THE NATIONAL SECURITY OF ISRAEL AND PALESTINIANS AND THE ONE-STATE SOLUTION: A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

[1]Ammar Hatem Mahariq, [2]Mohd Irwan Syazli Saidin, [3]Russli Kamaruddin

[1,2,3]Centre for Research in History, Politics and International Affairs,

Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia (UKM)

Email:P90600@siswa.ukm.edu.my

ABSTRACT *This article reviews the kinds of literature on the national security of the two conflicting parties in the Middle East, the Israeli and Palestinian states. The discussion focuses on the national security of Israel, the national security of the Palestinians, the national security of Israel as an obstacle during the rounds of negotiating with the Palestinians, and the national security of the two parties through the one-state solution. We argue by reviewing the authors' studies and writings that the two-state solution is dead and more than two decades of negotiating between Israel and Palestine resulted in nothing on the ground but only expanding settlements, changing the features of Jerusalem, occupying more lands in the West Bank, and recently the annexation of the West Bank. Thus, talking about a two-state solution in the shadow of these facts on the ground is a disregard for reality, a waste of time, and a waste of the legitimate rights of the Palestinians. In this article, we will focus on the earlier literatures that talk about the national security of both conflicting parties; Israel and Palestine, by proposing the two-state solution and the one-state solution. We will deal specifically with the impasse of the negotiating process that took place between the two conflicting parties.*

INTRODUCTION

Since the outbreak of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict in 1948, thousands of writers, authors, and leaders who participated in the conflict have written about the conflict, and many research papers have been reviewed by experts in the field of conflict and conflict resolution. Therefore, to narrow down the course of this review article, we will focus on two aspects: 1) The issue of national security that constituted an impasse in the negotiating process and led to the killing of the two-state solution, 2) The one-state solution that achieves the national security of the two conflicting parties; Israel and Palestine. However, the importance of this study stems from two main points: 1) it is the first academic research that focuses on the **security** needs of the two conflicting parties (Israel and the Palestinians), by applying the one-state solution to ending the conflict that lasted for several decades, 2) The researcher will conduct interviews with several political leaders and security experts from both sides which are not done before.

Research methodology:

In this study, the researcher relies on primary sources such as previous interviews, books of political figures who participated in the negotiating process, and statements of political officials and prominent political figures.

The researcher also relies on secondary sources, which are books that talk about the Palestinian-Israeli conflict and focus on the two-state solution and the one-state solution. The researcher also focuses on points of agreement with other researchers and points of difference that distinguish this study from other studies, as shown in the tables attached to the study.

These sources were chosen because they are written by prominent political figures in the security, political, and historical fields, as well as that a number of these sources, books, and studies are by political, strategic, and security experts.

These sources are the most prominent books and studies that talk about the failure of the two-state solution and suggest the adoption of the one-state solution as an alternative solution. While these sources were based on a personal vision and not academic research. In addition, the most important characteristic of this study is that the researcher will use the realism theory and will collect the required data by conducting several personal interviews with official and unofficial political figures from the Palestinian side and the Israeli side.

On the concept of national security

Security as a concept is a social phenomenon that has emerged throughout history, and it reflects a mental, psychological, and mental state of the individual, people, group, and the state in general therefore, security constitutes a necessary and urgent requirement for their establishment and continuation of their existence [1]. Security in its broad concept, or the national security of the state is subject to multiple definitions, as many of the visions and theories define it, so some of these visions and theories limit it to the military concept and the other expand it to include developmental and social theories. Within the traditional concept, the International Encyclopedia of Social Sciences defines national security as: "The ability of a nation to defend its security from any external threat" [2]. Several researchers in the field of security agree with this definition, Harold Clem believed that security does not go beyond being the protection of the state by using military force [3].

But, Hamid Rabie, who is a follower of the contemporary strategic school, adds another dimension to national security and believes that politics can stave off dangers and external threats to the state, along with or without military force. He believes that security is a set of rules that if the state respects them, may guarantee for itself a secure situation that does not cost it a regional or international military intervention to protect itself [4]. The followers of the social school tend to believe that security can be achieved through the cohesion, strength, and culture of society, so the social factor plays a prominent role in enhancing power, As Harold D Lasswell argues security is the highest value expected to be attained as a real status and a potential force that enhanced the influence and effectiveness of the state and maintains its security [5]; Others, [6]. While the development school owners add another dimension to security, they associate successful security with successful development, and they believe that security is achieved through that. Robert McNamara says if

security includes something, it includes a minimum of order and stability, if there is no internal development, even a minimum of it, then security becomes impossible, security is development. The owners of this school see internal security and development as a basis for external security [7].

The national security is one of the demands of citizens from their government. Without it any government becomes vulnerable. The people do not feel secure and thus lose faith in the government. Security is taken as a basic need by people. Ensuring security is mainly the responsibility of the government as this cannot be ensured by any other party [8]. Insufficient security can distract the citizens' focus by creating panic as they do not get assurance of survival and safe life. They get less focused on fulfilling their duties as citizens and thus institutional dysfunction captures the state [9]. Therefore, the survival of the state becomes questionable. According to Harold Brown [10], "the Former US Secretary of Defense" says that national security is "the ability to preserve the nation's physical integrity and territory; to maintain its economic relations with the rest of the world on reasonable terms; to protect its nature, institutions, and governance from disruption from outside; and to control its borders" (Brown, 1983)[10]. Meanwhile, former US President George W. Bush insisted that national security relies on two poles: "promoting freedom, justice, and human dignity" and "confronting the challenges of our time by leading a growing community of democracies" [11]. George W. Bush did not only confine the concept of national security to the people living inside the country border but also according to him, "The people of the country living overseas should also be given the national security. Moreover, according to him, citizens' access to natural resources and enhancing the living standards for the citizens are also part of national security [8]. National security should deal with both traditional and non-traditional threats. That is why, issues such as adverse effects of climate change, epidemics, disasters, poverty, and drug trafficking should also come under consideration, it was seen that after the 9/11 attack on the World Trade Center, many countries around the world have changed their national security strategies to face the international terrorist organizations [12].

