

1/18/82

AD HOC INTERFAITH DELEGATION TO ISRAEL AND THE WEST BANK

In response to the increasing tension and violent conflicts between Israelis and Palestinians, and out of a deep concern for the nonviolent resolution of the conflict in the Middle East, an interfaith delegation, co-convened by the American Friends Service Committee and the Fellowship of Reconciliation, traveled to Israel, the West Bank and Gaza. The delegation felt an urgency about traveling at this time, given the rapid development of events associated with the Israeli withdrawal from the Sinai, and a series of violent conflicts between Palestinians on the one hand and Israeli settlers and soldiers on the other.

The delegation included the following points in its stated objectives:

1. To meet with and listen to the perspectives and concerns of people on various sides of the conflict.
2. To communicate the concern of religious communities in the United States and indicate a desire to facilitate peaceful initiatives.
3. To search and probe for opportunities which encourage nonviolent alternatives to conflict.
4. To voice concern for the security rights and future of the State of Israel and the Palestinian people.
5. Returning to the United States, the group will report its findings to the various religious constituencies represented by the members of the Ad Hoc delegation.

The following report is an effort to highlight the major issues and concerns which emerged in the course of our meetings and conversations. Although

it is not an attempt to provide an in-depth historical framework for understanding the complexities of the Arab-Israeli-Palestinian conflict, some background information is included. It is hoped that this report on the delegation's encounters with the parties involved will serve to raise the level of informed discussion and thereby have a positive impact on the peaceful resolution of the conflict.

Opinions can and often do vary dramatically on any given issue. The following report is not an effort to catalogue the opinions and perspectives of all the people with whom we met. Rather, the focus is more on certain themes and perspectives which emerged in the course of our conversation. Nevertheless, an effort will be made to indicate the range of opinions.

#### THE OCCUPIED TERRITORIES: THE WEST BANK AND GAZA

March and April of 1982 have been marked by a series of violent encounters between Palestinian Arabs and the Israeli military, armed settlers, and Arab Village League members. Some of these incidents of violence have been provoked by acts of violence on the part of Palestinians. In other cases, it has been Israeli actions which have set off Palestinian demonstration in which acts of violence have occurred involving both Israelis and Palestinians. In either event, it seems clear that the timing of the conflicts is directly related to the major changes which are taking place in the Occupied Territories. Beyond the frustration and stress of day-to-day life under military occupation, Palestinians living in the West Bank and Gaza are clearly frightened and increasingly feel insecure. This is due in large measure to the very rapid deterioration in the post-1967 status quo during the past two months. The reasons for these changes are directly related to the implementation of the policies of the Likud government (elected in 1981). These policies were conceived and are being implemented by Ariel Sharon, the Defense Minister of Israel, and Menachem Milson, the Civil Administrator of the Military Government. The

recent developments in the territories can be best described in terms of the following categories: Village Leagues, Civil Administration, and settlements.

#### VILLAGE LEAGUES

Without doubt, one of the most dangerous and destabilizing new elements in the Middle East is the existence of the Israeli-sponsored Village Leagues. In May 1980, the military government began to establish the Village Leagues in the West Bank. The Leagues became a channel for all government-sponsored development projects, offering both technical and financial aid. In addition, they were established in order to develop an "alternative" Palestinian leadership in the territories. Since those who joined the Leagues were seen as collaborating with the military government, the Leagues were virtually boycotted by Palestinians. In recent months, they have become the focus of much unrest and violence.

In February of 1982, Yusef Katib, a well-known Village League member was murdered in Ramallah. In response, the Israeli government decided to train and arm Palestinian Arabs who were cooperating with the Village League program. In March, the Jordanian government issued a declaration saying that the current members had one month (until 9 April 1982) to withdraw. Failure to withdraw would result in the crime of treason and the seizure of all property and assets in Jordan. (Treason is punishable by death in Jordan.) Since this directive, many people have formally withdrawn from the Village Leagues. It must be noted that many of the Israelis with whom we had conversations pointed to this directive as another example of outside coercion and "terrorist threat" which attempted to control the political structures of the Palestinians in the Occupied Territories. In contrast, Palestinians view the Jordanian action as a political action designed to undermine further Israeli control of the Territories.

As of the middle of April, between 200 and 300 Palestinians have been trained and equipped with jeeps and weapons. In the view of most Palestinians,

for all intents and purposes, these people have joined the Israeli military occupation forces.

