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Introduction

The Israeli-Palestinian conflict is one of the oldest and most complicated conflicts in the world today, which goes back to the 20th of the last century with clashes between Jews to Arabs in the mandatory Palestine.

For almost 100 years International Community tries to find the right formula which will end this conflict and will stop the bloodshed, but such formula didn't find so far.

The centrality of the region, which connect between Europe, Asia and Africa, and even between Europe to the far-East polled many players to be involve and to try to be dominant player in the peace process between the Israelis and the Palestinians.

This research will focus the Europe Union and its attitude toward Israel and the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. The Europe Union is a very interest player to investigate, mostly because of the complex of the Europe Union as organization which combines by many players with different interests and views, and because of the importance of the EU as a strong and dominant player in the International level.

During the literature review I will cover 3 topics, which in my opinion are the basic for this research: Israel background, The Israeli-Palestinian conflict and the Israel-EU relations.

The research itself will focus the analysis level of the European Union Member States in order to try to understand the influence of each factor and player in the EU on the final and official policy:

As an Israeli I don't think that this topic ever checked in academy in such resolution and from my diplomatic work as International Relations Coordinator of the governing party in Israel, Likud, I understand how important is to understand what standing behind the EU’s attitude toward Israel in order to be able to dialogue with the EU on this topic from understanding and not for judgment. I believe that such research can be very useful for the official Israeli diplomacy from the same reason, and will help Israel to put the finger on the main problems in the relations with the EU and to spend more efforts on the right places. Moreover I believe such research will serve the common interest of both EU and Israel to get deeper and stronger relations in another issues as well, from the common understanding that both EU and Israel sharing
common values and common interests and good relations and cooperation between EU and Israel is important for everybody.
Research problem

The relations between Israel to the Europe Union had many ups and downs during the years, especially around the EU's attitude toward Israel regarding the conflict with the Palestinians and the EU's efforts to be dominant factor in the peace process.

The fact that the EU is not sovereign political unit but it is trying to be in international level as such raising a very interesting question regarding who are the dominant players in the Europe Union who leading for a policy in this topic and what is the motivation of these players. Moreover it is very interesting to check the dominant member states in the Europe Union and what is their attitude toward Israel and the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, and later to check what place taking any member state's attitude in the general policy of the EU and how each of one of the member states influence the process of getting decisions in the EU regarding this topic.

The policy of the EU in this topic is a big puzzle and the biggest question in this case is if there is a clear and declare policy from the first place, and how the EU's attitude shaped by the time, according specific events which took place in the Middle East, between the Israelis and Palestinians, and even events which took place on European soil, as terror attacks and the Immigration crisis, and why its shaped on the way it does?
Research question

The main question in this thesis, that will be the leading line for this research, is what is the official EU policy regarding the Israeli-Palestinian conflict specifically, and toward Israel in general, if there is a clear and declare policy from the first place, and how the EU's attitude shaped by the time, according specific events which took place in the Middle East, between the Israelis and Palestinians, and why its shaped on the way it does?

More one question I would like to figure out is who are the dominant players in the EU who influence the final and official policy of the EU?

I hope that in my research I could build a formula that will be useful for other researches which will focus other EU policies, and will help to understand better the process of decision making in the EU and the powers balance.
Chapter A

Literature Review
Israel's background

Zionism

Zionism ideology or Zionist movement was founded in the middle of the 19th century in Central and Eastern Europe by Jewish leaders and intellectuals (Tidhar, 1968; Kook institute, 2001-2002). The name "Zionism" call after Zion mount in Jerusalem, which is also one of Jerusalem's names and expressed the will to come back to Jerusalem. During the late 19th century, several groups in Eastern Europe starts to work on the idea of Jewish nationality, especially in the intellectual and spiritual aspects, and the renew of the Hebrew language. The first one who used this term was Nathan Birnbaum, a Jewish Austrian intellectual and activist. He used it in 1890 in his article Self-Emancipation (De Lange, 200; Harel, 1977).

The will of return to Eretz Israel (the land of Israel) was the common basic of all those groups and movements, which saw this land as the national homeland of the Jewish people. The main idea or the source of legitimation for a Jewish state in the land of Israel based on the historical and religion sentiments of the Jewish people to the "holy land" (Shimoni, 1995; Roshwald, 2000).

Two elements affected the most on the raising of the Zionist movement in the second half of the 19th century: the first one is the 'Spring of Nations' in Europe and the raising of national movements and national awakening all over Europe, and the second one is the raising of anti-Semitism in Europe and the persecute of Jews, especially in Eastern and Central Europe (Smith, 2001; Ben-Ami, 2012; LeVine, 2014; Gelvin, 2014).

Regarding the 'Spring of Nations' it is important to mention the Hungarian revolution against the Habsburg Empire. The reason why the Hungarian revolution is so important for the develop of the Zionist movement is thanks for the two most important leaders of the Zionist movement, who were born in Budapest in the post Hungarian revolution and were witnesses to the benefits of national union and national demands with the Austro-Hungarian compromise of 1867 and the re-establishment the full sovereignty of the kingdom of Hungary, and the full authority the Hungarians received from the Austrian Empire (Gerrits& Jan Wolffram, 2005).
Those two leaders are Max Nordau, who was born at 1849, and Theodor Herzel, who was born at 1860.

About the raising of anti-Semitism there were two events that shaped the conceptual thinking among the Jews in Europe, and especially on Theodor Herzel himself, regarding the need of national framework for the Jewish people to promote its national aspirations (Elbogen, 1952; Cohn, 1970; Hoare, 2014).

The first event is a series of pogroms against Jews in Russia, between April 1881 to May 1882. Those pogroms known also as "Storms in the South" and targeted Jews in the South-West part of the Russian Empire (Ukraine today) the direct results of the pogroms were immigration of 2.4 million Jews from Russia, mainly to the US, Argentina and Canada, but also a small group of Zionists who decided to move to the land of Israel, and actually combined the first immigration wave to the land of Israel. For the long term the consequences of the "Storms in the South" pogroms were wildly awakening of many Jewish intellectuals in Europe, as Yehuda Leib Pinsker and Mordechai Zeev Faiberg, which until those pogroms believed the idea of integration and emancipation, but the pogroms in Russia shocked them and led them to support the Zionist idea (Elbogen, 1952).

The second event, which deeply affected Theodor Herzel, was Dreyfus Affair. Dreyfus was a French captain who convicted in spying for Germany only because he was Jewish, in a trial took place between 1894 to 1906. Herzel, who worked as a journalist in Paris, sent to cover the trial for the newspaper he worked for. Later on Herzel himself stated that the Dreyfus case turned him into a Zionist and that he was particularly affected by chants of "Death to the Jews!" from the crowds (Cohn, 1970; Hoare, 2014).

In August 30th 1897 Theodor Herzel and Max Nordau took Zionist idea from the intellectual level to the political level with the establishing of the Zionist Organization, with the first Zionist congress in Basel, Swetzerland (Jewish agency, 2010; Reich& Goldberg, 2016).

When it was founded, the goals of the Zionist movement were stated in a resolution that came of that Congress known as the Basel Program.
Zionism main goal was to establish a Jewish home in the holy land, known in those days as Palestine. For the attainment of this purpose, the Congress considers the following means serviceable (Basel Program, 1897):

1. the promotion of the settlement of Jewish agriculturists [farmers], artisans, and tradesmen in Palestine;
2. the federation [unified organisation] of all Jews into local or general groups, according to the laws of the various countries;
3. the strengthening of the Jewish feeling and consciousness [national sentiment and national consciousness];
4. preparatory steps for the attainment of those governmental grants which are necessary to the achievement of the Zionist purpose.

Few days after the congress, in September 3th 1897, Herzel wrote in his diary the follow (Kadary, 2002):

"Were I to sum up the Basel Congress in a word - which I shall guard against pronouncing publicly - it would be this: At Basel I founded the Jewish State. If I said this out loud today I would be greeted by universal laughter. In five years perhaps, and certainly in fifty years, everyone will perceive it."

In 1902 Herzel wrote the book "Alteunland" (the old new land). In his book Herzel describe how the future Jewish state will look like in his vision. This book is what gave Herzel the title "the Jewish state visionary" (Macmillan, 1970).

What Herzel failed to see is the conflict between the Jews and the Arabs in Palestine, and his naïve perspective expressed with his character Reshid Bey, an Arab leader in Haifa. In Herzel's book the Arabs and the Jews are living in peace and respect and they are all productive to the entire society and creating cooperation and partnership which are the basis for the strong economic of the Jewish state, as well as the equal rights and religious freedoms and democratic freedoms that given to everybody, with no difference of race, religion or sex (Avineri, 2009).

Herzel also imagined the Jewish state as a middle way economic based when one side capitalism and free market and the other hand socialism and developed welfare program (Jewish Currents).
During the years after and until his death, in July 3rd 1904, Herzl spent all his efforts in diplomatic field in order to get international recognition and support by one of the powerful countries, in those days, for the idea of a Jewish state in Palestine (Herzl.org, 2012; Friedman, 2007; Klinger, 2010).

In May 17th 1901, Herzl managed to meet the Ottoman Sultan Abdulhamid II, but the Sultan rejected Herzl's offer regarding allowing the Zionists access to Palestine (Herzl.org, 2012; Friedman, 2007).

In October 1898 Herzl arrived to Palestine in order to meet Wilhelm II as part of his efforts to receive international recognition and with hope to find good will from Wilhelm II. Herzl met Wilhelm II first on October 29th, at Mikveh Israel, for a brief meeting. on November 2th Herzl and Wilhel II met again but none of those meetings stood in Herzl's expectations (Friedman, 2007; Daily Mail, 1898; Ginsberg&Ron, 2004).

Between 1902 to 1903, Herzl was invited to speak in front of the British Royal Commission on Alien Immigration. Herzl managed to build a good and close relations to many officials in the British government, particularly with the British secretary of state of the colonies, Joseph Chamberlain, who convinced by Herzl to negotiate with the Egyptian government for a charter for the settlement of the Jews in North-East side of the Sinai Peninsula, adjoining southern Palestine.

In 1903 Pope Pius X expressed his support in Herzl's ideas, according Herzl's diplomatic work (Schneer).

The ground prepared by Herzl in the international level used as a fruitful soil for the next Zionist leaders to take Herzl's vision to the practical level. The sympathy Herzl got from the British and the fact Britain was in a good position against the Ottoman Empire in the First World War, and the signs shows that Britain will take over the Ottoman territories after the war, led the Zionist leadership to spend more efforts and pressure on the British government in order to recognize their national rights and national aspirations, and indeed, in November 1917 the British Foreign Secretary, Lord Arthur James Balfour signed on a declaration, given to the Zionist leader and diplomat, Chaim Weitzman, when in this declaration the British government officially recognized the national aspirations of the Jewish people (Balfour declaration, 2917):
"His Majesty's government view with favor the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, and will use their best endeavors to facilitate the achievement of this object, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine, or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country …"

In 1919, and under British sponsorship, Chaim Weitzman, as the representative of the Zionist organization, and Emir Faisal, the son of Hussein – an Arab regional leader – have signed an agreement which said the follows (Weitzman-Faisal agreement, 1919):

"His Royal Highness the Emir Feisal, representing and acting on behalf of the Arab Kingdom of Hedjaz, and Dr. Chaim Weizmann, representing and acting on behalf of the Zionist Organization, mindful of the racial kinship and ancient bonds existing between the Arabs and the Jewish people, and realizing that the surest means of working out the consummation of their natural aspirations is through the closest possible collaboration in the development of the Arab State and Palestine, and being desirous further of confirming the good understanding which exists between them, have agreed upon the following:

- The agreement committed both parties to conducting all relations between the groups by the most cordial goodwill and understanding, to work together to encourage immigration of Jews into Palestine on a large scale while protecting the rights of the Arab peasants and tenant farmers, and to safeguard the free practice of religious observances. The Muslim Holy Places were to be under Muslim control.
- The Zionist movement undertook to assist the Arab residents of Palestine and the future Arab state to develop their natural resources and establish a growing economy.
- The boundaries between an Arab State and Palestine should be determined by a Commission after the Paris Peace Conference.
- The parties committed to carrying into effect the Balfour Declaration of 1917, calling for a Jewish national home in Palestine.
- Disputes were to be submitted to the British Government for arbitration…"

After the signing of the agreement Faisal conditioned his acceptance on the fulfillment of British wartime promises to the Arabs, who had hoped for independence in a vast part of the Ottoman Empire. He appended to the typed document a hand-written statement:
"Provided the Arabs obtain their independence as demanded in my [forthcoming] Memorandum dated the 4th of January, 1919, to the Foreign Office of the Government of Great Britain, I shall concur in the above articles. But if the slightest modification or departure were to be made [regarding our demands], I shall not be then bound by a single word of the present Agreement which shall be deemed void and of no account or validity, and I shall not be answerable in any way whatsoever."

