"Potential MENA Region Conflict Resolution Patterns"
Tentative Policy Recommendations for Stakeholders

By: Dr. Hassan RAHMOUNI
http://www.hassanrahmouni.com

[THIS DRAFT PAPER IS INTENDED FOR GROUP DISCUSSION. IT WILL BE FINALIZED IN LIGHT OF THE INPUT OF PARTICIPANTS]

Multiple apparently unsolvable conflicts have been poisoning MENA region interstate relationships during the recent decades (i.e. Arab Israeli Conflict, Inter-Palestinian power relationships, North African territorial claims & border issues, Ethnic based confrontations in various localities, etc…). Not only have they been harmful to the much sought peaceful coexistence between the concerned populations; but, they have also sensibly harmed potential economic development and cooperation perspectives in the region.

Diverse conflict solving styles and approaches have been launched and carried out during the recent decades with no perceptible success. Despite genuinely and deeply rooted wishes for peace, security, mutual respect and comprehension, the opponent parties, most particularly in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, seem to be ever adopting extremist positions. That's why utmost caution needs to be observed in venturing any new style solution in an area where much frustration has caused the chances of developing reciprocal trust progressively dwindle into a speck.

In this respect, the present practical tentative proposal mainly targets the Middle East Conflict, although it aims at acquiring chances of applicability in the larger Mediterranean region. It mainly capitalizes on this unique historical chance that may well be named the "Obama opportunity". Despite the persistence of substantial conflicting claims, chances for peace are more present nowadays than ever before! Yet, genuine solutions need to be sought and satisfactory results reached.

Using the awkward case of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict as a model, the peculiarities of the present attempt will specifically reside in **seeking mutually rewarding potential business opportunities** that may well reverse the trend of long lasting harmful conflicts. The bottom line will consist in solving political imbroglios through the wealth generating outputs of economic and financial ventures. The teaching of pertinent twentieth century theories will be heavily called upon as sources of potential inspiration. The sought proposals will thus be mostly inspired from existing managerial theories [1] that have proven their efficiency in various conflict solving situations, as will constantly be kept in mind the realistic visions of a few new Marxist theories [2] that focus on the determining effect of economic parameters on political realm. They also draw from well proven practical analytical frameworks whose field efficiency has been much demonstrated [3]. Transposing them into the uncertain turbulences of the political arena might appear very daring; but, with strong doses of goodwill, they may also bear the seeds for potentially positive outcomes for potential peaceful well being in the whole region.

I.   The Context:

Even though a few contemporary historians tend to occult essential facets of the ongoing conflict in the Middle East, a comprehensive solution seeking approach needs to embrace the vision of both conflicting parties. Within this scope, it is worth mentioning that History's legacy has created divisive issues between Palestinians and Israelis: Judea, seemingly and historically home of the Jews in ancient times, was conquered by the Romans and renamed Palestine, inhabited by Arabs for over a thousand years. Beyond Napoleon Bonaparte's intended 1799 proclamation declaring 'a Jewish State in Palestine), the Zionist movement arose to restore the Jews to Israel, largely ignoring the existing Arab population. In this context, the Balfour Declaration of 1917, a formal statement of policy by the British government stating that "_His Majesty's government view with favor the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people_" wears utmost contemporary importance. This evidently had positively echoed the claims of the 'Zionist movement'

that had been founded to create a national home for the Jews, to be secured by international law, and within which Theodore Herzl had played an important role in trying to secure a Jewish homeland in Palestine with the consent of the Ottoman Empire and the German Kaiser. He was rebuffed in both cases, and turned his efforts to securing a temporary home for the Jews in Uganda or Argentina or anywhere, a program that was controversial and eventually abandoned by the Zionist organization. Even though Lord Balfour had tried (in 1906) to convince Chaïm Weizmann, a Russian Zionist settled in England (and who later became the first President of the State of Israel), that the Zionist movement should accept Uganda, rather than Palestine, as a national home, Weizmann had already begun the process of convincing Balfour that Palestine ought to be the Jewish national home [4].