Virtually every political, religious and educational leader with whom we met on the West Bank reported having received threatening letters during the first three weeks in April. The origin of these letters, which were allegedly signed by the "Village Leagues," is unknown. When the letters had been turned over to the authorities, it was reported that there had been no response.

Our delegation heard numerous reports of unprovoked beatings and harassment by Village League members. Brother Albert Alonzo, Dean of Students at Bethlehem University, told us of one such violent incident in which he was beaten. The following account of that incident is Bethlehem University's official "Report on the Events of April 7, 1982, at Bethlehem University."

"On April 7, 1982, following a quiet day of classes at the University, two members of the staff were attacked without warning or explanation by five unidentified armed men. The attack occurred about 4:30 pm, just inside the entrance to the University. Mr. Farrah Massou, Gatekeeper, was severely injured and was taken to the French Hospital in Bethlehem; Brother Albert Alonzo, Dean of Students, suffered several contusions but did not require hospitalization. A number of University staff members and students witnessed the beatings but were unable to intercede as the attackers raised their machine guns in warning.

The five armed men drove past the University in their grey jeep, stopped and reversed direction, coming back towards the University. They parked about ten meters in front of the gate which had just been opened to permit a vehicle to exit. Two men went up to Mr. Farrah and suddenly began to beat him with a club and the butt of machine gun. When Brother Albert Alonzo attempted to intervene, two others stopped him and began striking him. When Mr. Farrah fell to the ground screaming with pain, the men left the campus and drove away in their jeep.

Brother Thomas Scanlan, Vice Chancellor, revealed that on the same day, the following letter (translated from Arabic) had been received in the mail.

"To: President of Bethlehem University, esq.  
Greetings,

We warn you from your continued opposition to us  
"Village Leagues in Israel" and from your continued

opposition to the civil administration. consequently, we inform you of the formation of factions for the village leagues in Israel so beware of your opposition to us.

Autonomy will be implemented on the 26/4/1982, so beware of opposition. Otherwise, the consequences will be reversible and dangerous.

Finally, "He who warns is excused".

This decision was taken unanimously in a secret meeting for Village Leagues in Israel."

The letter was signed by the "Leaders of Village Leagues and its factions in Israel."

Following the attack at Bethlehem University, five men with Uzi submachine guns continued their rampage, attacked a religious club and a coffee shop in neighboring Beit Sahur. Commenting on these events, veteran journalist David Richardson reported in the Jerusalem Post (April 11-17):

"Eyewitnesses claim to have recognized three of the assailants as members of the local Village League. They said the group used a Land Rover such as is used by the Leagues in their patrols in the area. By the week-end, five days after the complaint was made, no one had been arrested.....Local residents are adamant that the attackers are from the local Village League which have recently been armed and trained by the military authorities, ostensibly for self-defense. A local resident asked, 'Who else can drive around freely in a Land Rover armed with Uzis?'"

Without doubt, the presence of small bands of armed Arab Village Leaguers combined with the wide circulation of reports like the one above have added yet another explosive element to the already highly volatile situation in the West Bank. If there had been any possibility for the Village Leagues to represent an alternative Palestinian leadership in the Occupied Territories, that possibility is now completely out of the question.

#### CIVIL ADMINISTRATION

Most of the violent confrontations during the past two months in the Occupied Territories have been a direct result of the establishment of the

Civil Administration in the West Bank. A brief background will help set the context for these developments.

On November 1, 1981, Prof. Menachem Milson became the Civil Administrator for the Military Government. On November 4, he ordered Bir Zeit University closed for two months. Acting President Dr. Gabi Baramki, the administration, many faculty members and the nine members of the Student Council were placed under house or town arrest. This severe action was in response to demonstrations by Bir Zeit students.

The Bir Zeit students were protesting the policy of putting a civilian in charge of the Occupied Territories. Milson's appointment was interpreted by most Palestinians as a clear violation of the Geneva Convention with respect to Occupied Territories. They argued that this move represented a step toward de facto annexation by the Israeli government.

