

Israel/Palestine: where are we headed post – September Prof Jeff Halper – 7 November 2011

Lionel Louw: Thanks very much, thanks, Jeff. The way we do it is we'll take about 4 or 5 questions, comments, and then we'll invite you to respond, and then we'll do another round.

Jeff Halper: I need a pen....

Question 1: Thanks Jeff for that interesting talk. Obviously when you tell the human story, there's tragedy on both sides. As you know there are about 10,000 Israelis who were suffering shrapnel wounds from before the wall was put up, and it's a great tragedy what has happened there now, but of course it doesn't exist in a vacuum. You talked about 1998 when the Palestinians eventually came around to recognising the two state solution....in 1948, the Palestinians were offered more than 60 per cent of the land. They had the opportunity to accept

Jeff Halper: 42%

Okay, well they had a much bigger offer than what they have now...they had a problem of living side by side by with the Jews. In 1948 when Israel declared its independence, its Declaration of Independence gave complete recognition to Palestinians, to all ethnic groups, irrespective of religion, and irrespective of sex, it was complete, and David Ben-Gurion invited the neighbours to come to terms with Israel and make peace. In 1956, of course you know what happened after the war, in Sudan, no no no, so it's taken forty years, which is more than half the time that Israel's existed before the Palestinians were able to come to terms with the idea of the Israeli state. So what has been brought upon them now is not only Israel's fault, the Palestinians play a large part of responsibility, that's just my personal statement, but my question really is you mentioned that house demolitions are occurring within eyesight of Mount Scopus, or Har Hatsofimthat is one of the areas, A, B and C, in the West Bank. I'd like you to just comment on the areas under the Palestinian Authority, why do they not grant authority, which is more than, which is the majority of the area – do they grant authority to build houses, demolish houses, 'cos that's got autonomy under the Oslo Accords? Thank you

Question 2: Thanks very much. What I witnessed in Qalqilyah province, in those provinces in Area C, I found some of the Arab homes were playing the game. They knew that the Israelis had a backlog, a huge backlog of demolition orders, but it was becoming costly, and that Israel's government perhaps did not have the funds needed to do the demolition. And so the Arab families were building, hoping, taking a chance. Could you comment on the costing of demolitions, and how to make it more costly for the Israelis so they might stop?

Question 3: Thank you Jeff for the presentation. I just want to know what or who exactly pays for the roads built for Israel, and the roads built for Palestinians?

LL: any other questions

Question 4: Who profits? The organisation and the website, Who Profits, organised by the women for peace, details the international corporations and Israeli corporations who are actively involved on profiteering from the Occupation. Some of those companies are South African. Would you comment on those South African companies please?

Jeff Halper: Well, it all depends on how you look at, in terms of the first questions, I would put this within a colonial discourse, this is a map, I used two out of the three maps, I'll use the third one here. This is a map of the partition plan of 1947 in which...this map is the partition plan of 1947, which was accepted by the United Nations. Now there's a couple of things, from the Palestinian point of view, this is Palestine. They owned 90 something percent of the land, the Zionist movement had managed to buy 6% of the land before 1948. The 94% of the land was owned by Palestinians. They were by 1948 two thirds of the population, although the vast majority of Jews had only come in from the 1930s, so they were very new to the country. Why should I give more than half of my country, to people coming from Russia? We understand the Zionist logic, but the Palestinians didn't have to accept that. So the very idea that they should have accepted this, they should have lived with us in peace...two thirds of the population was Palestinian, they owned 94% of the land, and here comes a Zionist movement that said this is our country. And then they managed, because the Jews were coming from Europe, Chaim Weizmann, who was living in England, was very, became very close to the British government. The Jews came from Europe, they knew how to play the diplomatic game and finally got the United Nations to accept this partition plan where even though the Jews were a third of the population they got 56% of the land, the Palestinians who see themselves as the indigenous population got 42% with another 2%, Jerusalem/Bethlehem, that we internationalised. Well, I mean there's no reason why the Palestinians should have accepted that. From our point of view, well, we're both Jews, I don't know if we're both Zionists, but we're both Jews. From an Israeli Zionist Jewish point of view, they rejected, they're to blame, you see, that's what you hear. They went after more land, but they wanted war and conflict, they didn't accept us, and we wanted peace. Well of course we wanted the partition, it was a good deal, we're a third of the population, we get more than half the land,

