

DIPLOMACY AND CONFLICT RESOLUTION
THE ARAB-ISRAELI CONFLICT
(CASE STUDY)

By

Khalifeh Sulieman Mohammed Ad-Dayyat

Supervisor

Dr. Omar Hadrami

**This Thesis was submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the
Master's Degree in Diplomatic Studies.**

Faculty of Graduate Studies

The University of Jordan

December, 2006

This Thesis (Diplomacy And Conflict Resolution: The Arab-Israeli Conflict (Case Study) was successfully defended and approved on 7/12/2006.

Examination Committee

Dr. Omar Hamdan Hadrami, Chairman
Assist. Prof. of International Relations

Dr. Mohammed Hamdan Masalha, Member
Assoc. Prof. of International Relations

Dr. Ibrahim Mashhour Al-Jazi, Member
Assist. Prof. of International Law

Dr. Ihmoud Ali Abu-Saleem, Member
Assoc. Prof. of Foreign Policy Studies
(Muta' University)

Signature



DEDICATION

I am very glad to present this Thesis for the soul of my parents and my dearest cousin - Fahad -, may God rest their souls in peace.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my warm and deep acknowledgements to my supervisor, who was always in contact and ready to offer me what I need, Dr. Omar Hadrami. I would like, also, to extend my special thanks to all my tutors who taught me and supplied me with the necessary information and who were always helpful advisors. And my heart respect and greetings to the Examination Committee for their useful notes.

TABLE OF COTENTS

Committee Decision	ii
Dedication	iii
Acknowledgements	iv
Table of Contents	v
Abstract (in English)	vi
Introduction	1
Chapter One: The Concept Of Diplomacy	7
Chapter Two: Methods Of Diplomacy In Resolving Conflicts	57
Chapter Three: Applying A Conflict Resolution Strategy	92
Chapter Four: The Arab-Israeli Conflict: A Protracted Conflict	110
Results and Recommendations	145
References	147
Abbreviations	159
Abstract (in Arabic)	160

DIPLOMACY AND CONFLICT RESOLUTION
THE ARAB-ISRAELI CONFLICT
(CASE STUDY)

BY

Khalifeh Sulieman Mohammed Ad-Dayyat

Supervisor

Dr. Omar Hadrami

ABSTRACT

The Arab- Israeli conflict is one of the most problematic issues facing the international community leaders and policy makers. It is a different conflict in its nature, cause and effect.

This study investigates, first, the role of diplomacy in reaching a settlement. It also illustrates the methods and techniques used by successive communities and states to end their conflict. It explains how early communities depended on war to maintain their interests and to overcome political crises here and there. It, then, goes through the tendency to form alliances for the previous purpose. However, the world then becomes aware that diplomacy should practice its influence in order to avoid violence and

suffering. Then, the study investigates the methods of diplomacy used in resolving conflicts. Here, the study shows the conflict resolution mechanisms to end conflicts and reach settlements. These mechanisms are divided into two groups: peaceful mechanisms and non-peaceful mechanisms. In addition to, the study illustrates the conflict resolution strategies being applied. It also builds up a recommended strategy for Arab negotiators concerning their conflict. Moreover, the study goes to the major developments of the Arab-Israeli conflict. It mentions the violent confrontations between both sides of the conflict. It then briefs the peaceful attempts launched by the regional and international community to have a satisfactory settlement for both sides.

The study results in reaching that diplomacy is a better solution than violence. It also recommends Arab negotiators to have a competitive conflict resolution strategy while negotiating upon their issues with the Israelis. Also, the study shows that the international community is not totally neutral as the great powers are sympathetic with Israel ignoring the basic rights of the Palestinian people. Arab unity is recommended to get the Arabs to be able to return what they have lost in sometime of their history. The results and recommendations can be used and taken into account in trying to have an end to the Arab-Israeli conflict.

Diplomacy And Conflict Resolution

The Arab–Israeli Conflict

(CASE STUDY)

Introduction

The study is concerned with the fact that diplomacy is becoming a preferable trend adopted by the conflicting parties in order to pave the way toward a settlement. The international public opinion always focuses on peaceful means through diplomatic channels to reach a settlement to the conflicts throughout the World and, in particular, the Middle East crisis. There are frequent messages received daily from the main actors on the international scene to enhance and push forward the peace process in the Middle East. The Middle East is geographically, logistically, economically and politically important and coveted by the super powers. The region because of the Arab–Israeli conflict had witnessed lots of wars, battles and military confrontations which bring nothing but losses, so both sides reached the fact that they have to look for a new means to achieve their own goals. Thus, diplomacy is the new channel. As the Arab–Israeli conflict is a long–running conflict, so it has been the focus of worldwide media and diplomatic attention for decades.

Animosity emanating from this conflict has caused numerous attacks on supporters (or perceived supporters) of one side by supporters of the other side in many countries around the world. The conflict became a major international issue after the collapse of the Ottoman Empire in 1917, and in various forms it continues up to this day. The Arab–Israeli conflict has resulted in at least eight major wars and a number of minor conflicts. It has also been the source of two major Palestinian uprisings (intifada).

Despite the long history of the conflict between the Israelis and the Arabs, there are many people working on peaceful solutions that respect the rights of peoples on all sides. And there were and still many diplomatic initiatives to reach a settlement for this long conflict. Diplomacy shows better outcomes than military confrontations. These diplomatic attempts began with the UN Partition Plan in 1947. Then came the cease-fire agreements in 1949. And later the Egyptian-Israeli peace agreement in 1979. Then came the most important event, the International conference of peace in Madrid in 1991, where all sides were present even those who never sit on one table with Israel. This conference has played a significant role in bridging the gaps between the sides concerned and on this basis Jordan and Israel signed a Peace Treaty in 1994. The international actors still work to get other parties to enter into peace agreements with Israel. In addition to, many initiatives were conducted before and after these attempts.

Diplomacy has shown that it is a better chance to pave the way to have an end to conflicts. The focus nowadays is to reach settlement for this conflict. The super powers, UN and other main actors wouldn't let military actions take place as much as possible, and this enhances the possibility to have agreement through diplomatic means to settle the conflict. So, this study will investigate the role of diplomacy in conflict resolution and, in particular, the Arab-Israeli conflict since its emergence.

The study consists of four chapters. Chapter one is concerned about diplomacy. It gives a brief idea about the definition of diplomacy, its types, the diplomatic developments through history. It explains how the world witnessed new kinds of diplomacy due to the developments and the emergence of new conflicts and crises. Chapter two presents the mechanisms used to solve conflicts which are of two types: peaceful and non-peaceful. The third chapter provides explanation to the terms: conflict and conflict resolution. It then illustrates the sources and types of conflicts. Also, it

demonstrates the different conflict resolution strategies used and ends with a recommended strategy for the Arab negotiators. The fourth chapter comes to illustrate the emergence of the Arab-Israeli conflict and the main factors that help have this long standing conflict. It illustrates the major military confrontations between both sides. It then explains the diplomatic initiatives being suggested to settle the conflict.

The study gets its importance from the main topic it researches. It will investigate the role of diplomacy in conflict resolution. It will also try to find out if diplomacy plays a role to settle the Arab-Israeli conflict. Most studies were concerned about historical sides or Political views and attitudes. Few studies, which tackle the Arab-Israeli conflict, have dealt with diplomacy as a tool in conflict resolution. Also, the studies that dealt with the Arab-Israeli conflict lack studying the effete of diplomacy on the conflict. This study will feature the role of diplomacy in conflict resolution. It will feature the influence of diplomacy on the Arab-Israeli conflict. It will also briefly revise the history of the conflict. Then it will go through the record of military confrontations between the Arabs and the Israelis.

The study mainly aims to investigate the role of diplomacy in conflict resolution. Then the mechanisms used in solving conflicts are illustrated. The study also demonstrates the key strategies of conflict resolution. It also briefs the diplomatic efforts made to settle the conflict.

Literature Review

* Fred J. Khouri "**The Arab-Israeli Dilemma**" (1968). This study investigates the historical background of the conflict. It mentions the origins of the Jewish and the Arab ties to Palestine. It explains the effect of the Zionist movement and Balfour Declaration as well as the Arab Nationalist Movement. It discusses the role of the United Nations. The writer then explains the peace conferences held for the sake of the conflict. It doesn't discuss the diplomatic channels to end or settle the conflict.

* Robert O. Freedman "**World Politics and the Arab-Israeli Conflict**" (1971). The researcher points out the origin and the development of the conflict .It discusses the perspectives of the superpowers toward the conflict. It mainly talks about the attitudes of the USA and the USSR (Russia). It then explains some regional perspectives on the conflict. It also discusses the domestic perspectives on the conflict. The study lacks studying the effect of diplomacy in conflict resolution.

*Frank C. Sakran "**Palestine Still A Dilemma**" (1976). The study explains the roots of the problem. It discusses how the issue is viewed in the United Nations. It discusses the efforts to convert the conflict from military actions to peace. It studies the role of the PLO in the developments of the conflict. The study doesn't mention the record of military confrontations between both sides of the conflict. It doesn't discuss the role of diplomacy as a solution to the conflict.

*John Norton Moore "**The Arab-Israeli conflict**" (1974). The writer investigates the relationship between the international law and the continuing Middle East crisis. It discusses the Zionist-Israel judicial claims to constitute "the Jewish people". It explains the sovereignty over Palestine. The writer then goes through the Arab-Israeli conflict in international law. It also goes through the origins of the conflict. The study doesn't research the concept of diplomacy as a means of conflict resolution.

The above mentioned studies lack explaining the role of diplomacy in conflicts. So, this study will try to explain this role and find out the changes in the attitudes of parties of the conflict toward peaceful settlements and solutions. The study will examine how diplomacy helps the conflicting parties get better outcomes than before. It will also explain the conflict resolution strategies that might be applied.

Methodology

The researcher will use different methodologies to conduct this research:

- *The Historical Approach*: the researcher will use this approach to follow up the historical developments of the conflict. It will present the different stages of the conflict.
- *The Descriptive Approach*: The descriptive approach will be applied to the study to describe the role of diplomacy in conflict resolution. It will summarize the main military confrontations between both sides of the conflict.
- *The Analytical Approach*: The analytical approach will be applied in this study in order to analyze the impact of diplomacy in conflict resolution. The study will search how diplomacy can be a useful solution. It will then search the suitable conflict resolution strategy that is compatible with the conditions and the nature of the conflict.

Chapter One

Chapter One

The Concept Of Diplomacy

A-1- Definition

A-2- Diplomacy and War

A-3- Diplomacy of Alliance

A-4- Diplomacy and Peace

B- History of Diplomacy

B-1- The Development of Diplomacy

B-2- Old Diplomacy

B-3- New Diplomacy

B-4- The Future of Diplomacy

C- Kinds of Diplomacy

C-1- Military Phase Diplomacy

C-1-1- Coalition Diplomacy

C-1-2- Coercive Diplomacy

C-1-3- Diplomacy of Battleship and Military Fleets

C-1-4- Diplomacy of the Thick Stick

C-1-5- Diplomacy of the Stick and the Carrot

C-1-6- Nuclear Diplomacy

C-1-7- Preventive Diplomacy

C-2- Economic Phase Diplomacy

- C-2-1- Aid Diplomacy
- C-2-2- Supportive Diplomacy
- C-2-3- Development Diplomacy
- C-3- Old Phase Diplomacy
 - C-3-1- Old Diplomacy
 - C-3-2- Secret Diplomacy
- C-4- New Phase Diplomacy
 - C-4-1- United Nations Diplomacy
 - C-4-2- Parliamentary Diplomacy
 - C-4-3- Conference Diplomacy
 - C-4-4- Summit Diplomacy
 - C-4-5- The Public Diplomacy
 - C-4-6- The Shuttle Diplomacy
 - C-4-7- Settlement Diplomacy
- D- Tasks of Diplomacy
 - D-1- Representation
 - D-2- Reporting
 - D-3- Negotiation
 - D-4- Facilitation
 - D-5- Coordination

Chapter One

The Concept Of Diplomacy

A-1- Definition

Diplomacy is a word often used vaguely with different meanings. Sometimes, it is used to express the whole content of international relations; sometimes to express the manner in which personal affairs are conducted. Its proper and main meaning is, however, the manner in which international relations are conducted. Diplomacy is the management of international relations by negotiation: the method by which these relations are adjusted and managed by ambassadors and envoys; the business or art of the diplomatist (Fawq Aladah, 1973, 2). It stresses, however, the main point that it is the method, not the object, of the negotiation that is the subject of diplomacy. Bad objects may be sought by good diplomacy and vice versa. Still, diplomacy is in a sense a substitute for force; it is the means of obtaining the maximum national advantage without the use of violence and, perhaps one might add, with the minimum of friction and resentment (ibed, 3). It is also true, however, that sometimes it is interspersed with the threat of coercion; and it always depends in some degree on the power, whether military, economic, moral or deriving from association with others, of the state for which the diplomat is acting. It is characterized by movement and development to keep fit with the requirements of the present time (Rashwan, The Diplomat, 1992, 45).

Also, diplomacy is the established method of international discourse or the art of managing international relations, chiefly by negotiation (ibed, 4)

Historically, it meant the conduct of official relations between sovereign states, usually bilaterally. In the 20th century, however, diplomacy expanded to cover summit meetings

and other international conferences, public and parliamentary diplomacy, the international activities of supranational and sub national entities, unofficial diplomacy by nongovernmental groups, and the work of international civil servants (Shabanah, 2001, 16-19) .

However, diplomacy is often confused with foreign policy; the terms are related but not synonymous. Diplomacy is the chief instrument of foreign policy, which is set by political leaders, though diplomats may advise them (Fawq Aladah, 1973, 8). Foreign policy prescribes goals, strategies toward their accomplishment, and the broader tactics to be used. Diplomacy carries out the policy, using whatever tactics seem appropriate within the prescribed guidelines (Abd Almajeed, 1969, 182). Its primary tool is negotiation, mainly by accredited envoys though political leaders also negotiate. Foreign policy is generally publicly announced and practiced; most diplomacy is secret, though its results are usually made public (ibed, 9).

The goal of diplomacy is to further the state's interests, which are dictated by geography, history, and economics. Safeguarding its independence, security, and integrity—territorial, political, and economic—comes first. Preserving wide freedom of action to the state is nearly important. Beyond that, diplomacy seeks maximum national advantage without using force and preferably without causing resentment (ibed, 1969, 6). Diplomacy is an alternative to war to achieve the nation's goals. Its weapon is words, and it often, but not always, seeks to preserve peace. It usually, but not invariably, negotiates to achieve agreements and resolve issues between or among states. Diplomacy may employ coercive threats; its range, flexibility, and effectiveness are linked in part to the relative power of the state or states using it. Diplomacy seeks to

strengthen the state, gaining advantages and allies while neutralizing its opponents. Thus, it tries to create good will toward the state it represents.

Human societies by nature, since being on earth, are featured by commitment to communication and cooperation, for the sake of necessity and need, in order to have solutions for the troubles they encounter. These societies tried to avoid wars and settle their conflicts peacefully as much as possible. Whatever the relationship between states, peaceful or conflictual, diplomacy is deployed. Diplomacy is a basic international activity and it is a distinguished pattern of communication among the different political identities in the world (Alredha, 1997, 5). Diplomacy, classic or new, is a well-developed system for relations among states. It is based on law and on the institutional system. And aims at achieving peace and cooperation among the countries of the world (Shbat, 1968, 10). It is affected by the changes in the international relations, the international law, and the world political structure. Diplomacy has developed increasingly and reached its peak in Vienna conference of 1815 after the wars that swept over Europe at the time (ibed, 5). During that period, Europe wanted skillful and professional diplomacy to have a balance of power, protect peace and gain security after wars. However, the world recognizes the importance of diplomacy after the loss that countries suffered because of wars and violence. Then, states started to tend towards alliances. After all the opportunities the world employed, states recognized that diplomacy is much more fruitful and useful and reduces the losses of the states.

At the same time, diplomacy is not likely to be effective unless there is power behind it. Diplomacy and power can not be separated. Strength without skilled diplomatic direction may lead you straight against a stone wall (Pearson, 1958, 63). Power is not fearful when policy doesn't make it so. What is meant by power here is the strength, ability, skill and talent to keep diplomacy existing in dealing with conflicting

positions. To recognize the impact of power on diplomacy, the characteristics of power must be known. First, the "Offensive Power" which refers to the ability of a state to force another state to comply with its will. The second is the "Defensive Power" which is related to the ability of one state to overcome a coercion made by another state. The third is the "Deterrent Power" which refers to the ability of a state to prohibit threats from foreign powers by having similar or greater power (Bundy *et al.*, 1964, 18-19).

This kind of force includes nuclear weapons of mass destruction-the "deterrent".

Another kind of force is an international police and peace-insuring force, used as an instrument of the international community, after a United Nation's decision authorizing such use. Nowadays, such forces are spread worldwide. Where there is a dispute and is being discussed in the UN then authorized by a decision from the Security Council, the forces fly to that area to enforce peace and security. Sound policy and a state diplomacy are themselves as much a source of strength as military power. The two are interrelated and interdependent. Contemporary diplomacy has been strongly influenced by nuclear weapons (Alexandrof, 1981, 147). This is particularly true for those that possess them, but even for those that do not. Diplomatic bargaining has been strongly influenced by the strategic-diplomatic logic derived from the nuclear- weapons environment.

In reality, diplomacy and defense are interlocking and accumulating each other and there are many approaches illustrate the relationship between power and diplomacy (Martal, Dirasat Dawliah, 1995, 19). These include the following: National diplomacy which is the process of trying to advance a country's national interest by applying power assets to attempt to persuade other countries to give way. Power is the foundation of diplomacy in a conflictual world. National power is the sum of a country's assets that enhance its ability to get its way even when opposed by others with different interests and goals (Khalaf, 1997, 216-17). Measuring power is especially difficult. The efforts to

do so have not been very successful, but they do help us see many of the complexities of analyzing the characteristics of power. These characteristics include the facts that power is dynamic, relative, and multidimensional (Khalaf, 1997, 76-77).

The functions of diplomacy include advancing the national interest through such methods as observing and reporting, negotiating, symbolically representing, intervening, and propagandizing. Diplomacy does not occur in a vacuum. Instead, it is set in the international system, in a specific diplomatic environment (hostile, adversarial, coalition, and mediation diplomacy), and in a domestic context.

Diplomacy is an ancient art, and some of the historical functions of diplomacy are still important. Diplomacy, however, has also changed dramatically during the past century. Seven characteristics describe the new approach to diplomacy: expanded geographic scope, multilateral diplomacy, parliamentary maneuvering, democratized diplomacy, open diplomacy, leader-to-leader communications through summit meetings, and public diplomacy (ibed, 108). Diplomacy is a communication process that has three main elements. The first is negotiating through direct or indirect discussions between two or more countries. The second is signaling. The third is public diplomacy (ibed, 108). Good diplomacy is an art, but it is not totally freestyle, and there are general rules that increase the chances for diplomatic success. Among the cautions are to be realistic, to be careful about what you say, to seek common ground, to try to understand the other side, to be patient, and to leave open avenues of retreat (ibed, 108-109).

It is important to notice that when an international crisis is caused by any state, the response is often that something needs to be done. Several forceful foreign policy strategies represent measures short of declared war. They can be summarized as follows:

1. Sanctions and isolation to achieve containment and economic damage;
2. International courts and domestic prosecution;
3. Shows of strength and armed interventions;
4. Support for opposition movements or covert operations;

These stiff measures can be complemented by inducements to mend a state's behavior. Thus carrots can be offered in a carefully crafted approach along with sticks. But the danger in offering blandishments to a state is that it may misread the signals as appeasement. For example, before its invasion of Kuwait, Iraq misinterpreted as weakness the Bush administration's private expressions to Baghdad of continued friendship and wrongly concluded that Washington's public opposition to its planned invasion was mere window dressing for the international community.

A-2- Diplomacy and War

The world is always busy in the search for peace which in turn will produce security and stability (Abd Almajeed, 1969, 249). When diplomacy fails then war is the alternative (Eban, 1983, 387). And war is a form of coercive diplomacy which is conducted by political leaders (Eban, 1983, 389). States depend on economy and military capabilities to own weapons to achieve their power, ambitions and goals to carry out their plans of expansion. War was, for most states, the best solution to have a part of the resources of the universe. To get more land, to have markets for their own products and to keep control over resources, are among the key factors leading to war.

War is considered as process of organized violence between states in trying to protect or achieve their interests (Reynolds, 1989, 186). Wars were spread throughout the globe as each state wants to be better at the expense of the rest (Gandhi, 1st ed, 1942, 61).

As a result, great powers tried to have colonies in different parts of the world. There was a fierce competition between great powers to divide the resources. The human history witnessed many wars. That was due to the attempts of the great powers to protect their interests whatever they are (Acheson, 1958, 40-41). And it is crucial to notice that the competition, between great powers and the movements of resistance by the colonized nations, led to two world wars. After these wars, nations started to recognize the big losses they suffered. The world started to think of new ideology other than wars, therefore, came into existence alliances and international groupings depending on peaceful conviction. However diplomacy is not useful if it is not

supported by power (Fawq Aladah, 1973, 9-10).

War is nothing but a duel on an extensive scale. Each strives by physical force to compel the other to submit to his will. His first objective is to throw his adversary, and thus to render him incapable of further resistance (Freud, 1953, 84). War, therefore, is an act of violence to compel our opponent to fulfill our will, this violence is the means; the compulsory submission of the enemy to our will is the ultimate objective. In order to attain this objective fully, the enemy must be disarmed; and this is, correctly speaking, the real aim of hostilities in theory. It takes the place of the final objective, and puts it aside in a manner as something not properly belonging to war.

Wars are launched for the sake of states' interests, for the purposes of expansion and for keeping control (Abd Almajeed, 1969, 22).

The aim of the action in war is to disarm the enemy, and it shall be shown that this in theoretical conception at least is necessary. If the opponent is to be made to comply with the international will, he must be placed in a situation which is more oppressive to him than the sacrifice which is demanded. Every change in this position which is produced by a continuation of the war, should therefore be a change for the worse, at least, in idea. If, therefore, the enemy is to be reduced to submission by an act of war, he must either be positively disarmed or placed in such a position that he is threatened with it according to probability (Acheson, 1958, 44-45). Now war is always the shock of two hostile bodies in collision, not the action of a living power upon an inanimate mass, because an absolute state of endurance would not be making war; therefore, what we have just said as to the aim of action in war applies to both parties.

Anyway, war is no pastime; no mere passion for venturing and winning; no work of a free enthusiasm; it is a serious means for a serious objective. War is not merely a

political act, but also a real political instrument, a continuation of political commerce, a carrying out of the same by other means. And it must be kept in mind that if some changes in the life of a society occur, the causes of war will change automatically (Clark, 1956, 146-47).

Eventually, the world experienced many wars, the greatest were the First World War and the Second World War, and in all such wars the world lost more and more. Let's consider the First World War losses. The number of known dead has been placed at about 10,000,000 men, the wounded at about 20,000,000, distributed among the chief combatants. The total direct cost of the war has been figured at \$180,500,000,000, and the indirect cost at \$ 151,612,500,000 (Gibbons and Morican, 1965, 134-35). While the losses of the Second World War reached possibly 62 million people lost their lives- about 25 million soldiers and 37 million civilians, with estimates varying widely. Allied forces suffered approximately 17 million military deaths, of which about 10 million were Soviet and 4 million Chinese. Axis forces suffered about 8 million, of which more than 5 million were German (Internet Ed. 10/6/2006).

The 2003 invasion of Iraq, termed "Operation Iraqi freedom" by the US administration, began on March 20 is a recent example of the policy of force. It was originally coined "Operation Iraqi Liberation". The United States and the United Kingdom cooperated with Kurdish forces in the North, which numbered upwards of 50,000 (Majdalawi, 2004, 114-15). Other nations also participated in part of a coalition force to help with the operation by providing equipment, services and security as well as Special Forces. The 2003 Iraq invasion marked the beginning of what is commonly referred to as the Iraq war. Prior to the invasion, the United States' official position was that Iraq illegally possessed weapons of mass destruction in violation of UN Security Council Resolution (1441) and had to be disarmed by force. President George W Bush

stated Saddam's weapons of mass destruction needed to be disarmed, and the Iraqi people were to have control of their own country restored to them. UN inspection teams were searching Iraq for these alleged weapons for nearly four months prior to the invasion and were willing to continue, but were forced out by the onset of war in spite of their requests for more time. The Bush administration did not attempt to get a UN Security Council resolution authorizing military force, as it was obvious that France and Russia, and later joined by China, signaled that they would use their Security Council Veto power against any proposal, let alone any resolution, that would include an ultimatum allowing the use of force against Iraq. On March 20, 2003, the invasion of Iraq began (Majdalawi, 2004, 134-35). This was seen as a violation of the international law, breaking the UN Charter. Careful inspections after Iraq's capitulation failed to find weapons of mass destruction. This has again brought the various, already controversial, justifications for the invasion into dispute. Post invasion Iraq has experienced violence from warring sects and an Iraqi insurgency. Groups resisting invasion are active in the area, including one newly-formed called Al-Qaeda in Iraq (Internet Ed. 10/6/2006).

Another example of using force rather than peaceful diplomacy is the American war in Afghanistan (ibed, 134-35). The United States declared that it wanted to get rid of terrorists especially those belonging to Al-Qaeda group after the attacks of September 11. Afghanistan was the place where those people live but this is not the truth. The truth is that the US intervention was planned in detail and carefully prepared long before the terrorist attacks of September 11 (ibed, 114). The United States' ruling elite has been contemplating war in Central Asia for at least a decade. As long ago as 1991, following the defeat of Iraq in the Arabian Gulf War. American oil companies have acquired rights to as much as 75 percent of the output of these new fields, and the

United States' government officials have welcomed the Caspian and Central Asia as a potential alternative to dependence on oil from the unstable Arabian Gulf region.