The agreement failed after San Remo conference, in April 1920, gave the mandate for Syria to France, according the British-French secret agreement during WW1 for the division of the Middle East to ruling territories between the two powerful countries (Fromkin, 1989). The San Remo Conference and the adoption of the British-French agreement (Sykes-Pikot agreement) led to the Franco-Syrian War. In the Battle of Maysalun on 24 July 1920, the French were victorious and Faisal was expelled from Syria after which he contended that the conditions he appended were not fulfilled and the agreement therefore moot. According to contemporaries, including Gertrude Bell and T. E. Lawrence, the French, with British support, betrayed Faisal and the Arab cause rendering the treaty invalid (Howell, 2006).

**Pre-state challenges**

The 3 decades before the foundation of the state of Israel faced the Jewish colony in Palestine many new challenges. Beside the main mission of the settlers to build the new state the Jewish colony had to deal also with other problems as the Malaria disease, tough immigration policy for Jews by the British and security problems (Moriya, 1914; Macpherson & Herringham & Elliott & Balfour, 1923; Passfield white paper, 1930; White Paper, 1939; Ross, 2004).

The 20's and the 30's identified by riots and pogroms against Jews, led by the Jerusalem Mufti, Amin Al Husein, and Arab gangs. The most known riots took place in 1920 in Jerusalem, 1921 in Jaffa, 1929 all over the country and the big Arab revolt in Palestine between 1936 to 1939. After the 1920 Arab riots and 1921 Jaffa riots, the Jewish leadership in Palestine believed that the British, to whom the League of Nations had given a mandate over Palestine in 1920, had no desire to confront local Arab gangs that frequently attacked Palestinian Jews. Believing that they could not rely on the British administration for protection from these gangs, the Jewish leadership created the Haganah to protect Jewish farms and kibbutzim. In addition to
guarding Jewish communities, the role of the Haganah was to warn the residents of and repel attacks by Palestinian Arabs. In the period between 1920–1929, the Haganah lacked a strong central authority or coordination. Haganah "units" were very localized and poorly armed: they consisted mainly of Jewish farmers who took turns guarding their farms or their kibbutzim.

Following the 1929 Palestine riots, the Haganah's role changed dramatically. It became a much larger organization encompassing nearly all the youth and adults in the Jewish settlements, as well as thousands of members from the cities. It also acquired foreign arms and began to develop workshops to create hand grenades and simple military equipment, transforming from an untrained militia to a capable underground army (Jewish Virtual Library.; Freund, 2013).

In 1931 the Haganah had to deal with another challenge when a group of fighters split from the organization and established a new military organization call 'Irgun'. The Irgun policy was based on what was then called Revisionist Zionism founded by Ze'ev Jabotinsky. The policy of the new organization was based squarely on Jabotinsky's teachings: every Jew had the right to enter Palestine; only active retaliation would deter the Arabs; only Jewish armed force would ensure the Jewish state (Howard, 2007).

The Jewish Agency

The Jewish agency for was founded in 1929. The legality of a Jewish Agency regarding to the document "British Mandate for Palestine", which agreed in 1917 at Syks-Picot agreement, between United Kingdom and France, and confirmed by the League of Nations at San-Remo conference, in 1920. According article 4 of the Mandate provided for:

"the recognition of an appropriate Jewish agency as a public body for the purpose of advising and co-operating with the Administration of Palestine in such economic, social and other matters as may affect the establishment, of the Jewish National Home and the interests of the Jewish population of Palestine" (League of Nations, 1920; The Jewish Agency, 2013).

According 'The British Mandate for Palestine' the Jewish Agency used to be a framework that will manage the life of Jews in Palestine, it means to use as a Jewish government, and indeed in its first years, and until the establishment of the state of
Israel, in May 1948, the Jewish Agency used as the executive of the World Zionist Organization, the elective body of all the Zionist organizations who supported the idea of foundation of a Jewish state. The goal in having a Jewish Agency, from British perspective, is to respect the 'Balfour Declaration', given to the Jewish people by British Minister of colonies, Lord James Balfour, in 1917 with a promise for a Jewish homeland in Palestine (Balfour Declaration, 1917).

Between 1926-1927 the Jewish community in Palestine had a very hard economic crisis, what led the Jewish leadership to find a new finance sources in order to strengthen the Jewish community and the infrastructures of the new state. Chaim Weitzman, one of the Zionist leaders, believed that with the help of rich Jewish people, especially from the United States, he can get enough money to keep alive the Zionist horizon.

In 1927 Weitzman have signed an agreement with Louis Marshall, the head of the none-Zionist organization, 'The American Jewish Committee', and in this act, in fact, the Jewish Agency was founded, based on American Jewish philanthropists.

According Weitzman-Marshall agreement two committees was founded under the Jewish Agency – "the agency committee" and "the experts committee", which had a mission to come to Palestine in order to study the situation and to recommend for actions and for a budget to do so (Katzanelson, 1932).

Until the foundation of the state of Israel the Jewish Agency was the authority which managed the entire domestic issues of the Jewish community in Palestine, from education, religion institutes, regional municipal councils, connection with Jews in diaspora, connection to the British mandatory, fundraising, immigration of Jews to Palestine and diplomatic work in order to get international support to the establishment of a Jewish state.

In 1948 when the states of Israel was founded most of the Jewish Agency's authorities moved to the official government of the state of Israel, and the chairman of the Jewish Agency, David Ben Gurion, became the first Prime Minister of Israel (Weitzman, 1993).

On May 14th, 1948, David Ben-Gurion, the head of the Jewish Agency, declared on the establishment of the state of Israel, based on resolution 181 of the UN General
Assembly from November 29\textsuperscript{th}, 1949 (declaration of independence, 1948; UNGA archive, 1947).

\textbf{The structure of the state}

The structure of the state of Israel based on the "Independence scroll (declaration of independence), which written on April 23\textsuperscript{th} 1948 – three weeks before the declaration and the ending of the British mandatory on Palestine (Jerusalem Post, 1998).

The 'Independence Scroll' count as the most important document that express the "people's horizon" and belief, and is the source for most of the basic laws adopted by the Israeli parliament during the years, as basic law: Human dignity and liberty, and basic law: the nation state of the Jewish people (Barak, 2006). In paragraph 13 the founders of the State of Israel expressed their vision based on freedom, justice and peace as well as equality of social and political rights to all its citizens without any discrimination based on religion, race or sex. The declaration of independence has no legal status, as constitution for example, but according the Israeli Knesset it is a very important document that drawing the moral frame of the state (Knesset Website; Israeli Ministry of Foreign Affairs).

One of the first laws made by the Israeli Knesset is the right of return for Jews, as part of the Jewish identity and definition of the state of Israel, and based on the United Nation charter, yet the declaration of Independence insure the minorities right and democratic freedoms as freedom of speech, freedom for and of religion and the right to vote and be elected to the Israeli Parliament.

But beyond everything the main challenge of the new Jewish state is how to deal with none Jewish minority, and not less important – how to deal with the enemies from outside.
The Israeli-Palestinian conflict

The roots of the conflict

There is a big debate around the world, and specifically in academy, regarding the roots of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict when some believe that Six Days War in 1967 is the core of the conflict, with the occupation of the West Bank and East Jerusalem, and the beginning of the Israeli settlements, when others point on the 1948 war and what known as the Palestinian "Nakba" (disaster) and the refugees problem, and very few goes even more back to the first clashes between Jews to Arabs in the mandatory Palestine during the 20's and the 30's of the 20th century (Neal, 1995; Giller, 2010; Dekel, 2016; Quartet, 2016).

It does not mean that those arguments are completely not true, and no doubt we are talking here about events which are a very dominant part in the core of the conflict, but it is impossible to discuss about the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and totally ignore the religious element of the conflict.

Islamic–Jewish relations started in the 7th century AD with the foundation and spread of Islam in the Arabian Peninsula. The two religions shares similar values, guidelines, and principles. Islam also incorporates Jewish history as a part of its own. Muslims regard the Children of Israel as an important religious concept in Islam. Moses, the most important prophet of Judaism, is also considered a prophet and messenger in Islam. Moses is mentioned in the Quran more than any other individual, and his life is narrated and recounted more than that of any other prophet. There are approximately 43 references to the Israelites in the Quran (excluding individual prophets), and many in the Hadith (Prager&Telushkin, 1983; Quran; Keeler, 2005; Encyclopedia of Islam).

The first interaction between Muslims and Jews happened in the city of Yathrib (Al-Medina today) around the year 620. A delegation, consisting of the representatives of the twelve important clans of Medina, invited Muhammad to serve as chief arbitrator for the entire community; due to his status as a neutral outsider. There was fighting in Yathrib: primarily the dispute involved its Arab and Jewish inhabitants, and was estimated to have lasted for around a hundred years before 620. Muhammad instructed his followers to emigrate to Yathrib, until nearly all his followers left Mecca. Being alarmed at the departure, according to tradition, the Meccans plotted to
assassinate Muhammad. With the help of Ali, Muhammad fooled the Meccans watching him, and secretly slipped away from the town with Abu Baker. By 622, Muhammad emigrated to Yathrib, a large agricultural oasis. Those who migrated from Mecca along with Muhammad became known as muhajirun (emigrants) (Watt, 1977; Esposito, 1998).

In Yathrib of those times there were 3 main Jewish tribes, which live mainly from agriculture and trade. The tribes, Banu Nadir, Banu Qurayza and Banu Qaynuqa, had peaceful and friendly relations with Muhammad and his new Muslim community, but as much Muhammad gained power he tried to convert the Jews of Yathrib to Islam as well (Guillaume, 1955; Donner, 1979).

After failed to convert the Jewish tribes in Yathrib to Islam Muhammad decided to fight them. According some sources, the Banu Nadir invited Muhammad to their habitations for a religious debate, to which Muhammad accepted. Muhammad also accepted the condition that he bring no more than three men with him. On his way he was notified by a Banu Nadir convert to Islam of an assassination attempt at the debate (al-Halabi).

Muhammad besieged the Banu Nadir. He ordered them to surrender their property and leave Medina within ten days. The tribe at first decided to comply, but "certain people of Medina who were not Believers of Muhammad sent a message to the Banu al-Nadir, saying, 'Hold out, and defend yourselves; we shall not surrender you to Muhammad. If you are attacked we shall fight with you and if you are sent away we shall go with you.'" (ibn Ishaq). Huyayy ibn Akhtab decided to put up resistance, hoping also for help from the Banu Qurayza, despite opposition within the tribe. The Nadir were forced to surrender after the siege had lasted for 14 days, when the promised help failed to materialize and when Muhammad ordered the burning and felling of their palm-trees. Under the conditions of surrender, the Banu Nadir could only take with them what they could carry on camels with the exception of weapons.