Audience interjection- [along the lines of '*much of the land the Jews got was desert*']

Jeff Halper: But desert is very valuable land. I don't know about in South Africa, but in Israel desert has a lot of minerals. For example, Israel is the world's number one exporter of potassium, and chemicals, one of the largest industries in Israel is the dead sea industry. Israel uses it for its mineral wealth, in fact the northern Negev, this is where 30,000 Bedouin are being expelled from their homes because this is

very valuable land. And some of it is desert, in truth, but, of the Palestinian piece, also a good piece of it is desert. I mean this area here, this whole part here, actually like this, is the Judean desert. So even their little place had as much desert as the Israeli....the point I'm trying to make is this. In a sense, in a colonial sense, why should the Palestinian have accepted at all the partition plan? They rejected the partition plan. Here's where 'we were against five armies, and we were the weakest' isn't true. It was partially true. But in fact, and there's a book by Avi Shlaim, who is an Israeli historian called *Collusion Across the Jordan*. In fact, Israel went into the war in 1948 as an ally of Jordan. This result of the war was agreed upon before by Israel and Jordan. It wasn't a matter of peace. It's not an Arab-Israeli war. Israel was in league with a lot of the Arab rulers. In fact, Israel had very close relations with the Egyptian King Farouk before 1948. It's a much more complex issue. The point I'm trying to make is that Israel took more than half the land that had been apportioned to the Palestinians, so this is what happens, and this is the result of the 1948 war. So the Palestinians then could have said, alright, we want to go back to the 1947 partition plan. Instead what they did after 40 years is they finally said, look, we accept, we accept that we lost the war, that Israel exists – we don't legitimize it, I don't think there's an Palestinian today that legitimizes Israel, but they say look we accept this map and therefore we will accept Israel even on 78% of the country. So that is a tremendous move on the part of a colonized people, and Hamas has never accepted that by the way, Hamas still says, no, this land is Palestine and we don't recognize any Zionist claims. And there's as reason, there's a logic, there's certainly in the world....in Africa, there was certainly a logic. I mean what colonised people would have given up 78% of their country? America certainly wouldn't give up 78% of its country to the Native Americans and the Mexicans, so that in a way, I think it's a great gesture towards Israel to have done that. And we reject the idea of both sides. It's true that Israelis have been hurt and so on, but that's a false symmetry. You can't compare an asymmetric situation. Israel is a state, the Palestinians have no state. Israel is in the UN, Israel gets a strategic ally by formal treaty with the United States, Israel gets \$4 billion a year in military aid, Israel is the fourth largest nuclear power in the world. Everyone talks about Iran, everyone talks about attacking Iran, Iran doesn't have nuclear weapons. Israel has nuclear weapons, the ability to deliver them, and Israel is the only country that's actually threatened to use its nuclear weapons against its neighbours. Israel has one of the largest, strongest armies in the world. You know, Israel is the third largest arms exporter in the world, tied with France. Israel exports more arms than China. In fact Israel is the number two arms exporter to China after Russia, and it's the number two arms exporter to India after Russia. This is a tremendously powerful country, the Israeli economy is three times larger than each of Palestine, Jordan Lebanon and Syria put together. So I'm not talking about both sides. It isn't like there's some symmetry. The Palestinian people have no army, they have no economy, their control...they're living under Occupation. They're resisting. Now we may not like all their forms of resistance. I also don't accept terrorism. I don't accept that you can hit the civilian population. But to say that both sides are...that's a false kind of discourse that minimizes Israeli responsibility. You can hold Israel account for what it's doing, because it is not the victim, and there isn't a symmetry.

