

# TRUTH against TRUTH

A Completely Different Look at the  
Israeli-Palestinian Conflict

- ★ The Arabs believed that the Jews had been implanted in Palestine by Western Imperialism, in order to subjugate the Arab world. The Zionists, on the other hand, were convinced that the Arab resistance to the Zionist enterprise was simply the consequence of the murderous nature of the Arabs and of Islam.
- ★ The Israeli public must recognize that besides all the positive aspects of the Zionist enterprise, a terrible injustice has been inflicted on the Palestinian people.
- ★ This requires a readiness to hear and understand the other side's position in this historical conflict, in order to bridge the two national experiences and unify them in a joint narrative.

## The Tyranny of Myths

- 1 After more than a hundred years, the Israeli-Palestinian conflict still dominates all spheres of our lives and troubles the entire world. This is a unique conflict, born in extraordinary circumstances. It can be described as a clash between **an irresistible force and an immovable object** - Zionism on the one side, the Palestinian people on the other.
- 2 Already a **fifth generation** of Israelis and Palestinians has been born into this conflict. The entire mental world of this generation has been shaped by the conflict.
- 3 In the course of this long conflict, as in every war, an enormous mass of **myths**, historical falsifications, propaganda slogans and prejudices has accumulated on both sides.
- 4 The behavior of each of the two sides to the conflict is shaped by their historical narrative, the way they view the history of the conflict over the last 120 years. The Zionist historical version and the Palestinian historical version **contradict each other entirely**, both in the general picture and almost every detail.
- 5 From the beginning of the conflict up to the present day, the Zionist/Israeli leadership has acted in **total disregard** of the Palestinian narrative. Even when it wished to reach a solution, such efforts were doomed to failure because of ignorance of the national aspirations, traumas, fears and hopes of the Palestinian people. Something similar happened on the other side, even if there is no symmetry between the two sides.
- 6 The settlement of such a prolonged historical conflict is possible only when each side is able to understand the mental-political world of **the other** and is ready to speak as equal to equal, "eye to eye". Contemptuous, power-oriented, overbearing, insensitive and ignorant attitudes prevent an agreed solution.
- 7 **"Leftist"** Israeli governments that, at times, aroused much hope were afflicted with such attitudes as much as "rightist" ones, causing a wide gap between their initial promise and their disastrous performance. (For example, Ehud Barak's term in office.)

- 8 A large part of the **old peace movement** (also known as "the Zionist left" or "the sane camp"), such as Peace Now, is also beset by some of these attitudes, and so collapses in times of crisis.
- 9 Therefore, the first task of a new Israeli peace camp is to free itself from false and from **one-sided views**.
- 10 This does not mean that the Israeli narrative should automatically be rejected and the Palestinian narrative unquestioningly accepted, or the other way round. But it does require a readiness to hear and understand the other side's position in this historical conflict, in order to bridge the **two national experiences** and unify them in a **joint narrative**.
- 11 Any other way will lead to a perpetuation of the conflict, with periods of **ostensible tranquility** and conciliation frequently interrupted by violent hostilities between the two nations and between Israel and the Arab world. Given the pace of development of weapons of mass destruction, further rounds of hostility could lead to the an-

nihilation of both sides to the conflict.

## The Root of the Conflict

- 12 The core of the conflict is the confrontation between the Israeli-Jewish nation and the Palestinian-Arab nation. It is essentially a **national conflict**, even if it has religious, social and other aspects.
- 13 The Zionist Movement was, essentially, a Jewish reaction to the emergence of the **national movements** in Europe, all of which were more or less anti-Semitic. Having been rejected by the European nations, some of the Jews decided to establish themselves as a **separate nation** and, following the new European model, to set up a national State of their own, where they could be masters of their own fate.
- 14 Traditional and religious motives drew the Zionist Movement to Palestine (Eretz Israel in Hebrew) and the decision was made to establish the Jewish State in this land. The maxim was: **"A land without a people for a people without a**

land". This maxim was not only conceived in ignorance, but also reflected the general arrogance towards non-European peoples that prevailed in Europe at that time.

15 **Palestine was not an empty land** - not at the end of the 19th century nor at any other period. At that time, there were half a million people living in Palestine, 90% of them Arabs. This population objected, of course, to the incursion of foreign settlers into their land.

16 The **Arab National Movement** emerged almost simultaneously with the Zionist Movement, initially to fight the Ottoman Empire and later the colonial regimes built on its ruins at the end of World War I. A separate Arab-Palestinian national movement developed in the country after the British created a separate State called "Palestine", and in the course of the struggle against Zionist infiltration.

17 Since the end of World War I, there has been an ongoing struggle between **two national movements**, the Jewish-Zionist and the Palestin-



"The War of the Traumas": the Holocaust

ian - Arab, both of which aspire to accomplish their goals - which are entirely incompatible - within the same territory. This situation remains unchanged to this day.

18 As persecution of the Jews in Europe intensified, and as the countries of the world closed their gates to the Jews attempting to flee the inferno, so the Zionist Movement gained strength. Nazi anti-Semitism turned the Zionist utopia into a realizable modern enterprise by causing a mass-immigration of trained manpower, intellectuals, technology and capital to Palestine. The **Holocaust**, which took the lives of about six million Jews, gave tremendous moral and political force to the Zionist claim, leading to the establishment of the State of Israel.

19 The **Palestinian nation**, witnessing the growth of the Jewish population in their land, could not comprehend why they should be expected to pay the price for crimes committed against the Jews by Europeans. They violently objected to further Jewish immigration and to the acquisition of land by the Jews.

20 The struggle between the two nations in the country appeared in the emotional sphere as the **"war of the traumas"**. The Israeli-Hebrew nation carried with them the old trauma of the persecution of the Jews in Europe - massacres, mass expulsions, the Inquisition, pogroms and the Holocaust. They lived with the consciousness of being an eternal victim. The clash with the Arab-Palestinian nation appeared to them as just a continuation of anti-Semitic persecution.

21 The Arab-Palestinian nation carried with them the memories of the long-lasting **colonial oppression**, with its insults and humiliations, especially on the background of the historical memories from the glorious days of the Caliphs. They, too, lived with the consciousness of being victims, and the Naqba (catastrophe) of 1948 appeared to them as the continuation of the oppression and humiliation by Western colonialists.

22 The complete blindness of each of the two nations to the national existence of the other inevitably led to false and distorted perceptions, that took root deep in their collective consciousness.

These perceptions continue to affect their attitudes towards each other to the **present day**.

