Hollis, R. (2013) '**Europe and the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict'** in Joel Peters & David Newman, eds., *Routledge Handbook of the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict*. Pp.336-345.



European involvement in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict has taken various forms over the last hundred years. Certainly the origins of the conflict cannot be understood without reference to racism, nationalism and war in Europe. The political contours of the whole Middle East region were determined by British and French imperial machinations between the 1920s and 1950s. During the Cold War the superpowers became more instrumental but when they took opposite sides in the 1967 Arab-Israeli war, the Europeans adopted a range of positions somewhere in between.

Latterly the European Union (EU) has emerged as a new player in the quest for conflict resolution and while its role has been secondary to that of the United States, the EU was quicker to articulate the goal of independent statehood for the Palestinians in the West Bank and Gaza. Yet even though the EU, the US, the United Nations and Russia joined forces after 2002 in the so-called Quartet and endorsed a 'two-state solution' to the conflict, the EU has deferred to US leadership on how to get there.

Here the story of European involvement in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict is depicted in five successive phases. The first covers the period of the British Mandate in Palestine, Nazi ascendancy in Europe and the Holocaust, concluding with the establishment of the state of Israel in 1948 and genesis of the Palestinian refugee problem. The second phase sees the demise of European imperialism, the Suez debacle, superpower rivalry, the 1967 and 1973 wars, wherein Israel captured and occupied the West Bank and Gaza Strip, the oil shock, and the US-brokered Egypt-Israel peace treaty of 1979.

In 1980 the European Community (EC) issued the Venice Declaration, signalling for the first time a collective European position on the conflict that included recognition of the right of Palestinians to self-determination. This marked the beginning of the third phase, during which the EC was transformed into the European Union (EU). It then adopted a central economic role in what became the Middle East Peace Process (MEPP).

The outbreak of the second Palestinian Intifada in 2000 marked the beginning of the fourth phase, during which the advent of 'the war on terror' and the Iraq crisis transformed the international and regional context of the conflict. In the face of Israel's military crackdown on Palestinian resistance and terrorism, the EU poured its resources into keeping the Palestinian Authority (PA) afloat. Simultaneously, the EU also forged closer ties with Israel under the European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP).

The fifth and final phase in the story began in 2006, when the Islamist movement Hamas won Palestinian legislative elections that were financed and monitored by

the Europeans. The EU, along with the rest of the Quartet, then refused to deal with Hamas, pending satisfaction on Quartet requirements. After Hamas took sole control of the Gaza Strip in 2007, the EU focused on Palestinian institution-building in the West Bank, while Gaza languished under an Israeli blockade endorsed by Washington. Too embedded in bilateral economic relations with both Israel and the PA to walk away, EU policy now consists of repeated calls on both to agree a solution.

## Europe and the Origins of the Conflict

In the late nineteenth century, Europe was the context for the development of the Zionist movement (see Chapters 1 and 2). Simply put, were it not for the persecution of Jews in Europe, particularly in Eastern Europe and Russia in the nineteenth century, the impetus for the creation of a national homeland for the Jews might have gained less traction. The origins of Zionism are discussed in Chapter 2 and need not be repeated here. However, for present purposes it is important to mention how the British featured in the realisation of Zionist aspirations.

Members of the British establishment were divided in their reactions to the Zionist cause, though some saw it as potentially serving British interests in the context of the First World War and Britain's imperial ambitions in the Middle East. In November 1917 the British Foreign Secretary Lord Balfour wrote a letter to Lord Rothschild saying that the British Government:

> [v]iews with favour the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, and will use their best endeavours to facilitate the achievement of this object, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine…[1]

In the aftermath of war and the collapse of the Ottoman Empire, Britain and France took the lead in dividing up the Middle East into separate states and spheres of influence. Britain acquired the League of Nations Mandate for Palestine in 1922 and Balfour's letter, which became known as the Balfour Declaration, was incorporated into the terms of the Mandate.[2] At British insistence, a further provision was added by which Transjordan was excluded from implementation of the Balfour Declaration.

The flow of Jewish migrants to Palestine was to swell significantly during the 1930s and '40s as a consequence of the rise of Nazism in Europe. In the face of this and resulting Arab hostility, the British authorities took steps to control the numbers of Jewish immigrants, only to incur Zionist hostility and international opprobrium (especially in the United States) when they tried to turn away Jewish refugees seeking entry to Palestine.