The major problem in exploiting the energy riches of Central Asia is how to get the oil and gas from the landlocked region to the world market. The United States' officials have opposed using either the Russian pipeline system or the easiest available land route, across Iran to the Arabian Gulf. Instead, over the past decade, The United States oil companies and government officials have explored a series of alternative pipeline routes- west through Azerbaijan, Georgia and Turkey to the Mediterranean; east through Kazakhstan and China to the Pacific; and, most relevant to the current crisis, south from Turkmenistan across Western Afghanistan and Pakistan to the Indian Ocean. With the installation of George Bush in the White House, the focus of American policy in Afghanistan shifted from a limited incursion to kill or capture Bin Laden to preparing a more strong military intervention directed at the Taliban regime as a whole. This account of the preparations for war against Afghanistan brings us to September 11 itself. The terrorist attack that destroyed the World Trade Center and damaged the Pentagon on 11/9/2001 was an important link in the chain of causality that produced the United States attack on Afghanistan. The United States' government had planned the war well in advance, but the shock of September 11 made it politically feasible, by stupefying public opinion at home and giving Washington essential leverage on reluctant allies abroad. Both the American public and dozens of foreign governments were stampeded into supporting military action against Afghanistan, in the name of the fight against terrorism. The Bush administration targeted Kabul without presenting any evidence that either Bin Laden or the Taliban regime was responsible for the World Trade Center incident of 2001. It seized on September 11 as the occasion for advancing

longstanding ambitions to assert American power in Central Asia (Internet Ed. 17/6/2006).

It is clear that the relationship between diplomacy and military force is changing as well. Despite the so-called end of the "balance of terror", conflict remains an important target of diplomatic effort. The increase of terrorism and the potential proliferation of nuclear weapons makes diplomacy even more important in security terms. Moreover, the coordination of diplomacy and force in what are called "Operations Other than War" is becoming a more important issue as the mix of problems confronting world leaders changes. Meanwhile, for less-than-great powers, traditional security concerns continue to require as much if not more diplomacy than before. However, when the conflicting parties reach a cease-fire, diplomacy gets up immediately to carry out the new duties and exercise its influence (Abd Almajeed, 1969, 222).

A-3- Diplomacy of Alliance

"When there was one man in the world, peace was invented; when there was two, conflict; when there were three, alliances" (*). In this saying, one can realize how old the concept of alliance is. Alliance is an agreement between two countries or more for certain or more procedures in order to protect the members of the alliance from foreign powers that might threaten the security of those members of the alliance (Mansour, 1997, 137). Recently alliances are meant to use the common military capabilities against one or more countries. One of the basic features of alliance is the existence of political and military commitment. Also, it must be noticed that alliances are political instruments for regulating international relations. Alliances are required for the principle of balance of power. And they promote what is known by collective security (ibed, 142). Collectivity might play a crucial rule in keeping loyalty which in turn helps prevent occurring conflicts (Bu Isha', 1999, 168-169). This explains the occurrence of internal conflicts when individuality is over collectivity.

Internationally, to gain the loyalty of members of an alliance, treaty or grouping, then all members must take part in the political as well as the administrative process. When authority is in hands of certain categories, when the basic needs and interests of the other members of the community are not met, then wait conflicts if not directly they will arise indirectly (Alhashimi, 2003, 124-126). But, even at this stage, the world still searches for more sure strategy in resolving conflicts and keeping the interests. The world is starting to adopt diplomatic channels. The Cold War was a significant turn for the development of alliances. It was the first time in history that The United States, as a

(*) Donelon, Michael. (1990). **Elements of International Politics Theory**. Oxford: Larendson Press. P. 121.

world power, made a peace-time military alliance, resulting in the avoidance of military conflict .

The NATO is a good example of alliance. It was formed in 1949 with 12 members at the time as one of the results of the Cold War. The United States' wanted an organized coalition against the USSR and aimed at improving its military capabilities in order to achieve its own goals. The members have their own concern in defending Western Europe (Cleveland, 1966, 9). The Middle East was present in front of the main allies' expansion plans and foreign policies. They saw that the area is strategically important for them. They were concerned about the USSR relation with states in the Middle East. They were also concerned about the resources of the region. Oil is the key motive for these powers. Moreover, these countries were concerned to have a balance of power in the area (Buhairi, 1982, 7-10).

A-4- Diplomacy and Peace

As it is seen, the world hasn't found and peaceful solutions for the problems and conflicts among states. All states want as little loss as possible, therefore the world is enhancing diplomacy to practice its influence on the major issues the world witnesses. The concept of peace is always existing, and the search for peace occupies a wide place in the human's thinking (Abd Almajeed, 1969, 249). Diplomacy can be described as a complex and delicate instrument that measures the forces working at the level of international relations. Diplomacy is still a method of communication and of presenting agreements whose validity depends not merely on their intellectual validity but also on forces giving them weight beyond considerations of mere logic. These forces are political operating inside and outside the country to which diplomatic agreements are addressed-economic and military. These factors are closely interlocked (Bundy *et al.*, 1964, 89). Diplomacy is not a new instrument. It is an old one.

When diplomacy gets silent, the artillery speaks, and war is a continuity to the efforts of the diplomats but in a different way . Diplomacy is the art of compromise between the conflicting interests. Meanwhile, it is noticed that diplomacy doesn't make the foreign policy but implements it through the available opportunities and channels (Shabanah, 2001, 9). Also, diplomacy is the art of representing the government and its interests before the foreign countries. It also monitors the rights of the country and its interests and protecting them (ibed, 6-15). It is considered as an art because it requires special natural talents which can't be acquired but it is born with the person and it is characterized by sharp intelligence, fluency in the various topics in different languages, quick-witness and so on.

The art of diplomacy consists of making the policy of one government understood and if possible accepted by other governments. Policy is thus the substance of foreign relations, whereas diplomacy is the process by which policy is carried out (Nicolson, 1979, 5).

From the above mentioned definitions, it is said that diplomacy is consisted of two sides: material and humanitarian side (Alshukri, 2004, 12). The material side shows that diplomacy is an abstract science as it requires the person who exercises it to be of full and complete knowledge about international relations. Old or new diplomacy as a science has to be also aware of the nature of the political and legal relations that relate one country with other countries. The other side is humanitarian. It represents the ability of the diplomat to influence the other party. This requires the diplomat to be fluent, skillful and intelligent. He should control the basics of negotiation and should know the language of the receiving country either in speaking or in writing.

The art of diplomacy has a long-storied history. It is the practice of verbal discussion with the intent to influence, transmit a position or negotiate on a given issue or situation for a mutually acceptable outcome. It is often called an art because each situation requires a unique mixture of certain personal characteristics amongst other things. It has traditionally been a method of conducting interstate relations involving discussions and negotiations between heads of state or their representatives in order to advance national interests (Barakat, 1985, 293).

With increased internationalism and globalization, the sphere of participants in inter-communal conflicts is expanding. Participants include not only state actors but also the opposition parties and adversaries within the conflict itself, not to mention regional, multinational and non-governmental organizations. Anyway, diplomacy is the application of intelligence and tact to the conduct of official relations between the

governments of independent states or more briefly the conduct of business between states by peaceful means. The ability to practice diplomacy is one of the defining elements of a state, and diplomacy has been practiced since the first city-states were formed millennia ago. For the majority of human history, diplomats were sent only for specific negotiations, and would return immediately after their mission is concluded. Diplomats were usually relatives of the ruling family or of very high rank in order to give them legitimacy when they sought to negotiate with the other states (Shabanah, 2001, 1-6).

Diplomacy was a complex affair, even more so than now. The ambassadors from each state were ranked by complex levels of precedence that were much disputed. States were normally ranked by the title of the sovereign; for Catholic nations the emissary from the Vatican was paramount, then those from the Kingdoms, then those from duchies and principalities. Representatives from republics were considered the lowest of the low (Shbat, 1968, 176). Determining precedence between two Kingdoms depended on a number of factors that often fluctuated, leading to near constant quarrelling. Ambassadors needed to be supported by large embassy staff. These professionals would be sent on longer assignments and would be far more knowledgeable than the higher-ranking officials about the host country. Embassy staff would include a wide range of employees, including some dedicated to espionage. The need for skilled individuals to staff embassies was met by the graduates of universities, and this led to a great increase in the study of international law, modern languages, international relations, politics, economics and history at universities throughout the world (ibed,177).

At the same time, permanent foreign ministries began to be established in almost all states to coordinate embassies and their staffs. These ministries were still far from their modern form, and many of them had strange internal responsibilities. The elements of

modern diplomacy slowly spread to Eastern Europe and Russia, arriving by the early eighteenth century. Ranks of precedence were abolished. Napoleon also refused to acknowledge diplomatic immunity, imprisoning several British diplomats accused of scheming against France. He had no time for the often slow moving process of formal diplomacy (Shbat, 1968, 176-77). After the fall of Napoleon, the Congress of Vienna of 1815 established an international system of diplomatic rank. Disputes on precedence among nations (and therefore the appropriate diplomatic ranks used) persisted for over a century until after World War II, when the rank of ambassador became the norm.

Diplomatic traditions outside of Europe were very different. A feature necessary for diplomacy is the existence of a number of states of somewhat equal power, as existed in Italy during the Renaissance, and in Europe for much of the modern period (ibed, 178). By contrast in Asia and the Middle East, China and the Ottoman Empire were reluctant to practice bilateral diplomacy as they viewed themselves to be unquestionably superior to all their neighbors. The Ottomans, for instance, would not send missions to other states, accepting representatives to come to Constantinople. It would not be until the nineteenth century that the Empire established permanent embassies in other capitals. As European power spread around the world in the eighteenth and nineteenth century so too did its diplomatic system (ibed, 179-81).

It is essential to notice that several distinct functions of diplomacy can be distinguished. First, coercion on others is a technique of diplomacy (Plischke, 1979, 20). Coercion may be experienced in negotiation by giving a fixed time limit for the conclusion of an arrangement, or by proposing a formal or informal protest or complaint. Second, diplomacy is a means of persuasion. Most diplomatic initiatives and agreements are based on and built by persuasion (Nicolson, 1979, 20). Furthermore, diplomacy always plays a key role for introducing a policy or paving the way for new

initiatives and treaties (Barston, 1988, 2). In addition to, diplomacy is concerned with the maintenance of order. "Adam Watson" suggests: "the central task of diplomacy is not just the management of order, but the management of change, and the maintenance by continued persuasion of order in the midst of change" (Barston, 1988, 2). Diplomatic missions abroad should be able to maintain order and at the main time should cooperate in a suitable manner to deal with changes of all aspects in the receiving country.

However, it is just in the past decade, the context and content of the diplomatic enterprise have changed substantially. The conduct of modern diplomacy must now address the complete range of national interests-not only those that affect state power and influence, but also those that affect the well-being and diverse interests of the nation citizens. Effective diplomacy must utilize advanced information, communications, tools and techniques to reach beyond the narrow bounds of those constituencies traditionally interested in foreign affairs. Understanding the implications of both these factors is important to a better understanding of how Information Age Diplomacy must be conducted (Barakat, 1985, 294). While the classic functions of representation, reporting, and negotiation will continue, their form and substance will be significantly altered, and new importance will be given to the tasks of facilitation and coordination.

The revolutionary changes in which the conduct of diplomacy will be most significantly affected: process, organization, tools and methods. These changes will, in turn, have substantial implications for the tasks of diplomacy. Therefore, a number of international organizations were set up for the maintenance of world peace. All such attempts came forward after the suffering of human societies from the scourge of wars (Abd Almajeed, 1969, 251). Achieving world peace and security is a basic goal of diplomacy. Therefore, the diplomat should take into consideration issues of security, defense, arm monitoring and peace keeping (ibed, 293).

B- History of Diplomacy

B-1- The Development of Diplomacy

Diplomacy like any other science witnessed key developments through time. The development appeared on different aspects of diplomacy. One of these aspects is the procedure or the technique. The developments of this side is ascribed to the surprising technological development of telecommunications, the means of travel of individuals, and the movement of information. The communication between the diplomatic mission and its government is much easier than ever before. What needed days and weeks to be sent to the sending government can be nowadays be sent in a few minutes. Another aspect is related to the practice of diplomacy. Diplomacy has been influenced by the appearance of democracy. In the past, diplomats were mainly special envoys of the head of the state and they work for his own interests. Diplomacy at that time was featured as secret. This side was developed and nowadays we have open diplomacy (Barakat, 1985, 47-48). Furthermore, the scope of diplomacy has been increasingly widened and the world continued to experience new kinds of diplomacy. Also, diplomacy became more and more related and interlocked with other aspects of life such as economic and social affairs. Diplomacy is even practiced in preparing for wars and military interventions.

However, it should be understood that there is no contrast between old and new diplomacy, but it is rather a transition. The transition illustrates the changes in systems of government. This transition from old diplomacy to the new one is ascribed to three primary factors of development. First, the conception of common interests. Second, the belief in the force of public opinion. Third, the improvement in communications (Nicolson, 1963, 56).

On the other hand, there are two major forms of diplomacy. The simplest and the oldest is bilateral diplomacy between two states. Bilateral diplomacy is still common

with many treaties between two states (e.g. the Jordanian-American Free Trade Agreement), and it is the main concern of embassies and state visits. The other form of diplomacy involving many states. Formal multilateral diplomacy is normally dated to the Congress of Vienna in the nineteenth century. Since then, multilateralism has grown in importance. Today, most treaties, trade treaties such as the WTO, or arms control agreement, are multilateral. The United nations is the most important institution of multilateral diplomacy. Yet, there is a third form of diplomacy, a variant of multilateral diplomacy called regional diplomacy; that is, multilateral diplomacy that is practiced within a closed circle of geographic neighbors like the Arab League and the Gulf Cooperated Council. It might be called " multilateral diplomacy among intimates". Since neighborhood is a fact of life, regional diplomacy involves a close blend of the bilateral and the limited group multilateral methods in the pursuit of mutual interests (Ma'ahad Aldirasat Aldiplomacia: Alredha, 1992, 82).

B-2- Old Diplomacy

It is referred to also as "Secret Diplomacy". But the conditions on which old diplomacy was based no longer exist. Old diplomacy as a method of negotiation was efficient than that which we employ today. It was not under the pressure of their media or their citizens' effect. Anyway, old diplomacy is characterized by some features. First, Europe was regarded as the most important of all the continents (Mohammad, 2000, 66). Asia and Africa were viewed as areas for imperial, commercial or missionary expansion. Second, great powers were greater than small powers, since they possessed more extended range of interests, more money and more guns. Small powers were graded in importance according to their military resources, their strategic position, their value as markets or sources of raw material, and their relation to the balance of power. Third, great powers possessed a common responsibility for the conduct of the small powers and the preservation of peace between them. Fourth, the establishment of a professional diplomatic service. Fifth, the rule that sound negotiation must be continuous and confidential (Plischke, 1979, 44-45). It is necessary to notice that the primary feature of old diplomacy that it is was secret. Nations in the past tend to conduct their policies and relations secretly. Alongside this feature, old diplomacy was most the time bilateral. The concentration in conducting foreign policies of states was carried out mostly in bilateral work. States used to discuss their interests or conflicts with other states directly without the intervention of a third party. However, some criticized this kind of diplomacy for some reasons. First, it was the cause of many political disasters. Second, it was against the principles of democracy. Third, it was seen as a waste of time without usefulness (Shalabi, 1997, 91). A French writer, Le Trosne, had described diplomacy as "an obscure art which hides itself in the folds of deceit, which fears to let itself be seen and believes that it can exist only in the darkness of

mystery" (Eban, 1983, 331). Diplomacy as a word is based on the Greek diplomata, meaning "folded documents" (Mohammad, 2000, 19). The word began to occur in English at the end of the eighteenth century. Before that time diplomats were called heralds, messengers, orators, most recently, negotiators. But if the word is modern, the system where by groups seek agreement with other groups whom they regard as alien to themselves is as old as social history.

B-3- New Diplomacy

A lot of factors help this new form of diplomacy rise. Firstly, the growing number of states exercising such diplomacy. Secondly, the qualitative change in the tasks of diplomacy. Thirdly, the age of information and technology revolution (Shalabi, 1997, 91-94). New diplomacy is characterized as being open. It is also characterized as consisting primarily of parliamentary diplomacy practiced in the international organizations such as the United Nations (Fudah, 1989, 179). It is sometimes referred to as personal diplomacy of political leaders. Some scholars regard this new version as a new kind of "democratic" diplomacy. In addition to, the emergence of this new diplomacy was accompanied by increased reliance on "Conference Diplomacy", "Summit Diplomacy" and intensified diplomacy at the ministerial and technical levels and multi-forum diplomatic relations. The emergence of all these forms of diplomacy- democratic, conference, summit, parliamentary, open, personal and multilateral diplomacy- contributed to the emergence of the new diplomacy. It is also referred to as public diplomacy (Eban, 1983, 345). Moreover, the period of the Cold War and the introduction of nuclear weapons produced other forms- nuclear, cold war, crisis, corridor, low profile, hostage, instant, oil, dollar, preventive diplomacy and so on (Nicolson, 1979, 54-56).

A number of causes contributed to the evolving nature of new diplomacy (Plischke, 1979, 56-72). First, the enlargement of the society of states. Decolonization, and as more countries got independent, increased the number of member states into the family of nations. This increase in the number of participants increased the amplification of diplomatic contact and negotiation (Mohammad, 2000, 59). Second, the qualitative proliferation of functional international interests. Third, the technical revolution in the fields of transportation and communication. Direct contacts are established via

telephone, telegram, or by means of cable, radio, or television, and are even being bounced off space satellites. Negotiators in foreign capitals and at the conference table, therefore, are able to maintain intimate contact with policy makers in their national capitals (Mohammad, 2000, 59). Fourth, the emergence of a more democratic perception of international relations. As part of democratization of national states and their intergovernmental processes, the people are persuaded to become more involved, directly as well as indirectly-to express their views more freely, to arrive at their own conclusions, and to influence policy and negotiations through the media, mass meetings and demonstrations, and national legislatures. Finally, the rise of the United States' to a position of international paramount organ following World War II and its assumption of responsibility for worldwide interests and leadership (McCamy, 1964, 141-43). Foy D. Kohler says: "Modern diplomacy is a continuing and exhausting study of whole societies and of their inter-relationships". It requires a knowledge of the history and culture, of the political, economic, technological and social forces at work in the society in which the diplomat resides. It requires a careful evaluation of the direction in which these forces will move within that society and of the effect they will have on relations between that society and other societies, in particular his own (Plischke, 1979, 5).

Diplomacy is conducted in a number of modes. These range from exchange of news negotiation, arbitration, conciliation, mediation to adjudication. This expansion in the scope of diplomacy led to hire new kinds of people and diplomacy is now engaged in new functions (McCamy, 1964, 161). Many of the structural changes in international relations today and which will be even more relevant for the future will require important changes in some of the traditional ideas associated with the "art of diplomacy": (Alghafari, 2002, 163-64)

1. Openness instead of secrecy which means a sincere willingness to communicate with the interested public and explain positions and results achieved;
2. In the age of general mobility of the citizen, diplomacy must also be seen as a "service industry", helping citizens in need for assistance and advice;
3. To a very large extent networking and teamwork are replacing hierarchy; delegation of authority, and streamlining of administrative procedures and decision-making become essential;
4. Not the quantity or sheer speed but the quality information counts;
5. Diplomacy needs gender equality and must promote equal career possibilities.

By going back to diplomacy, many new types have been developed. A key feature of diplomacy is its rapid developments through time to meet the requirements of its time. Diplomacy after the World War II went through some developments which were imposed by the current history and the scientific, social, economic and technological revolutions. That period witnessed the end of secret diplomacy, diplomacy which depends on secret treaties and agreement and the rise of new topics of diplomacy (Shabanah, 2001, 17-21).

B-4- The Future of Diplomacy

Diplomacy will continue developing and improving in different aspects. Diplomacy is a means to bridge the gap of conflict in the world (Eban, 1983, 398). Problems of war and competition among states on the international level may never have the chance to be solved (ibed, 400). The developments in technology, telecommunication and industry will help diplomacy experience new progress in its quantity, quality, form, the scope of its work and so on. The key development will be related to quantity. As more states are becoming independent, more states join the international body through diplomatic relations. Once a state gains its independence, it starts to join the UN as a sign of sovereignty. As a result, these states start as soon as possible to send their diplomatic missions abroad. States try to open embassies in the capital cities of the important countries as their potential allow. The other development will be in relation to quality. The developments in other fields like technology and telecommunication will still create new techniques in exercising diplomacy. The shuttle diplomacy is an example of the developments related to quality. Diplomats with regard to the developments of telecommunication can easily be in touch with their central governments for consultation. This increases the role of the central management in the process of decision-making (Barakat, 1985, 285-92). Furthermore, multilateral diplomacy will come to impose great importance and there will be a tendency toward conducting such diplomacy in the search for solutions for international crises and conflicts. This kind of diplomacy requires certain characteristics on the person who will be chosen to conduct it. This diplomacy allows the states to address directly the general opinion of the international community. States through multilateral diplomacy seek support for their actions and decisions. States can send the message they want loud and clear through

conducting such diplomacy instead of wasting time in trying to reach each country alone to discuss their messages and attitudes (Alhashimi, 2003, 226).

Moreover, terrorism is another issue that will worry the work of the diplomats and the tasks of diplomacy (Barakat, 1985, 292). Terrorists, individuals or organizations, sometimes carry out attacks on diplomats of a certain country or on the belongings of the diplomatic mission of that country. Such attacks are ascribed to the policies and attitudes of the state and those terrorists want to influence the political decision-making process in order to shift the attention of the state from certain issues. Nowadays, many diplomatic missions and embassies are subject to violent attacks in response to the attitudes of their governments. The international community should work hard to achieve an international treaty for the protection of the diplomatic missions. Another concern of diplomacy is world peace and security. Diplomacy is basically concerned to resolve conflicts and crises peacefully. One diplomacy is mentioned, people immediately start to think about peace. Diplomacy uses its efforts by all the channels available to spread peace and stability all over the world. As such, diplomacy should take into account the military power and the strategic understanding of the interests of the super powers. Therefore, a diplomat should be knowledgeable enough about the issues of security, defense, armament and peacekeeping (ibed, 293-94). Local wars will continue to take place in some areas while stop in others. They will be in the place of a third world war. So, diplomacy and the military force are two faces of the same coin. Eventually, diplomacy in the future is hoped to adopt the dialogue of civilizations instead of the clash of civilizations. It is also hoped that peace should replace violence, strength and unilateralism. Yet, the weakness of tools of diplomacy will result in having diplomacy of force to control (ibed, 226-27).

C- Kinds of Diplomacy

Many kinds of diplomacy are experienced and developed according to the developments in the political arena. These types can be classified in terms of their targets.

C-1- Military Phase Diplomacy

C-1-1- Coalition Diplomacy

It represents the tendency toward alliances and multilateral actions. Two aspects can be noticed about this diplomacy. The first is that it had a heavy military emphasis. Great Powers adopt such type of diplomacy as a cover to provide legitimacy for their actions. A member of a coalition sometimes asks other members to make direct request and contact to his opponent (Lewicki *et al.*, 1997, 195-96). The United States of America depends heavily on this diplomacy when it can't get a legitimate decision from the UN concerning certain issue. This clearly appeared during the preparation for the war on Iraq in 2003. The USA failed to persuade the UN to take a decision that allows military actions against Iraq, so the American diplomacy started to work on building an international coalition to fight Iraq and the United States actually succeeded. Another aspect related to coalition diplomacy is consultation (Plischke, 1979, 15). Though this aspect is important, it is not easy to achieve. Consultations establish special relationships between the parties involved. No one party will act unless it discusses its proposed actions with the alliance partners.

C-1-2- Coercive Diplomacy

Some politicians refer to this diplomacy as "gunboat diplomacy". It refers to the use of force to achieve the goals. A clear example of this diplomacy was the confrontations between the United States of America and the ex-Soviet Union. The United States still applies this diplomacy in some occasions. It was exercised against Iraq after the Iraqi

invasion of Kuwait. Israel exercises such diplomacy in Palestine. The United States sometimes deploy its troops in an attempt to assist the government of a particular country in preventing interference by other countries.

C-1-3- Diplomacy of Battleship and Military Fleets

It is the diplomacy of showing and using force. A clear example of this diplomacy of recent history was the coalition in 1990 in the Arabian Gulf after the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait which was followed by using advanced weapons and bring large fleets carrying planes (Shabanah, 2001, 17). The American war on Iraq in 2003 is another example of such diplomacy. And as a result of that war some countries changed their attitudes towards certain sensitive issues.

C-1-4- Diplomacy of the Thick Stick

It is based on the use of force for a specific purpose to send a message to the other party that he might encounter serious coming punishments if he continues exercising the same behavior in the face of the great powers (ibed, 18). A clear example of this diplomacy was the American reaction response against Libya after the incidence of "Lockerby". The American aero planes attacked some Libyan military and civilian points. The Americans wanted to force Libya to comply with the international decisions. Really, the USA succeeded and at last Libya agreed to compensate.

C-1-5- Diplomacy of the Stick and the Carrot

This kind of diplomacy depends on the show of the stick-force-then the show of the carrot- support and aid (ibed, 18). This diplomacy is used to tempt the opposing party to accept the offer instead of suffering the risks of the stick-the military force.

C-1-6- Nuclear Diplomacy

With the appearance of weapons of mass destruction, peacetime defense strategy has become a bargaining or blackmail process of deterrence, a process which must consider the motives and expectations of opponents far more carefully than ever before. Nuclear diplomacy is a result of arm race between great powers to keep control over their interests wherever they are. A clear example of this competition is between the United States and the ex-USSR (Russia today). And for that purpose a great deal of the budgets of large countries is dedicated to military equipment. With the appearance of weapons of mass destruction, preventive or preemptive war is sometimes launched to keep balance on some region or to keep control over some interests (Quester, 1973, 67).

Having a nuclear weapon is a means of defense to protect yourself from attacks (Acheson, 1958, 63-64). The United States tries its best to prevent other countries from being capable of having and developing a nuclear weapon. But if it occurs and some country develops a nuclear weapon, then it would be save from American military threat. Some might ask in this regard that Iraq was attacked by the United States to get rid of its atomic weapons. But, it must be taken into account that Iraq was under siege for about ten years which kept it away from developing its weapons if it has. Also, it must be considered that if the United States was sure that Iraq possesses a nuclear weapon, it wouldn't attack it but the United States through the investigators got the fact that Iraq doesn't have atomic weapons, and it attacked Iraq not for this reason but for economic purposes. The United States wants to put its hands over the sources of oil in the Gulf region and as you might know that ex-Iraqi president Saddam Hussein announced to exchange his oil against the Euro not the Dollar which will be a painful economic blow to the United States.

