

City University of New York (CUNY)

## CUNY Academic Works

---

Dissertations and Theses

City College of New York

---

2012

### THE ONE STATE SOLUTION An Alternative Vision for Ending The Israeli-Palestinian Conflict

Abdul Yousef  
*CUNY City College*

[How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!](#)

More information about this work at: [https://academicworks.cuny.edu/cc\\_etds\\_theses/111](https://academicworks.cuny.edu/cc_etds_theses/111)

Discover additional works at: <https://academicworks.cuny.edu>

---

This work is made publicly available by the City University of New York (CUNY).  
Contact: [AcademicWorks@cuny.edu](mailto:AcademicWorks@cuny.edu)

# *THE ONE STATE SOLUTION*

*An Alternative Vision for Ending  
The Israeli-Palestinian Conflict*

*Abdul Yousef*

*December 2011*

*Master's Thesis*

*Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the  
Degree of Masters of Arts in International Affairs (MIA)*

*The City College of New York*

*Dr. Juergen Dedring*

# Table of Contents

<i>Introduction.....</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>Research Design and Methodology.....</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>Review of the Literature.....</i>	<i>5</i>
<i>The One State Agenda.....</i>	<i>14</i>
<i>Israeli Settlements.....</i>	<i>19</i>
<i>The Role of Demographics.....</i>	<i>32</i>
<i>The Model of One State.....</i>	<i>48</i>
<i>The South Africa and Northern Ireland</i>	
<i>Option.....</i>	<i>49</i>
<i>The Belgium and Switzerland</i>	
<i>Option.....</i>	<i>57</i>
<i>Potential Framework for a Single</i>	
<i>State.....</i>	<i>59</i>
<i>Advantages of the One State.....</i>	<i>63</i>
<i>Difficulties of the One State.....</i>	<i>79</i>
<i>Conclusion.....</i>	<i>88</i>
<i>Bibliography.....</i>	<i>90</i>

## *Introduction*

The debate for a two state solution for the Israeli-Palestinian conflict has been ongoing for decades. However, given the current circumstances and realities on the ground, this approach has become more implausible with each passing day. Therefore, many have come to argue the real solution would be a single state that would afford equal rights for both Israeli and Palestinian citizens regardless of ethnicity, religion, or racial background.

Considering the troubled history of the region, many would view a state where Israelis and Palestinians living together, sharing land, and engaged in a peaceful democratic process to be an unattainable fantasy. This paper does not purport that a single state is a guaranteed solution to the problem. Rather, it attempts to show that a one state solution is the most practical and pragmatic approach for a peaceful resolution. The one state solution is not necessarily what both parties are willing to accept, but considering the circumstances it is an alternative proposal which at the very least must be acknowledged, discussed, and examined. This proposal is not about what can be solved in the present, but rather what can be achieved in the future. Taking into account the current political climate, it would be irrational to believe creating a single state would automatically unite Jewish and Arab citizens and erase over half a century of troubled history. But what a secular, non-sectarian, democratic state can do is begin to lay a workable political framework for the next generation of Israelis and Palestinians. Hopefully, this study will add positively

to the discourse in better explaining and understanding the task which lies ahead.

## *Research Design and Methodology*

This paper will adopt a mainly qualitative, historical approach in addition to using various theories to support the study. In essence, this project is about policy; both those adopted by the Israeli state as well as the Palestinian government. For the research, a variety of sources will be used including books, journals, official government documents, and periodicals. It must be noted there are certain limits to the study, since the issue being dealt with is primarily an optional approach based on several varying factors and circumstances. What is being discussed is not a documented historical event, but rather a pragmatic proposal for a future resolution. Rather than examining a historical event, the study will seek to examine and analyze this future proposal within a historical context using the past as a reference for the feasibility and possibility of a one-state solution. In the interest of clarification, the terms bi-national state, single-state solution, and one-state solution all refer to the same concept and are used interchangeably.

In order to test the validity of the hypothesis of a one-state solution, a variety of issues and elements pertaining to the situation must be rigidly explained and analyzed. This paper will follow a decidedly pragmatic approach focusing on the possibility for a one-state solution, rather than taking a moral or ethical stance for or against either side of the debate. All of the topics addressed will directly relate to the concept of the one-state solution. Some of the topics that will be discussed include the following : the foundations of the

Israeli state; individual and group decision making by important and influential figures throughout the conflict; issues of cultural and national identity in Israeli and Palestinian societies; the nature of domestic politics; the status of the city of Jerusalem; the issue of Palestinian refugees; Israeli settlements and the Separation Wall built in Palestinian territories; Arabs citizens of Israel; the role of water as a valuable resource; the problem of demographics; the example of past conflicts and models applicable to the study; the failure of the two-state solution; and finally the advantages and potential problems a single state poses for both Israelis and Palestinians.

In addition to these fundamental issues, numerous others will be discussed and examined all within the framework or context in judging whether a one state solution would be the most practical. Once again, it must be reiterated that a one state solution is not a guaranteed remedy to the conflict. Any resolution would be a daunting obstacle. But considering the circumstances, a secular, democratic state for two peoples seems to be the only logical alternative to end the years of stalemate and violence.

## *Review of the Literature*

On November 29, 1947, the United Nations passed General Assembly Resolution 181 which called for the partition of Palestine. The resolution was a culmination of more than fifty years of Zionist attempts to establish a Jewish homeland in historic Palestine. The dream of an independent, Jewish state was finally realized when David Ben-Gurion declared Israeli independence on May 14, 1948. The United Nations created the Special Committee for Palestine, UNSCOP, to be entrusted with carrying out the partition. Under the partition, the Jewish people would receive approximately fifty-five percent of the land of historic Palestine, while the remaining forty-five percent would be allocated to the indigenous, Palestinian Arabs. Though the partition plan was approved by the Jewish side, the Palestinian Arabs rejected it on the grounds partition would deprive them of land rightfully theirs and would essentially spell the end of a future, independent Palestinian state. As Ilan Pappé notes, “It is clear that by accepting the Partition Resolution, the UN totally ignored the ethnic composition of the country’s population. Had the UN decided to make the territory the Jews had settled on in Palestine correspond with the size of the future state, they would have entitled them to no more than ten percent of the land.”<sup>1</sup> This would be one of the first times, but certainly not the last time, that Palestinian aspirations would be cast aside and ignored.

---

<sup>1</sup> Pappé, Ilan. (2006). *The Ethnic Cleansing of Palestine*. Oxford, England. Oneworld Publications Limited. Pg 31.

The idea of a Jewish homeland in Palestine was first openly discussed at the First Zionist Congress held in Basel in 1897. Led by Theodore Herzl, the objective of the Congress was to, “create for the Jewish people a home in Palestine secured by public law.”<sup>2</sup> Herzl, considered the father of political Zionism, was not necessarily interested in Judaism or Jewish affairs, but was motivated by his belief that assimilation into Western society and growing anti-Semitism required Jews obtain a state of their own. According to Avi Shlaim, “The Zionist Movement thus displayed two features that were to be of fundamental and enduring importance in its subsequent history: the non-recognition of a Palestinian national entity, and the quest for an alliance with a great power external to the Middle East.”<sup>3</sup> Almost all of the early Zionist leaders, such as Herzl, Chaim Weizmann, Vladimir Jabotinsky, and David Ben-Gurion, regardless of their political leanings, were in agreement a Jewish state could not survive without the protection and approval of the Great Powers. The trend of continually allying the state with a major power is a pillar of Israeli foreign policy that cuts across all party lines and continues to the present day.

At the time of World War I, Palestine was under a British mandate. Continuous lobbying efforts were directed by the Zionists, especially Chaim Weizmann, towards the British to secure a guarantee a national homeland for the Jews would be forthcoming. Eventually, their efforts would be successful and in 1917 the Balfour Declaration was signed, which stated “his Majesty’s

---

<sup>2</sup> Shlaim, Avi. (2000). *The Iron Wall Israel and the Arab World*. New York. W.W. Norton & Company. Pg. 3.

<sup>3</sup> Shlaim, Avi. (2000). *The Iron Wall Israel and the Arab World*. New York. W.W. Norton & Company. Pg. 5.

Government view with favor the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people.”<sup>4</sup> Furthermore, the declaration went on to state, “that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine.”<sup>5</sup> But taking into consideration the entire Jewish population constituted some 56,000, or approximately ten percent of the total, the Balfour Declaration’s promise not to impose on the native population, namely Palestinian Arabs, could not be taken very seriously. In fact, a simple analysis of the contents in the declaration would make it perfectly clear Great Britain had neither the intention of protecting the political rights of the Palestinians, nor was it too concerned about the future problems which would be certainly be created by such a decision.

The events that followed the Balfour Declaration, namely the Second World War and the subsequent massacre of six million European Jews, only hastened the desire to create a national homeland for the Jewish people. Jewish immigration to Palestine from all over the world had vastly increased, and Palestinian uprisings in 1927 and 1936 placed both sides on an inevitable collision course.<sup>6</sup> The collision would come in the year of 1948 when Israel would declare its independence as a sovereign state.

The concept of a one state solution is not a relatively new proposal, but support for it has emerged more strongly in the past decade. Even before the

---

<sup>4</sup> Long, David. Reich, Bernard. (1995). *The Government and Politics of the Middle East and North Africa*. Boulder, Colorado. Westview Press Inc. Pg. 240-241.

<sup>5</sup> Shlaim, Avi. (2000). *The Iron Wall Israel and the Arab World*. New York. W.W. Norton & Company. Pg. 7.

<sup>6</sup> Pappé, Ilan. (2006). *The Ethnic Cleansing of Palestine*. Oxford, England. Oneworld Publications Limited. Pg 14-15.

inception of the state of Israel, there were many Jewish and Palestinian intellectuals who called for a single state that afforded equal rights to all its inhabitants. Prominent Jews like Judah Magnes, Martin Buber, and Hannah Arendt staunchly opposed partition, arguing that partition would inevitably lead to conflict between the two communities.<sup>7</sup> Martin Buber, who had left Germany for Palestine in 1938, proclaimed the creation of Jewish majority would lead to “war- real war- with our neighbors, and also with the whole Arab nation: for what nation will allow itself to be demoted from the position of majority to that of a minority without a fight?”<sup>8</sup>

It is important to further analyze Buber’s comments for a variety reasons. First, it acknowledges the fact before the state of Israel came into existence Jews were the minority, constituting approximately one-third the entire population of Palestine in 1947.<sup>9</sup> Secondly, it banishes the myth made by many early Zionists violence between Jews and Arabs was avoidable if Arabs had accepted the United Nations decision to partition Palestine between the two peoples. No country or people would willingly accept a forced resolution that would cede land rightfully belonging to them to another group of people. Thus, war and conflict between the two sides was an inevitability that could not be avoided. As early Zionist leader David Ben-Gurion noted, “Let us not ignore the truth among ourselves ... politically we are the aggressors and they

---

<sup>7</sup> Abunimah, Ali. (2006). *One Country A Bold Proposal to End the Israeli-Palestinian Impasse*. New York, New York. Metropolitan Books. Pg. 105-106.

<sup>8</sup> Buber, Martin. (1983). *A Land of Two Peoples: Martin Buber on Jews and Arabs*, ed. Paul Mendes-Flohr. New York. Oxford University Press. Pg. 223.

<sup>9</sup> Abunimah, Ali. (2006). *One Country A Bold Proposal to End the Israeli-Palestinian Impasse*. New York, New York. Metropolitan Books. Pg. 23

defend themselves... The country is theirs, because they inhabit it, whereas we want to come here and settle down, and in their view we want to take away from them their country.”<sup>10</sup> These two points illustrate the fact many Jews believed partition to be a grave error not only because it would lead to an endless conflict between the two peoples, but it would also create a great injustice for the Palestinian inhabitants of the land.

For the Palestinian people, the concept of a single state was understandably much harder to acknowledge and accept. It was after all, their land that was partitioned, and they believed a great injustice was being committed against them. It was not until the 1960’s when some Palestinians began calling for a single state solution. By this time, the Six Day War had taken place and Israel had conquered the remaining Palestinian territories. The Palestinian call for a single state solution to the conflict was based on two key factors. First, the defeat of Arab forces in the wars of 1948 and 1967 had left the Palestinians in an extremely weak position. Israel had emerged as the vastly superior power in every respect. By 1967, Israel had become, unacknowledged at the time, a nation in possession of nuclear weapons and had the backing of major powers such as the United States, France, and Great Britain. Realistically, The Palestinians understood competing militarily and politically with the Israelis was a losing proposition, therefore, other alternatives had to be analyzed and explored.

---

<sup>10</sup> Chomsky, Noam. (1999). *The Fateful Triangle: The United States, Israel, and the Palestinians*. Cambridge, Massachusetts. South End Press. Pg. 91-92.

The second reason some Palestinians began calling for a single state was the fact that Israel's continued existence was becoming a reality even the most optimistic Palestinian could not deny. As a leader of the PLO's prevailing Fatah faction observed, "there is a large Jewish population in Palestine and it has grown considerably in the last twenty years. We recognize that it has the right to live there and that it is part of the Palestinian people. What we want to create in the historical borders of Palestine is a multiracial democratic state... a state without any hegemony, in which everyone, Jew, Christian, or Muslim will enjoy full civic rights."<sup>11</sup> Due to continuous pressure from the international community and the weakness of their political and military position, Palestinian leaders had no choice but to accept partition and enter into negotiations with their Israeli counterparts.

For the next few decades after 1967, the calls for a single state for two peoples virtually disappeared from the political discourse. Israel which had emerged as the dominant power in the conflict, and in fact the entire region, was content on maintaining the status quo regarding the Palestinian question. For their part, the Palestinians had further deteriorated into a fractured movement forced into accepting positions according to the impulses of the international community and Israel. At that point, the only things left to the Palestinians were the historical injustice of their cause, and the fact international law was on their side. Since the late 1980's, the official PLO position has been the adoption of the two-state solution with the independent

---

<sup>11</sup> Gresh, Alain. (1988). *The PLO: The Struggle Within*. London . Zed Books. Pg. 33.

states of Israel and Palestine coexisting side by side. Initially, the Israelis had rejected any notion of a Palestinian state, claiming all the land as an integral part of *Eretz Israel* (Greater Israel) which would remain undivided. However, the Israeli position began to gradually change due to pressure from the international community and the reality that “facts on the ground” were making the situation untenable. Israel could no longer rely on its superiority to maintain its more powerful negotiating position; it eventually had to address the question of Palestinian self-determination.

It was not until after the failure of the 1993 Oslo Accords and subsequent peace summits that the single state solution was beginning to once again gain serious ground in the conversation. All meetings and summits between Israeli and Palestinian officials since 1993 were based on the proposition of a two-state solution. But in the last few decades since the Oslo Accords, it has become more evident, considering the realities on the ground that a two-state solution has become unworkable. Continued Israeli settlement expansion, the rapidly growing population of Palestinians, Israeli intransigence concerning the issues of refugees and the status of Jerusalem, and the fact that a large portion of Israel’s fresh water supply lies in the Palestinian areas of the West Bank (all pertinent issues to be discussed in detail later) make the two-state solution an impractical proposal.

Thus, the calls for the abandonment of the two-state proposal in favor of a single state for all peoples have gained more legitimacy especially in the last

decade. While some intellectuals, politicians, and academics from all ethnic backgrounds and disciplines contend that a two state solution is no longer a viable option considering the present circumstances, others argue that a one-state solution is simply fantasy with no real possibility of success or implementation. The late NYU professor Tony Judt argues that the “two-state solution is already doomed” because in the present times “Israel is truly an anachronism. And not just an anachronism, but a dysfunctional one. In today’s ‘clash of cultures’ between open, pluralist democracies and belligerently intolerant, faith-driven ethno-states.”<sup>12</sup> Former Deputy Mayor of Jerusalem Meron Benvenisti echoes these sentiments when he claims, “The conclusion is that the seemingly rational solution of two states for the two nations can’t work here. The model of a division into two-states is inapplicable. It doesn’t reflect the depth of the conflict and doesn’t sit with the scale of the entanglement that exists in large parts of the country.”<sup>13</sup> And the late prominent Palestinian intellectual and academic Edward Said made similar arguments when he stated that, “Oslo [agreements] set the stage for separation, but real peace can only come with a bi-national Israeli-Palestinian state.”<sup>14</sup>

On the other hand, there is also considerable reservation in the applicability and viability of a single state for both peoples. Israeli historian Avi Shlaim has warned that “a one state solution would institutionalize apartheid.

---

<sup>12</sup> Judt, Tony. (September 25, 2003). Israel: The Alternative. *The New York Review of Books*. <http://www.nybooks.com/articles/archives/2003/oct/23/israel-the-alternative>.

<sup>13</sup> Tilley, Virginia. (2005). The One State Solution : A breakthrough for peace in the Israeli Palestinian deadlock. Ann Arbor. University of Michigan Press. Pg. 185.

<sup>14</sup> Said, Edward. (January 10, 1999). The One State Solution. *The New York Times*. <http://www.nytimes.com/1999/01/10/magazine/the-one-state-solution.html>.

It would be worse than South Africa under apartheid.”<sup>15</sup> While Tel Aviv university professor Carlo Stenger observes that, “As yet I have never seen a credible blueprint for the one-state solution. Most Israeli Jews will insist that the state have a Jewish character, but they can't explain how this character can be maintained with democratic means, if there will be almost as many Palestinian as Jewish citizens.”<sup>16</sup> The variety of differing opinions highlight just how difficult a solution acceptable to both sides will ultimately become and the magnitude of the task which lies ahead.

