

THE PALESTINIANS:  
THEIR PLACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

The 31st Annual Conference  
of  
The Middle East Institute

Washington, D.C.  
September 30 - October 1, 1977

953  
M  
1977

THE AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE  
Blauvelt Library

THE PALESTINIANS:  
THEIR PLACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

A Summary Record

PROGRAM.....	i
KEYNOTE ADDRESS..... <i>Lord Caradon</i>	1
SOCIAL AND CULTURAL ASPECTS OF PALESTINIAN NATIONALISM..... <i>Rapporteur: Sally Ann Baynard</i>	7
THE POLITICAL DIMENSIONS OF PALESTINIAN IDENTITY..... <i>Rapporteur: Helen D. Mak</i>	11
THE PALESTINIANS AND THE ARAB WORLD..... <i>Rapporteur: Mary G. Boss</i>	15
PALESTINIAN ATTITUDES AND PERCEPTIONS TOWARDS ISRAELIS..... <i>Rapporteur: James N. Falk</i>	19
BANQUET ADDRESS..... <i>William J. Porter</i>	23
ISRAELI ATTITUDES AND PERCEPTIONS TOWARDS PALESTINIANS..... <i>Rapporteur: Kathleen H.B. Manalo</i>	28
THE PALESTINIANS, ISRAEL, THE UNITED STATES AND GENEVA: THE PATH TO A SETTLEMENT..... <i>Rapporteur: G. Neal Lendenmann</i>	33
THE NATURE AND PROSPECTS OF A PALESTINIAN HOMELAND: THE SHAPE OF A SETTLEMENT..... <i>Rapporteur: Steven Dorr</i>	37
SUMMATION..... <i>L. Carl Brown</i>	42

The Middle East Institute  
1761 N Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20036

Price: \$2.00

THE PALESTINIANS:  
THEIR PLACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

31st Annual Conference of the Middle East Institute in conjunction with the  
School of Advanced International Studies of The Johns Hopkins University

The Mayflower Hotel  
Washington, D.C.  
September 30 - October 1, 1977

Program

Friday, September 30

9:30 am

Opening Remarks

*L. Dean Brown*  
*President, The Middle East Institute*

Welcome from The School of Advanced International  
Studies

*Robert E. Osgood*  
*Dean*

9:45 am

Keynote Address

*Lord Caradon*  
*Minister of State for Foreign and Commonwealth*  
*Affairs,*  
*Permanent Representative at the United Nations*  
*1964-1970, MEI Fellow, 1977-1978*

10:45 am

Panel I

SOCIAL AND CULTURAL ASPECTS OF  
PALESTINIAN IDENTITY

Presiding: *John K. Cooley, Middle East*  
*Correspondent, The Christian Science Monitor*

(1.00/1.00 Pub. Co.)

*Halim Barakat, Visiting Associate Professor of Sociology and member of the Center for Contemporary Arab Studies, Georgetown University*

*Kamal J. Boullata, Artist*

*Salma Al-Jayyusi, Visiting Associate Professor, The Middle East Center, University of Utah*

12:15 pm

Adjournment for Lunch

2:00 pm

Panel II

POLITICAL DIMENSIONS OF PALESTINIAN IDENTITY

Presiding: *Clovis Maksoud, Visiting Scholar, Center for Contemporary Arab Studies, Georgetown University*

*Hatem I. Hussaini, Member, Palestine National Council and Arab Information Center*

*Ann Mosley Lesch, formerly Associate Middle East Representative of the American Friends Service Committee*

*Hisham Sharabi, Professor of History, first occupant of the Umar al-Mukhtar Chair in Arab Culture, Center for Contemporary Arab Studies, Georgetown University*

3:30 pm

Break

3:45 pm

Concurrent Panels

Panel III

THE PALESTINIANS AND THE ARAB WORLD

Presiding: *Michael Hudson, Executive Director, Center for Contemporary Arab Studies and Professorial Lecturer, School of Foreign Service, Georgetown University*

*Samih Farsoun, Associate Professor, Department  
of Sociology, The American University*

*Paul Jabber, Assistant Professor of Political  
Science, University of California at Los Angeles*

*Ronald A. McLaurin, Research Scientist,  
Abbott Associates, Inc.*

Panel IV

PALESTINIAN ATTITUDES AND PERCEPTIONS  
TOWARDS ISRAELIS

Presiding: *Emile Nakhleh, Professor of Political  
Science, Mount St. Mary's College, Emmitsburg,  
Maryland*

*Fouzi El-Asmar, Writer, formerly Teaching  
Associate, Bradford University, School of  
Peace Studies, England*

*Khalil Nakhleh, Assistant Professor of Anthro-  
pology, Saint John's University (Minnesota)*

*Rima Salah, Ph.D. candidate in Anthropology,  
State University of New York at Binghamton*

8:00 pm

Banquet

Speaker: *The Honorable William J. Porter,  
Former Under Secretary of State and recently,  
US Ambassador to Saudi Arabia*

Saturday, October 1

9:30 am

Concurrent Panels

Panel V

ISRAELI ATTITUDES AND PERCEPTIONS TOWARD  
PALESTINIANS

Presiding: *Gabriel Warburg, Visiting Professor,  
Department of History, York University (Toronto)*

*Shoshana Berman, Judge of the Magistrate's Court*

*Dani Rubinstein, correspondent for Davar*

*Amnon Cohen, Professor, Hebrew University of Jerusalem*

Panel VI

THE PALESTINIANS, ISRAEL, THE UNITED STATES  
AND GENEVA: THE PATH TO A SETTLEMENT

Presiding: *Lord Caradon*

*M. Cherif Bassiouni, Professor of Law,  
De Paul University*

*Bernard Reich, Chairman, Department of Political  
Science, The George Washington University*

*Nadav Safran, Professor of Government, Harvard  
University*

11:15 am

Plenary Panel

THE NATURE AND PROSPECTS OF A PALESTINIAN  
HOMELAND: THE SHAPE OF A SETTLEMENT

Presiding: *George Assousa, Research Scientist,  
Carnegie Institution of Washington*

*Vivian Bull, Assistant Professor in Economics,  
Drew University*

*Robert Kattan, Director of Public Information,  
Society for International Development*

12:45 pm

Summation

*L. Carl Brown, Garrett Professor in Foreign Affairs,  
Near Eastern Studies, Princeton University*

1:15 pm

Adjournment of Conference

*L. Dean Brown*

## KEYNOTE ADDRESS

*Lord Caradon*

I doubt if I need emphasize the exciting challenge of speaking to such an audience at such a time on such a subject.

As to the audience, I well realize that the Middle East Institute can bring together a gathering as informed and as authoritative and as diverse as any gathering of its kind in the world outside the Middle East - perhaps even including the Middle East. And lest I should be intimidated by the erudition and distinction of my listeners I take some comfort in the fact that there may perhaps be safety in the variety of their opinions.

As to the time, we all realize more certainly than ever before that the future of the Middle East depends on the Palestinians. They have advanced to the center of the world stage. And we have seen in recent weeks how the future and the fate of three million Palestinians increasingly dominate the search for peace.

As to the subject, I must state my claim and qualifications to justify my speaking to you at the start of the searching discussions which the Institute is today initiating. I sometimes say that I am by upbringing a nonconformist and by training an administrator and by inclination a politician.

I am not sure that in this country the name nonconformist has the same meaning as in mine. We nonconformists like to believe that from the days of Oliver Cromwell we have stood for right against might, for justice against force and for freedom against tyranny. It can all be said more simply now. In modern fashionable terms it is sufficient in these days to say that we are the champions of human rights. It is this belief in human rights which has a vital bearing on the subject which we now discuss.

As a young administrator I spent almost a decade in Palestine, with a few subsequent years in what was then Trans-Jordan. Palestine was my first love. I arrived in Jerusalem just in time for the Wailing Wall riots of 1929. I left in the height of the Arab rebellion in the late thirties. But in the interval in Jerusalem and Haifa and Nazareth and Nablus - most of all in the beautiful villages of central and northern Palestine - I learnt to respect and admire and to love a people of intelligence and generosity and courage.



2.

I later knew much the same people in the Lebanon and Syria and Trans-Jordan. Once I walked alone for a week through the villages of southern Lebanon and Syria, from Sidon to Damascus over the top of Mount Hermon, a solitary figure received with mild surprise but always with a kindly welcome in the then peaceful villages, recently so sadly incited to fierce factional fighting. In the second world war I worked for a while with the villagers of the great plain of the Hauran. In the Jordan Valley and in the hills of es Salt and Ajlun and Irbid I used to ride each year to almost every village - impossible not to be deeply devoted to a people so hard working, so courteous, so full of human understanding and dignity.

Here let me pause to observe that the village people of Palestine, Jordan, Lebanon and Syria are really all one in tradition and temperament and in way of life. What shame that after the first world war European ambitions split them apart and divided them up. I often think that the worst legacy of colonialism was the false frontiers, in Africa as well as in Asia, which Europe imposed; the evil results of those false frontiers persist today. But when, as many of us fervently hope, the Palestinians win at last the right to genuine self-determination in their own homeland we can be sure that they will have no difficulty in working in full friendship and understanding with their true brothers to the East and the North.

So much for my qualifications to speak to you about the Palestinians. As a nonconformist I defend their human rights; as an administrator I recognize that only by genuine self-determination can they escape from the restrictions and humiliations of military occupation and regain their freedom and self-respect in a homeland of their own, and as a politician with some experience of international politics I should dearly like to convince you that the only hope of avoiding a future conflict - a conflict which would bring bloodshed and devastation on Palestinians and Israelis alike on a scale beyond imagination - is by undertaking now an irresistible international initiative. There is one last chance for peace.

You may well think that I am insufficiently academic and unduly personal in what I say. I cannot help that. And before I go on to deal with issues which are acutely controversial I ask you to let me say one other very personal word to you.

I feel passionately about the subjects we discuss but I would beg you to believe that I am not partisan. It is not my concern to argue for one side or the other. I am pro-peace. And whether

it was when I was under personal threat of assassination in the days of violent disorder in Palestine many years ago or when I was working for agreement in the United Nations in subsequent times my purpose, my motive has been to outmaneuver the forces of violence - both the violence of suppression and the violence of resistance - and to work, I can honestly say, for a lasting and peaceful settlement. It's my old United Nations slogan. We don't want a victory; we want a success.

Best with that motive in mind to speak frankly.

I do not need to spend long in referring to the double tragedy of Palestine. Many of us have visited the Palestinians in the squalor of refugee camps with grown children whose parents fled from the beautiful stone villages of Palestine and who have themselves known nothing but the mud and misery of the sorry shacks of exile under the law of no return. Many of us have also sensed their deep humiliation in the occupied territory where they are a subject people denied the opportunities of political organization and action.

And with regard to the refugees I might add that they find particularly distasteful and insulting the suggestion that they should quickly forget their homes and their lands in Palestine and settle down contentedly as a burden on their neighbors in other Arab countries. This suggestion comes specially ill from Zionists, who rightly take such pride in never forgetting or abandoning their long devotion to their own homeland.

I speak of a double tragedy. It will surely be a tragedy for the Jewish people too if they, having escaped from oppression, become themselves oppressors, if they deny to others the freedom they have so persistently sought for themselves, if Israel is founded on permanent suppression and dispersal of the Palestinians. To make Israel dependent on such foundations would surely be disastrous. That would be no less than a betrayal of a noble ideal. A house built on injustice could not stand.

I have spoken of a double tragedy. Let me suggest to you that we now witness a double delusion.