A chain of events began on March, when Ibrahim Tawil, the elected Mayor of El Bireh, was summoned to meet with Menachem Milson. Tawil refused to go, saying that he did not recognize Milson's authority. Milson promptly dismissed Tawil and his entire administration. This act triggered massive demonstrations in El Bireh, Ramallah and other West Bank towns. This spontaneous explosion of civil unrest has included elements of non-violent as well as violent resistance. In addition to general strikes and the singing of Palestinian national songs, many demonstrations have included rock-throwing, the burning of tires, the setting up of roadblocks and so on. Most often, such civil unrest has been met with a show of force. This, in turn, has heightened the tension and produced the phenomena of more demonstrations and incidents among the Palestinians.

In conversations with Palestinians in the Jalazone Refugee Camp near El Bireh, West Bank Mayors and others with whom we met, who raised the question

of violence and civil unrest, we asked if they thought the violence associated with the stoning of Israeli jeeps, soldiers and others, the setting of road-blocks, etc., was justified, in their minds. While no one openly advocated such measures, it seemed clear that most felt that this was an inevitable expression of the frustration of Palestinians living under the occupation. As one elder gentleman put it graphically, taking a water glass in his hand and saying, "If you fill water to the top of the glass and then keep pouring, the water is bound to overflow."

The Palestinians with whom we met and many of the Israelis as well believe that the incidents of the last month will be repeated in perhaps an even more intensified form in the weeks ahead. Most everyone felt that the dismissal of the three mayors was but a prelude of further things to come under the Civil Administration of Menachem Milson. One of the encouraging notes came from West Bank Mayors Kharim Kallaf and Ibrahim Tawil, two of the three who have been dismissed. (We were not able, for schedule reasons, to visit Basam Shaka, Mayor of Nablus.) Mayors Tawil and Kallaf both indicated that they had been visited by a large number of Israelis who were concerned about the implications of the civil administration dismissing democratically elected mayors in the Occupied Territories. Both mayors were equally appreciative of the support and encouragement they had received not only from Palestinians within and without the Occupied Territories, but also Israelis and others outside the Palestinian community.

One of the ironies and perhaps most serious consequences of this shift to the Civil Administration and the resulting ousting of the mayors was articulated to us by a well-known Palestinian intellectual. He noted that the ostensible purpose of the Civil Administration in coordination with the Village

Leagues was to develop a more moderate Palestinian leadership. Ironically, it has been the elected Mayors of the West Bank who have been among the most moderating influences on the PLO. The removal of these mayors, all of whom can be considered among the more moderate of Palestinian spokesmen, has the opposite effect of that which is stated by the Civil Administration. Namely, rather than developing a more moderate Palestinian leadership, the most moderate voices are being removed from the scene, thereby encouraging the more radical voices among the Palestinians.

#### SETTLEMENTS

Most people agree that the rapid escalation in the settlement process is a major destabilizing factor in the Middle East. At the time of the signing of the Camp David accords, there were some 3,000 Israeli settlers in the Occupied Territories. It is clear that both President Sadat and President Carter understood that the settlement process would be frozen during this five-year period of autonomy negotiations outlined in Camp David. It is also clear that the present Israeli government interpreted the autonomy framework rather differently. So, rather than there being 3,000 settlers as there were in 1978, there are now some 25,000 settlers living on 80 settlements in the Occupied Territories.

As the delegation was preparing to leave on Sunday, April 26, we noted a story in the Jerusalem Post in which the Defense Minister Ariel Sharon announced that on Independence Day, April 29, Israel would mark that occasion by the opening of 11 new settlements, ten on the West Bank and one in Gaza. Both Prime Minister Begin and Defense Minister Sharon have repeatedly said in recent weeks that the purpose of the process of settlement in the West Bank is to "create new facts which will permanently alter the situation" there and preclude the possibility of a Palestinian State.

In the face of this, it is difficult to expect Palestinians to take seriously the Camp David process. In fact, almost all the people with whom we met indicated that they felt the Camp David process had run its course and was now at a dead end. Few held out the hope that the autonomy talks could produce anything that might possibly be satisfactory to the national hopes and desire for self-determination of the Palestinian people.