The United Nations Partition Plan for Palestine [also called 'United Nations General Assembly Resolution 181(II)'] was adopted on November 29, 1947, to be soon followed by the Israeli Declaration of Independence made on 14 May 1948, the day the British Mandate expired, as an official announcement that the new Jewish state named the State of Israel had been formally established in parts of what was known as the British Mandate for Palestine and on land where, in antiquity, the Israelis claim that the "Kingdoms of Israel and Judah had once been".

The Arab states initially refusing to recognize Israel or make peace with it, long series of conflicts, wars, hostilities and reciprocal hatred had thus since culminated in multiple forms, thus digging the ditch much deeper between local, neighboring and regional belligerents: among which 1948, 1956, 1967, 1973, 1982 ………… and 2009 represent just a few samples. Each side believes different versions of the same history. Each side views the conflict as wholly the fault of the other and expects an apology.

a. The Actors:

Beyond the historical responsibility in the genesis and constant one sided support and follow up of the international community, and most particularly the Western powers in this ongoing crises (UK, USA and France to a certain extent), the primary actors in the conflict remain the Israelis and the Palestinians. The neighboring Arab States, the fading Arab League, the larger and much disseminated Islamic community and most particularly the front line Arab Neighbors of Israel and Palestine also represent a set of interested and concerned actors by the issues to be sought in this conflict. More recently, extremist movements from both sides have also been making their voice heard in terms of apparently declared rejections of a consensual settlement.

Presently, and beyond the direct protagonists, potential solutions may reside within the reach of back up financial and/or military support sources, i.e. some of the Gulf States on one side and the US on the other. UN structures may just represent a formal framework that may later endorse the decisions that will be reached by the key stakeholders.

b. The Root Causes:

There were times when it was believed that the existence of Israel and its "alien" presence in the predominantly Muslim Middle East was the "root cause" of the ongoing conflict in the Middle East. Within this belief, it was considered impossible to reconcile Israel's presence and its regional military supremacy with the presumed Muslim view that no Muslims should be subject to the political supremacy of a Jewish state. Supporters of this view argued that regardless of the small size of Israel, its existence would represent a cancer in the heart of the Islamic world.

Reciprocally, there were also trends of confusing thoughts that imparted most of the responsibility on a thirst for war among Arab societies against the hated infidels, most particularly against Americans and Israelis. Other similar trends also claimed that Arab-Muslim anger was the result of despair, hopelessness and poverty.

All this is evidently unacceptable and absurd!

A more reasonably wise analysis would certainly determine that both sides are at fault, even though the Palestinians have a real grievance consisting in the historical fact that there initially was an original injustice represented by their homeland for over a thousand years taken away from them by force without their consent and hundreds of thousands of Palestinians expelled from their ancestral homeland and turned into refugees. With a continuous refusal to allow them to return to their destroyed villages or to their expropriated land, orchards, houses, businesses and personal possessions! Then, the slippery slope left behind any claim to morality: continuous oppression has thus led to a growing ruination of the high moral standing of both communities.

Time has certainly come to transcend the reciprocal fears, restore the high moral character of the children of Abraham and build a new future based on trust and on the new driving force for better perspectives represented by joint business ventures.

c. **Issues and Scope:**

Over a long conflict period of more than sixty one years, what was initially a question of mere international right to existence for a newly established entity and of recognition of its rights has evolved into a more complex multi-faceted dilemma of reciprocal rejection. If the pending issues were to be recapitulated, the least that would preliminarily need to reach honorable solutions would (not exhaustively) need to be: the full reciprocal recognition and the advent of a viable Palestinian state, the reciprocal co-existence in peace and security for both parties (along with the dismantlement of the 'Security Barrier', the appropriate tackling of armed 'Resistance' and the securing of safe passages and open borders), the end of 'Land Occupation' both within Palestine and on the territories of neighboring States, the evacuation and dismantlement of the established settlements, the return of refugees, the release of prisoners and the securing of genuine solutions to the status of Jerusalem (Al Qods). Evidently, mechanisms for healing the profoundly inlaid wounds, occulting the side-effects of repeated repression and breaches to the due respect of human dignity and the reestablishment of reciprocal trust will need to be patiently developed. Furthermore, economic issues, i.e. water and other sources of wealth may well prove to represent sources of convergence if enough goodwill is deployed by both belligerent parties.