---

<sup>15</sup> Abunimah, A., Ali, S., Shlaim, A., Sleiman, M. (2008). “Palestinians and Israelis: Two States or One State?” *The Jerusalem Fund*. <http://www.thejerusalemfund.org/ht/action/GetDocumentAction/i/3198>.

<sup>16</sup> Stenger, Carlo. (September 25, 2011). Netanyahu Is Killing the Two State Solution. *The Huffington Post*. [http://www.huffingtonpost.com/carlo-strenger/netanyahu-two-state-solution\\_b\\_979325.html](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/carlo-strenger/netanyahu-two-state-solution_b_979325.html).

## *THE ONE STATE AGENDA*

Since this study is based on a relatively recent concept, the proposal deliberated in this paper relies considerably on the work of previous authors and commentators. The majority of single state supporters proceed from three basic assumptions. First, the present circumstances in the occupied Palestinian territories cannot sustain a functioning, sustainable independent state. Because of the ongoing construction of Israeli settlements and the fact that the Palestinian areas of the West Bank and Gaza constitute two non-contiguous areas separated by an Israeli state, realistically speaking any future Palestinian “state” would be nothing more than a series of cantons. In her book *The One-State Solution*, Virginia Tilley strongly states, “The premise for all for all present diplomacy- the two- state solution- has therefore become impossible. The same reality confronts all parties involved: only one state can viably exist in the land of historic Palestine between the Mediterranean and the Jordan River.”<sup>17</sup>

Secondly, any independent Palestinian based on the current realities would almost certainly be prone to economic and political instability. The resulting state would be blocked off from the Israeli economy and its major cities cut off from each other, making any meaningful trade or development severely problematic and virtually impossible. Predictably, Israel could not be

---

<sup>17</sup> Tilley, Virginia. (2005). *The One State Solution : A breakthrough for peace in the Israeli Palestinian deadlock*. Ann Arbor. University of Michigan Press. Pg. 1.

relied upon to support an independent Palestinian state, and for their part any Palestinian government would attempt to distance itself from perceived Israeli domination or interference in its economic affairs. A report in June 2011 issued by the UN Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees places unemployment in the West Bank and East Jerusalem between 25% and 27%.<sup>18</sup> Additionally, the Palestinian Authority is heavily dependent on foreign aid and donations totaling billions of dollars each year. Most significantly, there is a heavy economic dependence on Israel, which according to the Palestinian Authority's Central Bureau of Statistics accounts for nearly 89% of PA exports and 81% of its imports.<sup>19</sup>

Finally, supporters of the one-state solution make the argument a single state would not be that far-fetched since Israeli-Palestinian coexistence was put into effect when Israel conquered the remaining Palestinian territories in 1967. Despite Israel's disengagement from Gaza in 2005 and administrative control being taken over by the Palestinian Authority in the West Bank, the state of Israel still exerts complete military control over all the areas and borders surrounding the territories. Israel reserves the right, and has exercised that right on many occasions, to enter Palestinian territories under the pretenses of Israeli national security. All imports and exports are monitored and controlled by the Israeli government, and movement of people and goods is

---

<sup>18</sup> United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestinian Refugees. (2011). New UN research challenges conventional view of the West Bank economy. <http://www.unrwa.org/etemplate.php?id=999>.

<sup>19</sup> The PA Economy. Editorial. (August 15, 2011). *The Jerusalem Post*. <http://www.jpost.com/Opinion/Editorials/Article.aspx?id=233916>.

strictly controlled by the Israeli Defense Forces through a web of checkpoints, barriers, and arbitrary closures spread throughout Palestinian areas. In a report released in January 2008, Special Rapporteur John Dugard, independent investigator on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict for the U.N. Human Rights Council and professor of international law in South Africa concluded, “Checkpoints and roadblocks seriously obstruct the freedom of movement of Palestinians in the West Bank, with disastrous consequences for both personal life and the economy. There are 561 such obstacles to freedom of movement, comprising over 80 manned checkpoints and some 476 unmanned locked gates, earth mounds, concrete blocks and ditches. In addition, thousands of temporary checkpoints, known as flying checkpoints, are set up every year by Israeli army patrols on roads throughout the West Bank for limited periods, ranging from half an hour to several hours. In November 2007 there were 429 flying checkpoints.”<sup>20</sup> Furthermore, Israel has never declared its borders and does not officially accept the West Bank as occupied territory referring to the area not as the West Bank, but by the biblical names of Judea and Samaria. Under United Nations resolution 242, Israel’s annexation and seizure of the West Bank, Gaza, and East Jerusalem are deemed illegal under international law.

Since the two-state solution has become almost impossible, Israel is faced with a series of historical decisions in how best to deal with the

---

<sup>20</sup> Dugard, John. (January 2008). *Human Rights Situation in Palestine and other Occupied Territories*. The United Nations Human Rights Council. Pg. 15.

Palestinian question. Essentially, Israel has three options it can take for finding a resolution to the conflict. First, Israel can maintain the status quo by keeping full control over all Palestinian territories it captured in 1967. But in doing so, Israel risks the continued ire of the international community as well as the struggle to maintain control over an occupied and restless Palestinian population; a scenario very similar to the system that existed in South Africa during the apartheid era.

The second option would be the forcible expulsion of Palestinians from their lands to other states, mainly neighboring Arab countries. Though this route is not supported by the majority of Israelis, it does garner considerable support with far-right movements and politicians like Israeli Deputy Prime Minister Avigdor Lieberman who has openly called for the expulsion of Palestinians from Israel.<sup>21</sup> As recently as April 2010, the Israeli government enacted a law termed Military Order No. 1650 which states that any “Palestinians, and any foreigners living in the West Bank, could be labeled infiltrators and deported within 72 hours or jailed for seven years if they are found without the correct permit. It does not define what Israel considers a valid permit.”<sup>22</sup> Because of the broad and ambiguous wording, many human rights groups have condemned the law as an indiscriminate attempt at allowing arbitrary population transfer directly contravening the edicts of the Fourth

---

<sup>21</sup> Myre, Greg. (November 6, 2006). Hard-line Israeli Minister Avigdor Lieberman courts controversy. *The New York Times*. <http://www.nytimes.com/2006/12/06/world/africa/06iht-mideast.3808258.html>.

<sup>22</sup> McCarthy, Rory. (April 11, 2010). Israeli groups fight orders allowing army to jail West Bank residents. *The Guardian*. <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2010/apr/11/israeli-groups-attack>.

Geneva Convention which state, "Individual or mass forcible transfers, as well as deportations of protected persons from occupied territory to the territory of the Occupying Power or to that of any other country, occupied or not, are prohibited, regardless of their motive."<sup>23</sup>

The third alternative, which also serves as the basis for this study, is to create a single state which would incorporate both Israelis and Palestinians in an integrated, secular, democratic state. Admittedly, this one-state solution raises immense political and social difficulties, mainly concerning the fate of Israel as a "Jewish state" as well as the desire for Palestinians to reach independent statehood. But a one-state solution cannot be dismissed, however overwhelming the obstacles may appear, based on the reality no other practical choice remains. Israeli policy over the last forty years has made an independent Palestinian state a physical impossibility; there is only one state today in historic Palestine. As University of Chicago professor and author of the Israel Lobby John Mearsheimer correctly observes, "'A conversation about the two-state solution is meaningless, there's not going to be one. The Palestinians are never going to get their own state. Instead there is going to be a Greater Israel."<sup>24</sup> In the subsequent chapters, an assortment of issues will be discussed in detail relating to the possibility of success or failure for a one-state solution.

---

<sup>23</sup> Amnesty International. (April 28, 2010). *New Israeli military order could increase expulsions of West Bank Palestinians*. <http://www.amnesty.org/en/news-and-updates/new-israeli-military-order-could-increase-expulsions-west-bank-palestinians-2010-04>.

<sup>24</sup> D'Almeida. Kanya. (February 16, 2011). *Dead Peace Process Could be "National Suicide" for Israel*. *Inter Press Service News Agency*. <http://ipsnews.net/news.asp?idnews=54507>.

## *Israeli Settlements*

International law and the overwhelming majority of the international community recognize that Israeli settlements are illegal. And as recently as 2004, the International Court of Justice has deemed the settlements to be in breach of international law and the Fourth Geneva Convention, which explicitly forbids any occupying power from transferring its own population to territories it has occupied. It is widely recognized and accepted, even by Israel's staunchest ally the United States, that incessant settlement activity is a major obstacle in achieving a peaceful resolution. Unfortunately, this has not stopped the Israeli government from the ongoing and continuous building of settlements on Palestinian land. In fact, since the 1993 Oslo Peace Accords where Israel had promised to cease the building, the actual number of settlers has approximately doubled from 300,000 to almost 550,000.<sup>25</sup> In addition to forcibly removing Palestinians from their lands to create these settlements, a series of discriminatory policies has also been enacted to couple the seized land. Many settlements are provided with a network of private roads which strictly prohibit any Palestinians from using them, and Palestinian citizens are deprived the right to access lands which contain olive trees and fruit groves; lands that are sometimes the only means of sustenance and source of income for these families. The land Israeli settlements are built on, in violation of international law, is actually illegally confiscated Palestinian land supposed to

---

<sup>25</sup> B'tselem Israeli Information Center for Human Rights. (2009). *Land Expropriation and Statistics*. <http://www.btselem.org/settlements/statistics>.

serve as a future Palestinian state under prior agreements between Israeli governments and Palestinian representatives. Thus, Israel is in serious violation of Article 1 of the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights because its policy of settlements deprives Palestinians of the “fundamental right to self-determination” and under Fourth Geneva Convention Article 49 (f) which states, “The Occupying Power shall not deport or transfer parts of its own civilian population into the territory it occupies.”<sup>26</sup>

Since the inception of settlement policy, Israeli attitudes have not changed on the issue of settlements. Whether it is Labor, Likud, or Kadima controlling the Israeli government, settlement policy remained the same; continuous building and expansion of illegal housing to prevent any future resolution which would require Israel to relinquish control over the occupied areas. Commonly referred to as creating “facts on the ground”, this strategy attempts to create an irreversible situation, which would alter the starting point of any negotiations between the two sides. The settlements are essentially colonies, some small others large, that are built on land seized by the government. Like the South African system of designated “white only” areas, these settlements are heavily fortified enclaves that restrict any Arab Palestinians from living in them or even entering them. The overwhelming majority of these settlements is built in the West Bank and enjoy private, Jewish only roads with any Palestinians caught traveling along these

---

<sup>26</sup> Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights. (1950). *Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War*. <http://www.unhcr.ch/html/menu3/b/92.htm>.

settlement roads likely to be detained or even killed. All these settlements not only enjoy unlimited usage of Palestinian land at their disposal, but the Israeli government has a policy called “natural growth”, which refers to the continued expansion of these settlements. This “natural growth” policy is done in a step by step process allowing more and more Jews to live in these settlements, while more and more Palestinians are pushed further away from their land. First, the Israeli government seizes a considerable chunk of land from a Palestinian town or village and closes it off from Palestinian inhabitants and owners under the pretext of “security” reasons. Second, the government then brings a small group of settlers to reside in this closed off area in small trailers park homes. The government then supplies them with all the essential needs like water, electricity, and year round military escorts. Third, the government then begins replacing these small trailers with full-blown apartments and houses that allow more settlers to come in and live, once again with the financial help of the Israeli government. Finally, these settlements expand to such large sizes that many have become huge cities. If one can pinpoint an exact reason why a two-state solution is unachievable then the issue of Israeli settlements would be considered the primary reason.

Though Israeli settlement activity was vastly accelerated after the 1993 Oslo Accords, Israeli policy of building settlements on Palestinian land actually began immediately after the Six Day War of 1967. After the conquest of Palestinian territories, Israel’s deputy prime minister Yigal Allon put forth a proposition to retain control over the Jordan Valley and West Bank, while

granting limited autonomy to Palestinian areas.<sup>27</sup> Known as the Allon Plan, the proposal had two distinct objectives it aimed to achieve. First, it ensured Israel would maintain physical control over all occupied areas, thus setting the scene for future Israeli expansion within Palestinian territories. And second, it allowed the government of Israel to maintain control over the Palestinian population without having to grant them any political rights or citizenship. Doing so would mean Israel could relinquish responsibility for granting Palestinians basic rights as well preserving Israel's claim to being a Jewish state through Jewish majority. As Israeli architect Thomas Leitersdorf, who planned Israeli settlements in Jerusalem, explains, "The underlying political idea was that the further inside the Occupied Territories we placed settlers, the more territory Israel would have when the time came to set permanent international borders [Israel still has not declared any borders] –because we were already there."<sup>28</sup> In other words, the official Israeli plan on settlements was meant to deliberately create a situation which would become irreversible when the time came where either Israel was forced to declare its borders, or a negotiated settlement with Palestinians was inevitable.

But if Israel's earlier settlement policy was based on expanding borders and considered a matter of national security, then its later phase took a much more extremist, religious line. Beginning in the 1970s, an ultra-religious

---

<sup>27</sup> Makdisi, Saree. (2008). *Palestine Inside Out: An Everyday Occupation*. W. W. Norton & Company. New York. Pg. 77-78.

<sup>28</sup> Segel, Rafi. Eyal, Weisman. eds. (2003). *A Civilian Occupation: The Politics of Israeli Architecture*. Verso Books. London. Pg. 23-24.

nationalist settler's movement known as Gush Emunim (Bloc of the Faithful), began a campaign of accelerated settlement building throughout the entire West Bank.<sup>29</sup> Unlike the Allon Plan which was primarily based on national strategic interests, this new settler movement was motivated by the belief it was a divine right for Jews to possess all the land between the Mediterranean Sea and the Jordan River. In turn, the Israeli government was explicit in its support for these movements. Not only because it satisfied the state's desire for more land, but it also allowed the government to direct settler policy and ensure all new settlements constructed would serve the state's interests. In fact, settlement activity is not only supported by the state it is actively encouraged. As Segel and Weisman argue, "What becomes evident is that by placing settlers across the landscape, the Israeli government is not merely utilizing the agencies of state power and control, namely, the police and army, for the administration of power, but that it 'drafts' the civilian population to inspect, control, and subdue the Palestinian population."<sup>30</sup> Furthermore, Israelis are handsomely rewarded with a variety of subsidies meant to encourage families to move into settlements. Because some West Bank settlements are classified as priority developments by the Israeli state, settlers

---

<sup>29</sup> Makdisi, Saree. (2008). *Palestine Inside Out: An Everyday Occupation*. W. W. Norton & Company. New York. Pg. 120-121.

<sup>30</sup> Segel, Rafi. Eyal, Weisman. eds. (2003). *A Civilian Occupation: The Politics of Israeli Architecture*. Verso Books. London. Pg. 48.

are eligible for generous benefits and tax breaks provided by six government ministries.<sup>31</sup>

Part of the conventional wisdom has been that in order for Palestinians to have an independent state, they would have to accept that large Israeli settlement blocs were a *fait accompli*. But opinion polls show fewer than 4 percent of Palestinians in the occupied territories would accept such a proposal.<sup>32</sup> Israeli officials have repeatedly made the claim those larger settlement blocs in the occupied territories like Ariel, Gush Etzion, Betar Illit , Ma'ale Adumim, Modiin Illit should simply be viewed as “neighborhoods” rather than illegal settlements.<sup>33</sup> These larger settlements are equivalent to small cities with their own school systems, shopping malls, cinemas, parks, and cultural and recreational centers. Removing them would not only be a major physical obstacle, it would also take a herculean effort by Israeli politicians to convince settlers and the Israeli public alike the benefit and practicality of undertaking such a large scale effort. An effort, judging by Israel's continued construction of settlements throughout the West Bank and East Jerusalem, no politician or government is willing to make.

---

<sup>31</sup> Makdisi. Saree. (2008). *Palestine Inside Out: An Everyday Occupation*. W. W. Norton & Company. New York. Pg. 125.

<sup>32</sup> Jerusalem Media and Communications Centre. (June 2000). *On Palestinian Attitudes towards Final Status Negotiations and the declaration of the State*. <http://www.jmcc.org/Documentsandmaps.aspx?id=463>.

<sup>33</sup> Christian Science Monitor. (September 14, 2010). *Five largest Israeli settlements: who lives there, and why*. <http://www.csmonitor.com/World/Middle-East/2010/0914/Five-largest-Israeli-settlements-who-lives-there-and-why/Ariel>.

Another misguided belief by many supporters of the two-state solution is the possibility Israel would be willing or is able to remove the settlements from the West Bank and East Jerusalem, just as it did when Israel vacated all the settlements from the Gaza Strip. In 2005, then Prime Minister Ariel Sharon decided to unilaterally disengage Israel from the territory of Gaza under the stated purpose of national security, and as a show of Israel's good faith towards the creation of a future independent Palestinian state. But if Sharon's public declarations were meant for public consumption, then his true motives for the disengagement were vastly different. Sharon's plan was neither meant to end the occupation nor was it meant to bring a permanent peace between Israelis and Palestinians. The Gaza disengagement plan was actually a series of decisions undertaken by the government mainly to tighten control over areas in the West Bank and East Jerusalem.<sup>34</sup>

Disengagement from the West Bank would ultimately be an entirely different matter from that of Gaza. First, unlike Gaza which had a settler population of fewer than 9,000 and consisted of twenty one settlements, the West Bank has a settler population of approximately 550,000 living in 121 settlements which control over 42 percent of the entire land in the West Bank.<sup>35</sup> Secondly, Gaza was an impoverished, vastly overcrowded, violent area which served a far smaller interest for Israel to maintain in both political and

---

<sup>34</sup> Eldar, Akiva. Zertal. Idith. (2007). *Lords of the Land: The War over Israel's Settlements in the Occupied Territories 1967-2007*. Nation Books. New York. Pg. 446-447.

