

Jerusalem, den 17. Dezember 2007

Sehr geehrte Damen und Herren,
liebe Freundinnen und Freunde,

heute findet die Geberkonferenz in Paris statt, auf der Premierminister Dr. Salaam Fayyad seinen Reformplan für die Palästinensische Autonomiebehörde vorlegt und auf der über internationale Finanzhilfen in Höhe von 5,6 Mrd US\$ für die Palästinenser entschieden werden soll. Dies nehmen wir als Anlass, einen Rückblick auf die Annapolis-Konferenz Ende November vorzunehmen und Ihnen in einer Presseschau verschiedene palästinensische und andere arabische Stimmen zum Gipfel zu präsentieren.

Die Tatsache, dass der Gipfel nur die Ankündigung neuer Verhandlungen und keine konkreten Vereinbarungen mit sich brachte, enttäuschte viele Beobachter, vor allem in der arabischsprachigen Welt. Seit dem Ende des Gipfels in den USA sind zudem keine sichtbaren positiven Veränderungen vor Ort erkennbar. Im Gegenteil: die Einschränkung der Bewegungsfreiheit der Palästinenser durch Checkpoints wurde nicht gelockert, ein Stopp des Siedlungsausbaus ist nicht in Sicht und die humanitäre Lage im von der Außenwelt isolierten Gaza-Streifen verschlechtert sich.

Eine ausführliche Analyse der Annapolis-Konferenz finden Sie auf unserer Homepage www.fespal.org. Hier werden die Hauptakteure, ihre Positionen und die Voraussetzungen für eine Einigung dargelegt. Außerdem werden mögliche Hindernisse aufgezeigt auf dem Weg hin zu einer geplanten Unterzeichnung eines Friedensabkommens Ende 2008.

Inwiefern die Finanzhilfen der internationalen Staatengemeinschaft eine Verbesserung der Situation herbeiführen kann, diskutierte Stefan Heinlein (Deutschlandfunk) heute im [Interview mit der FES in Ost-Jerusalem](#).

Ich danke Ihnen für Ihr Interesse und Ihre Unterstützung unserer Arbeit und wünsche Ihnen ein frohes Weihnachtsfest und alles Gute für 2008.

Mit besten Grüßen aus Jerusalem

Knut Dethlefsen
Leiter des Büros
der Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung
in Ost-Jerusalem

Presseschau Palästina

Annapolis

Aus dem Blickwinkel palästinensischer und arabischer Medien

21. – 29. November 2007

1. Auszüge aus den Dokumenten und Reden der Annapolis Konferenz

Auszüge der Gemeinsamen Erklärung der israelischen Regierung und der PLO vom 27.11.2007

“The representatives of the government of the state of Israel and the Palestinian Liberation Organization... have convened in Annapolis, Maryland, under the auspices of President George W. Bush ...

We express our determination to bring an end to bloodshed, suffering and decades of conflict between our peoples; to usher in a new era of peace, based on freedom, security, justice, dignity, respect and mutual recognition; to propagate a culture of peace and nonviolence; to confront terrorism and incitement, whether committed by Palestinians or Israelis. In furtherance of the goal of two states, Israel and Palestine living side by side in peace and security, we agree to immediately launch good-faith bilateral negotiations in order to conclude a peace treaty, resolving all outstanding issues, including all core issues, without exception, as specified in previous agreements.

We agree to engage in vigorous, ongoing and continuous negotiations, and shall make every effort to conclude an agreement before the end of 2008. For this purpose, a steering committee, led jointly by the head of the delegation of each party, will meet continuously, as agreed...The first session of the steering committee will be held on 12 December 2007. President Abbas and Prime Minister Olmert will continue to meet on a bi-weekly basis to follow up the negotiations in order to offer all necessary assistance for their advancement.

The parties also commit to immediately implement their respective obligations under the performance-based road map to a permanent two-state solution...