The United States is not willing to attack any country having nuclear weapons. South Korea is developing its capability to own weapons of mass destruction. What could the United States do? Would it attack South Korea? Really, the United States is doing nothing but negotiating and uniting the international community and the public opinion against South Korea. Iran nowadays is in a confrontation with The United States as it tries to own nuclear weapons. The most important feature of such diplomacy is the avoidance of war (Mohammad, 1987, the diplomat, 43).

C-1-7- Preventive Diplomacy

The most desirable and efficient employment of diplomacy is to ease tensions before they result in conflict—or, if conflict breaks out, to act swiftly to contain it and resolve its underlying causes (Mohammad, 2000, 73-75). Preventive diplomacy may be performed by the United Nations Secretary-General personally or through senior staff or specialized agencies and programmes, by the United Nations Security Council or the General Assembly, and by regional organizations in cooperation with the United Nations. Preventive diplomacy requires measures to create confidence; it needs early warning based on information gathering and informal or formal fact-finding; it may also involve preventive deployment and, in some situations, demilitarized zones. The first practical application of such diplomacy was during the Swiss crisis in 1956 when the UN interfered by some military measures to have a cease-fire in order to settle the issue (Alhashimi, 2003, 123).

Preventive diplomacy is not a contemporary invention. It has always, or almost always, existed in all human societies. This diplomacy was developed by a state to serve its own ambitions and not necessarily to preserve regional peace. Centuries ago, a state did not hesitate to conduct a preventive war to serve its own interests. Preventive diplomacy aims at; preventing disputes arising between states or between governments

and minority parties within states; preventing an existing dispute from being transformed into an open conflict; and if a conflict breaks out to ensure that it spreads as little as possible (Cahill, 2000, 29). Recognizing this fact about preventive diplomacy, than it is like the preventive medicine that is used to prevent an illness from attacking the body. But, it has to be taken into account that the world today is with the leadership of the One Without the Other (Cahill, 2000, 33). And the new leader is willing to do whatever is possible to keep his interests and to keep control on the international arena. Also, the new leadership doesn't care to conduct a war here or there for the sake of applying its own strategies. The United States has conducted more than 200 military interventions abroad since its founding. Sixteen of these interventions can be categorized as nation-building attempts. Security and economic interests were the principal drivers of the United States interventions.

Anyway, the UN is the place where the preventive diplomacy is clearly experienced. Recognizing the need for adequate recourses in support of the United Nations efforts in preventive diplomacy, the General Assembly:

- 1- Invites Member States to provide political and practical support to the Secretary-General in his efforts for the peaceful settlement of disputes, including early-warning, fact-finding, good offices, mediation, arbitration and judicial settlement;
- 2- Also invites Member States, on a voluntary basis, to provide the Secretary-General with any necessary additional expertise and logistical resources that he might require for the successful execution of these functions of increasing importance (Brownlie, 1968, 361-64).

Emphasizing that, together with the Security Council and the Secretary-General, it has an important role in preventive diplomacy. Having an important role in preventive diplomacy, it has to work in close cooperation and coordination with the Security

Council and the Secretary-General in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and consistent with their respective mandates and responsibilities (Rotfled and Symonides, 1998, 136-37). The General Assembly decides to explore ways and means to support the recommendations of the Secretary-General in his report entitled "An Agenda for Peace" to promote the utilization of the General Assembly, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, by Member States so as to bring greater influence to bear in pre-empting or containing any situation which is potentially dangerous or might lead to international friction or dispute (Rotfled and Symonides, 1998, p. 142). The agenda includes four activities: preventive diplomacy which is concerned in preventing disputes to become a conflict; peacemaking which is mainly handed to bring conflicting parties toward agreement; peacekeeping which is after bringing stability in areas of tension; and peace-building which serves as a post-conflict process to deal with the causes of conflict and to find the structures that promote peace (Rotfled and Symonides, 1998, 142-143).

C-2- Economic Phase Diplomacy

Economic diplomacy is done through various techniques. It can be by encouraging foreign trade and investment, establishing monetary stability, stockpiling of raw materials, regulating the export of strategic material to potentially hostile states, and commodity agreement (Plischke, 1979, 16). Great powers tend to allocate certain percentages of their budgets to carry out aid programs outside their territories to get the support of those countries where the programs are carried out. However, this phase has a set of tools to achieve its goals. Applying trade exchange is the first tool. The second tool is the focus on the policies of imposing fees and tariffs. The third one is imposing limitations and fees on foreign investments. Giving grants and loans is another tool (Alhashimi, 2003, 130-31). Great Powers also try to prove the effectiveness and success of their initiatives. The United States of America sets out from time to time some initiatives here and there to prove its support of economic reform programs to help other nations improve the standard of living for the people. One of these programs is the free trade agreements and open markets policy. The United States has bilateral free trade agreements with many countries. Jordan is one of these countries which signed a bilateral free trade agreement with The United States. As a result Jordanian products have access to the American markets and consumers. The United States of America wants to prove its support for the Jordanian agenda related to economic reform improving the economic status for Jordan which is of major concern for the successive governments in Jordan. Therefore, Jordanian leadership always tries to be engaged in bilateral agreements that can promote present economic conditions or try to convince strong economies to sponsor development projects in Jordan. As a result, Jordan is engaged in a bilateral free trade agreement with the European Union . But the United

States -Jordanian free trade agreement is much more beneficial for the Jordanian economy.

C-2-1- Aid Diplomacy

It is used by the countries of the North to influence the attitudes and the policies of the Third World countries. This diplomacy is done by flowing or stopping grants and aids. Great Powers tend to use this weapon to get support to their policies and strategies (Shabanah, 2001, 17). The United States allocates a percentage of its budget to support its foreign policy objectives all over the world or give grants to countries to get their support on the international scene. The other side of this diplomacy is to prevent aids to exercise influence on the other party. The aftermath of the latest Palestinian parliamentary elections in which " Hamas " succeeded to win the majority in the Legislative Council which in turn gave " Hamas " the right to form the coming government, Israel on the other hand appealed the international community to stop flowing aids to Palestinians if " Hamas " will be in authority, Israel wants to force " Hamas " to give up its opposing ideologies.

C-2-2- Supportive Diplomacy

The purpose of this diplomacy is to urge states to provide assistance to other states. This diplomacy takes the form of grants and aids. Weak states at the beginning find aids and assistance the solution to their interior crises. By the time, these states will find themselves in a restricted circle in the isolated island. They will be instruments in the hands of supporting countries. They will be under new kind of occupation-political and economic occupation (ibed, 17-18).

C-2-3- Development Diplomacy

It deals with the difficult tasks of finding ways and means of encouraging and supporting nations. This diplomacy is concerned with assisting in the economic,

political and social development of the less developed nations of the world. The United States calls such diplomacy "nations-building" (Plischke, 1979, 16). Countries of large economies use this diplomacy to strengthen its relations with other countries or to insure support for their political views and attitudes. This diplomacy to some extent restricts the free space left for decision-making for those who are target of support and aid. The political decisions of countries of weak economies have almost to be on the track with the sponsors, otherwise; it won't benefit from such aids and privileges. Furthermore, the concept of development diplomacy has acquired new dimensions particularly in the countries of the Third World as a result of dealing with new concepts like foreign debts, resources of power, food, water ...etc (Shalabi, 1997, 16-17).

Furthermore, there is an increasing concern about protecting our environment from any damage. At the same time technology is sweeping over all aspects of life (Aldabagh, 1985, 46). Really, nowadays, the focus is not only military force but also knowledge, information and technology. The present and coming competition is and will be technological. The improvements in the field of technology will enhance the political and economic status of the state. However, the revolution of technology has a great evident effect on diplomatic performance. It made the movement easier. Also, new devices of contact were discovered. The technological revolution has not only developed the conduct of the diplomatic affairs but also opened new trends for cooperation among states (ibed, 47-48).

C-3- Old Phase Diplomacy

C-3-1- East-West Diplomacy

It presents the adversary relationship between the Soviets and the People's Republic of China on the one hand and the United States on the other hand. This type of diplomacy was characterized by some features. The first feature was the considerable bluntness of language (Plischke, 1979, 14 -15). Each side accuses the other of being responsible for generating crises. Communications between both sides tended to reflect a high degree of mutual distrust. Also, flash tensions characterized United States-Soviets relationships. Another characteristic of the East-West diplomacy was its heavy emphasis on information gathering.

C-3-2- Secret Diplomacy

This diplomacy is carried out away from the responsible authorities secretly. "Kissenger" used this diplomacy to enhance and improve the bilateral relations between America and China. "Kissinger" sent secret letters through the president "Ayob Khan" of Pakistan and in the end of these communications, the Chinese invited the Americans to visit Bekin in 1971. "Kissenger" visited China in September 1971. Then "Nikson" the United States President was invited to visit China. The whole was surprised by that invitation (Shabanah, 2001, 20-21). Recently, this diplomacy was used for several times between the Palestinian authority and the Israeli government in "Oslo" meetings and the meetings in Sweden and Norway away from the formal negotiation rooms.

C-4- New Phase Diplomacy

C-4-1- United Nations Diplomacy

It has been often called a parliamentary type of diplomacy. It seeks to develop on international consensus on a particular problem (Plischke, 1979, 15). This diplomacy suffers some limitations. The key limitation is the veto power of the five permanent members of the Security Council which prevent the passage of any resolution unacceptable to one or another of them. Another limitation is related to the resolutions of the General Assembly. While the passage of any resolution in the General Assembly is not subject to the veto power, a resolution is binding only on those members who have accepted it, not on others. Though these limitations, the UN sometimes serves as a useful device to defuse explosive tensions, it has less successful in solving some minor international problems.

C-4-2- Parliamentary Diplomacy

It is the task of members and committees of the parliament. It aims to strengthen bilateral relations and to explain the attitudes of the state towards certain issues (Shabanah, 2001, 17). It also tries to gain the support of the Public Opinion through addressing the parliaments of other states. Nowadays, parliamentarians play an active role in this respect. There are regular regional and international parliamentary conferences. Also, the multilateral diplomacy or negotiation is called parliamentary diplomacy (Alkhateeb, 1987, diplomatic studies, 39). It is also featured by being frank and clear. This indicates that the diplomatic work is under public monitoring (Alghafari, 2002, 182).

C-4-3- Conference Diplomacy

This kind appeared in the current age. The aim of a conference is to finish a certain work within a limited period in a located place. It needs special diplomats who are well-known for their knowledge of the topics to be discussed, who can easily socialize, who have a quick movement and behavior (Shabanah, 2001, 18). It also needs those who are familiar with the modern techniques of forming the drafts of decisions and treaties. The diplomat here should know the different tactics that are followed internationally. The United Nations contributed a lot in spreading and developing such kind of diplomacy. In conferences, professional diplomats rarely dominate; politicians or experts have primacy-especially at summits. Heads of states or governments or foreign ministers meet bilaterally or multilaterally. Summits also raise expectations; if poorly prepared, they can be disastrous failures. Haste can also lead to bad bargains. Summits put professional diplomats briefly into the shade but rarely hurt their standing unless there is constant intervention, as in the United States Secretary of State Henry Kissinger's 1973 shuttle diplomacy, where his presence became a prestige factor for Middle Eastern states (Alhashimi, 2003, 122-23). Normally, the professionals resume their roles when the summit ends. Indeed, a visit by the foreign minister can be an asset to an ambassador and heighten his standing. Larger conferences are called, often under UN auspices, to address specific problems. The more technical the topic, the larger is the role of specialists. Regular meetings of the UN, its agencies, and regional organizations provide the forum for parliamentary diplomacy (ibed, 19).

C-4-4- Summit Diplomacy

It is the meeting where Heads of States replace the ambassadors and diplomats to do the most important task of diplomacy—negotiation (ibed, 19). The modern technology helped hold such summit as the heads of states can easily and quickly move. It makes

reaching a solution easier and it is more binding on the parties (Mohammad, 2000, 70). Some of the negatives effects of this diplomacy is issuing immature decisions for the short time allocated and not consulting the professional diplomats. Heads of states negotiate directly (Eban, 1983, 358). A clear example of this kinds of diplomacy is the "Camp David Summit" in 1978 between president "Sadat" of Egypt and "Beigan" the Prime Minister of Israel and the American President "Carter" (Alghafari, 2002, 169). This kind of diplomacy implies that international relations become more sensitive and complex which need the presence of Heads of states (Shalabi, 1997, 15).

C-4-5- The Public Diplomacy

It is a kind of diplomacy done by sport, artistic, workers and students delegates. The purpose of this kind is to show the real image of the country to the others through non-politicians and non-diplomats to let nations in different countries get close (ibed, 2002, 185) . This diplomacy is distinguished by the reduced of the requirements of the protocol and formal rituals and procedures. The idea of public diplomacy came about because in our modern age of instant global media, mass democracy and transparency, governments need to present their policies to entire populations, not just in private to other governments (Eban, 1983, 345-48). This fact has resulted in major changes in the way that foreign services are organized and staffed. Some countries use the term "public diplomacy" to describe the way that they present the whole country-its products, its culture and its people as well as its government's policies-to the outside world. The UN is the most clear example on such kind of diplomacy where all independent states enjoy membership (ibed, 1997, 12).

C-4-6- The Shuttle Diplomacy

This kind depends on the movement of diplomats and Ministers of foreign affairs themselves to meet the parties in a conflict. Kissenger, a former American foreign

minister, used this kind of diplomacy after the war of 1973 (Shabanah, 2001, 18). He succeeded to change some concepts in the region and put the conflicting parties in the Middle East in front of new names of policies and strategies like step-step solution, land for peace, normalization before the final peace and so on. This kind of diplomacy depends on the direct and repeated contact in a short period of time (Alkhateeb, 1987, Aldiplomacy, 35).

C-4-7- Settlement Diplomacy

As the name implies, it is the wartime effort made with those who seek to negotiate a ceasefire and peace (Plischke,1979, 18). During a conflict, the international community interferes to resolve the issue by peaceful means when the parties in a conflict couldn't reach a compromise to end the conflict, then the efforts of the international actors will be concentrated on reaching a settlement rather than a final solution. Settlement is the point where both sides involved in a conflict can agree but can't give more concession.

D-Tasks Of Diplomacy

Under the Vienna Convention, the function of a diplomatic mission includes (1) representation of the sending state in the host state, which extends beyond the social and ceremonial, for any envoy is a substitute for this state in that country, (2) protection, within the host state, of the interests of the sending state and its nationals, including their property and shares in firms, (3) negotiation on behalf of his state with the host state and signing the resultant agreements when authorized, (4) reporting and gathering information by all lawful means on conditions and developments in the host country for his government, and (5) promotion of friendly relations between the two states and furthering their economic, cultural, and scientific relations, which includes commercial diplomacy. There are also public services for nationals of the embassy's state (R.P., 1988, 10-15).

The public services are provided by junior and consular staff, whereas specialized attaches engage in protection and much promotional activity. Reducing friction, improving relations, and managing change to keep it orderly are an ambassador's tasks. Commercial contracts are so important that he is heavily engaged with these as well. However, the diplomat's most demanding activities are reporting and negotiation.

One of the ambassador's tasks is to predict a developing crisis. This is accomplished through gathering information from an array of sources and using experience and expert knowledge in analyzing, interpreting, and spotting emerging key issues and patterns and their implications. The ambassador's duty is to advise and warn. Conversations with the Foreign Minister or Prime Minister and other key officials or politicians must be reported in detail and without distortion. Beyond that, the ambassador negotiates as instructed (ibed, 15-23).

As it is shown representation, reporting, negotiation, facilitation, and coordination are basic functions of diplomacy and the diplomatic mission.

D-1- Representation

The key function of future diplomats will continue to be the representation of national interests, not only to foreign governments, but also to a far broader range of foreign audiences, reaching well beyond the foreign ministry, the head of state, and traditional elites (Alhashimi, 2003, 144). In the light of the increasing practice of direct capital-to-capital contacts, carrying out the representational function effectively requires in-depth interaction with these broader audiences. However, diplomacy as a channel for representation includes presenting the credential, protocol and the participation in the formal activities in the receiving country (Barston, 1988, 2).

Regional organizations or their representatives located in the host country will be an important focus; many of these will be primarily concerned with trade and economic development rather than political issues. In addition to, there may be supranational organizations in offices with which representation will have to be coordinated. Finally, with the increasing frequency of large multinational negotiations that cover many nontraditional topics, it is to be expected that a wide range of nongovernment participants and interest groups will be key audiences (Sadeq, 1996, 19).

D-2- Reporting

The rapid growth of worldwide news-gathering and real-time news dissemination (by both news and other private organization) has significantly altered the nature of the diplomatic reporting function. Therefore, much of the traditional diplomatic reporting function has been displaced. Carrying out the reporting function requires in-depth understanding of the host country that is more than just elite opinion-and across not only political, but also economic and sociocultural arenas-in order to provide essential

context (Sadeq, 1996, 20). In addition to, concise and accurate reporting of host country reactions to position, assessing and reporting on key developments in the host country will include issues that could affect both bilateral and multilateral reactions, as well as functional transitional issues such as environmental security and antiterrorist activities (Alhashimi, 2003, 146). Also, the listening task is a primary function of diplomacy. Diplomats or embassies should follow all developments and arrangements of any aspect of life in the receiving country to report to the sending government. This act might help the sending government taking the necessary procedures according to the warning or advice they receive from their diplomatic mission (Sadeq, 1996, 20).

The diplomat must be able to place the host country's activities and thinking in a broad set of contexts (domestic as well as international), not just in terms of bilateral political impacts on its relations with the diplomat's country.

D-3- Negotiation

Negotiation is a complex process leading usually to a compromise agreement. It, perhaps with Cabinet involvement, also specifies the diplomatic strategy to be used. The foreign ministry also establishes broad tactics, often in terms of initial demands, bargaining counters, and minimum final position. For the rest, the negotiator, either an ambassador or a special envoy, is in most countries free to employ whatever tactics seem best (ibed, 19). These are fairly standard, although bilateral negotiations vary greatly and multilateral ones more so. The parties have common interests to negotiate over and areas of disagreement to negotiate about. There are two basic approaches: tackling issues piece by piece or establishing a framework of agreed principles at the outset. The latter works well, but if it can't be done, the piecemeal approach is necessary (ibed, 21).

Managing the relations between independent state is a primary function of diplomacy (Nicolson, 1963, 80). Diplomacy is a political technique to get into agreement, indeed, it is the art of negotiation (Nicolson, 1979, 21). Formal written agreements are more binding and carry international commitment, and can be brought into existence only by diplomatic procedures. It has been recognized as an activity that influence world peace and the maintenance of world political relations (Neale and Bazerman, 1991, 1). Mostly, negotiation is understood to mean a discussion with a view to achieve one or more of these objectives: either to identify common interests and agreement on joint actions; or to compromise on an issue where interests are in conflict (Berridge, 1987, 164- 65). Negotiations will remain a significant element of the diplomat's responsibilities. Future diplomats will continue to take an active part in international negotiations; but unlike their predecessors, they are likely to share negotiating responsibility with delegates from other government agencies, and, on occasion, with members of private organizations. Participation in bilateral talks about subjects covering the entire range of bilateral interests, however, will likely play a smaller role than multilateral negotiations. Increasingly, negotiations go beyond traditional bilateral relations because solutions to complex problems demand participation by a broad range of interested parties (Ahmed, 1997, 9-17). Eventually, it is essential to take into account that power is an effective factor in negotiation. It gives the negotiator some advantage over the other party. And negotiators use this advantage to gain a big deal of the outcomes or to impose solutions they prefer (Lewicki *et al.*, 1997, 179).

D-4- Facilitation

A significant element of diplomatic tasks in the future will involve the facilitation of nontraditional national interests (Alhashimi, 2003, 146-47). Many of these efforts will

involve providing support to visiting government, parliamentary and business delegations. In particular, facilitation of commercial interests, involving assisting companies of the diplomat's home country in developing contacts and closing significant commercial arrangements, will be a high priority (Sadeq, 1996, 21).

D-5- Coordination

A key task of diplomacy is coordination. This task covers all areas of politics, economics, culture and social affairs. A diplomat has always to work to pave the way for bilateral coordination between the sending government and the host. Coordination also includes the arrangements taken for state visits by Heads of states and other formal officials. This side of the work of diplomacy is sensitive and important which needs intelligence and profession (ibed, 21).

If the foregoing analysis is essentially sound, traditional diplomatic functions and practices face severe challenges in the years ahead. The dispersal of authority away from states, the predominance of economics over politics, and the growing role of NGOs, social movements, and other transnational collectives highlight the need for national governments to alter their modes of interaction. Traditional diplomatic functions and practices, are threatened by the easy and diverse routes wherein information flows and the acceleration of dynamics results (Alhashimi, 2003, 147).

Chapter Two

Chapter Two

Methods of Diplomacy in Resolving Conflicts

A- Negotiation

B- Conflict Resolution Mechanisms

B-1- Peaceful Conflict Resolution Mechanisms

B-1-1- Direct Negotiation

B-1-2- Good Offices

B-1-3- Mediation

B-1-4- Arbitration

B-1-5- Judicial Settlement

B-2- Non-Peaceful Conflict Resolution Mechanisms

B-2-1- Sanctions

B-2-2- The Use of Military Force

C- Helping Tools of Conflict Resolution Mechanisms

C-1- Early Warning

C-2- Fact-Finding

Chapter Two

Methods of Diplomacy in Resolving Conflicts

A- Negotiation

Negotiation is a process whereby the parties to the conflict seek to settle or resolve their conflicts by themselves or through the intervention of a third party. It is a process of direct or indirect communication between the conflicting parties, without the presence of a third party facilitator, in effort to reach a mutually acceptable agreement (Sabri, 1985, 136). Before the negotiation, it is helpful to plan. Know whether you are in a win-win or win-lose situation. Be sure of your goals, positions, and underlying interests. Try to figure out the best solution you can expect, what is a fair and reasonable deal and what is a minimally acceptable deal? What information do you have and what do you need? What are your competitive advantages and disadvantages? What is the other's advantages and disadvantages? Give a lot of thought to your strategy (Lewicki *et al.*, 1997, 92). It is very important to be clear on what is important to you. Be clear about your real goals and real issues and try to figure out the other party's real goals and issues. The parties who lose track of their own goals will break off negotiations even if they have achieved their needs because they become more concerned with whether the other side "won". Equally important, is to be clear and demonstrate why your goals, issues, and objectives are important to you (Lewicki *et al.*, 1997, 134). The other side needs to know why the issues are important to you, not just that they are important. It is also important to be clear about your walkaway point (also called reservation position or BATNA)-Best Alternative To a Negotiated Agreement (Fisher, 1981, 101). And it is important to know your competitive advantage-your strongest points. Also you need to know the advantages to the other's argument. Similarly, know your weaknesses and the other's weaknesses. In most conflict

resolution or negotiation situations you will have a continuing relationship with the other party, so it is important to leave the situation with both sides feeling they have "won". It is very important that the other party doesn't feel that he "lost". When the other party loses, the results are often lack of commitment to the agreement or even worse, revenge. The most common failure is the failure of negotiating parties to recognize (or search for) the integrative potential in a negotiating problem; beneath hardened positions are often common or shared interests (Neale and Bazerman, 1991, 19).

Negotiation is a tool which can be useful for resolving certain disputes but not all of them. Therefore, if the parties concerned have nothing in common to help settle the differences then negotiation is unlikely to succeed. Negotiation can be successful when the common needs of the parties concerned help to settle specific issues. In negotiation, proposals are put forward in order to overcome the conflicting position. The process of negotiation might be secret or public according to its subject matter (Alghafari, 2002, 130). The negotiation process goes through certain phases or stages.

1- Preparation

In this stage, the issues must identified. Each party must define his own needs. Also, each party might try to learn about the other party's position. Each party might use every possible means to explore and collect as much data as possible about the other party in order to understand how the other side thinks and to build his strategy in accordance with the information he gets(Ahmed, 1997, 34). However, each party during this stage has to choose the negotiating team in accordance with whom will they negotiate, the topic they talk about, the information they have about the opponent. Here, it is important for the negotiating team to appoint the chief negotiator. The chief negotiator is mostly responsible for doing most of the job. The negotiating team sometimes might

include some expertise in particular fields in order to reach important and successful decisions (Neale and Bazerman, 1991, 81-82). Then the team has to prepare their file. The file includes all papers and information necessary for the negotiators. Therefore, most cases the parties include a file manager in their delegations (Zayed, 2003, 23). Moreover, the negotiating team has sometimes an observer. The task of the observer is to watch deadlines, to watch the objectives, to watch the signals from the speakers of the other party's team. Also, a negotiating team might have a recorder. His task is to jot down and record all matters, offers and agreements. In addition to, a negotiating team is to assign a press representative (Ahmed, 1997, 35). The press representative answers the questions and gives information according to the negotiation plan of his delegation.

2- Exploration

In this phase, each party has to explain and state down his needs to the opponents. Each party tries to learn about the other party's needs (Lewicki *et al.*, 1997, 108-109). Also, the negotiators establish the best climate and situation for bargaining. It is more useful during this phase to listen more than you talk or as much as you talk. You shouldn't use all your cards (ibed, 37). Also, the negotiators shouldn't let the opponent meet their minimum needs while he is demanding more and more.

3- Bargaining

During this stage, the negotiators offer and debate over certain proposals (ibed, 39). A good negotiator has to get the other party feel that reaching an eventual settlement is possible. Here, concessions can be offered to reduce the distance and bring settlement closer (Lewicki *et al.*, 1997, 4).

4- Closing

This phase is possible when the proposals meet the needs and the demands of each party. The tactics applied by negotiators from both sides can help reach agreements.

Ratification is popular in this phase (Ahmed, 1997, 40).