One of the complicating factors in the current unrest is the presence of armed Israeli settlers. Reports abound in the West Bank and Gaza of unprovoked attacks by Israeli settlers. There have been several unexplained deaths, in some cases of small children. There have been reports of unprovoked harassment by settlers coming into schools wielding rifles and so on. The extent to which this is happening is impossible to judge. It may well be that a very small handful of settlers are provoking confrontation. It may also be the case that in many situations <sup>they</sup> are first harassed or confronted by Palestinians and they, in turn, respond. In any event, and without trying to spell out the particulars, it is clear that the presence of armed settlers, who are in the minds of most of the Palestinians virtually indistinguishable from the military itself, is a source of great irritation and frustration. Any minor incident is known widely throughout the West Bank and Gaza in a matter of hours. Therefore, regardless of who provokes whom in any given confrontation, the result ends up being the same, namely, heightened tension, more frustration and an increased hostility between the two parties.

In our visits to the refugee camps--both near El Bireh at the Jalazone Refugee Camp and at the Jabaliya Refugee Camp in the Gaza districts, where a number of shootings and confrontation have occurred in recent weeks, we found the tensions extremely high. In the case of the Jalazone Camp, an Israeli settlement sits on top of a hill overlooking the camp. We were told many

reports by refugees living in the camp of attacks by settlers. One feature of the confrontation or of the conflict of which many of us had not been aware is the shooting out of water storage tanks on top of the huts in which these people live. As we toured Jalazone Camp, we saw 30-40 places where the water tanks had been shot through. Clearly, the shots had come from the direction of the settlement on the hill overlooking the refugee camp. This of course is a major economic blow to people who are already hard pressed. In addition to the economic burden involved in repairing and replacing such water storage tanks, it is a major complicating factor in life itself. The importance of water for bathing, for washing clothes, for cooking and for drinking is obvious.

As we talked with many people in these camps, we discovered a very clear sense of a double standard. We asked if they had filed reports of these incidents and whether or not there had been any follow-up. A standard response went something like this: "We often filed reports but we had no way of knowing if anything is ever done. On the other hand, if one of our children throws a rock at an Israeli jeep, we are liable to have our house blown up as a form of collective punishment against our child." One of the members of our delegation upon seeing this particular situation which was repeated in several other places in the Occupied Territories--namely that of having a settlement overlooking a camp or a town or a village--commented on how this was a Golan Heights in reverse situation and that the Israelis ought to be particularly sensitive to how it feels to be sitting down below those with whom you are in conflict. The image was a striking one and one which resonated with many of the Israelis with whom we met.

GAZA

In general terms, the same issues and concerns occupy the people living in Gaza as those in the West Bank. We found the people in Gaza to be outspoken and direct in their criticisms of the current situation. Even the Mayor, Rashad Shawa, who is considered among the most conservative Palestinian mayors, was very straightforward in his assessment of the unraveling situation.

In visiting the hospital where many of the wounded had been taken during the recent confrontations, and in conversation with people in the refugee camp, we found the level of frustration and tension extremely high. It is clear that things have reached a boiling point.

Perhaps the most moving experience came during our visit to the family of a seven-year-old child who had been fatally wounded by an Israeli soldier. Sitting with the family and a host of their friends and relatives, we were told the story of how the young boy had been shot. According to the eyewitness accounts, he and a friend (whom we met) were some five blocks away from a demonstration when they were confronted by soldiers and, in an unprovoked action, subsequently shot.

The story of this boy's death is widely discussed in Gaza and elsewhere in the Territories. The precise details surrounding his fatal injuries remain to be discovered. Nevertheless, in the popular perception of the Palestinians living in the Jabaliya camp, he was murdered in cold blood by a soldier. And, no effort is being made to bring justice.

Many of the people injured during the demonstrations have not gone to the hospital for medical treatment. The reason: Palestinians who are treated for gunshot wounds are often arrested and charged with criminal offenses. At the very least, Palestinians charged with criminal offenses are fined and

have their identity cards taken away. The fines often run to \$250, a prohibitive amount for most.

### PROSPECTS FOR PEACE

In our conversations with Palestinians we sought to probe for possible directions or developments which they thought might improve the prospects for peace. We asked for specific steps they might suggest. We asked them to describe where they found reason for hope both in the short term and in the long term. In the following paragraphs, I will outline the major themes and perspectives we found.

In the short term, most people were very pessimistic. One man summed up the feeling of many with whom we met: "You ask me what I hope for...I hope that when I go home tonight my son will be there at the dinner table." The anxiety and uncertainty of day-to-day life is hard to fathom from without.