It is a delusion, I have no doubt, to believe that resistance by force can overcome or destroy Israel. To threaten or attack Israel would be to abandon hopes of peace and to condemn the Palestinians themselves to indefinite frustration and suffering. Neither West nor East would condone or tolerate the destruction of Israel. It would consequently be an unforgiveable deceit to lead the Palestinians to believe that Israel can be destroyed by Arab

4.

force alone. The reiteration of old threats against the survival of Israel is a self-defeating folly.

But there is an equally futile delusion on the other side. To imagine that security comes from repression, grabbing and holding territory, from creeping colonization in Arab lands or from the concrete encirclement of Jerusalem, from domination by forts and outposts, is a most dangerous deception.

I remember talking with General Weizmann, the Minister of Defense in the new Israeli Government, a year or two ago after a television discussion with him in Jerusalem. We were speaking of what was called the Allon plan, which provided for a string of Israeli forts in Arab territory along the Jordan Valley. I remembered my own experience in the Nablus fort in the Arab rebellion of the nineteen-thirties and I said to General Weizmann that surely every schoolboy knows that forts in enemy territory are not a guarantee of security, they are a guarantee of insecurity - an invitation to resistance and harassment and attack.

Rather to my surprise he seemed to agree - the security of Israel, he said, depended on Israel's Air Force. Not perhaps an unexpected answer from an Air Force General. But he did not claim that security comes from menace and intimidation.

So it is that the inescapable logic of the Middle East double tragedy leads inevitably to the necessity for abandoning the dangerous double delusions, and to acceptance of the necessity for peace by mutual advantage, with Israeli security and Palestinian self-determination together offering the way for both Israelis and Palestinians. My testimony, after repeated recent visits to the West Bank, is that the Palestinians overwhelmingly long for such a settlement in peace.

The outline of a potential settlement has become increasingly clear in recent years and there is now the widest international agreement. Bickering over the representation at Geneva does not touch the fundamental issue, the central question of the rights and the future of the Palestinians, and on that key problem the situation is now so seriously deadlocked that there is only one last possibility of escape. The United States is not free and capable to achieve a settlement singlehanded. The Soviet Union is committed to the principles of Resolution 242 and has never retreated from them, but its relations with Israel, and indeed with Egypt too, rule out for the present a successful separate Soviet initiative. Europe can greatly help, but has not the strength or authority to act alone. The Third World is in agreement, but its function in this respect is to support, not to initiate.

Only a fully united international endeavor can succeed, and all the necessary elements for international action already exist. Could it not be that the Security Council would now take hold of the situation and in unity require that neither party by precondition or by veto stand in the way of progress? The deadlock cries out for such a new agreed international insistence. Nothing else will do.

What should the new unanimous Security Council Resolution ensure?

- (a) Acceptance of the principles of Resolution 242 including withdrawal of troops from occupied territories and the security of all States in the area, free from force and threat of force.
- (b) Addition of provision for the self-determination of the Palestinians in their own homeland.
- (c) Cessation during the negotiations of all violence and all new settlement in the occupied territories.
- (d) Creation of a Frontier Commission to make proposals to the Security Council for permanent borders having heard recommendations from both sides on reasonable rectifications, and having regard to the overriding principle of "the inadmissibility of acquisition of territory by war."
- (e) Guarantees for the future security of all nations in the area by the United Nations and all permanent members of the Council with proposals for the period of transition under United Nations supervision while elections are undertaken in the West Bank and Gaza with a view to the early establishment under international auspices of the New Palestine State.

When I came back some time ago from the Middle East, I wrote in my report as follows:

"Whilst I was travelling on the West Bank in recent weeks, I heard many proposals from Palestinians themselves on the form of administration to be established if and when the Arab territories are restored. All of them proposed some interim period in which they should be free to consult together and to decide on their future form of government.

6.

The all important principle is that Palestinians in establishing their own homeland should be enabled to take their own unhurried decisions, and be seen to be under no duress."

There is widespread acceptance of the five purposes I have stated. But neither side will act alone. And both will not agree by themselves. To talk of leaving them alone to agree is to prolong the deadlock and to ensure the ultimate disaster. But the interest of both and the international interest are clear and compelling. Israel must be secure. The Palestinians must be free. One object depends on the other. Both are attainable. It is only by urgent, irresistible international action that a terrible tragedy can be averted and all can be saved and the people of Palestine can come into their own and play a proud part in a new era of Middle East security and prosperity.

We now face a crisis not only for the Palestinians and the Israelis and the Arabs and for West and East in the world, we also face a crisis for the United Nations.

In 1967 we achieved a unanimous Resolution of the Security Council. Under the Resolution Ambassador Jarring of Sweden, a diplomat of the highest reputation and experience, was appointed to promote the purposes of the Resolution. When he made his first recommendations they were immediately rejected, and, to the shame of all concerned, no further action under the Resolution has been taken for nearly a decade.

It has been the same in Rhodesia where a unanimous Resolution of the Council has been flouted. The same in Cyprus where a unanimous Resolution of the General Assembly has been ignored.

The time has come when the leading members of the United Nations are themselves on trial. There is nothing wrong with the instrument for peace which the Security Council provides, the instrument is available, it is powerful, the need to use it now is indisputable and desperately urgent.

It can be that by taking the necessary united international initiative at this time not only the Middle East will be saved from an appalling catastrophe but the authority of the United Nations in preservation of world peace will be vastly enhanced.

We must pray that the nations will not lack the foresight and courage and determination to initiate united international action while there is still time.

## SOCIAL AND CULTURAL ASPECTS OF

### PALESTINIAN NATIONALISM

*Rapporteur: Sally Ann Baynard*

The educational and artistic aspects of Palestinian life in recent times are reflections of the devastating experiences of the Palestinian people. Mirroring their lack of political control over their lives, formal education of Palestinian children has been carried on largely under foreign control - either in Israel, the occupied territories or foreign nations, either Arab or non-Arab. Palestinian art, even the art of children, captures the horror of Dayr Yasīn, Qibya or Tall Za'tar. Likewise, trends in Palestinian poetry have been responsive to the political events which constitute the modern history of the Palestinian people. However, despite human tragedies, political traumas and the limitations of life under occupation or in the diaspora, Palestinian identity in the form of arts and education has survived and, in some cases, even thrived in adversity.

Three major points stand out on the question of education among Palestinians. First, the Palestinian people have virtually no control over the education of their children. In Israel there is no Palestinian control over the education of Palestinian children; children are educated in the Israeli curriculum which tends to depromote any Palestinian self-identity. Children in the occupied territories continue to follow the curriculum established by Jordan and Egypt before 1967. Palestinian schoolchildren in Lebanon, Kuwait and Jordan and other Arab nations follow the program of studies of that country in which they reside. While this program is oriented to Arab culture in general, it is not necessarily conducive to the development of their identification of themselves as Palestinians *per se*. Even those Palestinian students educated in schools run by UNRWA, where there is some degree of local control over curriculum, face the limitations set by the political circumstances of schools in refugee camps located within areas controlled by sovereign states. Despite these problems, there have been formal and informal efforts to provide Palestinian schoolchildren with background in their own history and culture. Proscribed Arab and Palestinian books are often passed hand to hand and copied by students in Israel and the occupied territories. Since 1967 there have been systematic efforts by Palestinian organizations to produce books which might help to

8.

socialize Palestinian students into their own political culture.

Secondly, despite the limitations inherent in their political situation, or perhaps in part because of them, Palestinians in general are possessed of an insatiable thirst for learning. It is a truism, but nonetheless accurate, that Palestinians have produced, *per capita*, more university graduates, more men and women of achievement in the professions, the technical trades and the arts than any other Arab people. By overcompensating for their total lack of political security and managing to obtain the best education available, the Palestinians have won a new identity, that of a technical and technological élite. Because of this, they have played a role as agents of modernization in the Arab countries in which they live. For example, in Lebanon after 1949 large number of Palestinians went to work for American educational and business organizations. Likewise in Kuwait, Saudi Arabia and Jordan, they have played a significant part in the process of modernization.

The third important aspect of education among Palestinians is that of informal education through involvement in the daily struggle against forces which might otherwise accomplish the complete fragmentation of Palestinian society and individual personality. The educational aspect of this participation is reflected not only in the attitude of Palestinian children in the camps, but also in Palestinian literature. For example, the novels of Ghassan Kanafani in the pre-1967 period reflect a picture of the Palestinian people as trapped and dying by suffocation. His post-1967 work reveals a new dimension: instead of being trapped, the Palestinian people are portrayed as taking their destiny into their own hands. As one Kanafani character puts it, they are no longer just shoveling away the mud in front of their tents, but instead trying to prevent the rain.

It is more difficult to deal with the notion of Palestinian art, as art is primarily discussed within the context of an artistic tradition, which in the Arab world has been a tradition of the word as the primary mode of expression. Even, however, in a traditional society like that of the Palestinians, one can see artists attempting to break through with new modes of expression, such as the cinematography techniques of the late Hani Johariyyeh. He used the documentary film as a new means of artistic expression in the Palestinian search for identity and, in doing so, established a new idiom in Palestinian art. His film of a commando mission against the refineries at Eilat proved to be a medium of expression with the practical effect of recruitment among Palestinians to guerrilla groups.

Every culture has its own myths. Among the important myths of Palestinian culture the image of death has a place of major significance. The image of death - particularly when creativity is viewed as its antidote - has a particular poignancy in Palestinian art as five of the major contributors to Palestinian creativity died in the space of ten years - all in incidents somehow related to their people's tragedy and search for identity.

One cannot speak of the full history of Palestinian art without putting it into its larger Arab context. Since studio art is not traditional in the Arab world, the first period of modern Arab studio art was a result of the colonial period. In Palestine, Jewish immigrants from Europe brought with them a tradition of modern studio art, which was quickly imitated by native artists. The second stage of modern artistic development was an attempt by artists to portray a collective idiom; painters felt the need to represent their people in their work. This was perhaps an attempt to replace poetry as a mode of artistic expression. The third stage of Arab - and Palestinian - art took place during the 1950s. This period found more Arab and Palestinian artists searching for their personal identity in their work, and through the discovery of their personal identity, their identity as Arabs and Palestinians. It is interesting that the abstract school of painting of today goes back to the historical roots of Arab art, non-figurative calligraphy.

The poetry of the Palestinian people likewise shares motifs and historical development with Arab poetry at large. Arab poetry at the beginning of the nineteenth century was in a state of degeneration after centuries of occupation. A renaissance of Arab literature, beginning in the last century, consisted of three major axes: Shi'a, Sunni and Christian trends. Palestinians, isolated from much of the Arab world, did not share in the full literary blossoming of this period. By the beginning of the 1920s, Palestinians had become keenly attuned to the problems not only of British occupation, but also of Zionist immigration to Palestine. By the end of the 1920s, the avant-garde poets of Palestine had become the artistic spokesmen for a struggle against the British and the Zionists. This poetry of resistance against foreign occupation was tense, direct, lucid and full of irony and sarcasm. Thus a tradition of avant-garde Palestinian poetry existed even prior to 1948 - a date that was to be decisive in virtually all Arab poetry, but especially that of the Palestinians.