The Banu Nadir left on 600 camels, parading through Medina to the music of pipes and tambourines. Al-Waqidi described their impressive farewell: "Their women were decked out in litters wearing silk, brocade, velvet, and fine red and green silk. People lined up to gape at them." Most of Banu Nadir found refuge among the Jews of Khaybar, while others emigrated to Syria. According to Ibn Ishaq, the chiefs of Nadir
who went to Khaybar were Sallam b. Abu'l-Huqayq, Kenana ibn al-Rabi and Huyayy b. Akhtab. When these chiefs arrived in Khaybar, the Jewish inhabitants of Khaybar became subject to them.

Muhammad divided their land between his companions who had emigrated with him from Mecca. Until then, the emigrants had to rely upon the Medinese sympathizers for financial assistance. Muhammad reserved a share of the seized land for himself, which also made him financially independent.

Upon expulsion of the Banu Nadir, Muhammad is said to have received a revelation of the Surah al-Hashr (Al-Waqidi, 1966; Stillman, 1979).

In 627 a number of Jews who had formed a party against Muhammad, including Sallam b. Abu'l-Huqayq, Kenana ibn al-Rabi and Huyayy b. Akhtab, the chiefs of Nadir who had gone to Khaybar, together with two chiefs from the tribe of B. Wa'ili went to Quraysh and invited them to form a coalition against Muhammad so that they might get rid of him altogether. Then they persuaded the tribe of Ghaftan to join the battle against Muhammad. Banu Nadir promised half the date harvest of Khaybar to nomadic tribes if they would join the battle against Muslims. Abu Sufyan, the military leader of Quraysh, with the financial help of Banu Nadir had mustered a force of size 10,000 men. Muhammad was able to prepare a force of about 3000 men. He had however adopted a new form of defense, unknown in Arabia at that time: Muslims had dug a trench wherever Medina lay open to cavalry attack. The idea is credited to a Persian convert to Islam, Salman the Persian. The siege of Medina began on March 31, 627 and lasted for two weeks. Abu Sufyan's troops were unprepared for the fortifications they were confronted with, and after an ineffectual siege lasting several weeks, the coalition decided to go home (Guillaume; Watt, 1956).

In 628, Muhammad attacked Khaybar. Later, Muhammad sent a delegation under Abdullah bin Rawaha to ask another chief of the Banu Nadir, Usayr (Yusayr) ibn Zarim, to come to Medina along with other Nadir leaders to discuss the two groups' political relations. Among whom were Abdullah bin Unays, an ally of Banu Salima, a clan hostile to the Jews. When they came to him they spoke to him and treated him saying that if he would come to Muhammad he would give him an appointment and honour him. They kept on at him until he went with them with a number of Jews. Abdullah bin Unays mounted him on his beast until when he was in al-Qarqara, about six miles from Khaybar, al-Yusayr changed his mind about going with them.
Abdullah perceived his intention as he was preparing to draw his sword so he rushed at him and struck him with his sword cutting off his leg. Al-Yusayr hit him with a stick of shauhat wood which he had in his hand and wounded his head. All Muhammad's emissaries fell upon the thirty Jewish companions and killed them except one man who escaped on his feet. Abdullah bin Unays is the assassin who volunteered and got permission to kill Banu Nadir's Sallam ibn Abu al-Huqayq at a previous night mission in Khaybar.

Muhammad and his followers attacked Khaybar in May/June 628 after the Treaty of Hudaybiyyah. Although the Jews put up fierce resistance, the lack of central command and preparation for an extended siege sealed the outcome of the battle in favor of the Muslims. When all but two fortresses were captured, the Jews negotiated their surrender. The terms required them to hand over one-half of the annual produce to the Muslims, while the land itself became the collective property of the Muslim state (Guillaume).

The battle of Khaybar became to an ethos in the Islam culture and to a watershed in the relations between Jews to Muslims. According the tradition when Muhammad attacked Khaybar his followers shouted the sentence: "Khaybar Khaybar ya Yahud gish Muhammad fish yeud" which means: "Khaybar Khaybar oh Jews, Mohammad's army will be back". This sentence is a very popular sentence among Muslims even today, in anti-Israeli riots and demonstrations in the Arab world.

In 634 CE Umar Ibn Khattab became the second Caliph (the leader of the Muslim community after the death of Muhammed), after appointed by the first Caliph, Abu Baker, as his successor before his death (Blankinship, 1993).

Under Umar, the caliphate expanded at an unprecedented rate, ruling the Sasanian Empire and more than two-thirds of the Byzantine Empire. His attacks against the Sasanian Empire resulted in the conquest of Persia in less than two years (642–644).

A new Judeo-Arabic text, which discovered recently, has disclosed the following anecdote:

"Umar ordered Gentiles and a group of Jews to sweep the area of the Temple Mount. Umar oversaw the work. The Jews who had come sent letters to the rest of the Jews in Palestine and informed them that Umar had permitted resettlement of Jerusalem by Jews. Umar, after some consultation, permitted seventy Jewish households to return.
They returned to live in the southern part of the city, i.e., the Market of the Jews. (Their aim was to be near the water of Silwan and the Temple Mount and its gates). Then the Commander Umar granted them this request. The seventy families moved to Jerusalem from Tiberias and the area around it with their wives and children."

It is also reported in the name of the Alexandrian Bishop Eutychius (932–940 CE) that the rock known as the Temple Mount had been a place of ruins as far back as the time of the Empress Helena, mother of Constantine the Great, who built churches in Jerusalem. "The Byzantines," he said, "had deliberately left the ancient site of the Temple as it was, and had even thrown rubbish on it, so that a great heap of rubble formed." It was only when Umar marched into Jerusalem with an army that he asked Kaab, who was Jewish before he converted to Islam, "Where do you advise me to build a place of worship?" Kaab indicated the Temple Rock, now a gigantic heap of ruins from the temple of Jupiter. The Jews, Kaab explained, had briefly won back their old capital a quarter of a century before (when Persians overran Syria and Palestine), but they had not had time to clear the site of the Temple, for the Rums (Byzantines) had recaptured the city. It was then that Umar ordered the rubbish on the Ṣakhra (rock) to be removed by the Nabataeans, and after three showers of heavy rain had cleansed the Rock, he instituted prayers there. To this day, the place is known as ḳubbat es Ṣakhra, the Dome of the Rock (Assaf, 1946).

The expand of territory add a large population of none-Muslims to the Islamic Empire, especially Jews and Christians, what forced the Muslims to develop a policy toward those populations, which in one side were not Muslims but in the other hand based on the same principles as Islam as monotheistic religions. For this aim exactly the Muslims created the Dhimmi – a status for such populations which literally means "protected person", referring to the state's obligation under sharia (Islamic law) to protect the individual's life, property, and freedom of religion, in exchange for loyalty to the state and payment of the jizya tax. Dhimmis were exempt from certain duties assigned specifically to Muslims, and did not enjoy certain privileges and freedoms reserved for Muslims, but were otherwise equal under the laws of property, contract, and obligation (Patrick, 2007; Abou El Fadl, 2007).

The important element here is the jizya tax. Jizya is a per capita yearly tax historically levied on non-Muslim subjects, permanently residing in Muslim lands governed by Islamic law. Muslim jurists required adult, free, sane males among the dhimma
community to pay the jizya, while exempting women, children, elders, handicapped, the ill, the insane, monks, hermits, slaves, and musta'mins—non-Muslim foreigners who only temporarily reside in Muslim lands. Dhimmis who chose to join military service were also exempted from payment, as were those who could not afford to pay.

The Quran and hadiths mention jizya without specifying its rate or amount. However, scholars largely agree that early Muslim rulers adapted existing systems of taxation and tribute that were established under previous rulers of the conquered lands, such as those of the Byzantine and Sasanian empires (Abdel-Haleem, 2010; The Oxford Dictionary of Islam, 2010; Hilmi, 2002; Hallaq, 2009).

The importance of the Jizya is from the reason that many Dhimmmis who could not pay the tax forced to convert to Islam in order to save their life, what gives another perspective to the Jewish-Muslim relations.

**From religious conflict to national conflict**

For around 12 centuries, from the foundation of Islam and until WW1, the Muslims always had their own authority and territory, but WW1 and the collapse of the Ottoman Empire, with addition to Sykes–Picot Agreement, faced the Muslim world a new and unfamiliar situation, when foreign and stronger actors arrived to the Middle East and for the first time the region divided to a territory unites and borders. The Muslims, who used to live under Islam law and Muslim rulers, had to fit themselves to new rules and none-Muslim ruler.

Under the Ottomans, Palestine's Arab population mostly saw themselves as Ottoman subjects. In the 1830s however, Palestine was occupied by the Ottoman ruler of Egypt, Muhammad Ali and his son Ibrahim Pasha. The Palestinian Arabs revolt was precipitated by popular resistance against heavy demands for conscripts. In May 1834 the rebels conquered important cities as Jerusalem, Hebron and Nablus. In response, Ibrahim Pasha sent in an army, finally defeating the last rebels on 4 August in Hebron (Kimmerling& Migdal, 2003).

While most of the Arab nationalisms were the dominant tendencies along with Empire, Palestinian politics were marked by a continuing loyalty to the Ottoman reaction to foreign predominance and the growth of foreign immigration, particularly Zionist. Michelle Compos records that "Later, after the founding of Tel Aviv in 1909, conflicts over land grew in the direction of explicit national rivalry." Zionist ambitions were increasingly identified as a threat by Palestinian leaders, while cases
of purchase of lands by Zionist settlers and the subsequent eviction of Palestinian peasants aggravated the issue (Gelvin, 2005; Sufian & LeVine, 2007).

The most dominant character in the foundation of the Palestinian nationality is the Palestinians' first leader, Hajj Amīn al-Husayni. The al-Husayni family were a major force in rebelling against Muhammad Ali who governed Egypt and Palestine in defiance of the Ottoman Empire. This solidified a cooperative relationship with the returning Ottoman authority. The family took part in fighting the Qaisi family in an alliance with a rural lord of the Jerusalem area Mustafa Abu Ghosh, who clashed with the tribe frequently. The feuds gradually occurred in the city between the clan and the Khalidis that led the Qaisis, however these conflicts dealt with city positions and not Qaisi-Yamani rivalry.

In 1919, al-Husseini attended the Pan-Syrian Congress held in Damascus where he supported Emir Faisal for King of Syria. That year al-Husseini founded the pro-British Jerusalem branch of the Syrian-based 'Arab Club' (Al-Nadi al-arabi), which then vied with the Nashashibi-sponsored 'Literary Club' (al-Muntada al-Adabi) for influence over public opinion, and he soon became its president. At the same time, he wrote articles for the Suriyya al-Janubiyya (Southern Syria). The paper was published in Jerusalem beginning in September 1919 by the lawyer Muhammad Hassan al-Budayri, and edited by Aref al-Aref, both prominent members of al-Nadi al-'Arabi.

Al-Husseini was a strong supporter of the short-living Arab Kingdom of Syria, established in March 1920. In addition to his support to pan-Arabist policies of King Faisal I, al-Husseini tried to destabilize the British rule in Palestine, which was declared to be part of the Arab Kingdom, even though no authority was exercised in reality.