Evidently, reciprocal positions are diametrically opposed on these issues and extremist trends on both sides are presently exercising negative influential impacts on the ongoing attempts to secure acceptable solutions, even though both parties are profoundly suffering from this subsisting no-war no-peace situation.

d. **Positions and Power Relationships:**

Despite a clearly perceptible impression that the world seems to understand the urgency of supporting the peace process in the region and an equally expressed will by both leaderships of the conflicting parties to achieve an honorable peace, it also clearly appears presently that the ongoing peace process has reached an unbreakable standstill. For having personally had the opportunity of separately examining in November 1994 this peace issue both with Chairman Yasser Arafat and the then Israeli Minister of Foreign Affairs, Shimon Perez, I really feel the nostalgia for the then generated dynamics of the Oslo Accords [5]! Although, these accords were then signed by such leaders as Mahmud ABBAS on one side and Shimon PEREZ on the other side, it does not seem that their respective climbing higher in the leadership ladder of authority in their respective countries has helped much!

It thus makes it opportune to rightfully wonder about the present power relationship mechanisms that seem to strongly hamper the smooth search for acceptable solutions! What is then the state of the relationships among theses leaders and between these leaders and their domestic challengers? What are the existing channels of communication, if still any? And what are the present sources, strengths and capacities of each side? These and more questions need to be closely monitored if chances for a new peace dynamics were to be hoped for.

II. **The Previously Sought Solutions:**

The long history of conflict relationships between the diverse Middle East belligerents has mainly been marked by notorious armed deflagrations. Stigmata of the 1948 and 1956 wars are still deeply rooted in collective memories. The 1967 and 1973 wars along with multiple other outbursts also witness angrily boiling turmoil in the Middle East Region. But, it is only since the adoption by the UN Security Council Resolution 242 (November 22nd 1967), later followed by the UN Security Council Resolution 338 (October 22nd 1973), calling for "*negotiations (to) start between the parties concerned under appropriate auspices aimed at establishing a just and durable peace in the Middle East*", that a series of tentative negotiated solutions have been launched with relatively limited success stories!

a. **From the Initial Geneva Conference to the Camp David Agreements:**

In December 1973, following the cease-fire of the October 1973 Yom Kippur War, the United States and the Soviet Union invited Egypt, Jordan, Syria and Israel to a peace conference in Geneva, Switzerland on the basis of the UN Security Council's call for a "*just and durable peace*" in Resolution 338. In recognition and support of this effort, the UN Security Council adopted UN Security Council Resolution 344. UN Secretary-General Kurt Waldheim presided over the conference, formally called the *Geneva Peace Conference on the Middle East*, the first phase of a multi-step process. The United States and Egypt had then just restored diplomatic relations in November. This conference was the first time that foreign ministers of the United States, the Soviet Union and Middle Eastern states met at the same table. However, Syria refused to attend the conference and the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) was not invited due to opposition by the US and Israel. Within the PLO itself, there was reluctance to attend even if invited since doing so would give *de facto* recognition to Israel. Tensions remained high. During the conference not one word was directly exchanged between Arab delegates and the Israelis. There was little progress and the conference was adjourned inconclusively on January 9, 1974.

Since the abortion of the 1973 **Geneva Conference**, palliative diplomacy had progressively been nurtured by the October 1977 optimistic joint declaration of US Secretary of State Cyrus Vance and Soviet Minister of Foreign Affairs Andrei GROMYCO along with multiple other negotiated approaches. They have all adamantly failed.

Then came the signature (in September 1978) of the **Camp David** Framework for Peace in the Middle East between Egypt and Israel, under the auspices of US President Jimmy Carter, soon followed by the 12th Arab League Summit meeting in Fez (Morocco) calling (in September 1982) for Israel's withdrawal from all Arab territories occupied since 1967, including Arab Jerusalem, and the removal of Israeli settlements from Arab territories. That same summit also confirmed the right of self-determination of the Palestinian people under the leadership of the Palestine Liberation Organization. Simultaneously, President Reagan announced a U.S. initiative to settle the Arab-Israeli conflict, based on the Camp David Accords and on U.N. Resolution 242. Evidently, all these deployed effort in this respect have also failed.