<sup>35</sup> B'tselem Israeli Information Center for Human Rights. (2010). *By Hook and By Crook: Israeli Settlement Policy in the West Bank*. [http://www.btselem.org/publications/summaries/201007\\_by\\_hook\\_and\\_by\\_crook](http://www.btselem.org/publications/summaries/201007_by_hook_and_by_crook).

economic terms. The West Bank is not only strategically important, because it covers a large area constituting Israel's eastern borders; it also serves as a major source of Israel's freshwater supply. Israel has no intention of dismantling any settlements in the West Bank; on the contrary, Israel's policy aim has always been deepening the occupation and swallowing up of even more Palestinian land, specifically to prevent any future peace proposals from forcing Israel to relinquish any part it has deemed integral to the idea of a Greater Israel. As Sharon's close advisor and confidant Dov Weisglass so openly stated the following:

The disengagement supplies the amount of formaldehyde that's necessary so that there will be no political process with the Palestinians. And when you freeze that process, you prevent the establishment of a Palestinian state, and you prevent a discussion on the refugees, the borders and Jerusalem. Effectively, this whole package called the Palestinian state, with all that it entails, has been removed indefinitely from our agenda. And all this with authority and permission. All with a presidential blessing and the ratification of both houses of Congress.<sup>36</sup>

The disengagement of Gaza was not meant to be a prelude to what could possibly happen in the West Bank, but rather a deliberate effort on the part of the Israelis to create such "facts on the ground" where the creation of a

---

<sup>36</sup> Shavit. Ari. (October 6, 2004). Top PM Aide: Gaza plan aims to freeze the peace process. *Haaretz*. <http://www.haaretz.com/print-edition/news/top-pm-aide-gaza-plan-aims-to-freeze-the-peace-process-1.136686>.

Palestinian state would be delayed to the point where a state could and would never exist.

Another major issue of the conflict, that is no less important, but clearly relevant is the access to freshwater resources. Though the Middle Eastern region is known for its abundance of petroleum and natural gases, water is an increasingly scarce and valuable resource. Israeli need for water is very high, both for its economic and agricultural demands, and its desire to sustain a Western like living standard for its population. But in the last few decades Israel has had an increasing number of problems acquiring water resources. Most of Israel's freshwater is derived from the Sea of Galilee and a coastal aquifer, but approximately a third of Israel's resources comes from two large aquifers, the Yarkom-Tanninim Aquifer in the west and the northern Nablus-Gilboa Aquifer.<sup>37</sup> Between the two aquifers, some 450 million cubic meters of water are annually supplied to Israel. Though Israel has created other water resource developments such as water recycling and collection systems, water overuse forces it to rely heavily on the rain-fed West Bank aquifers. Where the problem truly lies, however, is that these aquifers exist under Palestinian land seized by the Israeli government. Israel does not allow the Palestinian Authority any access to the resources and controls the use of water by limiting Palestinian usage. To maintain their higher living standards and consumption, Israel uses around 93 percent of the West Bank aquifers' annual rainwater

---

<sup>37</sup>Tilley, Virginia. (2005). *The One State Solution : A breakthrough for peace in the Israeli Palestinian deadlock*. Ann Arbor. University of Michigan Press. Pg. 63.

recharge.<sup>38</sup> The World Health Organization and the United States Agency for International Development recommend 100 liters of water per capita per day as the minimum quantity for basic consumption. But daily per capita water consumption for the West Bank amounts to some 73 liters per day for Palestinians, while Israelis enjoy three times that amount with daily usage rate around 242 liters per day.<sup>39</sup> Essentially, 20 percent of Israeli settlers are allocated more water than the remaining 80 percent of Palestinians in the West Bank. A report by Amnesty International states, “Israel allows the Palestinians access to only a fraction of the shared water resources, which lie mostly in the occupied West Bank, while the unlawful Israeli settlements there receive virtually unlimited supplies.”<sup>40</sup> Under an interim agreement with the Palestinian Authority in 1995, certain quantities are allocated for Palestinian usage, but Palestinians are denied the right to drill new wells in any of the aquifers. In addition, the surface water of the Jordan River remains disputed between Israel, Syria, and Lebanon and prevents Israelis from exploiting the river as a major additional source of freshwater. The importance of the West Bank aquifers to Israel grows exponentially and adds one more reason for the continued Israeli dominance over the West Bank. Granting Palestinians sovereignty would mean relinquishing control of the aquifers; a situation highly

---

<sup>38</sup> Ibid. Pg. 63.

<sup>39</sup> B’tselem Israeli Information Center for Human Rights. (2008). *The Gap in Water Consumption between Palestinians and Israelis*. [http://www.btselem.org/water/consumption\\_gap](http://www.btselem.org/water/consumption_gap).

<sup>40</sup> Amnesty International. (October 2009). *Israel rations Palestinians to trickle of water*. <http://www.amnesty.org/en/news-and-updates/report/israel-rations-palestinians-trickle-water-20091027>.

implausible considering the scarcity of water in the region and the threat it would constitute to Israel's economic and national security. No peace process has made any progress on the issue, no amount of fences and security barriers can ensure Israel's water security, and certainly no partition of land between the two sides is likely to initiate a practical solution. If Israel refuses to share or render control over the aquifers under any agreement, then it only makes a two-state even more difficult and seemingly impossible.

A final reason Israeli settlements will not be removed is the fervor with which religious, nationalist Jews and Zionists view the West Bank as an integral part of Greater Israel. While statesmen like Sharon, Rabin, Olmert, and Barak attach political and national security objectives to the retention and occupation of the West Bank, many Israeli settlers believe creating a Palestinian state in the West Bank would be tantamount to national and religious treason. For many of these religious settlers, the land of the West Bank, which they refer to by their biblical names of Judea and Samaria, is considered a divine right and carries an almost mythical significance. As mentioned before, many settlers are drawn to the West Bank for pragmatic incentives such as affordable housing, generous tax breaks, and subsidized schools, but there also exists a section of settlers who view living in these settlements and outposts as a religious duty. Extreme nationalist, religious movements like Gush Emunim, which sprung up during the early 1970s, actively pursued an agenda of Jewish settlement in the West Bank. After the right wing Likud Party was elected in 1977, the members of Gush Emunim

openly celebrated believing Prime Minister Menachem Begin would be a willing ally in their drive to colonize Palestinian land. But the Gush Emunim was severely disappointed by Begin and the Likud when Israel signed a peace treaty with Egypt in 1977. The peace treaty was considered a treasonous act by the settlers and going against the very tenets of religious Zionist ideology. But if movements like Gush Emunim believed in apocalyptic fantasies based on religious doctrine, the governing parties of the Israeli state, regardless of which side they fell on the political spectrum, had a much more rational and realistic approach. As Shimon Peres, a supporter of these settler movements at the time of their inception, remarked, "To the credit of the Gush Emunim people, it should be said that they do not base themselves on the security argument, but rather on the historical argument...But in addition to our historical right there is also a historical obligation: to preserve the Jewish character of the state, and not just a formal deed of ownership."<sup>41</sup> Though Peres' admission was certainly a disingenuous attempt to placate the movement, it clearly highlighted his unwillingness to place matters of historical or religious precedence above matters of security and state. Every prime minister of Israel, whether Labor or Likud, has openly supported the Israeli settler movement in the occupied Palestinian territories, but their support only extends to a certain point. With regards to the state, the settlements were meant simply as a means to exert territorial control over Palestinian land and base the government's defense

---

<sup>41</sup> Eldar, Akiva. Zertal. Idith. (2007). *Lords of the Land: The War over Israel's Settlements in the Occupied Territories 1967-2007*. Nation Books. New York. Pg. 231.

strategy on the map of settlement construction and policy. Herein lays the dichotomy of the Israeli settler movement in a nutshell. Though supportive of settlements in as much as they fulfilled certain objectives pertaining to national interest, the government was neither willing nor interested in turning matters of state into a religious battlefield. However, it must be made clear, differences among Israeli leaders and the Israeli public does not mean settlement policy will be altered anytime in the near future.

Construction of settlements in the West Bank and East Jerusalem presently continues unabated to the chagrin of Palestinian leaders and citizens. The battle over settlement policy neither includes nor takes into account the aspirations or rights of the Palestinian people for independent statehood. In reality, settlement policy is an internal Israeli issue in which Palestinians have absolutely no power whatsoever in the matter. When Israel decides it wants to build new settlements, which it so often does, it does not consult Palestinian leaders or the international community on the wisdom or legality of the issue; it simply takes a unilateral decision and begins construction. Whether Israelis wish to acknowledge the fact in the present or the future, these unilateral decisions have completely and irreversibly altered the nature of the conflict. For all intents and purposes, the two-state solution might not be completely dead but it certainly has been comatose for some time. Partitioning the land under normal circumstances would be a difficult task on its own; partitioning land under these circumstances is virtually next to impossible.

## *The Role of Demographics*

In August 2005, for the first time in their history Israeli Jews were no longer the absolute majority in territories they controlled (In Israel proper Jews still constitute an overwhelming majority.) According to Israel's Central Bureau of Statistics there were approximately 5.26 million Jews living in Israel and the Palestinian Territories, while the Palestinian Bureau of Statistics showed around 5.62 non-Jews.<sup>42</sup> Professor Arnon Soffer, chair of geostrategic studies at Haifa University, predicts that by the year 2020 there will be 6.3 million Jews and 8.8 million Palestinians due to higher birth rates among the Palestinian population.<sup>43</sup> The debate among Israelis about the so called "demographic threat" is certainly not a new phenomenon. Since the founding of the state of Israel in 1948, the earliest Zionist leaders have maintained an ongoing obsession with maintaining the Jewish character of the state; an obsession that manifests itself mostly when the subject of demographics arises. Israeli policy concerning the growing population of Palestinian is very similar to its policy concerning settlements; Israel wants to unilaterally create and implement policies which would see it physically keep hold of the territories in the West Bank, but it neither wants to grant Palestinians any political rights, nor does it wish to assume the responsibilities of governing the population. In other words, Israel wants Palestinian land without Palestinian people.

---

<sup>42</sup> Abunimah, Ali. (2006). *One Country A Bold Proposal to End the Israeli-Palestinian Impasse*. New York, New York. Metropolitan Books. Pg. 56-57.

<sup>43</sup> Derfner, Larry. (January 9, 2004). *Sounding the Alarm About Israel's Demographic Crisis*. The Forward. <http://www.forward.com/articles/6070/>.

Even if there is debate concerning population projections, there is no debate Israel will have to contend with the fact that there will be a considerably larger Palestinian population in the near future. Judging by the current circumstances, Israel only has a few distinct alternatives to maintaining its demographic majority. First, Israel can vacate all settlements built behind the Green Line and allow for a creation of an independent Palestinian state in the West Bank and Gaza. Doing so would not only assure Israel preserves its Jewish character, it also would bring about a workable solution to the conflict. However, Israel has no intention of either withdrawing to the 1967 borders, nor does it have any intention of removing 500,000 Israeli settlers from the West Bank (an issue discussed more in detail in the previous chapter).

A second option would be the forcible transfer or expulsion of Palestinians. Though committing ethnic cleansing or genocide on a large scale would be highly improbable in the present day, this option certainly does carry some credence among some Israeli politicians and political parties. Leaders of some Israeli Knesset parties such as Moledet and the National Union Bloc have openly called for the forcible removal and transfer of Palestinians. As National Union Bloc politician and Knesset member Effie Eitam argued, "It's impossible with all of these Arabs, and it is impossible to give up the territory. We will have to expel the great majority of the Arabs from Judea and Samaria."<sup>44</sup> Though Eitam's racist views were condemned by Israel's more liberal

---

<sup>44</sup> Makdisi, Saree. (2008). *Palestine Inside Out: An Everyday Occupation*. W. W. Norton & Company. New York. Pg. 11.

politicians, his positions were not as extreme as they had made it seem. For decades, Israel has adopted an implicit policy of “voluntary transfer” of the Palestinian population. During the War of 1948, over 800,000 Palestinians either fled or were forced from their homes by the advancing Israeli army; a scenario highly unlikely to happen because of the vast degree and speed information and news travels in the present day. Therefore, Israel adopted a deliberate campaign of making life so unbearable and miserable for the Palestinian population it would force Palestinians to begin leaving their homes under the increasing pressure. An excellent example of the “voluntary transfer” policy is the construction of the separation barrier in the West Bank and East Jerusalem. Begun in 2000, the barrier encompasses some 760 kilometers and includes over 12 percent of territory which belongs to the Palestinians; territory which would ultimately be included in a future Palestinian state.<sup>45</sup> Israel has always argued that the purpose of the barrier was to deter and prevent any Palestinians from entering Israeli territory and committing terrorist acts. But the Israeli claims of security issues have no basis, since Israel decided to build a large part of the barrier on large swaths of Palestinian land. The 2004 ruling of the International Court of Justice made it clear Israel has every right to build a barrier, but that barrier must be contained within its internationally recognized territory.<sup>46</sup> Therefore, the ruling by the ICJ deemed the barrier

---

<sup>45</sup> B'tselem Israeli Information Center for Human Rights. (April 2006). *The Separation Barrier – Statistics*. [http://www.btselem.org/separation\\_barrier/statistics](http://www.btselem.org/separation_barrier/statistics).

<sup>46</sup> International Court of Justice. (July 9, 2004). *Legal Consequences of the Construction of a Wall in the Occupied Palestinian Territory*. <http://www.icj-cij.org/docket/files/131/1677.pdf>.

illegal under international law. Israel, however, was under no illusions about the legality of the barrier or its intended consequences on the Palestinian population. Israeli colonel Shaul Arieli clearly defines the objective when he says:

The enclave in this area captured no less than nine Palestinian villages in the area between the deep-territory barrier and the separation fence that runs along the Green Line. The objective is for them to not have access to the State of Israel, for demographic reasons. Conversely, the Palestinian authorities will have a hard time supplying the residents of this area with health, education and legal services, not to mention jobs. The village residents will not be able to continue living under these sorts of conditions. They will abandon their homes and go to the big cities, at which point it will be possible to expand the borders of the State of Israel without paying the demographic price. It would be voluntary transfer.<sup>47</sup>

The true problem for Zionists is –and always has been– the land they desire comes with Palestinians already existing on it. As the late Israeli sociologist Baruch Kimmerling observed, “One Zionist imperative –to possess the largest possible amount of sacred land–contradicting the other Zionist imperative–to ensure a massive Jewish majority inhabiting a land that was preferably free of all Arabs.”<sup>48</sup> But if Israel is unwilling to remove the

---

<sup>47</sup> Barzilai, Amnon. (February 18, 2004). The fence: A path to voluntary transfer. *Haaretz*. <http://www.haaretz.com/print-edition/features/the-fence-a-path-to-voluntary-transfer-1.114330>.

<sup>48</sup> Kimmerling, Baruch. (2003). *Politicide: Ariel Sharon's War against the Palestinians*. Verso Books. London. Pg. 17.

settlements and cannot openly ethnically cleanse the Palestinian population; then simply one final alternative remains. The abandonment of the impractical two-state solution for the adoption of a single state where both Israelis and Palestinians enjoy full and equal political and human rights. This scenario is not as far-fetched or impossible as it would seem. Both Israelis and Palestinians understand and acknowledge certain compromises have to be made to reach a peaceful resolution. Though the one-state solution is still confined to a minority in Israeli and Palestinian societies, the impending realities of the “facts on the ground” created by Israel will force both parties to reassess their positions and abandon certain tenets of their respective agendas.

The Palestinians are cognizant of the fact in the very near future they will have a larger population than the Israelis. However, being a majority does not automatically lead to a shift in the balance of power within a society. Even if Palestinians will outnumber Israelis, like the black community in South Africa outnumbered the Afrikaners, the Israelis will still control all the infrastructures of state power, which they will certainly not hesitate to use once that position of privilege is under threat. Like the Israelis, Palestinians would admittedly prefer their own independent state. But as Israeli intransigence on issues like the settlements continues to advance then more and more Palestinians will begin to accept the fact that an independent state is no longer a geographic possibility. Birzeit University Professor Ali Jarbawi states that, “Most Palestinians prefer the idea of separation, because they want their own state. But Sharon’s idea of a two-state solution is to squeeze us into cantons...Given

a choice between cantonization and one state, Palestinians will go for the latter.”<sup>49</sup> With over half a million Israeli settlers in the Palestinian territories and around 20 percent of Israel’s population being Palestinian, the reality is the two peoples have already been demographically integrated and inseparable. There is not and has never been a time since 1948 where the two peoples have been completely separated. Palestinians have always existed within the Israeli state since its founding, and since 1967 Israelis have been living in the occupied territories. As early as 1999, the late Palestinian professor Edward Said noted that an independent Palestinian state was, “just as unworkable as the principle of separation between a demographically mixed, irreversibly connected Arab and Jewish population in Israel and the occupied territories...I therefore see no other way than to begin now to speak about sharing the land that has thrust us together, sharing it in a truly democratic way, with equal rights for all citizens.”<sup>50</sup>

Electronic Intifada cofounder and author of *One Country* Ali Abunimah believes the shift in the Palestinian position towards a single state can be drawn from specific three factors. First, is the acceptance by the vast majority of both Israelis and Palestinians of the reality that neither one nor the other is going to disappear. Secondly, Abunimah believes Palestinians have grown disenchanted with and have abandoned the old and outdated ideas of decolonization and indigenous nationalism. Finally, he argues that decades of

---

<sup>49</sup> Hirschberg, Peter. (February, 9 2004). Hello, I'm Israeli-Palestinian. *Inter Press Service News Agency*. <http://ipsnews.net/news.asp?idnews=22318>.