During the annual Nabi Musa procession in Jerusalem in April 1920, violent rioting broke out in protest at the implementation of the Balfour Declaration which supported the Zionists demands for a Jewish homeland in Palestine. Much damage to Jewish life and property was caused. The Palin Report laid the blame for the explosion of tensions on both sides. Ze'ev Jabotinsky, organizer of Jewish paramilitary defences, received a 15-year sentence. Al-Husseini, then a teacher at the Rashidiya school, near Herod's Gate in East Jerusalem, was charged with inciting the Arab crowds with an inflammatory speech and sentenced in absentia to 10-years imprisonment by a military court, since by then he had fled to Syria. It was asserted soon after, by Chaim
Weizmann and British army Lieutenant Colonel Richard Meinertzhagen, that al-Husseini had been put up to inciting the riot by British Field-marshal Allenby's Chief of Staff, Colonel Bertie Harry Waters-Taylor, to demonstrate to the world that Arabs would not tolerate a Jewish homeland in Palestine. The assertion was never proven, and Meinertzhagen was dismissed (Freitag & Fuccaro & Ghrawi & Lafi, 2015; Segev, 2012; Morris, 2003).

On the night of 1 May 1921, the Jewish Communist Party (precursor of the Palestine Communist Party) distributed Arabic and Yiddish fliers calling for the toppling of British rule and the establishment of a "Soviet Palestine". The party announced its intention to parade from Jaffa to neighbouring Tel Aviv to commemorate May Day. On the morning of the parade, despite a warning to the 60 members present from one of Jaffa's most senior police officers, Toufiq Bey al-Said, who visited the party's headquarters, the march headed from Jaffa to Tel Aviv through the mixed Jewish-Arab border neighbourhood of Manshiyya.

Another large May Day parade had also been organized for Tel Aviv by the rival socialist Ahdut HaAvoda group, with official authorization. When the two processions met, a fistfight erupted. Police attempted to disperse the about 50 communist protestors, and Muslims and Christians intervened to help the police against the Jews. A general disturbance quickly ensued and spread to the southern part of town.

Hearing of the fighting and believing that Arabs were being attacked, the Arabs of Jaffa went on the offensive. Dozens of British, Arab, and Jewish witnesses all reported that Arab men bearing clubs, knives, swords, and some pistols broke into Jewish buildings and murdered their inhabitants, while women followed to loot. They attacked Jewish pedestrians and destroyed Jewish homes and stores. They beat and killed Jews in their homes, including children, and in some cases split open the victims' skulls.

At 1:00 pm, an immigrant hostel run by the Zionist Commission and home to a hundred people who had arrived in recent weeks and days was attacked by the mob, and though the residents tried to barricade the gate, it was rammed open and Arabs attackers poured in. The stone-throwing was followed by bombs and gunfire, and the Jewish hostel residents hid in various rooms. When the police arrived, it was reported that they weren't shooting to disperse the crowd, but were actually aiming at the
building. In the courtyard one immigrant was felled by a policeman's bullet at short-range, and others were stabbed and beaten with sticks. Five women fled a policeman firing his pistol; three escaped. A policeman cornered two women and tried to rape them, but they escaped him despite his shooting at them. A fourteen-year-old girl and some men managed to escape the building, but each was in turn chased down and beaten to death with iron rods or wooden boards.

The violence reached as far as Abu Kabir. The Jewish Yitzker family owned a dairy farm on the outskirts of the neighbourhood, in which they rented out rooms. At the time of the riots, Yosef Haim Brenner, one of the pioneers of modern Hebrew literature was living at the site. On May 2, 1921, despite warnings Yitzker and Brenner refused to leave the farm and were murdered, along with Yitzker's teenaged son, his son-in-law and two other renters.

As in the previous year's Nebi Musa riots, the mob tore open their victims' quilts and pillows, sending up clouds of feathers. Some Arabs defended Jews and offered them refuge in their homes; many witnesses identified their attackers and murderers as their neighbours. Several witnesses said that Arab policemen had participated.

High Commissioner Herbert Samuel declared a state of emergency, imposed press censorship, and called for reinforcements from Egypt. General Allenby sent two destroyers to Jaffa and one to Haifa. Samuel met with and tried to calm Arab representatives. Musa Kazim al-Husseini, who had been dismissed as Jerusalem's mayor on account of his involvement in the previous year's Nebi Musa riots, demanded a suspension of Jewish immigration. Samuel assented, and two or three small boats holding 300 Jews were refused permission to land, and were forced to return to Istanbul. At the same time, al-Husseini's nephew, Haj Amin al-Husseini, was appointed Grand Mufti of Jerusalem, a decision that later faced much criticism.

Fighting went on for several days and spread to nearby Rehovot, Kfar Saba, Petah Tikva, and Hadera. British aircraft dropped bombs "to protect Jewish settlements from Arab raiders." (Segev, 1999; Huneidi, 2001; Omissi, 1990).

August, thousands of Arab villagers streamed into Jerusalem from the surrounding countryside to pray at the Al-Aqsa Mosque, many armed with sticks and knives. The gathering was prompted by rumors that the Zionists were going to march to the Temple Mount and claim ownership, as they had belligerently marched on the
Western Wall demanding Jewish ownership 9 days earlier. Harry Luke requested reinforcements from Amman. Towards 09:30 Jewish storekeepers began closing shop and at 11:00, 20–30 gunshots were heard on the Temple Mount, apparently to work up the crowd. Luke telephoned the Mufti to come and calm a mob that had gathered under his window near the Damascus Gate, but the commissioner's impression was that the religious leader's presence was having the opposite effect. By midday friction had spread to the Jewish neighborhood of Mea She'arim where two or three Arabs were killed. The American consulate documented the event in detail, reported that the killings had taken place between 12:00 and 12:30. The Shaw report described the excited Arab crowds and that it was clear beyond all doubt that at 12:50 large sections of these crowds were bent on mischief if not on murder. At 13:15, the Arabs began a massacre of the Jews.

Reacting to rumors that two Arabs had been murdered by Jews, Arabs started an attack on Jews in Jerusalem's Old City. The violence quickly spread to other parts of Palestine. British authorities had fewer than 100 soldiers, six armored cars, and five or six aircraft in country; Palestine Police had 1,500 men, but the majority were Arab, with a small number of Jews and 175 British officers. While awaiting reinforcements, many untrained administration officials were required to attach themselves to the police, though the Jews among them were sent back to their offices. Several English theology students visiting from the University of Oxford were deputized. While a number of Jews were being killed at the Jaffa Gate, British policemen did not open fire. They reasoned that if they had shot into the Arab crowd, the mob would have turned their anger on the police.

Yemin Moshe was one of the few Jewish neighbourhoods to return fire, but most of Jerusalem's Jews did not defend themselves. At the outbreak of the violence and again in the following days, Yitzhak Ben-Zvi demanded that weapons be handed to the Jews, but was both times refused. By August 24, 17 Jews were killed in the Jerusalem area. The worst killings occurred in Hebron and Safed while others were killed in Motza, Kfar Uria, Jerusalem and Tel Aviv. There were many isolated attacks on Jewish villages, and in six cases, villages were entirely destroyed, accompanied by looting and burning. In Haifa and Jaffa, the situation deteriorated and a police officer succeeded in warding off an attack on the quarter between Jaffa and Tel Aviv by firing on an Arab crowd.
The administrative director of Haddasah hospital in Jerusalem sent a cable to New York describing the casualties and that Arabs were attacking several Jewish hospitals.

In a few instances, Jews attacked Arabs and destroyed Arab property. These attacks were in most cases in retaliation for wrongs already committed by Arabs in the neighbourhood in which the Jewish attacks occurred. A Police officer opened fire on an Arab crowd and succeeded in beating off an attack on the quarter which lies between Jaffa and Tel Aviv. The worst instance of a Jewish attack on Arabs occurred in this quarter, where the Imam of a mosque and six other persons were killed.

According to the Shaw Report, the disturbances were not premeditated and did not occur simultaneously but spread from Jerusalem through a period of days to most outlying centres of population. The Shaw report found that the "outbreak in Jerusalem on August 23 was from the beginning an attack by Arabs on Jews for which no excuse in the form of earlier murders by Jews has been established."

Later on 23 August, the British authorities armed 41 Jewish special constables, 18 Jewish ex-soldiers and a further 60 Jews were issued staves, to assist in the defense of Jewish quarters in Jerusalem. The following day, Arab notables issued a statement that "many rumours and reports of various kinds have spread to the effect that Government had enlisted and armed certain Jews, that they had enrolled Jewish ex-soldiers who had served in the Great War; and the Government forces were firing at Arabs exclusively." The Mufti of Jerusalem stated that there was a large crowd of excited Arabs in the Haram area who were also demanding arms, and that the excited crowd in the Haram area took the view that the retention of Jews as special constables carrying arms was a breach of faith by the Government. The Government initially denied the rumours, but by 27 August they were forced to disband and disarm the special constables.

On 24 August 1929 in Hebron, Arab mobs attacked the Jewish quarter killing and raping men, women and children and looting Jewish property. They killed 65–68 Jews and wounded 58, with some of the victims being tortured, or mutilated. Sir John Chancellor, the British High Commissioner visited Hebron and later wrote to his son, "The horror of it is beyond words. In one house I visited not less than twenty-five Jews men and women were murdered in cold blood." Sir Walter Shaw concluded in The Palestine Disturbances report that "unspeakable atrocities have occurred in Hebron."
Hebron Chief Rabbi, Rabbi Jacob Joseph Slonim, Describes the Massacre:

“On Friday morning I learned from Arab friends in Hebron that the Moslems had received instruction from the Mufti of Jerusalem to come with arms to Jerusalem and that the ‘government will not prevent.’ I also learned that local hooligans intend to attack the talmudical academy at Hebron. I immediately went to the District Officer, an Arab named Abdullah Kardus, to ask for preventative measures. I was not, however, admitted to his presence. At three o’clock Friday afternoon hooliganism and looting were already raging in Hebron. I attempted to speak to some of the disorderly groups, but because of that I was severely beaten. An American woman, Mrs. Bernstein-Sokolover, went to the Hebron chief of police, Mr. Cafferata, an Englishman, urging him to take measures to stop the hooliganism and the looting. She told him that the Chief Rabbi and the Jews of Hebron are protesting against the reign of terror. He refused to take any measures, telling her: ‘The Jews deserve it. You are the cause of all troubles.”

The lone British policeman in the town, Raymond Cafferata, who, "killed as many of the murderers as he could, taking to his fists even,” was overwhelmed, and the reinforcements he called for did not arrive for 5 hours–leading to severe recriminations. Hundreds of Jews were saved by their more benevolent Arab neighbors, who offered them sanctuary from the mob by hiding them in their own houses while others survived by taking a shalter in the British police station at Beit Ramon, nearby the city. When the massacre ended, the surviving Jews were evacuated by the British.

This massacre had a deep and lasting effect on the old and newer Jewish communities in Palestine (Segev, 1999; Marlin, 2002; Shaw Commission, 1930; Kiwe, 1953; Cohen, 2015).

During the 30's of the 20th century the Arab riots and pogroms against Jewish settlements continued when the British are those who standing in the middle, trying to separate and bridge between the sides but just the opening of the WW2 brought silence to the region, when each side bet on other powerful country in the world, in hope to achieve political benefits after the war, and this how the Arabs supported Germany and the Nazis while the Jewish Yishuv in Palestine stood next to Britain.

**Between crisis to solution**
Since the foundation of the state of Israel the conflict starts to shaped as political conflict as well, while next to wars and terror attacks we saw also efforts for negotiation between the two sides in order to find a solution and to end the conflict, but also more and more intervention by international community. Some of the events which happened from 1948 have dramatic influence on the structure of the conflict.

According the United Nations Special Committee On Palestine (UNSCOP), which based on its report the United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) adopted resolution 181 in November 29, 1947 which also known as "partition plan", in 1947 there were around 1,237,000 Arabs and 603,000 Jews in Palestine (UNSCOP, 1947).

The rejection of resolution 181 by the Arab nations gave a hint for what expected to come few months later.