Most of the people with whom we met were not very optimistic regarding any change in the downward spiral of violent confrontation. They felt that the policies of the Likud government were being implemented and that there was no good reason to assume that Begin or Sharon would not continue in the same fashion. As a result, people were preparing for a worsening situation. One man who has been a leading figure in the West Bank for years noted, "We used to talk about 'steadfastness'. Now, we are talking about 'maintaining a presence'. We feel ourselves increasingly under pressure to leave our homeland. But, we will not!"

One theme which was repeated in virtually every conversation was that of the need for third party initiative. People agreed that problems ultimately must be solved among the people living in the region. Nevertheless, a way must be found out of the current impasse. A few people mentioned the

possibility of European initiatives, possibly headed by President Mitterand of France. On balance, however, most Palestinians suggested that it was the United States which must play the crucial role.

There was great suspicion about current U.S. policies and open resentment of the history of U.S. voting patterns in the United Nations. Nonetheless, virtually every Palestinian leader with whom we met stressed that the single most likely path to peace involved direct U.S. intervention. And, again almost to a person, Palestinians suggested that the only way to reverse the current trends in Israeli policy was for the United States to threaten to cut off economic aid to Israel if it continued its policies in the West Bank and Gaza Strip. We discussed the ramifications of such pressure from the United States with Israelis as well. Their views varied considerably (see section on Israel) unlike the singular voice we heard from the Palestinians.

It is illegal for anyone in the Occupied Territories to be a member of any Palestinian nationalist organization. So, most people are careful to mention that they are not a member of the PLO. It is also clear that the overwhelming majority of people in the Occupied Territories support the PLO as the legitimate representatives of the Palestinian people. This is not uncritical support. Several people pointed out that the PLO had made serious mistakes in the past. And, some of the groups which make up the PLO are advocating a radical program with which most Palestinians would not agree. Still, in terms of the principle concerns and commonly-held aspirations of the Palestinian people, we found no evidence to suggest the PLO was not representing the Palestinians. This point needs to be reiterated since both the U.S. government and the government of Israel steadfastly refuse to recognize the PLO.

The mayors as well as others with whom we met were clear in their expectations for a negotiated settlement. Not one of them failed to acknowledge

Israel as an established fact. They all agreed that Israel had a right to exist within clear and secure borders, at peace with the neighboring states. They also agreed, in general terms, that the Palestinians would accept as their state the West Bank and Gaza with the approximate pre-1967 borders. When we asked why the PLO leadership had not stated the same in clear and unambiguous terms, we found different responses. These ranged from "Why should we have to make the first step?" to "This would be possible if the United States government would provide the assurances and support needed." (Presumably, this latter response means that the moderate PLO leadership must have support vis-a-vis the more radical Palestinian groups and protection from any actions the Syrian government might take.)

#### ISRAEL

Israel is deeply divided on how best to deal with the Palestinian issue. During the course of our conversations with Israelis, we had the opportunity to hear articulate spokespersons representing the range of opinions currently being debated. In addition to the expected points of disagreement, we found a number of points on which virtually all Israelis agreed. These are significant and bear repeating in this report.

The week our delegation was visiting the Middle East was the final week leading up to the April 25, 1982 withdrawal from the Sinai. Consequently, much attention was focused on the activities in Yamit. Virtually every Israeli with whom we met expressed the pain and difficulty of the pullout from Yamit. There was a clear sense that Israel was giving up something very substantial for the peace with Egypt. Related to this is the consensus we found on the importance of continuing the peace with Egypt. To a person, we were told that the peace process must not break down. Israelis feel that they have gone a

long way and made major concessions in this process. For Egypt to undermine the peace after regaining control of the Sinai would serve to reinforce the worst fears of all Israelis.

Everyone with whom we met agreed that there has been a qualitative change in the administered territories in recent weeks. The civil unrest and violent confrontations are seen as directly related to the implementation of the policies of Defense Minister Sharon and Civil Administrator Milson. Furthermore, Israelis acknowledged that a major change had taken place in the past three years vis-a-vis the settlements in the Occupied Territories. Whereas there were some 3,000 settlers when the Camp David accords were signed in 1978, there are now some 25,000 living in 80 settlements. No longer can one regard these people as ideologically tied to the Gush Emonim because many Israelis are moving into the settlements for economic reasons. The government subsidizes the settlements to the extent that housing in the Occupied Territories is priced at roughly 50% of that within the green line (i.e., the border of Israel proper prior to the 1967 war). We were told that some 1,700 families recently showed up at a movie theatre to participate in a lottery for 100 housing units in a newly established settlement. Given this trend, no one disagreed with Ariel Sharon that "new facts are being created in Judea and Samaria..."