Discourse on the Israeli National Security

Yisrael Tal defines Israeli national security as follows "It is the guarantor for the nation's existence and the defense of its interests" [13]. Israel relied on its army to keep its borders safe after the war of 1948 against the Arab armies in Palestine [13]. According to Drory, the military forces have been the main pillar of Israeli security after its independence [14]. It helped the physical survival of the state and kept its borders safe. The concept of Israeli security has become one of the major issues for the state because its neighbors have hostile attitudes toward Israel. That is why strengthening the military capabilities remained one of the major concerns for Israel [14]. Two major factors motivated this; first, it is believed that Israel as a land is a promise of God to His prophet Abraham. Secondly, Israel built its state by taking the

historical land of Palestine through hostility, force, and violence [15].

Ibrahim [16], agrees with Baha' al-Deen [15] by debating, that the Israeli security and military establishment plays a prominent role in building the state and preserving its security. Because of the nature of its existence, Israel has a permanent security concern. As a result, Israel grants the security and military establishment a wide authority where the security and military establishment plays a remarkable role in Israeli decision-making. Also, this establishment has always remained above criticism or blame, especially since the structure of Israeli society is largely militarized in Israel, in addition to the growing security concerns that affect the strategic decisions that are taken and determine its future path. Accordingly, the Israeli military and security circles derive their strength from the claim which says that Israel is an oasis of safety in the sea of turmoil and chaos. The implementation of this mission needs to grant the Israeli security cadres a wide influence [16].

Shimon Peres considered Israeli security matters a top priority [17]. Israel has considered the possession of advanced weapons by Arab countries and Iran as a threat and thus they continuously strive to improve their own security and military forces [18]. According to Drory [14], Israel constantly looks for alternatives to improve its security and the development of long-range missiles is one of the results of this continuous development and application of deterrence strategy. Johnson [19], mentioned that Israel had to rethink their military performance after the two *Intifadas* and the war against Hezbollah in South Lebanon. These two incidents affected the performance of the Israeli army badly [19].

Al-Masri, [20], mentioned that one Israeli author Haron Barev stated that the geographic situation is one of the main problems faced by Israel and that is why the Israeli security strategy undergoes change, renewal, and improvement continuously [20]. Also, the settlement in the West Bank and Gaza Strip is another strategy that the Israeli security theory focuses on to protect the state. Israel became concerned about the settlement in the West Bank, Gaza Strip, and East Jerusalem after the 6-days war with the Arab countries in 1967 [21]. All the Israeli governments supported the settlement projects on the Palestinian territories despite the ideological differences of these governments. They exploited the religious emotions of the citizens who claimed that the land of Palestine was their land. The Israeli government helped these religious fundamentalists to get settled in the land of Palestine. These settlers are called the 'messianic settlers' [22, 23]. Israel also thinks that having control of the natural resources (such as water) of the land of Palestine can ensure their national security [21]. The main goal of the conference of Basel in 1897 was to establish the state of Israel. The Zionist project had three targets; first to develop the state of Israel by defining its geographical location and demographic issues. Second, to maintain the survival of the state by establishing it as an actor member in the Middle East area. Third, to make sure that Israel is superior and to spoil the unity among Arab countries. Thus, Israel paid attention to two issues; first, identifying the ideal geographic defensive lines to confront with Arab armies. Second, any attempt of

invasion from the Arab countries should be detected as soon as possible (detection warning) [24].

Some new developments occurred in 2015. Senator Mike Huckabee, the Republican candidate for the US presidency called for recognizing the West Bank as part of Israel, "If you are going to visit Israel, you should visit all of Israel and that would include Judea and Samaria," Huckabee told reporters[25]. Israel also considers the recent upheavals in the Middle East as threats and thus they want to bring changes in Israeli security. In August 2015, Israel came up with a new military strategy with a basic assumption that 'the enemy cannot be defeated with defensive fighting, so an offense is required to achieve clear military results' [26]. Meanwhile, Al-Laham], in his article commented that the new military strategy of increasing the settlers and settlements in the West Bank will work to avoid any Arab attacks on Israel [27].

The Israeli National security in the negotiating process
The negotiations between the Israelis and Palestinians started in the 1990s when they signed the Oslo Accord sponsored by the US administration. Oslo Accord (in 1993) was the first accord between two conflicting parties. Though the Oslo agreement did not recognise explicitly the State of Palestine from the beginning, it proposed solving the obstacles one by one [28]. They decided to solve the problems (the future of Jerusalem, borders, refugees, settlement, and security) within five years [29]. The Oslo Accord is mainly based on UN resolutions 242, 338, and other resolutions that called for the Palestinians' rights on their lands [30, 31]. Soetendorp, [27], mentioned that the Israelis were trying to have control over different affairs of Palestine. Lia discussed this point clearly whereas the Palestinians wanted autonomy in their administration [32]. That means they wanted the Palestinian affairs to be handled by the Palestinians themselves. Palestinians wanted to run their police force according to their terms and not based on Israeli guidelines. Palestinians consider the police force and military forces as the nucleus of their state [32]. However, Israelis wanted the Palestinian police force to operate within the scope defined by Israel. Through this Oslo Accord, Israel sought the legitimacy of the Israeli state from PLO. Israel also tried to establish the idea that Israel's stability and security are the responsibility of Palestinian authority. That means Palestinian authority will be responsible for any kind of threat to Israeli security [33].