23 The Arabs believed that the Jews had been implanted in Palestine by Western Imperialism, in order to subjugate the Arab world and control its natural resources. This conviction was supported by the fact that the Zionist movement, from the outset, strove for an alliance with at least one Western power, in order to overcome Arab resistance (Germany in the days of Herzl, Britain from the Uganda plan and the Balfour Declaration until the end of the Mandate, the Soviet Union in 1948, France from the 1950s until the 1967 war, the United States from then on.) This resulted in practical cooperation and a community of interests between the Zionist enterprise and **imperialist and colonialist powers**, directed against the Arab national movement.

24 The Zionists, on the other hand, were convinced that the Arab resistance to the Zionist enterprise - which was intended to save the Jews from the flames of Europe - was simply the consequence of the **murderous nature** of the

Arabs and of Islam. In their eyes, Arab fighters were "gangs", and the uprisings of the time were "riots".

25 Actually, the most extreme Zionist leader, **Vladimir (Ze'ev) Jabotinsky**, was almost alone in having recognized by the 1920's that the Arab resistance to the Zionist settlement was an inevitable, natural, and, from its own point of view, just reaction of a "native" people defending their country against foreign invaders. Jabotinsky also recognized that the Arabs in the country were a distinct national entity and derided the attempts to bribe the leaders of other Arab countries in order to put an end to the Palestinian Arab resistance. However, Jabotinsky's solution was to erect an **"iron wall"** against the Arabs and to crush their resistance by force.

26 These completely contradictory perceptions of the facts permeate every single aspect of the conflict. For example, the Jews interpreted their struggle for **"Jewish Labor"** as a progressive social effort to transform a people of intellectuals, merchants, middlemen and speculators into one

of workers and farmers. The Arabs, on the other hand, saw it as a racist effort by the Zionists to dispossess them, to exclude them from the labor market and to create, on their land, an Arab-free, separatist Jewish economy.

27 The Zionists were proud of their "Redemption of



The Catastrophe: Palestinian refugees, 1948

the Land". They had purchased it at full price with money collected from Jews around the world. "Olim" (new immigrants, literally pilgrims) many of whom had been intellectuals and merchants in their former lives now earned their living by hard manual labor. They believed that they had achieved all this by peaceful means and without dispossessing a single Arab. For the Arabs this was a cruel narrative of dispossession and expulsion: The Jews acquired lands from Arab absentee landowners living in the cities of Palestine and abroad, and then forcibly evicted the peasants who had been farming this land for generations. To help them in this effort, the Zionists engaged the Turkish and, later, the British police. The Arab masses looked on in despair as their land was taken from them.

28 Against the Zionist claim of having successfully "Made the Desert Bloom", the Arabs cited the testimonies of European travelers who had, for several centuries, described Palestine as a comparatively populous and flourishing land, the equal of any of its regional neighbors.

## Independence and Disaster

29 The contrast between the two national versions reached a peak in the **war of 1948**, which was called "the War of Independence" or even "the War of Liberation" by the Jews, and "El Naqba", the catastrophe, by the Arabs.

30 As the conflict intensified in the region, and with the resounding impact of the Holocaust, the **United Nations decided** to divide the country into two States, Jewish and Arab. Jerusalem and its environs were to remain a separate entity, under international jurisdiction. The Jews were allotted 55% of the land, including the unpopulated Negev desert.

31 Most of the Zionist Movement accepted the **partition resolution**, convinced that the crucial issue was to establish a firm foundation for Jewish sovereignty. In closed meetings, David Ben-Gurion never concealed his intention to expand, at the first opportunity, the territory given to the Jews. That is why Israel's Declaration of Independence did not define the state's borders and

Israel has not defined its borders to this day.

32 The **Arab world** did not accept the partition plan and regarded it as a vile attempt by the United Nations, which at the time was essentially a club of Western and Communist nations, to divide a country that did not belong to it. Handing over more than half of the country to the Jewish minority, which comprised a mere third of the population, made it all the more unforgivable in their eyes.

33 The war initiated by the Arabs after the partition plan was, inevitably, an **"ethnic" war**; a war in

What happened in 1948 was an "ethnic" war, a war which each side seeks to conquer as much land as possible and evict the population of the other side.

which each side seeks to conquer as much land as possible and evict the population of the other side. Such a campaign (which later came to be known as "ethnic cleansing") always involves expulsions and atrocities.

34 The war of 1948 was a direct continuation of the Zionist-Arab conflict, and each side sought to fulfill its historical aims. The Jews wanted to establish a **homogenous national State** that would be as large as possible. The Arabs wanted to eradicate the Zionist Jewish entity that had been established in Palestine.

35 Both sides practiced **ethnic cleansing** as an integral part of the fighting. Almost no Arabs remained in the territories captured by the Jews and no Jews at all remained in territories captured by the Arabs. However, as the territories captured by the Jews were very large while the Arabs managed to conquer only small areas (such as the Etzion Bloc, the Jewish Quarter in the Old City of Jerusalem), the result was one-sided (The ideas of "population exchange" and "transfer" were raised in Zionist organizations as early as the 1930's.

Effectively this meant the expulsion of the Arab population from the country. On the other side, many among the Arabs believed that the Zionists should go back to wherever they came from).

36 The myth of **"the few against the many"** was created on the Jewish side to describe the stand of the Jewish community of 650,000 against the entire Arab world of over a hundred million. The Jewish community lost 1% of its people in the war. The Arab side saw an entirely different picture: A fragmented Arab population with no national leadership to speak of, with no unified command over its meager forces, poorly equipped with mostly obsolete weapons, facing an extremely well organized Jewish community that was highly trained in the use of the weapons that were flowing to it (especially from the Soviet bloc.) The neighboring Arab countries betrayed the Palestinians and, when they finally did send their armies into Palestine, they mainly operated in competition with each other, with no coordination and no common plan. From the social and military points of view, the fighting capabilities of the Israeli side were far superior to those of the

Arab states, which had hardly emerged from the colonial era.

37 According to the United Nations plan, the Jewish State was supposed to receive 55% of Palestine, in which the Arabs would constitute almost half of the population. During the war, the Jewish State expanded its territory and ended up with 78% of the area of Palestine, which was left almost empty of Arabs. The Arab populations of Nazareth and some villages in the Galilee remained almost by chance; the villages in the Triangle were given to Israel as part of a deal by King Abdullah and their Arab inhabitants could not, therefore, be driven out.

38 In the war, some 750,000 Palestinians were uprooted. Some of them found themselves in the battle zone and fled, as civilians do in every war. Some were driven away by acts of terror, such as the Deir-Yassin massacre. Others were systematically expelled in the course of the ethnic cleansing.