Another point on which virtually all Israelis agreed is the unlikelihood of any substantial change in Israeli government policy in the foreseeable future. It is widely acknowledged that Prime Minister Begin is stronger now than at the time of the last elections. And, if new elections were held today, all polls show that he would increase significantly the current narrow margin his coalition enjoys in the Knesset. In the absence of any unexpected outside influences/factors, no one expects that he will alter his present policies or change his interpretation of the autonomy negotiations outlined at Camp David.

Having reported the above, it is also true that we found a concern among almost all Israelis about the effects of occupation on Israel itself. Recent revelations about violations of civil and human rights in the Golan Heights, reports of unwarranted brutality by soldiers and settlers in the territories, government decisions about the limitations on freedom of the press, etc., have contributed to a growing debate in Israel. During our meetings, many people expressed the fear that the policies associated with the occupation were having the effect of eroding the moral fabric on which Israel was founded. Even the most forceful spokesman for the Likud coalition acknowledged this as a very real concern.

Throughout our meetings and conversations it was apparent that the Israelis were genuinely interested in peace. They stressed that Israelis would be prepared to give up a lot for true peace. At the same time, Israelis all across the political spectrum conveyed an equally heartfelt desire for security. As with the Palestinians with whom we met, most people talked in terms of peace and security for their children and grandchildren.

IMPORTANT POINTS TO NOTE FROM OUR CONVERSATIONS WITH ISRAELIS

--Among those sympathetic with the current Likud policies, the prevailing view rejected a Palestinian state in the West Bank and Gaza, saying, "There already is a Palestinian state: Jordan". Rafi Israeli actually argued that the current policies are desirable precisely because they reveal in clear terms to the Palestinians what they will lose if they don't come forward and seek peace now!

--A positive movement toward peace is possible if people in Israel are presented with clear choices. At this point, the intentions and goals of the Palestinians and the PLO are seen as at best ambiguous. Most of the people with whom we met who would fall under the political umbrella of "Labor party and to the left" clearly felt that public opinion about the PLO could shift if the Israelis were convinced that the Palestinians wanted peace and were prepared to offer negotiable alternatives. At present people fear the "alternatives" offered by the PLO are annihilation or capitulation.

--Peace Now, Civil Rights activists and others who share a similar perspective talked a good deal about the negative implications of the occupation for Israel's democracy. A clear illustration is found in recent government rulings regarding freedom of the press. For six weeks, reporters were barred from the Golan Heights (following the annexation). For one day, Israeli journalists were forbidden access to Yamit, a move which provoked quite an uproar within Israel. And, most recently, the state-run radio and television commission has issued a decree making it illegal for TV and radio journalists to initiate interviews with "hostile elements" (e.g., ousted mayors) in the administered territories.

--Most Israelis felt that the United States lacked a clear policy on the Middle East. As to whether pressure from Washington would have a moderating effect on Prime Minister Begin, opinions varied. Most felt, however, that strong pressure by the United States (e.g., cutting of economic aid) would likely be counter-productive. Several argued, for instance, that pressure from the United States was precisely what may provoke Begin into an outright annexation of the West Bank. Others felt that the United States must exert some pressure on Israel if there is to be any slowing of the implementation of the policies in the territories.



UPON OUR RETURN TO THE UNITED STATES, U.S. GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS MADE  
THE FOLLOWING POINTS TO US

---

--The U.S. government will pursue "quiet diplomacy" with Israel on the points which is seen differently by the two governments, e.g., settlements.

--Following the pullout from the Sinai, the focus will shift to the autonomy negotiations. All signs indicate that the United States will make a major push on this part of the Camp David process for the foreseeable future. (The time span mentioned was "for the next year".)