Hollis, R. (2013) '**Europe and the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict'** in Joel Peters & David Newman, eds., *Routledge Handbook of the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict*. Pp.336-345.



This friction notwithstanding, some of the measures the British authorities took to counter violent Arab opposition to their rule and to Jewish immigration, bolstered the position of the Zionists vis à vis the Palestinians. The British also deployed emergency powers to suppress unrest that were later adopted by Israel after the establishment of the Jewish state. From a Palestinian perspective, therefore, the British were deemed responsible both for enabling the Zionist enterprise to take off and for undermining the relative strength of the Palestinians in the ensuing contest.

Victorious but exhausted and overstretched at the end of the Second World War, the British were obliged to regroup. Britain's gradual withdrawal from its imperial domains began with Indian independence in 1947. The same year, the British referred the question of Palestine to the United Nations. However, when the UN voted in favour of partition, between a Jewish state and an Arab state, the Zionists acquiesced but the Arabs declared their opposition and the British, lacking the capacity and the will to enforce partition, packed up and left, leaving the parties to their fate in the war of 1948.

As a result Jordan, with British support, won control of the West Bank, including East Jerusalem, along with many of the 700,000 or so Palestinian refugees displaced in the fighting. Other refugees fled north to Syria and Lebanon. Many also ended up in the Gaza Strip, which came under Egyptian administration from 1948 until 1967.

## Europe and the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict during the Cold War

Israel's victory was the Palestinians' *nakba* or catastrophe and antipathy to the Jewish state became a central feature of the Arab nationalist cause, along with anti-European imperialism in the 1950s and '60s. The British and French progressively retreated in the face of independence movements across the globe, including in the Middle East.

Following the overthrow of the British-backed monarchy in Egypt, Gamal Abdel Nasser emerged as the President of the Republic and champion of Arab Nationalism. Opposed to Nasser's regional influence and fearing a curtailment of their access to the Suez Canal – a vital artery for European shipping between the Mediterranean and the Indian Ocean – in 1956 the British and French secretly colluded with the Israelis to seize the Canal and topple Nasser.[3]

Their mission was thwarted by the Americans, who forced a withdrawal of the British, French and Israeli armed forces and in the process won favour across the Arab world for countering the Israelis and the old imperialists. The Suez War marked the nadir of British imperial fortunes in the Middle East, after which the

monarchy they had installed in Iraq was ousted in 1958 and their influence in Jordan was curtailed. By 1967 they were forced out of Yemen by rebels supported by Nasser. The French retreated also and gave up their campaign to hold onto Algeria in 1962.

By 1967 both France and Britain had ceased to exercise decisive influence in the region. Until that date, France did serve as the principal supplier of arms to Israel, but as of the 1967 war, the French changed policy and opted for closer relations with the Arabs. Britain left its last outposts of empire in the Gulf in 1971 and became a competitor with the French, the Americans and others for lucrative commercial contracts in the Arab oil-producing states and Iran during the first oil boom. Most Europeans, with the notable exception of the Netherlands, accommodated to Arab pressure during the oil embargo that accompanied the 1973 war.

Meanwhile, Cold War rivalry between the United States and the Soviet Union became the overriding determinant of external engagement in the Middle East, as recounted elsewhere in this volume. In the 1967 war the superpowers were ranged on opposite sides. In the aftermath, however, the British and French, both Permanent Members of the UN Security Council, were instrumental in the drafting and adoption of UNSC Resolution 242.

This milestone bears mention here because Resolution 242 subsequently became the benchmark for official European pronouncements on the Arab-Israeli conflict. In essence, Resolution 242 and the successor Resolution 338, adopted in the October 1973 Arab-Israeli War, called for the exchange of land for peace. The Europeans have repeatedly referred back to this formula as the key to resolving the conflict. They contend that the most sustainable road to peace between Israel and the Arabs depends upon Israel giving up the land it captured in 1967, including the West Bank and Gaza Strip, in return for recognition and acceptance by its neighbours.

By contrast, the Americans have tended to assume that if the parties to the conflict can arrive at an agreement, so be it, irrespective of whether that agreement is fully in accordance with UN pronouncements. Judging by recent EU statements however (see below), the Europeans have come to the view that, provided both sides agree, there can be adjustments to the 1967 borders.