And finally in terms of the question, there are no demolitions in Area A, the Palestinian Authority on the contrary are trying to build. Fayyad is the Prime Minister, I don't agree with him, he has a whole neoliberal approach, the Palestinians are trying to build a city now, a new city, between, let me just show you, Ramallah and Nablus, a brand new city that the Palestinians have developed, that's right around in here. And they've got money from the World Bank...Fayyad has worked all his life for the World Bank, they have money from the World Bank, they've got money from Kuwait, from all kinds of places, he built a new city because there is no housing. But, the city is in Area C, no, no that's not true.....the city is in area B. Anyway, the city is in Area B, so they have a right to build, but the roads from Ramallah and Nablus come through Area C, and Israel refuses to allow them in to build the roads. So now you have a whole huge Palestinian city built with international funds but you can't get to it because you can't drive through, Israel won't allow the roads to be built through the city. So it's just an impossible situation....anyway, from that point of view.

In terms of house demolitions...it is a game Palestinians play, and like I say, it's like a game, like a lottery. You'll win some houses, they're not going to come and demolish your home.... We don't know how many demolition orders are outstanding in the West Bank. In East Jerusalem alone, which is not a big area, there are 15,000 demolition orders. So this is something facing a lot of Palestinians. There's no way they can really make it costly for Israelis except in the sense that we're doing it, except in the sense that we're doing it, trying to make this an issue. And in that sense, I think hopefully making it costly for Israel. In terms of the economy, who pays for all of this? Israel does, in a sense. I mean the Israeli economy is a very good economy. Israel has the only western economy that never went into recession in the last few years like every other Western economy did, so it's able to...the Israeli economy is based on diamonds, and that's certainly connected to South Africa, that's by far the largest Israeli industry and we have no diamonds, but Israel is one of the centres of refining diamonds in the world, diamonds from west Africa. Diamonds, security, and arms are the basis of the - and also have tourism and things like that - but those are pretty recession proof areas of the economy. But in addition to that we get three a half to four billion dollars from the United States, completely for military aid, but obviously that frees up funds for civilian uses, so Israel is perfectly capable for paying for settlements, for the walls, for everything, and finally in terms of the BDS in a sense.....what...the BDS movement is very powerful, it shows us that we can do something, and it shows us that were complicit, the occupation isn't there, the occupation is here. In a meeting that we had about BDS the other night, two ideas came out. One was, there's a company in Cape Town, and there was a name, it makes the wire

From audience: *Cape Gate*

They make a lot of the barbed wire for the wall. A lot of the barbed wire that's used, which I can't quite understand, why Israel can't make it's own barbed wire....so in a sense there's a real direct connection, so that should certainly be a BDS target I should think...and obviously diamond, diamonds, this is, South Africa is...and there

are also military issues, Israel is very involved with the military in South Africa, and I'm sure Israel is... I am sure, I'm writing a book about it, but I'm not sure about South Africa yet, but I'm sure that Israel trains the South African police. I don't know if your police is divided by cities or by provinces or if it's a national police force, but Israel trains.....So you can say, well why wouldn't Israel give up the Occupied Territories. Another reason is they're a laboratory. What country has four million people that I can experiment on? And that's what we saw certainly in Gaza....I know it sounds terrible what I'm saying, butit's been documented that the attack on Gaza, which was an attack on civilians.

