, 2nd edition, New York: Cornell University Press, Ithaca, 1959.

Paul D. Leedy, *Practical Research: Planning and Design*, New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc. and London: Collier Macmillan Publishers.

Peretz Don, *The Arab-Israel Dispute*, New York: Facts on File, 1996.

Peretz Don, *The Government and Politics of Israel*, Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1979.

Perry, Glenn E., *The Middle East: Fourteen Islamic Centruies*, 3rd edition, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1997.

Price, Randall, *Fast Facts on the Middle East Conflict,* Eugene, Oregon: Harvest House Publishers, 2003.

Quandt, William B., *Peace Process: American Diplomacy and the Arab-Israeli conflict since 1967*, Washington: Brooking Institution, 1993.

Ringrose, Marjorie and Adam J. Lerner, ed., *Reimagining the Nation,* Buckingham, Philadelphia: Open University Press.

Robinson, Glenn E., *Building a Palestinian State: The incomplete Revolution*, Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1997.

Ross, Dennis, *The Missing Peace: The Inside Story of the Fight for Middle East Peace*, NewYork: Sraus&Giroux, 2004.

Sachar, Howard, *A History of Israel from the Rise of Zionism to Our Time*, New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1998.

Saltman, Michael ed., *Land and Territoriality*, Oxford, New York: Berg, 2002.

Sharabi, Hisham, *Palestine and Israel: The lethal dilemma*, New York: Pegasus, 1969.

Sicker, Martin *Judaism, Nationalism and the Land of Israel,* Boulder, San Francisco and Oxford: Westview Press, 1992.

Silver, Abba Hillel, *A History of Messianic Speculation in Israel*, New York-Macmillan, 1987.

Smith, Anthony D., "Culture, Community and Territory: The Politics of Ethnicity and Nationalism", *International Affairs (Royal Institute of International Affairs,* 1994, Vol.72, No.3, *Ethnicity and International Relations,* Jul 1996.

Smith, Anthony D., *Myths and Memories of the Nation*, Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Smith, Anthony D., *Nationalism*, Cambridge: Blackwell Publishing Ltd..

Smith, Anthony D., *Theories of Nationalism*, New York: Holmes & Meier Publishers, 1983.

Starr, Harvey, and Thomas G. Dale, "The Nature of Borders and International Conflict: Revisiting Hypotheses on Territory", *International Studies Quarterly*, 2005.

Tay, Andy, "The Israeli-Palestinian conflict: is there an end sight?", *Defence Studies*, vol. 2, Issue 2, Summer 2004.

Tessler Mark, *A History of the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict*, Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1994.

Tibi, Bassam, *Arab Nationalism*, 3rd edition, New York St. Martin's Press, 1997.

UN, DFPR, *Special Bulletin on the Commemoration of the International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian People*, 1989.

UN, *The Need for convening the International Peace Conference on the Middle East*, New York, 1989.

Vital, David, *The Origins of Zionism*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1975.

Waines, David, *The Unholy War: Israel and Palestine 1897-1971*, Montreal/New York: Chateau Books Limited, 1971.

Williams, L.F Rushbrook, *The State of Israel***,** London: Faber and F. Ltd..

Yapp M.E, *The Near East since the First World War: A History to 1995,* 2nd edition, London: Pearson Education Limited.

Zionism, Jerusalem-Israel: Keter Books.

INTERNET SOURCES

www.mideastweb.org/briefhistory.htm
www.mideastweb.org/briefhistory.htm
www.state.gov/r/pa/ho/frus/
www.state.gov/r/pa/ho/frus/