39 No less important than the expulsion itself is

the fact that the refugees were not allowed to return to their homes when the fighting was over, as is usual after a conventional war. Quite the contrary, the new State of Israel saw the removal of the Arabs very much as a blessing and proceeded to completely erase some 450 Arab villages. New Jewish villages were built on the ruins, often adopting a Hebrew version of the former name. The abandoned neighborhoods in the towns were filled with masses of new immigrants. In Israeli textbooks, all mention of the former inhabitants was eliminated.

### "A Jewish State"

40 The signing of the armistice agreements at the beginning of 1949 did not put an end to the historical conflict. On the contrary, it raised it to a new and more intense level.

41 The new State of Israel dedicated its early years to the consolidation of its character as a homogenous "Jewish State". Huge areas of land were expropriated from the "absentees" (the refugees who were not allowed back), from those officially

designated as "present absentees" (Arabs who had stayed in Israel but were not accorded Israeli citizenship) and even from the Arab citizens of Israel, most of whose lands were taken over. On these lands, a dense network of Jewish communities was created. Jewish immigrants were invited and even induced to come en masse. This great effort increased the State's population several times over in just a few years.

42 At the same time, the State pursued a vigorous policy of obliterating the **Palestinian national entity**. With Israeli assistance, the monarch of Trans-Jordan, Abdullah, assumed control over the West Bank and since then there has been, in effect, an Israeli military guarantee for the existence of what became the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan.

43 The main rationale for the alliance between Israel and the Hashemite Kingdom, which has already existed for three generations, is to prevent the establishment of an independent and viable **Palestinian State**, which was - and still is - considered by the Israeli leadership a potential

obstacle to the realization of the Zionist objective.

44 A historic change occurred at the end of the 1950's on the Palestinian side when **Yasser Arafat** and his associates founded the Palestinian Liberation Movement (Fatah), not only for conducting the fight against Israel but also for freeing the Palestinian cause from the hegemony of the Arab governments. It was no accident that this movement emerged after the failure of the great Pan-Arab wave, whose most renowned representative was Gamal Abd-el-Nasser. Up to this point many Palestinians had hoped to be absorbed into a united pan-Arab nation. When this hope faded away, the separate national Palestinian identity reasserted itself.

45 In the early 1960's, Gamal Abd-el-Nasser set up the Palestinian Liberation Organization (**PLO**), mainly in order to forestall independent Palestinian actions that might involve him in an undesired war with Israel. The organization was intended to impose Egyptian control on the Palestinians. However, after the Arab debacle in the



Israeli soldiers at the Western Wall, June 1967: War of defense or an Israeli trap?

June 1967 war, Fatah under Yasser Arafat took control over the PLO, which has been granted international recognition as the sole representative of the Palestinian people ever since.

## "The Six Day War"

46 Like everything else that happened in the last 120 years, the **June 1967 war** is seen in a very different light by the two sides. According to the Israeli myth, it was a desperate war of defense, which miraculously left a lot of land in Israel's hands. According to the Palestinian myth, Israel drew the leaders of Egypt, Syria and Jordan into a war Israel was interested in, which was aimed right from the beginning at capturing what was left of Palestine.

47 Many Israelis believe that the "Six Day War" is the **root of all evil** and it was only then that the peace-loving and progressive Israel turned into a conqueror and an occupier. This conviction allows them to maintain the absolute purity of Zionism and the State of Israel up to that point in history, and preserve their old myths. There is

no truth to this legend.

48 The war of 1967 was yet another phase of the old struggle between the two national movements. It did not change the essence; it only changed the circumstances. The essential objectives of the Zionist Movement - **a Jewish state, expansion, and settlement** - were furthered by the addition of yet more territory.

49 The 1947 partition plan allotted to Israel 55% of Palestine, then an additional 23% was captured in the 1948 war, and now the remaining 22%, across the "Green Line" (the pre-1967 armistice line) was also captured. The particular circumstances of this war made complete ethnic cleansing impossible, but several hundred thousand Palestinians were expelled, nevertheless. In 1967 Israel inadvertently united under its rule **all the parts** of the Palestinian people that remained in the country (including some of the refugees).

50 As soon as the war ended, the movement to **settle** the occupied territories began. Almost all the Israeli political factions participated in this

movement - from the messianic-nationalistic "Gush Emunim" to the "leftist" United Kibbutz Movement. The first settlers were supported by most politicians, left and right, from Yigal Alon (the Jewish settlement in Hebron) to Shimon Peres (the Kedumim settlement).

51 The fact that all governments of Israel cultivated and advanced the settlements, albeit to different extents, proves that the urge to implant new settlements was particular to no specific ideological camp and extended to the **entire Zionist Movement**. The impression that only a small minority has been driving the settlement activity forward is an illusion. Only an intense effort of all parts of the government, including all ministries, from 1967 onwards, could have produced the legislative, strategic and budgetary infrastructure required for such a long-lasting and expensive endeavor.

52 The **legislative infrastructure** operates on the misleading assumption that the Occupation Authority is the owner of "government-owned lands", although these are the essential land reserves of

the Palestinian population. It goes without saying that the settlement activity contravenes international law.

53 The dispute between the proponents of **"Greater Israel"** and those of **"Territorial Compromise"** is essentially a dispute about the way to achieve the shared basic Zionist aspiration: a homogenous Jewish State in as large a territory as possible, but without a "ticking demographic bomb". The proponents of "compromise" emphasize the demographic issue and want to prevent the inclusion of the Palestinian population in the Israeli state.

The urge to implant new settlements was particular to no specific ideological camp and extended to the entire Zionist movement. It was an intense effort of all parts of the government.

The "Greater Israel" adherents place the emphasis on the geographic issue and believe - privately or publicly - that it is possible to expel the non-Jewish population from the country (code name: "Transfer").

54 The **General Staff** of the Israeli army played an important role in the planning and building of the settlements. It drew the map of the settlements (identified with Ariel Sharon): blocs of settlements and bypass roads along lateral and longitudinal axes, chopping the West Bank and



Photo: Ya'akov Salar, GPO

Historic handshake: Mutual recognition

the Gaza Strip into pieces and imprisoning the Palestinians in isolated enclaves, each of which is surrounded by settlements and the occupation forces.

55 The Palestinians employed several methods of resistance, mainly raids across the Jordanian and Lebanese borders and attacks inside Israel and throughout the world. These acts are considered "terror" by Israelis, while the Palestinians see them as the **legitimate resistance** of an occupied people. While the Israelis considered the PLO leadership, headed by Yasser Arafat, as a terrorist headquarters, it gradually came to be internationally recognized as the "sole legitimate representative" of the Palestinian people.

