



JEWISH COMMUNITY RELATIONS COUNCIL
of San Francisco, the Peninsula, Marin, Sonoma, Alameda and Contra Costa Counties

JCRC CONSENSUS STATEMENT ON THE ISRAELI – PALESTINIAN PEACE PROCESS

Approved by the Jewish Community Relations Council of San Francisco, the Peninsula, Marin, Sonoma, Alameda and Contra Costa Counties

November 13, 2007

INTRODUCTION

The Jewish Community Relations Council continues its strong support of constructive efforts to achieve peace in the Middle East. Within Israel's open democratic society and within the American Jewish community there is a wide range of perspectives on the Arab/Israeli conflict. At the same time, there is a strong consensus within the Bay Area organized Jewish community in support of Israelis and Palestinians who wish to live as good neighbors in peace and security.

In that context, the JCRC

- supports a two-state solution to end the conflict between Palestinians and Israelis, in which the parties peacefully co-exist with fully normalized diplomatic relations, in mutual cooperation that promotes the economic development and social welfare of their respective citizens;
- supports the continued constructive role the United States has historically played in the Middle East peace process;
- calls upon the Arab states and Israel to enter open negotiations toward a final conflict-ending peace settlement;
- supports efforts by the U.S., the West and Israel to bolster Palestinian moderates and reformists;
- urges a fair, reasonable, and practical resolution to both Middle East refugee populations – Palestinians and the Jews from Arab countries – that arose as a result of the Arab-Israeli conflict;
- believes Israel possesses the inalienable right of any sovereign nation to defend its citizens from violent attack;
- supports the civil, economic, and social rights of all Israelis, including Israel's Arab citizens.

BACKGROUND

The Arab-Israeli conflict is often framed as a dispute over land between Israel and the Palestinians. This is only partially true. The conflict is multi-dimensional. Israel has had to defend its very existence for more than half a century in the face of active and sustained hostility that includes terrorism, boycotts, an international campaign to de-legitimize Israel's

right to exist, and multiple wars waged by more than a dozen Arab and Muslim states. Most of these states have yet to follow the example of Jordan and Egypt in making peace with Israel.

True peace will only come when Israel's enemies renounce violence and accept Israel's right to exist in secure and recognized borders. When Israel is secure, and when the Arab world engages the Israeli people directly, it can – as it has already on numerous occasions – make bold moves for peace.

Israeli settlements continue to be a hotly debated issue, and we recognize that within our own community there are divergent views about current and future policies of the Israeli government toward settlements.

At the same time, we are united in the belief that the root cause of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict is not Israeli settlements but the continued unwillingness of the Palestinian national leadership and most Arab states to accept the state of Israel as a permanent sovereign Jewish state in the Middle East within secure borders.

Furthermore, there are many voices in the Arab world that see the term "settlements" as applying not only to communities in the West Bank or the Golan Heights but also to the whole of the State of Israel. Any discussion of settlements should fully recognize the complexities involved in the issue.

Successive Israeli governments have made clear their willingness to trade land for real peace, including offers to give up the overwhelming majority of the West Bank. Yet those offers have repeatedly been rejected.

In recognition of the tensions that have arisen within the West Bank we continue to strongly condemn any vigilante actions on the part of residents, Arab or Jewish. Such actions can only harm the prospects for peace.

RATIONALE FOR REVISITING OUR CONSENSUS STATEMENT

The JCRC has issued numerous consensus statements on the Middle East conflict over the years. Our most recent statement was issued on June 21, 2005. Since our last statement, there have been a number of major developments in the region:

- Israel enacted its Disengagement Plan that withdrew the Israel Defense Forces and evacuated all settlements from all of Gaza and four in the northern West Bank.
- The election of Hamas to a position of leadership in the Palestinian Authority. Hamas is a terrorist movement whose Charter calls for Israel's destruction¹, the killing of its Jewish citizens², and uses blatantly anti-Semitic stereotypes to underpin its ideology.³