LIST OF MEETINGS  
BY THE AD HOC INTERFAITH DELEGATION  
TO THE MIDDLE EAST  
APRIL 18-26, 1982

ISRAEL

Association for Civil Rights in Israel

Michael Berger, Lawyer

Ruth Gavison, Professor of Law, Hebrew University

Meron Benvenisti - Former Deputy Mayor, Jerusalem

Zvi Brosh - Special Advisor to Teddy Kollek, Mayor of Jerusalem

Naomi Chason - Professor of Political Science, Hebrew University

Elazar Settlement - South of Bethlehem, Gush Etzion Block

Rafael Israeli - Professor, Hebrew University

New Outlook

Simha Flapan - Founder of New Outlook

Willy Gaffney - Managing Director

Peace Now

Mordecai Bar-Om - Former Chief Education Officer, Israel Army

Jonathan Frankl - Professor of Contemporary Jewry, Hebrew University

Galia Golan - Professor of Political Science, Hebrew University

Ehud Olmert - Lawyer, Member of Knesset, Herut party or the Likud  
Coalition

Avraham Schenker - Head of Development Department, World Zionist Org.

Harold Z. Schiffrin - Director of Truman Institute

Nissim Yaish - Director, Department for Christian Communities,  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs

THE WEST BANK (INCLUDING ARAB EAST JERUSALEM)

Al Aqsa Mosque Tour - After the shooting incident of April 12

Issam Awad, Chief Engineer

LIST OF MEETINGS (continued)

Bethlehem University

Alonzo Albert - Dean of Students

Brother Thomas Scalan - Vice Chancellor

Manuel Hassassian - Professor, Graduate Univ. of Cincinnati

Prof. Jed Isaac - Academic Coordinator

Bir Zeit University

Dr. Gabi Baramki - Acting President

Ibrahim Dukkak - President, West Bank Engineers Association

Jalazone Refugee Camp, El Bireh

Tony Bakerjian, UNRWA Director

Karim Khallaf - Dismissed Mayor of Ramallah (under town arrest  
in Jericho)

Anwar Nusseibi - Director of Palestine Electric Company, Member  
of Supreme Muslim Council

Doris Saleh - Director of the Jerusalem YWCA

Ibrahim Tawil - Dismissed Mayor of El Bireh

GAZA

Jabaliya Refugee Camp

Usra Barbari - Director, Gaza Women's Union

Rashad Shawa - Mayor of Gaza

Shifa Hospital - (Visited some of those injured in the recent  
conflicts in Gaza)

UNRWA Officials

Tom McAndrew - UNRWA Deputy Director

U.S. OFFICIALS & REPRESENTATIVES OF U.S. ORGANIZATIONS

National Security Council (Washington)

Jeffrey Kemp, Mid-East Specialist

LIST OF MEETING (continued)

United States Embassy (Tel Aviv)

Paul Hare - Political Counselor

U. S. State Department (Washington)

Watt Cluverius

Amb. Richard Fairbanks - Special Assistant to Sec. Haig  
for the Autonomy Negotiations

John Yemma - Christian Science Monitor, Mid-East Correspondent



Biographical Sketches  
Interfaith Delegation

Bernita Bennette - Historian and Protocol Officer of the Martin Luther King Jr. Center for Nonviolent Social Change.

Wallace Collett - Retired businessman; former Vice President and Chairman of the Executive Committee of Servomation Corporation; Immediate Past Chairman, Board of Directors, American Friends Service Committee; Chairman, Board of Directors, Wilmington College; Member, Board of Directors, Haverford College.

The Rev. Charles Kimball - Director of Interfaith Activities, Fellowship of Reconciliation; Specialist in Islamic studies and Islamic-Christian relations; candidate for doctorate of theology at Harvard University Divinity School; Baptist Minister.

The Rev. George B. Telford, Jr. - Member, Commission on Faith and Order of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the USA (NCCC); Immediate Past Vice President of the NCCC Commission for Church and Society; Pastor, Blacksburg, Virginia Presbyterian Church; Member, Middle East Panel NCCC; Recipient, American Jewish Committee Award for Religious Affairs.

David Tullin - Executive Director, Fellowship House; Member, Executive Committee, American Zionist Federation; former Director Board of Jewish Education, Philadelphia; former, Chairman, Philadelphia Zionist Federation; Immediate Past President Americans for Progressive Israel.

The Rev. Dale White - Bishop of the Northern and Southern New Jersey Conference of the United Methodist Church; Member, Executive Committee, Council of Methodist Bishops; Board Member, Clergy and Laity Concerned; Board Member, Bread for the World.

Sister Virginia Williams - Member, Sisters of Loretto; Staffperson, National Organization for Women in St. Louis; Member, Executive Board, National Coalition of American Nuns; former member Human Rights Commission Catholic Archdiocese of St. Louis.