56 At the end of 1987, when the Palestinians realized that these actions were not putting an end to the settlement momentum, which was gradually pulling the land out from under their feet, they launched the **Intifada** - a spontaneous grassroots uprising of all sectors of the population. In this ("first") Intifada, 1500 Palestinians were killed, among them hundreds of children;

several times the number of Israeli losses, but it put the "Palestinian problem" back on the Israeli and international agenda.

## The Peace Process

57 The **October 1973 war**, which commenced with the surprise initial successes of the Egyptian and Syrian forces and ended with their defeat, convinced Yasser Arafat and his close associates that the realization of Palestinian national aspirations by military means was impossible. He decided to create a political option that would lead to an agreement with Israel and enable the Palestinians, through negotiations, to establish an independent state in at least a part of the country.

58 To prepare the ground for this, Arafat initiated contact with Israeli personalities who could influence public opinion and government policy. His emissaries (Said Hamami and Issam Sartawi) met with Israeli peace pioneers, who at the end of 1975 established the **"Israeli Council for Israeli-Palestinian Peace"**.

59 These contacts, which gradually became more extensive, as well as the growing Israeli fatigue with the Intifada, the official Jordanian disengagement from the West Bank, the changing international situation (the collapse of the Communist Bloc, the Gulf War) led to the **Madrid Conference** and, later, to the Oslo Agreement.

## The Oslo Agreement

60 The **Oslo Agreement** had positive and negative features.

61 On the positive side, the agreement brought Israel to its first **official recognition** of the Palestinian people and its national leadership, and brought the Palestinian national movement to its recognition of the existence of Israel. In this respect, the agreement - and the exchange of letters that preceded it - was of paramount historical significance.

62 In effect, the agreement gave the Palestinian national movement a territorial base on Palestinian soil, the structure of a **"state in the making"** and

armed forces - facts that would play an important role in the ongoing Palestinian struggle. For the Israelis, the agreement opened the gates to the Arab world and put an end to Palestinian attacks - as long as the agreement was effective.

63 The most substantive flaw in the agreement was that the **final aim** was not spelled out, allowing the two sides to continue to aim for entirely different objectives. The Palestinians saw the interim agreement as a highway to the end of the occupation and to the establishment of a Palestinian State in all the occupied territories (which altogether constitute 22% of the area of the former Palestine between the Mediterranean Sea and the Jordan). On the other hand, successive Israeli governments regarded it as a way to maintain the occupation in large sections of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, with the Palestinian "self-government" filling the role of an auxiliary security agency protecting Israel and the settlements.

64 Since the final aim was not defined, the Oslo agreement did not mark the beginning of the process to end the conflict but, rather, a **new**

**phase** of the conflict.

65 Because the expectations of both sides were so divergent and each remained entirely bound to its own national "narrative", every section of the agreement was **interpreted differently**. Ultimately, many parts of the agreement were left unimplemented, mainly by Israel (for example: the third withdrawal, the four safe passages between the West Bank and the Gaza Strip.)

66 Throughout the period of the "Oslo Process", Israel continued its vigorous expansion of the settlements, primarily by creating **new settlements** under various guises, expanding existing ones, building an elaborate network of "bypass" roads, expropriating land, demolishing houses, uprooting plantations etc. The Palestinians, for their part, used the time to build up their strength, both within the framework of the agreement and outside it. In fact, the historical confrontation continued unabated under the guise of negotiations and the "Peace Process", which became a substitute for actual peace.

67

In contradiction with his image, which was cultivated extensively after his assassination, **Yitzhak Rabin** continued furthering expansion "on the ground", while simultaneously engaging in the political process for the achievement of peace according to Israeli perceptions. As a disciple of the Zionist "narrative" and its mythology, he suffered from cognitive dissonance when his sincere desire for peace clashed with his conceptual world. This became apparent when he refrained from removing the Jewish settlement in Hebron after the Goldstein massacre of praying Muslims. It appears that he began to internalize some parts of the Palestinian narrative only towards the end of his life.

68

The case of **Shimon Peres** is much more damning. He created for himself the international image of a peacemaker and even adjusted his language to reflect this image ("the New Middle East") while remaining essentially a traditional Zionist hawk. This became clear in his short and bloody period as Prime Minister after the assassination of Rabin in 1995 and, again, in his joining the Sharon government in 2001 and accepting the role of

Photo: Barak Ochayon, GPO



Camp David, 2000: Ignorance and arrogance

As a result of Camp David, the dividing line between the Zionist "right" and "left" almost disappeared. The slogan "We have no partner" was adopted by all.

spokesman and apologist for Sharon.

69 The clearest expression of the Israeli dilemma was provided by Ehud Barak, who came to power thoroughly convinced of his ability to cut the Gordian knot of the historical conflict in one dramatic stroke, in the fashion of Alexander the Great. Barak approached the issue in total ignorance of the Palestinian narrative, showing utter contempt for its significance. He drew up his proposals in complete disregard of the Palestinian side and presented them as an ultimatum. He was shocked and enraged

when the Palestinians rejected them.

70 In his own eyes and in the eyes of the entire Israeli public, Barak "turned every stone" and made the Palestinians "more generous offers than any previous Prime Minister". In exchange, he demanded that the Palestinians sign a declaration that these offers constitute the "end to the conflict". The Palestinians considered this absurd, since Barak was asking them to give up their basic national aspirations, such as the Right of Return and sovereignty over East Jerusalem, including the Temple Mount. Moreover, the annexation of territories that were presented by Barak as negligible percentages (such as the "Settlement Blocs") amounted, according to Palestinian calculations, to an actual annexation of 20% of the West Bank to Israel.

71 In the Palestinian view, they had already made their decisive concession by agreeing to establish their State beyond the Green Line, in a mere 22% of their historical homeland. Therefore, they would only accept minor border changes in the context of territorial swaps. The traditional

Israeli position is that the territories acquired by it in the course of the 1948 war are beyond dispute, and the required compromise concerns only the remaining 22%.

72 Thus, as with most terms and concepts, the word "concession" has different meanings for the two sides. The Palestinians believe that they already "conceded" 78% of their land when they agreed in Oslo to accept a mere 22% of it. The Israelis believe that they are "conceding" when they agree to "give" the Palestinians parts of that 22%.