Gazans don't have an army, there were types of weaponry, anti personnel weaponry, that were called DIME weaponry dime - Dense Inert Metal Explosives, that burn you up.....there were types of weaponry used in white phosphorous, types of weaponry used in Gaza, that had never ever been used in modern warfare, and in fact are forbidden to be used in densely populated areas, they're supposed to be used in open areas. White phosphorous for example is used to light up a battlefield at night, they're not meant to be used in the middle of a dense city when they burn people up. White phosphorous melts glass, that's how hot it is. So I think, and I'm writing about this, that in a sense the attack on Gaza was a way of testing...I think Gaza is a field site for testing weaponry, but we call counter insurgency, for testing tactics, and I would submit to you that the Cape Town police or the South African police are getting weaponries of security and of crowd control...and there's a militarization of the police force, there's a book by Stephen Graham, wonderful, a really great book, a new book called *Cities Under Siege* about what he calls military urbanism which now with SWAT teams and all the police forces are now becoming military forces, so citizens are becoming terrorists, we're all becoming terrorists. I talk about global Palestine. We have a saying in the Israeli peace movement that we're all Palestinians. Now by that we mean in solidarity. But literally, we're all Palestinians, because don't think that what's happening to the Palestinians in Gaza remains in Gaza, is not coming right into Cape Town, right into your police forces and your security forces, and I think that that should be a focus of BDS, because I think it really shows how the Occupation is geared, both economically and in terms of security control.

Question 5: Just as a matter of information, our police force has in fact been militarized already. And the last police head was a general. I don't have a question, I just wanted to say this has been a fantastic and brilliant lecture. So informative, even if you know a lot about this, it's amazing.

[applause]

Jeff Halper: don't forget to fill out your evaluation forms.

Question 6: Hi, thank you. I grew up in a Jewish Zionist household and it took me until I was 19 really until I learnt about the Occupation. And I presume that you also were a Zionist because you also moved to Israel, and what I wanted to ask was, what

was the process you went on to first discover that this was going on, and how did that change?

Question 7: It was the same question – I wanted to ask, what was your vision Jeff, six years after the occupation, to decide as an adult at that point to move there.

I must...I must explain something...that I have spent a very happy years in Palestine, because it was Palestine then, from 1942 until 1947 and at that time the whole part of Palestine up to Gadera and Rehovot was Arab lands.....and I think it was lost in the war in 1947, but it created a tremendous number of refugees, and I think that until today they're very very sore that they lost this land. It wasn't very efficiently worked, but it was Arab lands, and they were left without anything....I wonder if you could mention something about that, because you haven't mentioned anything about Southern Israel at all.

Jeff Halper: Sorry? About?

Southern Israel because of course, Gaza remains...We had a very verybeach in Gaza, I spent many times swimming there and it was safe and it was perfectly alright. Thank you.

You work at a university and I want to know how your students respond to, I presume your beliefs come through in a lecture theatre and how they respond to that.

Question 8: You know, I resent the way that you talk about Gaza as a human experiment because of the connotations that Jews were experimented on during the war and I really take exception to that. Um, as far as Gaza is concerned by.

Jeff Halper: I'm appalled by it

Yeah I'm appalled

For the same reason.

Ja, okay. As far as Gaza, they're not completely defenceless, they fired over 8000 rockets into Israel, and they caused a lot of distress and casualties as well. So Cast Lead was given 90% support by the Israeli population for the reason that this went on for many years, and Israel was fed up with what was happening in Gaza. As far of the area, you've actually pulled a sleight of...your frame of reference has been that map, but you maybe remember than in 1922 when Britain divided Iraq and the Transjordan, Transjordan was deemed to be the homeland of the Palestinians

Jeff Halper: Yeah, by who?

By Britain

Jeff Halper: Right! What right does Britain have to tell the Palestinians where their homeland is?

This is history, okay! That, if you include Transjordan, and of course you will remember and you won't forget this, that Jordan is 70% Palestinian, then effectively the Palestinians have a majority in Jordan, and by you only focusing on that particular map, it's actually very deceptive.

Jeff Halper: in terms of myself, you know I grew up in the United States, in Minnesota no less, we're known as the frozen chosen, and my going to Israel had to do...I write about this...I wrote a book called *Israeli in Palestine*. I write about this, this movement of mine, because there are, there are different things, everybody has their own biography. On the one hand I really didn't like the US, I never found anything transcendent about life in the US and every time I go back I remember why I left.