<sup>50</sup> Said, Edward. (2001). *The End of the Peace Process: Oslo and After*. Vintage Books. New York. Pg. 318.

the diaspora life in multiethnic democracies across North America, Europe, and the Middle East have shown Palestinians a better way of achieving freedom than forming a state on nationalist, religious, or ethnic terms.<sup>51</sup>

But if the Palestinians, being the far weaker side in the balance of power, are willing to accept de facto the idea of a one state solution, then what about the Israelis? In the simplest of terms, Israel has no choice but to accept that its policies over the course of the preceding decades has destroyed any hope or prospect for a practical two-state solution. The Israelis being the more dominant side in the conflict would no doubt believe they are the party making the more painful and costly concessions. Israel would not only be relinquishing its prime position politically and militarily, it would also be asked to abandon its Zionist dream of a Greater Israel from the Jordan River to the Mediterranean Sea. To the Israelis, maintaining their Jewishness as a state is just as important as maintaining their regional military superiority. Israel is a state that is heavily driven by national as well as ideological interests. However, politics and ideology do not always go hand in hand. Israeli leaders understand the very survival of the state is in jeopardy if it does not curtail its ideological pursuits.

Jewish history, especially in the mid-20<sup>th</sup> century, has been an often sad and tragic story of severe persecution, oppression, and genocide. There is absolutely no reason why Jews around the world should not be afforded the

---

<sup>51</sup> Abunimah. Ali. (February 20, 2004). *Palestine/Israel: The end of road for the two-state solution?* St. Antony's College, Oxford Lecture. <http://www.sant.ox.ac.uk/events/lecturesarchive/abunimah.pdf>.

same human and political rights as any other peoples or nations. However, Jewish victimhood does not justify Israel's continued oppression and dispossession of the Palestinian people. There is an extremely crucial point that must be addressed when discussing the topic of Jews and their relation to the state of Israel. Not all Jews are Israeli or Zionist. In fact, of the worldwide population of approximately 14 million Jews only some 42 percent reside in Israel and the remaining 58 percent reside in states around the world.<sup>52</sup> Though Israel often portrays itself as a defender and authority of and for Jews around the world, the reality is quite different. True, there are many Diaspora Jews who do feel a spiritual or cultural affinity with the state of Israel, but some of Israel's harshest critics have been individuals of Jewish descent, both Israeli and non-Israeli. Like every other nation across the globe, Jews are neither a politically homogenous group, nor are they all supporters of the Zionist movement and the state of Israel. Where there is a consensus, however, among both Israeli and non-Israeli Jews (and among Palestinians as well) is the need for a permanent resolution to the conflict. Because of the Jewish experience, many Israelis believe a state without a Jewish majority based on Jewish principles is equivalent to no state at all. But many Israelis and Jews have now realized their ideological goals are no longer applicable in the present day, and have come to the often painful conclusion the status quo is no longer sustainable. There are two specific factors which merit this claim.

---

<sup>52</sup> DellaPergola, Sergio. (2010). World Jewish Population, 2010. *North American Jewish Data Bank*. [http://www.jewishdatabank.org/Reports/World\\_Jewish\\_Population\\_2010.pdf](http://www.jewishdatabank.org/Reports/World_Jewish_Population_2010.pdf).

Both factors not only address Israel's character as a Jewish state, they also address the future of Israel's very existence.

First, Israel cannot preserve its stated goal of being a Jewish, democratic state. Since its founding in 1948, Israel has attempted to portray itself as a state which respects the rights of all its citizens, but is distinguished by its uniqueness as being the only Jewish state in the world. However, Israel has continuously failed to reconcile its desire of being a democratic state with its continued maltreatment of the Palestinian population both within Israel and in the occupied territories. Despite a pledge in its Declaration of Independence to produce a constitution within six months, Israel still has no such document, instead relying on its 11 Basic Laws to deal with state institutions and authorities.<sup>53</sup> These 11 Basic Laws do not include guarantees on freedom of speech, religion, or equality, but simply address matters of constitutional law based on cases and precedents. The closest Israel has come to issuing a Bill of Rights is its Basic Law on Human Dignity and Liberty, which also fails to mention any sort of stipulation on equality, but instead emphasizes Israel's values as Jewish and democratic. As a result of these omissions on the issue of equality, state-organized discrimination cannot be easily challenged or proven within the Israeli court system. Palestinians wishing to bring claims of discrimination to the courts are left to the mercy of Israeli judges who possess no concrete legal framework to address their issues and grievances.

---

<sup>53</sup> Cook, Jonathan. (2006). *Blood and Religion: The Unmasking of the Jewish and Democratic State*. Pluto Press. Ann Arbor, Michigan. Pgs. 17-18.

In the battle over demographics it is easy to lose sight of the fact that approximately 20 percent of Israel's population consists of citizens of Palestinian descent. Oftentimes, the focus of the conflict centers mainly on Israel's policies in the occupied territories forgetting the fact Palestinians living within Israel face severe institutional discrimination as well. Though Israel claims to uphold democratic values for all its citizens, it is clear Jews and Judaism occupy a privileged position as the religion of the majority. Jewish religious holidays, Jewish holy sites, and Jewish schools are the only ones recognized, protected, and funded by the state.<sup>54</sup> Because of the fear of being over populated by Palestinians, Israel has passed legislation such as the 1950 Law of Return which gives every Jew in the world the right to migrate to Israel and receive automatic citizenship regardless of birthplace or existing nationality.<sup>55</sup> Palestinians, however, are not afforded the same rights under any circumstances. A 1970's ruling by Israel's High Court of Justice states, "there is no Israeli nation separate from the Jewish people. The Jewish people is composed not only of those residing in Israel but also of Diaspora Jewry."<sup>56</sup> Since Palestinians are not members of the Jewish nation, even if some do possess Israeli citizenship, they are not afforded the same benefits as members of that nation. For example, in the legal administrative process Israelis are tried

---

<sup>54</sup> Cook, Jonathan. (2006). *Blood and Religion: The Unmasking of the Jewish and Democratic State*. Pluto Press. Ann Arbor, Michigan. Pg. 19.

<sup>55</sup> Tilley, Virginia. (2005). *The One State Solution : A breakthrough for peace in the Israeli Palestinian deadlock*. Ann Arbor. University of Michigan Press. Pg. 47.

<sup>56</sup> Makdisi, Saree. (2008). *Palestine Inside Out: An Everyday Occupation*. W. W. Norton & Company. New York. Pg. 12.

by civil law while Palestinians in the occupied territories fall under the jurisdiction of military law. Palestinian citizens of Israel not only face systematic discrimination; they are openly referred to as a “fifth column” - an insidious and dangerous minority which seeks to undermine and poses a threat to Israel’s national security. In a highly contentious move, Israel even amended its citizenship laws calling on all non-Jews to pledge loyalty to Israel as a Jewish and democratic state. Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu defended the amendment stating, “There is broad agreement in Israel on the Jewish identity and the democracy of the state of Israel; this is the foundation of our existence here.”<sup>57</sup>

Even Arab Knesset (Israel’s Parliament) members are not immune to such overtly racist accusations. Members of the Arab Balad Party Amzi Bishara and Ahmed Tibi were barred by Israel’s Central Election Committee because they were accused of rejecting “the Jewish and democratic nature of the state, incited to racism, or supported armed struggle against Israel.”<sup>58</sup> Though the decision was later overturned by the High Court of Justice, it clearly highlights the difficulties and dangers faced by Palestinians existing within Israeli society, including members of Israel’s own parliament. Judging Israel by its treatment and policies regarding the Palestinians, both in the occupied territories and in Israel proper, the argument or claim of being “the only democracy in the Middle

---

<sup>57</sup> Kershner. Isabel. (October 10, 2010). Israeli Cabinet Approves Citizenship Amendment. *The New York Times*. <http://www.nytimes.com/2010/10/11/world/middleeast/11mideast.html>.

<sup>58</sup> Izenberg. Dan. (January 10, 2003). High Court overturns disqualifications of Tibi, Bishara. *Jerusalem Post*. [http://info.jpost.com/C002/Supplements/Elections2003/ld\\_03\\_1201.html](http://info.jpost.com/C002/Supplements/Elections2003/ld_03_1201.html).

East” holds no value when placed under closer scrutiny. Essentially, Israelis have two choices in the direction they wish to lead their state. Either Israel remains a Jewish state which cannot be democratic, or it becomes a democratic state which cannot be Jewish.

The second reason a one-state solution would be the more practical approach is the recognition that in the modern era of multi-ethnic nation states the idea of a state based on ethno-religious exclusivity is an archaic notion of the past. Many states around the world have their official religion as Christianity or Islam, and there is no reason why Israelis should not want Judaism as an official state religion. However, having Judaism recognized as an official state religion is very different than demanding recognition of Israel as a Jewish state. The former recognizes the will of a majority of the population, while the latter denies the minority equal status under the law, basically relegating them to second class citizenship. Israel’s insistence on recognition as a Jewish state stems not only from the desire to be a homeland for the Jewish nation; it also gives credence to the religious claim that the land was the spiritual and ancestral home of the Jewish nation stretching back thousands of years. Understandably, Palestinians take issue with this claim because it rejects their rights as documented residents also stretching back centuries, and acceptance of the Israeli-Jewish narrative would justify the historical injustice committed against the Palestinians when the state of Israel was created and would essentially mean the forfeiture of their rights and claims.

Critics of the one-state solution have launched scathing attacks arguing the proposal would mean the end of Israel as a Jewish state. Some critics have even gone as far as justifying and calling for ethnic cleansing to preserve a Jewish majority. In a 2004 interview, Israeli historian Benny Morris claims, “there are circumstances in history that justify ethnic cleansing.” A Jewish state “would not have come into being without the uprooting of 700,000 Palestinians. There was no choice but to expel the population. It was necessary to cleanse the hinterland and cleanse the border areas and cleanse the main roads.”<sup>59</sup> And Israeli demographic expert Professor Arnon Soffer, a major proponent of separation from the Palestinians, bluntly states that, “Unilateral separation does not guarantee ‘peace’ it guarantees a Zionist-Jewish state with an overwhelming majority of Jews... So, if we want to remain alive, we will have to kill and kill and kill. All day, every day.”<sup>60</sup> Though these are extreme examples of the sort of policies officially advocated, it highlights the desperation and the length some are willing to go to preserve a Jewish majority in Israel.

While some Israelis lament the demise of Israel’s Jewish majority and would resort to extremes to preserve it, there are others who have accepted, whether on the basis of fact or principle, that one-state is the only remaining

---

<sup>59</sup> Shavit, Ari. (January 8, 2004). Survival of the Fittest. *Haaretz*.  
<http://web.archive.org/web/20080515210330/http://www.haaretz.com/hasen/pages/ShArt.jhtml?itemNo=380986&contrassID=2>.

<sup>60</sup> Blum, Ruthie. (May 20, 2004). One on One: It’s the Demography, Stupid. *The Jerusalem Post*.

and reasonable solution. University of East London professor Haim Bresheeth sensed the lack of realistic alternatives when he said:

This is not something I find easy to say, as an Israeli and son of Holocaust survivors. I would like to be able to argue for an Israeli-Hebrew entity -- not a Zionist militarist enterprise, of course, but a democratic, autonomous political and cultural entity twinned with a similar Palestinian entity. But after four decades of military rule and all the desecration of political, human, civil, property and other forms of rights by the occupation regime, most reasonable people will agree that no support can be given to this outdated, violent, immoral and inefficient mode of domination of one people over another... Many Palestinians are now returning to an earlier, more principled stage of their political development and argument -- the PLO solution of a secular, democratic single state in the whole of Palestine; one state that allows equal rights to Jews and Arabs alike. It is ironic that through failing to grasp the nettle which would have enabled them to keep a separate Israeli state in the pre- 1967 borders, Israeli leaders have forced a change in Palestinian thinking: "if we are not allowed to live as a free people in 22 percent of our country, or come to that, even 10 per cent of it, maybe we should go back to fighting to liberate the whole country, for both people to live in peace, as equals."<sup>61</sup>

---

<sup>61</sup> Bresheeth, Haim. (March 17, 2004). Two states, too little, too late. *Al-Ahram Weekly*. Issue No. 681. <http://weekly.ahram.org.eg/2004/681/op61.htm>.

Others supporters have taken an approach based on principle, believing militarism and separation will neither ensure Israel's long-term security, nor will it bring any justice to Israelis and Palestinians. Long time Israeli peace activist Haim Hanegbi addresses the moral conundrum Israel faces because of its treatment of Palestinians and the harm it has done to Israel's character and standing:

There is something genetic here that doesn't allow us truly to recognize the Palestinians, that doesn't allow us to make peace with them. And that something has to do with the fact that even before the return of the land and the houses and the money, the settlers' first act of expiation toward the natives of this land must be to restore to them their dignity, their memory, their justness. But that is just what we are incapable of doing. Our past won't allow us to do it. Our past forces us to believe in the project of a Jewish nation-state that is a hopeless cause. Our past prevents us from seeing that the whole story of Jewish sovereignty in the Land of Israel is over. Israel as a Jewish state can no longer exist here. In the long term, Israel as a Jewish state will not be able to exist.<sup>62</sup>

And Meron Benvenisti, former deputy mayor of Jerusalem, is unequivocal when he states, "today we are living in a bi-national reality, and it is a permanent given. It cannot be ignored and it cannot be denied. What we have to do is adapt our thinking and our concepts to this reality. We have to

---

<sup>62</sup> Shavit, Ari. (August 7, 2003). Cry, the beloved two-state solution. *Haaertz*. [http://www.monabaker.com/pMachine/more.php?id=A1111\\_0\\_1\\_0\\_M](http://www.monabaker.com/pMachine/more.php?id=A1111_0_1_0_M).

look for a new model that will fit this reality. And the right questions have to be asked, even if they give the impression of a betrayal of Zionism; even if they give the feeling that one is abandoning the dream of establishing a Jewish nation-state in the Land of Israel.”<sup>63</sup>

Israel, which has sought to maintain a Jewish majority and possession of as much land as possible, now has to come to grips with the reality its dream of a Jewish, democratic state is no longer achievable. Ironically, it is not the Palestinians who are responsible for the quandary Israel now faces, but erroneous and short-sighted decisions and policies undertaken by Israel have left it potentially guilty of its own demise. But all hope is not lost for the future. Israel can still guarantee its survival if it accepts an exclusive ethno-religious state has no place in the modern world. Just as the Israelis are not going to disappear or abandon the land, they must understand and accept neither will the Palestinians.

---

<sup>63</sup> Shavit, Ari. (August 7, 2003). Cry, the beloved two-state solution. Haaertz. [http://www.monabaker.com/pMachine/more.php?id=A1111\\_0\\_1\\_0\\_M](http://www.monabaker.com/pMachine/more.php?id=A1111_0_1_0_M).

## *The Model of One-State*

The great advantage of the one state solution is that it allows all peoples to live freely within the entire state enjoying equal individual and collective political rights, while preserving their own ethnic and cultural identities and communities. Furthermore, a single state can potentially put an end to years of acrimonious disputes about territory, population, and historical injustices bringing about a real opportunity for stability in an often violent and chaotic region. The physical impossibility of two states means the single state alternative is the only practical alternative remaining. But a single state option does not necessarily mean a single option for statehood. In other words, there are many examples of what constitutes a single state. It could be a federation or unitary state with either a presidential or parliamentary system.<sup>64</sup> A bi-national state where the two peoples share the country but remain ethnically separated, or an integrated, secular, democratic state based on individual citizenship and equal rights like those found in most Western liberal democracies.<sup>65</sup> It has been a common refrain among detractors of the one-state solution that previous models or precedents are not applicable to Israel/Palestine because of the seemingly intractable nature of the conflict. But this argument negates the fact other violent and apparently insoluble conflicts have been ended through a variety of peacemaking and state-building

---

<sup>64</sup> Abunimah, Ali. (2006). *One Country A Bold Proposal to End the Israeli-Palestinian Impasse*. New York, New York. Metropolitan Books. Pg. 109.

<sup>65</sup> Karmi, Ghada. (2011). The One-State Solution: An Alternative Vision for Israeli-Palestinian Peace. *The Journal of Palestine Studies*. Vol. 40, No. 2. Winter 2011.

strategies. When one looks at the Israeli-Palestinian conflict there are a few recent examples in modern history which can be used as blueprints for achieving a peaceful solution.

Though each conflict is unique in its own right, there still remains striking similarities between experiences in such cases as South Africa, Northern Ireland, and the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. In addition, the cases of Belgium and Switzerland will be discussed since they demonstrate how some democratic countries have successfully managed conflicts between ethnic, religious, and linguistic communities. In South Africa during the apartheid era there existed a systemic and structural discrimination, while in Northern Ireland the conflict was steeped in major historical and ethnic tensions. Though both these conflicts went on for decades, eventually a peaceful solution was attained. Analyzing the differences and similarities between all these cases will lead to a better understanding for the chances of success in a single state for Israelis and Palestinians.