¹ "Israel will exist and will continue to exist until Islam will obliterate it, just as it obliterated others before it."
Hamas Charter, Preamble

- The sudden illness of Prime Minister Ariel Sharon, and his removal from the Israeli political scene.
- The election of Ehud Olmert and the Kadima Party to lead the new government on a platform of unilateral disengagement from the West Bank.
- The non-stop smuggling of arms to Hamas and other Palestinian terror groups into the newly evacuated Gaza Strip.
- A continuous rocket barrage lasting for months by Hamas and other Palestinian terror groups into southern Israeli towns, particularly Sderot.
- Hamas's kidnapping of Israeli corporal Gilad Shalit, and the subsequent Israeli incursions into Gaza in an attempt to free Shalit and stop the rocket barrages. The declaration of a truce is declared after months of fighting, which Israel observes despite continuing rocket fire.
- Hezbollah firing of rockets into northern Israeli communities as a diversionary tactic while sending a raiding party across Israel's border with Lebanon, which attacks an Israeli patrol, killing 3 and capturing 2 soldiers. This action touches off the Second Lebanon War. Hundreds of Lebanese and scores of Israelis are killed in the conflict, which comes to an end with the acceptance of UN Security Council Resolution 1701. This resolution requires the disarming of Hezbollah (but instead Hezbollah has rearmed itself to pre-war levels).
- In late December 2006 Prime Minister Ehud Olmert and Palestinian President Mahmoud Abbas meet, beginning a tentative set of contacts between the two sides.
- Palestinian factions – Fatah and Hamas – engage in internecine fighting over power sharing issues, leaving scores of Palestinians dead. The fighting eventually comes to an end with the Palestinian Unity Agreement in Mecca, brokered by Saudi Arabia. Hamas and Fatah agree to share power. Hamas officials reiterate that they will never recognize Israel. The US, "Quartet" and Israel insist that the new government must recognize the right of Israel to exist, disarm terrorist groups and agree to end violence.
- Saudi Arabia, concerned about regional instability and Iranian assertiveness, convenes an Arab League summit to revive the 2002 Saudi peace initiative, now called the Arab Peace Initiative. The Arab League reaffirms its support for the plan; Israel responds cautiously but positively.
- Following the latest outbreak of fighting between Fatah and Hamas, Hamas takes complete control of Gaza, while Fatah retains control of the West Bank.
- In response, Palestinian Authority President Mahmoud Abbas declares a state of emergency, dismantles the Palestinian National Unity Government and nominates a new emergency government of Fatah loyalists, whose legitimacy is challenged.

² "The Day of Judgment will not come about until Muslims fight Jews and kill them. Then, the Jews will hide behind rocks and trees, and the rocks and trees will cry out: "O Muslim, there is a Jew hiding behind me, come and kill him.'" *Hamas Charter, Article 7*

³ See Appendix B.

- To avoid a humanitarian crisis, while continuing to impose its sanctions on Hamas, many of the key actors – including the United States, Israel and the United Nations Security Council – send humanitarian aid to the people of Gaza.
- International sanctions are removed from the West Bank, under control of the Palestinian government, now controlled by Fatah. The United States, Israel and European states opened the financial taps to the new government after a 15-month embargo of the Hamas-led unity government.
- In November 2007, the United States convenes an international conference in Annapolis, Maryland. U.S. President George W. Bush hosts the conference. Attending are Israeli Prime Minister Ehud Olmert, Palestinian Authority President Mahmoud Abbas, and representatives from a number of Arab states including Egypt, Jordan, Saudi Arabia, Syria, and others. A Statement of Understanding is jointly released committing Israel and the Palestinian Authority to “immediately implement their respective obligations under the performance-based road map to a permanent two-state solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict issued by the Quartet.” The parties set the goal of establishing a Palestinian state by the end of 2008.

In light of these new developments, through a deliberative process involving a wide-range of diverse perspectives, we have agreed on points of consensus to reflect this rapidly changing reality in the region.