Audience: that's probably because you grew up in Minnesota

Jeff Halper: Probably! No seriously, if I had been brought up in New York City it might have been different. Minnesota was pretty thin if you were Jewish. And part of the 60s was that there was a return to roots in the United States, Alex Haley had written a book called *Roots*, and the Africans – that's when you began to talk about African-Americans, the whole idea had been a melting pot, in the United States.

Well...the blacks didn't melt very well in the United States, so they were the first ones to say no, our ethnic heritage, our historical heritage, our identity, Africa is important to us, we're African Americans, and then you had Cesar Chavez and you had the Latino American, and then you had the Native American. There was even in Minnesota, I swear, there was a Swedish American movement, kids would go back to Sweden for their holiday. And so I started to go back to my Jewish identity, now I'm not religious, so for me, seriously, if I'd been in New York, maybe there would have been enough Jewish substance that I might have stayed, but simply, I went to Israel and it spoke to me. It was a country I could be...in a sense I'd made an identity shift to being Israeli even before I went to Israel, in the sense that my Jewish identity became more important than my American identity, I stopped being a Jewish American, I became Jewish, but Jewish if you're not religious and you're not ethnic is Israeli, in a sense. And you're secular. So I became Israeli. And I went to Israel, I went as a student but I moved there in 1973, but I have to say that I didn't give up my new left 60s ideas, and so from the very beginning I knew there was an Occupation.

I was involved in the Israeli peace movement, in fact I met my wife who's here, the first week I was in Israel in a new left meeting. So I was always active against the Occupation. I don't think I was a Zionist in the sense that I knew anything about Zionism, it was more that it was a sense of belonging and identity with a process that came out of my own story in the 60s, and that's why I still have arguments with my Palestinian friends, and a lot of my friends on the left, because more and more Zionism is being characterised as a colonial movement. It became a colonial

movement when it said, that this is our country and it denied the identity and rights and the history of Palestinians, then it became colonial, but the first impulse wasn't colonial. It wasn't like some British farmer that got up one day and went to Kenya to get 1000 acres of free land or something.

That wasn't Zionism. There was a genuine tie between the Jewish people and this country, and that's what....that's what I sort of came off, but for me there doesn't have to be a Jewish state, so I think the idea of cultural Zionism as it was called, is the way to go today but the fact that, I mean I'm not from South Africa and it's terrible when people talk about your country, and if I'm wrong you can correct me, but in a sense what I say abroad and you can correct me is that when South Africa became one country, people didn't stop....I mean the Afrikaners for example didn't stop speaking Afrikaans. There are still Afrikaner universities and newspapers. The different cultural and even national groups here still.....they still have their cultures.

If there's one state of all of us, whether it's democratic like here or a bi-national state, it doesn't mean we're going to stop speaking Hebrew, it doesn't mean you have to close the Hebrew University, there's no reason why there has to be a state, the state is what is the problem. So from my point of view the question is how do we decolonise Zionism? How do we have a national presence in the land of Israel/Palestine, we have all the trappings of our identity, we have our language, we have our literature, we have music, but nevertheless we find way of living in one country with the Palestinians who want the same thing, they also want their Palestine...it's different from South Africa in a sense that it isn't really a unitary country, it's moreits' really a bi-national reality. The question is how do you create a bi-national reality, when bi-national states don't work so well? It's really a challenge, but I think that's the way we have to go. So I don't accept the idea that Israel was...that Zionism was merely settler colonialism...because that's what Hamas look at. It's like Algeria, when Palestine is liberated, we all go home, I go back to Minnesota, which I don't really want to do.