The war in 1948 started at May and ends around July 1949 with a victory of Israel on 7 Arab countries, but those who paid the highest cost, as a consequences of the war, were the Palestinians, who mentioned until today the 1948 war as their "Al-Nakbah" (the disaster).

During the 1948 Palestine War, 711,000 out of 1,237,000 Palestine Arabs fled or were expelled from the territories that became the State of Israel. According many historians most of the Palestinians left the land from their own will, and in some cases with the encouraging of the Arab league and Arab countries, which promised the Palestinians to come back as a winners and take over the Jewish property, after the Arab countries will defeat Israel. Steven Glazer supports this argument when he based his work on several historians and writers as Joseph Schechtman, Leo Kohn, Jon Kimche and Maria Syrkin. According Glazer the Arabs in Palestine were asked to stay and live as citizens in the Jewish state. Instead, they chose to leave, either because they were unwilling to live with the Jews, or because they expected an Arab military victory which would annihilate the Zionists. They thought they could leave temporarily and return at their leisure. Later, an additional claim was put forth, namely that the Palestinians were ordered to leave, with radio broadcasts instructing them to quit their homes (Glazer, 1980).

According to Benny Morris, between December 1947 and March 1948, around 100,000 Palestine Arabs fled. Among them were many from the higher and middle classes from the cities, who left voluntarily, expecting to return when the Arab states
won the war and took control of the country. When the Haganah and then the emerging Israeli army (Israel Defense Forces or IDF) went on the defensive, between April and July, a further 250,000 to 300,000 Palestinian Arabs left or were expelled, mainly from the towns of Haifa, Tiberias, Beit-Shean, Safed, Jaffa and Acre, which lost more than 90 percent of their Arab inhabitants. Expulsions took place in many towns and villages, particularly along the Tel Aviv–Jerusalem road and in Eastern Galilee. About 50,000–70,000 inhabitants of Lydda and Ramle were expelled towards Ramallah by the IDF during Operation Danny, and most others during operations of the IDF in its rear areas. During Operation Dekel, the Arabs of Nazareth and South Galilee were allowed to remain in their homes. Today they form the core of the Arab Israeli population. From October to November 1948, the IDF launched Operation Yoav to remove Egyptian forces from the Negev and Operation Hiram to remove the Arab Liberation Army from North Galilee during which at least nine events named massacres of Arabs were carried out by IDF soldiers. These events generated an exodus of 200,000 to 220,000 Palestinian Arabs. Here, Arabs fled fearing atrocities or were expelled if they had not fled. After the war, from 1948 to 1950, the IDF resettled around 30,000 to 40,000 Arabs from the borderlands of the new Israeli state (Morris, 2003).

The events in 1948 and the Palestinian refugees are one of the most important elements of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, and together with the events of 1967 they are the core of the conflict today.

At its first summit meeting in Cairo in 1964, the Arab League initiated the creation of an organization representing the Palestinian people. The Palestinian National Council convened in Jerusalem on 28 May 1964. Concluding this meeting the PLO was founded on 2 June 1964. Its stated goal is the "liberation of Palestine" through armed struggle, include terror. The ideology of the PLO was formulated in the founding year 1964 in the Palestinian National Covenant. The document is a combative anti-Zionist statement dedicated to the "restoration of the Palestinian homeland". It has no reference to religion. At the core of the PLO's ideology is the belief that Zionists had unjustly expelled the Palestinians from Palestine and established a Jewish state in place under the pretext of having historic and Jewish ties with Palestine. The PLO demanded that Palestinian refugees be allowed to return to their homes. This is expressed in the National Covenant:
Article 2 of the Charter states that "Palestine, with the boundaries it had during the British mandate, is an indivisible territorial unit", meaning that there is no place for a Jewish state.

Article 20 states:

"The Balfour Declaration, the Mandate for Palestine, and everything that has been based upon them, are deemed null and void. Claims of historical or religious ties of Jews with Palestine are incompatible with the facts of history and the true conception of what constitutes statehood. Judaism, being a religion, is not an independent nationality. Nor do Jews constitute a single nation with an identity of its own; they are citizens of the states to which they belong".

Article 3 reads:

"The Palestinian Arab people possess the legal right to their homeland and have the right to determine their destiny after achieving the liberation of their country in accordance with their wishes and entirely of their own accord and will".

The PLO has always labelled the Palestinian people as Arabs. This was a natural consequence of the fact that the PLO was an offshoot of the Arab League. It also has a tactical element, as to keep the backing of Arab states. Over the years, the Arab identity remained the stated nature of the Palestinian State. It is a reference to the "Arab State" envisioned in the UN Partition Plan (Mazen Masri, 2010; PLO, 1964).

The foundation of the PLO gave the conflict political aspect as well, as addition to the religious and national that it's already had.

In June 1967, and after was threaten by its neighbor countries Egypt, Jordan and Syria, Israel open a "surprise attack" against the air forces of its three main enemies while their air strikes are not ready, on the ground, in what started the six days war, where Israel extended its land and took over the West Bank and East Jerusalem from Jordan and Gaza Strip from Egypt. In a census, made by the Israeli Central Bureau of Statistics and published 50 years after the war it turns that after the war 356,000 people lived in Gaza Strip and around 600,000 in the West Bank (not include East Jerusalem) (ICBS, 1967).

After the war over, Israel prepared a peace offer that included retreat from most of the occupied territories. According to Chaim Herzog:

"On June 19, 1967, the National Unity Government [of Israel] voted unanimously to return the Sinai to Egypt and the Golan Heights to Syria in return for peace agreements. The Golans would have to be demilitarized and special arrangement would be negotiated for the Straits of Tiran. The government also resolved to open negotiations with King Hussein of Jordan regarding the Eastern border." (Herzog, 1982).
On September 1, 1967 the Arab league placed its summit convened in Khartoum, Sudan, in order to discuss the results of the Six Days War and the conclusions they have to take from the war. Eight Arab states attended the summit, including Egypt, Jordan, Lebanon and Syria. The leaders discussed more issues beside Israel, including the civil war in Yemen and economic cooperation, but this summit most known because of the part refer to Israel and the relations between the Arab world and Israel after the Six Days War and what we know today as the "Three No's": "no peace with Israel, no recognition of Israel, no negotiations with it..." (Jewish Virtual Library, 2012).

But while Egypt and Jordan found, during the years, the way for a peace with Israel, the situation with the Palestinians was a bit different and more complicated.

As we can see so far the Israeli-Palestinian conflict is very unique from few reasons: First of all if the conflict between Israel to the other Arab countries started at 1948 the conflict between the Israelis and Palestinians goes back to the beginning of the 20th century.

Second the Israelis and Palestinians are actually lives on the same land and have to share a small territory.

And third the Israeli-Palestinian conflict builds on three levels: religious, national and political. In some way we can see that the conflict with Israel is what actually shaped the Palestinian nationality and political structure.

With this challenges International community tries over and over again to find a solution and to end the conflict. Beyond the importance of the region for the powerful countries, and their will for stability in this region there is also a lot of prestige in international community to deal with what count as "the most complicated conflict in the world". Therefor we see during the years more and more countries which trying to influence the peace process and being a dominant actor, exactly as the European Union is trying to do for the last decades.
Israel – EU relations
The relations between Israel to the European Union is very complicated and complex. In one side Israel was founded by majority of Jewish refugees from European countries and based on European values and culture but in the other hand the tragedy of the Jewish holocaust creates doubts and suspicion in the Israeli side toward the European nations. Israel and the European Union have common interests in trade and security issues but the will of the EU to become a dominant actor in the peace process sometimes forced the EU to be more critics toward Israel and Israel's policy.

To understand better the complex of these relations we will try to understand in this chapter the background of the EU and the relations between Israel to the EU and to the dominant EU member states and actors.

Background
In 1959 Israel and the EU formed official diplomatic relations, and since 1994 the EU expressed its will to establish a special relation with Israel, in Essen Council.

in 1995 Israel attended the Barcelona process (Euro-Mediterranean Partnership), and more conferences regarding EU relations to the Mediterranean countries, including in 2003 and 2008 (ENP).

Regarding trade in 1975 Israel and the EU signed on cooperation agreement in several fields, including economic, commercial, technological and research. This agreement came into force in 2000 and it is included measures for the creation of a free trade zone. The agreement also set the basis for cooperation in another fields as culture, research and political (European Council; Del Sarto, 2014).

On 2012 Israel and the EU signed on ACAA (Agreements on Conformity Assessment and Acceptance) free trade agreement in pharmaceuticals. The ACAA of Industrial Products was adopted by the European Parliament on 23 October 2012.

In June 2013, the European Union and the Israel signed an open skies agreement, in order to encourage more companies to flight between Israel to the EU countries with less regulation, what led to increase in tourism from both sides.
The EU is Israel’s biggest trading partner today. In 2013 the total volume of bilateral trade came to over 27 billion euros. In 2013, 32% of Israel’s exports went to the EU, and 34% of its imports came from the EU.

Total EU trade with Israel rose from 19.4 billion euros in 2003 to 31.0 billion euros in 2012 and 31.4 billion euros in 2013. EU exports to Israel reached 17.9 billion euros in 2013, while imports from Israel were 13.5 billion euros. The trade deficit with Israel was 4.4 billion euros in the EU’s favor in 2013.

Israel was the first country that it is not European country, to be associated to the European Union's Framework Program for Research and Technical Development (RTD). The high-level of Israeli science and technology, and also good repetition as startup nation, turns Israel to a very important partner of the EU regarding those issues. In 2004 Israel allowed to participation in the EU’s Galileo project for a global navigation satellite system, according agreement signed with the EU commission, and in 2014, Israel became the only non-European member of the European science organization, CERN (World Jewish Congress, 2017; Herb, 2013; European Commission).

No doubts that Israel's unique repetition in science, technology and high-tech made Israel to a very strategic partner of the EU, which also see a lot of benefit from such co-operation.

There is an idea that discuss from time to time, especially among politicians in both sides, regarding a possibility that Israel will join to the EU as a member state. There were some decisions to upgrade Israel's status as a "special priority partner" but it is always comes as condition to motivate Israel to drive the peace process with the Palestinians (Ravid, 2013).

Regarding the Israeli-Palestinian conflict the Council of the European Union published its official position at July 20, 2015, and it says the follow:

" 1. The EU reaffirms its commitment to a just and comprehensive resolution of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, based on the two state solution, with the State of Israel and an independent, democratic, contiguous, sovereign, and viable State of Palestine, living side by side in peace and security and mutual recognition. The EU reaffirms that there is no alternative to a negotiated two state solution. The regional context, including the ongoing radicalization and spread of terrorism, makes it even more urgent to end the conflict. The status-quo is not an option, as the viability of the two state solution is
constantly being eroded by new facts on the ground. The EU urges both parties to demonstrate their stated commitment to the two state solution through concrete actions. Actions by either side which call into question their stated commitment to a negotiated solution must be avoided. The EU will actively support the parties to restore confidence and create an environment of trust necessary to engage in meaningful negotiations as soon as possible.

2. An immediate priority must be to address the grave situation in the Gaza Strip. One year after the conflict, the humanitarian and socio-economic situation in the Gaza Strip remains dire. In light of the urgent needs of the people in Gaza, all international community pledges should be honored. The EU furthermore expresses its concern over UNRWA's severe lack of funds and, as a leading donor to UNRWA, calls on all concerned donors to step up their funding.

The EU believes that compliance with international humanitarian law and international human rights law by states and non-state actors, including accountability, is a cornerstone for peace and security in the region.