=====

CONSENSUS POLICY POSITIONS

WE SUPPORT A TWO-STATE SOLUTION TO END THE CONFLICT BETWEEN PALESTINIANS AND ISRAELIS, IN WHICH THE PARTIES PEACEFULLY CO-EXIST WITH FULLY NORMALIZED DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS, IN MUTUAL COOPERATION THAT PROMOTES THE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND SOCIAL WELFARE OF THEIR RESPECTIVE CITIZENS.

Two states for two peoples

We support Israel’s right to exist within defined, secure and internationally recognized borders as a democratic and Jewish state. We also affirm the right of Palestinians to an independent and viable state within defined, secure and internationally recognized borders. Our vision is the State of Israel and a future State of Palestine living side by side in peace, mutual recognition, and economic cooperation. A critical element in the continuing search for peace is the commitment to previous agreements and the ability of both sides to prevent acts of provocation.

Progress toward an independent Palestinian state is contingent upon the ability of the PA to reform itself financially and structurally so as to develop the Palestinian economy and fight the corruption that previously undermined Palestinians’ confidence in their own government.

In order for Israel to reconcile its legitimate and justified security concerns with the movement of people and goods in the West Bank, the PA will need to take concrete and firm steps toward streamlining, reforming and professionalizing its security services. The PA also must disarm extremist groups such as Hamas and Islamic Jihad. Such moves would reassure the Israeli people of Palestinian commitment to a successful conflict-ending peace process.

We also call upon the international community, specifically the United States, Europe, Russia, Egypt and other Arab states, and the United Nations, to undertake a major effort to stop the flow of weapons into Gaza. Peace and the realization of a two-state solution are mutually exclusive to an unending arms build-up by Hamas in Gaza.

Final status issues

We support direct negotiations between the Government of Israel and the Palestinian Authority toward the attainment of a compromise agreement that will sufficiently fulfill the aspirations of both peoples so that they can eventually live together in peace and security.

We assert that the final determination over such issues as Jewish settlements, Jerusalem, refugees, sharing of water and other natural resources, and security arrangements, must be left to the parties themselves to negotiate in a peace process, free from violence and the threat of violence, based on United Nations Security Council Resolution 242.⁴

Opposition to the bi-national state proposal

We unequivocally oppose calls for a bi-national state. Such a call is not compatible with a fair resolution of the Israeli-Palestinian dispute, and does not take into consideration the legitimate and inalienable right of the Jewish people to national self-determination.

Acceptance of Israel necessary for true peace

As a practical matter, compliance with the Quartet's three requirements is essential to a peaceful two-state solution. A Palestinian government that does not fully accept Israel as its neighbor, and is not fundamentally opposed to violence and terrorism, is a recipe for disaster.

The Quartet's three requirements are:

- accepts the right of Israel to exist,
- accepts all former agreements between Israel and the Palestinians
- renounces violence and terrorism.

WE SUPPORT THE CONTINUED CONSTRUCTIVE ROLE THE UNITED STATES HAS HISTORICALLY PLAYED IN THE MIDDLE EAST PEACE PROCESS.

We urge the United States to play an active role in the Israeli-Palestinian peace process in assisting the parties achieve a just, fair and final resolution to the conflict. The challenges are great, given the situation in Iraq and the growing threat of radical Islamist movements in the

⁴ See Appendix A for full text of UNSC Resolution 242

region. The resurgence of Iran's Islamic Revolution, its growing influence in the Shi'ite communities in Iraq, Lebanon, Saudi Arabia and various Gulf Arab states, threatens to destabilize and plunge the Middle East into wider sectarian conflict, and possibly a regional war. A constructive, active, creative engagement of US diplomacy can go a long way to defuse the tensions in the region.

WE CALL UPON THE PALESTINIANS, ARAB STATES AND ISRAEL TO ENTER NEGOTIATIONS TOWARD A FINAL CONFLICT-ENDING PEACE SETTLEMENT.