**From the Venice Declaration to the Demise of the Oslo Process (1980-2000)**

The EC's Venice Declaration of 1980 constituted the first major joint statement of the Europeans on the Arab-Israeli conflict and the beginning of Europe's emergence as a new player in the region. It broke new ground by recognizing the right of Palestinians to self-determination and calling for the inclusion of the

Palestine Liberation Organisation (PLO) in peace negotiations. However, Israel rejected the declaration out of hand and the Americans pursued their own initiatives. As of the Israeli invasion of Lebanon in 1982 that country became the main focus of such efforts. The emergence of Hizballah, with Iranian support, hostage-taking and the attacks on US and French marines in Beirut widened the conflict and engendered animosities that still endure.

Escorted out of Lebanon under US and French mediation, the PLO leadership decamped to Tunis. Notwithstanding some unofficial European contacts with the Organisation, it continued to be barred as a terrorist group by the Israelis. Even the PLO was then taken by surprise when the first Palestinian *Intifada* or uprising broke out spontaneously in Gaza in December 1987 and spread rapidly to the West Bank. Television coverage of armoured Israeli forces confronting stone-throwing youths and civilian demonstrators on the streets of Palestinian towns drew international sympathy for the Palestinians and triggered a shift in European thinking about the conflict. Israel came in for much criticism, but the emergence of a strong peace camp in Israel also opened up possibilities for new 'people-to-people' initiatives involving both sides, many of which the Europeans helped to fund and facilitate.

Iraq's invasion of Kuwait in 1990 diverted attention to the Gulf. In the ensuing crisis the Arabs divided, with the PLO taking the Iraqi side. The Europeans contributed troops, armour and funds to the US-led coalition force that defeated the Iraqis in early 1991. Yet, when the United States (and Russia) convened the ground-breaking Middle East peace conference at Madrid in November 1991, the EC was granted only observer status. Europe was not yet considered a serious player. The European case for involvement was not helped by internal disagreement over who should represent European member states on such occasions and to this day the EU suffers from the difficulties of establishing a unified position on foreign policy issues.

However, in the multi-lateral talks initiated by the Madrid conference, the EU was made 'gavel-holder' of the Regional Economic and Development Working Group (REDWG).[4] The Europeans also participated in parallel talks on regional security, refugees and environment, but they used REDWG to carve out a role for the EU in the MEPP that became increasingly instrumental in the fortunes of the Palestinians. The purpose of the multilateral talks was to bolster the prospects of the bilateral negotiations between Israel and the Arabs, hosted by Washington.

However, it was a Norwegian initiative that produced what became the Oslo Accords between Israel and the PLO, soon to be adopted and managed by the United States. The details of the ensuing 'Oslo Process' are discussed in Section 2 of this volume. Here, suffice to say, the Europeans embraced that process as a

recipe for resolving the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and expected that it would likely lead to Palestinian statehood, alongside Israel, in the West Bank and Gaza.

Meanwhile, in 1995 the EU initiated the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership programme (EMP), the central goal of which was to turn the Mediterranean basin into a free trade area encompassing Israel as well as the Arab littoral states and Jordan. Security cooperation was also envisaged, as well as cultural exchanges and environmental protection. Crucially, through promoting human rights and political reform in the Arab partner countries the EU hoped to use the EMP to transform these states and thereby address its own security concerns about migration and terrorist violence perpetrated by Islamist groups linking militants in Europe and North Africa.

A central assumption of the EMP was that the MEPP would deliver. All the protagonists, including Syria and Lebanon, as well as the Palestinians and Jordan, attended EMP meetings alongside the Israelis, notwithstanding setbacks and reversals in bilateral peace negotiations during the 1990s. This experience encouraged the EU to believe that the EMP could make progress in parallel with but not dependent upon the fortunes of the MEPP. However, the vision of the EMP could not ultimately be realised without resolution of the conflict. Meanwhile, the institutional frameworks through which the EU pursued its objectives in both arenas overlapped and became fused.[5]

Once the PA was established the EU and its member states began channelling funds previously dispersed to Palestinian NGOs directly to the PA, along with development aid, though EU support for 'people-to-people' projects also continued. In addition, European governments identified various infrastructure projects, such as a port facility in the Gaza Strip and an airport, for state and EU funding.

On the diplomatic front, the Americans took the lead and expected the Europeans to be supportive but in the background. For the most part the Europeans went along, but when progress on implementation of the Oslo Accords faltered, particularly during the tenure of the Likud government in Israel from 1996 to 1999, the Europeans were frustrated and critical, and they showed it by delaying ratification of successive trade and cooperation agreements with Israel. However, under the EMP, the EU did eventually sign and ratify Partnership Agreements with both Israel and the PA.