Later, in 1996, at the Washington Summit, Israelis asked for a demilitarized Palestinian state and control over the vital facilities of the Palestinians [34]. The dispute reached a climax when the Palestinians threatened to establish their state by having East Jerusalem as the capital, and the Israeli Prime Minister tried to annex some Palestinian areas to Israeli autonomy [35]. According to Slater, though the US, the sponsor of this negotiation process, wanted to reinstate peace, Israelis wanted to achieve an interim status and Palestinians wanted a final two-state solution [36].

In 2000, the Camp David Summit was held to rescue the talks between these two conflicting parties and apply the two-state solutions. According to Nahas, the conditions given by Israel were derogatory to the Palestinians and thus they refused to comply with them [37]. In Clinton's Parameters, an attempt was made to resume the discussion and find solutions sponsored by the American administration. These solutions were to be applied to both conflicting parties. Hanieh mentioned that most of the suggestions from the Americans supported Israel and did not consider the needs of the Palestinians [38]. Elsewhere, Qurie also mentioned that the failure of Camp David can be related to the inflexible attitude of the Israelis [39]. In this summit, Israelis did not show any positive attitude towards Palestinian rights. Israel highlighted their national security issues and denied negotiating on these issues [39, 38]. These positions resulted in the second *Intifada*. Although the previous research identified the causes of all these non-negotiations, the issue of Israeli's argument of their national security as a cause of non-negotiation was never scrutinized. This proposed research, by examining the documents of the several negotiation processes, will try to focus on the Israeli security issue as a reason for non-negotiation.

Discourse on the Palestinian National Security
Palestinian national security was not one of the main issues in the political settlement process in the Middle East, it was the less fortunate subject among others in the discussions as there was little recognition of Palestinians' right to security. But in return, there was a focus on Israeli security and there was a recognition of Israel's right to security particularly in light of the imbalance of power in favor of Israel since a long time ago [40]. The Israeli strategic analysts tend in the justifications of Israel's security needs to what they believe in asymmetries occurred in the overall balance between Israel and her Arab neighbors. But from the Palestinian perspective, the asymmetries in the overall balance appear clearly between Israelis and the Palestinians themselves. the overall balance of power has been inclined in favor of Israel since 1948 and it will be so surly for unspecified future. Based on both historical experience and outlook, there is a deep and general Palestinian sense of insecurity. Among the parties of the Israeli-Arab conflict, Palestinians have continued to be the less fortunate in terms of national, regional, humanitarian, and material terms. Moreover, the prospects for partial remediation of this situation, namely the establishment of a secure homeland at least, remain elusive in light of the structural imbalance in the balance of power and the ongoing process of political and demographic change in the rest of the Palestinian heritage [41].

What the Palestinians are betting on in the peace process is not only to provide better security conditions for the Palestinian people, but also one more vital thing which is to create a new system that stops the threat to their existence and ultimately guarantees their security and freedom from aggression, expansion, or external hostility. However, by looking at these basic concepts we find that they are duplicated concerns that have already been preoccupied with the Israeli Zionists thinking. So, if portraying Israel as the embodiment of the security of the Jewish people, then certainly the Palestinians' aim to create their statehood should be understood similarly. Likewise, the security fundamentals for the Palestinians include dispelling past fears and future threats, and this in turn requires an end to the Israeli occupation and settlement, then establishing the Palestinian national entity on Palestinian soil as an irreversible reality. Therefore, without consideration of the Palestinian security concerns, a truly stable settlement will remain elusive [41].

Researchers of the Palestine Institute for National Security define Palestinian national security as the "set of measures taken by the PLO to protect the rights of the Palestinian people and their national project in the face of internal or external threats and challenges to achieve national goals of survival, freedom, independence, and return" **[42].** Khalidi and Agha [43], argued that national security, which we mean in the Palestinian case, deals with the nature of the population and the people within the framework of the state of formation, not the state and its security, they also continued talking about security for the Palestinians in their book, and they assure that one of the problems of the Palestinian situation is that Israel succeeded in monopolizing the concept of security to the extent that the security has become an Israeli demand only, but there are Palestinian security needs equal to the Israeli needs and perhaps the Palestinians need security more than the Israelis. S, Palestinians do not accept a state with temporary borders because it affects a series of other national issues whereas a state with temporary borders conditions that end at certain geographic borders and leaves the other issues such as Jerusalem, and refugees to another later stage while there is a Palestinian consensus that borders cannot be exchanged for fundamental or substantive issues [43].

Others discussed, that Palestinian national security has three dimensions; internal, regional, and international. Internally, the political and geographical division threatens the Palestinian cause and makes it difficult for Palestinians to achieve their national goals, in addition to sagging in the Palestinian political system, which has become an obstacle to any significant progress in the Palestinians' lives. At the regional level, Palestinians are closely linked to their regional environment and Arab depth. Therefore, the revolutions of the so-called Arab Spring, the political changes, and the political instability of the regimes of their Arab neighbors threaten their security and lead to weakening their ability to continue their struggle towards achieving their national goals, which are an essential part of their national security [44, 39].