In avant-garde Palestinian poetry, two very different strains developed during the period between 1948 and 1967: that of Palestinians within Israel, and that of Palestinians in the diaspora. The poetry of Palestinians in exile showed the existence of two forms of self-identification: the Palestinian poet suffering from the problems of exile, and the Arab avant-garde poet suffering



from some degree of repression under Arab régimes. Beyond this problem of dual identity, Palestinian avant-garde poets in exile experienced a period of shocked silence during the first three years after the 1948 war, a period in which these traumatic events had to be internalized. In the mid-1950s, they began to write about the shock of 1948, but their poetry had abandoned its previous lucidity and had become instead very oblique, heavy with symbolism. Major themes of avant-garde Palestinian poets in exile during this stage included rejection, loss of identity, the search for cultural roots, escape from refugeeism and themes related to death. Palestinian poets within Israel, while sharing some of the developments of Arab poets in general, remained lucid, straightforward and rejectionist.

The year 1967 produced another turning point in Palestinian avant-garde poetry. This time, however, it did not take three years for poets - both in Israel and in exile - to internalize the changes. The differences that had characterized Palestinian poetry in Israel and in exile were smoothed out by the mixing of the two groups. There was an immediate impact. Palestinian poetry of self-hate and insecurity became a poetry of resistance and faith in the future.

Contemporary avant-garde Palestinian poetry has a wide audience in the Arab world. Changes have occurred in the post-1967 period. While Palestinian poets had previously attacked obstacles to Palestinian goals in an oblique and general fashion, contemporary Palestinian poetry attacks quite specifically those who stand in the way, even other Arabs. The most recent examples of avant-garde Palestinian poetry also indicate that there is coming into being a more complex form of expression than had existed previously.

As the Palestinian poets participating in the 11th Conference of Arab Writers have said, the voice of Palestinian art and culture is an embodiment of an identity forged by the ordeal of destitution, repression, exile and struggle. It is not, however, a tragic culture, but a culture full of faith and hope in the future, the expression of a people who have learned to make out of deep sorrow a resource for steadfastness and a power for change.

THE POLITICAL DIMENSIONS OF  
PALESTINIAN IDENTITY

*Rapporteur: Helen D. Mak*

Central to achieving peace and stability in the Middle East is the settlement of the Palestinian issue. Though this point is recognized today, the Palestinian question in the past tended to be ignored in hopes that it would disappear. The former US Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, is credited with saying in 1953 that the Palestinian issue would resolve itself with time as the new generation of Palestinians would no longer feel the same attachment to Palestine as their parents shared. Likewise, the Zionists expressed the belief and hope that the Palestinians would readily assimilate into the neighboring Arab countries. Hence, it was thought that the younger Palestinians would accept Palestinian expulsion and dispersal as an established reality.

The events of the past 30 years do not support this claim. Instead, the Palestinians have striven to preserve their identity and to survive as a national group complementing their historical Arab heritage. A growing political dimension of Palestinian identity has surfaced, and the centrality of the Palestinians to settlement within the Arab-Israeli conflict environment is indisputable.

The disruption of Palestinian social and political organizations in 1948 was somewhat less disastrous than might originally be thought. While the upper class Palestinians dispersed more widely, the middle and lower classes that relocated together were better able to maintain their fundamental social organization. In many cases, members of the upper class reestablished themselves in surrounding Arab countries, Europe and the United States, thus separating from members of their extended families and from the land of Palestine. On the other hand, Palestinian middle and lower class families generally relocated together in the refugee camps. Village life patterns were reconstructed as families settled in the new areas. An example is the Ain al-Hilwe camp which is made up of several villages (hence, many families) from northern Galilee and is now located near Sidon. The importance of the

Palestinian family unit is recognized as having formed the base for the continuation of Palestinian social patterns. Dispersal of the upper class caused the breakdown of the traditional leadership structure. Hence, any subsequent political organization of the Palestinians arose from within the camp population in the form of grass roots leadership.

Since 1948 the Palestinians have lived under foreign domination. Those who live in the West Bank and Gaza territories have spent almost 20 years under Egyptian and Jordanian rule and ten years under Israeli control. It is currently estimated that 1.5 million Palestinians live in the occupied lands and 2.5 million reside in neighboring countries with major concentrations in Jordan, Syria, Lebanon and Kuwait. The search for political identification among the West Bank population in the 1950s led the Palestinians to regard pan-Arabism and Jamal Abd al-Nasir as the means for expression of their political interests. Although many Palestinians assumed economic and political roles within the Jordanian government, Palestinian political interests were not forgotten. But, 1961 brought the Palestinians disappointment and political frustration as the breakup of the United Arab Republic, a setback for pan-Arabism, sharply reduced their expectations for a settlement. Several years later in 1965, there was renewed optimism among Palestinians as the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) was founded. Designed to provide a political and economic framework for Palestinian activities, the PLO has become today the central organizing institution of the Palestinians.

The PLO derives its authority from the Palestine National Council which is a popular assembly representing major Palestinian parties, unions, professionals and guerrilla organizations. PLO decision making involves democratic debate from which a collective position is reached. Since the establishment of the PLO and with its assistance, the Palestinians have organized their own schools, hospitals, educational centers, clinics and economic institutions. The Samed Enterprises are an example of the high degree of economic organization achieved through the support of the PLO. Samed Enterprises encompass a conglomeration of multi-million dollar businesses including factories, banks and trading companies each managed and owned by the PLO. In addition to PLO organized activities, the Palestinians have made impressive educational advances. Excluding those Palestinians who live in Israel or the territories, the Palestinians have achieved the highest level of education in the Arab world. According to one source, there are over 80,000 Palestinians registered for the academic year 1977-1978 in institutions of higher learning in the Arab world, Europe or the United States.

With the Arab defeat in 1967 came increased political isolation of the Palestinians as the West Bank and Gaza territories were annexed under Israeli military control. The Palestinian residents were not passive, though, and they organized local committees to resist politically the Israeli military occupation. Membership of these committees frequently consisted of leading individuals within the municipalities and included mayors, journalists, lawyers, doctors and religious leaders. These groups were quickly broken up by the Israelis and the members were jailed or deported, yet Palestinian activism did not decrease. School and court boycotts were also organized, thus compelling the Israeli officials to meet at least some Palestinian demands.

Another incident was to dampen Palestinian spirits. The expulsion of the PLO from the East Bank in Jordan in 1970-1971 was a blow to Palestinian political aspirations, and it was not until 1973 when nationalist expectations were again encouraged. The PLO took the lead in formulating a political and military strategy which Palestinians and the outside world alike would recognize as a unified political focus. The PLO strategy included the establishment of the Palestine National Front (PNF) in August 1973. The PNF platform called for an end to Israeli occupation and for support of Palestinian national self-determination with return to the 1967 borders and an amended Security Council Resolution. The improved morale of the Arab world following the 1973 October War and the Arab League's endorsement of the PLO as the Palestinian spokesman gave added support to political action within the territories. The West Bank and Gaza nationalists' decision to participate in the April 1976 elections and their success in winning a majority of the council seats demonstrate the unity of determination for self rule.

Despite restrictions on Palestinian activism, West Bank and Gaza residents have not allowed themselves to become isolated, and they continue to express their political views. Press censorship, restrictions on the reunion of families and the Gazans' lack of passports are cited as examples of hardships encountered by the Palestinians. In efforts to reach a settlement, Palestinians living in the territories have been careful not to cast themselves as an alternative to the PLO but instead to work through the PLO in support of a limited solution and attendance at the Geneva Conference.

Having gained observer status at the United Nations and with offices in 61 countries, the PLO is generally recognized today as representing Palestinian political and national aspi-

rations. Although there is not total agreement among the Palestinians as to the most appropriate strategy to be used toward reaching a settlement, there is general support for a separate Palestinian state. The characteristics of the state (e.g. socialist, religious, conservative, bourgeois national, democratic secular, etc.) and the appropriate degree of involvement of the outside powers continue to be disputed. There is, however, a growing consensus among the Palestinians and Arab states in favor of a PLO supported state in the West Bank and Gaza territories. This state is described as a homeland for Palestinians living under Israeli rule and for those now in exile. Although they represent a minority, three distinct groups of Palestinians are likely to oppose such a settlement: those who have accepted Israeli control of the territories, those who prefer to live under Jordanian rule, and those who would accept no less than a state comprising all of Palestine. There is also a group of Palestinians that considers all such discussions to be academic as it believes that Israel has no intention of relinquishing any territory. Recent Israeli settlements in the occupied lands and Menachem Begin's reference to the "liberated" lands are cited as proof of this position.

It has been acknowledged that among the Palestinians there is no unanimity but instead a consensus, and the PLO constitutes the forum for general political agreement among disparate Palestinian groups. The settlement of Zionist and Palestinian claims to the same territory, however, is viewed less optimistically as a major issue to be resolved. Furthermore, some Israelis and Palestinians have stated that recognition by the other of their representative national movements, Zionism and the PLO respectively, is essential to any lasting settlement. Additionally, some Palestinians believe that in order for them to recognize another state, namely Israel, the Palestinians must have a homeland. Although the lack of a settlement has aroused bitterness and frustration among many Palestinians, there is constant determination to survive as a national group and to seek a settlement through political and diplomatic means involving the PLO.

## THE PALESTINIANS AND THE ARAB WORLD

*Rapporteur: Mary G. Boss*

The Palestinian dispersal throughout the Arab world has had resounding political consequences for the individual host countries as well as for the prospects for a general peace settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict.

According to most estimates, the Palestinian population currently numbers approximately 3,500,000. The bulk of this population resides on the East Bank of the Jordan River (31.4%) followed, in descending order, by the West Bank and Gaza, Israel, Lebanon and Kuwait. Palestinians have become differentially integrated in these states; their economic and political role and its impact has also varied commensurately. Political consequences of this Palestinian dispersal are rooted in the fact that despite physical and jurisdictional fragmentation, a collective consciousness of distinct national identity has remained.

Just as the Palestinians in the different Arab states have varied in their roles and impact, government policy in the host countries has also varied. There have been, however, strict political limitations in the form of permanent factors which establish parameters of choice in official policy towards the Palestinians. The following three permanent factors are operative regardless of ideology:

- (1) Arab national sentiment. From the wider concept of Arab nationalism derives the idea that Palestine is an integral part of the Arab patrimony.
- (2) Sense of outrage. Moral indignation interlaced with feelings of responsibility and guilt for injustices suffered by the Palestinians sets a ceiling on any acceptable political compromise in a solution of the Palestinian problem.
- (3) Larger historical role for the Arab world. A strong sense of a historic, glorious past strengthens the conviction that the Arab world, in time, will once again be a world power and should beware of compromise.

There is a clash, however, between these permanent factors and pressing objective conditions in the host countries. Surging economic problems, domestic political vulnerability and Arab military inferiority are examples of powerful pressures that force the Arab governments into seemingly inconsistent policies toward the Palestinians. Thus this tug-of-war between shared Arab sentiments and national pressures result in ambivalent positions, subject to expressions of undaunted support, denials and occasional backtracking.

Recent years have seen the growing use of two perceptual categories of Arab states with respect to both the Arab-Israeli conflict and the Palestinians - "moderates" and "rejectionists." By "moderate" is meant those states purportedly willing to accept the existence of Israel and end hostilities with the Jewish State. The major "moderates" include Egypt, Jordan, Saudi Arabia and Syria. Each of these countries for its own reasons seeks settlement with Israel. None seeks peace at any price. The Palestinian issue is also important to each of these states; its salience varies and depends upon needs specific to each of the countries.

"Rejectionist," by contrast, is used to describe those Arab states that oppose acceptance of Israel's "right to exist" and conclusion of any peace treaty with Israel. None of the states sharing a border with Israel is in the "rejectionist" camp, and none has the legitimacy conferred by the presence of a large Palestinian community. They need not compromise and therefore do not. They oppose any but a sovereign Palestinian state.