The parties further commit to continue the implementation of the ongoing obligations of the road map until they reach a peace treaty. The United States will monitor and judge the fulfillment of the commitment of both sides of the road map. Unless otherwise agreed by the parties, implementation of the future peace treaty will be subject to the implementation of the road map, as judged by the United States. “

Auszüge aus der Rede von Premierminister Ehud Olmert vom 27.11.2007

“... I came here, despite the concerns and the doubts and the hesitations to say to you, President Mahmoud Abbas, and through you to your people, and to the entire Arab world, the time has come. We no longer and you no longer have the privilege of adhering to dreams which are disconnected from the sufferings of our peoples, the hardships that they experience daily, and the burden of living under ongoing uncertainty, which offers no hope of change or of a better future...I am convinced that the reality that emerged in our region in 1967 will change significantly... I believe that we shall be able to arrive at...two states for two peoples, a peace-seeking Palestinian state, a viable, strong, democratic and terror-free state for the Palestinian people; and the state of Israel, Jewish and democratic, living in security and free from the threat of terrorism, the national home of the Jewish people... I long for the day when I can see Gilad, Eldad and Udi back with their families. And I will continue relentlessly in my efforts to achieve their release.”

Auszüge der Rede von Präsident Mahmoud Abbas vom 27.11.2007

“...I thank you Mr. President on my behalf as Chairman of the PLO, the sole and legitimate representative of the Palestinian people and on behalf of the Palestinian people, for inviting us to attend this international conference... This Arab and Islamic participation in today’s meeting is also an affirmation that the Arab peace initiative was not a step without well-defined targets, but indeed it was a bold strategic plan that aims changing the nature of relations in the region and to usher in a new era there. But to achieve that does not depend on the Arab and Islamic position by itself, but requires meeting this position by a reciprocal strategic willingness that would basically lead to ending the occupation of all Palestinian occupied territories in 1967, including East Jerusalem, as well as the Syrian Golan and what remains of occupied from Lebanese territories, and to resolve all other issues relating to the conflict, especially the Palestinian refugees question in all its political, humanitarian, individual and common aspects, consistent with Resolution 194, as emphasized by the Arab peace initiative and the participation of sister states that host refugees and carry huge burdens in this regard. ... We want East Jerusalem to be our capital and to establish open relations with western Jerusalem, and to ensure for all the faithful from all religions their right to exercise their rituals and to access holy shrines without any discrimination and on the basis of international and humanitarian goals... We want East-Jerusalem to be our capital and to establish open relations with western Jerusalem, and to ensure for all the faithful from all religions their right to exercise their rituals and to access holy shrines without any discrimination and on the basis of international and humanitarian goals.”

2. Palästinensische und arabische Stimmen vor dem Treffen in Annapolis

Im Vorfeld der Annapolis-Konferenz wurde deutlich, dass die Themen, die auf palästinensischer Seite diskutiert wurden, einerseits Verhandlungspositionen wie der Status Jerusalems oder die Frage der Siedlungen waren, andererseits wurden die nationale Einheit und die Rolle der arabischen Staaten und der USA diskutiert. Die meisten palästinensischen Stimmen betonten die Wichtigkeit der Annapolis-Konferenz, zeigten sich allerdings äußerst skeptisch über den möglichen Ausgang der Gespräche.

Hoffnungen in Annapolis – Die Interessen der USA

“[...] Arab countries without peace treaties with Israel are going to the Annapolis meeting in the apparent hope that attending a meeting with Israel will somehow benefit the cause of peace. The key here is Washington. It is clear that above all else, the participation of Saudi Arabia and Syria is a victory for the US. The question now is what the US promised Arab countries in return for this massive gesture. Is it possible that the White House has promised that Israel is ready to take some serious steps in order to achieve peace with the Palestinians? One can only surmise that such promised steps are of a nature that falls into line with the Arab Peace Initiative and international law [...] But if that is the case, then there are no guarantees that these promises will be honoured. Neither the US nor Israel are run by decree and what the president of the one and the prime minister of the other may promise can easily be undone by biased or hostile legislatures. [...] The voting record of the US Congress on all matters Israel is a well-known, long and shameful one. There is no reason that that should change.

So, with no agreement on using the Arab Peace Initiative as the basis for discussion, it is not at all clear why Arab countries have decided to attend. One can only hope this is not all done simply to appease the US.”
Jordan Times 25.11.2007

Forderungen an die USA

“We held a meeting with the US secretary of state, Condoleezza Rice, yesterday [...] We stressed on two major elements. The first element is that this conference must affirm the references of the political process and the negotiations. This means affirming the Road Map plan, the Arab Peace Initiative and the obligations that Israel pledged to fulfill especially with regard to cessation of settlement, reopening the institutes in Jerusalem and lifting up the siege on the Palestinian people. Furthermore, the USA must function as a 3 guarantying party for the fulfillment of all these matters during and after the conference. [...] The Americans are also interested in intensive and continuous negotiations that deal with the final status affairs. These negotiations should not last for over a year in order to reach an agreement on the final status affairs and the establishment of the independent Palestinian state with Jerusalem as its capital in addition to a just solution for the refugees` affair. No one should

expect a solution for all these affairs during the conference. The conference is one station on the path of preparations for the negotiations over the affairs“.

