

: Text wording: 2008-5.-5.

The PIF-Plan (englisch)
(Palästina-Israel-Friedensplan)
 Palestine-Israel-peace plan

In Germany, the institute for international law submitted the peace plan to the Ambassador of Israel, Mr. Shimon Stein, and to the chief representative of the Palestine people Mr. Abdallah Frangi in 2002 already. No response was received.

The violent clashes between Israeli and Palestine people continued to escalate. In Israel the political forces who supported a peace agreement that would consolidate and secure the status quo were gaining. On the Palestinian side Hamas – an organisation that Israel and the Western world consider to be terrorist - won a majority in the elections for the parliament of the autonomy government. In the Gaza strip they gained exclusive power through violence. Aim of Hamas is not only to set up a Palestinian state, but also to abolish the Israeli one.

What might appear to be the culmination of an anti-peace could also mean that this climax of violence cannot be topped any further and the consequence to follow is that the only doors to be opened hereafter are the ones towards peace. The Israeli army finds itself already defending the Palestinian government and people against acts of terrorism or violent attacks by Hamas.

Prime Minister Ehud Olmert and the president of the autonomy government Mahmud Abbas both expressed their commitment to peace at the conference in Annapolis where it appeared both politicians agree on the necessity of a Palestinian state. Both politicians have little power. But neither side can provide any other politician to defend a peace plan against political fundamentalists within their own ranks. A peace plan must be executed in a way that both sides win because it needs to convince at least part of the extremists as well, so that the rest will follow a clear majority and allow peace to happen.

My own concepts:

All peace concepts to date have not established peace. There is no way that this conflict will be eliminated by simply giving the Palestinians a state consisting of the Gaza strip and the West Jordan territory. A plan like that is - like all before it - not comprehensive enough. Terror and violence since 1949 suffice to show to all inhabitants of Palestine that the ultimate object cannot be the establishing of a Palestinian state, but peace between the two peoples so that they can co-exist without constant violent clashes, so that they both profit from one another. The reason for no permanent peace solution to date bases on aims in the past that

did not embrace permanent peace between the people but only concentrated on securing and increasing their respective positions of power. Israel was only interested in protecting its people from outside and inside violent dangers and not to lose any more territory while the sole Palestinian purpose was to establish a state with a maximum size territory free of Israeli settlers, in complete independence from Israel and the return of all refugees into the Israeli territory. These agreements could not lead to a lasting peace even where there was a cooperation of the two sides concerning the economy and the infrastructure detailed and partially agreed upon. Both parties of the conflict did not consider in detail how the opposite party should survive politically and for real in case of consolidating their own ideas of peace. Each party needed to be separate from the other. A clean separation of the two states without permanent organisational connections is not viable due to the limits of space, the limits of resources and the population density. This connection must be established in a way that in future any disadvantage but also every advantage will be shared between the two people. With a strict separation and a separate "next to one another" of the two states the result will always be that one party will feel disadvantaged or cheated. Each part of the population will feel displaced, disadvantaged and disturbed in their peace by the other and that will be even if the open questions about Jerusalem as capital of which state, the administration of the Holy places, water distribution and the return of the refugees are answered. The reason for all agreements to date not to lead to pacification at all is that they did not offer a perspective to a lasting peace. The plans drawn up so far always looked like permanent regulations and never offered any hope of ending the violent fights. These plans could only have been agreed upon with a view to the future as changing the situation anyway towards more agreeable conditions. Such a positive perspective could be offered by none of the parties involved because either of the people would have agreed to a maximum of concessions thinkable already. So any later demands of the other party would be rejected as unacceptable and contrary to the agreement regardless and all possible improvement of situation for the other party would be hindered for an indefinite time. To end the crisis in the near east region the only aim to head for is to secure a peaceful future for Israeli and Palestine people on the relatively small territory that they both occupy. For all future talks this means that the Palestinian suggestions will have to consider the Israeli interests as well and vice versa putting themselves consciously into the position of the other partner as if taking their side. If the overall aim is to provide a basis for a prosperous co-existence of all the people, of all religions and of all citizens it would not be considered a treacherous move to partake in talks like this since given the political situation

there is no other constructive way of conduct. That is the way in which crises between persons are often successfully handled through mediation. Such a procedure would require a great strength of character on the parts of the participants in talks. A generous granting of one side would not be considered a weakness. Each party has already demonstrated its potential to act tough and relentless.