b. **From Shuttle Mediation to Direct Bilateral Negotiations:**

During spring of the year 1988, Secretary of State George Shultz, in a letter to Prime Minister Yitzhak Shamir, launched a new **shuttle mediation** effort and set a timetable for talks on transitional arrangements and a permanent solution in the West Bank and Gaza Strip. The proposal, which had then called for bilateral Arab-Israeli talks following an international conference also failed to gain support from all parties. However, in December 1988, the Palestinian National Council accepted the original U.N. partition plan (U.N. General Assembly Resolution 181), Israel's right to exist, U.N. Security Council resolutions 242 and 338 and renunciation of terrorism. The U.S. thus opened dialogue with the Palestine Liberation Organization thus renewing contact with the PLO! Yet, no tangible results emerged from this new effort.

In a new attempt to launch the ailing peace process again in October 1991, US President George H. W. Bush and Soviet President Gorbachev extended an invitation on October 1991 to Israel, the Arab states and the Palestinians to attend a Middle East peace conference due to be held in Madrid, Spain. In remarks formulated during that Madrid conference, Secretary of State James Baker declared that a breakthrough was achieved with the start of "*direct bilateral negotiations*." This was to be considered as an enormous accomplishment! The framework for a comprehensive peace was finally being discussed through semi-official channels in which most concerned parties were represented. This was soon to be relayed by second track meetings opened in Oslo with the help of the Norwegian government. Thus, early in the Bill Clinton presidency, a new breakthrough occurred: The Israelis met with PLO negotiators and reached agreement on what came to be known as the **Oslo Accord**, signed at the White House on September 13, 1993 and 'Letters of mutual recognition' were also exchanged. Thus, Israel and the Palestine Liberation Organization finally agreed to recognize each other after 45 years of conflict; PLO leader Yasser Arafat thus signed a letter recognizing Israel and renouncing violence while Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin signed a document recognizing the PLO. The dynamics thus generated by this giant leap soon led (in October 1994) to the signature of the Treaty of Peace between the State of Israel and the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, (and in September 1995) to the signature in Washington of the Israeli-Palestinian Interim Agreement on the West Bank and the Gaza Strip. During that period of time, encouraging signs of '*détente*' were clearly perceptible with the launching, in November 1994, of the then promising process of economic cooperation then known as the "**Middle East and North African Economic Conferences**" with the first Conference hosted in Casablanca by King Hassan II with the participation of 61 States and 1114 businessmen then convened under the sponsorship of the U.S. Council on Foreign Relations and the Geneva-based World Economic Forum. This conference was followed by three others held respectively in Amman (November 1995), Cairo (November 1996) and Doha (November 1997). This was an evidently illustrative example of the important outcomes of economic promises within uncertain political contexts, as it had been timidly tried during the Clinton presidency through the two parallel tracks of peacemaking that were pursued. Needless to ascertain that it also was a difficult and frustrating process, marked by fits and starts as one side or another pulled back from making the hard decisions whenever needed for compromise.

c. **The Mitchell Report and the Tenet Plan:**

Other new attempts were also experienced (in October 1998) with the signature at the White House of the Wye River (Maryland) Memorandum between Israel and the Palestinian Authority under the auspices of President Clinton and Secretary of State Madeline Albright, and again (in April 2001) with the Sharm el-Sheikh Fact-Finding Committee, chaired by former U.S. Senator George J. Mitchell, issuing its final report on "*how the Israeli-Palestinian conflict might be solved*", the "**Mitchell Report**" then calling for "*an immediate cease-fire, a renunciation of terrorism and a resumption of peace talks, as well as a freeze on construction of Jewish settlements in the West Bank and Gaza*".

In its issued 'Report' the Mitchell Commission summarized the main points of its inquiry into the Israeli-Palestinian violence which broke out in September 2000 under three headings: End the violence, Rebuild confidence and Resume negotiations. The commission urged Israel and the Palestinians to "*reaffirm their commitment to existing agreements*" and call an immediate, unconditional ceasefire. The Palestinians were invited to prevent 'Fidayine' operations and punish the perpetrators, while the Israelis were urged to freeze all new constructions of settlements and stop shooting unarmed demonstrators! The report also called upon both sides to "*act quickly to pull the region back from the abyss*" and warned that "*fear, hate, anger and frustration had risen on both sides, (that) the 'culture of peace' was in danger of being destroyed and (that) the situation will keep on getting worse unless the government of Israel and the Palestinian Authority take swift and decisive action*".