So I think that decolonized Zionism, and we have to do that, but at the same time I don't think there's any contradiction between what I call a cultural Zionism and Palestinian rights, and having a vision of all of us living in that country. And in fact, one cute thing. Today we use the word global for everything, global this or global that. Back in the 60s we had globes on our desk, but we didn't really use that term. The term we used, if some of you'll remember this, if you were in the left a little bit, the term we used was the revolution. It was even in the music. The revolution, the revolution was what we meant by global, and it could be political or it could be cultural or it could be drugs or whatever your revolution was, but in other words I felt like I wasn't leaving the United States and everything else and running to this garden of Eden that was Israel. I was simply moving from one front in the revolution to another front, to a place where I felt more belonging but also more engaged with the world than I would have been in the States. So there I was, you know, it's complicated, because I don't want to throw out the baby with the bath water.

I mean I do say...I'm Zionist in the sense, if you want to put it that way, that I do see a national element in Judaism, but I'm certainly not Zionist in the sense that I think that we have to find a way of decolonizing Zionism and living with Palestinians.

In terms of the refugees and so on talking about the Southern Israel I didn't talk about, it's a fairly sad story, Israel basically...house demolitions is a common theme throughout these whole thing. What happened was - well you're in Palestine when it was Palestine, and this whole area, Gaza was a part of it, and Yigdal and Ashkelon and all, this was all a Palestinian area. I mean the Jewish people focused more on the centre and the north of the country, more than here, but Israel in 1948 and after demolished more than 500 Palestinian villages, towns and urban areas and what's important to understand is they weren't demolished in the heat of battle, all of them were demolished after the war had ended, between the end of the war in 1948/49 and the 1960s - the systematic destruction of the Palestinian landscape and the expulsion of Palestinians as refugees took place for the most part after the war, the refugees were expelled during the war, but their villages and towns and cities were afterwards.

Ilan Pappé, who's a very well known Israeli historian has a marvellous book, sad, it's like holocaust literature, but it's called *The Ethnic Cleansing of Palestine*, and the term we use in Israel is *Judaisation*, we're Judaising the country. And in a sense it was very much like the relocations that took place here, certainly in District Six and so on, in the sense being that we're going to Judaize this country, we're going to destroy the Palestinian places where they lived, we're going to displace as many people as we can. And that's still happening with the house demolition policy and other policies. We're going to rename the country, this is not the West Bank this is Judea and Samaria, you see in Silwan today, the village of Silwan, which is a part of Jerusalem, is officially called the City of David, and we're using archaeology to completely destroy any presence and any historical tie between Muslims and Arabs and Jerusalem, so it's all becoming a 'Jewish Jerusalem'. This process of *Judaisation* I think gets at what you were talking about, the fact that there's an attempt to completely de-Arabise the country and to make it a completely Jewish country. Jabotinsky, the right wing politician/philosopher, in 1923, when he wrote the essay *The Iron Wall*, said that our task is to, well he put it the other way, he said what we have to do is to build an iron wall, so that the natives - it's interesting, he called the Arabs natives, you would never do that today, because we're the natives, it's very interesting, he said we have to create a situation where the natives despair of the land of Israel ever becoming Palestine. So it's really replacing one whole construct with another, so it's much more than just refugees, and just a wall and everything else, this is really an ethnic cleansing. It's a cleaning of the sense not just of getting rid of the people, but any sense any hint that they had, that there ever was a people besides the Jews connected to the country.

Okay two more quick things....my students are very much with me when I'm teaching, I haven't taught for a few years, because we do have Israelis, especially young people who are a little more critical, but basically this has become a non issue in Israel. The Occupation isn't thought about, people just don't care. So people ask

me, can I give this lecture in Tel Aviv. And I say yes, but no one would come. People just don't care, it's not an issue. The huge protests we had this summer for social justice which was really a revolt against neo liberalism in Israel... a return to socialism and the welfare state, had nothing whatsoever to do with the Occupation. It was consciously cut out because it would divide the consensual movement. So Israelis are living very well inside an Israel and really have no – it's not for or against, there's a two state solution fine, and if there isn't, fine, we really don't care, and I think that's the big problem.