On the international level, the American bias towards Israel and the recent American decisions in favor of Israel at the expense of the Palestinians have shown sagging in the world order. No one, whether the Palestinians or others, can rely on international powers to achieve their security. The United Nations has been unable to deter Israel and even the US administration from changing the features of the conflict by unilateral decisions without resorting to international legitimacy. The global imbalance of power has created arrogance by the superpowers on oppressed people. Accordingly, the changes in these three constituencies mainly affect Palestinian national security, because Palestinians live in an ever-changing environment under the influence of many tidal waves [42].

The One-State Solution and the National Security of Israel and Palestine

Solving the idea of a two-state solution has become impossible in the shadow of the Israeli racist policies and imposed facts on the ground without any commitment to the conventions signed with the Palestinians. Mahariq, [43], said in his research which relied on the theories of Israeli security and the doctrine of Zionism that the Jewish state is based on,

that Israel is very keen not to give any elements of sovereignty to the Palestinians and she refuses the discussion of the return right, full withdrawal from the West bank and end up the illegal settlements. Moreover, Israel does not accept the division of Jerusalem and the demarcation of the borders with the Palestinians because each one of these steps threatens the national state security and the survival of the state. Therefore, Israel proceeded to blow up all the final status issues by taking unilateral proactive steps aimed at eliminating the idea of a two-state solution [45].

Ilan Pappe in his book (2017), addresses the myth that the two-state solution is the only way forward, the solution being promoted by the Israeli propaganda machine and its supporters in the West. The author sees the two-state solution as a mythical solution and that Israel has killed the two-state solution through settlement expansion, and they only aim to make a Palestinian state leadership without actual sovereignty [46]. He said in 2018, that the US President, Donald Trump, has not deviated from the prevailing US policy towards the Palestinian issue, as it is based on three principles: First: America is the only mediator that can bring peace, second: America is a biased mediator and supportive of Israel, and third: The principle of the two-state solution is subject to the Israeli interpretation, without the right of return or the capital of Palestine in Jerusalem, as well as Israeli control of large areas of Palestinian land, directly or indirectly. Pappe added that Trump says: "The Israelis violate international law, and we accept these violations because they are necessary for Israel's survival." Which means giving them a blank check to do whatever they like. On the other hand, Pappe argues that the Palestinians must reintroduce the idea of a one-state solution and support this idea again. he further argues that it would be better for Jews to accept living in a multi-ethnic Palestinian state [47].

Farsakh, [48], investigated in her paper the two views of the Zionist and Palestinian understanding of a one-state solution by examining the two central historical texts that raised the idea of a one-state solution, first is Palestine: A bi-national state, written by Martin Buber, Judas Magnus, and Moses Smilansky in 1946 and re-discussed in several articles in; towards union in Palestine, essays on Zionism and Jewish-Arab cooperation published by Ihud in 1947, and the second one is Fatah's publication towards a democratic state in Palestine for Muslims, Christians, and Jews, published in 1970. Farsakh aimed in her paper to review how each of these two views paved the way for the idea of a one-state solution and how they made the case for sharing the power in the common state [48].

However, the election of 2015 in Israel proved that the two-state solution had died by bringing up the far right again to power, Netanyahu declared that there would not be a Palestinian state during his term, and that proved the real intention of Israel to dominate the whole land of Palestine by expanding their economic, political, and physical existence over the Palestinians and their lands [48]. Moreover, the result of the new general elections in Israel (2019) proved beyond doubt that the majority of Israelis no longer see two state-solution as an option, they elected the most extreme right-wing parties led by Benjamin Netanyahu again, while the two parties which talked about peace with the Palestinians

got only 10 seats out of 120 Parliament seats [49]. However, Oded Revivi the Yesha council foreign envoy said in response to the recent general election 2019 "If we are looking for peace in this region, we will have to look for a different plan from the two-state solution" [50]. After more than two decades of peace negotiations between Israel and the Palestinians, there was no such one result to go forward for a two-state solution, so many academics, politicians, activists, and researchers called upon the one-state solution as the possible solution for the raging conflict.

Yet, Efraim Karsh and Yezid Sayigh [51], argued that the eastern Mediterranean region needs regional or sub-regional players for security including Turkey, Iran, Arab countries, Afghanistan, and Ethiopia also can be added in addition to Israel. Therefore, it will be more effective for the Arab countries and Israel to conduct a final peace agreement rather than bilateral peace agreements. Above all, the security in the Middle East is mostly complicated and each party will respond to this complexity differently and show countermoves. Karsh and Sayigh [51], however, discussed the need for an institutional and multilateral framework to manage these security problems effectively, they also focused in their discussion on the security issues of all parties in the Middle East and the need for security cooperation among all parties in the region through the regional or sub-regional organization, others [51], suggested that there must be a security community for all states in the Middle East and this community must be built on a mutual comprehensive understanding which leads to recognition of each other rights; the Palestinians' right of self-determination, the right of Arabs to recover their lands lost in 1967s war and on the other hand, Israel's right of existence and acceptance among Arab states. So Karsh and Sayigh asserted that the security issue is the main subject in the Israeli-Arab conflict. Furthermore, the creation of a Palestinian state and the acceptance of the state of Israel among Arabs will be done through comprehensive security understanding [51].