3. The EU welcomes recent steps taken by Israel to ease restrictions in Gaza. However, further positive measures are now needed that enable the full delivery of humanitarian aid, reconstruction and economic recovery on a permanent basis. The EU calls for a fundamental change of the political, security and economic situation in the Gaza Strip, including the end of the closure and a full opening of the crossing points, while addressing Israel's legitimate security concerns. Recent rocket fire by militant groups is unacceptable and underlines again the danger of escalation. All stakeholders must commit to non-violence and peace. The EU calls on all parties to agree on a durable ceasefire that prevents a return to conflict, strengthens Gaza, as it is an integral part of a future Palestinian state, and reinforces the link between Gaza and the West Bank.

4. The EU urges all Palestinian factions to find common ground, based on non-violence and reconciliation, and to work together to address the needs of the Palestinian population. Intra-Palestinian reconciliation is an important element for reaching the two states solution. In that regard, the EU calls on the Palestinian factions to make reconciliation and the return of the PA to Gaza a top priority. The PA must take greater responsibility in this regard and assume its government function in the Gaza Strip, including in the field of security, civil administration and through its presence at the Gaza crossing points. The EU is ready to provide full support to these efforts, including
through the rapid reactivation and possible extension in scope and mandate of its EUBAM Rafah and EUPOL COPPS missions.

5. The EU is committed to working with all sides, including through implementation of existing agreements, to allow the socio-economic development of the West Bank, including East Jerusalem, and empower Palestinian institutions in preparation for statehood, based on the rule of law and respect for human rights. The EU stresses that actions such as the easing of restrictions must be part of a fundamental change of policy with regard to the occupied Palestinian territory. It calls on Israel to enable accelerated Palestinian construction, as well as social and economic development in Area C. Such actions will serve to strengthen the prosperity and security of both Israelis and Palestinians. It further calls on Israeli authorities to halt plans for forced transfer of population and demolition of Palestinian housing and infrastructure in the Susya and Abu Nwar communities.

6. The preservation of the viability of the two state solution is at the core of EU policy and will remain a priority. In this regard, and recalling that settlements are illegal under international law, the EU reiterates its strong opposition to Israel's settlement policy and actions taken in this context, such as building the separation barrier beyond the 1967 line, demolitions and confiscation - including of EU funded projects - evictions, forced transfers including of Bedouins, illegal outposts, settler violence and restrictions of movement and access. These actions seriously threaten the two state solution. Settlement activity in East Jerusalem seriously jeopardizes the possibility of Jerusalem serving as the future capital of both states. The EU will continue to closely monitor developments on the ground and their broader implications and remains ready to take further action in order to protect the viability of the two state solution. The EU and its Member States reaffirm their commitment to ensure continued, full and effective implementation of existing EU legislation and bilateral arrangements applicable to settlement products. The EU expresses its commitment to ensure that - in line with international law - all agreements between the State of Israel and the EU must unequivocally and explicitly indicate their inapplicability to the territories occupied by Israel in 1967.

7. Securing a just and lasting peace will require an increased common international effort. The EU, notably through the action of its recently appointed Special Representative for the Middle East Peace Process, will work actively on a renewed multilateral approach to the peace process in consultation with all relevant
stakeholders, including partners in the Quartet, notably the US, in the region and the United Nations Security Council. The establishment of an International support group is a possible way to contribute to this end; the Council asks the High Representative to explore options for implementation of this initiative with regional and international actors and to report back in early September. The EU’s position on parameters, as set out in the Foreign Affairs Council Conclusions of July 2014, provides a basis for achieving consensus on the way forward. The EU is ready to engage in joint work with regional partners on the basis of the Arab Peace Initiative, and welcomes ongoing efforts of the Quartet in this regard.” (Council of the European Union, 2015).

In the political level Israel never was too much involve in the European Union. The only political parties in Israel which cooperate with groups in the European Parliament are Meretz and HaAvoda, which are associate members in the Socialists and Democrats group, from left, and the Likud party, which joined the Alliance of Conservatives and Reformists in Europe as regional partners in 2016, and cooperate also with many political parties from the Europe People Party group as well. The author of this research also served as vice chairman in the European Young Conservatives, the youth wing of the Alliance of Conservatives and Reformists in Europe, and led the Likud party to a full membership in this organization in December 2016.

The relations between Israel to the dominant EU member states

Germany

The relations between Israel and Germany are very complex and very unique, because of the common history that the two countries shares, with the Jewish holocaust.

In the early 1950s, the negotiations began between the Prime Minister of Israel David Ben-Gurion, the chairman of the Jewish Claims Conference Nahum Goldmann, and the Chancellor of West Germany Konrad Adenauer. Because of the sensitivity of accepting reparations, this decision was intensely debated in the Israeli Knesset. In 1952, the Reparations Agreement was signed. All in all, as of 2007 Germany had paid
25 billion euros in reparations to the Israeli state and to Holocaust survivors (Congressional Research Service, 2007).

The negotiation between the Israeli government to West Germany led to big demonstrations against the Israeli government from its opposition. In debate about the agreement in the Israeli Knesset, at January 1952, the head of the opposition, Menachem Begin, hardly criticized the government, mainly for the national dignity aspect and the international legitimation and acceptation this negotiation gives to Germany after the second world war and the Jewish holocaust (Begin, 1952).

On May 1965 West Germany and Israel established diplomatic relations and since then Germany became a very strategic ally of Israel in trade, security, science and culture, but beyond that Germany is a very important weapon provider of Israel, especially tactics weapon as submarines. In an interview to the Israeli news website YNET Chancellor Angela Merkel said about this issue the follow:

"Israel's security was and Is a very important matter for every German chancellor – and so it will be in the future, too. My statement must be understood in a very comprehensive way. It is frequently reduced to the military aspect, but it refers to an entirely fundamental commitment to Israel's security. We are certainly not neutral. I am working on instilling this recognition in the next generation of young people. I am similarly working to make the future generation's young people to be aware of it." (YNET, 2015).

There is no doubt that the unique history of the two nations shaped these relations along the way and creates big responsibility from Germany to Israel's security and survival, yet Germany is trying to be fair and balance in the peace process between the Israelis and Palestinians also, and Germany's history influence Germany policy today as well, in the aspect of human rights and international law.

**France**

The relations between Israel and France had many ups and downs, from very close and warm relations to crisis and distance. France, who wish also to be a very
dominant factor, not only in the peace process between the Israelis and Palestinians but also in all the Middle East.

The connection of France to the Israeli-Zionist development is very deep and rooted, and goes back to Dreyfus affair, in what for many is the trigger for the foundation of the Zionist movement by Theodor Herzel.

After the WW2 over the Jewish leadership hoped that France will help them with their will to establish a Jewish state. At the beginning Israel and France had a very good and close relations, mainly because of the French interests in the region and their struggles with Arab nationalists. France recognized Israel immediately after established and even provided Israel weapons.

In October 1957 France and Israel signed on agreement when the French actually helped Israel with its nuclear program (Gilmore, 2001; FOX NEWS, 2001). In 1956, and after Egypt nationalized Szuez canal, Israel, France and United Kingdom co-operate in military operation in order to remove Egypt from the Suez canal and Tiran canal in order to control it and open back the shipping moving to Africa and the far East. (Newman, 2010; Black, 2010; Mayer, 2010).

In 1967, and before the beginning of the Six-Day War France turns against Israel and imposed embargo on Israel. With lack of weapons Israel had to find a new allies and new strategy, and this how its turns to a blitz attack by the Israeli air force, in order to hit the enemies strong and fast as possible and to not pull to a long war.

According to the New York Times France had to pick a side after a double game that ended with the Six Days war in 1967. France took the Arab side, and despite aggressive moves by Egypt France imposed a temporary arms embargo on the region, which mostly hurt Israel, and warned senior Israeli officials to avoid hostilities.

The vacuum France left filled by USA very quickly and with the independency of the former French colonies in north Africa French took more and more the Arab side and became more critics toward Israel. In some way the massive immigration of Muslims to France, from the former French colonies, during the 50s' and the 60s' was one of the reasons for this change as well, since the Muslims immigrants, who arrived to
France and accepted as a citizens, were already affected from the Israeli-Arab conflict with a very radical approach against Israel (Bass, 2010).

The large Muslim population in France brings the Israeli-Palestinian conflict into the country, what also express by violence and increase of anti-Semitism and terror attacks against Jews. In the last decade several terror attacks took place in France, directed to Jews and Jewish institutes, including the attack on Jewish school in Toulouse from 2012, and the attack in the Jewish Kosher store during the Charlie Hebdo attack from 2015.

As a response the Israeli government trying to encourage French Jews to immigrant to Israel, what makes the relations between Israel and France more stress, when each side don't really trust the other.

**United Kingdom**

United Kingdom is the European country, and even all over the world, with the longest relations with Israel, and the Zionist movement before. In fact there is no other country which involve so deep and for so many years in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, and there are some people who even blames United Kingdom for many of the problems in the Middle East, and specific in what was British mandatory of Palestine.

Britain occupied Palestine from the Ottoman Empire after WW1. During the war, and in hope to find Britain a cooperative partner that will fulfill its promise for the Jewish people to a homeland in Palestine, the Zionist movement established the intelligence agency Nili, that cooperated with Britain against the Ottomans and provided the British signal intelligence. Moreover many Jews joined the Jewish legion in the British army in order to take active part in the battles. Accordingly the British provided the Balfour Declaration in 1917, which called for the "establishment of a national homeland for the Jewish people in Palestine." Later on, and under the leadership of General Allenby, the British took control of all Palestine from the Ottoman Empire, and in 1920 the British mandate on Palestine officially started. The British appointed a commission in order to fulfill their promise to the Jewish people, but in 1922, in San Remo conference the territory of Palestine divided for two when Transjordan splits for Abdallah al Husein from Hijaz, who the British had obligation for as well.(Gilbert, 2008).
Later on, when the British prevented Jews to immigrate to Palestine and some of the Jews in the Yishuv felt that the British are not fulfill their promises, some organizations, as Menachem Begin's Irgun, decided to raise the struggle level and to turn to offensive actions against British authorities and facilities in Palestine. They saw the British mandatory as part of the problem not less than the struggle against the Arabs.

In 1956, Egypt took very offensive actions against Israel when nationalized the Suez Canal and blocked the Straits of Tiran. In this way Egypt prevented goods to Israel, and also hurts the British and French trade to the Far East. The aggressive actions by Egypt led Britain and France to a military operation, together with Israel, in order to secure the Suez Canal by force. In November 1956, Israel opened the attacked against Egypt, and Britain and France seized most of the Suez Canal before intervention by Russia and the United States forced them to stop and get a ceasefire (Newman, 2010).

In 2009, the United Kingdom's Department for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs decided to label products from the Israeli settlements in the West Bank. Israel's foreign ministry said that the UK was "catering to the demands of those whose ultimate goal is the boycott of Israeli products", but this was denied by the UK government, which rejected Israel's claims.

In the last decade there is a large increase of Anti-Israel and anti-Semitic activity in UK, including in politics and universities, and UK is a very fruitful soil for BDS (Boycott Divestment, Sanctions). Yet in the state level the relations between the two countries are very stable and strong, and in summer 2018 the crown prince, prince William, was the first royal member to visit Israel for official visit, since ever.

**Sweden**

Sweden is one of the most dominant actors regarding the Israeli-Palestinian conflict from two main reasons: first of all it is the biggest country in the Scandinavian block and second Sweden today is the most Anti-Israeli voice in Europe. What interesting about Sweden is that its attitude today toward Israel is absolutely opposite of its attitude and policy toward Israel in the first years of Israel's existent. During Prime Minister Tage Erlander's the Relations between Sweden and Israel were good and
many young Swedish came to Israel to volunteer in Kibutzs and villages. Sweden under Erlander also strongly supported Israel during the Six-Day War (Ahlmark, 1997). Olof Palme, who came after Erlander, held a very different point of view, especially regarding US and its allies, which he saw as aggressive and imperialists. Since than the relations between Israel to Sweden got worse and worse.  