### *The South Africa and Northern Ireland Option*

Inevitable comparisons have been made between the old apartheid regime that existed in South Africa and the current situation of the Palestinians living under Israeli occupation. Though there are certain differences in their stated policies, the comparisons between the two states reveal a strikingly similar history. Coincidentally, both South Africa and Israel trace their beginnings to the year 1948. The Afrikaner Nationalist Party gained

control in South Africa, and Palestine was partitioned by the United Nations. South Africa was one of the first countries in the world to recognize Israel, and its Prime Minister D.F. Malan was the first foreign chief of government to visit it. The connection between the newly founded governments was evident from the start, as both felt that their victories were achieved by some divine right they were destined to achieve. They believed their successes were based on the fact a much more superior people and society had overtaken backward, inferior territories and transformed them into legitimate, civilized states. The white, South African Nationalists believed that they were “*par excellence* the nation of the Book; Zionist Jews were returning to the promised land of their ancestors that had been given to them by God.”<sup>66</sup>

Since both states drew inspiration from the colonial model of conquest, land was extremely important to both Israel and South Africa. The success of these states depended on the deliberate dispossession of the indigenous populations. As discussed previously, the settlers in both states relied and unabashedly promoted the myth of “empty lands”. Contrary to these myths, however, both South Africa and Palestine were inhabited by other peoples, South Africa by black Africans and Palestine by Palestinian Arabs. When the Dutch settlers arrived in the Cape of Good Hope in 1652, the land was already inhabited by native Africans. By the time of the creation of the Union in 1910, the settler society had consolidated its land base in South Africa, and the

---

<sup>66</sup> Davis, Uri. (2003). *Apartheid Israel: Possibilities for the Struggle Within*. London. Zed Books.

Africans were confined by law to certain areas referred to as “reserves”. Eventually these “reserves” were converted into ten “homelands”, which constituted less than 8 percent, later expanded to the 13 percent, of the total land area of the Republic. The white, ruling government then drafted what was commonly known as the Land Act, which confined African purchases and agriculture to these generally unproductive areas. <sup>67</sup> As George Fredrickson describes, “The architects of the Land Act of 1913 had certainly not envisioned a total and permanent partition of population; in fact their main concern was to increase the supply of labor available to white farmers and industrialists by stifling the incipient growth of an African peasant class outside the reserved areas.”<sup>68</sup>

Zionist propaganda also relied on the “land without a people for a people without a land” myth. Unfortunately for these settlers, however, this assertion was totally untrue. In his classical work on early Zionism *The Crisis*, Hillel Zeitlen charged that what the Zionists bent on settlement “forgot, mistakenly or maliciously, is that Palestine belongs to others, and *is totally inhabited*.”<sup>69</sup> In any case, Zionist settlers did enter Palestine and eventually forcibly removed the native Arabs from the land. Only a small percentage of the population remained in Israel, while the rest were either forced out and became refugees in

---

<sup>67</sup> Will, Donald. Ryan, Sheila. (1990). *Israel and South Africa: Legal Systems of Settler Dominance*. New Jersey. Africa World Press.

<sup>68</sup> Fredrickson, George. (1981). *White Supremacy: A Comparative Study in American and South African History*. Oxford. Oxford university Press.

<sup>69</sup> Finkelstein, Norman. (2003). *Image and Reality of the Israel/Palestine Conflict*. New York. Verso Books.

camps in the West Bank, Gaza, Lebanon, Egypt, Syria, and Jordan. Israeli government officials recognizing the problem they had, devised a set of laws to ensure Palestinians, both inside of Israel and in the West Bank and Gaza, would never have the opportunity to reclaim their lost lands or purchase new property. These laws were created not only to expropriate land belonging to Palestinian refugees, but also to some of those belonging to the minority Palestinian population who were able to remain inside Israel proper.

The Law of Acquisition of Absentees' Property gave settlers the right to lease or even dispose of property belonging not only to refugees forcibly removed, but also because of the irregular wording of the law, Palestinians who had not even left their homes.<sup>70</sup> Fundamentally, what this law meant was that Palestinian refugees, referred to by Israeli law as "absentees", could never claim land they were displaced from, which under the Geneva Conventions had every right to return to, and even more amazingly the government could marshal the homes while Palestinians still lived in them. As Sir John Hope Simpson, who studied the situation in British Mandate Palestine for the British government commented, "It ceases to be land from which the Arab can gain any advantage now or in the future. Not only can he never hope to lease or cultivate it, but by the stringent provisions of the lease of the Jewish National Fund, he is deprived forever from employment on the land."<sup>71</sup> The Jewish National Fund was an

---

<sup>70</sup> Jiryis, Sabri. (1976). *The Arabs in Israel*. New York. Monthly Review Press.

<sup>71</sup> Will, Donald. Ryan, Sheila. (1990). *Israel and South Africa: Legal Systems of Settler Dominance*. New Jersey. Africa World Press.

organization created by the first Zionists back in 1901 to secure landownership for Jews in Palestine. In the present time, The Jewish National Fund is a quasi-governmental organization owning approximately 13 percent of state land in Israel; land which it has consistently refused to sell or lease to the non-Jewish population.<sup>72</sup>

Other laws enacted include the Defense Laws of 1945 which gave a military governor the power to declare an area “closed”, thus denying villagers who fled or were expelled from their homes the right to return. And the Emergency Laws of 1949 gave the Minister of Defense of the Israel government the power to declare an area a “Security Area” and expel the inhabitants from it.<sup>73</sup> Through these laws the lands of refugees were taken, as well as most of the lands belonging to Palestinians who remained in the state of Israel. Over 90 percent of the land within the borders of the state is presently held either by the state itself or by the Jewish National Fund, meaning Palestinians cannot return to homes they were forced out of, cannot purchase any land even if they had the money to pay for it, and cannot try to lease or work on land officially reserved for Israeli Jews. It must be noted that these laws not only apply to Palestinians who live in the West Bank and Gaza who do not possess Israeli citizenship, but also to those Israeli Arabs who under the laws of the state are given “full political rights” like Jewish Israelis.

---

<sup>72</sup> Pfeffer, Anshel. Stern Yoav. (September 24, 2007). High Court delays ruling on JNF land sales to non-Jews. *Haaretz*. <http://www.haaretz.com/news/high-court-delays-ruling-on-jnf-land-sales-to-non-jews-1.229946>.

<sup>73</sup> Jiryis, Sabri. (1976). *The Arabs in Israel*. New York. Monthly Review Press.

In addition to the many similarities the two states shared, there are some differences between the two states which merit discussion. Unlike South Africa which served a geo-strategic, economic purpose for the great colonial powers, Israel was created to solve a political problem. The Afrikaner project was also different in that it wanted to subjugate and rule over the black population, while the Zionist project wanted to negate the idea of a non-Jewish population. In the case of South Africa, the state developed a policy of “separate development” and “independent homelands”. These designated areas gave control of only 13 percent of the total land of South Africa, and was deliberately meant to deny any citizenship rights to black Africans, knowing that giving them citizenship would have to include them into the democratic process. By keeping the black Africans entrenched in this 13 percent and effectively excluded from holding any meaningful government positions, the white minority government could keep total state and governmental control.<sup>74</sup>

The case of Israel, however, was more complicated based on various reasons. First, Israel is much smaller geographically than South Africa; therefore, there was not enough land to separate the indigenous populations into small cantons away from the settler population. Second, unlike the whites of South Africa who wanted to rule over the population, the Zionist settlers goal from the beginning was to cleanse the land of the native inhabitants. The ultimate objective of these Zionist settlers was to establish an exclusively

---

<sup>74</sup> Will, Donald. Ryan, Sheila. (1990). *Israel and South Africa: Legal Systems of Settler Dominance*. New Jersey. Africa World Press.

Jewish state, which entailed forcibly removing Palestinian Arabs. Finally, if Israel chose to abide by the democratic process, it would mean rights would have to be given not just to Palestinians who remained in Israel after 1948, but also all the refugees evicted from their lands and homes by the creation of the state of Israel.

History has shown time and time again that trying to achieve security through violence and the subjugation of another is futile- unless complete genocide is committed. Privileged groups have always felt insecure about relinquishing their privileges, both for the obvious reason of power, and from fear of being consumed by the majority. As the last apartheid-era South African president F.W. de Klerk speaking about Afrikaner nationalism states that it “was our conviction that without apartheid, our people would be swamped by the vast black majority- and this would inevitably lead to the extinction of our own hard-won right to national self-determination.”<sup>75</sup> It is a similar feared voiced by many Israelis that a one-state solution would not only mean the end of a Jewish state, but would also threaten the very existence of the Jewish people under fear of reprisals and revenge at the hands of Palestinians- based on the racist assumption Palestinians are inherently violent and unable to engage and adapt to the tenets of the democratic ideal.

Another example would be the case of Northern Ireland, where Protestant Unionists and Catholic Republicans fought for decades before a peace deal was

---

<sup>75</sup> de Klerk. F.W. (1999). *The Last Trek*. London. Pan Books. Pg. 16.

reached with the 1998 Good Friday Agreements. The Unionists, backed by the British government, dominated the government in Northern Ireland and clearly enjoyed an economic advantage compared with Catholics who suffered years of disenfranchisement and exclusion. Both sides had to abandon their claims to exclusive ethnic possession of the land and begin a reconciliation process based on the democratic process. Through a varying set of agreements, both agreed to respect the political and human rights of the other, and recognize the traditions of each of Northern Ireland's communities. Like the case of South Africa, the agreement in Northern Ireland was based on the fundamental recognition by the privileged party (the Protestants) that maintenance of the status quo was untenable, and the only way towards a peaceful resolution was the acceptance of a negotiated power sharing agreement between the two sides. The Northern Ireland conflict can also serve as a valuable lesson on the need to include all parties in the negotiated process. The Protestant Unionists designated the Irish Republican Army as "terrorists", but when the time came for a peacemaking settlement the IRA was included in the process. The same would have to be done with parties like Hamas which Israel designates a "terrorist organization". Peace is not made between friends, it is made between enemies. Therefore, a solution can only be successful if all parties are included in the process; no matter how despicably one side is viewed by the other.

## *The Belgium and Switzerland Option*

In addition to the examples of South Africa and Northern Ireland, there are also two more options to consider when debating the nature of the one-state solution -those of Belgium and Switzerland. Both states are based on a federalist system which incorporates and addresses the needs of the various communities in existence. Belgium has a parliamentary system with universal suffrage, and the country is split between the two main groups, the Flemish and the Walloons. About 60 percent of the population lives in the Flemish region, while the Walloons comprise some 30 percent of the remaining population. Belgian political parties only run candidates in their own region and language and the Flemish region elects about 60 percent of the seats in parliament-proportional to the total population.<sup>76</sup> Canada has a similar system split between the French and English speaking parts of the country. Because of the similarities in geography, demographics, and two distinct communities, Belgium can be used to determine the success of such a system in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Though plagued by violence and bitterness in the past, in the present day Belgians rely heavily on negotiations to find a middle ground. Although neither side is completely satisfied with certain political outcomes, they are not discontented enough to take up arms and start a bloody conflict. It must be noted, however, that in the last few years Belgium has undergone a political crisis with the country having no elected government in the last fifteen

---

<sup>76</sup> Abunimah, Ali. (2006). *One Country A Bold Proposal to End the Israeli-Palestinian Impasse*. New York, New York. Metropolitan Books. Pg. 115-116.

months.<sup>77</sup> Though presently Belgium is not a model of political stability, Israelis and Palestinians can only hope for an instability similar to that which exists in Belgium today.

If there is a model of political stability that can also serve as a framework for a single state, then Switzerland is certainly an excellent example. Like Belgium, Switzerland's political system relies on a federalist form of government which decentralizes authority to each of its 26 self-governing cantons.<sup>78</sup> But whereas Belgium has been plagued in the past by violent conflict between its two groups, the Swiss have largely avoided any ethnic tensions, and unlike Belgium Switzerland does not suffer from the alienation of one ethnic group from another. Germans, French, and Italians all live and move freely about the country and each group is allowed to administer and govern its own respective populations with the federal government handling such tasks as foreign affairs and the management of currency.<sup>79</sup> The Swiss model is not unlike the United States where individual states are left alone to manage and govern their own affairs answering to the federal government only in national matters.

---

<sup>77</sup> Price, Matthew. (June 15, 2011). Belgium still without a government. *BBC News*. <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-europe-13773297>.

<sup>78</sup> Kincaid, John. Tarr, Alan. eds. (2005). *Constitutional Origins, Structure, and Change in Federal Countries*. Montreal. Queen's University Press.

<sup>79</sup> Reding, Andrew. (June 26, 2002). Call it Israel-Palestine – Try Federal Solution in the Middle East. *Pacific News Service*. <http://www.worldpolicy.org/sites/default/files/uploaded/image/PNS-2002-Swiss%20set%20good%20example%20for%20a%20new%20Palestine-Israel.pdf>.

## *Potential Framework for a Single State*

Based on the previous examples, Israelis and Palestinians do have a number of options to consider when the time arrives to determine how their new state would look like. However, debating the state's precise design at this point would be premature. Like the case of South Africa, the transition to statehood must first be preceded by intense discussions on such issues as security, economics, political and individual freedoms. Changing attitudes, preparing and informing citizens of both sides on the need and necessity for patience, compromise, and negotiations will arguably prove more difficult than the state building process itself. Expecting either side to simply forget or set aside decades of acrimony, bloodshed, and violent history in a short time would be naïve and unrealistic. The entire process will take time and enormous amounts of effort, but it is not impossible. Before a specific model of government is chosen, it would be important to discuss a set of principles which could serve as a preliminary framework. Drawing inspiration from past peace agreements in South Africa and North Ireland and from circumstances unique to this particular conflict, the following principles can serve as a possible blueprint for a future one state solution:

1. Recognize the rights of all citizens regardless of race, ethnicity, and religious background. All shall be equal under the laws of the state. The law shall enshrine the separation of church and state. Religious

- traditions can be recognized and respected but the state will remain the ultimate authority on legal matters and maintain strict neutrality in religious affairs.
2. Acknowledge the unique culture and histories of Jews and Palestinians within the land while respecting the right of any citizen who does not wish to be identified or belong to either community. Granting a degree of autonomy to each community to pursue and preserve its own linguistic and cultural traditions is also possible.
  3. All citizens will be allowed the right to freedom of movement and be permitted to seek residence of their choosing eliminating any form of land tenure and ownership based on ethnic or religious background.
  4. Shared responsibility for the city of Jerusalem and its holy sites while recognizing the unique history and importance to all Christians, Muslims, and Jews throughout the world. Each quarter can be administered by its respective religious denomination. If the parties cannot reach any workable agreement, then there is also the option of internationalizing the city and placing its jurisdiction under a panel of various religious and international administrators.
  5. Negotiate a just and practical resolution to the Palestinian refugee issue. While acknowledging that the Palestinian right of return is a principle protected under international law, allowing the return of a vast number of refugees would upset the population balance in the country. Those Palestinians not wishing to return or choose to settle

- elsewhere shall be granted just compensation. Jewish immigration must also be monitored and negotiated for the same reasons.
6. Create a centralized education system which offers equal opportunities for both communities and oversees education for the entire country. Taking into account cultural and linguistic differences, the state can create mechanisms allowing a degree of autonomy for each community to decide on educational matters pertaining to their respective communities. However, the state is the ultimate arbiter in ensuring against any form of discrimination, racism, or segregation.
  7. The state must actively pursue and promote equal economic opportunities for all citizens. Any sort of special financial privileges based on race, ethnicity, or religion must be abolished. Employers cannot allow any discriminatory hiring practices and all workers must be paid fair and minimum wages set by the discretion of the state.

Of course, the principles set forth are general and vague in nature, but are only meant to serve the specific purpose of a starting point and highlight what a future agreement might entail. Judging by the current circumstances, it would be a serious stretch of the imagination to believe all problems can and will be solved without serious compromises from both communities. Since every case is unique in its own right, it would be too simplistic and unreasonable to believe that merely transporting any of the aforementioned

scenarios would immediately result in a solution to the daunting task that lay ahead. Success depends heavily on the distinctive factors that shape the needs and requirements of this particular conflict. Either Israelis and Palestinians choose to follow the South African model of a unified, democratic state with the principles of one-person, one-vote, or they choose the Swiss model where separate Israeli and Palestinian administrative units are linked to a centralized federal government, it does not change the fact a two-state solution is no longer applicable. The question is not whether Israelis and Palestinians will end up coexisting in a single state, but when and in what capacity.

## *Advantages of the One-State Solution*

In the previous chapters, the success of the one-state solution has been primarily based on the factors of practicality and inevitability driven by the policies, decision-making, and “facts on the ground”. The one-state solution should not be viewed by Israelis or Palestinians as a defeat or capitulation. Despite the difficulties, a single state can be advantageous in a variety of ways for both parties. Like the one-state solution, the choice of opting for two independent states does not guarantee a successful conclusion to the conflict. Creating two states could arguably prolong the conflict, because border disputes and unresolved injustices can linger and eventually create more and deeper problems for the future. But a one-state solution cannot only address many deeply rooted grievances; it can also possibly serve as a starting point for reconciliation and a truly lasting peace.