Savera Kalideen and Haidar Eid interviewed Ali Abunimah in 2008, whereas Abunimah argued that some previous polls have shown that Palestinians' support of two state-solution reached maximum to 60% while the support of one state-solution hit 35%, and the reason for this low ratio was difference in the promoting of one-stat solution compared to a two-state solution. In return, there is a massive support of one state-solution among the Palestinians in the 1948 areas and they mark it as a great idea, but will Israel accept it? According to Abunimah [52], the PLO position in the late of 1960 until 1980 supported the idea of a secular democratic state in Palestine. Dismantling the apartheid and racist state which is called Israel and replacing it with a democratic state for both Palestinians and Israelis. Abunimah asserted that people in South Africa have overcome the apartheid state and established a democratic state in south Africa. So that, Israel will not wake up one day and say apartheid state must be dismantled and Palestinians should take their rights. This needs a concerted effort from many national and international parties to be done [54].

Raef Zreik [55], aimed in his article to discover the source of the impetus for revival of the one-state solution and he outlined a typology of the arguments commonly evoked in favor of the one-state solution, exploring its attract for Palestinians. Zreik in his research aimed to discover the problems that the one-state solution can solve and how it can be a real solution, he argued that many arguments that were spread around to support one state solution are not really in the course of the response to the real problems that Palestinians face. Zreik debated that the one-state solution is not the final solution as much as it is the mean which supplies the Palestinians by tools for change of the present relations with Israel. According into Zreik this change will shift the Palestinian position from the struggle unto death to the master-slave dialectics with Israelis. Therefore, this change will turn the weakness of Palestinians into strength, put the limits in front of the Israeli power and provide them with plan and new agenda in their struggle with Israelis [55].

Abunimah [52], saw that two-state solution became an impossible vision to solve the Israeli-Palestinian conflict due to the new realities on the ground installed by the Israelis, Abunimah argued that the two-state solution is a racist vision, nd solving the Israeli Palestinian conflict based on the two-state solution is anchoring the concept of racism. Thus, Abunimah debated that the vision of one-state solution is more realistic and braver to be alternative for two-state solution. This vision involves the two peoples - Israelis and Palestinians - live side by side as neighbors based on equality in the rights. One-state solution could solve most of the outstanding issues in the conflict, it could provide the two conflicting parties with the security needs, as well as it could relieve the tension in the Middle East region. So that, the one state solution could open the horizon for cooperation with regional countries. Abunimah presented a vision which meets the geographic needs for both sides, one state allows all people to live and enjoy the new entire state with preserving their communities [52].

Ghada Karmi, in her interview in 2009[53], stated that the existence of the state of Israel for the Palestinians was a disaster in the sense of the word, she added that the existence of Israel tore the Palestinians into groups; displaced groups, refugee groups, exiled groups and groups which do not know what is next for them. According to Karmi, Palestinians lost their homes, their lands, their properties and their live; what happened to them is really a disaster with all its connotations [56]. Karmi [56], further debated that if the international community wants to be fair with the Palestinians, it should return the Palestinians back to their homeland and share it with the Israelis without partition, and that what we call the one state. She added in her interview that this solution can be brought out of the circles of debates to the implementation and make it on the world map for solving the conflict only by a United Nations resolution whereas it can be discussed on the international level [56]. But, although Karmi supports and defends the idea of a one-state solution, she confirms in her article 2011 that there is no road map for how to implement the one state-solution [57].

According to Joel Kovel [58], Israel is a racist state, and the racism of Israel resides in its basic social compact. He argued that Israel prevents this compact to be a constitution, so that, it keeps the lawlessness inherent to the Jewish state, Israel is very clear in declaring that there is no way within its system to challenge the Jewishness of the state. Accordingly, the

problem then is not in its occupation of the Palestinian territories as much as with the Zionism and Jewish state. If Israel wants to be a normal state, it must end the occupation of the Palestinian territories and Palestinians are to get their own state, hence the two-state comes out.[58]. However, he, [58], argued that ending the occupation will not occur because the occupation is simply unavoidable manifestation of the essential goal of the Jewish state and what is understood of it is to dismantle the Palestinian society then to sweep it. Kovel in his book talked about the Israeli occupation for the Palestinian territories which he describes it as a python that squeezes Palestine to death. On the other hand, Kovel asserted that for getting Israel to relinquish its occupation that will require essential changes into the Israeli society, Israel must give up of the Jewish state. Accordingly, Kovel talked about the just peace which can be the foundation that the one state could be built on; the only meaning of just peace under the current circumstances is a bi-national state in which both nations can coexist, or as something beyond that and people retain some national identity [58].

Giora Eiland discussed in his article [31] that in recent years resolving the Israeli-Palestinian conflict is as more important than any time ever, but before of two-state solution is impossible if the two conflicting parties are adhered to the currently accepted solution. The Israeli-Palestinian conflict is more different from other conflicts around the world such as between Pakistan and India over Kashmir, the difference of this conflict takes shape of three points; first, the Palestinians are living under occupation in unacceptable conditions in the twenty-first century. Second, Israel refuses to determine its final borders until the conflict ends. Third, the conflict has regional threats to all parties in the Middle East. Moreover, he argued that the Palestinians will not accept a state which could not be viable, and the Israelis will not accept indefensible borders for their state. However, Eiland exaggerated in his talk about a regional solution and proposed to cut off part of the territory of neighboring countries to solve the problem of the Palestinians [31].