All of the central or pivotal states fall under the rubric "moderate." The central states are Syria, Jordan, Egypt and Saudi Arabia. It is because they are central to the issue that a non-nation state such as the Palestinians cannot dominate, but is inevitably dominated by, the key countries. In the past, only when social and security disintegration were very advanced - as in the aftermath of the 1967 war - have the Palestinians been able to dominate central states. The Palestinians may often grab the headlines, but these states hold the power.

An examination of the situation of Palestinians in two of the Arab host countries - Jordan and Lebanon - reveals common political dilemmas caused by the Palestinian dispersal.

The Palestinian community in Jordan constitutes approximately 60% of the total Jordanian population. Granted full rights of citizenship, Palestinians entered into all aspects of life in

Jordan, ranging from officials in the Jordanian government to entrepreneurs in all sectors of the economy. Jordan also has the largest Palestinian refugee population, most of whom became wage workers in agricultural projects, in services and in industry. In short, the Palestinians became fully integrated in the Jordan nation state and reflected the typical structure of Third World undeveloped society.

Despite Palestinian numerical, economic and technical force in Jordan, rule was by the Jordanian minority with the support of the loyal Bedouin army of King Hussein. With the rise of the popular Palestinian movement in the wake of the 1967 war, the increasingly mobilized, organized and armed guerrillas became a threat to the Hussein regime, culminating in the civil war of September 1970. It ended a few months later with the expulsion of the armed guerrillas from Jordan. Since 1970, the Jordanian regime appears to have eased out most Palestinians from official state apparatuses, especially the army, the intelligence agencies, the ministries and the central bank. The current nature of the relationship between the Jordanian government and the Palestine Liberation Organization is best characterized by mutual distrust and veiled enmity.

Palestinians in Lebanon divide nearly equally between camp dwellers and those living in private residences. Their role in Lebanon, unlike that of Jordan, was restricted to the private sector. The dynamic Palestinian role in the private economy of Lebanon has been matched by their political activity on several levels - in pan-Arab parties and movements as well as student, worker and white collar union organizations. The rise of the Palestinian movement coincided with the structural crisis of Lebanese society; the socio-political polarization of Lebanon became lethally enmeshed with the Palestinian movement and served as a catalyst for the recent civil war.

Attempts to control, if not suppress, Palestinian guerrilla activity in Lebanon has dotted Lebanese recent history. As early as 1969 the Lebanese sought to control the popular Palestinian guerrillas; the inconclusive conflict resulted in the Cairo Accords which have since become the basis for regulating Lebanese-Palestinian relations. In Lebanon, however, at least half the population, nationalist and progressive, supported the Palestinians and learned from them. Thus a Lebanese progressive-Palestinian alliance was forged as the country polarized.

The civil war has ended, but issues that triggered that conflict have not been resolved. The situation will remain



18.

uncertain until the outline of the Lebanese system, and the role the Palestinians might play in it, becomes clear. Lebanon's future is dependent as well on the resolution of the outstanding regional issues, particularly the establishment of a Palestinian entity.

Arab host countries do seem to agree on three basic concepts with regard to a Palestinian solution in the context of a larger settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict. These three elements are: (1) acceptance of the state of Israel and readiness for a formal peace, (2) insistence on a return to the pre-1967 borders and (3) insistence on the right of the Palestinians to a role in the peace process. Indeed, there seems to be consensus that stability in the Middle East is contingent on Palestinian exercise of self-determination in their quest for a homeland.

PALESTINIAN ATTITUDES AND PERCEPTIONS  
TOWARDS ISRAELIS

*Rapporteur: James N. Falk*

In the field of international politics, states and individuals often act as if image and perception were as important as reality. This phenomenon is especially true in the Middle East where the acknowledgement of the perceptions and attitudes held by Palestinians towards Israel is essential for a feasible peace settlement. Moreover, in Israel, these perceptions are reflected in concrete policies and the following examples are, as they must be for a scholarly study, based on factual episodes.

Since 1948, some Palestinian Arabs have lived under Israeli control. This has meant that approximately 470,000 Palestinian Arabs have been educated in Israeli administered schools. In comparing census figures, there is a notable discrepancy between the official figures of the government of Israel and those of certain researchers. This can be explained, in part, by the fact that the Israelis do not include in their estimate of Palestinian Arabs those residing in East Jerusalem. In examining the reasons for Palestinian attitudes toward Israel, it is important to note that of the aforementioned 470,000 Palestinian Arabs, 75 per cent are under the age of 30.

Contrary to Israeli aspirations, since 1967, there has been a noticeable increase in the intensity of Palestinian national consciousness. The Palestinians are not, for numerous reasons, being absorbed into the Arab states. This has brought about what can be described as a "chain process." In other words, the perceptions held by the Palestinian population are directly affected by what they consider that of Israel's to be toward them.

Since the occupation, the Palestinians have undergone a process which they hope will enable them to win their struggle against what they perceive to be a foreign, imperialist power. This process of "retribalization" takes place when an ethnic group feels that its identity is being lost. In order to regain their culture, more emphasis is placed on customs, values and symbols. All of these aforementioned tools are used as weapons in the war

against "Zionist oppression." The heightened interest in folklore dancing was given as an example of "retribalization." Before 1967, there were only a few scattered clubs devoted to the teaching of this indigenous art. Now, however, it seems as if every Palestinian has or is taking part in some activity that allows him to demonstrate loyalty to his cultural heritage.

Palestinian perceptions differ according to the level from which they are examined. Concerning the population, the class nature and the degree of contact between the Palestinian Arabs and the Israelis greatly affect the subjective nature of their attitudes.

The most common perception is that they, the Palestinian Arabs, do not constitute a part of the aggregate Palestinian identity. In fact, the Israelis do not grant them the right of qualifying as a "people"; individuals not of the Jewish tradition form what is described as the "non-Jewish minority." This classification, however, is not afforded to the Palestinians who are constantly reminded in the diurnal press and in official government announcements that they are not a national minority. Indeed, they are barely tolerated.

Along these same lines, a survey of Israeli literature shows that the level of generalization or classification has recently undergone a radical change. Since 1967, the Palestinians have emphasized a distinct character. This can be explained by the increased awareness of the official Israeli position to dissuade the Palestinians from expressing their national identity, and by the increased frustration at being demarked as second class citizens.

It has been said that visitors to Israel are often led to believe that the Palestinians passively accept their status. Conversations with land owning elites are often arranged by the Foreign Ministry and, therefore, do not demonstrate the same perceptions and attitudes that the more reflective and representative intellectuals and peasants might have if engaged in similar conversations.

Peasants and other tillers of the soil view the occupation of Palestine by the Israelis as one that is both ruthless and omnipotent. There is no escape. An example of the duress that the Palestinians must endure is clearly illustrated in their forced compliance with the Defense Emergency Regulation of 1945. This *modus operandi* was adopted from the British Mandate and used in 1936 against several Jewish underground organizations. This Regulation allows for land expropriation, censure and banning of assembly and association. Article 125 gives the military commander

the authority to place borders wherever he wants. Naturally, the borders have been located so that 90 per cent of all arable land lies outside of the Palestinian villages. Furthermore, before an inhabitant of a village can farm the land, permission must be secured first from the military commander who is under no obligation to hear his request. According to all public reports, such permission has never been granted. Article 111 of the Regulation provides the commander with express authorization to incarcerate a suspect without a specific charge. This article is often applied in cases involving intellectual freedom.

Another example of the everpresent encroachment on Palestinian rights is evidenced in the manner in which the government of Israel allocates hectares of land to the Kibbutzim. A "non-Jew" can never become a member of the cooperatives.

In 1961, there was a highly charged debate in the Israel Knesset over the issue of redemption of land. This movement, inspired and organized by the Jewish National Front (Keren Hakayemet Le Israel) gathered 89 per cent of the land in Israel, most of which was transferred by the Israeli government to the Jewish people. Again one sees that "non-Jews" are not allowed to own or rent any of the land owned by the Jewish National Fund. The Israeli government has also permitted bars, prostitutes and establishments that are generally rather cheap to operate in East Jerusalem, whereas the code of morality is substantially more strict in West Jerusalem.

The number of Palestinian-authored publications has recently undergone a noticeable increase. Yet a Palestinian writer frequently runs the risk of censure and possibly a term in prison. In 1969, a well known Palestinian poet had his book dismembered by the Israeli censure. Entire poems and key lines were edited out, judged unprintable for "security reasons."

In effect, the Israeli government justifies most of its repressive acts as being vitally necessary for the security of the state. When pressed for reasons why certain clubs and ethnic museums were forced to close, the government cited "security reasons"; rarely, however, does it define the threat against the state.

It should be remembered that in discerning whether or not the Palestinian Arabs can have their full rights in Israel, that this would be in direct contradiction to Zionist ideology. Zionism clearly states that Israel by definition belongs solely to the

Jewish people. A number of scholars believe that the Palestinians will not get their just rights until Israel abandons her dependence on Zionism. This can be taken as saying that the first step toward peace is the de-Zionization of the state of Israel.

Although the standard of living of the Palestinian villagers in occupied territories is ameliorating, their fundamental desire for a homeland remains unabated. It is true that the majority of Palestinian Arabs are earning a salary, but this should not be taken to mean that the distrust of Israeli policies has disappeared. For years the Palestinians have watched their fashion, culture, cuisine, etc., by exported as representing Israel. No longer will the Palestinian Arabs allow their heritage to be usurped.

Finally, a discussion of perceptions and attitudes such as this one is not without certain caveats. For instance, although most scholars insist on specific cases and accurate facts, the method used in acquiring the data depends largely on the researcher's training. Anthropologists, for example, tend to draw their conclusions from studies centering around group organization and behavioral science. Authors, on the other hand, lean towards issues concerning literary freedom. Intellectuals have often been the victims of many of the alleged, though often documented, violations, of human rights. As evidenced earlier, it is quite common for a writer to have his work run through the censor while he waits in prison without knowledge of the charge or charges against him.

Taking note of the ideological dispositions of both sides, it would be a serious mistake for anyone to assume that the Palestinians will ever accept the *status quo*. Acceptance of that *status quo* would not permit their national character to be expressed, nor their rights upheld, in a country that, they argue, is rightfully their own.

BANQUET ADDRESS

*William J. Porter*

It would be pleasant to stand here this evening and rejoice with you if the Middle East burden had been lifted from our backs, minds and pocketbooks, but alas! that has not happened. The annals of the Foreign Service, the archives of the United States record no more dismal or prolonged failure than that resulting from our efforts to bring about a constructive solution, a rational solution, to this problem. Some day, the reasons for this will be exhumed, and they will, I predict, amaze and shock the American people. They will not enhance the reputation of many so-called statesmen and officials whose combined efforts have resulted in a massive deterioration of the conditions in which many of the people of the Middle East live.

Tonight, therefore, I shall not discuss Arabs and Israelis. They receive enough of our attention. I shall try to limit my remarks to what their problem has done to us and to some things we might do for our own protection in the future. I will hold out no prospect for a solution. Given our lamentable performance in the past, to do so would be unwise. My principal interest in the matter at this point is to see whether anything can be done to improve the image and posture of our own country if we are, as I believe, fated to stay with the problem into the indefinite future.

Our incapacity to achieve useful results in the Middle East became more evident during and after the war of 1973. From that time on we increasingly interwound our affairs, political, military and economic, with those of the contending parties and we have now reached the point where we are completely unable to persuade or to pacify them without doing great damage to our own interests.