73 Things came to a head at the Camp David Summit in the summer of 2000, which was imposed on Arafat against his will and without any time for preparations. Barak's demands, presented at the summit as Clinton's, were that the Palestinians agree to end the conflict by relinquishing the Right of Return and any return of refugees to Israel; accept complicated arrangements for East Jerusalem and the Temple Mount without obtaining sovereignty over them; agree to the annexation by Israel of large settlement blocs

on the West Bank and the Gaza Strip; accept an Israeli military presence in other large areas (such as the Jordan valley); agree to Israeli control over the borders between the Palestinian State and the rest of the world. There was no possibility that any Palestinian leader could sign such an agreement and convince his people to accept it, and thus the summit ended without results. Soon after, the terms in office of Clinton and Barak also came to an end, while Arafat was received by the Palestinians as a hero who had withstood the pressure of Clinton and Barak and not surrendered.

### The El Aqsa Intifada

74 The breakdown of the summit, the elimination of any hope for an agreement between the two sides and the unconditional pro-Israeli stance of the United States inevitably led to another round of violent confrontations, which became known as "the al-Aqsa Intifada". For the Palestinians, it was a justified national uprising against a protracted occupation with no end in sight, that has allowed the continued pulling out of their land

from under their feet. For the Israelis, it was an outburst of murderous terrorism. The perpetrators of these attacks appear to the Palestinians as national heroes and to the Israelis as vicious criminals who must be liquidated.

75 During Barak's short term as Prime Minister, **settlement activity** continued at an accelerated pace. Palestinian resistance was minimal. The Israeli authorities saw in every violent attack on the settlers a crime against civilians. The Palestinians saw it as a legitimate defense against the spearhead of a dangerous enemy, which was dispossessing them of their land.

76 In the course of the al-Aqsa Intifada, a large part of the Israeli **"Peace Camp"** collapsed, demonstrating the shallow-rootedness of many of its convictions. Since it never undertook a real revision of the Zionist narrative and never internalized the fact that there exists a Palestinian narrative, too, the Palestinian behavior appeared quite inexplicable, especially after Barak had "turned every stone and made more generous offers than any previous Prime Minister". The only remaining explanation

was that the Palestinians had deceived the Israeli Peace Camp, that they had never really intended to make peace and that their true purpose was to throw the Jews into the sea, as the Zionist right has always claimed. The conclusion: "We have no partner".

77 As a result, the dividing line between the Zionist **"right"** and **"left"** almost disappeared. The leaders of the Labor Party joined the Sharon Government and became his most effective apologists (e.g. Shimon Peres) and even the formal leftist opposition became ineffective. This proved again that the original Zionist narrative is the decisive factor unifying all parts of the political system in Israel, making the differences between them lose their significance in times of crisis

78 The Second Intifada, resulting from the failure of the Camp David conference, raised the intensity of the conflict to a new level. More than 5000 Palestinians and more than 1000 Israeli soldiers and civilians were killed. The Israeli military reaction turned the lives of the Palestinians into hell, cut towns and villages off from each other, destroyed

their economy and their homes. Palestinian militants were executed ("targeted liquidations"), often killing civilian bystanders. Yasser Arafat was effectively imprisoned in his Ramallah compound (the "Mukata'ah").

79 The extreme military and economic pressure did not break the Palestinian population. Even in the most extreme circumstances, they managed to maintain some semblance of normal life and found means to fight back. The suicide bombings brought the confrontation into the center of Israeli cities.

80 As a response to the attacks, the leaders of the "Zionist Left" demanded a physical barrier between Israel and the Palestinian territories. At first, the "Zionist Right" opposed this "Separation Fence", fearing that it would create a political border in close proximity to the Green Line, but it soon realized that it could exploit the idea of the fence for its own purposes. Ariel Sharon started to build the fence/wall rapidly along a path that cut deep into Palestinian territory, joining the large settlement blocs to Israel and cutting many

Palestinian villages off from their lands. In the course of the fight against the fence, the village of Bil'in became the symbol of a stubborn, non-violent struggle, creating a partnership between Palestinians, Israeli peace activists and international volunteers. Additional Palestinian villages, such as Ni'lin, saw in the fight of Bil'in a model to emulate.

81 After the failure of the Camp David conference and the collapse of the Israeli peace movement, several attempts at furthering the peace process were made. In December 2000, just before leaving office, President Bill Clinton published guidelines that constituted a full and sensible peace plan. In March 2002, the Arab League summit conference in Beirut unanimously accepted the peace proposal initiated by the (then) Saudi Crown Prince, Abdullah. In Israel, too, alternatives to the government policy were proposed. In August 2001, Gush Shalom published a draft peace agreement and in July 2002, the Israeli Ami Ayalon and the Palestinian Sari Nusseibeh published the principles for an agreement. In October 2003, the "Geneva Initiative" was published as the draft of a peace

agreement worked out by a group of Israeli and Palestinian personalities, and the signing ceremony turned into an international event. These initiatives created a consensus about a solution based on the principle of "Two States for Two Peoples". They did not bear fruit in practice because of the opposition of the Israeli government.

82 In May 2003, the Sharon government was compelled to accept - though only for show - the **Road Map** imposed by President George W. Bush on behalf of the "Quartet" consisting of the USA, the European Union, Russia and the UN. The attacks by suicide pilots in the US on September 11, 2001, the American invasion of Afghanistan and then of Iraq increased American sensitivity to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, but did not weaken the pro-Israel lobby in the US.

83 The Road Map of 2003 is afflicted with the same basic fault as the Oslo Declaration of Principles of 1993. Although, unlike Oslo, it does define an aim ("**Two States for Two Peoples**"), it left the delineation of the borders of the Palestinian state to later stages. Sharon and his colleagues

were ready to confer the designation of "Palestinian state" on the Palestinian enclaves that they wanted to set up in 11% of the country. They attached to the acceptance of the Road Map 14 conditions that turned it into a dead letter.

84 The experience of the Road Map, like the experience of the Oslo declaration before, confirms conclusively that a document that sets out interim stages is valueless, unless it clearly spells out from the outset the details of the **final peace agreement**. In the absence of such a definition, there is no possibility at all that the interim stages will be realized. When each side is striving for a different final aim, the confrontation is bound to flare up at every interim stage.

85 Well knowing that there is no chance at all for the actual realization of the Road Map, Sharon announced at the end of 2003 his plan for "**Unilateral Steps**". This was a code-name for the annexation of about half the West Bank to Israel and the confining of the Palestinians in isolated enclaves, connected only by roads, tunnels and bridges that could be cut at any time. The plan



-The "Separation Wall": Sharon realized that he could exploit it for the annexation of settlement blocs

was constructed in such a way that none of the Palestinian population would be added to Israel, and no land reserves would remain for the Palestinian enclaves. Since the plan did not involve any negotiations with the Palestinians, but claimed to bring "peace and security" to the Israeli citizens, it was able to exploit the growing Israeli longing for a solution.