As of the **Tenet Plan** (June 2001), its effect was also aborted by the resurgence of violence even before it knew its way to practical field execution! Initially and following the failure of

the Mitchell Plan, a US CIA Director George Tenet was called upon to work out a detailed plan for ending the violence and resuming negotiations, with the consent of the parties in conflict, i.e. Israel and the PLO. The plan went into effect June 13, 2001, but resumption of negotiations was conditional on there being a single week free of violence. No such week occurred. It was hoped within this 'Plan', that the parties agree to initiate and abide by the following specific, concrete and realistic security steps:

- Immediately resume security cooperation;
- Take immediate measures to enforce strict adherence to the declared cease-fire and to stabilize the security environment;
- Provide each other with information on terrorist threats, including information on known or suspected terrorist operation in areas under the other's control;
- Move progressively to prevent individuals and groups from using areas under their respective control to carry out acts of violence;
- Develop a specific timeline for the lifting of internal closures as well as for the reopening of internal roads, bridge, Port and Airport as well as border crossings.

But, by the spring of 2002, Israeli forces had invaded Palestinian areas and the Palestinians refused to further negotiate until Israel withdrew its forces.

d. **The Softened Attitude of Arab States and the Quartet Initiative:**

In February 2002, a bold and daring new initiative within the uncertain contexts of the Middle East conflict was put forward by the then Saudi Crown Prince Abdullah Ibnou Abdelaziz: This took the form of a Saudi proposal to normalize Arab relations with Israel in exchange for Israel's withdrawal to its 1967 borders, with the Arab League soon endorsing the proposal in its Beirut meeting held in March 2002 and accepting a two-state peaceful settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict. For its part, the U.N. Security Council adopted at the same date Resolution 1397, endorsing a "*vision of a region where two states, Israel and Palestine, live side by side within secure and recognized borders*" and standing as the first Security Council resolution to mention Palestinian statehood. Despite this giant Arab leap towards a just peace in the region, the outcomes have still proven to be very meager. Thus new international attempts were launched, and most importantly what grew to be known as the "**Quartet**" Initiative: In May 2002, the United States, the United Nations, the European Union and Russia announced plans to arrange for more effective security arrangements in the region. Beyond its monitoring of the political developments in the region, a **road map** seemingly solution-bearing initiative was also put forward on April 2003 with multiple ups and downs following its deployment, one of the most recent of which having been the diplomatic talks held in Annapolis (Maryland) in November 2007!

The basic concept of the Road map consists in according statehood to the Palestinian Authority in exchange of the enactment of democratic reforms and the renunciation to the use of violence. Israel, for its part, would have to support and accept the emergence of a reformed Palestinian government and end settlement activity of the Gaza Strip and West Bank as Palestinian threats would be removed. Initially the road map was elaborated as to comprise three goal-driven phases with the ultimate goal of ending the conflict as early as 2005: **Phase I** (2003): End to Palestinian violence, introduction of Palestinian political reform, organization of Palestinian elections along with Israeli withdrawal and freeze on settlement expansion; **Phase II** (2003): International Conference to support Palestinian economic recovery and launch a process, leading to the establishment of an independent Palestinian state with provisional borders; revival of multilateral engagement on issues including regional water resources, environment, economic development, refugees, and arms control issues; **Phase III** (2004-2005): second international conference; permanent status agreement and end of conflict; agreement on final borders, clarification of the highly controversial question of the fate of Jerusalem, refugees and settlements; Arab state to agree to peace deals with Israel.

But, the renewed raise of violence greatly affected this moribund plan even though it continues to be claimed as one of the most promising ways towards peace in the region.