Despite the fears and misgivings of many Israelis, the one-state solution could be a benefit which gives them the two things they most desire- peace and security. Since its founding in 1948, Israel has been plagued by numerous wars, occupations, and security issues. Because of its conflict with the Palestinians, and the Arab world at large, Israel has had to rely on its military superiority and the unconditional backing of the United States to achieve security. But as history has shown lasting security can never be attained simply through the use of force. A just and peaceful resolution can only come through compromise and negotiation. The reliance on military means has failed

to bring peace to Israelis, and one could argue it has only exacerbated the situation, further endangered Israeli lives, and made Palestinians more determined and steadfast in continuing an armed struggle. Only addressing the legitimate grievances of the Palestinians will lead to the elusive peace and security so fervently sought after by Israelis. The one-solution will not only solve the conflict with the Palestinians, it can also bring about numerous changes which would be in the better interest for Israel's future.

First, having Israelis and Palestinians coexist in a single state would lead to more integration, which could possibly lead to less acrimony and distrust. By having the two peoples live together, it creates a degree of mutual interdependence, invariably leading to the conclusion that sharing the land and a future would create a variety of long-term benefits for both sides. As international lawyer and UN Special Rapporteur on Palestinian human rights Richard Falk responded when asked about the viability of a one-state solution, "Well of course there are many variations of how a one-state solution would be actualized in practice, and so it's hard to anticipate exactly how it would work. But it would overcome, if it was well implemented, this sense of hatred and hostility between these two peoples and convey the sense that they're sharing land, resources, and political destiny, and that this represents the best hope of the modern vision of a sovereign state."<sup>80</sup> Up until recently, the prevailing argument has been that separation between the two peoples in two states

---

<sup>80</sup> Movement for One Democratic State in Palestine. (November 1, 2010). *Dr. Richard Falk Endorses One State In Israel-Palestine*. <http://www.countercurrents.org/ods011110.htm>.

bought the best chance of success for a resolution. But not only is the two-state solution simply unrealistic at this point, it is also arguably the option that brings less, not more peace and security. An independent Palestinian state which is neither economically viable nor in control of its own borders would have little if any chance of success. Israel would find itself in the very same predicament it has fought for decades to avoid- more instability in an already unstable region. But by accepting Palestinians and affording equal status in a single state, Israel can ensure any conflicts needing to be resolved would be done by the ballot box rather than the barrel of a gun.

A second advantage a one-state solution would bring to Israelis is the regional stability such a proposal would create. The conflict with Palestinians is still Israel's first priority, because it directly affects the day to day lives of ordinary Israelis, and is for all intents and purposes an internal matter. But peace with the neighboring Arab countries is also a massively important issue for the security and future of Israel. Israel, being a nuclear power and possessing one of the most formidable militaries in the world does not face an imminent threat of danger from its neighbors, because most of the surrounding Arab nations are weak militarily and economically. Israel has signed peace treaties with both Egypt and Jordan; a peace that has lasted many years and in both cases is in no danger of reverting to an armed conflict. Israel's other Arab neighbors Lebanon and Syria pose no immediate military threat to Israel. Both states face severe economic and political problems which would prohibit

them from attempting any military action against Israel; attempting to do so would not only be too costly it would be foolish as well.

However, where Israel does have cause for concern is the overwhelming anti-Israeli sentiment among the populations of the aforementioned countries. Recent events that have caused the overthrow of the old, autocratic regimes could pose serious problems for Israel in the near future. In the past, Israel has relied on pro-American Arab dictators and kings to suppress popular opinion and keep the order within their borders.<sup>81</sup> The “Arab Spring” that has swept across the Arab world initiating regime change in countries such as Egypt, Tunisia, and Libya would mean the blanket of security Israel counted on in the past can no longer be relied upon in the future. A peaceful solution with the Palestinians would not only prevent Israel from facing an internal threat, it would also allow Israel to eliminate external threats and normalize relations with its Arab neighbors. Considering the enmities that exist in the region between Israel and the Arab world, this proposal would seem fantastical and far-fetched. However, serious peace negotiations have actually been conducted between Israel and Syria, and Israel has signaled in the past that it would be willing to negotiate peace with Hezbollah and Hamas.<sup>82</sup>

---

<sup>81</sup> Ignatius, David. (September 13, 2011). Israel’s new problem with the Arab Street. *The Washington Post*. [http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/israels-new-problem-with-the-arab-street/2011/09/13/gIQAzdaQK\\_story.html](http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/israels-new-problem-with-the-arab-street/2011/09/13/gIQAzdaQK_story.html).

<sup>82</sup> Wheeler, Carolyne. (June 18, 2008). Israel hints at peace with Hizbollah. *The Telegraph*. <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/middleeast/israel/2151997/Israel-hints-at-peace-with-Hizbollah.html>.

The final advantage of a single state would be the improvement of Israel's standing and image within the international community. Because of its policies towards the Palestinians, Israel suffers from a very negative image and has faced various calls for boycotts and divestments from countries around the world. It has been repeatedly compared to apartheid South Africa and is condemned for its perceived over-reliance on violence and military actions- an accusation often leveled by Israelis themselves.<sup>83</sup> In a study called the National Brands Index, Israel placed at the bottom of the list in the public's perception of its image. "Israel's brand is by a considerable margin the most negative we have ever measured in the NBI, and comes at the bottom of the ranking on almost every question," states report author Simon Anholt.<sup>84</sup> And in an unpublished survey conducted by the European Commission, 59 percent of the 7,500 Europeans polled considered Israel the "top threat to world peace".<sup>85</sup> Many Israelis recognize the fact their state is suffering from a serious image problem that is growing with each passing day a solution becomes less and less probable. Even the Israeli government, which implemented the controversial policies in the first place, has now begun to worry about Israel's declining public image and has launched a campaign to paint Israel in a more positive light.<sup>86</sup> But in the present day of countless and instant sources of information,

---

<sup>83</sup> Laor. Yitzhak. (November 8, 2009). Israel's apartheid is worse than South Africa's. *Haaretz*. <http://www.haaretz.com/print-edition/opinion/israel-s-apartheid-is-worse-than-south-africa-s-1.4590>.

<sup>84</sup> Cravatts. Richard. (February 16, 2007). The Brand Image of Nations: Israel. *American Thinker*. [http://www.americanthinker.com/2007/02/the\\_brand\\_image\\_of\\_nations\\_isr.html](http://www.americanthinker.com/2007/02/the_brand_image_of_nations_isr.html).

<sup>85</sup> Beaumont. Peter. (November 1, 2003). Israel outraged as EU poll names it a threat to peace. *The Guardian*. <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2003/nov/02/israel.eu>.

<sup>86</sup> Bronner. Ethan. (February 17, 2010). Positive Views of Israel, Brought to You by Israelis. *The New York Times*. <http://www.nytimes.com/2010/02/18/world/middleeast/18israel.html>.

spinning or concealing the truth of what is truly happening has become virtually impossible. Simply relying on a public relations campaign and political propaganda to shift global opinion will not work; the only successful option Israel has in improving its image abroad is to take meaningful and concrete steps in a negotiated settlement with the Palestinians.

Palestinians would also greatly benefit from seeking a one-state solution despite the difficult compromises needed to be made. For the Palestinians, compromise has been something they have been forced to make since the beginning of the conflict. This does not absolve Palestinians or the Palestinian leadership over the years of making poor or counterproductive decisions; it simply acknowledges the asymmetrical nature of the conflict, and the reality that Palestinians as the weaker side have, more often than not, been obligated to accept or adapt to consequences they had little control over. Palestinians believe they have already compromised enough agreeing to the creation of a state on only 22 percent of their historic homeland; therefore, they should not be asked to cede even more land to Israel's control. Realistically speaking, the Palestinians understand what they desire and believe they are entitled to, is not necessarily what they are going to receive. Palestinians also know that they are in no position of strength to demand or conduct negotiations on an equal footing with the Israelis. Therefore, it would be in their best interest to seriously consider the one-state alternative since Israeli policies have destroyed any hope for a two-state settlement. Understandably for Palestinians, this

would be another compromise they would have to endure. But for a number of reasons this could be the solution bringing the most benefits in the long term.

The first advantage would be the end of the occupation, and by extension the oppression, of the Palestinian population. If Israel has no desire to relinquish the land or grant Palestinians the independent state they desire, then the only remaining option would be to grant Palestinians citizenship and incorporate them into the political system. Palestinians are clearly aware incessant settlement activity would mean an independent state is no longer a feasible option. Any state created under the present circumstances would be nothing more than a non-contiguous, potentially unstable entity which would be dwarfed by a much more powerful and advanced neighboring Israel. Furthermore, past Israeli proposals of an independent Palestinian state would have actually meant giving up *more* land than what Palestinians already possessed. The prevailing argument among many Israeli leaders has been there are “no partners for peace” on the Palestinian side, and that Palestinians have rejected generous Israeli proposals in the past - namely at Camp David in 2000. However, this argument has been debunked as myth by various independent, as well as Israeli observers, who were present at the summit and concluded that Israel never attended seeking any sort of compromise, rather they were looking for Palestinian concessions. <sup>87 88</sup>

---

<sup>87</sup> Swisher, Clayton. (2004). *The Truth About Camp David*. New York. Nation Books.

<sup>88</sup> Shamir, Shimon. Maddy-Weitzman, Bruce. eds. (2005). *The Camp David Summit- What Went Wrong?* Brighton, UK. Sussex Academic Press.

Abandoning the idea of an independent Palestinian state and demanding equal rights would place the onus of negotiating a just and final solution squarely on the shoulders of the Israeli state. A scenario which would leave the Israelis with the choices of withdrawing to the 1967 borders, committing ethnic cleansing or mass expulsion against the Palestinians, or maintaining the status quo of an apartheid-like system in the occupied territories- all options Israel is either unwilling or unable to pursue. What would benefit Palestinians most in this situation would be the demand for full democracy, even it means the end of Palestinian national aspirations; a likely predicament that has not escaped the attention of many Israelis. As former prime minister Ehud Olmert states, "More and more Palestinians are uninterested in a negotiated, two-state solution, because they want to change the essence of the conflict from an Algerian paradigm to a South African one. From a struggle against 'occupation,' in their parlance, to a struggle for one-man-one-vote. That is, of course, a much cleaner struggle, a much more popular struggle - and ultimately a much more powerful one."<sup>89</sup>

The second advantage of a one-state solution for Palestinians is not necessarily an advantage per se; it is actually the realization that an independent Palestinian state is not only unlikely to happen, but if it does happen, the state Palestinians create would not really be a state at all. In other words, Palestinians can turn a negative reality by using Israel's destructive

---

<sup>89</sup> Landau. David. (November 13, 2003). 'Maximum Jews, minimum Palestinians'. *Haaretz*. <http://www.haaretz.com/general/maximum-jews-minimum-palestinians-1.105562>.

policies to create potential advantages by dropping the impractical plan of independent statehood in favor of opting for a one-state solution. As discussed in the previous chapters, Israel has no true intention of allowing the creation of a Palestinian state, and if it does allow a state to be formed then Israel would surely do everything it can to have as much control as possible over the future Palestinian state. Israeli officials have clearly stated in the past that any future Palestinian state would have to accept being demilitarized and accept Israel's control over its airspace and borders.<sup>90</sup> UCLA professor Saree Makdisi believes a two-state solution under this sort of scenario would be impossible due to the "grossly" unequal status of the two sides. "If a two-state solution were to be passed, the only Palestinian state Israel would approve of is a Palestinian nation that is stripped of any means of self-defense and territorial defenses," he said. "A state like that would look more or less like the present reality [of Palestine]."<sup>91</sup> A non- contiguous Palestinian state stripped of its own defenses and not in control of its own borders not only hampers the state's ability to properly function when it came to matters of security, it would also potentially stunt any independent economic growth since imports and exports would most likely be monitored and approved by the Israeli government.

In recent months, Palestinian leaders have begun taking unilateral steps to declaring independent statehood, culminating in the September 2011 United

---

<sup>90</sup> The Reut Institute. (July 23, 2009). *Demilitarized Palestinian State*. <http://reut-institute.org/en/Publication.aspx?PublicationId=3679>.

<sup>91</sup> Khuder. Suha. (October 14, 2010). Speaker discusses one-state solution. *The Independent Collegian*. <http://www.independentcollegian.com/speaker-discusses-one-state-solution-1.2365678#.TriDQmvCKSp>.

Nations bid to create a Palestinian state. Though support for a Palestinian state drew support from nations and peoples around the world, the bid for UN membership will not bring any concrete changes for Palestinians and their desire for independent statehood. Israel was vehemently opposed to the Palestinian bid and warned of severe repercussions, while the United States has promised to use its Security Council veto to thwart any vote concerning the issue.<sup>92</sup> Since application of the resolution requires Security Council approval, the vote essentially is nothing more than a symbolic gesture which brings no practical effects for a resolution to the conflict. A legal opinion issued by Senior Research Fellow at Oxford University Guy S. Goodwin-Gill explains the bid for statehood by stating the following:

Until such a time as a final settlement is agreed, the putative State of Palestine will have no territory over which it exercises effective sovereignty, its borders will be indeterminate or disputed, its population, actual and potential, undetermined and many of them continuing to live under occupation or in States of refuge. While it may be an observer State in the United Nations, it will fall short of meeting the internationally agreed criteria of statehood, with serious implications for Palestinians at large, particularly as concerns the popular representation of those not currently present in the Occupied Palestinian Territory.

---

<sup>92</sup> Bowen, Jeremy. (September 23, 2011). Palestinian statehood bid: Useful points scored at UN. *BBCNews*. <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-middle-east-15045011>.

In fact, there is the possibility the bid could turn out to counterproductive for Palestinians, because Israel, and to a certain extent the United States, would use the vote as an excuse to take even harsher punitive measures to punish Palestinians. Almost immediately following Palestine's successful bid to join UNESCO, Israel accelerated construction of 2000 Jewish homes in the West Bank and East Jerusalem, and imposed a temporary halt on the transfer of tax revenues which it collects on behalf of the Palestinian Authority.<sup>93</sup> Furthermore, a Palestinian push for a two-state solution based on the assumption a bid for statehood would force the Israelis into meaningful negotiations is not only naïve it is also untrue. Realistically, Israel can adopt and initiate any policy or decision it desires because the balance of power is heavily skewed in its favor and it benefits from the military, political, and economic protection of the United States. Gidi Grinstein, a member of Ehud Barak's negotiating team at Camp David in 2000, spelled out the strategic benefits of Palestinian statehood for Israel when he stated, "A declaration of a Palestinian state in September includes the possibility of a diplomatic breakthrough as well as significant advantages for Israel. The establishment of such a state will help anchor the principle of two states for two peoples, shape the permanent situation with Israel controlling the security assets and the new state's surroundings, and diminish the refugee problem by marginalizing

---

<sup>93</sup> Sherwood. Harriet. (November 1, 2011). Israel rushes settlement growth after Unesco accepts Palestinians. The Guardian. <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2011/nov/01/israel-settlement-growth-unesco-vote-palestinians>.

UNRWA [the United Nations relief and works agency] and limiting refugee status."<sup>94</sup>

The final advantage of a one-state solution is the sense of justice it would bring to Palestinians after many decades of war, dispossession, and oppression. The Palestinian people existing in the Middle Eastern region are essentially split into three distinct camps – those living in the West Bank and Gaza, those Palestinians living in scattered refugee camps around the region, and finally Palestinians who are citizens in the state of Israel. Each group is striving to achieve justice in its own way, and each group benefits from the one-state solution, perhaps not separately, but differently. One must be realistic, and Palestinians certainly are, that an honest and total remedy to the historical and present injustices committed against them can and will never be fully realized. Palestinians displaced during the founding of the state of Israel in 1948 that have been languishing in refugee camps ever since will not be allowed to return en masse to the homes they were forced to abandon and evacuate by Israeli forces. Even if Israelis agreed to allow an independent Palestinian state to be created, this new Palestinian state would have enough trouble accommodating the millions already existing in its borders, let alone millions of returning refugees from other parts of the world. Because of the size and availability of limited resources, the land simply cannot sustain such a large population. Though the right of return for Palestinian refugees is

---

<sup>94</sup> Hasan. Mehdi. (September 1, 2011). A State of Palestine would backfire on its own people. <http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2011/sep/01/state-palestine-play-into-israeli-hands>.

guaranteed under international law and is considered one of the pillars of Palestinian nationalist discourse, for many years Palestinian leaders have understood and begrudgingly accepted a complete right of return will never materialize. But this does not mean that the rights of those refugees can be dismissed; neither the state of Israel nor Palestinian leaders can forego the rightful legal and moral claims the refugees possess. There are no precise figures for how many Palestinian refugees would actually want to return. Many of them are already well established, and have built new lives in countries around the world. An alternative solution would be to allow a limited number of refugees to return, and for those not wishing to return the option of receiving a just compensation as affirmed under United Nations resolution 194.<sup>95</sup>

Professor Virginia Tilley puts forth a solution when she proposes the following:

Establish some parity principle for Palestinian return: for example, provide for some initial adjustment period to repatriate Palestinian refugees who wish to return, then, if the state feels compelled to limit immigration for logistical reasons, insure the annual quotas for Palestinians at least match annual Jewish immigration numbers. Second- and third- generation Palestinians not born in the territory should be held to the same naturalization criteria applied to prospective Jewish citizens.<sup>96</sup>

---

<sup>95</sup> The United Nations. (December 11, 1948). *Palestine -- Progress Report of the United Nations Mediator*. <http://unispal.un.org/UNISPAL.NSF/0/C758572B78D1CD0085256BCF0077E51A>.