We reaffirm our support for UN Security Council Resolution 242, which is the basis for the land for peace and security formula for Arab-Israeli peacemaking. UNSC Resolution 242 has long been accepted by Israel; it served as the cornerstone for the negotiations that led to the peace treaties with Egypt and Jordan, as well as the Oslo Peace Process.

Arab Peace Initiative

In March 2007, the Arab League reaffirmed the 2002 Saudi-inspired Arab Peace Initiative (API). We are encouraged by Israel's positive, and justifiably cautious, response. Israel legitimately is focused on the constructive elements of the document while it determines the level of flexibility of the Arab side.

The API can only serve as the basis for dialogue between the Arab states and Israel if it is turned from a position – an offer of full diplomatic relations with Israel *following* its full withdrawal from *all* territories occupied in the 1967 war – into a proposal that could become a framework for the kind of negotiations envisioned in UNSC 242, whose language intentionally allows for flexibility on final borders in an end-of-conflict final peace agreement.

For the sake of a successful peace process, we call upon the Arab League to moderate its positions, including the "right of return," final borders, and Jerusalem. The Israeli people, who are asked to make tangible sacrifices (e.g. strategically vital territory) for intangible promises, must be assured that the Arab world's intentions in the peace process is to end the conflict once and for all, with full normalization with all member states of the Arab League, including full diplomatic relations. We urge the Arab League to adopt a policy of recognition of Israel first as an essential first step toward a successful peace process.

WE SUPPORT EFFORTS BY THE U.S., THE WEST AND ISRAEL TO BOLSTER PALESTINIAN MODERATES AND REFORMISTS.

We urge the international community to continue engaging with and encouraging Palestinian moderates to support and strengthen them, while keeping pressure on the extremists. Such support should also be provided to Palestinian Authority President Mahmoud Abbas, but should be conditional on his not making statements, or taking actions, that support violence

such as his call for Palestinians to direct their guns only against Israel's "occupation" instead of each other.⁵ Such declarations impede rather than help the peace process.

We urge support for those Palestinians who are committed to peace and co-existence with Israel, including through the international community, led by the US, taking steps to support institutions of civil society and the standing of democratic reformists in Palestinian society.

Peace education

We call on the Palestinian leadership – political, academic and religious – to engage in the preparation of the Palestinian people for peace by means of including the educating of children for peace, and encouraging the general population to resist recruitment to violence and terrorism. The ongoing incitement to violence and hatred in Palestinian textbooks, mosques and media are inconsistent with peacemaking, and in fact make peace all the more distant.

WE URGE A FAIR, REASONABLE, AND PRACTICAL RESOLUTION TO BOTH MIDDLE EAST REFUGEE POPULATIONS – PALESTINIANS AND THE JEWS FROM ARAB COUNTRIES – THAT AROSE AS A RESULT OF THE ARAB-ISRAELI CONFLICT.

"Right of return"

We reject the demand that all Palestinian 1948 war refugees and their descendants have a right to immigrate to the State of Israel, the so-called "right of return." There is no such "right."⁶ Such a demand is incompatible with a two-state solution and is code for the destruction of the State of Israel. Any resolution of the Palestinian refugee question must be practical, reasonable and equitable as determined by negotiations between the relevant parties and that it is the Palestinian state that will be the home for Palestinian refugees and their descendants seeking to live under Palestinian sovereignty.

Jewish refugees from Arab states

The Palestinian refugee issue is intertwined with a parallel Jewish refugee issue, given that as a result of repressive policies enacted by Arab governments fully 99% of the Arab world's Jewish inhabitants – nearly one million people – were either expelled or otherwise compelled to flee from their homes in ten Arab countries, and most of these refugees settled in Israel where today they and their descendants are full citizens. Arab governments confiscated their properties without compensation. Some of these Jewish communities were over two thousand years old, but no longer exist.⁷

We therefore call upon the United States, countries in the Middle East and North Africa, the international community and all fair-minded people to recognize that two refugee populations were created as a result of the years of turmoil in the Middle East. We strongly support redress for the Jews displaced from Arab countries.