The most important problems arising out of a possible solution to the conflict are as follows:

- 1.) Establishment of a state for the Palestinian people with clearly defined borders
- 2.) Relations of such a state to Israel
- 3.) Water supply for the new state
- 4.) Regulations concerning minorities in both states (e.g. Israeli people in the new state (settlements) and the Palestinian people in Israel),
- 5.) the Problem of the Refugees
- 6.) Talks about avoiding social segregation between the peoples
- 7.) Planning of equal infrastructures
- 8.) Talks about abolishing deeply rooted hostilities (hatred, grief, anger)
- 9.) Question of status of Jerusalem and of administration of holy places
- 10.) Compensation for acts of injustice

Among the main prerequisites of a peace concept offered by the institute are:

1. The Palestinian as well as the Israeli people have a right to self determination
2. Both people should be able to heed this right by establishing a territory according to their respective population sizes – with Israel already having gained this aim and Palestine acknowledging this.
3. The territory of a Palestinian state should at least contain the Gaza strip and the West Jordan territory.
4. Both states will be inhabited by minorities of the other ethnic and religious people. To these people minority rights will be awarded in both states – to at least the extent given by the International Agreement on Civil and Political Rights (19.12.1966)
The European Anti Discrimination law could also serve as a model. Both states should be constituted in a way that the Israeli and the Palestinian people both head the government and the majority of delegates in their own state.

5. Both states should be constituted with a local self government so that the Jewish settlements would belong to the Palestinian territory and therefore lose their Israeli citizenship
6. The borders between the states remain open.
7. Both states establish a federation that takes responsibility for the following
 - a. foreign security (military)
 - b. foreign policy
 - c. main transport routes (waterways/road network)
 - d. postal services
 - e. currency
 - f. last resort jurisdiction of all law suits and jurisdiction of constitutional law
 - g. for the next 20 years the government and head of government are formed of equal numbers of Israeli and Palestinian people (parity). In case of a tie cast a die.
 - h. The federation should be formed of two chambers. A parliament with delegates of the two states (both states with equal numbers of elective areas, majority rule).the second chamber filled with delegates of the two governments in equal numbers.

A lot of the problems arising from pacification would be self effacing with this peace concept:

1. The return of the Palestinian refugees to Israel. The Israeli people will keep the majority of delegates in Israel even if the Palestinians should turn out to be the majority of the population. It is to be expected that the refugees would not primarily opt to move to Israel but into the new Palestinian state – be it named Palestine hereafter. To counter the possible threat of overpopulation it is to be envisioned that talks with Libanon about the purchase of extra territory can be started.
2. Jerusalem would be the capital of all three states – Palestine, Israel and the Federation.
3. Administration of the holy places would lie with the Federation
4. The actual borderline is of minor importance since all citizens are entitled to citizenship of the Federation. The Wall should be retained as symbol of horror and be turned into a piece of art – in places where it is not blocking roads.
5. The settlers could remain in West Jordan. They should be given the choice of citizenship. If they opt for the Palestinian one, they gain all political rights of Palestine, e.g. they vote in elections on local level and for the Palestinian Government. If they opt for the Israeli one they do not gain the political rights of Palestine, but neither the Israeli ones because they do not live in the state. They may vote in elections on the Federation, though. Regardless of their decision they gain equality of rights with Palestine people and minority

status. The Institute regards it as extremely important that the Israeli settlements remain part of Palestine. Both states will have minorities of the other within their borders. Both states can compete in the amount of minority ruling and protection allowed.

The other problems of water supplies and social segregation can be left to the Federation for future positive development.

This peace plan cannot be presented to the people without preparations. Through long periods of violence on both sides, of killings, humiliations and destruction and the following pauperization the hatred between the two people is so great that before any attempts at a peace pact are undertaken this hatred needs to be addressed and possibly reduced so that the communal idea can grow of a peaceful long term future for both of them.

There are methods in psychology developed that help free a person of the hatred for another. This Institute is not aware of any methods being scientifically proven to help in the case of collective hatred between people.

According to ethnology and to history as well there is an option of reducing hatred between people through contests or other communal projects. The conductor and pianist Daniel Barenboim has established one such project. He formed an orchestra with musicians from both Israeli and Palestinian origin and held concerts in Israel as well as in the autonomy regions. Sportive contests offer themselves as well given they are conducted fairly and in the true spirit of sportsmanship. Further options would be sports teams with members of both nations.

Both people should engage in a peace institution. Its sole purpose would be to find methods to eliminate hatred between the two people. It would be run by psychologists of both states. They would be in talks with the most important religious leaders but also all of the political parties and groups, including the Israeli orthodox and members of Hamas. All of these need to be included as they represent the hatred, the evil that needs to be overcome. If they succeed in convincing these representatives the peace would be almost won.

Hinrich Bartels