86 The general attack of the Sharon government and the army leadership on the population of the occupied territories (extension of the settlements, establishment of new settlements called "outposts", building the "separation fence" and settlers-only "bypass roads", incursions of the army into Palestinian towns and "targeted liquidations", demolition of homes and uprooting of plantations), on the one hand, and the lethal Palestinian attacks inside Israel on the other hand, put the Palestinian citizens of Israel in an intolerable position.

87 The natural inclination of the Arab citizens of Israel to help their brethren on the other side of the Green Line conflicts with their desire to be

accepted as equal citizens of Israel. At the same time, the fear and hatred of the Jewish population in Israel against all "Arabs" was growing and threatened the foundations of equality and civil rights. These processes came to a head in the events of **October 2000**, immediately after the outbreak of the al-Aqsa Intifada, when the Israeli police opened lethal fire on Arab citizens.

88 These processes, together with the re-emergence of the "demographic problem" on the Israeli agenda, cast new doubt on the "Jewish and democratic state" doctrine. The internal contradiction between these two attributes, which has not been resolved since the founding of the State of Israel, neither in theory nor in practice, is more conspicuous than ever. The exact meaning of the term "Jewish State" has never been spelled out, nor the status of the Arab-Palestinian minority in a state officially defined as "Jewish". The demand to turn Israel into a "State of all its citizens" and/or to give defined national rights to the Arab-Palestinian minority is being heard more and more, and not only from Arab citizens.

89 As a result of all these processes, the conflict is becoming less and less an Israeli-Palestinian confrontation, and more and more a Jewish-Arab one. The support extended by the vast majority of the Jewish Diaspora to Israel, irrespective of its actions, and the adherence of the Arab and Muslim masses to the Palestinian cause, irrespective of the attitude of their leaders, have consolidated this phenomenon. The assassination of Hamas leaders Sheik Ahmed Yassin in March 2003 and of Abd-al-Aziz al-Rantissi three weeks later fanned the flames even more.

90 After being besieged for two years in his Ramallah compound, Yasser Arafat died on November 11, 2004. His sudden demise is shrouded in mystery, and many believe that he was murdered by means of a sophisticated poison. Masses of the Palestinian people turned the funeral of the father of the nation, as they saw him, into a huge demonstration of mourning. His last ten years were marked by the inherent contradiction between his two functions: leader of a liberation movement that had not yet achieved its aim and chief of a state-on-the-way. He was succeeded by his long-time

partner in the Fatah movement, Mahmoud Abbas (Abu Mazen).

91 In the course of 2005, Ariel Sharon started carrying out the "separation", which included the dismantling of all the settlements in the Gaza Strip and some in the North of the West Bank. The implementation of the "separation" took a year and a half, in the course of which the confrontation looked as if it had only two sides: Sharon on the one side and the settlers on the other. The Geneva initiative and all the other peace proposals were eradicated altogether from the public mind.

The radical Israeli peace movements can be likened to a small wheel with an autonomous drive which turns a bigger wheel, which in turn activates an even bigger wheel, and so on.

The main aim of the "separation" was strategic: to get rid of the small and bothersome Gaza Strip in order to concentrate on the struggle against the Palestinian people in the West Bank - contrary to the impression created in the world, that Sharon had "started down the path of peace".

92 Sharon tried to convince the leaders of the settlers that it was worthwhile to give up some far-away settlements in order to concentrate on the enlargement of the important settlement blocs. However, these leaders were afraid that the **evacuation** of the settlements in the Gaza Strip would create a dangerous precedent and refused their assent. The evacuation turned into a tear-soaked melodrama designed to convince the world that any future large evacuation would create a profound national crisis.

93 The "separation" was carried out without any agreement or dialogue with the Palestinians, in adherence to the principle of "unilateral steps". It left behind a power vacuum which was **filled by Hamas**. The Israeli government asserted that it had voluntarily "given up" the Strip and ter-

minated the occupation, but the Palestinians felt that the Israeli occupation was continuing with even more force, since Israel cut off the Strip on land, on the sea and in the air. The result: the Palestinian organizations started to launch home made "Qassam" rockets against the neighboring Israeli towns and villages, and Israel imposed on the Strip a blockade that deprived the inhabitants of raw materials and even medicines and foodstuffs. The situation once again created two



Peace demonstration: To understand the other

Photo: Rachel Avnery

contradictory narratives: In Israeli eyes, "we left and got Qassams"; in Palestinian eyes, the Strip had become "the biggest prison on earth".

94 In January 2006, a few days after Sharon had sunk into a coma, elections for the Palestinian parliament took place, monitored by ex-President Jimmy Carter. Contrary to expectations, Hamas won a **resounding victory** with 75 of the seats, as against 48 seats for Fatah. Most of the Palestinian voters had not become more religious, rather they had become convinced that only violent resistance would bring results. Also, unlike Fatah, Hamas was considered untainted by corruption.

95 Israel, followed by the European governments and the US, **boycotted** the new Palestinian government headed by Hamas. The boycott continued even when the Hamas government was replaced by a Government of National Unity with the participation of Hamas. This radicalized the internal struggle within Palestinian society, and in June 2007 Hamas took possession of the Gaza Strip, while Fatah took control of the West Bank. Thus,

two mutually hostile Palestinian entities came into being.

96 The capture of the soldier **Gilad Shalit** by Hamas and its associates in a military action on June 26, 2006, illustrated again the difference between the narratives of the two sides to the conflict. According to the Israelis, the soldier was "abducted" in an action by terrorists, who demanded for his return the freeing of criminals with "blood on their hands". According to the Palestinians, the soldier was taken prisoner in a legitimate military action, and for his return the freeing of hundreds of Palestinian fighters was demanded.

97 After the capture of Shalit on the Gaza border, Hizbullah carried out a similar incursion on the northern border and captured Israeli soldiers. Ehud Olmert, who was chosen to replace Sharon as Prime Minister, saw this as an opportunity to eliminate the threat of Hizbullah, which was supported by Iran and Syria. On July 12, 2006, he started **Lebanon War II**, which lasted 34 days. Its incompetent conduct by the political and military leadership caused a profound crisis in Israel.

Hizbullah claimed victory, and a tense ceasefire took hold on the northern border.

98 In order to restore to the Israeli army its honor and power of deterrence, the Israeli government, in December, 2008, launched the "Cast Lead" operation against the Gaza Strip. The unofficial war aim was to overthrow the Hamas regime in the strip by exerting massive pressure on the civilian population. The narratives parted again: most Israelis believed that the war ended in an Israeli victory, while most Palestinians were convinced that victory was theirs, since the handful of Hamas fighters had held out against the Israeli army. Hamas was left in control of the Strip and the blockade became even stricter. As on the northern border, a tense quiet took hold. In the Gaza War, as in Lebanon War II, the "Zionist Left" supported the war in the beginning but changed its stance towards their end. "Gush Shalom" and its partners in the consistent peace camp demonstrated against both wars right from their start.