⁵ "Abbas: Aim guns against occupation," by Khaled Abu Toameh, *Jerusalem Post*, January 11, 2007

⁶ See Appendix C.

⁷ See JIMENA (Jews Indigenous to the Middle East and North Africa) www.JIMENA.org

Support for pending legislation

JCRC supports the House and Senate resolutions (H.R. 185 and S.R. 85) that call attention to the fact that Jews living in Arab countries suffered human rights violations, were uprooted from their homes, and were made refugees. These Resolutions signify that “it would be inappropriate and unjust for the United States to recognize rights for Palestinian refugees without recognizing equal rights for former Jewish, Christian, and other refugees from Arab countries.”

ISRAEL POSSESSES THE INALIENABLE RIGHT OF ANY SOVEREIGN NATION TO DEFEND ITS CITIZENS FROM VIOLENT ATTACK.

On stopping terrorism

We reiterate our support of Israel’s efforts to suppress terrorism by any reasonable means. We also support efforts by Israel to cooperate with Palestinian security forces to ensure a cessation of violence.

The Security Barrier

We also recognize that Israel erected the security barrier in response to an intense wave of Palestinian terrorism that targeted Israeli civilians. This barrier has proven effective in significantly reducing terror attacks against Israelis. We further recognize that the route of the security barrier is controversial, and support the Israeli Supreme Court’s ruling that the barrier must be built so as to minimize hardships to Palestinians. We also acknowledge that the security barrier does not constitute Israel’s final border, and it is our profound hope that when the will exists on the Palestinian side to disarm the extremists and put an end to terrorist incursions into Israel the barrier will become unnecessary and be removed.

The kidnapped soldiers

We call for the immediate and unconditional release of Gilad Shalit, Ehud Goldwasser, and Eldad Regev, the three IDF soldiers kidnapped on sovereign Israeli territory by Hamas and Hezbollah in 2006. We condemn the refusal of Hamas and Hezbollah to allow visits by the International Red Cross with the soldiers, which is a clear violation of international law.

WE SUPPORT THE CIVIL, ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL RIGHTS OF ALL ISRAELIS, INCLUDING ITS ARAB CITIZENS.

We call for continuing the support by the organized Jewish community for coexistence projects in Israel designed to improve relationships between Israeli Jews and Arabs and to strengthen Israel’s already vigorous democratic institutions.

Nearly twenty percent of the total Israeli population—over one million people—is comprised of non-Jewish citizens, including Muslim and Christian Arabs, Bedouin, and Druze. Israeli Arabs, Bedouin and Druze are full citizens with full civil and political rights protected by law. No other

state in the Middle East grants and protects such freedoms to its minority citizens. Israeli Arabs enjoy full voting rights, are represented in the Israeli Knesset, judicial system, university student bodies, and other institutions within Israeli society. Members of the Druze and Bedouin communities serve in the Israel Defense Forces as both enlisted personnel and officers. Arabic is an official language of Israel, and the Arabic media in Israel is the freest in the Arab world.

At the same time, social and economic disparities do exist between Israel's Jewish and Arab citizens, resulting in significant gaps between the two sectors in such areas as housing, education and employment.

For many years the San Francisco-based Jewish Community Federation has been in the forefront of funding co-existence projects in Israel aimed at bringing together Israeli Jews and Arabs. To date, there are about 150 such programs, aimed at bridging the gaps between Israeli Jews and Arabs by deepening Israeli democracy and pluralism. We applaud these efforts to enhance Israeli Jewish–Arab relations and urge their continuation. Through such efforts, we support Israel's commitment to maintain a strong vibrant democracy with active participation by, and integration of, all its citizens.