<sup>96</sup> Tilley, Virginia. (2005). *The One State Solution : A breakthrough for peace in the Israeli Palestinian deadlock*. Ann Arbor. University of Michigan Press. Pg. 222.

Proposals like Tilley's are not only important and beneficial because they provide a concrete framework; they also address the needs and concerns of both sides- Palestinian refugees desire for justice, as well as Israeli concerns about a vast influx of non-Jewish immigrants.

Because so much focus is placed on the plight of Palestinians in the territories and those in the refugee camps, an oft forgotten or less discussed subject is that of Israeli Arabs. Arab citizens of Israel face a litany of discriminatory and exclusionary policies aimed at marginalizing and repressing the minority that constitutes 20 percent of Israel's total population. Over the course of several decades, the state of Israel has enacted a series of laws and amendments which target Arab Israelis, essentially institutionalizing racism and discrimination at the very highest levels of government.

In a study conducted by Israel's Courts Administration and the Israel Bar Association, the results found that, "Arabs are given jail sentences more often than Jews convicted of the same offenses, and Arabs receive longer sentences than Jews who are jailed. The study's authors conclude that their most conspicuous finding is the tendency of Israeli courts to treat Arab defendants more harshly: When Arabs wind up in court, they are more likely to be convicted; when convicted, and they are likely to receive a stiffer sentence than a Jew normally would."<sup>97</sup> Another example of the legal discrimination Palestinians face in Israel is the 2003 law passed by the Israeli Knesset which

---

<sup>97</sup> Zarchin. Tomer. (August 2, 2011). Israeli courts must end anti-Arab discrimination. *Haaretz*. <http://www.haaretz.com/print-edition/opinion/israeli-courts-must-end-anti-arab-discrimination-1.376666>.

prohibits Palestinians who marry Israeli citizens from living in Israel.<sup>98</sup> Israeli Arabs who marry Palestinians from the West Bank or Gaza must either move to live in the territories, or remain in Israel and live apart from their spouses. Since the state owns almost all of the land in Israel, Arab Israelis are denied the right to purchase land and Arab Israeli exemption from military service deprives them of generous state benefits; benefits afforded to almost all Israeli Jews since a two year military service is mandatory.<sup>99 100</sup>

Racism towards Arabs in Israel is not only systemic and institutionalized, it also pervasive among Jewish Israeli attitudes towards their fellow Palestinian citizens. A report published by the Association for Civil Rights in Israel found that “Over two-thirds Israeli teen believe Arabs to be less intelligent, uncultured and violent. Over a third of Israeli teens fear Arabs all together.” another poll conducted in 2007 found that “fifty percent of Israelis taking part said they would not live in the same building as Arabs, will not befriend, or let their children befriend Arabs and would not let Arabs into their homes.<sup>101</sup> But arguably the most incendiary and controversial scheme targeting Israeli Arabs is the “Populated-Area Exchange Plan” put forth by Israeli Foreign Minister

---

<sup>98</sup> Huggler. Justin. (August 1, 2003). New Israeli marriage law racist, say critics. *The Irish Independent*. <http://www.independent.ie/world-news/new-israeli-marriage-law-racist-say-critics-207114.html>.

<sup>99</sup> Safian. Alexander. (December 1997). Can Arabs Buy Land in Israel? *The Middle East Quarterly*. Vol. 4. Num. 4. Pg. 11-16.

<sup>100</sup> Khoury. Jack. (August 12, 2010). No place in university dorms for Arabs who didn't serve in IDF. *Haaretz*. <http://www.haaretz.com/print-edition/news/no-place-in-university-dorms-for-arabs-who-didn-t-serve-in-idf-1.307448>.

<sup>101</sup> Zino. Avaram. (August 12, 2007). Racism in Israel on the rise. *Ynet News*. <http://www.ynetnews.com/articles/0,7340,L-3480345,00.html>.

Avigdor Lieberman which would see Israel's Arab population moved to a newly created Palestinian state in exchange for the evacuation of some Israeli settlements in the West Bank.<sup>102</sup> Israeli Arabs, through no choice of their own, would be uprooted from their lands and homes, stripped of their Israeli citizenship, and moved into an uncertain future in an uncertain Palestinian state.

Segregation, discrimination, and military repression are never the answer in the long-term because they fail to address the roots of the conflict; they merely prolong an inevitable clash which is bound to occur in the future. Even if Israel were to reverse decades of policy and decides to allow the creation of a Palestinian state it would not necessarily be the most viable option at this point. Despite the many difficulties, a one-state solution could carry a great deal more benefit for Israelis and Palestinians than a partitioning of the land- a fact many Jewish intellectuals recognized very early on. However, there are still a variety of issues and problems of a single state that simply cannot be ignored.

---

<sup>102</sup> Ravid. Barak. (September 28, 2010). Lieberman presents plans for population exchange at UN. *Haaretz*. <http://www.haaretz.com/news/diplomacy-defense/lieberman-presents-plans-for-population-exchange-at-un-1.316197>.

## *Difficulties of the One-State Solution*

Because a two-state solution is no longer a practical or viable option to ending the conflict, this does not necessarily indicate a single state can be created without overcoming a variety of issues and problems. The distinct historical and religious narratives coupled with political and geographic realities will render any solution, whether it is one or two states, a daunting and time consuming undertaking. There are, however, a series of particular problems that must be addressed concerning the one state solution.

First, the one state solution, at the present time, only garners minor support among both Israelis and Palestinians. The majority of Israelis and Palestinians still believe that two independent states is the most appealing option. But among intellectuals, academics, and left wing observers having one state is the only remaining alternative offering the most realistic, as well as democratic solution. For Israelis, lack of support for a one state solution is based primarily on the view that a single state would mean the end of Israel as a Jewish state and the death of Zionism as a political ideology.<sup>103</sup> While Palestinians believe adopting the one state solution would spell the end of Palestinian national aspirations and the dream of a sovereign state. While both arguments are clearly valid, this has not stopped the growing emergence of support for the one state solution.

---

<sup>103</sup> Hazony, Yoram. (2001). *The Jewish State: The Struggle for Israel's Soul*. New York. Basic Books.

Though Israelis view a single state with antipathy, there are a growing number of Jewish voices who support the proposal not only in practical terms, but on deeply held principles of justice and equality. Israeli politicians like Meron Benvenisti and peace activists like Haim Hanegbi have both arrived at the conclusion, albeit for different reasons, that unless Israel adopts the one state solution, then Israel's future is in serious peril. Both Benvenisti and Hanegbi agree Israel's future is not in jeopardy because of Palestinian violence or resistance, but through Israel's own policies which have created a state that relies on militarism, racism, and oppression to achieve its Zionist ideological goals.<sup>104</sup> For individuals like Benvenisti and Hanegbi, the real battle is not only for Israel's physical existence, it is also for Israel's soul and character as a nation. Many Israelis have painfully and begrudgingly come to realize that Zionism as an ethno-religious movement is no longer sustainable or applicable in a modern world dominated by diverse, multi-cultural nations states. The recognition Western liberal democracies have indeed provided a safe and stable environment for Jews invalidates the claim Israel needs to be a predominately and exclusively Jewish state to act as a sanctuary for Jews worldwide. Avraham Burg, former Knesset speaker and former head of the Jewish Agency says "to define the State of Israel as a Jewish state is the key to its end. A

---

<sup>104</sup> Shavit, Ari. (August 7, 2003). Cry, the beloved two-state solution. *Haaertz*. [http://www.monabaker.com/pMachine/more.php?id=A1111\\_0\\_1\\_0\\_M](http://www.monabaker.com/pMachine/more.php?id=A1111_0_1_0_M).

Jewish state is explosive. It is dynamite... the strategic mistake of Zionism was to annul the alternatives. Israeliness has only body; it doesn't have soul."<sup>105</sup>

Palestinians also have serious reservations about adopting a one-state solution since it would be viewed as capitulation or a national betrayal to become citizens of a state which has dispossessed and oppressed them for decades. Obviously, the idea of an independent Palestinian state will have to be set aside and Palestinian self-determination subordinated. Palestinians are well aware of the second-class status Israeli Arabs face and will expect the same sort of treatment- simply trading one form of discrimination and oppression for another. However, despite any misgivings they may possess Palestinians have come to acknowledge the pragmatic reality a two-state solution is no longer in the cards. Israeli policies, the failure of the peace process, and the inadequacies of the Palestinian government have pushed more and more Palestinians to support a one-state solution. Polls among Palestinian residents of the West Bank and Gaza show a marked increase in their support of a single state model, especially because of Palestinian failure to halt settlement activity.<sup>106</sup>

There is also a growing sentiment among members of the Palestinian Authority that abandoning the two-state solution is becoming necessary. A report written by Palestinian chief negotiator Saeb Erakat cites several different

---

<sup>105</sup> Shavit, Ari. (June 7, 2007). Burg: Defining Israel as a Jewish state is the key to its end. *Haaretz*.

<http://www.haaretz.com/news/burg-defining-israel-as-a-jewish-state-is-the-key-to-its-end-1.222491>.

<sup>106</sup> Murphy, Dan. (March 23, 2010). Palestinian support for 'two-state' solution drops with Israel defiant on settlement freeze. *The Christian Science Monitor*. <http://www.csmonitor.com/World/Global-News/2010/0323/Palestinian-support-for-two-state-solution-drops-with-Israel-defiant-on-settlement-freeze>.

methods and options that can be taken by Palestinians “to reduce damage, unify our discourse and preserve all our rights on grounds of the international law and legitimacy as well as exercise pressure on the Israeli government by exposing its policies and positions through all relevant international and regional organizations.”<sup>107</sup> Erakat’s recommendations include various forms of non-violent resistance, nullifying the Oslo Accords, dissolving the Palestinian Authority, and finally abandoning the two-state option in favor of a single state for both Israelis and Palestinians.<sup>108</sup> Some have argued official Palestinian adoption of the single state is nothing more than political leveraging intent on forcing Israel to withdraw to the 1967 borders and initiate the creation of an independent Palestinian state. Virginia Tilley believes this to be the case when she states, “some elements have much to lose from a multi-ethnic state; not least, the old-guard Palestinian elite and their clients in the PA would lose the fat sinecures of their much-abused positions.”<sup>109</sup> Whether Palestinian leaders are seriously considering the proposal or simply using it as a political ploy, a one-state solution appears to be the only option remaining.

A second argument against the one-state solution is the belief that inherent Arab hostility towards Jews and Israelis will prevent any sort of peaceful coexistence between the two peoples. Israelis view their state as a tiny,

---

<sup>107</sup> Erakat. Saeb. (February 28, 2010). The Political Situation in Light of Developments with the U.S. Administration an Israeli Government and Hamas' Continued Coup d'etat. *Haaretz*. <http://www.haaretz.com/news/saeb-erekat-the-political-situation-1.263864>.

<sup>108</sup> Eldar. Akiva. (February 26, 2010). Palestinians threaten to adopt one-state solution. *Haaretz*. <http://www.haaretz.com/print-edition/news/palestinians-threaten-to-adopt-one-state-solution-1.266295>.

<sup>109</sup> Tilley, Virginia. (2005). *The One State Solution : A breakthrough for peace in the Israeli Palestinian deadlock*. Ann Arbor. University of Michigan Press. Pg. 193.

segregated peace seeking entity surrounded by a sea of hostile, blood-thirsty Arab nations' intent on bringing about its imminent destruction. Aside from the obvious racial stereotyping, this assertion has little validity for a number of reasons.

First, Palestinians bear animosity towards Israelis considering the history of oppression and dispossession Palestinians experienced at the hands of Israelis. Unlike the old, nefarious anti-Semitism which existed in Western Europe and elsewhere, the Middle East does not have a history of hatred towards Jews. Negative Arab reactions are not carried out towards Israelis simply because they are Jews. Because of Israel's insistence on being recognized and referred to as the "Jewish state", the conflict thus becomes between "Jews and Arabs" not "Israelis and Arabs", simply by the fact it is how Israelis refer to themselves. If, for example, the occupiers had referred to themselves as "Catholics", then the enemy would be known as the "Catholics". This is not to deny genuine anti-Semitism or anti-Jewish sentiments exist in the Arab world, it merely points out the semantics of the terminology in relation to the conflict. The current attitudes towards Israelis and Jews in Arab countries are colored mainly through the prism of Palestinian maltreatment at the hands of Israeli authorities. The majority of Palestinians still believes and

accepts that negotiations, not violence, will ultimately bring about a peaceful and final resolution.<sup>110</sup>

Secondly, the Arabs in Israel serve as an example of what a future Israeli state may entail if citizenship is granted to Palestinians in the West Bank and Gaza. Though undeniably marginalized and discriminated against, Arab Israelis have adopted a strained, yet tolerated, existence with their fellow Jewish citizens- a fact which proves affording individuals or groups the basic minimum of human and political rights will inevitably lead to more peace and stability.

Third, the example of liberal Western democracies where Jews, Arabs, and Muslims peacefully coexist proves hatred can certainly have a political nature, and does not necessarily have to include racial or religious undertones. Because of the political and economic equality guaranteed under the state in a liberal democracy, each ethnic and religious group is allowed to pursue its own agenda without fear of persecution or discrimination. Most opposition to the one-state solution would most likely come from Israeli and Palestinian religious zealots, who would oppose any sort of compromise based on their respective religious traditions and narratives. However, it is possible to remedy this issue by ensuring the state has a strict and defined separation between church and state. There is absolutely nothing wrong with the official recognition of religious and linguistic traditions within a constitution; however, in the interest of law

---

<sup>110</sup> Jewish Virtual Library. (October 2010). *Palestinian Attitudes About Peace With Israel*. [http://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/jsource/arabs/pal\\_peace\\_2009.html](http://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/jsource/arabs/pal_peace_2009.html).

and equality the state must be the ultimate authority on issues of general national concern.

Finally, various Arab states like Egypt and Jordan have already signed peace agreements with Israel, and those states that have not, have signaled a willingness to do so with full normalization of relations between the Arab states and Israel.<sup>111</sup> In fact, the Arab states have been yearning for a peace with Israel for quite a while. The ongoing security problems, the hampering of business and trade throughout the region, the radicalization of their own populations, and the instability large numbers of Palestinian refugees create are some of the reasons why the Arab world is desperate for an end to the Arab-Israeli conflict.<sup>112</sup> Even if the Arab state did actually entertain the idea of confrontation with Israel, it would certainly be a losing proposition. Israel enjoys a vast military superiority over any and all the Arab states, and also possesses a powerful alliance with the United States which would render military action against Israel out of the question.

The final problem of a one-state solution centers on the argument that is racist to deny Jews the right of self-determination as a distinct religious and ethnic group. Critics maintain that Jews possess an inherent right to rule themselves in their professed ancestral homeland free from anti-Semitism and persecution they might face elsewhere. Because of the shameful and criminal

---

<sup>111</sup> Teitelbaum, Joshua. (2009). The Arab Peace Initiative: A Primer and Future Prospects. *Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs*. <http://www.jcpa.org/text/Arab-Peace-Initiative.pdf>.

<sup>112</sup> Tilley, Virginia. (2005). *The One State Solution : A breakthrough for peace in the Israeli Palestinian deadlock*. Ann Arbor. University of Michigan Press. Pg. 115.

treatment that Jews have historically suffered throughout history, one can certainly understand the reasoning behind such fears. However, the proposal put forth of a one-state solution does not deny Jews have a right to self-determination or safety from persecution; it simply rejects the notion of an ethno-centric Jewish *state*. Adopting the one-state solution does not mean the end of Jewish presence in Israel or the abandonment of Jewish connection to the land. But what a single state does is dismantle the system of privilege one ethnic group enjoys over the other and demands equal rights be given to Palestinians.

As discussed in the previous chapters, Israel now faces a serious conundrum since it has to choose between being Jewish, being a state, and being democratic; at any given moment it can only have two of three options, it simply cannot have all three. An issue that was realized very early on by many prominent Jews like Rabbi Judah Magnes, Martin Buber, Hannah Arendt, and Albert Einstein - who supported a national homeland for Jews in Palestine, yet rejected any sort of ethnic nationalism. In an article written the same month Israel declared independence, Arendt made her position very clear on the need for Jewish-Arab cooperation when she states, "The idea of Arab-Jewish cooperation, though never realized on any scale and today seemingly farther off than ever, is not an idealistic day dream but a sober statement of the fact that without it the whole Jewish venture in Palestine is doomed."<sup>113</sup> And in a speech given in 1938, Albert Einstein echoes Arendt's statement on the dangers of

---

<sup>113</sup> Arendt, Hannah. (May 1948). To Save the Jewish Homeland: There is Still Time. *Commentary*. Pg. 403.

Zionist exclusivity when he says, “I should much rather see reasonable agreement with the Arabs on the basis of living together in peace than the creation of a Jewish state...the essential nature of Judaism resists the idea of a Jewish state with borders, an army, and a measure of temporal power....I am afraid of the inner damage Judaism will sustain – especially from the development of a narrow nationalism within our own ranks.”<sup>114</sup> What is remarkable about the comments made by Arendt and Einstein is not only did they see the inherent problems with ethno-centric and religious ideologies like Zionism; they also had the prescience to recognize partition of the land into two states was an impending disaster which would lead to a violent and seemingly unending conflict between Jews and Arabs.

---

<sup>114</sup> Jerome. Fred. (2009). *Einstein on Israel and Zionism: His Provocative Ideas about the Middle East*. New York. St. Martin's Press.