However, it is important to look for some data about the opposing negotiating team. Such data might include: the other party's objectives, his interests, needs, his alternatives, his resources, his reputation, his negotiation style, his behavior, his authority to make an agreement, and his likely strategy and tactics (Zayed, 2003, 27). Then, the team is responsible for building the negotiation plan. A good negotiation plan has to include the following steps: defining the issues, assembling the issues and defining the agenda, analyzing the other party, defining underlying interests, consulting with others, setting goals for the process and outcome, identifying the party's own limits and developing supporting agreements. Negotiations vary according to whether one is treating with a friend or an enemy (Lewicki *et al.*, 1997, 1). Whether the other state is of similar or disparate power. Whether one wants agreement or is negotiating for propaganda purposes or to avoid the obloquy of refusing, and whether the aim is to prolong an existing agreement or to change the status quo, perhaps redistributing benefits or ending hostilities (ibed, 39-40). Whatever the problem, the negotiator must display reliability and credibility. He tries to create trust and to seem both honest and fair. He must strive to understand the other side's concerns. Stamina, being precise, clarity, courage, patience, and an even temper are necessary, though calculated impatience or anger may be used as a tactic. A skilled negotiator has a sense of timing, knowing when to use threats, warnings, or concessions. Sometimes a third party is discreetly used to facilitate initial contact or to press the sides toward agreement (Zayed, 1997, 52). The negotiator must be persuasive, flexible, and creative in devising new

solutions or reaffirming issues from a new angle to convince the other party that agreement is in its interest. Smaller and easier issues are tackled first, building an area of agreement, which is then stressed to create a stake in success, whereas harder issues are postponed and played down.

Multilateral negotiations demand the same skills but are more complex. The process is usually protracted and fragmented, with subsidiary negotiations in small groups and occasional cooling-off periods. Skilful representatives of small states often play important roles. Unanimity, majority, or consensus (to avoid voting) reaches decisions. International organizations have several roles in multilateral negotiations (Sabri, 1985, 161). One is sponsorship of conferences. Another is coalition diplomacy (Neale and Bazerman, 1991, 109). However, increasing the number of participants complicates the possibility of reaching agreement. Therefore, to settle a dispute, particularly at the international level, which involves just two parties, but a number, each with separate interests and objectives that may coincide or conflict (Mitchell, 1981, 249).

Going into any negotiation it is important to be very clear on your BATNA or the course of action you would take if you do not reach an agreement. If you are negotiating over salary, your alternatives might include a specific job elsewhere, a longer job search, or remaining at your current job. This is important because the negotiation needs to aim to match or do better than your BATNA. The BATNA establishes an introductory for the settlement (Lewicki *et al.*, 1997, 9). Determining your BATNA or walkaway is not always easy. You have to establish a concrete value for various alternatives.

In simple negotiations, there may be just one issue but often negotiations involve multiple issues making the determination of BATNA even more difficult. So, in the planning process it is also important (and difficult) to estimate the other side's BATNA.

A goal of negotiation is to come as close to the other party's BATNA as you can and you need to estimate the BATNA to do this. Skilled negotiators also often try to influence the other party's BATNA. This happens when you convince the other party that his alternatives are not as good as the other perceives them to be.

On the other hand, it is critical to address problems, not personalities and avoid the tendency to attack your opponent personally; if the other person feels threatened, he defends himself-esteem and makes attacking the real problem more difficult. Try to maintain a rational goal oriented frame of mind: if your opponent attacks you personally, don't let him take you into an emotional reaction; let the other blow off steam without taking it personally; try to understand the problem behind the aggression. The negotiator has to make sure you send signals that you know the conflict is about the issues at hand and not personal. This will help prevent the other side from being defensive. It is important to be very clear about your interests and this may not be as easy as it would appear. Equally important is the need to find out the other party's key interests. Negotiators are used to identifying their own interests, but a critical element in negotiation is to come to understanding the other party's underlying interests and underlying needs (Zayed, 2003, 23). With probing and exchanging information they can find the commonalities between them and minimize the differences that seem to be evident. Understanding the needs of the other party is also critical (Lewicki *et al.*, 1997, 65). Too often negotiators think a situation is win-lose when it is actually a win-win situation. This mistaken view causes them to often use the wrong strategy. Consider a situation where your boss rates you lower on a performance assessment than you deserve. Negotiators often tend to see this as win-lose- either he gives in or I give in. There is probably a much higher chance of a successful negotiation if the conflicting parties can turn this to a win-win negotiation (Sabri, 1985, 133).

A key part in finding common interests is the problem identification. It is important to define the problem in a way that is mutually acceptable to both sides (Lewicki *et al.*, 1997, 68). This involves depersonalizing the problem so as not to raise the defensiveness of the other party. However, negotiators should try to have the result be based on some objective standard. They have to make the negotiated decision based on principle and result, not emotions or pressure; they have to try to find objective criteria that both parties can use to evaluate alternatives; they shouldn't give in to emotional please, assertiveness, or stubbornness. Having appropriate definition of the problem in question, an accurate judgment can be made (Neale and Bazerman, 1991, 41). There is tendency to think about conflict or the negotiating situation as an isolated incident. It is probably more useful to think about conflict as a process, or a complex series of events over time involving both external factors and internal social and psychological factors. Conflict episodes typically are affected by preceding and in turn produce results and outcomes that affect the conflict dynamics. A negotiation usually involves a number of steps including the exchange of proposals and counter proposals. In good-faith negotiation, both sides are expected to make offers and concessions (Lewicki *et al.*, 1997, 46-47). The negotiator's goal here is not only to try to solve the problem, but to gain information that will enable the parties to get a clearer notion of what the true issues might be and how the opponent sees reality. Through offers and counter offers there should be a goal of a lot of information exchange that might yield a common definition of the problem. Such approach suggests the importance of perception-conflict is in the eye of the beholder. Thus, situations which to an outside observer should produce conflict may not if the parties either ignore or choose to ignore the conflict situation.

Next, once being aware of the conflict, both parties experience emotional reactions to it and think about it in various ways. These emotions and thoughts are crucial to the course of the developing conflict. For example, a negotiation can be greatly affected if the parties react in anger perhaps resulting from past conflict. Then, based on the thoughts and emotions that arise in the process of conflict resolution, negotiators formulate specific intentions about the strategies that will be used in the negotiation. These may be quite general (e.g. plan to use a cooperative approach) or quite specific (e.g. use a specific negotiating tactic). Finally, these intentions are translated into behavior. These behaviors in turn get some response from the other party and the process recycles. And, it is important to communicate very carefully. Unseen verbal and body language can make a difference in how the negotiation progresses. Spend more time listening than talking and make direct eye contact. Use the word "and" instead of "but". This helps to send the signal that you are interested in the other party and are seeking common ground. Also, intangibles are often the key factors in many negotiations. Firstly, the key factor is communications. The negotiator has to be careful about using the phone, e-mail, and other nonvisual communication means. A negotiator has to keep reminding and repeating his interest in the other side's concerns and his determination to find a mutually satisfactory resolution (Sabri, 1985, 145-46). Moreover, negotiators must be willing to state down what they want and why they want that point or set of points in particular (Lewicki *et al.*, 1997, 87). Secondly, the negotiator has to be conscious of the aspects of his personality such as his own needs and interpersonal style as well as the other party's personality; these factors will play a key role and understanding himself will be an important factor. Thirdly, as a negotiator, be aware of how much you trust the other party; how free with your emotions; how much you want to conceal or reveal. Sometimes where the negotiation takes place can

be important; Are the conflicting parties negotiating in a space that is uncomfortable for one party and the other is comfortable? Also, if there is a history of conflict resolution with the other party, negotiators have to think about how this history might affect the upcoming negotiation. Then, negotiators should pay attention whether time pressure will affect negotiation and whether the negotiating team needs to try to change this variable. Moreover, negotiators should be aware that people place very different values on elements of negotiation. For example, in negotiating for a job, you may place a high value on location and relatively lower on salary; it is important to be aware of your subjective utilities and try to ascertain the other party's subjective utilities; it is difficult to know in advance or even during the negotiation what a particular outcome will mean to the other party. Finding out what is valued is one of the key parts of negotiation. Then it is essential to avoid focusing on the past, or blaming the other party. A good negotiator is an active listener (Lewicki *et al.*, 1997, 144). This involves continuously checking to see if you are understanding the other party. Negotiators must focus on the future; talk about what is to be done; tackle the problem jointly (Ahmed, 1997, 54).

There are many advantages to try to shift a win-lose situation to a win-win. Yet, it will be in situations where the other party either doesn't wish to reach a "win-win" or doesn't realize it is in his best interest to achieve a collaborative solution. In these situations, it is necessary for negotiators to open lines of communication, and try to increase trust and cooperativeness. It is not easy to shift this situation to a win-win but the following techniques might be used. A negotiator might reduce tension through making a small concession as a signal of good faith (Zayed, 2003, 96-100). He should increase the accuracy of communication; listen hard in the middle of conflict; rephrase the other's comments to make sure he hears them; mirror the other's views. Also, he searches for ways to slice the large issue into smaller pieces; to depersonalize the

conflict. Then, he starts to establish commonalities since conflict tends to magnify perceived differences and minimize similarities, the negotiator has to look for greater common goals and to focus on what you have in common. In addition to, a negotiator focuses less on his position and more on a clear understanding of the other's needs and figure out ways to move toward them and focuses more on interests (Fisher, 1981, 41). Also, the negotiator tries to sweeten the offer; emphasize the positives. Then, he tries to find a legitimate or objective criteria to evaluate the solution. Other techniques can be used. First, broadening the pie by creating additional resources so that both sides can obtain their major goals (Neale and Bazerman, 1991, 61-62). Second, applying the tactic of nonspecific compensation. One side gets what it wants and the other is compensated on another issue. Third, logrolling-each party makes concessions on low-priority issues in exchange for concessions on issues that it values more highly. Fourth, cost cutting is another technique: one party gets what it wants; the costs to the other are reduced or eliminated. Fifth, bridging is another tactic: neither party gets its initial demands but a new option that satisfies the major interests of both sides are developed (Neale and Bazerman, 1991, 35-38).

Everyone can negotiate successfully; everyone can reach agreements where all sides feel at least some of their needs have been satisfied. This involves a lot of alertness, active listening, good communication skills, great flexibility, good preparation, and above all, it involves a sharing of responsibility for solving the problem, not a view that this is their problem. Negotiation as a process is included in most mechanisms of conflict resolution.

B- Conflict Resolution Mechanisms

It has been agreed upon that a third party is essential to conflict management only when a conflict has reached a point of escalation and deadlock in which contentious behavior has exhausted its effectiveness and party-to-party negotiations are either non-existent or ineffectual (Salem, 1997, 98). States in their search for resolutions to the conflicts they encounter can go to apply a certain mechanism or another according to the nature of the conflict. The primary objective of a third party intervention is to enhance the relationship between the conflicting parties, rather than to assist in the resolution of a specific dispute (Neale and Bazerman, 1991, 135). These mechanisms can be classified into two categories: peaceful mechanisms and non-peaceful mechanisms (Sabri, 1985, 135).

At the main time, it is essential to distinguish between parties' positions and interests in the course of trying to reach a compromise. One of the classical ideas in conflict resolution is to distinguish between the positions (i.e. concrete demands) held by the parties and their underlying interests and needs. Interests are often easier to reconcile than positions, since there are usually several positions that might satisfy them (Neale and Bazerman, 1991, 20).

Matters may be more difficult if the conflict is over values (which are often non-negotiable) or relationships, which may need to be changed to resolve the conflict, although the same principle of looking for a deeper level of compatible underlying motives applies. Some analysts take this to the limit by identifying basic human needs (for example, identity, security and survival) as lying at the roots of other motives.

In the Camp David negotiations between Menachem Begin of Israel and Anwar Sadat of Egypt over the status of the Sinai Peninsula, each took the position that his country wanted complete control of the land. On deeper investigation, they discovered

that the Israeli's primary interest was in security-having fought a series of wars with their neighbors. The Egyptian's interest was in sovereignty, having only recently achieved independence. This enabled the two sides to come up with a solution that satisfied the interests and needs of each without impinging on the other's. The Sinai was given to the Egyptians (sovereignty), but was demilitarized (security). By exploring a range of positions that satisfied their underlying needs, the conflict was resolved (Neale and Bazerman, 1991, 19-20).

B-1- Peaceful Conflict Resolution Mechanisms

The international community has several opportunities to resolve conflicts peacefully. The peaceful mechanisms that can be applied include: good offices, mediation, arbitration and judicial settlement. States start to rely heavily on peaceful mechanisms for the great deal of losses for using force which even if it ends it might result in having given the chance for violence or terrorism to rise.

B-1-1- Direct Negotiation

This is a very active and mostly successful as both parties directly negotiate their positions and situations. Here both parties are willing and satisfied to start negotiation with each other without the intervention of a third party in the process of negotiation. Both parties here are supposed to maintain good relations and might reach reconciled and satisfactory settlement. Direct negotiations are mostly conducted by Heads of states.

B-1-2- Good Offices

Good offices is applied as a mechanism for keeping international peace and security (فوق العادة, 1973, 358). Good offices can be used when there is no contact between parties. It is non-binding. The third party voluntarily offers its good offices. In offering its good offices, the state advises the parties to go to negotiation to resolve their conflicts (Cot, 1972, 22). The third party might intervene by himself or upon the request of one of the conflicting parties where he urges them to keep calm and pave the way for a peaceful settlement through negotiation or resuming it if existed (Ramcharan, 1982, 12-17). Mostly, the third party holds non-official meeting with each side alone and conveys each side's view of the conflict. The third party is usually has a friendly relationship with both sides and he is interested in resolving the conflict. He does his best to get the views of both sides close. This third party might be a state, a group of states, the General Assembly of the UN, the Secretary General of the UN, the Security

Council, one of the international or regional organizations or a VIP figure (Alyousifi, 1997, 49-50). The importance of "good offices" become clear and evident particularly when the dispute leads to withdrawing ambassadors and freezing diplomatic relations which might turn into the use of force. The good officer doesn't offer a solution for the dispute, but helps the parties to go to negotiation to have a peaceful outcome compatible with the conflicting parties' interests. He stops when the parties sit around the table. This means that the third party should not be involved in a way or another in the conflict, he should be neutral. He couldn't suggest solutions or put any kind of initiatives. He should also convey the messages between the parties as accurate as possible to get their trust.

The good officer is the link between the conflicting parties. He might meet all parties together or each party alone in the place that he locates. He might sometimes, according to the nature of the conflict and upon the agreement of the parties involved, send a personal delegate or technical missions to provide him with all necessary details to the subject of the conflict (ibed, 50-51).

Good offices are often confused with "mediation". Good offices imply a more discreet action, limited to initiating direct negotiations between the parties concerned without active participation, whereas a mediator generally takes a more active part in the discussion and is often expected to suggest some solutions to the problem. Good offices may be very extensive in the services and facilities rendered but are slightly short of and even not any actual participation in the process of negotiation. The success or failure of "good offices" therefore depends on an appreciable extent on the skill and patience of the officer rendering the good offices (Sanders, 1967, 346). Most states believe that the use of the good offices of the Secretary-General of the United Nations

was most useful and could be employed more frequently and consistently (Ramcharan, 1983, 6-7).

The history of international disputes experiences many examples of using good offices. One of such events was when the ex-Secretary General of the UN (De Coupiar) offered his good offices before the Gulf War in 1991 when the Security Council requested him upon decision number 666 of September 13th, 1990 to provide his good offices to ensure handing rations to Iraq and Kuwait (Alyousifi, 1997, 29). Another example, during the Gulf crisis in 1990, was the good offices offered by His Majesty later King Hussein Bin Talal of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan. His Majesty offered his good offices for both sides to contain the crisis and to try to reach a peaceful outcome for it. He also emphasized both parties to keep calm as much as possible to keep the crisis in and within Arab capabilities without giving the chance for foreign interventions. And what he feared occurred and the crisis complicated more than before.

B-1-3- Mediation

Mediation can be viewed as the efforts of one or more parties to affect one or more other parties when ... the former, the latter or both perceive a problem requiring a resolution. Others define mediation as the process by which the participants, together with the assistance of a neutral party or parties, systematically isolate disputed issues in order to develop options, consider alternatives, and reach a consensual settlement that will accommodate their needs (Bercovitch, 1996, 13). Mediation provides the principle on which conciliation is based. It is an intervention in a dispute by a third party who proposes a solution to the disputants. It is the oldest method devised for the peaceful settlement of international disputes through the intervention of a body independent of the disputants (Cot, 1972, 31).

Then, it is crucial to take into account the contextual attributes that explain what is a successful mediation. The first attribute is the characteristics of the conflicting parties. In this regard, the parties' political context should be studied (Bercovitch, 1996, 13). The political context refers to the type of government of each party, which can be a monarchy, one-party state, a military regime, a multiparty democratic regime, or another. It could be found that mediation is easier and close to success when the parties of a conflict have similar political systems. Also, the parties' power has to be studied. When the parties of a conflict enjoy equal power, then the process of mediation will be much more easier. On the other hand, when one of the conflicting parties is more powerful and has more power capabilities than the other, the process of mediation and the mediators' efforts will encounter many difficulties as the powerful side will try to show his power as a remark to get more concessions from the other party and to impose its decisions. Moreover, the previous relations between the parties should be considered. There is no international dispute without a past. Many scholars emphasize that the previous relationship between the parties is one of the main variables affecting the course and outcome of a conflict (Bercovitch, 1996, 22). The probability of success of mediation will increase when the parties involved have previous friendly relationships. This indicates that the historical context does influence the management and the outcome of the conflict.

The Arab–Israeli conflict can be classified as a conflict where both sides had previous disputes which make the possibility of successful mediation unlikely. The second attribute to successful mediation is the nature of the dispute. Mediation in issues related to sovereignty or territorial integrity is unlikely to succeed. The time of initiating mediation has a large effect on the success of mediation. If mediation is attempted at an early stage, it will be more likely to succeed (Bercovitch, 1996, 25). The nature of the

mediator is a third attribute for a successful mediation. Mediators should enjoy certain characteristics to conclude effective and successful mediation. Mediators must be perceived as reasonable, acceptable, knowledgeable, and able to secure the trust and cooperation of the disputants (Bercovitch, 1996, 23). The rank of the mediator is also important whether they are leaders and representatives of regional organizations, leaders or representatives of small governments. The previous relationship between the mediator and the disputants is helpful.

Mediation is a form of alternative dispute resolution where a third party aids the disputants in the resolution process but has no authority to impose a settlement (Neale and Bazerman, 1991, 136). It is a collaborative process in which a neutral third party, called a mediator, facilitates discussion between two or more parties, in an attempt to help them reach agreement. The mediator does not decide how the matter should be resolved; only the parties decide whether, and on what terms, their dispute should be resolved. In effect, mediation is a structured settlement conference, conducted in a confidential setting (Fawq Aladah, 1973, 361). Mediation is like a trial and more like a negotiation. Most mediations are coordinated by a certified mediator. A mediator will bring the parties together and allow them to communicate regarding their particular issues. It is the job of the mediator to ensure that all communications are respected and any barriers to communication are overcome. Mediation allows the parties their greatest degree of control over the resolution of their conflict. Since it encourages communication and mutual resolution over adversarial confrontation, this method is highly useful in solving conflicts. The mediator has to keep in mind the importance of keeping the doors of communication open between the conflicting parties at every stage of the conflict (Edmead, 1971, 31-32). Mediation is the inclusion in the negotiation process of an impartial "third party" who is knowledgeable in effective negotiation

processes but has no power of compulsion to lead or assist disputing parties toward a favorable resolution of a dispute (Rabow, 1990, 24). It refers to a dispute resolution process involving the assistance of a third party; it is voluntary and the parties retain control over the outcome, although it may include positive and negative inducements. Mediation occurs on many different levels and can refer to very different types of third-party intervention. The mediator acts as a neutral facilitator of the process of communication, and remain impartial between the parties and with regard to the outcome of the conflict (Neale and Bazerman, 1991, 136-140). Third party assistance or mediation is one of the most promising approaches to constructive conflict management.

Mediation is practiced in numerous arenas; that is, in many ways, a continuation of the parties' own conflict-management efforts; and that it involves the noncoercive intervention of a third party who seeks to influence or resolve a particular conflict. The mediator's objective of changing, reducing, or resolving a conflict legitimates their intervention (Bercovitch, 1996, 3). However, the third party may be an individual, an ad hoc group, an organization, or a state. A mediator enters a conflict and becomes part of a voluntary and unique conflict system. That system comprises two parties in conflict, each with its own concerns and interests, and a set of issues that may or may not be clear to all. Mediation is likely to occur when a conflict has gone on for sometime; the efforts of the individuals or actors involved have reached a blockage; neither actor is prepared for further costs or escalation of the dispute; and both parties welcome some form of mediation and are ready to engage in direct or indirect dialogue (Bercovitch, 1996, 12). Mediation can be seen as an extension of the negotiation process where by an acceptable third party intervenes to change the course or outcome of a particular

conflict. Mediation is initiated upon request and it leaves the ultimate decision making power with the disputants.

However, in order to do its job effectively, mediation requires leverage, problem-solving abilities, strategy and timing. Leverage is the ability of the mediator to alter the objective environment of the disputants. The mediator here is to raise the costs of continuing a war (Brown, 1996, 336). The mediator then might show the threat of force, but the more the mediator is credible in his offers the more successful outcomes he might gain for the sake of having a peaceful settlement. In relation to problem-solving strategies, the mediator has to develop practical solutions to the demands and needs of the disputants (Brown, 1996, 360).

In terms of a strategy, a mediator must have preferred outcomes and ways of linking incentives and tactics to that outcome (Brown, 1996, 361). The mediator should, in advance, be prepared for the coming job. He should have enough knowledge about the issue of the conflict and the relationship between the parties involved as they will help him build a well-organized strategy to succeed in his work. Moreover, timing is essential for the success of mediation, so mediation should be timed. Mediation should be like one never knows if and when it is likely to pass by again taking place at the right time, then it is more likely to succeed (Bercoviteh, 1996, 23). At the main time, warring parties should not feel that mediation is always available as they will be unlikely to fear the consequences of continuing to fight if they feel that mediation is always available as a fallback option (Brown, 1996, 363). The mediator is considered as a channel for information where the mediator works as a messenger between the parties involved in a conflict and the mediator has to bring the point of view of each party to the opposing and vice versa. Therefore, to a large extent, mediation depends on the mediators' skill, the authority he derives from the body sponsoring him, and the procedure he uses

(Edmead, 1971, 31-34). The mediator's task is to propose solutions as mediation is not a binding process (Cot, 1972, 32). The mediator has no authority to force both parties to comply with his solutions as he works upon the request of both sides. In the present world context, power, established ties, and other factors of influence-building are among the elements of authority which must not be underestimated (Pechota, 1971, 18).

A great deal of examples are there that show the use of mediation in conflicts. One of the clear examples those attempts related to the Arab-Israeli conflict. After the Arab-Israeli war of July 5th, 1967, "Junaryarnej" who was an ambassador of Sweden in Moscow-was appointed as a special envoy of the Secretary General of the United Nations to the Middle East. The task of the envoy was to make the necessary contacts between the countries concerned in the region-Egypt, Syria, Jordan, Lebanon and Israel-in order to reach a peaceful solution for the conflict. The Secretary General in turn would provide the Security Council with reports about the efforts his special envoy does as soon as possible(Alyousifi, 1997, 60). And, as it is noticed there is no limited time for mediation to be carried out. The needed time depends on certain circumstances related to the nature of the dispute. The mediator has to allocate a period of not more than six months and not less than three months to reach a sort of peaceful settlement. In cases when mediation fails, then the conflicting parties might move toward negotiation or to another mechanism to end the conflict.

The Camp David agreement between Israel and Egypt, mediated by ex-US president Jimmy Carter, provides an example of mediation. The mediator resolves conflict by attempting to re-focus the parties from positions to interests. The mediator starts by determining the true reasons (interests) why they are. The mediator attempts to engage both in the process of generating new alternatives that satisfy the interests of both parties.

To sum up, mediation is successful when it has made a considerable and positive difference to the management of a conflict and the subsequent interaction between the parties. Mediation is an extension of the parties' efforts at conflict management. Mediation involves the intervention of an individual, group or organization into a dispute between two or more actors. Mediation is non-coercive, non-violent and non-binding. The mediator enters a dispute in order to affect, change, resolve or influence it in some way. International mediators are both interested and concerned parties. Mediation is a voluntary form of intervention; and mediation operates on an ad hoc basis only if mediation as a process of conflict management, related to but distinct from the parties' own efforts, where the disputing parties or their representatives seek the assistance or accept an offer of help, from an individual, group, state or organization to change, affect or influence their perceptions or behavior, without resorting to physical force or invoking the authority of law (Alghafari, 2002, 132-133).

B-1-4- Arbitration

Some defines arbitration as the reference of a dispute between not less than two parties for determination to resolve the conflict in a judicial manner by someone else (Gill, 1975, 1). The conflicting parties—whatever they are—should agree upon the arbitrator in advance. Arbitration is another form of alternative dispute resolution. In arbitration, the parties concerned agree to have a neutral third party, called arbitrator, who decides how their dispute should be resolved. Arbitration can be held with one arbitrator or a panel of three or more arbitrators, whose consensus decides the outcome of the dispute. Arbitration can be either binding in the sense that the parties agree to abide by the arbitrator's decision or non-binding in which case the parties may pursue other means of resolving their dispute, such as standing before a judge and court (Toope, 1990, 117). Arbitration is a means by which disputes are settled by a private

procedure agreed to by the parties (Toope, 1990, 1-3). The parties are bound by the arbitrator's decisions, which has the force of law and may be executed in a manner similar to that for a court award (Rabow, 1990, 121). Arbitration has today become a prime method of settling international disputes. Arbitration is applied when negotiation, with or without mediation is unsuccessful. So, arbitration is a judicial function. Also, arbitration decides. The settlement of disputes between states through arbitration comprises the only means for the elimination of international controversy through resort to law and judicial procedures (Carlston, 1946, 264).

However, arbitration is of three types. The first type is called voluntary arbitration where both conflicting parties submit their issue to an arbitrator. The second type is arbitration by order of the Court where the High Court brings the issue in dispute to an arbitrator. The High Court has the power to move any issue to a special referee. The third type is statutory arbitration. There is a tendency to have ad hoc tribunals (Parris, 1974, 3-8). In such cases, arbitral courts are formed from a previously prepared list of arbitrators (Alyousifi, 1997, 75-76).

An arbitrator is presided over by an independent third party who has no interest in the outcome of the dispute (Simpson and Fox, 1959, 81-82). The arbitrator usually has specific expertise in the field in which the dispute has arisen. For example, a construction dispute will have an arbitrator who may be a civil engineer or an attorney with many years experience in construction law. An accounting dispute will have an arbitrator who is a Certified Public Accountant. With an expert presiding over the dispute, the parties can benefit from the particular understanding and analysis of the facts an expert can provide. Additionally, the arbitrator may be better aware of the law governing the dispute than a Judge drawn at random or a court which does not have that type of specific experience and education. This allows the parties to focus on the

particular strengths of their position without concerning themselves as much with what laws should apply (Simpson and Fox, 1959, 87).