Consider for a moment also: As a result of the growth of world influence of one of the parties, we see arrayed against the United States the United Nations, the Islamic World, the Third World and of course the communist world; and even our allied partners look askance at our approach to the

Middle East problem both inside and outside the UN.

Yet, oddly enough, the thirty disastrous years which have brought us to that point have not altered our belief that we alone have the talent and the insight and the influence to coax the parties toward a reasonable solution. After the initial shock of reality, each administration plunges on like the man on a lonesome road who dares not turn his head. Boasting publicly about our influence with both sides is pure bravado: The plain truth of the matter is that they merely find it expedient to permit us to exhaust ourselves. If that's "influence," I think P.T. Barnum had a more apt description for it.

We should also think about our present role of self-appointed mediator and the unfortunate posture we have assumed in it. In September 1975, we yielded our right to deal with one of the principal elements of the problem because they are said to desire the elimination of their adversary. What's novel about that in a wartime situation? Is it not the task of negotiators and mediators to attempt to modify or attenuate extreme positions? In this particular case the attitude of both parties toward each other seems equally lethal. The results of our attitude are all bad: They make our task much more difficult and our seriousness of purpose and our credibility are questioned around the world.

Another interesting facet of diplomacy is our habit of repeating that we have no intention of imposing a settlement on the parties. That is disingenuous. We know perfectly well after thirty years of trying, half-trying or not unsuccessfully trying, that our methods are not conducive to imposing anything on anyone in this dispute. We have seen two "solutions" imposed on Palestine in this century and I feel sure we would not wish to repeat them in form or results. Also, I propose that we cease issuing premature statements setting forth what we believe should be basic elements which have been stated publicly, but going public with them at this stage merely hardens the resolve of those who are opposed to a negotiated outcome.

Where does all this take us? It should, aside from any handwringing one may feel is justified, bring us to the point of understanding that reassessments of the problem and our methods and tactics are long overdue. To remain as we are for another thirty years is unthinkable. We must face our predicament resolutely, realizing that if we do certain possibilities are open to us:

First, this President appears to have the will to make a real try. He has not yet encountered the resistance we know the problem can generate, but he does have his own general ideas concerning an arrangement. If his intention remains firm, he will sooner or later find it necessary to end the present practice of receiving nothing while we provide a very great deal of our time and material assistance. That is where an understanding with the leadership of the Congress becomes crucial. Historically, whenever a President or Secretary of State has been bold enough to express the thought that a real compromise is required, the most powerful lobby in the United States has successfully undermined Congressional acceptance of his views. Perhaps there was one exception when Mr. Dulles encountered intransigence abroad over the Sina in 1957 and effectively dealt with it.

Next, allied assistance and advice should be sought to coordinate and design methods of dealing with the problem in a manner that would be supported by the majority of the nations. A political consortium of some kind. The United States must not remain isolated and it cannot cope alone with the adversaries. A share of the responsibility, and the cost, should be borne by others, especially by those allies and friends who have great and increasingly lucrative interests in the Middle East. The allied front for peace in the Middle East, like that here at home, must be both solid and evident.

Third, whatever our individual or collective role may be in future, the President should restore our credibility by regaining our negotiating autonomy. It is unsuitable and de-meaning, as well as self-defeating, for the United States as a mediator to exclude one of the principal parties in the struggle, at the behest of another, from the mediatory process.

Fourth. Middle East leaders of peaceful intent should be encouraged to remain in close touch with each other and with the United States and other countries which seek peace. The Arab leaders must accept the chief responsibility for convincing the Palestinian leaders, including the PLO, that peace will serve their people better than war; and the US must face up resolutely, as the administration appears now to be trying to do, to Israeli attitudes that do not appear to us and other like minded nations to be conducive to a peaceful outcome.

Fifth. It is worth repeating that the US government should cease sending high level envoys to the Middle East before the home front is properly prepared. Every government in that region keeps close tabs on the Congressional state of



mind concerning Middle East developments. As one of the more outspoken Foreign Ministers put it to an American visitor who repeated several times that he had the President's complete confidence and backing: "Yes, Yes, Mr. Secretary, I'm sure of it. But you haven't said anything about Congress."

The arrivals of our special envoys in small countries are rather splendid occasions, but alas, they do not always improve our image. The planners of such expeditions seem to have little regard for the natural modesty which is the hallmark of our people outside Washington. Their idea seems to be to overwhelm our hosts with officials, mountains of baggage and the noise of scores of walkie-talkies. We've seen planes disgorge as many as ninety-five people, including the head man, his administrative team, his substantive team, his blood plasma team, his security guards, the gentlepersons of the media, and of course the caterers. It is only fair to say that this flamboyance has changed for the better and a more subdued style is now in vogue.

On one occasion, our hosts pointed out the simultaneous arrivals of an American and an official of equal rank from another important country. Our man arrived in purple pomp, riding a moon-white plane. The other arrived commercial, accompanied by one aide. His Embassy and local security took over and looked after him quietly and efficiently. I regret to recall that on that occasion the other foreign dignitary accomplished for his country more than ours did for us.

Sixth. The Soviet Union is expected to co-chair a Geneva conference with us if and when one is convened. But the State Department should be wary. Soviet cooperation at such a conference would be useful, but nightly statements by Moscow on the perfidious role of the United States against Arab interests do not bode well for a constructive Soviet role at Geneva. In any case, the concept of such a conference should be carefully reexamined to determine whether the results we seek might be better achieved through less formal rituals. I believe that a gathering at Geneva should be limited to a ceremonial event which should follow rather than precede a general agreement on principles by all parties concerned, including those nations involved in the peacemaking process.

Seventh. The United States should form an appropriate *ad hoc* coordinating team to stay with the problem and report to the President and Secretary of State. This should be done immediately, so that if we do go to Geneva the United States will arrive there with a cohesive unit ready for the long pull

instead of one composed of tired bureaucrats who have been associated with past failures.

All of this is based on the assumption that we will stay with our albatross despite past and, no doubt, future setbacks. As you know, there have been hints in high places here in Washington to the effect that if we continue to encounter intransigence we will give our attention to other matters. But I have news for those who think that way, although I sympathize with them: We are far too deeply enmeshed in the problem, and responsible for it, to simply pick up our marbles and go play elsewhere. We lost that privilege years ago. After all, we and our friends have the means. Only our national will needs to meet the test. We have a President with a majority in both houses of Congress and if they can't make it they will at least be noted for that in history.

ISRAELI ATTITUDES AND PERCEPTIONS  
TOWARDS PALESTINIANS

*Rapporteur: Kathleen Manalo*

The panel on Israeli attitudes towards Palestinians started off with a descriptive account of such attitudes. Other panelists spoke not of the attitude of Israelis in general towards Palestinians but rather of Palestinians and Israelis, thereby exhibiting their individual attitudes and hopes as Israelis.

There are inner contrasts and contradictions of the Israeli attitude towards the Arabs. While desiring peace with all their hearts, they would still not make any concessions that would mean returning territory to the Arabs, if this would create an immediate threat to the feeling of security of the average Israeli.

Israeli public opinion, generally speaking, is united in regards to three elements, which reflect the realization of a sovereign Jewish State in Israel:

- a. The right of the Jewish people to establish their homeland in the land of Eretz Israel.
- b. The necessity for a secure life for the Jewish people in Israel.
- c. That the State of Israel will be democratic and Jewish in its nature, with implications like that the first official language would be Hebrew, and that any Jew would be granted a right to emigrate.

One may classify Israeli public opinion according to the emphasis that various groups in Israel give the three elements mentioned above.

The first group, which is often known as the "right wing," attributes the main importance to the first element - the Jewish right over the land of Zion. This group includes radical

nationalists and most of the Orthodox Jews, who religiously believe in the return of the Jewish people to their land. For these people the Palestinians are of marginal significance. According to their opinion, the Palestinian problem can, and should, be solved within the borders of any of the Arab countries.

The second group attributes the main importance to the security of the Jewish State. The majority of Israelis belong to this group, which politically includes the central Liberal party and the Labor Party. This central group is prepared to recognize the rights of the Palestinians to the extent that those rights do not constitute a threat to the security of the Jewish state. This central group would, therefore, oppose Palestinian rights as they appear in the PLO Covenant.

The third group believes that the State of Israel must be first and foremost democratic, and Jewish, and is therefore willing to recognize Palestinian rights and withdraw from almost all occupied territories. They believe that the Arabs may be trusted and that negotiations along with agreements and withdrawals from the occupied territories would bring the desired peace and security. This approach would not oppose the establishment of an independent Palestinian state, as long as it will not threaten the pre-1967 borders.

Over the years, the centrist group became larger, partly because the left shifted to center. The ruling coalition includes not only rightists but liberals who are moderate on the Palestine issue. It is hoped that the moderates in both the government and the opposition will review the Palestine issue with less fear and suspicion than in earlier times.

\* \* \* \*

One panelist appeared in a private capacity to give personal impressions and attitudes as an Israeli citizen. She expressed her feeling of frustration at hearing, during the conference, of the "deprived Arab population in Israel." She spoke of persecution, which she said she knew well. As a child she was raised in a refugee camp. But she survived and she was not brought up on hatred nor with the expectations that she must live on the same piece of land on which she was born. There have been refugees for centuries but the Palestinian refugees have developed into a unique problem.

She stated her attitude as one of equality. Mistakes are made by governments and individuals but one should not cultivate the mistakes and turn them into ideology, ignoring completely all the rest, that is good, human and liberal. Considering the state

of terrorism, the State of Israel must take exaggerated precautions for security reasons. To Israelis, the term "security reasons" is very meaningful. Restrictions are imposed on Israelis as well as Arabs. Even if such restrictions are wrong, and possibly unjust, they, as all things, must be seen in their proper proportions, free of propaganda. If the destruction of Israel ceases to be the main objective of the Palestinians, then the Israelis can view things differently, and maybe peace can be achieved.

\* \* \* \*

Palestinians can be classified into four categories. There are Jewish Palestinians and there are Arab citizens of Israel. They share the general basic concept of the State of Israel as an independent state as it now exists. The third group is composed of Palestinians living outside the boundaries of Israel or Israeli-held territory. This is the most radical segment of Palestinians, as manifested in the PLO National Covenant. The general spirit of hostility and the hope to eradicate the State of Israel Israelis abhor and wish to see basically changed. The fourth category are the Arabs of the West Bank.

The local leadership of the West Bankers play a positive role in the political dimension of the Arab-Israeli conflict. New mayors are active in promoting the welfare of their constituents. The most conspicuous common characteristic is their degree of political realism. New mayors and councillors do not cease expressing their support for the PLO as the only representative of the Palestinians. But many do not fail to go to Amman to declare their loyalty to King Hussein. And the daily activities of normalization bring them more into touch with Israeli authorities in pursuit of interests mutual to these authorities and their own communities. Their general attitude is one of patience and the maintenance of good relations with Israel. They do not like it but consider it a part of life. But there is growing awareness that the future is bound to be interwoven with Israeli society. This awareness gives a reason for optimism about a future accommodation between the State of Israel and the Palestinians.

\* \* \* \*

Palestinian nationalism and the Palestinian right of self determination are both facts which have to be accepted by Israel, just as Zionism and the Jewish State are facts which have to be accepted by the Palestinians. The degree of tolerance required for the peaceful coexistence of the two people within one democratic state does not exist. Consequently it is unrealistic

and undesirable to annex the West Bank and the Gaza Strip to Israel. It is quite unrealistic to assume that three million Jews or three million Arabs would forsake their national identity. A Jewish State with a minority of three million Arabs or Palestinian state with three million Jews would lead automatically to internal strife, second class citizenship, etc.