## *Conclusion*

For an area constituting such a small such a percentage of the earth's people and land, the Israeli-Palestinian conflict certainly casts one of the largest shadows in present day global politics. The confluence of various histories, languages, cultures, and religions creates such a highly charged environment that, oftentimes, the necessity for a practical resolution becomes eclipsed by emotional narratives and poisonous rhetoric. A single state solution does not guarantee a sufficient end to the conflict which would ultimately satisfy both parties, but what it does offer is the opportunity for a constructive, alternative vision to the failure of the already doomed two-state settlement. The Israeli-Palestinian conflict has once again demonstrated that security can never be achieved through violence and repression. Lasting peace can ultimately be realized only through negotiation and dialogue, and this conflict is no different. Partition and segregation has proved to be an ineffective method thus far; therefore, the time has come to begin accepting a single state based on true democratic values and principles remains the only viable option. Admittedly, this will be a long and arduous process requiring great compromise from both sides. Israelis will have to relinquish the Zionist dream of a state excluding non-Jews, and Palestinians will have to realize their dream of independent statehood is no longer attainable. The fact is Israelis and Palestinians have

already been living in a single state since 1967 rendering the two peoples virtually inseparable; nothing short of genocide and ethnic cleansing on the part of the Israelis can change this actuality.

Throughout history, every instance of wishing to inspire change has begun with the voices of the few courageous individuals daring to challenge the entrenched narratives and attempting to reimagine the direction of their communities. For those Israelis and Palestinians envisioning a better future, the one-state solution is the lone solution remaining which brings about a just, peaceful, and pragmatic end to the conflict. Unfortunately, for this generation of Israelis and Palestinians this might have come a little too late. But this proposal has never been about the present; it has always been about the future. As Israeli peace activist Miko Peled rightly states, “The era of cosmetic changes together with the two-state solution is gone forever. Only full equal rights for both peoples in their historic homeland will bring an end to this conflict. And while there are those who will claim that this is a naïve dream and will never become a reality, we could do well to remember that the success of any struggle depends on the determination of its leaders and the clarity of its purpose, not the doubts of its naysayers.”<sup>115</sup> Hopefully, both Israelis and Palestinians will reach the same conclusion sooner rather than later.

---

<sup>115</sup> Makdisi, Saree. (2008). *Palestine Inside Out: An Everyday Occupation*. W. W. Norton & Company. New York. Pg. 293.

# Bibliography

Abunimah, Ali. (2006). *One Country A Bold Proposal to End the Israeli-Palestinian Impasse*. New York, New York. Metropolitan Books.

Arendt, Hannah. (May 1948). To Save the Jewish Homeland: There is Still Time. *Commentary*.

Barzilai, Amnon. (February 18, 2004). The fence: A path to voluntary transfer. *Haaretz*. <http://www.haaretz.com/print-edition/features/the-fence-a-path-to-voluntary-transfer-1.114330>.

Beaumont, Peter. (November 1, 2003). Israel outraged as EU poll names it a threat to peace. *The Guardian*. <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2003/nov/02/israel.eu>.

Blum, Ruthie. (May 20, 2004). One on One: It's the Demography, Stupid. *The Jerusalem Post*. <http://rabbibrant.com/2009/01/06/israel-and-gaza-one-geographers-prediction>.

Bowen, Jeremy. (September 23, 2011). Palestinian statehood bid: Useful points scored at UN. *BBC News*. <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-middle-east-15045011>

Bresheeth, Haim. (March 17, 2004). Two states, too little, too late. *Al-Ahram Weekly*. Issue No. 681. <http://weekly.ahram.org/2004/681/op61.htm>.

Bronner, Ethan. (February 17, 2010). Positive Views of Israel, Brought to You by Israelis. *The New York Times*. <http://www.nytimes.com/2010/02/18/world/middleeast/18israel.html>.

B'tselem Israeli Information Center for Human Rights. (April 2006). *The Separation Barrier – Statistics*. [http://www.btselem.org/separation\\_barrier/statistics](http://www.btselem.org/separation_barrier/statistics).

B'tselem Israeli Information Center for Human Rights. (2008). *The Gap in Water Consumption between Palestinians and Israelis*. [http://www.btselem.org/water/consumption\\_gap](http://www.btselem.org/water/consumption_gap).

B'tselem Israeli Information Center for Human Rights. (2010). *By Hook and By Crook: Israeli Settlement Policy in the West Bank*. [http://www.btselem.org/publications/summaries/201007\\_by\\_hook\\_and\\_by\\_crook](http://www.btselem.org/publications/summaries/201007_by_hook_and_by_crook).

B'tselem Israeli Information Center for Human Rights. (2009). *Land Expropriation and Statistics*. <http://www.btselem.org/settlements/statistics>.

Buber, Martin. (1983). *A Land of Two Peoples: Martin Buber on Jews and Arabs*, ed. Paul Mendes-Flohr. New York. Oxford University Press.

Chomsky, Noam. (1999). *The Fateful Triangle: The United States, Israel, and the Palestinians*. Cambridge, Massachusetts. South End Press.

Christian Science Monitor. (September 14, 2010). *Five largest Israeli settlements: who lives there, and why*. <http://www.csmonitor.com/World/Middle-East/2010/0914/Five-largest-Israeli-settlements-who-lives-there-and-why/Ariel>.

Cook, Jonathan. (2006). *Blood and Religion: The Unmasking of the Jewish and Democratic State*. Pluto Press. Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Cravatts, Richard. (February 16, 2007). The Brand Image of Nations: Israel. *American Thinker*. [http://www.americanthinker.com/2007/02/the\\_brand\\_image\\_of\\_nations\\_isr.html](http://www.americanthinker.com/2007/02/the_brand_image_of_nations_isr.html).

Davis, Uri. (2003). *Aparthied Israel: Possibilities for the Struggle Within*. London. Zed Books.

De Klerk, F.W. (1999). *The Last Trek*. London. Pan Books.

DellaPergola, Sergio. (2010). World Jewish Population, 2010. *North American Jewish Data Bank*. [http://www.jewishdatabank.org/Reports/World\\_Jewish\\_Population\\_2010.pdf](http://www.jewishdatabank.org/Reports/World_Jewish_Population_2010.pdf).

Derfner, Larry. (January 9, 2004). Sounding the Alarm about Israel's Demographic Crisis. *The Forward*. <http://www.forward.com/articles/6070/>.

Dugard, John. (January 2008). *Human Rights Situation in Palestine and other Occupied Territories*. The United Nations Human Rights Council.

Eldar, Akiva. Zertal, Idith. (2007). *Lords of the Land: The War over Israel's Settlements in the Occupied Territories 1967-2007*. Nation Books. New York.

Eldar, Akiva. (February 26, 2010). Palestinians threaten to adopt one-state solution. *Haaretz*. <http://www.haaretz.com/print-edition/news/palestinians-threaten-to-adopt-one-state-solution-1.266295>.

Erakat, Saeb. (February 28, 2010). The Political Situation in Light of Developments with the U.S. Administration an Israeli Government and Hamas' Continued Coup d'etat. *Haaretz*. <http://www.haaretz.com/news/saeb-erekat-the-political-situation-1.263864>.

Finkelstein, Norman. (2003). *Image and Reality of the Israel/Palestine Conflict*. New York. Verso Books.

Fredrickson, George. (1981). *White Supremacy: A Comparative Study in American and South African History*. Oxford. Oxford University Press.

Gresh, Alain. (1988). *The PLO: The Struggle Within*. London . Zed Books.

Hasan, Mehdi. (September 1, 2011). A State of Palestine would backfire on its own people. *The Guardian*. <http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2011/sep/01/state-palestine-play-into-israeli-hands>.

Hazon, Yoram. (2001). *The Jewish State: The Struggle for Israel's Soul*. New York. Basic Books.

Hirschberg, Peter. (February, 9 2004). Hello, I'm Israeli-Palestinian. *Inter Press Service News Agency*. <http://ipsnews.net/news.asp?idnews=22318>.

Huggler, Justin. (August 1, 2003). New Israeli marriage law racist, say critics. *The Irish Independent*. <http://www.independent.ie/world-news/new-israeli-marriage-law-racist-say-critics-207114.html>.

Ignatius, David. (September 13, 2011). Israel's new problem with the Arab Street. *The Washington Post*. [http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/israels-new-problem-with-the-arab-street/2011/09/13/gIQAzzdaQK\\_story.html](http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/israels-new-problem-with-the-arab-street/2011/09/13/gIQAzzdaQK_story.html).

International Court of Justice. (July 9, 2004). *Legal Consequences of the Construction of a Wall in the Occupied Palestinian Territory*. <http://www.icj-cij.org/docket/files/131/1677.pdf>.

Izenberg, Dan. (January 10, 2003). High Court overturns disqualifications of Tibi, Bishara. *Jerusalem Post*. [http://info.jpost.com/C002/Supplements/Elections2003/ld\\_03\\_1201.html](http://info.jpost.com/C002/Supplements/Elections2003/ld_03_1201.html).

Jerome, Fred. (2009). *Einstein on Israel and Zionism: His Provocative Ideas about the Middle East*. New York. St. Martin's Press.

Jerusalem Media and Communications Centre. (June 2000). *On Palestinian Attitudes towards Final Status Negotiations and the declaration of the State*. <http://www.jmcc.org/Documentsandmaps.aspx?id=463>.

Jewish Virtual Library. (October 2010). *Palestinian Attitudes About Peace With Israel*. [http://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/jsourc/arabs/pal\\_peace\\_2009.html](http://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/jsourc/arabs/pal_peace_2009.html).

Jiryis, Sabri. (1976). *The Arabs in Israel*. New York. Monthly Review Press.

Judt, Tony. (September 25, 2003). Israel: The Alternative. *The New York Review of Books*.

Karmi, Ghada. (2011). The One-State Solution: An Alternative Vision for Israeli-Palestinian Peace. *The Journal of Palestine Studies*. Vol. 40, No. 2. Winter 2011.

Kershner, Isabel. (October 10, 2010). Israeli Cabinet Approves Citizenship Amendment. *The New York Times*. <http://www.nytimes.com/2010/10/11/world/middleeast/11mideast.html>.

Khoury, Jack. (August 12, 2010). No place in university dorms for Arabs who didn't serve in IDF. *Haaretz*. <http://www.haaretz.com/print-edition/news/no-place-in-university-dorms-for-arabs-who-didn-t-serve-in-idf-1.307448>.

Khuder, Suha. (October 14, 2010). Speaker discusses one-state solution. *The Independent Collegian*. <http://www.independentcollegian.com/speaker-discusses-one-state-solution-1.2365678#.TrjDQmvCKSp>.

Kimmerling, Baruch. (2003). *Politicide: Ariel Sharon's War against the Palestinians*. Verso Books. London.

Kincaid, John. Tarr, Alan. eds. (2005). *Constitutional Origins, Structure, and Change in Federal Countries*. Montreal. Queen's University Press.

Landau. David. (November 13, 2003). 'Maximum Jews, minimum Palestinians'. *Haaretz*. <http://www.haaretz.com/general/maximum-jews-minimum-palestinians-1.105562>.

Laor. Yitzhak. (November 8, 2009). Israel's apartheid is worse than South Africa's. *Haaretz*. <http://www.haaretz.com/print-edition/opinion/israel-s-apartheid-is-worse-than-south-africa-s-1.4590>.

Long, David. Reich, Bernard. (1995). *The Government and Politics of the Middle East and North Africa*. Boulder, Colorado. Westview Press Inc.

Makdisi. Saree. (2008). *Palestine Inside Out: An Everyday Occupation*. W. W. Norton & Company. New York.

McCarthy. Rory. (April 11, 2010). Israeli groups fight orders allowing army to jail West Bank residents. *The Guardian*. <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2010/apr/11/israeli-groups-attack>.

Movement for One Democratic State in Palestine. (November 1, 2010). *Dr. Richard Falk Endorses One State In Israel-Palestine*. <http://www.countercurrents.org/ods011110.htm>.

Murphy. Dan. (March 23, 2010). Palestinian support for 'two-state' solution drops with Israel defiant on settlement freeze. *The Christian Science Monitor*. <http://www.csmonitor.com/World/Global-News/2010/0323/Palestinian-support-for-two-state-solution-drops-with-Israel-defiant-on-settlement-freeze>.

Myre. Greg. (November 6, 2006). Hard-line Israeli Minister Avigdor Lieberman courts controversy. *The New York Times*. <http://www.nytimes.com/2006/12/06/world/africa/06iht-mideast.3808258.html>.

Pappe, Ilan. (2006). *The Ethnic Cleansing of Palestine*. Oxford, England. Oneworld Publications Limited.

Pfeffer. Anshel. Stern Yoav. (September 24, 2007). High Court delays ruling on JNF land sales to non-Jews. *Haaretz*. <http://www.haaretz.com/news/high-court-delays-ruling-on-jnf-land-sales-to-non-jews-1.229946>.

Price. Matthew. (June 15, 2011). Belgium still without a government. *BBC News*. <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-europe-13773297>.

Ravid. Barak. (September 28, 2010). Lieberman presents plans for population exchange at UN. *Haaretz*. <http://www.haaretz.com/news/diplomacy-defense/lieberman-presents-plans-for-population-exchange-at-un-1.316197>.

Reding. Andrew. (June 26, 2002). Call it Israel-Palestine – Try Federal Solution in the Middle East. *Pacific News Service*.

<http://www.worldpolicy.org/sites/default/files/uploaded/image/PNS-2002-Swiss%20set%20good%20example%20for%20a%20new%20Palestine-Israel.pdf>.

Safian, Alexander. (December 1997). Can Arabs Buy Land in Israel? *The Middle East Quarterly*. Vol. 4. Num. 4.

Said, Edward. (2001). *The End of the Peace Process: Oslo and After*. Vintage Books. New York

Segel, Rafi. Eyal, Weisman. eds. (2003). *A Civilian Occupation: The Politics of Israeli Architecture*. Verso Books.

Shamir, Shimon. Maddy-Weitzman, Bruce. eds. (2005). *The Camp David Summit-What Went Wrong?* Brighton, UK. Sussex Academic Press.

Shavit, Ari. (August 7, 2003). Cry, the beloved two-state solution. *Haaretz*. [http://www.monabaker.com/pMachine/more.php?id=A1111\\_0\\_1\\_0\\_M](http://www.monabaker.com/pMachine/more.php?id=A1111_0_1_0_M).

Shavit, Ari. (January 8, 2004). Survival of the Fittest. *Haaretz*. <http://web.archive.org/web/20080515210330/http://www.haaretz.com/hasen/pages/ShArt.jhtml?itemNo=380986&contrassID=2>.

Shavit, Ari. (October 6, 2004). Top PM Aide: Gaza plan aims to freeze the peace process. *Haaretz*. <http://www.haaretz.com/print-edition/news/top-pm-aide-gaza-plan-aims-to-freeze-the-peace-process-1.136686>.

Shlaim, Avi. (2000). *The Iron Wall Israel and the Arab World*. New York. W.W. Norton & Company.

Sherwood, Harriet. (November 1, 2011). Israel rushes settlement growth after Unesco accepts Palestinians. *The Guardian*. <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2011/nov/01/israel-settlement-growth-unesco-vote-palestinians>.

Stenger, Carlo. (September 25, 2011). Netanyahu Is Killing the Two State Solution. *The Huffington Post*. [http://www.huffingtonpost.com/carlo-strenger/netanyahu-two-state-solution\\_b\\_979325.html](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/carlo-strenger/netanyahu-two-state-solution_b_979325.html).

Swisher, Clayton. (2004). *The Truth About Camp David*. New York. Nation Books.

Teitelbaum, Joshua. (2009). *The Arab Peace Initiative: A Primer and Future Prospects*. *Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs*. <http://www.jcpa.org/text/Arab-Peace-Initiative.pdf>.

The PA Economy. Editorial. (August 15, 2011). *The Jerusalem Post*. <http://www.jpost.com/Opinion/Editorials/Article.aspx?id=233916>.

The Reut Institute. (July 23, 2009). *Demilitarized Palestinian State*. <http://reut-institute.org/en/Publication.aspx?PublicationId=3679>.

Tilley, Virginia. (2005). *The One State Solution : A breakthrough for peace in the Israeli Palestinian deadlock*. Ann Arbor. University of Michigan Press.

United Nations. (December 11, 1948). *Palestine -- Progress Report of the United Nations Mediator*. <http://unispal.un.org/UNISPAL.NSF/0/C758572B78D1CD0085256BCF0077E51A>.

United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestinian Refugees. (2011). *New UN research challenges conventional view of the West Bank economy*.  
<http://www.unrwa.org/etemplate.php?id=999>.

Wheeler, Carolyne. (June 18, 2008). Israel hints at peace with Hizbollah. *The Telegraph*.  
<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/middleeast/israel/2151997/Israel-hints-at-peace-with-Hizbollah.html>.

Will, Donald. Ryan, Sheila. (1990). *Israel and South Africa: Legal Systems of Settler Dominance*. New Jersey. Africa World Press.

Zarchin, Tomer. (August 2, 2011). Israeli courts must end anti-Arab discrimination. *Haaretz*. <http://www.haaretz.com/print-edition/opinion/israeli-courts-must-end-anti-arab-discrimination-1.376666>.

Zino, Avaram. (August 12, 2007). Racism in Israel on the rise. *Ynet News*.  
<http://www.ynetnews.com/articles/0,7340,L-3480345,00.html>.