John Bickel in his book (2011)[59], talked about the one-state solution created by Saif Islam Qaddafi; the son of Muammar al-Qaddafi, the leader of Libya, the proposal of Saif Islam Qaddafi offered a bi-national state for Jews and Palestinian people named as "Federal Republic of the Holy Land". This proposal described the new republic through five administrative regions; Jerusalem as a capital city, all Palestinian refugees are allowed to return to their lands, mass destruction weapons must be removed from this state, there should be UN supervision for free and fair elections on the first and second occasions and this state would be recognized by the Arab league. Bickel argued that this proposal was granted a little media attention. Bickel debated that a one-state solution which is the only solution can be implemented on the ground and could create a successful peace agreement in the Middle East region [59]. However, Bickel was further of the opinion that although a one-state solution is the only solution for the profound conflict there must be tremendous efforts to implement it, whereas the Middle East must be ready for that solution. Therefore, the negotiation about this solution must start between Israel and the Palestinian

National Authority, while the international community such as United Nations, United States of America, Russia, European Union, and Members of Arab League should be mediators during this negotiation [59].

Muriel Asseburg, [53], discussed that the nine months of talks between Israelis and Palestinians in 2014 yielded nothing. Thus, the consolidation of the two people became an optimal choice to wrap up the long conflict between the two conflicting parties. Therefore, the European countries must follow a more firm approach to achieve the two-state solution or they must demand Israel to grant all people in the lands controlled by her, equal political, cultural, and economic rights [53]. Meanwhile, Virginia Tilley, stated that the current reality imposed by Israel on the Palestinian territories is not conducive to supporting the establishment of a viable Palestinian state [60]. It has become clear to all world diplomacy that a two-state solution is no longer achievable. In addition, all the world parties involved in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict including the two conflicting parties are facing the same reality which states that only a one-state solution can be viable in the historical land of Palestine [60].

Yousef Munayyer, in his article, said, that the two-state solution became impossible due to the realities on the ground set by Israeli Authorities, these realities therefore created significant impediments to the birth of a distorted Palestinian state [61]. Thus, the Palestinians will never accept a series of cantons as a state for them. Moreover, Munayyer further mentioned in his article that the U.S. Secretary of State John Kerry informed Congress that two years left for the two-state solution before it would no longer be viable, and that was 6 years ago[61]. Accordingly, Munayyer debated that the two-state solution is dead, and the time has come to talk about the last chance for peace which is equal rights for both nations in Palestine and Israel in a single shared state [61].

D'Almeida, [62], mentioned in his article, that Mearsheimer talked about the submission of US foreign policy to the Zionist lobby in America, where 70% of the use of the US veto was in favor of Israel against the Palestinians. Whereas the Israeli lobby in the United States of America sought to establish a greater Israel "A conversation about the two-state solution is meaningless, there is not going to be one," Mearsheimer noted. "The Palestinians are never going to have their state. Instead, there is going to be a Greater Israel" [62]. On the other hand, Bisharat [63], evaluated the one-state solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict by employing a "based-rights approach", Bisharat was based on the evaluation of a one-state solution on the necessary normative standard provided by the international human rights for the only fair resolution of this prolonged conflict. So that, this solution offers the topmost opportunities of maximizing the interests, legitimate rights, and aspirations to the largest possible population of both people. He continued, that both Israeli and Palestinian people have internationally recognized rights of self-determination and sovereignty. Therefore, the one-state solution could only be imposed by exercising each one's respective right of self-determination to avoid violating the respective rights of both people [63].

Jane Farrington and others asserted that most of the policymakers of both conflicting parties assist with three obstacles in front of the two-state solution, first, the

settlement in the Palestinian territories which killed the idea of land swapping for the two-state solution [64]. Secondly, there is no seriousness from one side to the other to save the two-state solution. Third, both conflicting parties complain that there is no peace partner, accordingly, the option of the two-state solution for making peace is no longer available. However, Farrington and other authors argued that the one-state solution is a threat to most of the Israelis' desire for a democratic Jewish state. Moreover, the one-state solution is unacceptable by the international community if there are incomplete or limited political rights for Palestinians [64].

CONCLUSION

All in all, the current research has discussed several studies on the concept of national security with specific attention to the discourse on the conflict and issues of Israeli and Palestinian national security. Some of the literature debatably discussed the Israeli security concerns as if Israel is the legal heir to the land of Palestine, where they ignored the same security concerns for the Palestinians. Some authors also discussed the security issues away from the one-state solution. A One-state solution in their works was discussed as an alternative to the two-state solution which has been spoiled by the Israeli aggressiveness and unilateral actions. Furthermore, it can be argued that there were authors who discussed the one-state solution not in the sense of a model to fulfill the security concerns of the two conflicting parties. However, in this research, we will address the one-state solution based on the security needs of both parties, and based on the realism theory of conflict and conflict resolution, we believe that a one-state solution is the only rational solution that can be applied, and it can achieve the security needs of the two people. Since, through this solution, the Palestinian people can enjoy the humanitarian, political, civil, religious, and social rights as they as the Israelis. the war must stop forever, and the souls of innocent people must be saved. There should not be an apartheid regime in Palestine. International law guarantees the rights of the Palestinian people, and the apartheid imposed on them by Israel must end. The international community should work to adopt the vision of a one-state solution in which everyone enjoys equal rights. No extremism must be allowed to dominate the lives of innocent people. Wars must be defused forever.