Yaser Abedrabou: General Secretary of the PLO Executive Committee. JMCC Daily 22.11.2007

Israel als jüdischer Staat

"Anyone who raises the idea of transferring the Arab population in Israel to the territories of the state of Palestine is anti-democratic."

Ghaleb Majadele, Minister für Wissenschaft Kultur und Sport, zitiert von George S. Hishmeh, Arabisch-Amerikanischer Kolumnist aus Washington, JMCC Daily 27. 11 2007

Braucht die Region eine neue Friedensinitiative?

"The strange thing is that the Arab Peace Initiative does not need a counter initiative. All it needs is the Israeli approval. Its platform is the decisions of the international legitimacy, Road Map and all previous signed agreements. The Arab Peace Initiative states: a full withdrawal in exchange with a complete peace. The use of the phrase" an initiative to confront the Arab Initiative" pulls us into a whirl. The Israeli defense minister likes to launch large-scale invasion and assignation operations before Annapolis conference and he says they want an Arab presence in this meeting. "

Saeb Erakat, palästinensischer Chefunterhändler JMCC Daily 14.11.2007

Niemand hat die alten Positionen aufgegeben - Angst vor einer Spaltung der palästinensischen politischen Arena

"While the Palestinian arena is supposed to be more unified and the Palestinian national consensus supports the political leadership at this critical stage and confrontation of multiple pressures, we are still the prisoners of moves and attitudes that have been proven along over half a century of not getting us close to achieving our national goals. The continuation of the prevailing slogans of rejection, treachery and assaults in the addresses of some forces at the time they do not offer any real alternative to our people is unreasonable. We are not asking any party to change its stance but we demand maintaining the unity of the Palestinian arena and to support the legitimate leadership of our people and not resorting to the method of accusations of treason and expiation instead of the rational political dialogue. [...]"

Al-Quds Newspaper 27.11.2007

Ramallah-Annapolis via Beirut – Die Rolle Syriens in Annapolis

"Syria announced it will participate in the Annapolis Middle East peace summit called at the behest of the United States to try and revive the all but dead Palestinian-Israeli peace initiative.

However, Damascus said it would be sending its deputy foreign minister rather than the country's top diplomat, an indication that Damascus is not entirely satisfied with the agenda. Syria had pegged its participation on condition that the question of the Golan Heights occupied by Israel in June 1967 would figure on the agenda...And it's probably no coincidence either that the election of the Lebanese president, who's deadline expired midnight Friday, Nov. 23, has been postponed for the fifth time. This latest postponement gives the Syrians an extra card to play at Annapolis...The delay in Beirut serves the interests of Syria more so than anyone else in the region. It gives Damascus an additional bargaining point at Annapolis, something Syria's President Bashar Assad badly needs. The Syrians realize they hold no aces other than the Lebanon card. The danger is that plans can go astray and that Washington may not see the situation through the same lens as Damascus...The one hope for a quick resolution of the Lebanese crisis is the inclusion of the Golan question on the agenda at Annapolis. The road to peace in Ramallah, Jerusalem, and Beirut needs to detour via the Golan." *Middle East Times (Ägypten) 26.11.2007*

Die Versprochene Entlassung von mehr als 400 Gefangenen im Zusammenhang mit der Konferenz in Annapolis wurde immer wieder verschoben

"[...] I do not think that Israel would cancel the release of the detainees because it is a small measure through which Israel seeks to gain the support of the international public opinion. The majority of the detainees who will be released, according to the published Israeli list, are about to conclude their imprisonment term [...]"