In October 1973, during the Yom Kippur War, while Israel defends itself from 3 Arab countries, Sweden's Minister for Foreign Affairs Krister Wickman pointed Israel as the aggressive power and the main reason for the instability in the Middle East. After the Israeli attack on the nuclear facilities in Iraq, at June 1981, Sweden was one of the first countries to condemn Israel, for what in Swedish eyes was violation of international law. During the first Lebanon war, in 1982, Swedish Prime Minister, Olof Palme, compared between Israel to Nazi Germany and to the treatment of Jewish children in the Nazi concentration camps and ghettos during World War II (Ahlmark, 1997; Ahlmark, 2004). 

In 2014 Sweden became to the first European country to recognize Palestine as a state, one sided. Swedish Prime Minister, Stefan Löfven, announced it would recognize the state of Palestine saying that:

"the conflict between Israel and Palestine can only be solved with a two-state solution... A two-state solution requires mutual recognition and a will to peaceful co-existence. Sweden will therefore recognize the state of Palestine." (BBC, 2014).

**Hungary**

The reason why I see Hungary as important actor in the EU is because of the influence Hungary has in V-4 group and the warming in the relations with Israel in the last years. The relations between the two countries formed at 1949 and in 1952 Hungary opened official diplomat office in Israel but after six days war, as part of the soviet bloc, Hungary cut the relations with Israel (ministry of foreign affairs). Since the renew of the relations between Hungary and Israel in 1989 the countries became closer and closer.
In July 2017 the Israeli Prime Minister, Benjamin Netanyahu was the first Israeli Prime Minister to visit in Hungary and one year later the Hungarian Prime Minister, Viktor Orban arrived to Israel.

Hungary was the first EU country which rejected the EU resolution to label products from the West Bank and the first EU country which open official diplomatic office in Jerusalem, in 2019.

The close relations between the two current leaders of Israel and Hungary is a key issue in the relations between the countries (kahana, 2019).
Chapter B

Research
Introduction to the research

Method

The main goal of this research is to try to create formulation that will help us to understand what actors have more influence on the general policy by the European Union regarding Israel and the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

For this aim I will cut from the chapter about the Israeli-Palestinian conflict in the literature review the core issues in the conflict and then will cut from the chapter about the Israel-EU relations in the literature review the official policy of the European Union, and will try to identify what is the EU view regarding each of one of the core issues.

After identify the EU policy regarding each of one of the core issues I will take one proposal on each core issue, which discussed and raised for voting in some international organization or even in the EU institutes, and will check how every actor voted in each case.

My assumption is that representative of actor (state\political group) usually are votes according the policy of the body they representing and therefore the actor's policy reflected in this votes.

So after find out what is the policy of each of one of the actors and all the actors together, I can compare it to the official policy and to see which actors have more influence on the official policy by the European Union.

To make it clearer I need also to define what the meaning of each voting pattern (for\against\abstention) and to translate it to policy. Therefore I decided to define it in the follow way:

Any abstention vote will count as neutral, except specific cases that will discuss per case.
In anti-Israeli proposal FOR will mean pro-Palestinian policy and AGAINST will mean pro-Israel policy.

In pro-Israeli proposal FOR will mean pro-Israel and AGAINST will mean pro-Palestinian.

My decision to define it in this way comes from the assumption that neutral means to save the status quo and any change in favor of one of the conflict sides is in fact a pro policy of the same benefited side.

The core issues of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict

1. Jerusalem – the issue of Jerusalem is maybe one of the most sensitive and exploded issues in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Jerusalem, and the temple mount, is the holiest sites in Judaism, but the occupation of Jerusalem by Caliphate Umar and the build of the rock tomb mosque on the temple mount gave Jerusalem important status in Islam as well. Six days war in 1967 and the liberation of East Jerusalem by Israel raised the issue of Jerusalem, and its status, to the top of the conflict, when from one side Israel ruling the entire city and see both the East and West sides as one united Jerusalem that shall not divide again and will be the capital of Israel as united city, when on the other hand the Palestinians demands to get back East Jerusalem, that will be the capital of the future Palestinian state.

2. Palestinian state – the foundation of Palestinian state is an issue that obvious to everybody around the world except the Israelis and the Palestinians themselves. while Palestinian state is the final result of any offer by any international factor in the peace process for decades those who rejected those offers over and over again were actually the Palestinians, start in 1947 and resolution 818 of the UN. The position in the Israeli side is not clearer and it is change according the government ideology. For example left governments were more positive about the idea of Palestinian state while right governments reject this idea. What more sure in this case is that from the Israeli side this issue should be discussed and agreed in direct negotiation and any try to achieve
this goal without direct negotiation between the two sides will make the conflict more complex.

3. Israeli settlements – after the six days war Israel starts to build new towns in the West Bank and Gaza Strip from two main reasons: first of all Israel believes that Jews have historical rights on this land and therefore they have moral legitimation to settle there. Second the Israeli government saw the importance of settling Jews among the Arabs as strategic move for the security of the state, also for keep army units in those territories and to break the series of Arab territory. The Palestinians are trying to mark the Israelis settlements as illegal and violation of international law. Their diplomatic efforts in this issue turns around DE legitimation and demonization of Israel, because of its policy in the West Bank, and the boycott campaign against Israel and the Israeli settlements.

4. 1967 lines – 1967 lines refers to the borders between Israel and the future Palestinian state. The year 1967, of course, point on the six days war and draw the international ceasefire lines between Israel to Jordan and Egypt as the as the optimal lines. The conception is that if Israel will reverse to the point it was before six days war its will be much easier to achieve peace. The Palestinians of course demands full retry by Israel, while from the Israeli side there is claims that 1967 lines are not defendable lines and Israel must to keep strategic territories plus the big Jewish urban areas as well.

5. Palestinian refugees – the Palestinian refugees issue is one of the biggest obstacles, which failed many efforts to achieve peace agreement, during the years. According the UN refugees organization for the Arabs from Palestine, UNRWA, which founded after the war in 1948, the status of refugee, will move from fathers to sons forever, what make 700,000 refugees in 1949 to around 5 million Palestinian refugees today. For the Palestinian UNRWA is another source to range money and attention from international community to the Palestinian problem. The Palestinians demands to include all the Palestinian refugees in any agreement and all for the right of return of the refugees to their homes and towns before 1948. For Israel such case is absolutely unaccepted and its will be death sentence to the Jewish state. Israel also point
UNRWA as one of the problems that preserve the poorness of the Palestinians and prevent them to develop and move on.

6. **Terror support** – from the beginning of the 20th century the massacres and pogroms of the Arabs against Jews led and directed by the Arab leadership. Israel always tried to throw the responsibility for terror attacks against Israeli citizens on the PLO, and especially to focus the salary that PLO pays to Palestinian prisoners who convicted in terror and to terrorists' families, and the incitement in the PLO against Israelis and Jews. This issue is always on the table in negotiation between the sides, and especially according the fact that most of the PLO budget combine from foreign money the PLO receives from other countries' including the EU. The Palestinians from their side see those prisoners and terrorists as "freedom fighters" and justify their actions and the PLO support.

**The European Union Policy**

In the Council Conclusions on the Middle East Peace Process document from July 20th 2015 the council of the European Union section 1 says the follow: "..The status-quo is not an option, as the viability of the two states solution is constantly being eroded by new facts on the ground…” that means that the EU policy necessary will be in favor of one of the sides and not neutral.

1. **Jerusalem** – East Jerusalem mentions in this document for the first time in section 5 and says the follow: "… The EU is committed to working with all sides, including through implementation of existing agreements, to allow the socio-economic development of the West Bank, including East Jerusalem, and empower Palestinian institutions in preparation for statehood, based on the rule of law and respect for human rights…” in this sentence we can see that the EU dos not separate between the West Bank and East Jerusalem and treat it as one unit. In section 6 the EU is clearer about the way it sees Jerusalem: "Settlement activity in East Jerusalem seriously jeopardizes the possibility of Jerusalem serving as the future capital of both states…”
So about the issue of Jerusalem there is no doubt the EU support the Palestinians claims and does not recognize East Jerusalem as part of Israel's capital.

2. Palestinian state – in this issue the EU even more clear and speaks about it more often. In the Council Conclusions on the Middle East Peace Process document the term "two states" mentioned 8 times but still the EU is trying so far to prevent one-sided recognition. In September 2018 the Spanish government announced that they are planning to push for such move in the European Union but such propose didn’t get yet to the council's table so in this issue the EU right now go with Israel.

3. Israeli settlements – here the EU is not only have a clear policy but also a very tough and critics one, which also expressed by actions. According the document the EU sees the Israeli settlements and the construction in the West Bank as violation of international law. In the website of the Office of the European Union Representative the EU published its actions in area C (an area that according Oslo agreement from 1994 is under Israel responsibility) at October 20th 2016 the follow:

" Area C constitutes more than 60% of the West Bank and at the same time represents the main land and natural resource reserve of the future Palestinian State and is critical for the viability of a two-state solution.

Israel retains almost exclusive control over law enforcement, planning and construction in Area C.

In line with the recommendations of the EU Foreign Affairs Council Conclusions, the European Union works in Area C on two fronts: humanitarian assistance and development.

The EU provides humanitarian assistance to communities in need in Area C in accordance with the humanitarian imperative. At the same time, the EU works with the Palestinian Authority to develop Area C and support Palestinian presence there. This includes projects promoting economic development and improving the quality of life of Palestinian communities in the areas of the private sector development, the environment and agriculture. The EU consults with the local communities themselves and the Israeli authorities where necessary
In the last three years, the EU committed around €20 million Euros to support the Palestinian socio-economic development in Area C. While around €23 million Euros were provided for humanitarian assistance through the European Commission's Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection Department (ECHO).

In a document by the European Commission from November 11th 2015 the commission clarify its position regarding labeling of Israeli products from the West Bank as part of the EU anti-settlements attitude.

So in this issue is pretty much clear as well that the EU totally adopted the Palestinian position, and even took it few steps forward with actual actions on the field.

4. 1967 lines – as direct continue to the previous section here as well the EU is taking the Palestinian position in 100% when they repeat over and over again about the need to return to 1967 lines as a basic for the future Palestinian state in their Council Conclusions on the Middle East Peace Process document. Although the document also discuss about the security issue and the security needs of Israel but the EU does not link between the security issue and the 1967 lines.

5. Palestinian Refugees – regarding this issue the EU doesn't speak about the right of return of the Palestinian refugees but they do speak about the importance of UNRWA and the need to strengthen the refugees' organization. In section 2 for the Council Conclusions on the Middle East Peace Process document they says: "…The EU furthermore expresses its concern over UNRWA's severe lack of funds and, as a leading donor to UNRWA, calls on all concerned donors to step up their funding…"

So even if the EU doesn't adopt all the Palestinian position in this case we can say that their attitude is more bias in favor of the Palestinians in this issue as well.

6. terror support – for this issue the EU shows 0 tolerance to terror attacks toward Israeli citizens, and do see the PLO as the one who should be charge and responsible on the field and to prevent terror attacks, as expressed in sections 3 and 4 for the Council Conclusions on the Middle East Peace Process document. The EU doesn’t talk about the budget for terrorists and the incitement but in this case is more taking the Israeli position. (Council of the European Union, 2015; Landau , 2018; The Office of the European Union Representative, 2016; EUROPEAN COMMISSION, 2015).
So as we can see in this tablet the policy of the European Union is pretty much pro-Palestinian. In most of the core issues in the conflict the EU adopted the Palestinian position, what leads me to the next part of the research – to find out who are the actors who influence this policy more.
Analysis the states level

In this part I will take 6 proposals in the EU or international organization, one proposal for one core issue, and will see how each of the EU member states voted in this case.