Arbitration is similar to a traditional case in that the parties generally must agree to make the result binding on all parties. For that reason, arbitration is very similar to a court trial, only with a more relaxed set of rules governing the proceeding. In certain circumstances non-binding arbitration may be available, but either way, the parties cannot be compelled into arbitration without having a signed agreement (Simpson and Fox, 1959, 42-43). Arbitration can be used to settle small parts of the total dispute. This particular benefit helps to decrease the time and expense of a full courtroom trial on all issues. Many disputes handled in arbitration involve the scope of what is to be arbitrated and even whether the parties agreed to arbitration at all. Other benefits of arbitration include greater privacy (as opposed to a public report created by a trial), and quicker resolution.

The arbitrator resolves the conflict by actually making the decision for the parties. Each party may defend a position or interest to arbitrator (Fawq Aladah, 1973, 364). A group leader may decide to take on this role to resolve intra-group conflict. Parties are encouraged to select an arbitrator and agree upon compensation at or before the first non-binding arbitration session.

Is Arbitration Useful?

Arbitration seems to be useful and advantageous for the parties and issues concerned. One of these merits is the existence of arbitrators who are rich with the qualifications necessary to have a just solution for the dispute in question (Gill, 1975, 5). An arbitrator is normally chosen for his experience and knowledge of a particular issue or topic. Another advantage of arbitration is that it is a speedier process. It is a faster means than other techniques in reaching a settlement. It is a saving in costs. A

third merit is its convenience. A successful arbitrator chooses the time and place suitable for both parties concerned (Parris, 1974, 9).

As it is seen, arbitration is a useful and practical method. But, when the arbitrator declares his judgment, then all parties concerned should take the necessary procedures to comply with the decisions adopted. The parties are not allowed to withdraw their commitment if they feel that the decisions are not in their favor. Anyway, the arbitrator is neither more or less than a private judge of a private court called an arbitral tribunal which gives a private judgment called an award. The arbitrator is not an investigator but a person before whom material is placed by the parties (Waltson, 1979, 110-11). It is necessary to have in mind that the arbitrator is chosen and paid by the disputants. His powers are only what is given to him by the disputants' agreement.

Arbitration is Applied

One of the basic principles in international arbitration law is that arbitration must include an accurate and clear defining of the dispute in question. And, in cases where the dispute is of a multi of issues then the arbitration agreement should contain a detailed explanation to all issues related to the dispute.

Many disputes are moved to arbitral tribunals to have settlements. In 1966 both Argentina and Chili went for arbitration for their conflict over the borders between both sides. Yemen and Areteria applied arbitration in their conflict over some regional issues and marine borders between both sides when Areteria occupied the Yemeni island "Hunnish Al-Kubra" in 1995 (Alyousifi, 1997, 74-84).

B-1-5- Judicial Settlement

It refers to the settlement of conflicting issues depending on the principles of law (Simpson and Fox, 1959, 43). When all previous methods don't succeed to reach a settlement, then the conflicting parties are subject to international jurisdiction. For this

purpose, the "International Court of Justice" was established to be as a major judicial system of the UN where all states are equally represented. The ICJ is concerned with disputes among states. States which go to the Court are those members of its basic law. The Security Council determines the conditions, for the states which are not members of the basic law of the ICG, which allow these states to bring forward their issues and disputes in front of the court (Alghnaimi,1953, 176).

Since its founding, the ICG has dealt with many disputes all over the world (Alghafari, 2002, 138). One of these disputes is the English–Iranian conflict over oil. Iran nationalized the Anglo-Iranian oil company. England, in turn, brought its claim to the ICG in June 22nd, 1951. The court, in 1952, announced that the issue is not of its specialization (ibed, 305). The court also issues advisory opinions. States or individuals have no right to ask the court for its advisory opinion (Alyousifi, 1997, 91). One of such recent practice was the issue of the "Isolation Wall" in the occupied territories in Palestine. One of the recent major developments in the course of the Arab-Israeli conflict was the Israeli decision to build a cement wall around Gaze Strip and other parts of the areas occupied in 1967. Palestine presents its issue to the Security Council which in turns ask the ICG for its advisory opinion concerning the problem. The advisory opinions have no authority over the conflicting parties to comply with them.

It is important to notice that all conflicting parties have to agree in advance to go to the court and accept its resolutions (Fawq Aladah, 1973, 369). If they haven't agreed upon presenting the issue to the court, the issue is impossible to be submitted to it. The advisory opinions of the court can only be given upon the request of the Security Council, the General Assembly, other agencies of the UN, or any international specialized organization.

B-2- Non-Peaceful Conflict Resolution Mechanism

B-2-1 Sanctions

Sanctions are collective actions against a state that is accused of violating the international law. It is used to get that state to comply with the will or the decisions of the international community (Daoudi and Dajani, 1983, 5). Under Article 41 of the UN Charter, the Security Council may call upon Member States to apply measures not involving the use of armed force in order to maintain or restore international peace and security. Such measures are commonly referred to as sanctions (Ramsbothman, 1995, 1). The Security Council has invoked Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter to impose sanctions in sixteen cases: Afghanistan, Angola, Ivory Coast, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ethiopia and Eritrea, Haiti, Iraq, Liberia, Libya, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Somalia, South Africa, Southern Rhodesia, Sudan and the former Yugoslavia (Internet Ed. 31.7.2006). Throughout most of modern history, economic sanctions have preceded or accompanied war. Sanctions often have taken the form of a naval blockade intended to weaken the enemy during wartime. Sanctions were incorporated as a tool of enforcement in each of the two collective security systems established in this century- the League of Nations between the two world wars and the United Nations since World War II (Daoudi and Dajani, 1983, 56). But individual countries, especially the United States, often use economic sanctions unilaterally. Economic sanctions were relatively effective tools of foreign policy (Daoudi and Dajani, 1983, 125).

Many instances of sanctions are there. In the case of Iraq, economic sanctions were waged simultaneously by the United Nations and the United States, resulting in the most comprehensive siege against the country. The Security Council issued on August 6th, 1990 Resolution 661 which imposed economic sanctions on Iraq, including a full

trade embargo barring all imports from and exports to Iraq, excepting only medical supplies, foodstuffs, and other items of humanitarian need, as determined by the Security Council sanctions committee, which was also established by Resolution 661 (Internet Ed. 31.7.2006). Other resolutions were issued according to the developments of events. Sanctions against Iraq were lifted by the United Nations on May 22, 2003. United States' sanctions were not lifted until July 29, 2004, a few days shy of fourteen years of economic warfare. Libya also was another case where sanctions were imposed upon. The first resolution was Resolution 748 of 31 March 1992 which imposed an arms and air embargo and a reduction of Libyan diplomatic personnel serving abroad. Resolution 883 of 11 November 1993 tightened sanctions on Libya. In this resolution, the Security Council, among other items, approved the freezing of Libyan funds and financial resources in other countries and banned the provision to Libya of equipment for oil refining and transportation (Internet Ed. 31.7.2006). Sudan also experienced sanctions. By Resolution 1054 of 26 April 1996, the Security Council decided that, unless Sudan complied with its demand to extradite the three suspects wanted in connection with the 26 June 1995 attempted assassination of President Hosni Mubarak of Egypt and to stop supporting terrorist activities, limited diplomatic sanctions would be placed on Sudan. As of 10 May 1996 sanctions were imposed against Sudan. Member States were required to reduce the number of Sudanese diplomatic personnel and restrict the entry/transit of Sudanese Government officials in their respective countries. More resolutions were raised concerning Sudan then. And a lot of examples are there of economic sanctions which will continue practice its effect (Internet Ed. 31.7.2006).

B-2-2- The Use of Military Force

When available peaceful techniques fail to resolve a conflict or when one of the conflicting parties refuse to comply with the resolutions reached, the international community will move the conflict toward Chapter VII of the UN's charter. Nations depend on the use of force or threats as the ultimate means to secure and maintain their interests and objectives or to avoid aggression by other nations (Smith, 1972, 432).

Why Disputes Among States?

In most cases of conflicts, states get involved in conflicts with one another about some part of territory or other possessions. States are usually directed by some factors that cause conflicts to rise (Northedge and Donelan, 1971, 70-83). The key factor is interests and honour. Interests, whatever they are, political, economic or cultural—are mainly the basic motive of disputes. Strong or Great powers always try to impose their domination on the resources of the universe to keep controlling the globe. Honour or dignity of a state is a fundamental stone in conflicts. Some states might count its concession over a certain possession as a matter of dignity though it realizes it must get it back to the other party. The reputation for power is another motive of conflicts among states. States see that abandoning a thing for another side as a loss of reputation to that state and a gain to the other. States, nowadays as always, are highly concerned about their prestige—reputation for power. A third motive for conflicts among states is security. The issues of security are at the top priorities of states. The United States justifies its military operations as well as its attempts of regime change as a preventive action to ensure its national security and to secure its interests in other parts of the world. When Iraq invaded Kuwait in 1990, the United States got afraid that Iraq is going to control the wells of oil in the region. Also, Iraq was always claiming having developed weapons especially nuclear weapons that might threaten the security of the

United States in the area. At that time, ex-president "Saddam Hussein" announced his willingness to exchange his oil against the Euro not the Dollar and that's something the United States will not allow to take place easily. The decision was to get Iraq out of Kuwait. Then the United States worked to isolate Iraq from the world by imposing the sanctions. And it felt that the Iraqi regime is not a pro-American, so the United States decided to attack Iraq to have a regime change to guarantee the security of its interests in the area and to ensure the flow of oil to the United States and its allies in the west.

Power is also a factor in arising conflicts. As states possess more power, it is more likely that these states will use the threat of using their force to achieve their ambitions and to put their hands over scarce resources to dominate the international market. The United States, the Great power, attempts to dominate the world. Power is the primary factor for achieving its goals. It has military bases in different parts of the world to be able to deal with any threat against its interests. The United States exercises its power all over the world, especially after the disintegration of the Soviet Union, as an effort to achieve the United States' quest for world leadership and then controlling the world. It became the world police since then.

However, even when states tend to use military force or launch a war, it is a diplomacy. War is the other face of diplomacy. When all possible peaceful techniques fail, then nations attempt to gain their goals through war. So, war is an attempt to gain which diplomacy fails to gain. But the start of a war doesn't mean the end of diplomacy. Diplomacy exists even during war or conflict to try to reduce the friction or escalation of present situation (Shalabi, 1997, 37).

C- Helping Tools of Conflict Resolution Mechanisms

C-1- Early Warning

Early warning is a critical part of conflict prevention and management. It aims to serve human security, national or state interests by providing the Government and officials by continuous and timely reports and facts about the surroundings and how things go on here and there. Also, early warning systems should provide the state with possible future predictions that might help in building state's strategy and to take potential preventive measures. It requires a co-operative effort at international, regional, national and local levels. No single state or organization can do it alone or retain a monopoly over it. Early warning information needs to be timely, accurate, valid, and reliable. The purpose of early warning is the formulation of strategic options directed at taking preventive action (Cahill, 2000, 243).

Early warning models differ in terms of their objective, structure, manner in which data is collected, and mandate of the monitoring authorities. When choosing a methodology each system has to determine whether to use short-term or long-term indicators, take a qualitative or quantitative approach, or collect generic vs. specific information. Most of these choices have to be adapted to the specific context of the region where the data is collected, as well as to the availability and reliability of information. In addition to, the task of setting up an early warning structure is far from simple. It requires a comprehensive and exhaustive strategy for the employment of the mechanisms. Early warning projects should prioritize putting in place short-term systems that can provide information on the most immediate threats of the escalation (ibed, 247).

However, effective preventive strategies rest on three principles: early reaction to signs of trouble, a comprehensive balanced approach to alleviate the pressures, or risk factors that trigger violent conflict ;and an extended effort to resolve the underlying root causes of violence. In order for early warning systems to function properly, they must be integrated into the international framework preferably the UN system. However, even more importantly they have to be visible for local politicians and elites in order for them to access the information and address the situation themselves. The goal of early warning systems may be conceived as avoiding deprivation or humanitarian crises that threaten the sustainability of human development. Human development implies improving quality of life through expanding human and social capital as required to adapt to change and better satisfy human needs such as those for security, identity, valued relationships and effective participation (Cahill, 2000, 244). Reliable early warnings buy time not only to prepare for short-term containment and relief strategies, but also to design, build support for and implement long-term proactive strategies and development programs that can reduce the likelihood of future disasters. An early warning system is more than the flow of information and reports from those on the ground regarding highly visible or rapidly escalating crises. More than that, early warning systems can generate analyses that identify key factors driving the instability, providing a basis from which to assess likely future scenarios, and recommend appropriate options for local and international policy makers oriented toward preventive action. They also should keep track of what preventive strategies have been used in what context in the past, to what effect and at what cost. Such analyses improve the reliability of conflict early warnings, and can be used to build political will and coalitions among potential responders for appropriately designed preventive action, at a fraction of the cost of reactive humanitarian and peace-keeping initiatives. Boutros

Boutros Ghali, the former UN Secretary General, in his agenda for peace called for enhancing international early-warning systems to assess the threats for peace and prepare for the necessary actions to be taken to get rid of such threats to peace (Cahill, 2000, 244-53).

Eventually, early warning is a precondition for timely response and, therefore, also for the development of the political will to respond—although the provision of early warning in itself is an insufficient precondition to effect response. Early warning must be designed to anticipate rather than predict possible outcomes. Early warning should therefore enable the responsible authority to initiate informed and reasonable response strategies (Cahill, 2000, 244) In order to promote effective preventive diplomacy, policy makers need to know a number of facts about the potential real cost of conflict, the risks and effectiveness of preventive action, and the mechanisms and ways by which prevention can be implemented.

C-2- Fact Finding

Fact finding refers to a mechanism in which a neutral third party examines documents and interviews witnesses to determine what happened, so parties can then determine the appropriate course of action (Alghafari, 2002, 136). Fact finding merely provides the party or parties an understanding of what, at least one neutral observer would conclude, had occurred. The fact finder's job is to weigh the relative credibility of the witnesses and documentary evidence, to reach a conclusion as to what happened. It is then up to the party or parties to decide what, if any, legal consequences arise from those facts. A fact finding mission (FFM) is a group of individuals assembled at the request of the Secretary-General, the Security Council, the General Assembly, other UN bodies or the parties in the conflict for the purpose of investigating a situation of potential violent conflict, a current crisis, or other problems affecting one or more

member states. The mission is concerned about gathering information as much as possible about the issue in hand (Ramcharan, 1982, 6-7). Typically, FFMs perform functions such as consulting with various stakeholders, reviewing previous agreements for compliance and presenting comprehensive reports of findings. Disputes can occur over a seemingly endless variety of issues, and each kind of dispute carries unique challenges and management strategies (Ramcharan, 1982, 1). A successful fact-finding effort results in a determination of how much agreement has been achieved, where facts remain in dispute and where there are irreducible unknowns and uncertainties, in addition to establishing some hard facts. It is unreasonable to expect that all the relevant facts can be absolutely determined. It may also be unreasonable to expect that all involved people will understand either the established facts or their implications. In order for decisions to be made, these parties must be given a clear picture of the information by utilizing the best methods of factual communication (Ramcharan, 1982, 15). Yet, in addition to enabling understanding and comprehension, diplomacy must also be used. Fact finding missions are likely to achieve their most effective impacts in conflict prevention to the extent that there is consent and co-operation of the parties, perception of objectivity and good investigative skills of members. Fact finding missions are less likely to be successful if, among other things, parties perceive the FFM as an investigation, they believe they may be indicted or states perceive it as a challenge to their sovereignty.

Chapter Three

Chapter Three

Applying A Conflict Resolution Strategy

A- Defining Conflict Resolution

A-1- What Is A Conflict?

A-2- What Is Conflict Resolution?

A-3- Types Of Conflicts

A-4- Sources Of conflicts

A-5- Power And Conflict

A-6- What Affects The Course Of Conflicts?

A-7- Land As A Source Of Conflicts

B- Applying A Conflict Resolution Strategy

B-1- Five Strategies

B-1-1- Avoiding Strategy

B-1-2- Accommodating Strategy

B-1-3- Competitive Strategy

B-1-4- Collaborative Strategy

B-1-5- Compromising Strategy

C- Choosing A Strategy

C-1- Which Strategy To Choose

C-2- The Arab-Israeli Conflict(A Suggested Strategy For Arab negotiators)

Chapter Three

Applying A Conflict Resolution Strategy

A- Defining Conflict Resolution

A-1- What Is A Conflict?

Conflict is a general feature of human activity and it is towards its more general aspect. A conflict exists when two sides wish to carry out acts which are mutually inconsistent (Nicholson, 1970, 2). They may both want to do the same thing. Therefore, a conflict must be defined in terms of the wants or needs of the parties involved. The desires of a nation which motivates its actions are based ultimately on needs or obligations, but these sets of needs and obligations are justifiable only within their own self-contained system. No form of conflict can be understood unless the internal organized structure of the conflicting units is understood. (Raport, 1974, 12). Conflict requires at least two parties or two analytically distinct units or entities. Conflict arises from position scarcity and resource scarcity (Smith, 1972, 8). Position scarcity is a condition in which an object cannot occupy two places at the same time, an object cannot simultaneously serve two different functions, a role cannot be simultaneously occupied or performed by two or more actors, and different prescribed behaviors cannot be carried out simultaneously. But resource scarcity is a condition in which the supply of desired objects is limited so that parties cannot have all they want of anything. Here, it has to be taken into consideration that gains for one party result either from a net loss to the other party or from one party's having less of what he wants than he would have had in the absence of opposition. Conflict requires interaction among parties in which actions and counteractions are mutually opposed. Also, it is necessary to notice that a conflict cannot exist without action. Threats are a key form of actions. At the same time,

conflict relations are crucial to be taken into account as they always involve attempts to gain control of scarce resources and positions or to influence behavior in certain directions; hence a conflict relationship always involves the attempt to acquire or exercise power or the actual acquisition or exercise of power. Power is defined as control over decisions as the basis of reciprocal influence between or among parties. (Smith, 1972, 9). Conflict relations constitute a fundamental social–interaction process having important consequences. Also, a conflict process or relation represents a temporary tendency toward disjunction in the interaction flow between parties. It is considered that all conflict between states is intervention. (Ayoob, 1978, 1). A state cannot fire bullets or rockets across a border without intervening in the domestic affairs of another state. Wars between neighbors are far more likely to occur, and are more convenient to prosecute when they do occur, than wars between non-neighbors. To sum up, a conflict can be seen as a situation in which two or more parties desire goals which they perceive as being obtainable by one or the other but not both. Therefore, as "Ross Stagner" says: in a conflict there must be at least two parties; each party is mobilizing energy to obtain a goal, a desired object or situation; and each party perceives the other as a barrier or threat to that goal. (Mitchell, 1981, 15). Moreover, conflict refers to actual behavior. The behavior is aimed at least at preventing the opposing party preventing one from reaching one's own goals (ibed, 15). Conflict may be as a situation in which the conflicting parties are incompatible about potential future positions. Each party then is concerned to occupy a position that is incompatible for the other side (Carlston, 1946, 5). It is a problem for parties involved in a conflict to decide when to give up. In other words, how to make peace or arriving decision to compromise through negotiation (ibed, 165). Therefore, termination of conflict refers to the process where at least one party in a conflict decides to stop the coercive action and go for some sort of

settlement strategy (Mitchell, 1981, 105). Conflict then is the perceived incompatibility of goals, actions, and/or outcomes.

A-2- What Is Conflict Resolution?

Conflict resolution as a subject deals with interventions in relations between states and peoples. Trying to determine the exact meaning of conflict resolution, then a wide range from deterrent strategies and star wars, through power-bargaining techniques, normative and legal approaches to psychological attempts to change attitudes of participants are to be in mind (Azar and Burton, 1986, 40-41). In order to reach an accurate definition of the term "conflict resolution", it has to be taken into account other related terms like "conflict settlement", "peace building" and "preventive diplomacy" which need to be explained. Conflict resolution is a means to arrive some solution to end a conflict (Mitchell, 1981, 274). Whereas, preventive diplomacy is usually used in the international arena and refers to efforts of outside nations or groups of nations (for example, the UN) to prevent the escalation of conflicts between or within other nations. Although potentially effective, often nations feel that they should not intervene in the internal affairs of others if the situation has not yet become frightening. By that time, preventive measures are likely to be impossible. Conflict prevention is also useful in smaller-scale conflicts. To the extent that the parties can control complicating factors from the outset, define the conflict as a mutual problem rather than a competitive or win-lose situation, and utilize a strategy that depends most on integrative and exchange approaches more than force, the conflict is likely to be more productive than destructive (Mitchell, 1981, 254). Once escalation sets in and other complicating factors develop, the strategy must change from conflict prevention to conflict management or resolution, which is generally considerably harder to accomplish successfully. Conflict Prevention is particularly favoured as a means of preventing human suffering and as an alternative to costly politico-military operations to resolve conflicts after they have broken out (Mitchell, 1981, 263). Although preventive diplomacy is a well-tried means of

preventing conflict, and is still the primary political measure preventing and resolving conflicts. United Nations' experience in recent years has shown that there are several other forms of action that can have a useful preventive effect including: preventive deployment; preventive disarmament; preventive humanitarian action; and peace-building undertaken in preventive context. These can involve, with the consent of the Government or Governments concerned, a wide range of actions in the fields of good governance, human rights and economic and social development. Conflict resolution or peacemaking refers to the use of diplomatic means to persuade parties in conflict to cease hostilities and to negotiate a peaceful settlement for their dispute. As with preventive action, the United Nations can usually play a role as its Charter includes that it would take what possible measures to settle or end conflicts and to spread peace. Peacemaking thus excludes the use of force against one of the parties to enforce an end to hostilities (Mitchell, 1981, 280). While, conflict settlement denotes outcomes in which the overt conflict has been brought to an end, even though the underlying bases may or may not have been addressed. It implies the consequence of compliance—a change in behavior. Also, conflict resolution denotes as an outcome a state of attitude change that effectively brings an end to the conflict in question. It implies internalization—a more profound change, of underlying attitudes as well as behavior. But peace-building refers to activities aimed at assisting nations to cultivate the promotion of peace before during and after conflict.

A-3- Types Of Conflict

Different types of conflict can be distinguished and noticed. Firstly, conflicts within persons and conflicts between persons or groups. Secondly, realistic conflicts which are characterized by opposed means and ends, by incompatibility of values and interests. Thirdly, realistic conflicts which arise from the need for tension release, and from deflected hostility, from historical tradition, and from ignorance or error. Fourthly, induced conflicts where representatives of conflicting groups have ends to be gained. Fifthly, institutionalized and non-institutionalized conflicts. Institutionalized conflicts have explicit rules, predictable behavior, and continuity. Non-institutionalized conflicts are not organized or regular. They appear in sometime as a reflection to certain circumstances. Racial conflicts are clear examples of non-institutionalized conflicts. War between armies is an example of an institutionalized conflicts. It is organized and planned (Smith, 1972, 10-11). Also, there are violent conflicts and diplomatic conflicts. Other types of conflicts include conflicts of right and conflicts of interest. Moreover, an ideological conflict is another type which is characterized by a clash of conceptions of the desirable and perspective norms and beliefs which do or should govern particular behaviors. Besides, a cultural conflict refers to conflicts between cultures, depending on the nature of the contracts which might include conflicting ideologies, religions, interests, rights and all other types mentioned before (Smith, 1972, 10-11).

A-4- Sources Of Conflicts

Conflicts arise due to certain preconditions. Position and resource scarcity are among the necessary preconditions. Other sources include tension and ignorance (Smith, 1972, 12-13). Sources of conflict extend to include a wide range of levels: political, economic, social, educational, technological, geographical, industrial, ideological and cultural. But there are three main motives to conflicts (Smith, 1972, 12). First, the desire for

acquisition of scarce values—political or power conflict. Second, the desire to convert others—ideological conflict. Third, the desire to prevent contact with inferiors—racist conflict. In addition to, economic factors have their considerable position in the emergence of conflicts. Therefore, rising living standards and national economic growth contribute to peace among nations (Dougherty and Pfaltzgraff, 1971, 213).

A-5- Power And Conflict

It is clear that there is a strong relationship between power and conflict. One party strength is a factor in the general relationship between party characteristics and conflict interaction. When a state possesses power and strength, it tends to deploy its power to achieve its desirable goals and expansion interests. The power-relations component of any conflict system consists of the respective bases of effective influence on which the parties can operate and the allocation of control over decisions which occur during the interaction. (Smith, 1972, 29). Also, power plays a significant role in reaching an end to a conflict. A clear example of such effect of power is the international community intervention to resolve the Gulf Crisis which took place because of the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait in 1990. The UN gave the international community legitimacy to use force to withdraw Iraqi army from the land of Kuwait. Accordingly, a coalition was formed under the leadership of the United States and Britain, and the coalition succeeded to get the Iraqi army out of Kuwait. But, it is shameful that such act is not recommended or adopted to end the Arab-Israeli conflict.

On the other hand, power plays a role in producing conflicts. The Arab–Israeli conflict which is one of the old, more complicated and historic conflicts is the legacy of the Great Powers at the time. Britain gave the Jews the right, protection and help to live in Palestine and establish their state through what is known as "Belfour Declaration" in 1917 (Ayoob, 1978, 248).

A-6-What Affects The Course Of Conflicts?

Whatever the conflict is, there are a lot of variables that affect the course of a conflict. The primary factor of these variables is the characteristics of the parties involved in the conflict. You should know their values and motivations; their aspirations and objectives; their physical, intellectual, and social resources for waging or resolving conflicts; their beliefs about the conflict, including their conceptions of strategy and tactics, and so forth (Smith, 1972, 37). Another factor is related to the conflicting parties' prior relationship to one another. You have to take into account their attitudes, beliefs, and expectations about one another including the beliefs about the other's view of oneself. A third variable is the nature of the issue giving rise to the conflict. Fourth, the social environment within which the conflict occurs. A fifth variable to focus on is the interested audiences to the conflict. The attention is given to their relationships of the parties in conflict and to one another, their interests in the conflict and its outcomes and their characteristics. Sixth, the strategy and tactics employed by the parties in the conflict. At last, the consequences of the conflict to each of the participants and to other interested parties. The concentration will be paid to the gains or losses relating to the immediate issue in conflict.