Ashraf Al-A`jami: Minister of Detainees` Affair. 26.10.2007

3. Palästinensische Stimmen nach dem Treffen in Annapolis

Die Annapolis Konferenz am 27. November 2007 leitet den Beginn neuer Verhandlungen ein, die ein bilaterales Abkommen zur Beendigung des Nahost-Konfliktes bis Ende 2008 zum Ziel haben. Die Positionen über den Erfolg der Konferenz gehen weit auseinander. Während Bush, Abbas und Olmert einen Durchbruch in den Beziehungen zwischen Israel, der PLO, der Palästinensischen Autonomiebehörde und den arabischen Staaten verkünden, sieht die palästinensische Öffentlichkeit den Gipfel sehr kritisch. Vor allem die schwache Position der PLO und der Autonomiebehörde und die Bevormundung durch Israel und die USA werden als Hindernisse für die bevorstehenden Verhandlungen gesehen.

Annapolis: Für die Zukunft sieht es schlecht aus

"The most dangerous part of Bush speech is that he declared in front of 17 Arab FM's and officials that the US is committed absolutely on Israel as a

Jewish state and a national homeland to all Jews and this of course establishes for a dark future”

Abdul Bari Atwan – al-Quds al-Arabi (London) 28.11.2007

Die Rolle der Amerikaner

“The Israeli and Palestinian governments are both weak and politically constrained by serious domestic opposition. Palestinian President Mahmoud Abbas is only quasi-legitimate, given the absence of Hamas from the process. The Arab participants, like young children dragged to an ancient history museum by their parents, are not going to win any enthusiasm awards for their presence.

This leaves the American hosts as the main drivers of the process. The intensity of the American push for Arab-Israeli negotiations in the past nine months has been impressive in its mechanics, but unconvincing in its political substance[...]

Rami G. Khouri – Daily Star Lebanon 28.11.2007

Die Reaktion der Hamas

“The Islamic Resistance Movement Hamas stressed yesterday evening that what came in the speeches delivered at Annapolis Conference is a proof on the failure of the conference. Hamas also warned that Israel might resort to escalation in the Palestinian territories to cover up for this failure. Sami Abu Zuhri said: ‘We in Hamas affirm on the failure of the conference according to what came in the speeches.’

Al-Ayyam 28.11.2007

Die Palästinenser sind die Verlierer des Annapolis-Gipfels – Von Balfour bis Bush

“The [joint Israeli-Palestinian] statement underlined how far Abu Mazen had retreated from his earlier promises to the Palestinians that he would not go to Annapolis before agreeing on a declaration of principles that would address fundamental issues in the conflict...The Palestinian negotiating team had also vowed not to travel to Annapolis until Olmert announced the freezing of Israeli settlements on occupied Palestinian territory, a halt to construction of the apartheid, and the removal of military checkpoints around the West Bank. More alarming, perhaps, is the fact that the declaration considers the roadmap the sole reference for the negotiating process. [...] Bush may have stressed that both Israel and the Palestinians must fulfill their commitments outlined in the plan but the Americans and Israelis hold that these commitments must be successive. What this means in fact is that the PA must first fulfill its obligations and, if it succeeds, it will be the turn of Israel to meet its obligations. The PA then must succeed in the impossible task of disarming Palestinian resistance movements before Israel is obliged to lift a finger.”

Saleh Al-Naami – Al Ahram Weekly 29.11.07

Bushs Konferenz bringt nichts weiter als leere Worte

"[...] The US administration needed something to prove that its policy towards the Arab region was not a drastic failure. It came up with nothing better than to restage the Madrid peace conference. [...] What have the Arabs done from Madrid to the present day? They've negotiated. Why do we need another rhetoric orgy to introduce more of the same? [...] The Palestinians and Israelis have reached no understanding with regard to the status of Jerusalem, borders or dismantling Israeli settlements. On the Palestinian right to return, on the other hand, they've made no small amount of headway -- towards the Palestinian and Arab official abnegation of the exercise of that right. This was done by turning a non-subject -- the Jewishness of the state of Israel -- into a negotiating issue on par with all the others, such as Jerusalem, the refugees, borders and settlements [...] With these accomplishments harvested by Israel even before negotiations began, the Palestinian negotiator is weaker than ever. He's even weak in the eyes of Israeli public opinion as a consequence of the Palestinian rift."
Azmi Bishara – "Daily Email" from the Jerusalem Media and Communication Center 28.11.2007

Veröffentlicht am: 17. Dezember 2007

Verantwortlich: Knut Dethlefsen, Leiter des Büros der Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung in Ost-Jerusalem

Redaktion: Barbara Obele, Projektmanagerin der Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung in Ost-Jerusalem / Alexander Raev, Assistent der Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung in Ost-Jerusalem

Homepage: www.fespal.org

Email: info@fespal.org