Any abstention vote will count as neutral, except specific cases that will discuss per case.

In anti-Israeli proposal FOR will mean pro-Palestinian policy and AGAINST will mean pro-Israel policy.

In pro-Israeli proposal FOR will mean pro-Israel and AGAINST will mean pro-Palestinian.

My decision to define it in this way comes from the assumption that neutral means to save the status quo and any change in favor of one of the conflict sides is in fact a pro policy of the same benefited side.
1. Jerusalem

In December 2017 the United Nations General Assembly passed resolution to condemn the US President's declare about recognition in Jerusalem as the capital of Israel. The resolution adopted in large majority of 128 for, 9 against and 35 abstains. This resolution is Anti-Israel although its condemn US declaration (UNGA, 2017; YNET, 2017).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>FOR</th>
<th>ABSTENTION</th>
<th>AGAINST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On May 2018 the council of the EU tries to adopt a statement that condemn the will of the US President, Donald Trump, to move the American Embassy to Jerusalem with the support of all the 28 EU member states but this statement failed because of the refusal of three EU countries: Czech Republic, Hungary and Romania. Few months before this voting in the UNGA, on July 2017, the Israeli Prime Minister, Benjamin Netanyahu, arrived to Budapest, in the first visit of Israeli Prime Minister to Hungary ever, to attend the V-4 conference and to meet with all the leaders of the V-4 countries. We absolutely can point on this visit as a turning point in the relations between Israel to V-4 countries, what expressed by more pro-Israeli policy from those countries. Regarding Romania Israel and Romania traditionally has very close relations, including military cooperation. Moreover along the history many Jews and even Israelis served in the Romanian Parliament and government, what strengthen the pro-Israeli sentiment among the Romanian leadership (13news, 2018). The policy of those countries expressed also by actions. Czech Republic was the first European country to recognize Jerusalem as the capital city of Israel, after the recognition of the US President, Donald Trump, and Hungary was the first European country to open an official diplomatic office in Jerusalem at 2019. At the same year the Romanian Prime
Minister also declare that his country will move its embassy to Jerusalem but so far it is a statement only.

Beyond those cases we can see a large consensus among the EU member states regarding this issue, what can explain the general policy by the EU, which reflected the will of the majority among the EU member states. Yet the contra position of the member states mentioned here is a big obstacle for the EU to apply this policy to actions.
2. Palestinian State

In the very symbolic date of November 29th 2012 the UNGA adopted resolution 67/19, that upgrades Palestine to non-member observer state status in the United Nations. With this resolution the UN actually recognized Palestinian state in one-sided decision, what again is a very Anti-Israeli resolution. The resolution adopted in majority of 138 for, 9 against and 41 abstains (UNGA, 2012).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FOR</th>
<th>ABSTENTION</th>
<th>AGAINST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxemburg</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United kingdom</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When we see the voting decide among the EU member states we can see that this issue is much more controversial. 16 of the EU member states supported this resolution when 11 abstain and 1 against. In this case, and since Israel's position is to save the status-quo and to decide about this issue only in direct negotiation, the abstention voting is not necessary neutral, since it stands in one line with the Israeli policy. What more interesting is to see that even if majority of the EU member states supported one-sided recognition in Palestinian state still the official policy of the EU is different, what leads me to conclusion that in this issue the influence of the wealthy countries, as Germany and United Kingdom, and even blocks as V-4 countries is bigger in controversial cases as this one.

Regarding the V-4 countries, as mentioned in the previous case, their attitude in the last decade is more pro-Israeli. We also saw that Israel has very close and special relations to Germany and UK as well. We can assume that the rest of the member states who didn't support this resolution are pretty much neutral in this issue but the biggest question is, if still the majority of the EU member states have pro-Palestinian policy in this issue, why the official policy of the EU is still pro-Israeli?
To answer this questions I have try to find any advantage that the member states who didn't support this resolution has on the other group of member states who voted "for". When I'm talking about advantage in term of international relations I mainly talking about soft power, and therefore I checked the EU budget and how much each country contributes to the EU budget.

According the details I found my conclusion is that in controversial cases the decision moves to the 3 biggest contributors of the EU: Germany, France and United Kingdom. Those three countries are actually the only member states who contribute the EU budget more than 10,000 M euro, when Germany contribute 19,587.04 M euro, France contribute 16,233.93 M euro and UK contribute 10,574.98 M euro. Together this three member states contribute 41% of EU budget, what leads me to conclusion that the soft power of those three countries increase their influence in controversial cases, and here we got the advantage of Germany and United Kingdom on France in this case, what can explain why the EU general policy is pro-Israeli in this issue, as Germany and UK's policy, and not pro-Palestinian, as the majority of the member states (EU, 2017).
3. Israeli settlements
In December 2011 the UNGA adopted resolution 66/225 in majority of 167 for, 7 against and 6 abstain. The resolution title was "Permanent sovereignty of the Palestinian people in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, and of the Arab population in the occupied Syrian Golan over their natural resources" and in section 4 says the follow: "Stresses that the wall and settlements being constructed by Israel in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including in and around East Jerusalem, are contrary to international law and are seriously depriving the Palestinian people of their natural resources, and calls in this regard for full compliance with the legal obligations affirmed in the 9 July 2004 advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice and in relevant United Nations resolutions, including General Assembly resolution ES-10/15" (UNGA, 2011).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FOR</th>
<th>ABSTENTION</th>
<th>AGAINST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxemburg</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United kingdom</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For this resolution there was 100% consensus among the EU member states, what can explain that critics and very active policy of the EU in this issue.
4. 1967 lines

So far there was any resolution that focus specific this issue but yet, in resolution 66\225 for " Permanent sovereignty of the Palestinian people in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, and of the Arab population in the occupied Syrian Golan over their natural resources" Israel always mentioned as "the occupier power" and Israel attendance in the West Bank present as illegal and against international law. From this terminology as appear in this resolution we can throw it on the way countries sees the 1967 lines issue as well (UNGA, 2011).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FOR</th>
<th>ABSTENTION</th>
<th>AGAINST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxemburg</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

So here we got the same tablet and the same conclusions as presented in the Israeli settlements issue. All the EU member states stands in one line for the Palestinians and against Israel in 1967 lines issue also, what also expressed in the EU policy.
5. Palestinian refugees

The easiest way to check the attitude of countries to the Palestinian refugees issue is to check resolutions that refer to support in UNRWA – the UN refugees agency for the Palestinians.

On December 2017 the UNGA adopted resolution regarding UNRWA that supported the organization and its original goals, including the save of refugee status for the Palestinians who left after the 1948 war and the right of return. The resolution recalling previous resolutions in this issue, including from 1949, and its appear under the title "Operations of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East". The resolution adopted in majority of 162 for, 6 against and 7 abstain. (UNGA, 2017).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FOR</th>
<th>ABSTENTION</th>
<th>AGAINST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxemburg</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United kingdom</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here again we can see 100% consensus among the EU member states in this issue. It is important to say again that that the question of right of return to the Palestinian refugees never discussed in international stage as separate topic so its hard to know what the policy of the countries in this particular case but in general we can see that there is 100% support in the Palestinian refugees issue and the need to strengthen UNRWA. Like in the other issues where the EU policy is in favor of the Palestinians here we can see also that this support by the EU is actually reflection of its member states' policy.
6. Terror support

The last issue is the support of the PLO in terror and terrorists. As mentioned already the PLO sees terrorists as "freedom fighters" and justifies terror against Israeli citizens. From international eyes the domestic conflict between the PLO and Hamas dose not remove responsible from the PLO to what happening in Gaza strip, and international community do expect the PLO to take back the charge on Gaza strip and stop the terror and firing of rockets toward Israeli citizens.

In November 2018 the UNGA failed to adopt American proposal to condemn Hamas after decided to pass this resolution only in two-third majority. In the proposal written in section 6 the follow: "Encourages (the UNGA) tangible steps towards intra-Palestinian reconciliation, including in support of the mediation efforts of Egypt, and concrete steps to reuni the Gaza Strip and the West Bank under the Palestinian Authority and ensure its effective functioning in the Gaza Strip.." (UNGA, 2018).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FOR</th>
<th>ABSTENTION</th>
<th>AGAINST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxemburg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United kingdom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compare to the all other issues in this issue we have a pro-Israeli resolution, what makes the 100% consensus among the EU member states this time in favor of Israel and the Israeli position, what also fit to the general EU policy.
Conclusions

According the results it is very clear that the official EU policy regarding Israel and the Israeli-Palestinian conflict is reflection of the policies and attitudes of large majority of the EU member states, except one issue – the Palestinian state issue.

The EU seems to be a very homogeneous framework where most of the member states, at least in this case, sharing very similar views, so when the council of the European Union asked to form a policy for this issue, it doesn't seem that the discussions demands too many arguments between the members.

If we take the issue of Palestinian state, where the votes were more split and even the majority of the EU member states voted the opposite of the official EU policy, we can refer this gap to the influence that the wealthy countries, as Germany and United Kingdom, have, and also to the influence of groups and coalitions as V-4 group that include Poland, Czech republic, Slovakia and Hungary.

My conclusion is that when the EU faces controversial issue wealthy countries and groups has more influence than the simple majority.

But as for the Israeli-Palestinian conflict we can see wildly agree among the member states.
Summarize
The Israeli–Palestinian conflict is one of the most complicated and complex conflicts in the world today, and so it is to try to understand the policy of other actors, who wish to be dominant factors in the peace process. If a conflict is the status quo it is impossible to end a conflict without changing the status quo, and it is impossible to change status quo when all the conflict's parties are satisfied. Yet, if some actor wants to be a dominant and important factor in the peace process, and to receive trust from all the parties, he must be balanced as much as possible.

In my research, I found out that the European Union has a very clear and strong policy regarding Israel and the Israeli-Palestinian conflict on each of the core issues in the conflict.

What really surprised me is how much the EU policy is biased and unbalanced in favor of the Palestinians. From 6 core issues that I checked, the EU policy goes in favor of the Palestinians in 4 of them, with a strong and striking position.

Regarding the influence of the actors in the EU on the general policy, as I already discussed in my research conclusions, it turns out that the EU is a very homogeneous body so the general policy simply reflected the will of all or a large majority of the member states in most of the cases.

In the one core issue where we saw a small majority to one approach, we could see the opposite approach in the official EU policy. The only conclusion is that some actors who voted with the minority have more power and more influence in the EU than the others, in this particular case.

I'm sure that this topic can be investigated from more perspectives in deeper in order to look on the influence of more actors, that I didn't look on, as political groups in the EU and lobbies and NGOs who work in the EU, and also to try to find out not only who are the dominant actors and what the policy is but also what is the motivation of every actor to behave in the way it is and what the reasons that led every actor to hold his own policy and positions.

I believe that this research can be very useful for both the EU and Israel.

For the EU, this research is a good mirror to take a look and understand how to shape its policy to a more balanced and soft, in order to gain Israel's trust and cooperation as well and become a dominant and legitimate factor in the peace process from the two conflict's parties.
For Israel in some way is the same principle. This research can show Israel on what issues and which actors it should turn its diplomatic efforts in order to change the negative picture, that draw here, more to its favor.

Finally I think that this research can also be useful for future academic works, that will ask to understand better any other of EU policies. The formulation I built here helps to understand and simplify the influence of every actor in multi-players framework as the EU.

In personal perspective I have to admit that it was very challenging to write about topic that I'm much related to but to do it from position of neutral researcher. The research conclusions were a big surprise for me. When I starts to write I was sure that I will find more heterogeneous European Union with debates and disagrees among the member states. The fact that the results dose not stands with my first expectations strengthen the importance of this research, in my opinion, and I'm glad for the opportunity to write it and hope to see more people finds this research useful and benefit.
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