It is illogical to argue against a Palestinian state at this stage. First, the Palestinians would constitute a large majority even if the West Bank returned to Jordanian rule. Hence it would be impossible to guarantee the future regime of such a state or to determine whether it will be ruled by a Hashemite monarch, a democratically elected parliamentary government or more likely by a military dictatorship. Second, it is inconceivable for Israel to take sides in what is for all interests and purposes an internal Palestinian-Jordanian problem. Lastly, Israel has the right to insist that whoever she negotiates with and returns territories to, will recognize her right to exist within secure and recognized borders. Moreover, just as Israel has to come to terms with the acceptance of Palestinian nationalism, the Palestinians, including those who represent them, will have to accept Zionism as the representative movement of Jewish nationalism.

The plight of Palestinian refugees has to be brought to a speedy end. Of the 35 million or so refugees created since World War II, these are the only ones whose suffering has been perpetrated due to political reasons and who are expected to be repatriated to their place of birth. Once a Palestinian state comes into existence, whether in conjunction with Jordan or not, the refugees will have to be settled within that state, unless they prefer to become citizens of other countries in the Middle East or elsewhere. The Arabs choosing to remain within the boundaries of Israel will do so with the full understanding that they choose to live as a minority in a Jewish state. The Jews who choose to live in the Arab part of Palestine will do so with a similar understanding. To achieve these aims, current views and perceptions, both in Israel and among the Palestinians will have to change radically. Ideologically, the so-called "Crusader concept" viewing Israel as a temporary evil, which will vanish from the Middle East either through disintegration or be wiped away by force, will have to vanish. Similarly, a change of attitudes among Israelis is called for. The gap existing even between so-called moderate Arabs and so-called Israeli doves seemed so great that even a Labor government in Israel would not be able to make much progress.

For the vast majority of Israelis real peace is the ultimate dream, overriding by far any craving for expansionism. Any Israeli political force which will be able to deliver real peace will be empowered by the electorate to negotiate and give away the bulk of the territories conquered in 1967, provided that adequate safeguards for such a peace are part and parcel of such an agreement.

To conclude, it would be naive and unrealistic to expect a conflict of such duration and dimensions as that of the Middle East to be solved by signing a piece of paper at Geneva or elsewhere. To achieve real peace, a complete change of perceptions and attitudes is called for. Both sides, as well as the super-powers, will have to realize that what is required is a long process and not a diplomatic miracle. It is useless and harmful to talk about Israeli intransigence in face of Arab moderation. If the Palestinian problem is as is claimed by many "the heart of the Middle East conflict," and if the PLO is indeed, as claimed by some, the sole representative spokesman of the Palestinians, all that remains to be done is to study carefully the resolutions of the last two sessions of the PLO's Supreme National Councils, in order to arrive at the sad conclusion that there is no sign of moderation yet, even in comparison with the Likud.

THE PALESTINIANS, ISRAEL, THE UNITED STATES  
AND GENEVA: THE PATH TO A SETTLEMENT

*Rapporteur: G. Neal Lendenmann*

The United States has been and will continue to be centrally involved in the attempt to achieve peace in the Middle East. United States policy is therefore a crucial element in the development of a Middle East solution. US policy towards the Palestinians has gone through several periods of evolution since the creation of Israel. In the period between 1948 and 1967 the United States attempted to resolve the Arab Israeli conflict by trying to bring together the Arab states and Israel in order that they might work out their own solution. During this period US policy was concerned not with "Palestinians" but with "refugees." The Palestinian question, therefore, was of a humanitarian nature, and concerned displaced persons for whom "justice" should be provided. The United States supported resolutions in the United Nations General Assembly calling for repatriation of refugees or their resettlement with compensation, and it provided about \$600 million during the period for the refugees through international agencies. The solution of the Arab Israeli conflict, however, was to be left to the Arab states and the Israelis without Palestinian participation.

The second period of US policy began with the June War of 1967. It is true that all US peace proposals between 1967 and 1973 retained the focus on Palestinians as refugees. Nevertheless, an additional element in US policy began to appear as new forces emerged within the context of the Arab Israeli confrontation. Prior to 1967, the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) had been an instrument of the governments of the Arab states, but it emerged reinvigorated and increasingly independent of those governments after the June War. Beginning in 1968, terrorist attacks on Israel and Israeli aircraft carried out by the PLO caused the US to adopt a second element in its policy towards the Palestinians--that of opposition to international terrorism. By 1970 this element was firmly in place.

The third period in the evolution of US policy towards the Palestinians occurred following the October 1973 War and marked



the emergence of the Palestinians as a political factor, although US policy did not reflect this emergence for some time. Initial agreements between the opposing parties, including the disengagement agreement between Israel and Egypt in January 1974 and that between Israel and Syria in May of the same year, had three major characteristics: they were state oriented, they dealt with territory and they avoided the Palestinian question.

The US had also hoped to work out an agreement between Israel and Jordan as an alternative to the Palestinian problem, but efforts in this direction failed. At the Rabat summit conference of October 1974, the Arab states designated the PLO as the sole representative of the Palestinian people. This designation precluded the possibility of a "Jordanian option" and was the crucial factor in the emergence of the Palestinians as a political force. From 1974 to 1976 the US began to reevaluate its policy position. Although sympathy towards refugees and opposition to terrorism remained policy foci under Secretary of State Henry Kissinger and his deputies, the need to take the 'interests' of the Palestinians into account began also to be recognized. But while "Palestinians" emerged as a factor to be dealt with in US policy, the methods of dealing with the Palestinians remained unclear.

Thus, in 1975, as the Sinai II Agreement was being worked out, Secretary of State Kissinger pledged to Israel that the US would not recognize or negotiate with the PLO as long as the PLO did not recognize Israel's right to exist and did not accept Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338. But the growing awareness of the political aspect of the Palestinian question was reflected in November 1975 when Deputy Assistant Secretary of State Harold Saunders testified on Capitol Hill that in many ways the Palestinian dimension of the Arab Israeli conflict was "the heart of that conflict." Despite assertions by Kissinger and others that no change in policy was reflected in the statement, the Saunders testimony indicated the beginnings of change in the US attitude towards the Palestinians.

This change has been accelerated under President Carter. While the Carter Administration opposes terrorism and is concerned with the refugee problem, the issue of the Palestinians in US policy has clearly taken on a political emphasis. While the dimensions of the Carter Administration's policy towards the Palestinians remains somewhat obscure, the salient characteristics of that policy appear to be that the legitimate interests of the Palestinian people must be represented in any peace solution and that some form of "homeland" must exist for them. The preference at this point is for a Palestinian entity linked with Jordan.

President Carter has said that the PLO must endorse Resolution 242, but that if such an endorsement is made the US could then meet with it. This represents a significant change in US policy, although the PLO has recently rebuffed the offer.

It may be said that with respect to the securing of Palestinian participation in any future Geneva conference, the US has been attempting to follow two alternative avenues. The first avenue, that of nudging the PLO towards acceptance of Resolution 242 and thereafter attempting to secure direct PLO participation in Geneva, has been rejected, for different reasons, by both the PLO itself and by Israel. The second avenue has been to secure agreement by the parties in the dispute for the acceptance of Palestinian (in effect, informal PLO) participation alongside representatives of various Arab states in one overall Arab delegation.

This second alternative presents some attractive possibilities. First, it would present Israel with the opportunity of allowing Palestinian participation without forcing it to deal directly with the PLO. Israeli opposition to negotiating with the PLO, even if the latter accepts Resolution 242, is virtually unanimous, and US insistence on Israeli negotiations with the PLO could engender massive opposition to US policy not only in Israel but also in the US.

Second, the one Arab delegation approach would allow the PLO to participate indirectly in the negotiations without "compromising" itself. The PLO is reluctant to surrender its principal bargaining leverage without receiving any assurances that by accepting Resolution 242 it would subsequently be a party to Geneva. By participating only indirectly, the PLO would lose nothing should negotiations fail, but should they progress sufficiently, direct PLO participation might well be secured in the future. Thus, the single Arab delegation approach would allow both the Arabs and the Israelis to work out a heretofore insoluble procedural dispute without appearing to compromise their principles. The US would then be freed to offer its good offices to the two parties, present alternatives towards a peace settlement and help shape a procedural format within which the substantive issues can be dealt with effectively.

It is essential that the US negotiating role be defined cogently and carried out consistently. A Special Negotiator for the Middle East, who would devote full time to reaching a Middle East settlement, assume an operational role in the day to day activities of the peace process and represent the US at Geneva, should be appointed by the President. Two deputies,

one with the task of working on a national level with Congress and with special interest groups concerned with the Middle East, and the other working on an international level through visits to the Middle East, should also be appointed. The Special Negotiator and his staff would work towards the convening of a Geneva Conference (as well as towards the implementation of any agreements which had been reached there once the conference had been held) and would in addition relieve the Secretary of State from the necessity of shuttling back and forth from the Middle East.

Once the procedural matters leading up to the conference had been settled, a General Assembly Resolution calling upon the two co-chairmen of the previous Geneva conference to convene a new conference might be passed. This would lend the weight of international support to the conference and reinforce the role of the co-chairmen. After a date for the conference had been agreed upon, the conference might open in plenary session, attended by Cabinet level representatives from the invited states, and formulate an agenda for the conference. Thereafter multi-lateral committees might be convened to deal with specific technical issues. Several bilateral subcommittees, attended by Israel on the one hand and one Arab state on the other, could be appointed to work out issues of bilateral interest.

After agreement had been reached at the committee level a plenary session might again be convened to sign the formal agreement. The document should contain basic principles of peace to apply multilaterally to all the parties, and a separate section should contain the bilateral undertakings. Because any agreement reached would be likely to give rise to problems of interpretation and application, moreover, mediation after the agreement would be essential for the implementation of the specified undertakings. A permanent structure either at Geneva or elsewhere that would help implement and monitor decisions taken at the conference might well be established to deal with disputes. In addition, the US through its Special Negotiator, should continue to offer its good offices towards the goal of the achievement of peace in the Middle East.

THE NATURE AND PROSPECTS OF A PALESTINIAN  
HOMELAND: THE SHAPE OF A SETTLEMENT

*Rapporteur: Steven Dorr*

The political parameters of a possible settlement of the Palestinian question have been discussed at length. But the economic and institutional determinants may also be critical for the future viability of any Palestinian state. A new network of economic interests, new patterns of economic interdependence among the economies of Israel, the West Bank, the Gaza Strip and Jordan, along with the growth of Palestinian economic and social institutions have become important elements in the negotiating process, making a clearer understanding of their interrelationships worthy of further examination.

Labor conditions, trade and its impact on agriculture and industry, the monetary system and tourism -- all illustrate the economic prospects a new Palestinian state will face. Women, children and older people comprise the preponderant portion of the 1,106,800 inhabitants of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, as most able young males have left to work in Jordan or other Arab countries. From 1968 on, however, increasing numbers of unskilled laborers, estimated to exceed 100,000, have been going to work in Israel. Only 66,300, however, or 32% of the occupied territories' labor force of 207,000, are legally registered. Working primarily in construction and agriculture, these unskilled laborers will often find that their upward mobility is restricted, special benefits available to others are denied to them, and ultimately their vulnerable jobs are the first eliminated during an economic decline. In 1976, the Bank of Israel reported some 20,000 had lost work in Israel. Increased education may not help to solve this problem as positions for the educated and professionals are few and difficult to obtain. Nevertheless, a link between Israel and the territories has been secured. Palestinian workers generate up to one half of the GNP and the demand for unskilled labor in Israel continues to pull up wages (the differential is now less than 20%) and cut unemployment (now below one per cent). If, as a result of a settlement, the Israeli labor market were closed to Palestinians, the resultant

dislocation could be substantial, requiring massive capital investment in infrastructure and industry.