99 The Gaza War ("Cast Lead") had a devastating

impact on Israel's standing in the world. The UN appointed an investigation committee headed by the Jewish judge Richard Goldstone, whose report accused Israel - and also Hamas - of war crimes.

100 The Gaza War did not change the decision of successive Israeli governments to reject any talks with Hamas, much as they had in the past rejected dialogue with the PLO. Hamas refused to recognize Israel or to sign a peace agreement with it, but announced that it would accept an agreement based on the Two State Solution, along the 1967 borders, if the agreement were to be confirmed by the Palestinian people in a referendum or a decision of the Palestinian parliament. In Israel, voices were heard that proposed talking with Hamas, since it is an integral part of Palestinian reality. According to this view, Israeli interests demand the restoration of Palestinian unity, contrary to the "divide and rule" policy of the Israeli government.

101 In November, 2008, Barack Obama was elected President of the US and immediately changed



Gaza war, 2009

the style of American policy towards the Muslim world. Some months later, a new Israeli government was elected. It was headed by Binyamin Netanyahu and included extreme-right and even fascist elements. It seemed that Washington was headed towards a clash with Jerusalem, but Obama avoided a confrontation and contented himself with a half-hearted recognition by Netanyahu of the "Two States for Two Peoples" solution. Netanyahu made this conditional upon Palestinian acceptance of Israel as "the state of the Jewish people", which means the acceptance of the Zionist narrative, giving up in advance the rights of the Palestinian refugees and the negation of equality for the Arab citizens of Israel. Netanyahu hoped that no Palestinian leader could accept that.

102 The perceived **Iranian effort** to acquire nuclear arms was defined in Israel as an "existential danger". It threatened to create a "balance of terror", such as had existed in the past between the United States and the Soviet Union. The only practical way to avoid this danger is to turn the region into a zone free of means of mass de-

struction, in the framework of a regional peace treaty, after the signing of an Israeli-Palestinian peace treaty.

103 The postulated danger of an Iranian nuclear bomb served the Netanyahu government also as a means to **divert attention** from the necessity of conducting practical peace negotiations with the Palestinian people. Like all Israeli governments in the past, it acted to prevent the creation of a sovereign Palestinian state, the opposition to which is imbedded deeply in



demonstration in Tel-Aviv: against the 2nd Lebanon war

Photo: Rachel Avnery

Zionist consciousness.

104 In the course of 2009, there was again a historic opportunity for the achievement of peace: the Palestinian Authority and the PLO publicly called for full peace between Israel and Palestine, Hamas agreed indirectly, the President of the US promised to help with all his might and a world consensus favored the "Two States for Two Peoples" solution. However, in Israel, which was ruled by the **extreme right**, there was no effective peace movement able to focus public opinion in this direction.

### A New Peace Camp

105 The Israeli peace movement has not yet recovered from the blow dealt it in October 2000, after the Camp David conference, when the Israeli public - including a large part of the peace movement itself - came to believe that **"there is no partner for peace"**. The results of the "separation" from Gaza reinforced this belief, owing to the simplistic version that "we have returned all the territory and got Qassams in

return". Parts of the peace camp join in the demonization of Hamas and are not ready to accept it as a potential partner in peace negotiations.

106 These opinions led to the conclusion that there is no sense in demonstrations or in voting for peace parties. Some determined extra-parliamentary organizations continued with their important activities - the struggle to convince the public that there is a different way to settle the conflict, contrary to the prevailing brain-washing, as well as the monitoring of road blocks, reporting on the expansion of settlements, medical aid and the fight against the "separation fence", sometimes taking physical risks - but the peace camp has lost its **mass basis**. This found its expression in the collapse of the political parties identified with the peace movement - at least in theory - in the Israeli parliamentary elections of February 2009.

107 The Israeli conviction that there is "no partner for peace" has been reinforced by the almost total **cutting off** of the connection between the

new Palestinian leadership and the Israeli peace movement - a connection that had been diligently furthered by Yasser Arafat for decades.

108 More and more individuals and groups who should have been natural supporters of the peace camp have turned to other matters, which are important in themselves - such as protection of the environment, feminism, the rights of gays and lesbians, worker's right in general and the rights of foreign workers in particular, and religion-state relations. These subjects have become **asylums** for those who are tired of the struggle for peace, against occupation and settlements. This inclination has been encouraged by the tendency of the media to cover these subjects while ignoring almost completely any activities for peace.

109 There is an urgent necessity for the building of a new Israeli peace camp, on firmer foundations than in the past. This new camp must be able to attract people from **all sectors** of Israeli society - women and men, Jews and Arabs, Orientals and Ashkenazi, the elderly and the young, old-timers

and new immigrants, secular and religious - and to encompass all progressive causes.

110 The new Peace Movement must be based on the understanding that the conflict is a clash between the Zionist-Israeli movement, whose **"genetic code"** directs it to take over the entire country and to drive out the non-Jewish population, and the Palestinian national movement, whose "genetic code" directs it to halt this drive and set up a Palestinian State in the entire country.

111 The task of the Israeli peace movement is to stop the historical clash, overcome the Zionist-Israeli "genetic code" and to cooperate with the Palestinian peace forces, in order to enable a peace through historic **compromise** that will lead to reconciliation between the two peoples. The Palestinian peace forces have a similar task.

112 For this, diplomatic formulations of a future peace agreement are insufficient. The Israeli peace movement must address **the hearts and**

the minds of the entire Israeli population, and especially of those sectors that are hostages to the old myths and prejudices.

113 The small and consistent peace movements, that served as a compass and continued the struggle with unwavering determination when most of the peace camp collapsed, must play a significant role. These movements can be likened to a small wheel with an autonomous drive which turns a bigger wheel, which in turn activates an even bigger wheel, and so on, until the whole machinery springs into action. All the past achievements of the Israeli peace forces were attained that way, such as Israeli recognition of the existence of the Palestinian people, the wide public acceptance of the idea of a Palestinian State, the readiness to start negotiations with the PLO, to compromise on Jerusalem, and so on

114 The new peace camp must lead public opinion towards a reassessment of the national "narrative". It must make a fundamental effort to unite the historical versions of both peoples into a

single "narrative", free from historical deceptions, acceptable to both sides and respectful of their sentiments.