REFERENCES

1. Nahar, G. (1993). *Al'amn Al-Qawmi Al-Arabi.* Amman: Dar Al'aml Liltibaeat Walnashr
2. Muhareb, M. (2011). *Process of National Security Decision-Making in Israel and the Influence of the Military Establishment.* JSTOR.
3. Clem, H.J. (1983). *The environment of national security.* National Defense University.
4. Rabe', H. (1984). *nadhariat al'Amn al-qawmii al-arabi wa al-tatawur al-mu'asir lilta'amul al-duwli fi mintaqat al-sharq al'awsat (The theory of Arab national security and the contemporary development of international interaction in the Middle East).* al-qahirah: dar al-mawqif al-'arab
5. Lasswell, H.D. (1950). National security and individual freedom

6. O'Brian, J.L. (2014). *National Security and Individual Freedom.* Harvard University Press.
7. McNamara, R.S. (1968). The essence of security.
8. Milton-Edwards, B. (2008). *The Israeli-Palestinian Conflict: A People's War.* Routledge.
8 Hoppe, H-H. (2003). *Myth of National Defense: Essays on the Theory and History of Security Production, The.* Ludwig von Mises Institute.
9. Watson, C.A. (2008). *US National Security: A Reference Handbook.* ABC-CLIO.
10. Brown, H. (1983). *Thinking about national security: defense and foreign policy in a dangerous world.* Westview Press.
11. Bialasiewicz, L., Campbell, D., Elden, S., et al. (2007). Performing security: The imaginative geographies of current US strategy. *Political geography* 26(4): 405-422.
12. Ripsman, N.M. and Paul, T.V. (2010). *Globalization and the national security state.* Oxford University Press on Demand
13. Tal, I. (1996). National Security: The few against the many. *Tel Aviv: Dvir [in Hebrew].*
14. Drory, Z. (2005). *The Israel defence force and the foundation of Israel: utopia in uniform.* RoutledgeCurzon.
15. al-Deen, A.B. (1972). *Israa'ilyat (Israelites)* Beirut: al-mu'ssasah al-'arabiyah lillderasat wa al-Nashir.
16. Ibrahim, A. (2016). *'aql el-'adiw: dawr al-mu'asasah al'amniah fi Sina'at al-qarar al-isra'yiyli (The mind of the enemy: The role of the security establishment in Israeli decision-making).* al-Qahira: markaz al-badil liltakhtit waldirasat al'istratijiah.
17. Peres, S. and Naor, A. (1993). *The new middle east.* HarperEleme
18. Rózsa, E.N. (2019). Weapons of Mass Destruction in the Middle East and North Africa. *MENARA.* 148.
19. Johnson, R.T., (2011). Balancing the Israeli Defense Force for future warfare. Army Command and General Staff Coll fort Leavenworth KS School of Advanced Military Studies.
20. Al-Masri, M. (2009). *nadhariat al-'amn al-Israeli. (the Israeli security theory).* Nablus, Palestine: al-markaz al-filistinee lillbohoth wa al-derasat
21. Bard, M.G. (2007). *Will Israel Survive?* : Palgrave Macmillan
22. Shahak, I. and Mezvinsky, N. (2004). *Jewish fundamentalism in Israel.* Pluto Press London.
23. Al-Shabib, M.A.R. (2003). *nadhariat al-'amn al'sraeiliyah fi dhell al-taswiah al-selmiyah fe al-sharqh al-'awsat wa 'tharoha 'la 'maliyat al-tahawool al-siasee wa al-'qhtisadee lillsha'b al-filisteeni fe al-dheffah al-gharbiyah wa qita' Gaza min 1991-2002 (The Israeli security theory in light of the peace settlement in the Middle East and its impact on the process of political and economic transformation of the Palestinian people in the West Bank and Gaza Strip from 1991-2002(* . Master, al-Najah National University.
24. Kilani, H. (2008). nadhariyat al-'amin al-Israeli wa 'osoloha al-'amrekiyah wal-'orobiyah (The Israeli security theory and its American and European origins). *Journal of Arab affairs, League of Arab states* 153.
25. Keinon, H. and Lazaroff T (2015) Huckabee: All presidential candidates should visit all of Israel, including W. Bank settlements. *The Jerusalem Post* 18 August.
26. Shoval, L. (2015). Israeli military reveals its official defense strategy for first time in 60 years. *Jewish News Service*, 14 August

27. Al-laham, N. (2015). al'stratejiyah al-'skariyah al-jadeedah Le Israel hieh "qatil walaysah Harib" (Israel's new military strategy is "kill, not war"), *Maannews egency,* August 16

28. Soetendorp, B. (2007). *The Dynamics of Israeli-Palestinian Relations: Theory, History, and Cases.* Springer.

29 Milton-Edwards, B. (2008). *The Israeli-Palestinian Conflict: A People's War.* Routledge.

30 Kelman, H.C. (2007). The Israeli-Palestinian peace process and its vicissitudes: Insights from attitude theory. *American Psychologist* 62(4): 287.*Security: Two Views.* International Security Studies Program, American Academy of Arts and Sciences.

31. Eiland, G. (2008). *Rethinking the Two State Solution.* Washington Institute for Near East Policy.

32. Lia, B. (2006). *A police force without a state: A history of the Palestinian security forces in the West Bank and Gaza.* Ithaca Press.