The occupied territories' markets, now open to Israeli trade, have become a heavily protected market for Israeli products as Jordan's trading position has eroded and an already large trade deficit has expanded. Before 1967, most imports were manufactured goods with agricultural products constituting the major proportion of exports. Today, two-thirds of the West Bank's exports go to Israel and one-third to Jordan with 85% of the Israeli-destined exports being industrial goods largely manufactured under sub-contracts for Israeli firms while the exports to Jordan remain primarily agricultural. The Gaza Strip's chief exports are also mainly agricultural with large percentages of these goods going to the Arab world and Iran *via* Jordan, although a new industrial zone near Erez has boosted Gaza's industrial exports. Imports into the occupied territories are overwhelmingly Israeli in origin (89% for the West Bank and 94% for the Gaza Strip). The "Open Bridges" policy, initiated soon after 1967 in order to absorb what was becoming a bumper crop in Israel and the occupied territories, has not really generated trade as goods coming into the West Bank are subject to Israeli tariffs and trade in the other direction is inhibited by the Arab boycott. Trade in agriculture between the occupied territories and Israel only began to grow in 1970-1971 as some Israeli protective restrictions were relaxed. Now the agricultural sectors of Israel and the territories are treated as a single agricultural area and some new crops plus a degree of central planning are being introduced.

In the industrial sector, small scale enterprises and traditional crafts generate important trade with Israel by serving as centers for the sub-contracting operations of Israeli firms in labor intensive businesses. Even though some Palestinian women have gained employment as a result of these subcontracting activities, and other workers have also gained new skills and experience, the emphasis on unskilled labor remains the hallmark of the economic relationship between Israel and the occupied territories. In the long term the economic interests of these territories would benefit from a change in policy which would protect or subsidize some branches of local industry against Israeli competition, expose Israeli imports to competition with imports of other countries and develop markets for local products elsewhere in the Middle East.

A political settlement would also improve two other important areas of the economy: tourism and the monetary sector. The West Bank was greatly dependent upon tourism before 1967, but this source of foreign currency was lost when most Arab

visitors were excluded after the territories were occupied. The monetary sector has remained confused and underdeveloped since 1967. Almost no banking system exists as more than 90% of the area's means of payment are accounted for by currency in circulation. Both the Israeli pound and the Jordanian dinar are legal tender on the West Bank but the widely fluctuating exchange rates and the absence of a capital market have led residents to hold large quantities of cash, often in foreign currencies. After a settlement one would expect tourism to increase and greater confidence to be placed in the monetary sector of the new state's economy. However, a political settlement is not enough. Massive capital investment will also be needed to improve the quality and quantity of the work force, to upgrade and develop the industrial sector and its infrastructure, to introduce long range planning into the agricultural sector and to attract Palestinians who will serve as managers, entrepreneurs and resident investors. Israel, local Arab investors and even international organizations are unlikely sources for investment funds, therefore, existing and prospective Palestinian institutions must be evaluated as possible input sources for the West Bank and the Gaza Strip.

In recent years Palestinian economic and social institutions, both private and public, have developed and now operate in Israel, in the occupied territories, with the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) and in the diaspora. In the West Bank and Gaza, the survival and propagation of various Palestinian administrative, community development, educational, health and commercial institutions have become major objectives. These institutions include the municipalities, Musa Alami's Arab Development Society in Jericho, In'ash al-'Usrah in Birah, the Palestine Women's Union in Gaza and the Palestine Chambers of Commerce to name just a few. The limited resources channelled through the UN and several charitable international sources over the last five years have been welcome by the leadership, both traditionalists and the younger generation. However, the internal structure of these Palestinian institutions lacks the necessary planning, decision making and executive capabilities effectively to utilize even this limited assistance. In Israel proper, the one-half million Arab inhabitants are without leadership as traditional institutions of leadership, such as the *mukhtars* (a system of notables built on the family clan) have passed away succeeded only by weak and insufficiently financed municipal councils.

The PLO has established a number of institutions designed to meet the political, administrative, military, economic and

social needs of the Palestinian people. Under the overall supervision of the Palestine National Council (PNC), which is elected by Palestinians through their unions and federations, Palestinian institutions have continued to multiply. At the PNC's 13th meeting in Cairo, March 21-25, 1977, several new programs were established including: the Institutions for the Families of Prisoners and Martyrs; a Funding Institution to provide financial support to other Palestinian institutions and to specific housing, agricultural and industrial projects in the West Bank and Gaza; new cultural and educational programs including the establishment of an Open University in Palestine; a Special Research Department for Occupied Palestine Affairs; and a Department of Popular Organizations to support various Palestinian union activities. Financial support for much of this work comes from Arab and non-Arab sources and is consolidated within the framework of the Palestine National Fund, governed by the Executive Committee of the PLO. In the diaspora, additional cultural and social organizations and federations function both independently and through the PLO to perpetuate international ties among the Palestinian community.

The effective utilization of the various Palestinian institutions innumeraed above in the process of social and economic development requires the establishment of strong intra-institutional linkages (i.e. between Palestinian groups) and inter-institutional linkages (i.e. between Palestinian and international groups). Formal linkages at the governmental level have not been established but Arab Development Institutions and the PLO work closely together on an informal basis. Non-governmental and voluntary organizations have established supportive linkages with other voluntary organizations and institutions in the West Bank and Gaza but the difficult political conditions have tended to constrain these activities. It is the United Nations which has taken the most active role in Palestinian institutional development as Western opposition to the Palestinians has lessened as Arab financial contributions to the UN have increased. As a result of the UN Economic and Social Council resolution 2026 (LXI) of August 4, 1976, various UN agencies, from UNESCO, UNDP and the Economic Commission for Western Asia (ECWA), through UNICEF, UNRWA, UNIDO, FAO, WHO and the UN Fund for Population Activities, have begun to coordinate their own activities in cooperation with the PLO to establish and implement concrete projects designed to improve the economic and social conditions of the Palestinian people. These UN sponsored educational, agricultural and industrial training programs; the new efforts to improve the health standards of the Palestinian people

and the financial support channelled through the UN to these projects will necessarily expand upon the settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict, and thereby play a greater role in the future development of any new Palestinian state.



## SUMMATION

*L. Carl Brown*

You have been an attentive audience, and it seems to me that there is little need for the usual step-by-step summary of the conference proceedings. Indeed, step-by-step summary may well be - like step-by-step diplomacy - somewhat out of style.

This, then, leaves me in a quandary. My plight calls to mind the story told by the late Kentucky humorist, Joe Creason. It concerns a young man who finally got a job with the railroad. This was back in the days of steam, and the young man's job was to fill up the water car. Too happy in his new position of responsibility to pay attention properly, he slipped and fell into the water car. Since the water in that car was eight feet deep he had to thrash around frantically to stay afloat while trying to get out. The veteran engineer, seeing his plight looked up and said, "Son, this being your first day on the job, I've got a suggestion. You just have to fill it up. You don't have to jump in and stomp it down."

The subject of this conference has been, I feel, quite effectively "filled up" by our several panelists. I am reluctant to jump in and stomp it down. Instead of a narrative summary, panel by panel, I propose instead to isolate and comment on a few dominant motifs that have characterized our discussion here.

In another sense, I suggest that in our summing up we try to look at our subject and ourselves historically. More precisely, how will the historian likely view this subject and this conference a century from now?

The first point I want to make is that our conference on this politically sensitive subject has struck a commendably serious, sober and realistic tone. There have, of course, been a few lapses, a few plays for the gallery. Given the long, bleak history of this problem, given the distressing background of full-throttle polemics on all sides, a few

such failings were only to be expected.

We have made progress on this point, and I would like to call this to the attention of one or two younger students here who cornered me expressing some distress that the conference discussion was too polemical and was not really tackling the issues. I am sympathetic with this concern and even more supportive of these students' passionate demand for serious, objective scholarship. At the same time I would mention to them, to paraphrase Martin Luther King, while we've got a long way to go yet, just look where we've come from.

This conference stands in clear contrast with past polemical and rhetorical statements - from all sides. This surely denotes a new mood, but it is a mood that we must not misunderstand. This new mood of sober realism, of calmly considering the range of possible options, does not in any way represent a cooling of passion or commitment.

No, the new mood is, I think, similar to that expressed by a regimental historian during the American Civil War. He wrote that after the first major encounter in which the troops were badly mauled thereafter the regiment was always ready and always responded effectively, but "we were never again quite so enthusiastic."

The new mood, then, reflects the sobriety of veterans who have lived and fought with the problem for decades. They (indeed, all of us - active participants and concerned observers) now have more experience and fewer illusions. There is quite possibly considerable hope in all this.

To explain the mood in another way, General Charles de Gaulle in the final stage of Algeria's decolonization coined the phrase "peace of the brave." What he meant was that each side had taken the other's measure, neither had completely defeated the other, neither had reason to feel humiliated. All could take pride in having persevered. On this basis, de Gaulle argued, there emerged the possibility of an accommodation. I think there is something of this Gaullist theme informing much that has taken place here at this conference.

A second point. Our topic has been the Palestinians and their place in the Middle East. For that very reason - and it's commendable that the panelists kept this in mind - we have focussed on the Palestinians. We have given them their due which they have not always been given in past conferences or colloquia. Some might argue that we have not given adequate attention to

other things that are closely related to the question: "What future for the Palestinians?" We have dealt less with the major adversary, Israel. We have said very little about the recent events in Lebanon, hardly anything about the oil issue, and not all that much about the Great Powers, though quite a bit about the American role, past, present and future.

More important, however, than arguments on what we did not do is that we stuck to our task and did what we should have done. We have given a thorough and, I think, fairly comprehensive - for a day and a half - coverage of the Palestinians, their recent past, where they are now, and their future prospects.

In the process, we did establish what one speaker referred to as the centrality of the Palestinian issue. I believe that whatever disagreements among the panelists on other points, there has been a clear agreement on this point.

The Palestinians exist as an entity, but not as an entity to be completely cut off from other Arabs. That point, too, has been stressed, but the Palestinians do exist as an entity. Many, probably most, of us came to this conference already convinced of that fact - but it was a useful review of past history - past history of American policy, past history of the Palestinians themselves, past history of how others perceive the Palestinians to be reminded in several different ways throughout our two days of this clear fact that the Palestinians exist.

This is important because at times it has been an understandable, but for the long run ineffective, tactic on the part of Israel to deny this Palestinianness. From time to time, it has been a tactic of now one, now another, or now several Arab states to control the Palestinians, and thereby to some extent "merge" them into a larger Arabness. Several outside powers, including of course the United States, have often toyed with the same tactic.

Further, given the human penchant for simplification, we often read too much into the journalistic shorthand that speaks of the Arab-Israeli issue. In the process sometimes there is not nearly enough emphasis on the separate components of the Arab side and not often nearly enough emphasis on the fact - the obvious fact - that the Palestinians are, in the Saunders formula, at the heart of the problem, the heart of the conflict. It has, thus, been useful and refreshing for us to review this basic truth.