It thus clearly stems from about six decades of relationships between the parties concerned with the Middle East conflict that multiple conflict solving strategies have been adopted:

- The logics of war, recurrent armed disputes and of call upon violence has evidently proven its multiple inadequacies;

- Efforts based on international conferences have also shown their shortages;

- Deployment of small steps shuttle mediation diplomacy has not proven much efficient either, as have also failed direct negotiation efforts;

- Carefully tailored plans, committee reports and road-maps have also shown their limitations;

- Parallel track undercover negotiations have for a while shown promises that were soon to be aborted;

- Even economic cooperation perspectives have apparently been abandoned!

What then remains to be tried in a renewed attempt to bring the parties back together around shared peace challenges?

New opportunities have stemmed with the election to office of President Barack OBAMA who has immediately generated a new worldwide dynamic of trust and hope. Local stakeholders in the Middle East conflict are urgently invited to seize this new chance due to be offered to peace by a leader who also realistically acknowledges the prevailing "*profound cynicism around the possibility of making any progress on this matter*", urges the parties to contribute to "*avoiding the abyss*" and reminds them that "*diplomatic negotiations must not eternally continue and that there will come a time when concrete measures must be taken to reach the objectives of any negotiations*". Even though this fortuitous situation may not validly be considered as a panacea, it is also true that never before had such a potential of will prevailed! But, at the same time, never have the conflicting parties previously adopted such diametrically opposed positions, both regarding each other and towards competing leaderships on their own board. The imbroglio then seems so much inextricable as violence continues, anger grows and extremist leaderships conquer power positions.

Yet it is still worth venturing proposals mainly articulated around an optimistic futurist vision of shared benefits from potential cooperative economic growth. This is justified by our conviction that while economic parameters exercise a determining factor on political choices in domestic politics, transposing this vision initially developed within domestic boundaries to the international arena of power struggle will also be hope bearing. This is one of our challenges. Yet, for adopting it, there will however be a need to transcend all past hard feelings generated by continued violence and to overcome all chauvinistic thinking on behalf of new peace opportunities aiming at joining the conflicting forces together in efforts to achieve jointly defined goals. Here again, most of the inspiration for such an approach will be sought from decades-old managerial theories, the most representative of which being "the theory of Integration"!

III. The "Integration" Approach:

This conflict solving approach has been first developed in the U.S. almost one century ago. It is borrowed from the thinking of a U.S. lady who has been acknowledged as the first to integrate the idea of organizational conflict into management theory and rightfully considered as the "*mother of conflict resolution.*" She is a nearly-forgotten writer to whom modern management theory owes a lot: Mrs. Mary Parker Follett (1868-1933), born in Quincy, Massachusetts, graduated *summa cum laude* from Radcliffe (1898) and developed her ideas through publications and lectures at the London School of Economics. She was often known for identifying a leader as "*someone who*

sees the whole rather than the particular". She was also known as coining the words "power-over" and "power-with" to differentiate coercive power from participative decision-making, showing how "power-with" can be greater than "power-over"[6].

The origin of her thinking regarding the theory of 'integration' has been reported as having initially stemmed from a concrete situation: In the Harvard Library one day, in one of the smaller rooms, someone had wanted the window open while she had wanted it shut. They finally settled on opening the window in the next room, where no one was sitting. She thus considered this as not being a compromise because there was no curtailing of desire; they both got what they really wanted. For she did not want a closed room; she simply did not want the north wind to blow directly on her; likewise the other occupant did not want that particular window open; he merely wanted more air in the Room.

She thus developed her broad thinking on conflict resolution underlining that there are three main ways of dealing with conflict: domination, compromise and integration.

- **Domination**: It evidently and obviously reflects a victory of one side over the other. This has been the easiest and most common way of dealing with conflicts, generating a winner and a loser; it may offer momentary settlements but is not usually successful in the long run, as causes of renewed war will continuously be embedded with the solution. Fighting solves no problems. The problems which brought on war will all be there to be settled when the war ends; and the losing party will always seek opportunities for retaliation and revenge.

- **Compromise**: This is another way in which most controversies are settled, when the belligerents accept to convene around a table for negotiation; each side gives up a little in order to have peace, or in order that the activity which has been interrupted by the conflict may go on. Compromise has been the most accepted and approved way of ending most controversy. Yet no one really wants to compromise, because that means a giving up of something, and therefore continuously searching for means to obtain back what has been ceded on the negotiation table!