The results were mixed. The agreement with the PA took it for granted that economic protocols between Israel and the Palestinians, which assumed complex interdependence and a customs union between the two, would proceed to plan. In reality, the Palestinian economy was subordinate and constrained by the effects of Israeli security measures. The EU Partnership Agreement with

Israel, meanwhile, drew a distinction between goods made in Israel and those made in settlements in the Occupied Territories, such that only the former could enter the EU without paying customs dues. However, in practice observance of this distinction was cumbersome and fudged, and it became a source of contention between the Israelis and Europe.

With respect to US handling of the peace negotiations, European pronouncements indicated a level of scepticism about Washington's capacity to understand Palestinian concerns as readily as those of Israel. Yet they recognized the limits of their own leverage with the Israelis in comparison to that of the United States and therefore looked to Washington to deliver Israel. On occasion the French suggested a new peace conference might be required to trigger progress, but could not force the issue without US concurrence. British Prime Minister Tony Blair made a number of efforts to actually assist US diplomacy.[6] Yet the Israelis and even the Palestinians remained more attentive to Washington than any European mediation.

Eventually, following the unsuccessful US summit at Camp David in July 2000, the Oslo Process collapsed. The second Palestinian Intifada unleashed a series of Palestinian suicide attacks on Israeli civilians that destroyed the Israeli peace camp and led to the election of Ariel Sharon. He initiated a crackdown on the Palestinians intended to crush Palestinian resistance and 'lower their expectations'.

## Vain quest to re-start the MEPP (2001-2005)

In 2001 George W Bush became the new US President and initially showed little interest in resolving the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. In the absence of US engagement the Europeans could do little more than provide the funds to keep the PA from total collapse while the conflict raged. The EU contended that preservation of the PA was essential to counter the Israeli claim that there was no Palestinian partner to negotiate with. Even so, the suicide attacks on Israeli civilians eroded public sympathy for the Palestinians in Europe. Accusations of corruption in the PA prompted the EU to demand stringent reforms in PA accounting practices. Meanwhile, the EU was itself evolving and preoccupied with the absorption of new members and the quest for a European constitution.

Against this backdrop the attacks on the United States of 11 September 2001 (9/11) transformed the context of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and the hopes for peace. The Bush administration declared 'war on terror' and the Israelis defined their confrontation with the Palestinians in this context. Arafat, previously a frequent guest at the Clinton White House, was no longer welcome in Washington and remained holed up in his headquarters in Ramallah. After the Americans cut funding to the PA, it fell to the EU to pay the salaries of PA

employees as a way to avert a humanitarian crisis in the Occupied Territories. EC officials contemplated cutting support to oblige the Israelis to shoulder responsibility in accordance with the Geneva Conventions – but they baulked for fear that the strategy would backfire.

Meanwhile, attention in Europe and the Middle East became riveted on US plans for Iraq. The Iraq crisis and invasion of 2003 caused a major split in the Atlantic alliance and within the EU. The British stood beside the Americans, but largely failed to use their access in Washington to convince them of the importance of reviving the MEPP. The new East European members of the EU were also supportive of Washington, but Germany opposed the invasion as too did the French, who joined various Arab leaders in predicting mayhem across the Middle East as a result of it.

Against this backdrop, EU engagement on the Israeli-Palestinian issue followed two parallel tracks. Funding of the PA was continued, while diplomacy was focused on Washington – where EU leverage was compromised by the Iraq crisis. Following Bush's pronouncement in 2002 that Palestinian statehood alongside Israel was his vision for peace, the EU worked within the Quartet to devise a road map for reaching that goal. The plan was finally launched in the wake of the Iraq invasion, but languished thereafter, in part because of US and Israeli manoeuvres to keep Arafat out of the frame. After his death in November 2004 the Israelis began a series of unilateral moves that changed the shape of the conflict. In summer 2005 they withdrew all the Jewish settlers from the Gaza Strip, but continued to control the borders and curtail the movement of Palestinians and trade. Work began on the security barrier around and within the West Bank, separating major settlement blocks from Palestinian population centres.