Another thing that impresses me is an implicit conference theme. It has been pointed out that the Palestinians today are

estimated to number roughly three and one half million to a maximum of four million. Now this figures out to be about three per cent of the total Arab world. It is less than the Kurds, less than the total number of Berbers, less than the total number of Southern Sudanese, less even than the total number of Copts in Egypt. We were also told that the number of Jews living in Israel is something in the neighborhood of just over three million. The two combined comes up to a total of about seven plus million or, that is to say, roughly the estimated population of present day Cairo, and somewhat less than the population of New Jersey. And the immediate confrontation peoples, the Palestinians and the Israelis - the peoples now living in the area of the former Palestine mandate - are occupying a territory smaller than the state of New Jersey.

I call these facts to your attention, not in any way to belittle the problem that we've been addressing, but to underline the way in which today - and really throughout history for at least the last 50 years - this problem involving, by world standards, such a small number of people, and such a tiny bit of territory, has seized the attention and the activity of the entire world. It does so to this day. Many of you, I'm sure, already have in the back of your mind, or right on your lips, the thought that the Palestinians didn't will this international spotlight, and, of course, that is true. Yet, peoples and societies must move on from the point to which history has brought them. At the same time, if we can keep in mind this paradoxical background theme - a territorially and demographically "small" problem that has always loomed large on the international scene - we will better appreciate the delicate nature of the search for peace now.

Another theme was evoked by an interesting and also poignant question presented to the Keynote Speaker. In effect, the question was: Has there really been any change? Is it just plus ca change, plus c'est la meme chose or "there is nothing new under the sun," as the preacher in Ecclesiastes told us? We can best begin to address this point by noting the comprehensive nature of our conference. This conference did not stick strictly to political considerations, even less to diplomatic considerations.

I remind you that the first panel in this conference dealt with cultural affairs. Many old line political historians, social scientists, diplomats and former diplomats might think, "Well, that's all very well, that's the overture before the play really begins." It was not. The planners of this conference realized it was not. We treated many subjects - the economic issues that we talked about in the last session, the prospects for a Palestinian state, assuming a settlement makes this a possibility, cultural

aspects, education, demography and many others. We took on a very rich diet in these two days, and this was planned. Nor were we moving aimlessly from one thing to another.

Back to this cultural issue, surely the historian has only to be reminded of the importance of Risorgimento and the unification of Italy. Or the importance of early precursors in arts and letters for various nineteenth century nationalisms in Europe or elsewhere. Or the importance of at one time a small handful of American Black intellectuals in setting the stage for the Black liberation movement that's been one of the most encouraging things in our own national history in this century. And, of course, the interesting irony that historians run up against time after time, the way in which enemies learn from each other, adapt each other's ideas. Zionism itself had a group of precursors in the arts and letters. So it is important for those of us concerned, primarily with political, military or diplomatic possibilities, to follow the cultural dimensions of the problem.

Back then to the question "Have things really changed?" We received here a necessarily rapid view of the historical evolution of Palestinian self-identity and of the ways in which various Palestinians have wrestled with political options available to them over time. Recall some of the major phases: After the First World War many, certainly not all, were inclined to go along with Abdullah and the Hashimites. In the 1950s and after many saw the ideology and diplomatic tactics represented by Abd al-Nasir as providing the answer. The PLO, as is well known, was first created largely as a tool to be controlled by the existing states of the Arab League. Then, with the watershed of the June 1967 war the PLO came forward as a representative of an entity, of a people who in the historic process of struggle had developed a much greater sense of self-identity than they had previously held.

Reviewing this historical development, a historian gets very impatient with polemical arguments that such-and-such a people, or such-and-such a nationalism, or such-and-such an ideology, did not even exist before this or that period of time. After all, most major historical movements involve adaption of old and new in a continuous process. To challenge the authenticity of existing "Palestinianness" by arguing that it did not exist in the past, or at least did not exist in its present form is surely the weakest of polemical arguments. One has heard equivalent arguments during the Algerian War of Independence concerning whether Algeria was a nation before the French came. The whole approach is anachronistic and irrelevant. Fortunately, we managed to avoid such sterile disputations in our conference. It is surely much more

important to record the great degree of change and to understand how and why it took place.

Other things we've heard make clear that there has been considerable change. I was especially impressed by the review of social and demographic elements: the figure - really a dramatic figure - that there are over 80,000 Palestinians in higher education. Or that roughly 50 per cent of the Palestinians, wherever they live, are estimated to be 20 years of age or younger. And that the majority of the Palestinians are now urban. Also that the family cohesion, especially of those who move straight from exile into the refugee camps, remained much more intact than many of us had realized.

Just think of these statistics. Contrast them with, say, the statistics of Palestine in 1930 or 1936. We now have a very young population. A population that has undergone great uprooting, a population that has a much higher proportion of highly educated individuals. All of these are radical changes - quantum jump changes. Clearly, those of us who have been studying this problem as best we can for perhaps too long a time must be very careful lest we bring to bear certain notions, certain approaches that we thought were the received wisdom concerning what the fabric of Palestinian life was all about, based on what we knew of Palestine in the 1920s and 1930s or even 1940s and 1950s. I would not presume, and our panelists did not presume, to give more than impressionistic points of what this all means. I leave with you for the moment the obvious thing that we can all agree on - these kinds of raw statistics bring home the fact that clearly there has been great, great change.

Yet, certainly not all has changed. The several different panelists who got into the dimension of the diplomatic or the military tactics leave many of us with the feeling that in this arena things perhaps are not all that different.

Moving on to political and diplomatic tactics, it can be said that the closer we got in this conference to spokesmen for, or those closely linked with, the PLO the less precise were the statements and interpretations heard. Yet, in properly muting the apparent criticism, one must point out the general problem facing official representatives (and this would include, substantively, the spokesmen for the PLO). They are not, by definition individual, free-wheeling academicians who can say what they wish. They represent a group, and must stay within the guidelines of that group. To this extent spokesmen for the State Department are similarly constrained.

Further, by following the Algerian experience, by following the long, painful disengagement from Vietnam, by following the many other examples of emigré or guerrilla groups we come to realize that such groups are understandably much more skittish about taking publically flexible positions. Such groups do not have sovereign control over a territory. They do not have a conscripted army, or an ability to tax its citizens or to raise loans. Admittedly, the PLO (as with other such groups) does have alternative ways to raise men and money, conduct diplomacy, etc., but this is not the same as a state-in-being. Such a group still in this nebulous twilight zone of not yet being a state in possession of the instrumentalities of a state can more easily be jockeyed into a position from which it is difficult for them to reestablish legitimacy. So there is that ambiguity, the reluctance to make certain statements, even the appearance of paranoia, that several of you have noted. But we need to understand it.

Equally, looking at the Palestinians, at the other Arabs, at the Israelis, at the Great Powers, another great theme is what I would call the special diplomatic culture that characterizes the modern Middle East, and characterizes it for strong cultural and historical reasons.

One panelist referred to the ambiguity which characterizes inter-Arab relations and he went on to note, in a slightly different context (others emphasized this in virtually the same words) the ambiguity and impreciseness which characterizes so much of the diplomacy in the area. This, I suggest, has long been the case.

Many people from the floor, from the panels, time after time, came back to the fervent plea that the parties must not get bogged down in procedures. Surely, all of us are very sympathetic with that plea. Yet, a major contribution of other panelists was to make it clear that because of this special diplomatic climate, because of the great numbers of actors involved, and because there's no realistic way for all of these actors to get themselves uninvolved, we are necessarily seized with delicate procedural problems.

Implicit in what so many said, especially about this diplomatic dimension, are certain ideas and terms of the game theorists. I would see Middle Eastern diplomacy, with the Arab-Israeli confrontation being the extreme case, as partially explained by almost an excessive regard for politics of the *fait accompli*. It is very like the childhood game that many of you know called "steal the bacon." (Perhaps an inappropriate parallel for our conference.)

Suffice it to observe here that "steal the bacon," when seen as a metaphor for Middle Eastern diplomacy puts a premium on the quick grab, then hanging on by appeals to the *fait accompli*, all of which creates among those discomfited a stubborn tendency to diplomatic counter-punching plus refusal to recognize "established facts." There is a bit of all this, of course, in all diplomacy everywhere, but the special nature of Middle Eastern characterized by many minor power centers and the oppressively close ties linking local, regional and international issues gives the politics of this region a special cachet.

Another characteristic of the Arab-Israeli confrontation is the lack of synchronization between military power and political power. It's not the only region where this occurs, nor is there ever a complete synchronization between military power and political power. Yet, note the extremes at play here. The Israelis are smitten with what can be called the military Midas touch. They win wars, but don't win peace.

As for the Palestinians, many of our panelists have made clear that they cannot be counted out. They cannot be brought to heel simply by overwhelming military power either of Israel or of others. Yet, they cannot be sure of their capacity to rally enough supporters and hold them long enough to achieve their minimal aims.

As a result, there is a considerable sense of insecurity and tension on all sides. This was implicit in several of the more pessimistic prognoses that we received. Yet, such hard-eyed pessimism is needed, if we are to avoid the platitudinous or the simplistic. It is not especially useful to assert that we must not get bogged down in details. It is much better to appreciate what details are important and why.

For all of these reasons (this is implicit in what our discussions of the diplomatic dimension left us with) it is very, very easy for anyone at all to throw a monkey wrench into this delicate machinery we call the search for peace in the Middle East.

Where does all this leave us? It seems to me that this conference comes quite close to the following consensus. We understand and sympathize with the impatience with procedure and details expressed on many sides, but we are persuaded by the necessity of a very nuanced approach to the diplomacy of this problem, whether we're talking about going to Geneva or whether we're talking about getting ready to go to Geneva, or talking about being sure that Geneva is not another Lausanne.



There seems to be basic agreement that the substance of UN Resolution 242 provides the basis of a feasible settlement, provided appropriate changes are made to recognize the legitimate status of Palestinians and Palestinianness as an entity.

Many have dealt with the question: "Is this really our last best chance?" And most did have the feeling while prospects for peace unfortunately are still fairly slim, the likelihood that all of us - Palestinians, Israelis, everyone living in the area, we in the US, others in the world - will pay a heavy penalty, possibly a very heavy penalty, for not securing peace now are very strong indeed. I don't think we are being excessively apocalyptic, excessively dramatic, by pointing out that it is a difficult time, there are many things that need to be done, and we do not have all the time in the world. We need to sort out our priorities, and move on from there. We must seek not victory, but success; and we must be very realistic.

Several different panelists have emphasized the need to accept and understand and empathize with the acute mutual suspicions and antipathies that clearly prevail on all sides. Yet, perhaps even these mutual suspicions and antipathies, if properly balanced, can be turned in the right direction. Perhaps we can change the inertia that now exists of yet another no-war-no-peace stalemate, certain to be broken by yet another war at some future date, into a different inertia which moves us along the road to settlement. And I think of the old story that Vice President Alben Barclay used to tell. It expresses the attitude that the parties need to have.

Two farmers, each with his team of mules, reached a one lane bridge, one from one direction, one from the other, at exactly the same time. And one of them whipped up his mules, got onto the bridge, and said, "I never back down for any damn fool." The other one pulled aside and said, "Well, that's alright, I always do."

What, then, is the historian of the 21st century going to say about these issues? Let us look at what is possible, given the existence of great revenues that can be used for imposing economic development in the entire area, given the existence of so many trained people, among the Palestinians as we learned here, and in other parts of the area, it is possible that an accommodation - not victory but success - can serve to rechannel human

energies and natural resources of the area toward an impressive economic, social and cultural flowering.

Then the historian of the 21st century will look back at this conference and wonder what in the world we were worried about. And it is our fervent hope that this is just the way it will be viewed 100 years from now.