33.Abu-Lughod, I.A., Abū 'Amr, Z. and Heacock, R. (1995). *The Palestinian-Israeli Declaration of Principles: Proceedings of Birzeit University's Seminar, 17 December 1993.* Birzeit University Publications.

34. Schiff, Z. and Satloff, R. (1996). After the Washington Summit: Implications for Security and the Peace Process. Reportno. Report Number|, Date. Place Published|: Institution|.

35. Nofal, M. (2002). *al'ntifadhah- infejar 'amaliyaht al-salam: Hawl al'ntifadhah al-thaniyah (The Intifada - The Explosion of the Peace Process: About the Second Intifada).* Amman, Jordan: dar al- 'ahliyah lilltiba'ah wa al-nashir.

36. Slater, J. (2001). What went wrong? The collapse of the Israeli-Palestinian peace process. *Political Science Quarterly* 116(2): 171-199.

37. Nahas, F. (2012). Israel wal'ghwar: bain al-mafhom al-a'mnee wa 'stratigiayat al-dam (Israel and the Jordan Valley: Between the Security Concept and Annexation Strategies). MADAR: the Palestinian forum for Israeli studies, November 2012, Ramallah.

38. Hanieh, A. (2000). *The Camp David Papers.* Al-Ayyam Newspaper

39. Qurie, A. (2008). *Beyond Oslo, the struggle for Palestine: Inside the Middle East peace process from Rabin's death to Camp David.* Bloomsbury Publishing.

40.Khalidi, A.S. and Evron, Y. (1990). *Middle East*

41 . Khalidi, A.S. (1993). nahw 'aqidah filastiniyyah lil'amn al-qawmi (Towards a Palestinian Doctrine for a National Security). *majallat al-dirasat al-filastiniyyah* 15.

42. Al-baba, J. (2016). *al'amn al-qawmi al-filastini murtakazat watahadiyat (Palestinian National Security: Pillars and Challenges).* Palestinian Planning Center (PPC)/ Palestine Liberation Organization.

43. Āghā, Ḥ. and Khalidi, A.S. (2006). *A framework for a Palestinian national security doctrine.* Royal Inst of Intl Affairs.

44. Jarad, N. (2017). *'iitar al-makhatir waltahdidat walfuras al-muhitah bi al'amn al-qawmii al-filastini wakharitat al-tariq lilbada'yil al-astiratijiah (The framework of risks, threats and opportunities surrounding Palestinian national security and the road map for strategic alternatives).* ma'had filastin li'abhath

45. Mahariq, A.H. (2017). *Obstacles in the negotiating process between Palestinians and Israel: an analysis*. Gombak, Selangor: International Islamic University Malaysia, 2017.

46. Pappe, I. (2017). *Ten myths about Israel.* Verso Books.

47. Pappe, I. (2018). The Palestinian cause following US recognition of Jerusalem as the capital of Israel and the "deal of the century". *The Gulf, the Arabs and the world.* ALJAZEERA CENTER FOR STUDIES.

48. Farsakh, L. (2016). A common state in Israel–Palestine: Historical origins and lingering challenges. *Ethnopolitics* 15(4): 380-392.

49. Alpen, H. (2019). Yes to occupation, no to peace: That's how the Palestinians view the outcome of the Israeli elections, and they hope the world is watching. *International Politics and Society*, 11 April.

50. Federman, J. (2019). Israeli election may have dimmed hopes for 2-state solution. *Associated Press*, 21 April.

51. Karsh, E. and Sayigh Y (1994) A cooperative approach to Arab—Israeli security. *Survival* 36(1): 114-125.

52. Abunimah, A. (2006). *One country: A bold proposal to end the Israeli-Palestinian impasse.* Macmillan.

53. Asseburg, M. (2014). Middle East peace talks at the end of the road? One-state reality consolidating.

54 Kalideen, S. and Eid, H. (2008). A One State Solution for the Palestine-Israel conflict: an Interview with Ali Abunimah. *Nebula* 5(3): 78-83.

55. . Zreik, R. (2011). A one-state solution? From a 'struggle unto death'to 'master-slave'dialectics. *Social Identities* 17(6): 793-810.

56. Karmi, G. (2009). Palestinians Require a 'One-State' Solution. In: Steinberg M (ed). Executive Intelligence Review.

57. Karmi, G. (2011). The one-state solution: An alternative vision for Israeli-Palestinian peace. *Journal of Palestine Studies* 40(2): 62-76.

58. Kovel, J. (2007). *Overcoming Zionism.* Pluto Press: Ann Arbor and London.

59. Chao, K-B. and Bickel, M.J. (2011). Isratin: The one-state solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

60. Tilley, V. (2010). *The one-state solution: A breakthrough for peace in the Israeli-Palestinian deadlock.* University of Michigan Press.

61. Munayyer, Y. (2019). There Will Be a One-State Solution. *Foreign Aff.* 98: 30.

62. D'Almeida, K. (2011)0 Dead Peace Process Could be "National Suicide" for Israel. Inter Press Service, News Agency, 16 February.

63. Bisharat, G. (2010). Maximizing rights: The one-state solution to the Palestinian–Israeli conflict. *International Law and the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict*. Routledge, pp.307-339.

64. Farrington, J., Hinman, R., Joyce, D., et al. (2012). Exploring Alternatives to the Two-State Solution in the Palestinian-Israeli Conflict. *Woodrow Wilson School Graduate Policy Workshop, December.*