The EU expressed concerns about the route taken by the barrier, which was pronounced contrary to international law by the International Court in the Hague. EU statements and approaches to the Israelis included frequent complaints about the effects of Israeli security measures on Palestinian economic life and welfare in both the West Bank and Gaza. When Palestinian elections were called for January 2006, the EU hoped to make this a turning point for the MEPP. It was, but not as anticipated. The Hamas victory triggered a crisis from which EU diplomacy has not recovered.

The EU decision to put Hamas on its list of terrorist organisations, thereby barring it from receipt of EU funds, was taken in 2004, at the height of the 'war on terror'. Having divided over the issue of Iraq the Europeans were at pains to demonstrate solidarity with Washington on the terrorism issue at least. In addition, Europe was itself the target of terrorist plots, many of which appeared to be 'home-grown' and European governments began to fear a new phenomenon

within, which has been dubbed 'radicalisation'. A counter-phenomenon, labelled Islamophobia, also worried the authorities, as well as incidences of anti-Semitic attacks on Jews and Jewish sites. Government responses included measures to control immigration and taking a tougher line on asylum seekers.

In theory, the EU remained committed to its political reform agenda in the Middle East, enshrined in the EMP. When the Bush administration announced its democratisation strategy for Iraq and the 'Wider Middle East', the EU countered with its Neighbourhood Policy (ENP). In the Mediterranean, this was supposed to supplement the broad brush approach of the EMP with a differentiated approach to partner countries, tailored to suit the different economic conditions in each. Action Plans were agreed with Europe's southern neighbours that were supposed to bring them into closer harmony with EU internal market standards. In the process Israel, with the most advanced economy among the partner countries, attained a new level of integration with the EU. An opportunity to condition closer EU-Israeli relations on progress in conflict resolution was sidestepped.

With Europe's Arab neighbours, meanwhile, closer security cooperation took precedence over democratisation and human rights promotion. Only the Palestinians were held to strict standards of financial accountability and transparency. However, once Hamas won the elections in 2006, the EU faced a dilemma. The EU had called for, financed and monitored the elections. Yet not only would financing a Hamas-run PA be illegal under EU law, but according to the Americans and Israelis, pressure on Hamas would eventually force the movement to change fundamentally or relinquish power. The EU opted to join the rest of the Quartet in devising three principles that Hamas was enjoined to embrace in order to gain acceptance. These were: recognition of Israel's right to exist; renunciation of violence; and acceptance of all previous agreements reached between Israel and the PLO and PA.

## EU Opts for Risk Avoidance

Devising a unified position across the EU and agreement within the Quartet have become the objectives of EU policy on the Arab-Israeli conflict, to the neglect of action to resolve it. Whereas in the past individual governments and leaders in Europe saw fit to speak out or propose new initiatives, latterly they appear to have calculated that risk avoidance is the best policy. Seemingly they have little hope that the EU can make a difference, even if it could agree on a more interventionist policy.

Yet by going along with the status quo, while issuing dire warnings about the situation being unsustainable, the EU has become more deeply embedded in the structure of the conflict. By its avoidance of dealing with Hamas and grumbling

compliance with the Israeli blockade of Gaza, it has intervened directly in Palestinian factional politics. When Hamas ousted its Fatah rivals and took control of Gaza in 2007, the EU quickly embraced the emergency administration formed in the West Bank under President Mahmoud Abbas, and steered by Salam Fayyad as Prime Minister. Since then EU and US funds have been channelled into Fayyad's state-building project and paid Fatah supporters in Gaza to stay at home rather than work for Hamas-run organisations. Only the UN Relief and Works Agency (UNWRA) has been able to continue an international presence in Gaza, but under the blockade, even UNRWA cannot import the materials it needs to run its operations.

In a calculated response to Hamas intransigence and rocket attacks into Israel from the Gaza Strip, in December 2008 the Israelis launched an offensive that resulted in the deaths of some 1,300 Palestinians, including many children, and thirteen Israelis. Public opinion polls in Europe revealed a surge of sympathy for the Palestinians and the EU, under the Czech presidency, postponed plans for upgrading existing agreements with Israel. The realisation that anger at the Israelis over the plight of the Palestinians could contribute to the radicalisation of Muslim opinion and thence threaten European internal security was acknowledged in official circles.

However, the EU looked to the new Obama administration to give the lead on what to do next. When President Barack Obama obliged with an urgent call for action to resolve the conflict once and for all, on the basis of a two-state solution, the relief in Europe was palpable and optimism returned for the first time in years. Obama appointed George Mitchell to head up his new initiative; called on the Israelis to halt all 'settlement activity' in the West Bank; favoured Abbas and his administration with renewed support; shunned Hamas; and appealed to the Arab states to help persuade the Israelis to resume negotiations with the Palestinians.