115 This must include an effort to help the Israeli public to recognize that besides all the great and positive aspects of the Zionist enterprise, a terrible injustice has been inflicted on the Palestinian people. This injustice, most extreme during the "Naqba", obliges us to assume responsibility and correct as much of it as possible.

116 A peace agreement is valueless unless the majority of both sides are able to accept it in spirit and in practice, in as much as it satisfies the basic national aspirations and does not offend national dignity and honor.

117 In the existing situation, there is no realistic solution but the one based on the principle of "Two States for Two Peoples", meaning the peaceful coexistence in two independent states, Israel and Palestine.

118 The idea voiced sometimes that it is possible

and desirable to replace the two-state with a **one-state solution** in all the territory between the Mediterranean Sea and the Jordan River, either as a bi-national or non-national state, is unrealistic. The vast majority of Israelis will not agree to the dismantling of the State of Israel, much as the vast majority of Palestinians will not give up the establishment of a national state of their own. This is also a dangerous "solution", since it undermines the struggle for the two-state solution, which can be realized in the foreseeable future, in favor of an idea that has no chance of realization in the coming decades. This illusion can also be misused as a pretext for the existence and extension of the settlements. If a joint state were set up, it would become a battlefield, with one side fighting to preserve its majority by the expulsion of the other side. There is no lack of examples of the failure of this kind of solution.

119

The new peace camp must formulate a **peace plan** based on the following principles:

- a. **The occupation will come to an end. An inde-**



The Dome for Palestine, the Western Wall for Israel

pendent and viable Palestinian State will be established alongside Israel.

- b. The Green Line will be the border between the State of Israel and the State of Palestine. Limited exchanges of territory will be possible only by mutual agreement, arrived at in free negotiations, and on the basis of 1:1.
- c. All Israeli settlers will be evacuated from the territory of the State of Palestine, and the settlements turned over to returning refugees.
- d. The border between the two states will be open to the movement of people and goods, subject to arrangements made by mutual agreement.
- e. Jerusalem will be the capital of both States. West Jerusalem will be the capital of Israel and East Jerusalem the capital of Palestine. The State of Palestine will have complete sovereignty over East Jerusalem, including the Haram al-Sharif (Temple Mount). The State of Israel will have complete sovereignty over West Jerusalem, including the Western Wall and the Jew-

ish Quarter. The two states may reach agreement on the unity of the city at the municipal level.

- f. Israel will recognize, in principle, the Right of Return of the Palestinian refugees as an inalienable human right, and assume moral responsibility for its part in the creation of the problem. A Committee of Truth and Reconciliation will establish the historical facts in an objective way. The solution on the practical level will be achieved by agreement based on just, fair and practical considerations and will include return to the territory of the State of Palestine, return of a limited and agreed number to the territory of Israel, payment of compensation and settle-

The occupation will come to an end. The

Green Line will be the border between Israel and Palestine.

The settlers will be evacuated.

A just, fair and practical solution of the refugee problem will be found.

The Peace Agreement and its honest implementation will lead to the end of the historic conflict between the two peoples, based on equality, mutual respect and maximum cooperation.

ment in other countries.

- g. The **water resources** will be controlled jointly and allocated by agreement, equally and fairly.
- h. A **security pact** between the two States will ensure the security of both and take into consideration the specific security needs of both Israel and Palestine. The agreement will be endorsed by the international community and reinforced by international guarantees.
- i. Israel and Palestine will cooperate with other States in the region for the establishment of a **regional community**, modeled on the European Union.

- j. The entire region will be made free from **weapons of mass destruction**.

120 The signing of the peace agreement and its honest implementation in good faith will lead to the **end of the historic conflict** and the reconciliation between the two peoples, based on equality, mutual respect and the striving for maximum cooperation.

---

January 2010

GUSH SHALOM is the consistent hard core of the Israeli peace movement. It is known for its unwavering stand in times of crisis, such as Lebanon War II and the Gaza War. For years, GUSH SHALOM has played a leading role in determining the moral and political agenda of the Israeli peace movement. The primary aim of GUSH SHALOM is to win over Israeli public opinion for these principles:

★ an end to the occupation.

★ acceptance of the natural right of the Palestinian people to an independent and sovereign state.

★ the pre-1967 Green Line as the border of peace between the State of Israel and the State of Palestine.

★ Jerusalem as the capital of the two states, East Jerusalem as the capital of Palestine and West Jerusalem as the capital of Israel. A city open for all, not cut into pieces by walls and roadblocks.

★ just and agreed solution to the refugee problem, that will include repatriation to the State of Palestine, return of an agreed number to Israeli territory, payment of compensation and settling in other countries.

★ evacuation of all the settlements in Palestinian territory. GUSH SHALOM is an independent extra-parliamentary organization. Being free of any obligations to parties and lobbies, the movement can

advance its principles clearly, completely and resolutely. Not seeking any fleeting popularity, the Gush can act as a vanguard - advocating ideas years, and sometimes decades, before they are generally accepted.

GUSH SHALOM is based solely on volunteers, and has no salaried employees. Any financing for actions comes from peace groups and individuals, in Israel and abroad.

**Gush Shalom is engaged in a wide range of activities - such as political information campaigns, public petitions, publications, propagation of our "heretical" positions on the internet, a weekly political ad (since 1993), lectures and conferences in Israel and abroad, demonstrations and direct actions on the ground. Among the Gush's prominent actions: the call "Release all Palestinian Prisoners" (Campaign 1993); "Jerusalem - Capital of Two States" (Petition signed by 850 leading intellectuals and artists, Israel Prize laureates, peace activists and Palestinian leaders, 1995); Boycott the Products of the Settlements (Ongoing campaign since 1997); "Marking the Green Line on the Ground" (Campaign 1997); Publication of the first complete draft of an Israeli-Palestinian peace agreement (2001), Campaign against War Crimes (2002); Creation of a Human Shield for the protection of Yasser Arafat from assassination by Sharon (2003), "The Wall Must Fall" (Ongoing campaign, from 2003 on); Demonstrations against Lebanon War II (2006) and Operation "Cast Lead" (2008) from the first day on; Participation in humanitarian actions.**

## **CAUTION!**

**This is a subversive text. It undermines the very foundations on which the National Consensus is based.**

**These 101 points demolish the myths, conventional lies and historical falsehoods, on which most of the arguments of both Israeli and Palestinian propaganda rest. The truths of both sides are intertwined into one historical narrative that does justice to both. Without this common basis, peace is impossible.**

By Uri Avnery

**For additional information:**

Gush Shalom

P.O.Box 3322, Tel-Aviv 61033

[info@gush-shalom.org](mailto:info@gush-shalom.org)

[www.gush-shalom.org](http://www.gush-shalom.org)

Third Addition