- **Integration**: It may be achieved when the contending parties treat their controversy as a problem to be solved jointly and, working together, find the wider solution that includes their respective interests. Ethically right, integration works better in practice. It resolves the conflict between the parties constructively and, in addition, provides the foundation for better future relations between them. Thus, when two desires are _integrated,_ that means that a solution has been found in which both desires have found a place and in which neither side has had to sacrifice anything. Stemming the conflicting energies and transforming them into challenging positive action that seeks to accomplish rewarding outcomes may certainly be bearing better future perspectives for both conflicting opponents and their respective communities. But, for this purpose to be achieved, their leaderships may however need to show maximal humility, good will of solidarity so that mutually rewarding outcomes may be attained.

In this respect, domination is considered as potentially suppressing conflict and compromise as temporarily removing it. But, integration, however, uses conflict to provide the traction that enables organizations to move beyond the conflict to a greater understanding of their and the other party's nature and needs, and an optimal means of realizing them. It's worth emphasizing here that Follett promoted integration as a means of dealing with a conflict – not of avoiding it. Conflict, properly perceived and exploited, is a potentially positive contributor to vitality and progress. The proper pursuit of integration of differences in order to constructively resolve conflict, according to Follett, "_needs just as great a respect for your own view as for that of others and a firm upholding of it until you are convinced_". The concerned region will thus be regenerated by the people who rise above both these passive ways and heroically seek, by whatever hardship, by whatever toil, the methods by which people can agree!

In our opinion, and with due reference to the no less confirmed thinking of Nicos Poulantzas, we consider that, within organized societies, the economic parameters exercise a

determining factor on political choices. Transposing this vision initially developed within domestic boundaries to the international arena of power struggle and enriching it with Follett's established theory of 'Integration' may certainly prove to be a challenging methodological pattern to be put forward in most MENA region outbursts whether ethnic, religious, territorial, political, economic or existential!

Let us together forge an approach that transforms ongoing conflicts into challenging business opportunities. Let us join energies with humility and share the generated benefits!

IV. **Practical Steps: [**For Group Discussion articulated around the following issues; participants will be invited to explore the potential use of **the integration theory within an economic vision** that may allow to transcend ongoing political standstills**]**

- **Middle East Issues**:

    - The Two State Solution vs. institutional merger with mutual respect and equal rights
    - The settlements issue
    - The right of return of refugees
    - The status of "Al Qods"
    - Joint Economic Ventures
    - Other issues….

- **North African Issues**:

    - The North African Applications of the Principle of "*Uti Possideti Juris*": territorial claims and border issues
    - Libya-Chad
    - The Darfur Issue
    - Other issues….

Casablanca, July 11th 2009.
Hassan RAHMOUNI

_____

[1] – Mary parker Follett

[2] – Nicos Poulantzas, (Greek political scientist and euro-communist activist, born in Athens in 1936, influenced by Karl Marx, Antonio Gramsci & Louis Althusser): "Political Power and Social Classes" (1973), "Classes in Contemporary Capitalism" (1975) & "State, Power and Socialism" (1978).

[3] – US Institute for Peace, http://www.usip.org/training/online/index.html

[4] - Other plans such as the 'Madagascar Plan' suggested by the Germans for "relocating the Jewish population of Europe in the island of Madagascar" (cf. Browning, Christopher R, *The Origins of the Final Solution.* 2004. Page 81) and the 'British Uganda Program' which aimed at giving a portion of 'British East Africa' to the Jewish people as a homeland (Theodor (Binyamin Ze'ev) Herzl, in Jewish Virtual Library, http://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/jsource/biography/Herzl.html).

[5] – Wrapped-up in Oslo, Norway on 20 August 1993 and subsequently officially signed at a public ceremony in Washington D.C. on 13 September 1993.

[6] - "*Do we not see now that while there are many ways of gaining an external, an arbitrary power —- through brute strength, through manipulation, through diplomacy —- genuine power is always that which inheres in the situation*?"; M. P. Follett, quoted by Albie Davis in "*Dynamic Conflict Management: The Wisdom of Mary Parker Follett*", at the "Beyond Mediation: Strategies For Appropriate Early Dispute Resolution In Special Education" conference held in DC (2002).