However, Binyamin Netanyahu, who became Israeli Prime Minister in 2009, declined to institute a total freeze on settlement building. Abbas consequently refused to enter into negotiations with him and the Arab states sat on the fence – apart from urging the Palestinian factions to overcome their differences. The EU had been told by Washington to expect a breakthrough in the MEPP by September 2009. It did not materialize and the Obama administration conceded that they had underestimated the difficulties and constraints on both sides.

By the end of 2009 the EU was set to introduce the new leadership structure outlined in the Lisbon Treaty, inclusive of an EU President and Foreign Minister. Pending this development, however, Sweden, which was the last to hold the rotating EU presidency before the change, managed to broker a new European policy statement on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict which broke new ground. It

became the basis of the policy stance of the new EU Foreign Minister Cathy Ashton.

The 'Conclusions of the Council of Ministers on the MEPP' released on 8 December 2009[7] was the clearest yet statement of EU thinking on the requirements for a comprehensive peace deal. The core element was a renewed call for 'a two-state solution' to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, with 'the State of Israel and an independent, democratic, contiguous and viable State of Palestine, living side by side in peace and security'. The Council further stated that the EU 'will not recognise any changes to the pre-1967 borders including with regard to Jerusalem, other than those agreed by the parties' and that, in the interests of 'genuine peace, a way must be found through negotiations to resolve the status of Jerusalem as the future capital of two states'. More broadly, the Council noted that: 'A comprehensive peace must include a settlement between Israel and Syria and Lebanon.'

The Council document represented the culmination of successive European statements over several decades, commencing with the 1980 Venice Declaration. Seventeen years on, in March 2010 a Joint Statement by the Quartet incorporated much of the essence of the EU Council's December 2009 Conclusions.[8] Thus the Europeans have effectively blazed a trail for all the major international stakeholders in the MEPP. Yet while leading on declaratory policy, the EU has consistently deferred to the United States when it comes to policy implementation.

**No Exit Strategy**

Since the mid-1990s European engagement in pursuit of a negotiated solution to the conflict has grown to an extent that the EU could not now walk away without significant costs to the fate of the Palestinians and European relations with Israel. European involvement combines: a strong EU declaratory position; membership of the Quartet; leading donor support to the PA; co-financing UNRWA; training and equipping the Palestinian Police in the West Bank (EUPOL COPPS); and providing a monitoring mission for the Gaza-Egypt border crossing (inactive).

EU partnership agreements with Israel, the PA, Jordan and Egypt have endured, in the case of Egypt even through the fall of Mubarak in the so-called Arab Spring of 2011. Yet Syria's descent into civil war in 2012 and the threat of war between Israel and Iran have subsequently put the quest for resolution of the Arab-Israeli conflict on hold.

European investment in containing the conflict and funding the basic needs of the Palestinians is vital to the continuance of the status quo. If Europe withdrew its personnel and economic support there would be a humanitarian crisis, increased

instability, lawlessness, disillusionment and generalised conflict. Yet without agreement between the opposing sides, there can be no resolution. The Europeans are no more capable of imposing a two-state solution now than the British were of enforcing partition in Mandate Palestine.

---

[1] John Norton Moore, ed., *The Arab-Israeli Conflict: Readings and Documents*, sponsored by The American Society of International Law, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1977, p.879.
[2] For an analysis of the genesis of the Balfour Declaration see D.K. Fieldhouse, *Western Imperialism in the Middle East 1914-1958*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.
[3] See for example: Keith Kyle, *Suez*, London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1991; and Mohamed H. Heikel, *Cutting the Lion's Tale: Suez through Egyptian Eyes*, London: Andre Deutsch, 1986.
[4] Joel Peters, *Pathways to Peace. The Multilateral Arab-Israeli Peace Talks*, London: Royal Institute of International Affairs, 1996.
[5] Rouba Al-Fattal, *European Union Foreign Policy in the Occupied Palestinian Territory*, Jerusalem: PASSIA, 2010.
[6] Rosemary Hollis, *Britain and the Middle East in the 9/11 Era*, London, Wiley Blackwell and Chatham House, 2010, Chapter 4.
[7] http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_Data/docs/pressdata/EN/foraff/111829.pdf.
[8] http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cmsUpload/113436.pdf.