And finally I just want to say about Gaza and Jordan, to respond to you just really quickly. The Gaza just isn't factual. In Gaza we have to remember there's an Occupation, there again you see what I'm saying, when people are presenting a so called Israel line they never mention Occupation. So here it is, rockets coming from Gaza, there's Israelis being hurt, there's no reference to the fact that Gazans are living impoverished after 44 years of occupation. And I was in Gaza, I was on the first boats that managed to break the siege in 2008, there's a blockade, not just an occupation and so on. But precisely about the rockets, the rockets ended, they ceased, before...in the July of 2008. And Hamas wanted to renew...there was a six month ceasefire, Hamas wanted to renew the ceasefire. And the day Obama was elected, November 4th 2008, Israel broke the ceasefire, when Hamas had offered it and attacked and killed Palestinians in Gaza and that's what unleashed the hail of rockets onto Israel. Even Hamas, that we demonise so much, wanted to continue the ceasefire with Israel and it's Israel that broke it, factually.

And finally I wanted to say this issue that Jordan is Palestine is simply not true. What's true is that Transjordan was part of the British mandate, but the British mandate, you certainly know in Africa, where the colonists drew the border has nothing to do with histories, or the peoples, or - what right do the British have to decide what's Palestine and not Palestine. Historically, this was Palestine. Jordan was a Bedouin area, it was a part of what became Saudi Arabia, Jordan is an artificial creation, they had an extra prince, the British, and they had to find an extra country for him, but it had nothing to do with Palestinians. Palestinians as Palestinians were farmers, they lived in Palestine it was defined almost always by the river. So the fact that the British created some entity that they called Palestine, and then they cut off a part of it and called it Transjordan has nothing to do with the Palestinian issue, and the fact that is true, that 60-70% of Jordanians today are Palestinians is because they are the refugees. But in any rate, Jordan is a country, and that's a Jordanian issue, and if we accept the right of return which we should accept, because this is the right of the Palestinians to return, then maybe some of them will return to Palestine...but it's hard to say Jordan is a Palestinian country simply because it has a lot of Palestinian refugees.

So what I'm just saying in the end is it doesn't help us to get into these whole arguments. What we have to say is what has to be done, and I'm not going to go over it, but what has to be done to bring a just peace? And we, like I've said, we don't advocate any solutions, but what I would urge on all of us is that these are elements that have to be present in any peace, any just peace. If all of these

elements are present, two states can work, one state can work, a regional federation can work, but if any one of these is missing, nothing's solved. I don't care how good it looks on paper. There has to be a national expression for both peoples, in other words there has to be an inclusive peace, but inclusive that understands both peoples are national groups, a bi-national reality, there has to be economic viability, there can't be a Palestinian Bantustan even if it's a state. It has to be conforming with human rights and international resolutions, that sets the parameters, and not power and negotiations that Israel wins, can't be a win – lose situation, it has to be win-win, the refugees have to have the right of return, even if they don't return they have to have that right, we claimed the right to return after 2,000 years, why can't they return after 60 years? That is a non negotiable for Palestinians. There will never ever be peace unless the Palestinians can return. I don't think they will return, all the research says that 90% of the refugees want to start their life somewhere else. Maybe some of the older people want to return, but unless you have the ability to choose what you do with your life, as a refugee, it's crucial. There has to be a regional approach, I think Israel/Palestine is too small a unit to cram everything into, so I've written a lot about a middle east economic federation, something like the European Economic Community was thirty years ago, not the current one, which doesn't even work for Europeans. And finally, obviously the region, the security concerns, I think these are the elements that we can take home and say how can we then construct the peace, or construct a peace agreement that incorporates these elements, this is what we have, rather than arguing whether the border should be here, here, here. So thank you very much.