Note: *JCRC By-laws provide for the opportunity to record a dissenting opinion when a consensus is reached (a minimum of 75% is required for consensus) and the overall vote in support does not exceed 85%.*

A dissenting position was recorded on this statement based on the belief that the consensus statement: 1) did not recommend certain actions that Israel, which the dissent believes also bears some responsibility for the continued conflict, could take toward peace including a freeze on settlement construction, evacuation of settlement outposts and easing of Palestinian freedom of movement; and 2) did not fully describe the diversity of opinion within the Bay Area Jewish community on the Israeli/Palestinian conflict.

APPENDIX A

U.N. SECURITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION 242 NOVEMBER 22, 1967

The Security Council,

Expressing its continuing concern with the grave situation in the Middle East,

Emphasizing the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by war and the need to work for a just and lasting peace in which every State in the area can live in security,

Emphasizing further that all Member States in their acceptance of the Charter of the United Nations have undertaken a commitment to act in accordance with Article 2 of the Charter,

1. *Affirms* that the fulfillment of Charter principles requires the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East which should include the application of both the following principles:

- i. Withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from territories occupied in the recent conflict;
- ii. Termination of all claims or states of belligerency and respect for and acknowledgement of the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of every State in the area and their right to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries free from threats or acts of force;

2. *Affirms* further the necessity

- a) For guaranteeing freedom of navigation through international waterways in the area;
- b) For achieving a just settlement of the refugee problem;
- c) For guaranteeing the territorial inviolability and political independence of every State in the area, through measures including the establishment of demilitarized zones;

3. *Requests* the Secretary General to designate a Special Representative to proceed to the Middle East to establish and maintain contacts with the States concerned in order to promote agreement and assist efforts to achieve a peaceful and accepted settlement in accordance with the provisions and principles in this resolution;

4. *Requests* the Secretary-General to report to the Security Council on the progress of the efforts of the Special Representative as soon as possible.

Adopted unanimously at the 1382nd meeting.

The Meaning of UNSC Resolution 242: 242's Legislative History

Mr. George Brown, British Foreign Secretary in 1967, on January 19, 1970:

"I have been asked over and over again to clarify, modify or improve the wording, but I do not intend to do that. The phrasing of the Resolution was very carefully worked out, and it was a difficult and complicated exercise to get it accepted by the UN Security Council.

"I formulated the Security Council Resolution. Before we submitted it to the Council, we showed it to Arab leaders. The proposal said 'Israel will withdraw from territories that were occupied', and not from 'the' territories, which means that Israel will not withdraw from all the territories." (The Jerusalem Post, 23.1.70)

Mr. Michael Stewart, Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs, in a reply to a question in Parliament, December 9, 1969:

"As I have explained before, there is reference, in the vital United Nations Security Council Resolution, both to withdrawal from territories and to secure and recognized boundaries. As I have told the House previously, we believe that these two things should be read concurrently and that the omission of the word 'all' before the word 'territories' is deliberate."

Mr. Geraldo de Carvalho Silos, Brazilian representative, speaking in the Security Council after the adoption of Resolution 242:

"We keep constantly in mind that a just and lasting peace in the Middle East has necessarily to be based on secure, permanent boundaries freely agreed upon and negotiated by the neighboring States." (S/PV. 1382, p. 66, 22.11.67)

Eugene V. Rostow, Professor of Law and Public Affairs, Yale University, who, in 1967, was US Under-Secretary of State for Political Affairs:

a) "... paragraph I (i) of the Resolution calls for the withdrawal of Israeli armed forces 'from territories occupied in the recent conflict', and not 'from the territories occupied in the recent conflict'. Repeated attempts to amend this sentence by inserting the word 'the' failed in the Security Council. It is, therefore, not legally possible to assert that the provision requires Israeli withdrawal from all the territories now occupied under the cease-fire resolutions to the Armistice Demarcation lines." (American Journal of International Law, Volume 64, September 1970, p. 69)

b) "The agreement required by paragraph 3. of the Resolution, the Security Council said, should establish 'secure and recognized boundaries' between Israel and its neighbors 'free from threats or acts of force', to replace the Armistice Demarcation lines established in 1949, and the cease-fire lines of June 1967. The Israeli armed forces should withdraw to such lines as part of a comprehensive agreement, settling all the issues mentioned in the Resolution, and in a condition of peace." (American Journal of International Law, Volume 64, September 1970, p. 68)