A-7- Land As A Source Of Conflicts

Land is the basic non-living resource of conflict. Human populations need to possess their own land to have their states on, to live, to build their cities and so on. And as populations grow, the need for more land will be evident and there will be fierce competition to add more land. Nowadays, whenever you look you find a conflict on the issue of borders. Shortages of land have been at the root of almost all wars throughout human history. It has been argued that perhaps one of the most important underlying causes of World War I was the pressure of population, that is, a need for land, in central

Europe (Westing, 1986, 7-8). This source of conflict contributed a lot to the Middle East dilemma that is the Arab–Israeli conflict. Europe was busy to find a place to be given to the Jewish people to establish their state on. But at the main time, Europeans appeared as trying to have the Jews out of the continent of Europe. They had different choices, but they found that the land of Palestine the solution so aids were directed toward Jewish organizations to help them come to Palestine. Then, Britain issued "Belfour Declaration" which includes the promise for the Jews to settle down in Palestine as it was under the British mandate at the time. Since then the world is in the face of an complicated conflict. This clearly illustrates the contribution of land for the emergence of conflicts.

B- Applying A Conflict Resolution Strategy

Having identified your own positions, then you are willing to select a strategy for the negotiation process with the other party. There is no one defined strategy that suits all issues and problems. The nature of the issue, the relationships between the involved parties, and the parties' concern of outcomes may play a role in deciding which strategy to choose (University Lectures, 2005). Each situation determines the strategy to be applied. Then each strategy is applied to a particular set of circumstances and has its own advantages and disadvantages (University Lectures, 2005). Therefore, each conflict requires a certain strategy based on the nature of the conflict and the parties engaged.

However, it is essential to take into consideration the factors that affect the choice of which strategy. The first factor is the relationship between the parties. The past and future relationship is important in deciding which strategy (Fisher and Ury, 1981, 38). Each party should decide if maintaining a good relationship with the other party is important or not. At the main time, a set of factors affect the importance of the relationship between the two parties. One factor is that if there is a relationship at all. Another factor is whether that relationship is generally positive or negative. Then, whether a future relationship is desirable or not. Also, the length and history of the relationship if it exists is a major factor. Besides, the level of and commitment to the relationship is an important factor. Another factor is the degree of interdependence in the relationship. The last factor is the amount and extent of free and open communication between the parties concerned (Fisher and Ury, 1981, 38).

The second factor affecting choosing a strategy is the parties' concern of the outcome. It is important to decide if the outcome is important regardless other relations or you care about both relationship and outcome (University Lectures, 2005). During preparation and planning for the coming negotiation, each party puts its own priorities

and decide in advance his concern whether on maintaining the relationship or achieving the outcome you want.

B-1- Five Strategies

Having examined these two factors, it is easier which strategy to use. There are five distinct strategies: Avoiding, Accommodating, Competitive, Collaborative and Compromising strategy.

B-1-1- The Avoiding Strategy

Avoiding or lose-lose strategy is used when negotiations are costly in time, money, and relationships. Here the negotiator sees negotiation as a waste of time. It is called a loss in terms of the outcome and the relationship. Parties avoid certain bargains when there is another bargain they can go to (Carlston, 1946, 3-8). This strategy has a possibility when a party can pursue a very strong alternative outcome (University Lectures, 2005). So, when a party reaches the point that he is not concerned about either the outcome or the relationship or when he realizes that it is not fruitful, then such strategy will be the option. The negotiator here is to postpone until a later time dealing with the conflict in anticipation of some type of resolution which is not eminently available.

B-1-2- The Accommodating Strategy

It is also called a lose-win strategy. Here, the negotiator, when he is more concerned about the relationship more than the outcome, applies this strategy in his negotiation process (University Lectures, 2005). The negotiator then is mainly interested in building, improving or strengthening a relationship. The outcome is not a priority for this strategy. Therefore, if a party wants something in the future from the other party, he will focus on maintaining a good relationship regardless the outcome. The purpose of a negotiator through applying this strategy is to encourage a more interdependent

relationship (University Lectures, 2005). It is expected that accommodation now will help create a better opportunity to achieve the goals in the future.

B-1-3- The Competitive Strategy

It is a win-lose strategy. Here, the concern over the outcome is more important than the relationship. The negotiator here wants to achieve as much as possible of preferred outcomes. So, each party is mainly concerned with the outcome. The relationship here doesn't matter for several reasons. One reason is that there will be a one-time negotiation without future relationship. Another reason is when the future relationship is not important. Also, when the relationship exists but it is poor to enhance or to start with. Then, when the other party has a reputation for hard bargaining or dishonesty, such strategy is more suitable (University Lectures, 2005). This strategy of negotiation emphasizes the differences between the parties. The negotiator's goal here is to get the other party give in. The win-lose approach is the one that many people believe to be the best. Unfortunately, it can be very destructive. People learn the win-lose approach very early in life. It has been taught that it is better to be a victor than a loser who withdraws in shame. But, the loser will be preparing very carefully for the next round. In the long run, everyone loses with this approach.

However, some factors in a competitive strategy should be examined. First, a well-defined bargaining range should be taken into account. The bargaining range of a party consists of a starting point, a target, and an ending or walk away point. Second, a good alternative is an option that can be pursued if the current negotiation fails. Alternatives interact with walkaway points to influence the choices one party makes (University Lectures, 2005). Third, tactics are a characteristic of a competitive strategy.

At the same time, a number of drawbacks of using a competitive strategy may arise. A major problem of such strategy is that its usage by inexperienced or untrained

negotiators (University Lectures, 2005). Time and good will may be lost if the competitor anticipates that the other party will be competitive and prepares a competitive strategy.

B-1-4- The Collaborative Strategy

It is a win-win strategy. Both parties consider the relationship and the outcome are equally important (University Lectures, 2005). The negotiators might begin with compatible goals so that both sides can gain. The relationship between the parties concerned is an ongoing one. Also, the parties trust each other and know that they can work together. Both parties are interested in establishing long term goals for particular outcomes and for the relationship (University Lectures, 2005). To apply this strategy, both parties must be willing to use it. To work well, collaborative strategy requires a high degree of trust, openness, and cooperation. The parties involved look for common needs and goals. This strategy requires extra time and creativity to build trust and find win-win solutions. Negotiators are in front of some keys that lead to successful collaboration. The first key is commitment. Both parties should be committed to understanding the other party's needs and objectives, providing a free flow of information, and finding the best solution to meet the needs of both sides (University Lectures, 2005). Good collaboration requires not only understanding the other party's stated objectives but also their underlying needs. Also, both parties must be willing to share information. Then, both parties should work hand in hand toward achieving mutual goals that will satisfy both of them (University Lectures, 2005). Here, differences have to be minimized and similarities emphasized and maximized.

On the other hand, there are some obstacles in the face of having a collaborative strategy. One party might not recognize the situation as potential for collaboration. One party is concerned about reaching his own ends. And, when one party is historically

competitive this might make collaboration difficult to reach. Also, if one party expects the other to be competitive and prepares for negotiation depending on this expectation. Moreover, when a party is not ready to take the time to search for collaborative items is another difficulty for collaborative strategy. Then, when the negotiation includes competitive and collaborative issues, it is difficult to apply collaborative strategy. At the same time, communication is of major importance when you are trying to establish a collaborative relationship (University Lectures, 2005). The win-win approach is a conscious and systematic attempt to maximize the goals of both parties through collaborative problem solving. The conflict is seen as a problem to be solved rather than a war to be won.

B-1-5- The Compromising Strategy

In this strategy, each party has to allocate its priorities in terms of the relationship with the other party and the needed outcomes. One of its key merits is that each party gains. It requires less effort than other strategies. It is an acceptable second choice. It is an effective and of high speed strategy. The key evident feature of this strategy is that it offers some gain on both the relationship and the outcome for both parties involved (University Lectures, 2005). Moderate amounts of cooperativeness and assertiveness are required to make a compromise (Mitchell, 1981, 200). The party compromising expects that the outcome will be a partial fulfillment of the needs, concerns, and goals of both parties to the conflict. Both search for a mutually acceptable, partially satisfying solution.

C- Choosing A Strategy

C-1- Which Strategy To Choose

As it is mentioned before, choosing a strategy is determined by the nature of the conflict and the relationship between the conflicting parties. Therefore, two main factors are important to be examined in deciding which strategy. First, if the outcome is important. Second, if the relationship is important. Also, there are a lot of other factors that play a role in choosing the suitable strategy. One of them is the situation of the issues in conflict. Here, it is crucial to study the conditions that make each strategy effective. The type and situation of the conflict is important as each strategy has its own advantages and disadvantages. Also, the personal preferences should be taken into account. A negotiator has to understand his party's preferences (University Lectures, 2005). Here, each party's goals, priorities and limits are important. In addition to, the negotiator's experience is a key factor that forms his preferences (University Lectures, 2005). The negotiator's experience and knowledge of the issues in conflict will help the party achieves the anticipated outcomes. Moreover, it is helpful to decide the style that interacts with the style of the other party. Besides, the party's perceptions and past experience with the other party is of a key effect. At the end, some negotiators might adopt a "no strategy" choice. When a negotiator doesn't want to exhaust himself in planning and preparing a negotiating strategy, then this choice might be the alternative. This choice has some advantages for the negotiator. It allows him know a lot of the opponent party. It also keeps him away from a commitment to one strategy (University Lectures, 2005). This choice is the choice of lazy negotiators. The other party has the opportunity to gain some advantage over the opponent.

C-2- The Arab–Israeli Conflict (A Suggested Strategy For Arab–Negotiators)

The most important concept known about this conflict and the parties involved is that the relationship is the last thing both sides concern of though Israel have recently worked hard to have good relations with its Arab negotiators. Their main concern is how to gain over the other side. Both sides are highly interested in the outcomes rather than the relationship. Each side tries to get as much as possible for his own possession. Even politically each side does its best to gain the support of the international community, the international public opinion and the key actors on the international and regional levels. Having recognized and reached this point, then a competitive approach is suggested for the Arabs. Through past and recent developments of the Arab-Israeli conflict, one can recognize that Israelis look for protecting themselves whatever the cost and regardless of other parties concerned. Security issue is the main factor for Israelis. Normalization, so other goals can be served, economic and opening markets to Israelis' goods and investments. Also, through revising peace conferences and negotiation sessions between the Arabs and the Israelis, one can then know how the Israelis are hard negotiators whose concern is to get much and give little.

Chapter Four

Chapter Four

The Arab-Israeli conflict: A Protracted Conflict

A-1- A Protracted Conflict

A-2- Background

A-3- A Legacy Of Colonization

B- Military Confrontations

B-1- War Of 1948

B-1-1- UN Resolution 194

B-2- War Of 1956

B-3- War Of 1967

B-4- War Of 1968

B-5- War Of 1973

B-6- War Of 1978

B-7- War Of 1982

B-8- Israeli Attacks Of 2006 On Lebanon

C- Diplomatic Efforts And Initiatives

C-1- The Partition Resolution

C-1-1- Reactions To The Plan

C-2- 1949 Arab-Israeli Cease-Fire Agreements

- C-2-1- Egypt
- C-2-2- Lebanon
- C-2-3- Jordan
- C-2-4- Syria
- C-3- The Road Map
- C-4- Roger's Initiative
- C-5- Kissinger Initiative
- C-6- The Camp David Initiative Of 1978
- C-7- Egypt-Israeli Peace Treaty
- C-8- Jordan-Israel Peace Treaty
- C-9- Camp David 2000
- C-10- Madrid Peace Conference Of 1991
- C-11- Oslo Agreements Of 1993
 - C-11-1- Principles Of The Agreements
- D- Who Is Responsible For Peace In The Middle East?
- E- The Conflict Shrinking
- F- Israel Is Winning

Chapter Four

The Arab-Israeli conflict: A Protracted Conflict

A-1: A Protracted Conflict

The Arab-Israeli conflict is a clear example of protracted conflicts. The word protracted implies that something is on-going and irresolvable. Protracted conflicts have certain characteristics that give them such name. First, a protracted conflict has some features that account for their prolonged nature like shortage of economic and technological development. Second, the denial of human needs is a key source of such conflicts. Third, ethnic and communal differences are important factors related to the rise of protracted conflicts. Fourth, the lack of security, identity and recognition play a role in the existence of protracted conflicts. However, in order to reach a resolution for such conflicts, it is essential to have a face-to-face exploration into the needs of the opposing parties and the ways and means of satisfying them (Azar and Burton, 1986, 28-39).

A-2: Background

The Arab-Israeli conflict is a long-running conflict in the Middle East which is sometimes referred to it as the Middle East issue. Actually, the conflict has been the focus of world wide media and diplomatic attention for decades. The conflict is sometimes seen by some Arab scholars as a part of a wider clash of civilizations between the Western World and the Arab and Muslim World. More countries outside the Arab world, in one way or another, are involved in the conflict. In fact, many reasons stand behind this feeling such as cultural and religions ties with Islam and or Arab culture, Christianity, Judaism, or for ideological or strategic reasons. The United states and Iran are clear examples for such involvement in the conflict.

However, the Arab-Israeli conflict is one of the most complex problems of the twentieth century. Palestine was under the Ottoman Empire rule since 1517. In the early beginnings of 1880, immigration of Jews from East Europe was encouraged to settle in Palestine. After the collapse of the Ottoman Empire, Palestine became under the British mandate (Hadawi, 1967, 55). During this critical period, the dispute still between the two sides and reached its peak in the 1940s. The Arab Palestinians were forced to leave their land. They immigrated to the neighboring Arab countries in their search for security and home (Alrfou', 1990, 22).

The history of Palestine goes back 5000 years ago. Its inhabitants were the Arab Canaanites immigrated to Palestine from the Arabia. Britain, at that time, worked as if Palestine is part of its territories (ibed, 1990, 43). The end of the First World War resulted in the collapse of the Ottoman Empire, thus the countries of the Ottoman Empire were in the hands of the victories. It was decided, in Paris Peace Conference in 1919, to put the Ottomans territories under mandate. As a result, Palestine became under the British mandate.

A-3: A Legacy of Colonization

The Arab-Israeli conflict is clearly considered by the Arabs as a legacy of the colonial systems. Colonization played a major role in growing up the conflict as Britain issued Balfour Declaration in 1917. After putting Palestine under the British mandate according to the Paris Peace Conference in 1919 and according to the Charter of the League of Nations at the time, the British government made all its possible efforts to help the Jews have their state in Palestine. The mandate government paved the way for the Jews to settle in Palestine (Hadawi, 1968, 19).

The British helped the Jewish gangs to control as much land as possible. They also closed their eyes in front of the crimes the Jews committed to frighten the original

people to force them leave their native land. The British mandate reign was useful and fruitful for the Jews. The British government didn't stop at these actions, it also issued what is known as "Balfour Declaration" (Hadawi, 1968, 19). This declaration was a promise from Britain to establish a national state for the Jews in Palestine (Alrfou', 1990, 41). The declaration which was issued in 1917, was as a knife in the back of the Arabs. By issuing that declaration, Britain ignored the rights of the Arabs in Palestine. This attitude exemplify the policy of the Western World toward the Eastern World, particularly the Arabs. Since then, the West hasn't stopped fueling the wheels of the Jewish state. Israel was provided with all necessary aids and projects a state needs. It was supplied with modern weapons. Even the weapon of mass destruction, including the nuclear weapon Israel owns it. Thus, the attitude of Israel will be difficult to be changed. Having a nuclear power means a strong role to affect and influence what is going on around you and to protect you from outside threats. This makes Israel more consistent to its previous policies as she knows that no state has or will it be allowed to have the possibility to own or produce nuclear weapons (Alsharabi, 1975, 65). In conclusion, the Jews would not be able to come and live in Palestine unless they have been protected by he Great Powers, especially the British mandate and now the USA ignoring the Palestinians' rights.

B- Military Confrontations

Since the end of the British mandate in 1946, many military actions occurred between both conflicting parties-Arabs and Israelis. The Arab-Israeli conflict became a major international issue after the collapse of the Ottoman Empire in 1917, and in various forms it continues to this day. The Arab-Israeli conflict has resulted in at least eight major wars and a number of minor conflicts. It has been the source of two major Palestinian uprisings. The Arab-Israeli conflict began before the establishment of the state of Israel during the period of the British rule (1917-1948). Several violent outbreaks occurred during this period: riots of 1920 in Palestine, Jafa riots of 1921, riots of 1929 in Palestine, great Arab uprising 1936-1939. Since the United Nations partition of Palestine in 1947 and the establishment of the modern state of Israel in 1948, there have been eight major Arab-Israeli wars (1948, 1956, 1967, 1968, 1973, 1978, 1982, and 2006) and numerous intermittent battles. Although Egypt and Israel signed a peace treaty in 1979, hostility between Israel and the rest of its Arab neighbors was complicated by the demands of Palestinian Arabs for an independent state in the occupied territories by Israel. However, these wars have come to nothing to end the suffering of both parties concerned, especially the Palestinians. The international community, the key actors and both sides of the conflict gain nothing except violence, insecurity and instability in the Middle East. Therefore, during and after every period of tension because of the conflict, the international community interferes to have peaceful settlements as violence will not help any party.

B-1: War of 1948

The 1948 Arab-Israeli War, known as the Israeli War of Independence or Al-Nakba, 1948-1949, began after the British withdrawal and the declaration of the State of Israel on May 14, 1948 (Hurley, 1999, 46). The 1948 Arab-Israeli War is the first in a series

of armed conflicts fought between Israel and its Arab neighbors in the ongoing Arab-Israeli conflict. For Palestinians, the war marked the beginning of the events referred to as (al-Nakba) (Hurley, 1999, 51-52). The Arabs had rejected the November 1947 UN Partition Plan, which proposed the establishment of Arab and Jewish states in Palestine. Jewish and Arab militias had begun campaigns to control territory inside and outside the designated borders. Joint Jordanian, Egyptian, Syrian, Lebanese, and Iraqi troops invaded Palestine. Then, the Security Council attempted to stop the war and called for a four-week truce. During the truce, the Israeli government improved its military position and capability in violation of the truce terms. Fighting then resumed and lasted for only ten days and was stopped by a second truce ordered by the Security Council. The war of 1948 was concluded by four agreements signed by Israel with Egypt on 24 February 1949, with Lebanon on 23 March 1949, with Jordan on 3 April 1949, and with Syria on 20 July 1949 (Cattan, 1976, 23-24).

At that period, many efforts of conciliation were offered to settle the dispute. Mediation was applied by the UN in an attempt to end the conflict. But, all the efforts made including the Conciliation Commission for Palestine, which was appointed by the UN to discharge the functions of the mediator, failed. Israel refused to allow the Palestinian refugees to return to their homes. Israel's attitude toward the issues of territory, refugees, and Jerusalem was the real blockage to reach a settlement (Cattan, 1976, 25).

As a result, the region was divided between Israel, Egypt and Jordan. The attacks on the state of Israel by Arabs had three lasting effects. First, they led to the formation and development of Israeli underground militias, primarily the Haganah, which were to prove decisive in 1948. Secondly, it became clear that the two communities could not

be reconciled, and the idea of partition was born. Thirdly, the British responded to Arab opposition with the White Paper of 1939, which severely restricted Jewish immigration.

B-1-1: UN Resolution 194

In December 1948, the UN General Assembly passed Resolution 194 which declared (amongst other things) that in the context of a general peace agreement "refugees wishing to return to their homes and live in peace with their neighbors should be permitted to do so" and that "compensation should be paid for the property of those choosing not to return" (Hadawi, 1968, 57).

The first war began as a civil conflict between Palestinian Jews and Arabs following the United Nations recommendation of Nov. 29, 1947, to partition Palestine, then still under British mandate, into an Arab state and a Jewish state (Aladaylah, 2005, 118-119). Fighting quickly spread as Arab guerrillas attacked Jewish settlements to prevent implementation of the UN plan.

Jewish forces prevented seizure of most settlements, but Arab guerrillas, supported by the Transjordanian Arab forces under the command of British officers, besieged Jerusalem. By April, Haganah, the principal Jewish military group, seized the offensive, scoring victories against the Arab Liberation Army in northern Palestine, Jaffa, and Jerusalem. British military forces withdrew to Haifa; although officially neutral, some commanders assisted one side or the other (ibed, 2005, 120-121).

After the British had departed and the state of Israel had been established on May 15, 1948, under the premiership of David Ben-Gurion, the Palestinian Arab forces and foreign volunteers from outside Palestine were joined by regular armies of Transjordan (now the Kingdom of Jordan), Iraq, Lebanon, and Syria, with token support from Saudi Arabia. Efforts by the UN to stop the fighting were unsuccessful until June 11, when a 4-week truce was declared. When the Arab states refused to renew the truce, ten more

days of fighting erupted. In that time, Israel greatly extended the area under its control and broke the siege of Jerusalem. Fighting on a smaller scale continued during the second UN truce beginning in mid-July, and Israel acquired more territory, especially in Galilee and the Negev. By January 1949, when the last battles ended, Israel had extended its frontiers by about 5,000 sq km. It had also secured its independence. During 1949, truce agreements were signed under UN auspices between Israel and Egypt, Jordan, Syria, and Lebanon. The truce frontiers were unofficial boundaries until 1967 (Aladaylah, 2005, 125).

B-2: War of 1956

The 1956 Suez War was a joint Israeli-British-French operation, in which Israel invaded the Sinai Peninsula. British and French forces landed at the port of Suez to separate the warring parties though the real motivation of Britain and France was to protect the interests of investors in those countries who were affected by Egyptian president Nasser's decision to nationalize the Suez Canal (Hurley, 1999, 56). Israel justified its invasion of Egypt as an attempt to stop attacks upon Israeli civilians especially by the Fedayeen. Israel also attempted to restore Israel shipping rights through the Straits of Tiran, which Egypt claimed was within its territorial waters. The invading forces agreed to withdraw under the United States and international pressure, and Israel withdrew from Sinai as well, in return for the installation of U.N. separation forces and guarantees of Israel freedom of shipment (Hurley, 1999, 56). The Canal was left in Egyptian rather than British and French hands (Syed, 1965, 24-26). Anyway, border conflicts between Israel and the Arabs continued despite provisions in the 1949 truce agreements for peace negotiations. Thousands of Palestinian Arabs who had left Israeli-held territory during the first war concentrated in refugee camps along Israel's frontiers and became a major source of friction when they went back to their homes or

attacked Israeli border settlements. A major tension point was the Egyptian-controlled Gaza Strip, from which Arab guerrillas attacked southern Israel. Egypt's blockade of Israeli shipping in the Suez Canal and Gulf of Aqaba intensified the hostilities (Hurley, 1999, 56). However, these escalating tensions accompanied with the Suez Crisis caused by the nationalization of the Suez Canal by Egyptian president Gamal Abd An-Naser. Great Britain and France actively objected to Nasser's policies, and a joint military campaign was planned against Egypt with the understanding that Israel would take the initiative by seizing the Sinai Peninsula. The war began on Oct. 29, 1956, after an announcement that the armies of Egypt, Syria, and Jordan were to be integrated under the Egyptian commander in chief (Hadawi, 1968, 96). Israel's forces reached the eastern bank of the Suez Canal in about 100 hours, seizing the Gaza Strip and nearly all the Sinai Peninsula (Hurley, 1999, 56). The Sinai operations were supplemented by a British-French invasion of Egypt on November 5, giving the allies control of the northern sector of the Suez Canal. Then, as usual, the war was stopped by a UN General Assembly resolution calling for an immediate cease-fire and withdrawal of all occupying forces from Egyptian territory. The General Assembly also established a United Nations Emergency Force (UNEF) to replace the allied troops on the Egyptian side of the borders in Suez, Sinai, and Gaza. By December 22 the last British and French troops had left Egypt. Israel's forces were not withdrawn from Gaza until March 1957 (Hurley, 1999, 56).

B-3: War of 1967

On 5 June 1967, Israel launched a large aggression attack on Egypt, Syria and Jordan. It was a short war of only six days (Hurley, 1999, 56). During that period, Israel occupied Jerusalem, the West Bank and Gaza Strip, the Sinai peninsula, and the Golan

Heights (Cattan, 1976, 26). Actually, Israel's occupation of the territories of three Arab States and her refusal to withdraw from them created a new explosive situation (Holbraad, 1979, 76-77). Since then, all diplomatic efforts concentrated upon securing Israel's withdrawal from the territories she seized in 1967. The evident result of that war, was that the Middle East crisis got more complicated than before as more issues and parties are involved. This added another obstacle in the face of the effect to settle the crisis in the area. In the following decade, the Suez Canal remained closed to Israeli shipping, the Arab boycott of Israel was maintained, and periodic border clashes occurred between Israel, Syria, and Jordan. However, UNEF prevented direct military encounters between Egypt and Israel.

By 1967, the Arab confrontation states-Egypt, Syria, and Jordan-became impatient with the status quo, and border incidents increased. Tensions reached its peak in May when Egyptian forces gathered in Sinai, and Cairo ordered the UNEF to leave Sinai and Gaza (Hadawi, 1968, 6-7). Believing that war was inevitable, Israeli leaders approved preemptive Israeli strikes at Egyptian, Syrian, Jordanian, and Iraqi airfields on June 5, 1967. By the evening of June 6, Israel had destroyed the effectiveness of the major Arab air forces. Israel also swept into Sinai, reaching the Suez Canal and occupying most of the peninsula in less than four days (Hadawi, 1968, 100-101). His Majesty late King Hussein rejected an offer of neutrality and opened fire on Israeli forces in Jerusalem on June 5. But a lightning Israeli campaign placed all of Arab Jerusalem and the Jordanian West Bank in Israeli hands by June 8 (Mutawi, 1987, 126-27). As the war ended on the Jordanian and Egyptian fronts, Israel opened an attack on Syria in the north. In a little more than two days of fierce fighting, Syrian forces were driven from the Golan Heights, from which they had fired Jewish settlements across the border. The Six-Day War ended on June 10 when the UN negotiated cease-fire agreements on all fronts.

However, The Six-Day War increased several fold the area under Israel's control (Hurley, 1999, 57). Through the occupation of Sinai, Gaza, Arab Jerusalem, the West Bank, and Golan Heights, Israel shortened its land frontiers with Egypt and Jordan and temporarily increased its strategic advantages with the neighboring Arab states. But the addition of more than 1,500,000 Palestinian Arabs to areas under Israeli control threatened internal security.