APPENDIX B

Anti-Semitic examples from the Hamas Charter:

- “The Nazism of the Jews does not skip women and children, it scares everyone. They make war against people’s livelihood, plunder their moneys and threaten their honor.” *Hamas Charter, Article 21*
- The enemies (Jews) have been scheming for a long time, and they have consolidated their schemes, in order to achieve what they have achieved. They took advantage of key-elements in unfolding events, and accumulated a huge and influential material wealth, which they put to the service of implementing their dream. This wealth [permitted them to] take over control of the world media such as news agencies, the press, publication houses, broadcasting and the like. [They also used this] wealth to stir revolutions in various parts of the globe in order to fulfill their interests and pick the fruits. They stood behind the French and the Communist Revolutions and behind most of the revolutions we hear about here and there. They also used the money to establish clandestine organizations that are spreading around the world, in order to destroy societies and carry out Zionist interests. Such organizations are: the Free Masons, Rotary Clubs, Lions Clubs, B’nai B’rith and the like. All of them are destructive spying organizations. They also used the money to take over control of the Imperialist states and made them colonize many countries in order to exploit the wealth of those countries and spread their corruption therein.

As regards local and world wars, it has come to pass and no one objects, that they stood behind World War 1, so as to wipe out the Islamic Caliphate(50). They collected material gains and took control of many sources of wealth. They obtained the Balfour Declaration(51) and established the League of Nations in order to rule the world by means of that organization. They also stood behind World War II, where they collected immense benefits from trading with war materials, and prepared for the establishment of their state. They inspired the establishment of the United Nations and the Security Council to replace the League of Nations, in order to rule the world by their intermediary. There was no war that broke out anywhere without their fingerprints on it.

Hamas Charter, Article 22

- Israel, by virtue of its being Jewish and of having a Jewish population, defies Islam and the Muslims. *Hamas Charter, Article 28*
- “Zionist scheming has no end, and after Palestine, they will covet expansion from the Nile to the Euphrates River. When they have finished digesting the area on which they have laid their hand, they will look forward to more expansion. Their scheme has been laid out in the ‘Protocols of the Elders of Zion... More steps need to be taken by the Arab and Islamic peoples and Islamic associations throughout the Arab and Islamic world in order to make possible the next round with the Jews, the merchants of war.”

APPENDIX C

See the following essays and articles on the “right to return” issue;

- **History Questions “Right of Return”**
by Kenneth W. Stein, Middle Eastern History and Political Science at Emory University.
www.ismi.emory.edu/Articles/gjngp22001.html
- **The Right of Return - An Idea that Cannot Be Implemented**
by Yousef Nasser Al-Sweidan, *Al-Siyassa* (Kuwait), March 5 & 16, 2007 (Translated by MEMRI)
(<http://memri.org/bin/articles.cgi?Page=archives&Area=sd&ID=SP154007>)
- **Legal Aspects of the Palestinian Refugee Question,**
by Ruth Lapidoth, <http://www.jcpa.org/jl/vp485.htm>
- **No Palestinian ‘Return’ to Israel,**
by Joel Singer, (www.wcl.american.edu/hrbrief/08/2palestinians02.cfm)
- **Right of Return to Palestine**
by Gershon Baskin, Co-CEO of IPCRI – the Israel/Palestine Center for Research and Information,
(www.ipcri.org).
- **Rights and Wrongs: History and the Palestinian “Right of Return.”**
by Efraim Karsh, *Commentary Magazine*, May 2001.
- **Clearing Up the Right-Of-Return Confusion**
by Jerome M. Segal, From the Volume VIII, Number 2 issue of “Middle East Policy” (NO. 68) published by Blackwell Publishers. June 2001 (www.peacelobby.org/MiddleEastPolicyJune001.htm)