B-4: War of 1968

Al Karameh is a town in Jordan, near the Allenby Bridge which divides the Jordan River. The river defines the border with territory controlled by Israel. Karameh was also the battle ground for one of the main events in the history of the Palestinian national movement. In 1968, the city served as the political and military headquarters of the Palestinian al-Fatah movement (Almoussa, 1998, 33-34). Israeli military forces entered the city in search of the Palestinian leadership, which the Israelis labelled as terrorists. Supporters of the Palestinians characterize it as an event in which the heavily armed and technologically advanced Israeli military was defeated and forced to retreat, suffering a blow to their reputation while heartening the Palestinian resistance to Israel. For the Palestinians, therefore, Karameh was seen not as a victory in battle, but survival against the majority-an event that placed Palestinians back on the political map (ibed, 1998, 36). Supporters of Israel, by contrast, characterize the battle as a successful operation in which the number of terrorists killed outweighed the number of Israeli soldiers killed. Jordanian army succeeded to prove the capability to defeat the enemy through loyalty, courage, faith and creed.

B-5: War of 1973

Ramadan war as it is called by the Arabs started on 6 October 1973. The Arabs aimed from this war to achieve two clear objectives. Firstly, the Arabs hoped to get back the territories occupied in 1967. Secondly, the Arab countries wanted to restore the rights of Palestinians. It was also aimed from the war to get back a morale target for the Egyptian army after the defeat of 1967 (Cattan, 1976, 29-30). As it is known, Israel was the dominant military power in the region for the next six years. Israel was generally satisfied with the status quo, but Arab leaders repeatedly warned that they would not accept continued Israeli occupation of the lands lost in 1967. After Anwar Al-Sadat succeeded Nasser as president of Egypt in 1970, threats were more frequent, as was periodic gathering of troops along the Suez Canal. Egyptian and Syrian forces underwent massive rearmament with sophisticated Soviet equipment. Sadat consolidated war preparations in secret agreements with President Hafez Al-Assad of Syria for a joint attack and with King Faisal of Saudi Arabia to finance the operations (Elizabeth and Farrar-Hockey, 1975, 14).

Therefore, Egypt and Syria attacked on Oct. 6, 1973, pushing Israeli forces several miles behind the 1967 cease-fire lines (Hurley, 1999, 58). Israel was hit easily and successfully, partly because the attack came on the Day of Atonement, the most holy Jewish religious day. Although Israel recovered from the initial setback, it failed to regain all the territory lost in the first days of fighting. In counterattacks on the Egyptian front, Israel seized a major bridgehead behind the Egyptian lines on the west bank of the canal. In the north, Israel drove a wedge into the Syrian lines (Amos, 1979, 1-2). After 18 days of fighting in the longest Arab-Israeli war since 1948, hostilities were again stopped by the UN. The costs were the greatest in any battles fought since World War II. The three-week war cost Egypt and Israel about \$7 billion each, in materiel and

losses from declining production or damage. The political phase of the 1973 war ended with disengagement agreements accepted by Israel, Egypt, and Syria after negotiations in 1974 and 1975 by the United States Secretary of State Henry A. Kissinger. The agreements provided for Egyptian reoccupation of a strip of land in Sinai along the east bank of the Suez Canal and for Syrian control of a small area around the Golan Heights town of Kuneitra. UN forces were stationed on both fronts to oversee observance of the agreements (Hurley, 1999, 58). Under an Egyptian-Israeli peace treaty signed on March 26, 1979, Israel returned the Sinai peninsula to Egypt. Hopes for an expansion of the peace process to include other Arab nations declined, however, when Egypt and Israel were subsequently unable to agree on a formula for Palestinian self-rule in the West Bank and Gaza Strip. In the 1980s tensions were increased by conflicts between Israeli authorities and Palestinians in the occupied territories, by Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) guerrilla attacks on Israeli settlements in Galilee, and by Israeli retaliatory attacks into Lebanon.

The PLO was seen as the key winner of that war. The General Assembly of the UN called it in October 1974 to take part in the sessions of the General Assembly. Another gain was in November 1974 when the General Assembly also invited the PLO to present in the General Assembly's sessions as a monitor (Alhamad, 1997, 296).

B-6: War of 1978

On March 15, 1978, Israel launched Operation Litani, occupying the area south of the Litani River, excepting Tyre, with over 25,000 soldiers. Its stated goals were to push Palestinian militant groups, particularly the PLO, away from the border with Israel, and to enhance Israel's ally at the time, the South Lebanon Army (ibed, 1997, 309). During the 7-day offensive, the Israeli Defence Forces first captured a belt of land

approximately 10 kilometres deep, but later expanded north to the Litani river. The PLO retreated north of the Litani River, continuing to fire at the Israelis.

In response to the invasion, the UN Security Council passed Resolution 425 and Resolution 426 calling for the withdrawal of Israeli forces from Lebanon (Alhamad, 1997, 309). The UN Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) was created to enforce this mandate, and restore peace and sovereignty to Lebanon. UNIFIL forces arrived in Lebanon on 23 March 1978, setting up headquarters in Ras Naqoura. Then, Israeli forces withdrew later in 1978.

B-7: War of 1982

On June 6, 1982, Israel launched a full-scale invasion of Lebanon to destroy PLO bases there and to end the attacks across its borders. Meeting little resistance, Israeli commanders pushed northward, reaching the outskirts of Beirut within a week (Rayen, 1984, 1). Fighting with Syrian forces also erupted; a number of Syrian MiGs and missile batteries in the Bekaa Valley were destroyed without loss of a single Israeli plane (Rite, 1984, 61-62). By the end of June, Israel had captured most of southern Lebanon and besieged PLO and Syrian forces in West Beirut. The siege ended through U.S. mediation in August, when Israel agreed to leave Beirut provided Syrian and PLO forces also withdrew. A multinational force from the United States and Western Europe supervised the Syrian and PLO departure of Lebanon. Then, Israel signed an agreement with Lebanon ending the state of war in May 1983, but Lebanon renounced the pact under Syrian pressure in March 1984. Anyway, two major factors led to the invasion of South Lebanon. First, the formal American state of hostility to Palestinian nationalism was a key factor. Second, some Israeli group who reached authority and aimed to annihilate the Palestinian National Movement (Rayen, 1984, 2). However, it is crucial

to take into account that the United States did nothing to prevent the Israeli invasion of Lebanon. On the other hand, the United States continued to flow its support and weapons to Israel (Rayen, 1984, 22).

B-8: Israeli Attacks of 2006 on Lebanon

Though there are many interacting factors, the immediate issue that lies behind the latest Israeli invasion of Lebanon remains, as it is believed, what it was in the preceding invasions: the Israel-Palestine conflict. In the most important case, the devastating US-backed 1982 Israeli invasion was openly described in Israel as a war for the West Bank, undertaken to put an end to annoying PLO calls for a diplomatic settlement with the secondary goal of imposing a friendly regime in Lebanon. Despite the many differences in circumstances, the July 2006 invasion falls generally into the same pattern.

Hezbollah, a major threat to the security of Israel, must be severely weakened or destroyed, just as the PLO had to be thrown away from Lebanon in 1982. But, Hezbollah is too deeply embedded within Lebanese society. An expected benefit for the United States and Israel was to enhance the credibility of threats against Iran by eliminating a Lebanese-based deterrent to a possible attack. Much as in Iraq, and elsewhere, the Bush administration planners have created disasters, even for the interests they represent.

The July 2006 invasion was justified by legitimate outrage over capture of two Israeli soldiers at the border. The United States and Israel, and the West generally, have little objection to capture of soldiers, or even to the far more severe crime of kidnapping civilians or of course to killing civilians. That had been Israeli practice in Lebanon for

many years, and no one ever suggested that Israel should therefore be invaded and largely destroyed. But one might ask: why the international community wasn't effectively engaged to stop the invasion? Really, the attacks destroyed Lebanese infrastructure and Lebanese civilians were killed and injured which show the Israeli over reaction to the capture of the two soldiers just as the United States when it is attacked inside it overreacts outside. In fact, the international community was so late after huge losses to the economy of Lebanon. This shows the unjust attitudes of the international community which is controlled and directed by the only hegemony world power-America. Israel wants from this invasion to get the attention of the international community to the threats because of the existence of Hezbollah. Israel succeeded as the international community led by the United States started to call Hezbollah and Syria to stop their actions on the lands of Lebanon. And inside Lebanon, some groups started to call for the disarmament of Hezbollah.

C- Diplomatic Efforts and Initiatives

The diplomatic activity has accompanied the Middle East crisis since its emergence. The diplomats of the region and that of the main actors on the international level were and are always engaged and concerned with the developments of the crisis. The need for peaceful diplomatic effort is as a result for the awful violence occurring because of the conflict. Ensuring security and stability in the region and the concern of the international actors to maintain their interests and objectives are other related factors that make the international community interested in having diplomacy to play its influence to settle the conflict and enjoy stability. However, since the existence of the conflict, many initiatives were and are still put forward to help both conflicting parties live in peace and security. Anyway, all the parties concerned recognize that diplomacy is much more better to take place rather violence. But, are the initiatives being put forward neutral and dedicated directly to end the conflict. In fact, some of such diplomatic efforts being offered now and then are not totally neutral as they are sometimes intended to help one party rather the other or to maintain the interests of some of the key actors and Great Powers which prevent some efforts from being changed into a real success to settle the tension between the conflicting parties.

C-1: The Partition Resolution

One of the early attempts to settle the conflict and reduce the favor of violence between both sides involved in the conflict is the Resolution of the Partition of Palestine into Arab and Jewish states under the United Kingdom mandate (Alhoor and Almousa, 1986, 23). The resolution was adopted by the General Assembly of the UN on November 29th 1947 (Kahng, 1969, 77-80). The plan partitioned the territory of Western Palestine into Jewish and Arab states, with the Greater Jerusalem area, encompassing Bethlehem, coming under international control. The failure of the British

government and the United Nations to implement this plan and its rejection by first the Palestinian Arabs and then Israel resulted in various wars, starting with the 1948 Arab-Israeli War (Hadawi, 1968, 39). Following the adoption of the plan, Arab countries proposed to query the International Court of Justice on the competence of the General Assembly to partition a country against the wishes of the majority of its inhabitants (Cattan, 1976, 26). Meeting in Cairo in November and December of 1947, the Arab League then adopted a series of resolutions aimed at a military solution to the conflict. The land allocated to the Arab state consisted of all of the highlands, except for Jerusalem, plus one third of the coastline (Hadawi, 1968, 39). While the Jewish state was to receive 55% of Mandatory Palestine. In the north, this area included three fertile lowland plains (Hadawi, 1967, 39). The UN General Assembly made a non-binding recommendation for a three-way partition of Palestine into a Jewish State, an Arab State and a small internationally administered zone including the religiously significant towns Jerusalem and Bethlehem (Hadawi, 1968, 42).

C-1-1: Reactions to the plan

The majority of the Jews and Jewish groups accepted the proposal, in particular the Jewish Agency, which was the Jewish state-in-formation. A minority of extreme nationalist Jewish groups which had been fighting the British, rejected it. The Arab leadership in and out of Palestine opposed the plan, arguing that it violated the rights of the majority of the people in Palestine, which at the time was 67% non-Jewish and 33% Jewish. Arab leaders also argued a large number of Arabs would be trapped in the Jewish State as a minority. While some Arab leaders opposed the right of the Jews for self-determination in the region, others criticised the amount and quality of land given to Israel (Hadwi, 1968, 40).

On the other hand, Great Britain refused to implement the plan arguing it was not acceptable to both sides. It also refused to share with the UN Palestine Commission the administration of Palestine during the transitional period, and decided to terminate the British mandate of Palestine on May 15th, 1949 (Alhamad, 1997, 468-469).

C-2: 1949 Arab-Israeli Cease-Fire Agreements

The 1949 Cease-Fire Agreements are a set of agreements signed during 1949 between Israel and its neighbors Egypt, Jordan, Lebanon, and Syria. The agreements ended the 1948 Arab-Israeli War, and established the armistice lines between Israel and the West Bank (Hadawi, 1968, 49-50)

C-2-1: Egypt

The agreement with Egypt was signed on February 24. The agreement included several key points. The truce line was drawn along the international border dating back to 1906 for the most part, except near the Mediterranean Sea, where Egypt remained in control of a strip of land along the coast, which became known as the Gaza Strip (Hadawi, 1967, 140). Egypt was forced to sign the agreement because of the successive defeats they suffer and all Arabs as well. Israel aimed from this agreement to reach a peace treaty with the biggest Arab power which in turn will actually affect the attitude of the Arab countries (Alaqad, 1968, 106). Israel knows that any decision taken by Egypt might be adopted by other countries.

C-2-2: Lebanon

The agreement with Lebanon was signed on March 23 and included that the truce line was drawn along the international border (Hadawi, 1968, 52). Unlike the other agreements, there was no clause disclaiming this line as an international border, which was thereafter treated as it had been previously, as a de jure international border. Israel

withdrew its forces from 13 villages in Lebanese territory, which were occupied during the war.

C-2-3: Jordan

The agreement with Jordan was signed on April 3. It included that Jordanian forces remained in most positions held by them in the West Bank, particularly East Jerusalem which included the Old City. Jordan withdrew its forces from their front posts. In return, Israel agreed to allow Jordanian forces to take over positions in the West Bank previously held by Iraqi forces (Hadawi, 1968, 52). The agreement as other agreements was intended to establish for a future peaceful settlement (Alaqad, 1968, 123).

C-2-4: Syria

The agreement with Syria was signed on July 20. Syria withdrew its forces from most of the territories it controlled west of the international border, which became demilitarized zones (Hadawi, 1968, 52). The truce agreements were intended to serve only as interim agreements, until they would be replaced by permanent peace treaties. However, no peace treaties were actually signed until decades later.

Excepting the agreement with Lebanon, the truce agreements were clear (at Arab insistence) that they were not creating permanent or de jure borders.

C-3: The Road Map

It is one of the key initiatives that is proposed to reach a settlement regarding the Arab-Israeli conflict. The Road Map is based on a permanent two-state solution to the Arab-Israeli conflict. This recent diplomatic initiative was put forward as a joint venture by the United States, the European Union, the United Nations and Russia during the second half of 2002. The Road Map is composed of five concepts: gradualism,

reciprocity, comprehensiveness, multilateralism and the goal of a final status agreement by 2005. However, the Road Map is composed of three phases. Phase one starts from the declaration of the initiative to May 2003. In this phase, both parties are toward normalizing the security and humanitarian situation. Palestinians are required to end planning violent attacks on Israelis. Whereas, the Israelis are required to withdraw progressively from the lands occupied since September 28, 2000. However, both sides should resume security cooperation. Palestinian institution-building is another element in this phase. On the humanitarian front, Israelis are to alleviate conditions in the occupied territories (ICG, M.E.R, May 2003, 2). The second phase starts in June 2003 and ends in December 2003. This phase includes organizing an international conference related to the conflict. The conference aims to help create an independent Palestinian state with provisional borders. Arab States are to begin restoring pre-intifada relations with Israel (ICG, M.E.R, May 2003, 2). The third phase is arranged to take place in 2004 to 2005. In this phase, the focus is on reaching a permanent status agreement. The concern will be toward having a move in the way of achieving a comprehensive Arab-Israeli peace as soon as possible (I CG, 2003, 2-3).

However, no phase of this initiative is totally applied. In terms of the violent attacks on both sides haven't stopped yet. Israel army still exercises military attacks on civilian Palestinian points. On the other side, some Palestinian groups also still attack Israelis. Also, it is noticed that Palestinians made some steps in the government institution-building through appointing a prime minister and having parliamentary elections. The Israelis withdrew from some areas, but they reoccupy such areas from time to time as a reaction to Palestinian attacks. On the second phase, it is essential to take into account that an international conference hasn't been held to settle the conflicting issues. Regarding phase three which implies a final status agreement, such agreement is not

reached. The Road Map requires assistance and encouragement from the Quartet and other main actors in order to achieve its stated objectives. Also, the main actors on the region should be engaged in the process of bringing peace, security and stability to the peoples of the region.

C-4: Roger's Initiative

Roger's initiative is an American attempt for peace in the Middle East. It started off in 1970. This American diplomacy at that time succeeded in stopping the Egyptian war of attrition against Israel. It also aimed in containing the Palestinian armed struggle and resistance. It was thought that the initiative is to build up the foundations and conditions to set up peace in the region (Brecher, 1974, 478-79).

However, the Americans didn't succeed to fulfill their promise in the establishment of peace and Egypt was told that the way toward is closed (Arab Thought Forum, 1985, 17). Therefore, the Arab-Israeli war in 1973 was as a message and reminder to the United States of its unfulfilled promise for peace. The American diplomacy announced this initiative after feeling that the ex-USSR is building strong relations with the Arabs, especially Egypt which was supplied with developed military equipment. The United States wanted to stop the Soviet's expansion in the Middle East to ensure its interests in the region (Alhoor and Almousa, 1986, 121).

C-5: Kissinger Initiative

This is another American attempt and promise concerning the Arab-Israeli conflict. This initiative is also known as a 'step-by-step' peace (Arab Thought Forum, 1985, 17). Apparently, this promise is not really directed for peace, but the Americans wanted to give Israel the time to recover their wounds and absorb the shock they suffered during the 1973 war. It helped Israel to prepare for its attack on Lebanon in 1978.

C-6: The Camp David Initiative of 1978

The Camp David initiative of 1978 came in the form of the superpowers cooperation to have a peace conference in Geneva to be attended by all the parties involved (Arab Thought Forum, 1985, 17). As the initiative turned out, it is meant to set the scene for the 1982 Israel invasion of Lebanon and strike at Syrian armed forces. As it is seen, the American efforts during the Arab-Israeli conflict were not mainly designed for peace but for Israel's favor. One can notice that The United States interferes and suggests a peace initiative only when Israel is trapped and can't get out of a situation (Hurley, 1999, 77). The treaty succeeded, as Israel and the Great Powers aimed, to keep Egypt away of its Arab nations by signing a peace treaty with the enemy. Sinai was under the American occupation through what is known as multinational forces. Tiran and the Aqaba Gulf were considered international open water isles. Israel was the winner from the treaty while Egypt in fact lost (Alhamad, 1997, 478).

C-7: Israel-Egypt Peace Treaty

The Israel-Egypt peace treaty was signed in Washington, DC, United States, on March 26, 1979, following the Camp David Agreements (1978) (ibed, 1997, 478). The main features of the treaty were the mutual recognition of each country by the other, the ending of the state of war that had existed since the 1948 Arab-Israeli War, and the withdrawal by Israel of its armed forces and civilians from the Sinai Peninsula which Israel had captured during the 1967 Six-Day War. The agreement also provided for the free passage of Israeli ships through the Suez Canal and recognition of the Stait of Tiran and the Gulf of Aqaba as international waterways.

The agreement notably made Egypt the first Arab country to officially recognize Israel. The peace treaty was signed sixteen months after Egyptian President Anwar

Sadat's visit to Israel in 1978 after intense negotiation. Even after the landmark Camp David agreements, there was no certainty that a treaty would be signed. Egypt was under intense pressure from Arab countries not to sign a separate peace treaty.

C-8: Jordan-Israel Peace Treaty

It was signed on October 26, 1994 between the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan and the State of Israel. Jordan was always afraid of the concept of the alternative nation as some Israelis suggest. Jordan finds in the treaty maintenance for its territory and sovereignty through international insurance (Ibrahim, 2003, 98). However, a number of interlocking factors made Jordan sign the peace treaty with Israel. Firstly, the PLO signed secretly Oslo agreements in 1993 which gives Jordan the legitimate umbrella to have a peace agreement with Israel, especially when the only legal representative of the Palestinian people entered the circle of peace. Secondly, policy-decision makers in Jordan wanted to get back economic aids for their country especially by the United States. Thirdly, Jordan finds such treaty a means to ensure security where he has the longest line of confrontation with Israel (Aladaylah, 2005, 206-208). The treaty determines the issues of borders and sovereignty (Dirasat Sharq Awsat, 2002, p. 44-47).

C-9: Camp David 2000

The Middle East Peace Summit at Camp David of July 2000 took place between United States President Bill Clinton, Israeli Prime Minister Ehud Barak, and later Palestinian Authority Chairman Yasser Arafat. It was an ultimately unsuccessful attempt to negotiate a "final status settlement" to the Arab-Israeli conflict.

President Clinton announced his invitation to Barak and Arafat on July 5, 2000, to come to Camp David to continue their negotiations on the Middle East peace process.

Building on the positive steps towards peace of the earlier 1978 Camp David where Jimmy Carter tried to have a peace agreement between Egypt, represented by President Anwar Sadat, and Israel represented by Prime Minister Menachem Begin. In 2000, US President Bill Clinton convened a peace summit between later Palestinian President Yasser Arafat and Israeli Prime Minister Ehud Barak (Omar Alfarra, 2001, 273). The Israeli prime minister, Ehud Barak reportedly offered the Palestinian leader approximately 95% of the West Bank and Gaza Strip, as well as Palestinian sovereignty over East Jerusalem, but Prime Minister Barak proposed that 69 Jewish settlements which comprise 85% of the West Bank's Jewish settlers be left to Israel. He also proposed "temporary Israeli control" indefinitely over another 10% of the West Bank territory-an area including many more Jewish settlements (ibed, 274).

In conclusion, the treaty emphasized what has been agreed upon on Camp David Treaty of 1978 (Ibrahim, 2003, 95). The treaty actually ended the state of war between both sides. It also said that the lasting borders between Israel and Egypt is that borders internationally recognised between Egypt and Palestine during mandate. And the treaty implied that both sides must avoid threatening each other by force (ibed, 274).

C-10: Madrid Peace Conference of 1991

The Madrid Peace Conference was hosted by the government of Spain and co-sponsored by the USA and the USSR. It convened on October 30, 1991 and lasted for three days (ibed, 19). It was an early attempt by the international community to start a peace process through negotiations involving Israel and the Arab countries including Syria, Lebanon, Jordan and the Palestinians. In the aftermath of the 1991 Gulf War, US President George W. Bush and his Secretary of State James Baker formulated the framework of objectives, and together with the Soviet Union extended a letter of

invitation, dated October 30, 1991 to Israel, Syria, Lebanon, Jordan, and the Palestinians (Alhamad, 1997, 484). The US President George Bush, the father, at that time, declared to have a settlement for the Arab-Israeli conflict. He explained that all the countries of the region must live in peace and prosperity (ibed, 1997, 484).

However, the Palestinian team, due to Israeli objections, was initially formally a part of a joint Palestinian-Jordanian delegation and consisted of Palestinians from the West Bank and Gaza. (Omar Alfarra, 2001, 19). The purpose of the conference was to serve as an opening forum for the participants and had no power to impose solutions or veto agreements. It inaugurated negotiations on both bilateral tracks and on multilateral tracks that also involved the international community. The first-ever public bilateral talks between Israel and its neighbors (except Egypt) were aimed at achieving peace treaties between the 3 Arab states and Israel, while the talks with the Palestinians were based on a 2-stage formula, the first consisting of negotiating interim self-government arrangements, to be followed by permanent status negotiations. They opened immediately following the conference on November 3, 1991 in Madrid, and were followed by over a dozen formal rounds in Washington, D.C from December 9, 1991 to January, 1994 (Alhamad, 1997, 485). The multilateral negotiations which opened in Moscow on January 28, 1992 were held in 5 separate forums each focused on a major issue - water, environment, arms control, refugees and economic development, and were later held, until November 1993 throughout the world including European capitals and the Middle East. At first, Israel refused to take part in the refugee and economic meetings as Palestinians from outside the West Bank and Gaza were present. Syria and Lebanon refused to take part in multilateral meetings as long as there was no concrete progress on the bilateral level (ibed, 21). Formal talks in the multilateral track, which had been frozen for several years, resumed on January 31, 2000 with a meeting of the

Steering Committee in Moscow, to be followed by meetings of the working groups. The Israeli-Jordan negotiations eventually led to a peace treaty signed in 1994, while the Israeli-Syrian ones led to several series of negotiations, which came quite close on some reports, but did not result in a peace treaty. The bilateral Israeli-Palestinian negotiations were upstaged and eventually replaced by initially secret negotiations that finally led to the exchange of letters of 9 and 10 September 1993 and the subsequent 13 September 1993 signing in the White House of the Declaration of Principles, which however were essentially based on terms which the Madrid round Palestinian negotiators had earlier rejected.

Actually, Israel cites as a major benefit of the conference and the process, the greatly increased number of countries which recognize and have some degree of diplomatic relations with it-nearly doubling-in particular citing the major powers of China and India and some even in the Arab world, like Oman, Qatar, Tunisia, Morocco and Mauritania, along with the decline of the Arab boycott and economic relations with some of the Arab countries.

C-11: Oslo Agreements of 1993

The Oslo Agreements, officially called the Declaration of Principles on Interim Self-Government Arrangements or Declaration of Principles (DOP), were finalized in Oslo, Norway on August 20, 1993, and subsequently officially signed at a public ceremony in Washington D.C. on September 13, 1993, with Mahmoud Abbas signing for the Palestine Liberation Organisation and Shimon Peres signing for the State of Israel (Ibrahim, 2003, 96). It was witnessed by the United States and Russia, in the presence of US President Bill Clinton and Israel's ex-Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin with the PLO's later Chairman Yasser Arafat (ibed, 2003, 96). The Oslo Agreements were a

group of a series of secret and public agreements, dating particularly from the Madrid Conference of 1991 onwards, and negotiated between the Israeli government and the Palestine Liberation Organization acting as representatives of the Palestinian people in 1993 as part of a peace-process trying to resolve the Arab-Israeli conflict (Ibrahim, 2003, 96).

Despite the high hopes expressed in the Agreements and in the subsequent agreements, which also promised the normalization of Israel's relations with the Arab world, the conflict has not been resolved.

C-11-1: Principles of the Agreements

Mainly, the agreements call for the withdrawal of Israeli forces from parts of the Gaza Strip and West Bank and affirm the Palestinian right to self-government within those areas through the creation of the Palesinian Authority. Palestinian rule would last for a five-year interim period during which a permanent agreement would be negotiated beginning not later than May 1996. Permanent issues such as Jerusalem, refugees, Israeli settlements in the area, security and borders were deliberately excluded from the Agreements and left to be decided. The interim self-government was to be granted in phases (Alhamad, 1997, 492). Until a final status agreement was established, West Bank and Gaza would be divided into three zones:

1. Area A - full control of the Palestinian Authority.
2. Area B - Palestinian civil control, Israeli military control.
3. Area C - full Israeli control.

Together with the principles the two groups signed Letters of Mutual Recognition- The Israeli government recognized the PLO as the legitimate representative of the

Palestinian people while the PLO recognized the right of the state of Israel to exist and renounced terrorism, violence and its desire for the destruction of Israel. The aim of Israeli-Palestinian negotiations is to establish a Palestinian Interim Self-Government Authority, an elected Council, for the Palestinian people in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, for a transitional period not exceeding five years, leading to a permanent settlement based on Resolution 242 and Resolution 338, an integral part of the whole peace process (Omar Alfarra, 2001, 91-92).

In order for Palestinians to govern themselves according to democratic principles, free and general political elections would be held for the Legislative Council. Jurisdiction of the Palestinian Council would cover the West Bank and Gaza Strip, except for issues that would be negotiated in the permanent status negotiations. The two sides viewed the West Bank and the Gaza Strip as a single territorial unit. The five-year transitional period would begin with the withdrawal from the Gaza Strip and Jericho area. Permanent status negotiations would commence as soon as possible between Israel and the Palestinians. The negotiations should cover remaining issues, including: Jerusalem, refugees, settlements, security arrangements, borders, relations and cooperation with other neighbors, and other issues of common interest (ibed, 2001, 92-93).

However, there will be a transfer of authority to the authorised Palestinians, concerning education and culture, health, social welfare, direct taxation, and tourism. The Council would establish a strong police force, while Israel will continue to carry the responsibility for defending against external threats. Also, an Israeli-Palestinian Economic Cooperation Committee will be established in order to develop and implement in a cooperative manner the programs identified in the protocols. And a

redeployment of Israeli military forces in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip would take place. The Declaration of Principles would enter into force one month after its signing. The DOP is another success gained by Israel after putting Egypt away of armed confrontation in 1979. The DOP gets the conflict from its international circle to a regional one (Alhamad, 1997, 496).

C-12- Other Attempts

Having investigated the previous peace efforts, it must be kept in mind that there are many other attempts. Before the 1967 war many settlement projects were put forward. Such attempts include the Norway project of 1952 which aimed to find a peaceful settlement for the conflict, the American Jama project of 1955 which aimed to bridge the gap differences between Jamal Abd AnNasser and Ben Georion, Johnson project of 1953-1955 which aimed to deal with the question of refugees, the Israeli project of 1956 which included making amendments on the truce lines but refusing negotiation upon the basis of the Partition Resolution, and the Tunisian project of 1965 which was based on the Partition Resolution (ibed, 1997, 468-71).

After the 1967 war more projects were offered also. They included Alloun Project of Israel of 1967 which aimed to add more distances in the West Bank to Israel and to consider the River Jordan as a line of border between Jordan and Israel. Then, the Security Council issued Resolution 242 on November 22nd, 1967 and Resolution 338 on October 22nd, 1973 which were both calling for the concept of peace against land.

However, a lot of initiatives were put forward but what is mentioned is not in chronological follow up but for the purpose to examine if diplomacy makes anything for the Arab-Israeli conflict (ibed, 1997, 471-90).

D- Who is responsible for peace in the Middle East?

It is a fact that peace in the Middle East region is not the responsibility of one party rather than the other. Arabs alone are not responsible for establishing the conditions for peace and security in this unstable region. Israelis, Palestinians, Americans, the EU, the UN, Russia, Iran and other actors are responsible to set up the foundations for peace and stability in the region. The right to exist is one of the basic rights of every state (Feinberg, 1971, 129-130). Israelis has to comply with the UN resolutions regarding the conflict. Also, the Americans are required to use their power and diplomacy for the sake of establishing peace and security. Britain and Russia have to be in the side of making comprehensive and just peace as well. The European Union tries to play a role on the international scene. The UN which is sometimes described as a servant for the American's policy is becoming weaker and weaker to apply the provisions of its Charter and the international law in a just manner regarding the issues in conflict. The Arabs have a part of responsibility in getting to peace. Palestinians should reduce the violent attacks on Israelis. They should be hand in hand instead of the state of difference in the strategies and policies. Iran, however, is accused by the international community as trying to encourage the situation of no peace and instability in the region. Iranians are accused of giving support for "Hezbollah" in Lebanon who aims to destroy the state of Israel.

E- The Conflict Shrinking

The conflict is originally known as an Arab-Israeli conflict. After Egypt signed a peace treaty with Israel in 1979, the conflict started to be the concern of some Arab countries. Madrid peace conference of 1991 gave a new shape to the conflict and made the conflict be known as a Palestinian-Israeli conflict. Also, the Palestinians themselves were and are busy in their internal differences over certain political attitudes and views. This difference is clearly evident in the recent developments on the Palestinian front particularly after the latest Palestinian legislative elections through which Hamas got the majority and formed the government. The reaction of Israel and the major power was very negative and they frankly announced measures to be taken to weaken the new government. At this stage, it is felt that the conflict will be in front of another development. It might be a Hamas-Israeli conflict. Ironically, the conflict might be the concern of some group and then some person, who knows?

F- Israel is winning

Through the developments of the Arab-Israeli conflict, Israel gained a lot. In 1947, it got the Resolution of Partition from the General Assembly of the UN. Before that, Britain gave them the most valuable present, "Belfour Declaration". Then, the Israelis imposed by force the truce agreements which gave them more distance than those allocated in the Partition Resolution. Also, they froze the Fedayyeen activities from the Egyptian front. Israel also always enjoys the support of the Great Powers through history. They are up to this moment enjoy the help of key actors on the international level. They gained another success by having a peace treaty with Egypt-the most challenging Arab state to Israel. Israeli diplomacy continued its activity in its search for peace treaties with its Arab neighbors to ensure security and stability. It succeeded to

sign a peace treaty with Jordan. It also succeeded to start negotiation with Palestinians through what is Known Oslo Talks.

RESULTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study is an attempt to find a link between conflicts and violence. Therefore, in the first chapter, it starts with diplomacy and the techniques used to end conflicts. Then it goes through the conflict resolution mechanisms. Also, it explains the conflict resolution strategies used by negotiators. And, it ends in investigating the major developments to the Arab-Israeli conflict.

The study concludes that communities try many techniques to settle their crises. Also, the international community is convinced that violence and wars only bring suffering and seldom help reach a settlement. Moreover, the policy-makers find that diplomacy is much more better and safer than wars and the use of force. In fact, those who still apply the use of force are not totally directing their force for the sake of reaching an end to a conflict but for maintaining their own interests. Diplomacy should be given enough time and opportunity to find its way and to practice its effect on crises. Moreover, peaceful conflict resolution mechanisms should be encouraged and supported to avoid humanitarian disasters caused by wars, the use of force and violence. Furthermore, choosing a strategy to be applied in negotiation is restricted to the circumstances of the issues, the nature of the relationship between the conflicting parties, and their concern for the outcomes. In the case of the Arab-Israeli conflict a competitive strategy is recommended for Arab negotiators.

However, the key actors and the great powers are always slow to interfere to keep justice and to spread peace and security, but most the time the incentive is their own interests. Therefore, having a well-developed weapon like WMD can deter threats. The international community contributes nothing serious regarding the Arab-Israeli conflict as the United States is in the side of the Israelis to ensure balance of power in the region which is rich in oil and other valuable minerals. The international community and the

main actors on the international scene can do nothing unless the United States gives the green light. Therefore, Arabs are invited to be united to gather the efforts to solve their long conflict with Israel. The Israeli state supported by the international movement of Zionism does its best to keep the Arab states separated and not united. It always tries to deal with Arabs individually. It actually succeeded in such approach. To sum up, if diplomacy and peaceful initiatives keep failing to end this global conflict, then it should be taken into account that what is taken by force should be returned by force. The Palestinians are also required to appear united instead of their internal political difference and competition. The focus must be on the core of their rights and state not on winning this position or that.

REFERENCES

ARABIC:

BOOKS:

- إبراهيم، بيسم منسي، (2003). إسرائيل: مؤتمر مدريد للسلام، قيام السلطة الفلسطينية و الاتفاقيات، الانتفاضة و خارطة الطريق. (ط1). عمان: المكتبة الوطنية.
- احمد، محمود حسن، (1997). المفاوضات الدولية: الأسس و النظم. (ط1). دمشق: دار الجليل للطباعة و النشر.
- بحيري، مروان، (1982). الحلف الأطلسي و الشرق الأوسط. (ط1). بيروت: مؤسسة الدراسات الفلسطينية.
- بركات، جمال، (1985). الدبلوماسية: ماضيها و حاضرها و مستقبلها. الرياض: مطابع الفرزدق التجارية.
- بو عشة، محمد، (1999). التكامل و التنازع في العلاقات الدولية الراهنة: دراسة المفاهيم و النظريات. (ط1). بيروت: دار الجيل.
- حسن، غازي، (1986). الوجيز في الدبلوماسية المعاصرة: دراسة قانونية. الدوحة: المطبعة الأهلية.
- الحمد، جواد، (1997). المدخل إلى القضية الفلسطينية. (ط1). عمان: دار البشير للنشر و التوزيع.
- خلف، محمود، (1997). النظرية و الممارسة الدبلوماسية. (ط2). عمان: دار زهران.
- الدباغ، ضرغام عبدالله، (1985). قوة العمل الدبلوماسي في السياسة. (ط1). بغداد: المؤلف.

- رايت، كليفورد أ.، (1984). آلة الحرب الإسرائيلية في لبنان. في: مؤسسة الدراسات الفلسطينية (محرر)، الاجتياح الإسرائيلي للبنان-1982: دراسات سياسية و عسكرية. (ط1). (ص 57-86). قبرص: شركة الخدمات النشوية المستقلة المحدودة.
- راين، شيلا، (1984). الاجتياح الإسرائيلي للبنان: خلفيات الأزمة. في: مؤسسة الدراسات الفلسطينية (محرر)، الاجتياح الإسرائيلي للبنان-1982: دراسات سياسية و عسكرية. (ط1). (ص 1-24). قبرص: شركة الخدمات النشوية المستقلة المحدودة.
- الرضا، هاني، (1997). الدبلوماسية: تاريخها قوانينها و أصولها. (ط1). بيروت: دار المنهل اللبناني.
- الرفوع، فيصل عودة، (1990). في العلاقات الدولية: السلام المنشود. (ط1). عمان: المؤلف.
- زايد، محمد بدر الدين، (2003). المفاوضات الدولية بين العلم و الممارسة. القاهرة: مكتبة الشروق الدولية.
- شباط، فؤاد، (1968). الدبلوماسية. دمشق: مطابع ألف باء الأديب.
- شبانه، عبد الفتاح، (2001). الدبلوماسية: القواعد الأساسية، الممارسة العملية، المشكلات الفعلية. (ط1). القاهرة: مكتبة مديولي.
- الشرابي، هشام، (1975). الدبلوماسية و الاستراتيجية في الصراع العربي الإسرائيلي. (ط1). بيروت: الدار المتحدة للنشر.
- الشكري، علي يوسف، (2004). الدبلوماسية في عالم متغير. (ط1). القاهرة: ايتراك للنشر و التوزيع.
- شلبي، السيد أمين، (1997). في الدبلوماسية المعاصرة. (ط2). القاهرة: عالم الكتب.

- صادق، حيدر بدوي، (1996). مستقبل الدبلوماسية في ظل الواقع الإعلامي و الاتصال الحديث: البعد العربي. (ط1). (العدد 5). أبو ظبي: مركز الإمارات للدراسات و البحوث الاستراتيجية.
- عبد المجيد، احمد، (1969). أضواء على الدبلوماسية. القاهرة: مكتبة الانجلو المصرية.
- عبد المحسن، رباب يحيى، (2005). كامب ديفيد: خروج مصر إلى التيه. (ط1). القاهرة: مكتبة مدبولي.
- العضايبة، نضال، (2005). الحداثة و التطور في التربية الوطنية: تاريخ الأردن السياسي (1920-2004). (ط1). الكرك: مركز يزيد للخدمات الطلابية.
- العقاد، صلاح، (1968). قضية فلسطين: المرحلة الحرجة (1945-1956). القاهرة: معهد الدراسات العربية العالية.
- "عمر الفرا"، محمد علي، (2001). السلام الخادع-من مؤتمر مدريد إلى انتفاضة الأقصى (1991-2000م). (ط1). عمان: مجدلاوي.
- الغفاري، علي عبد القوي، (2002). الدبلوماسية القديمة و المعاصرة. (ط1). دمشق: الأوائل للنشر و التوزيع و الخدمات الطباعة.
- الغنيمي، محمد طلعت، (1953). التسوية القضائية للخلافات الدولية. (ط1). القاهرة: مطبعة البرلمان.
- فوده، عز الدين، (1989). النظم الدبلوماسية. (ط2). القاهرة: مكتبة الآداب.
- فوق العادة، سموحي، (1973). الدبلوماسية الحديثة. (ط1). بيروت: دار اليقظة العربية للتأليف و الترجمة و النشر.
- كتن، هنري، (1970). فلسطين في ضوء الحق و العدل. (ط1). بيروت: مكتبة لبنان.

- مجدلاوي، فاروق، (2004). *الدبلوماسية الوقائية في المسألة العراقية في ضوء الهيمنة الاميركية على الهيئات و المنظمات الدولية*. (ط1). عمان: دار روائع مجدلاوي للنشر و التوزيع.
- محمد، ثامر كامل، (2000). *الدبلوماسية المعاصرة و استراتيجية إدارة المفاوضات*. (ط1). عمان: دار المسيرة للنشر و التوزيع و الطباعة.
- مركز دراسات الشرق الأوسط، (2002). *عملية السلام في الشرق الأوسط: الدوافع و الانعكاسات (1991-2001)*. (العددان 18، 19). عمان: مركز دراسات الشرق الأوسط.
- معهد الدراسات الدبلوماسية، (1992). *ندوة الدبلوماسية في المجتمع الدولي المعاصر*. الرياض، السعودية.
- منصور، ممدوح محمود مصطفى، (1997). *سياسات التحالف الدولي*. الإسكندرية: جامعة الإسكندرية، كلية التجارة.
- الموسى، سليمان، (1998). *تاريخ الأردن السياسي المعاصر (حزيران 1967-1995م)*. عمان: منشورات لجنة تاريخ الأردن.
- الهاشمي، مجد، (2003). *العولمة الدبلوماسية و النظام العالمي الجديد*. (ط1). عمان: دار أسامة للنشر و التوزيع.
- الهور، منير و الموسى، طارق، (1986). *مشاريع التسوية للقضية الفلسطينية 1947-1985*. (ط2). عمان: دار الجليل للنشر.
- أبو هيف، علي صادق، (1975). *القانون الدبلوماسي*. (ط3). الإسكندرية: منشأة المعارف.
- اليوسفي، أمين محمد قائد، (1997). *تسوية المنازعات الدولية بالوسائل السلمية*. بيروت: دار الحدائث للطباعة و النشر و التوزيع.

PERIODICALS:

- الخطيب، باسل. (1987). الدبلوماسية المكوّنة. **الدبلوماسي**، (8)، 45. الرياض: وزارة الخارجية- معهد الدراسات الدبلوماسية- إدارة البحوث.
- _____ . (1987). الدبلوماسية المتعددة الأطراف و المنظمات الدولية. **مجلة الدراسات الدبلوماسية**، (4)، 39. الرياض: معهد الدراسات الدبلوماسية- إدارة البحوث.
- رشوان، حسن. (1992). الدبلوماسية الحديثة. **الدبلوماسي**، (5)، 45. الرياض: وزارة الخارجية- معهد الدراسات الدبلوماسية- إدارة البحوث.
- محمد، فاضل زكي. (1987). العصر الحديث و مراحل التحولات في الأساليب الدبلوماسية. **الدبلوماسي**، (8)، 43. الرياض: وزارة الخارجية- معهد الدراسات الدبلوماسية- إدارة البحوث.
- مارتال، اندري. (1995). الدفاع و الدبلوماسية. **دراسات دولية**، 3 (56)، 19. تونس: مجلة دراسات دولية.
- صبري، إسماعيل. (1985). النظرية التفاوضية في العلاقات الدولية. **مجلة العلوم الإدارية و السياسية**، (1)، 133. جامعة الإمارات العربية المتحدة.

ENGLISH:

BOOKS:

- Acheson, Dean. (1958). **Power and Diplomacy**. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Alexandroff, Alan S. (1981). **The Logic of Diplomacy**. (Vol. 120). Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Amos, II, John W. (1979). **Arab-Israeli Military; Political Relations: Arab Perceptions and the Politics of Escalation**. New York: Pergamon Press.

- Arab Thought Forum. (1985). **Palestine, Fundamentalism, And Liberalism: International Dialogues Series (3)**. Amman: Arab Thought Forum.
- Ayoob, Mohammed. (1978). **Conflict And Intervention In The Third World**. London: Croom Helm.
- Azar, Edward E. and Burton, John W. (1986). **International Conflict Resolution: Theory and Practice**. Sussex: Wheatsheaf Books.
- Barston, R.P. (1988). **Modern Diplomacy**. London: Longman.
- Bercovitch, Jacob. (1996). **Resolving International Conflicts: The Theory and Practice of Mediation**. London: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Berridge, G.R. (1987). **International Politics: States, Power and Conflict since 1945**. Sussex: Wheatsheaf Books.
- Brecher, Michael. (1974). **Decision's In Israel's Foreign Policy**. London: Oxford University Press.
- Brown, Michael E. (1996). **The International Dimensions of Internal Conflict**. London: The MIT Press.
- Brownlie, Ian. (1968). **International Law And The Use Of Force By States**. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Bundy, Mc George, and Kissinger A., and Rostow, W.W., and Kivllian, James R., Jr., and Berle, Adolf A., and Merchant, Livingston, and Johnson, E.A.J. (1964). **The Dimensions of Diplomacy**. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press.
- Cahill, Kevin M.D. (2000). **Preventive Diplomacy: Stopping Wars Before They Start**. New York: Routledge.
- Carlston, Kenneth S. (1946). **The Process of International Arbitration**. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press.

- Cattan, Henry. (1976). **Palestine and International Law: The Legal Aspects of the Arab-Israeli Conflict.** (2nd ed). London: Longman.
- Clark, Sir George Norman. (1956). **War And Society In The Seventeenth Century.** London: Cambridge University Press.
- Cleveland, Harlan. (1966). **The Obligations of Power: American Diplomacy In The Search For Peace.** New York: Harper & Row Publishers.
- Cot, Jean-Pierre. (1972). **International Conciliation.** London: Europa Publications Limited.
- Daoudi, M.S. and Dajani, M.S. (1983). **Economic Sanctions: Ideals and experience.** London: Melbourne and Henley.
- Donelon, Michael. (1990). **Elements of International Politics Theory.** Oxford: Larendson Press.
- Dougherty, James E. and Pfaltzgraff, Robert. (1971). **Contending Theories of International Relations: A Comprehensive Relations.** (2nd ed). Philadelphia: Lippincott.
- Eban, Abba. (1983). **The New Diplomacy: International Affairs in the Modern Age.** New York: Random House.
- Edmead, Frank. (1971). **Analysis and Prediction in International Mediation.** New York: UNITAR.
- Feinberg, Nathan. (1971). **On An Arab Jurist's Approach To Zionism And The State Of Israel.** Jerusalem: Magnes Press.
- Freud, Sigmund. (1953). **Civilisation, War And Death.** London: The Hogarth Press.
- Gandhi, M.K. (1942). **Non-Violence in Peace & War.** (Vol. 1). (1st ed). Ahmedabad: Navajivan Publishing House.

- Gibbons, S.R. and Morican, OP. (1965). **World War One**. London: Longman.
- Gill, William H. (1975). **The Law of Arbitration**. (2nd ed). London: Sweet and Maxwell.
- Hadawi, Sami. (1967). **Bitter Harvest: Palestine between 1914-1967**. New York: The New World Press.
- Hadawi, Sami. (1968). **Palestine In Focus**. Beirut: Palestine Research Centre.
- Holbraad, Carsten. (1979). **Superpower And International Conflict**. London: The MacMillan Press Ltd.
- Hurley, Andrew. (1999). **One Nation Under Israel**. East Greenway: Trush Press.
- ICG: International Crisis Group. (2003). **Middle East Report N 14**. Amman, Washington, Brussels.
- Kahng, Tae Jin. (1969). **Law, Politics, And The Security Council: An Inquiry Into The Handling Of Legal Questions Involved In International Disputes And Situations**. (2nd ed).The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.
- Lewicki, Roy J. and Saunders, David M. and Minton, John W. (1997). **Essentials Of Negotiations**. Boston: IRWIN.
- McCamy, James L. (1964). **Conduct of The New Diplomacy**. New York: Harper & Row Publishers.
- Mitchell, C.R. (1981). **The Structure Of International Conflict**. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Monroe, Elizabeth and Farrar-Hockey, A.H. (1975). **The Arab-Israel War, October 1973: Background and Events**. London: The International Institute for Strategic Studies.
- Mutawi, Samir A. (1987). **Jordan in the 1967 War**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Neale, Margaret A. and Bazerman, Max H. (1991). **Cognition and Rationality in Negotiation**. New York: The Free Press.
- Nicolson, Harold. (1963). **Diplomacy**. (3rd ed). London: Oxford University Press.
- Nicolson, Harold. (1979). **Changing Diplomatic Practice**. In: Plischke, Elmer and
- Lerche, Charles O., Jr., and Said, Abdul A., and Satow, Sir Ernest M., and Thayer,
- Charles W., and Christopher, Warren (Eds). **Modern Diplomacy: The Art And The**
- Artisans. (pp. 43-72). Washington D.C.: American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research.
- Nicholson, Michael. (1970). **Conflict Analysis**. London: The English University Press Limited.
- Northedge, F.S. and Donelan, M.D. (1971). **International Disputes: the Political Aspects**. London: Europa Publications.
- Plischke, Elmer. (1979). Transition from the Old to the New Diplomacy. In:
- Plischke, Elmer and Lerche, Charles O., Jr., and Said, Abdul A., and Satow, Sir - - -
- Ernest M., and Thayer, Charles W., and Christopher, Warren (Eds). **Modern Diplomacy: The Art And The Artisans**. (pp. 1-40). Washington D.C.: American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research.
- Parris, John. (1974). **The Law And Practice of Arbitration**. London: George Goodwin Limited.
- Pearson, Lester B. (1958). **Diplomacy In The Nuclear Age**. London: Oxford University Press.
- Pechota, Vratislav. (1971). **Complementary Structures of Third-Party Settlement of International Disputes**. New York: United Nations Institute for Training and Research.

- Quester, George H. (1973). **Nuclear Diplomacy: The First Twenty-Five Years.** (2nd ed). New York: Dunellen Publishing Company.
- Rabow, Gerald. (1990). **Peace Through Agreement: replacing war with non-violent dispute-resolution methods.** New York: Praeger publishers.
- Ramcharan, B.G. (1982). **International Law And Fact-Finding In The Field Of Human Rights.** The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.
- Ramcharan, B.G. (1983). **Humanitarian Good Offices In International Law: The Good Offices of the United Nations Secretary-General in the Field of Human Rights.** The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.
- Ramsbothman, David. (1995). **The Changing Nature of Intervention: The Role of UN Peacekeeping.** The United Kingdom: Research Institute For the Study of Conflict and Terrorism (risct).
- Reynolds, Charles. (1989). **The Politics of War: A Study of the Rationality of Violence in Inter-State Relations.** Hertfordshire: Harvester Publishers.
- Roger, Fisher and Ury, William. (1981). **Getting to Yes.** Boston: Houghton Miffling Company.
- Romahi, Seif Ahmed El-Wadi. (1980). **Studies In International Law And Diplomatic Practice.** Tokyo: Data Labo Inc.
- Rotfled, Adam Daniel and Symonides, Janusz. (1998). **Peace, Security And Conflict Prevention: SIPRI-UNESCO Handbook.** Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Salem, Paul. (1997). **Conflict Resolution in the Arab World: Selected Essays.** Beirut: American University of Beirut.
- Sanders, Pieter. (1967). **International Arbitration.** The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.

- Simpson, J.L, and Fox, Hazel. (1959). **International Arbitration: Law and Practice**. London: Stevens & Sons Limited.
- Smith, Clagett G. (1972). **Conflict Resolution: Contributions of the Behavioral Sciences**. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Syed, Ayub. (1965). **India And The Arab World**. New Delhi: Orient Publishers, Clatridges Press.
- Toope, Stephen J. (1990). **Mixed International Arbitration: Studies in Arbitration between States and Persons**. Cambridge: Grotius Publications Limited.
- Raport, Anatol. (1974). **Conflict In Man-Made Environment**. England: Penguin Books Ltd.
- Watson, Adam. (1982). **Diplomacy: The Dialogue Between States**. London: Mathuen.
- Waltson, Bnthyony. (1979). **Russell On The Law Of Arbitration**. (19th ed). London: Stevens and Sons.
- Westing, Arthur H. (1986). **Global Resources and International Conflict: Environmental Factors in Strategic Policy and Action**. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

WEBSITES:

- <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Second-World-War>.(10/6/2006).
- <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/2003-invasion-of-Iraq>. (10/6/2006).
- http://www.wsws.org/articles/2001/nov_2001/afgh-n20.shtml. (17/6/2006).
- <http://www.un.org/New/oss/sg/Sanctions.htm>. (30/7/2006).

Other Sources:

- University Lectures. (2005). **Course: Diplomacy and Negotiation.** 2nd Semester
2004/2005.

Abbreviations

- BATNA: Best Alternative To a Negotiated Agreement.
- DOP: Declaration Of Principles.
- FFM: Fact-Finding Mission.
- ICG: International Crisis Group.
- NATO: North Atlantic Treaty Organization.
- NGO: Non Government Organization.
- PLO: Palestinian Liberation Organization.
- UN: United Nations.
- UNEF: United Nations Emergency Force.
- UNIFEL: United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon.
- US: United States.
- USA: United States Of America.
- USSR: United Soviet Socialist Republics.
- VIP: Very Important Person.
- WMD: Weapons of Mass Destruction.
- WTO: World Trade Organization.

()

:

:

