Slobodan JANKOVIĆ[1]

ISRAELI BORDERS AMID GLOBALISATION AND REGIONAL TENSIONS[2]

ABSTRACT

Green revolutions/Arab spring 2010/2011 in the North Africa and in the Middle East (MENA region) caused upheavals, changes of autocrats (Egypt and Tunisia), civil war with foreign intervention (Libya), civil unrest and military crackdown of unrest (Syria, Bahrain, Yemen). Globalisation opposes sovereignty and importance of borders as an expression of national authority and delimitation of power. It goes against sectarian, either religious or ethnic. Do these two processes influence the Peace process between Israel and the Arabs? If yes, do they have any repercussions on the issue of the Israeli borders? Delimitation between Israel, Palestinian Authority and Arab states is an issue that has existed since the emergence of the Middle East crisis (1948). It is an unalienable part of the peace process because the definition of the state borders is part of the durable peace between the neighbouring countries. Yet, the Israeli borders are an open issue as long as the process of searching for the status of the Palestinian autonomy and its territorial extension lasts.

Key words: border, globalisation, Israeli/Arab Peace process, Palestine, security, regional reorder.

Changes in international order for the past two centuries (at least) were followed by reorder in the Middle East. After the fall of the Berlin Wall, more than probably with the hint of the Americans, Iraq invaded Kuwait and the stage for the placement of new military bases, soldiers and confirmation of the regional domination of the USA was set.[3] Invasions

---

[3] Recently, Wikileaks has published a cable that should diminish the prospect of USA suggesting Saddam that agression against Kuwait would pass without American intervention. Yet, transcripts published in august 1990, and the timeline of the statements of US officials regarding the future non involvement of

of Afghanistan and Iraq (2001 and 2003) came after economic growth of China and the beginning of the Russian upheaval recovery. These events came as a broader strategy that embraces a narrower Israeli one. Broader is a strategy for the *Greater* later renamed as *New* Middle East (democratisation and liberalisation of MENA region –Middle East and North Africa). Israeli strategy precedes American, supported by G8 in 2004.[4] *A Clean Break: A New Strategy for Securing the Realm* is Israeli strategy announced in 1996. It was made for the Benjamin Netanyahu liberal cabinet (1996-1999) by American neo-conservatives such as *Prince of Darkness*–Richard Perle, proposed internal reforms and called for aggressive approach toward Syria after the negotiations between two countries came in impasse in the same year. Internal reforms consisting mainly of the liberalisation of economy were undertaken by first and today by the second Netanyahu government (2009-present) which resulted in series of general strikes and largest ever gathering of up to 400.000 Israelis protesting against government policies. The same document calls upon the total ouster of Saddam Hussein that sees it as part of "foiling Syria's regional ambitions."[5] Same document defines regional anti-Syria coalition as "the prelude to a redrawing of the map of the Middle East which would threaten Syria's territorial integrity." Subsequent withdrawal of Syrian army from Lebanon in 2005, after 29 years and a military aggression of Israel against Hezbollah dominated territories in Lebanon, year after seemed to follow the previously mentioned blueprint.

Further existence of Iraq, after various proposed divisive lines by USA officials, today is being discussed by think-thanks not to speak of big media.[6]

In 2006, the American *Armed Forces Journal* published the map of a region with changed borders.[7] Author of the map states that "The most arbitrary and distorted borders

---

the USA if Iraq is to invade Kuwait, show a clear indication that Saddam may proceed with his military plan. See for comparison: http://wikileaks.nl/cable/1990/07/90BAGHDAD4237.html and „Is the US State Department still keeping April Glaspie under wraps?", *Information Clearing House* 12/25/05, Internet, http://www.informationclearinghouse. info/article11376.htm. retrieved on 30/01/2012.

[4] "Fact Sheet: Broader Middle East and North Africa Initiative", *U.S. State Department, The White House Office of the Press Secretary*, Georgia June 9, 2004, Internet, http://www.state.gov/e/eb/rls/fs/33380.htm, 20/09/2006.

[5] "A Clean Break: A New Strategy for Securing the Realm", Internet, *The Institute of Advanced Strategic and Political Studies* 1996, Internet, http://www.iasps.org/strat1.htm, retrieved on 27/11/2011.

[6] See for example how U.S. senator Lindsey Graham proposed a loose confederation for Iraq: "What's best for the Kurds in the north? To live in a confederation where your children can be prosperous and you never have to worry about Turkey invading you. It's in all of their interest to live together in a loose confederation.", in: Ümit Enginsoy, "US senator urges Kurds to stay in Iraq to avoid Turk invasion.", TDN, March 6, 2007, Internet, http://www.turkishdailynews.com.tr/article.php?enewsid=67556, retrieved on 06/03/2007. Nowdays there are debates on the eventual split of Iraq, like in Turkish think-thank ORSAM: "ORSAM Report 102: How and under what circumstances could Iraq be split up? Being ready for the worst", 31 January 2012, Internet, http://www.orsam.org.tr/en/showArticle.aspx?ID=1561.

[7] Ralph Peters, "Blood borders: How a better Middle East would look", *Armed Forces Journal* – June 2006.

in the world are in Africa and the Middle East." Retired colonel from the *U.S. National War Academy* called for the changes in order to bring more justices and stop the bloodshed. He just briefly mentions Israel asserting that "it will have to return to its pre-1967 borders — with essential local adjustments for legitimate security concerns."[8] Saying that in particular the conflict over territories surrounding Jerusalem (he should have included Jerusalem proper) „may prove intractable beyond our lifetimes"... and conflicts here "have tenacity unrivalled by mere greed for oil wealth or ethnic squabbles…" emphasizes tension in and over the Holy Land.

Recent Arab revolutions may prove to be a trigger for the new map of the Middle East including North African countries. Yet, at the crossroads of the revolution map is Israel and its Arab–Israeli and Israeli–Palestinian conflict.

Indeed, unlike Iraq, the conflicts in Israel/Palestine are not even discussed as related to oil, or mostly not. Borders of African and Middle Eastern countries are the results of the decolonisation but borders of Israel bare only partial influence of the great power divisions of mandate territories. They are actually results of political and armed struggle pressure, wars, and battles, negotiations, meddling of third parties, just as borders in Europe or in Far East.

Globalisation and current regional reordering do affect not only the type, authority and the structure of the state government but they challenge the post-Second World War importance and legal protection of the international borders. In this text, we will try to respond partially to the question whether regional tensions impact the borders of the State of Israel.

Post–modern order

In the post-modern era relativity of the borders is one of the components of the globalisation and supranational integrations and governance. This is in particular a peculiarity of the Western civilisation to which Israel ascribes its belonging. Recent calls for the establishment of the world wide (global) financial regulatory mechanism that would overview financial policies of the nation-states, namely to strip the nations further of their financial sovereignty, as well as western promoted carbon emission trade, downsizes the importance not only of borders but also of the principle of self-determination, free will to establish rules for the society we live in, be it one way or another.[9]

---

[8] Ibidem.

[9] Vatican called upon establishment of "global public authority" and a "central world bank" to rule over financial institutions, in October 2011, French Nicolas Sarkozy called for the same in Davos 2010, businessmen like Deloitte **Jack Ribeiro already see it coming, in "**The 'devil is in the detail' of global financial regulatory reform", 27 January 2011, http://globalblogs.deloitte.com/deloitteperspectives/2011/01/the-devil-is-in-the-detail.html, retrieved on 01/02/2011.

Yet, Israeli policy over territorial integrity and staunch defence of its sovereignty not only in resolving disputes with Arab minority in the West Bank and until recently in the Gaza Strip make Israel pretty modern (as predating post-modernity) or someone would like conservative.

"It is quite clear that the state borders do not delimitate or usually not, the area inhabited with one nation (in ethnic sense). But they do ascribe to the principle of sovereignty and are one of the testimonies of it and of the territoriality – of territorial integrity of the state."[10] In that sense, very notion of a state border represents the challenge and resists the globalisation of authority, defies the concept of the world citizenship, and the claim that universal human rights are higher principle than sovereignty (as is promoted by UN and NATO in *Responsibility to protect* policy).[11]

Since the takeover and subsequent decolonisation of the Ottoman Asian territories, the Israeli-Arab conflict erupted and has not yet been solved. Middle East is now passing through probably the most turbulent period since the 1940s. Western grip for the control of North Africa and the Middle East (Broader Middle East) that tends to include Afghanistan and Somalia (growth of the region?!) results in siding away of overused clients, that started to show signs of too autonomous policy. That was the case with Zinedin Ben Ali in Tunisia and with Mubarak in Egypt. Back in 2008, these two leaders have opted for slower or frozen privatisation, thus opposing unconditional liberalisation of economy. Both have tightened control of local civil society organisations funded by western governments or 'philanthropists' such as George Sorosh.[12] Mubarak was also resisting division of Sudan that was split after Egyptian revolution. Western grip for power resulted also in Libyan war to help the rebels and strip Libya of its sovereign policy, of its unprecedented profit from oil and gas (Gaddafi had introduced EPSA-4 contracts for the oil exploitation and production that guaranteed 90 percent or more of the oil profit to Libya) and its non alliance with Western security arrangements (NATO).[13] Violent overthrow, torture and killing of the Libyan revolutionary leader Gaddafi just as in Tunisia, Egypt and Morocco will probably result in the political affirmation of the Islamist representation. Even before the end of the Libyan war,

---

[10] Slobodan Janković, "National, Cultural and Civilisation Borers in the Balkans", in: *On Borders: Comparative Analyses from Southeastern Europe and East Asia*, Lingua-Culture Contextual Studies in Ethnic Conflicts of the World (LICCOSEC), Vol. 17, Osaka 2011, Proceedings of Round Table Conference, Belgrade, September 17–18, pp. 34.

[11] On R2P see: Slobodan Janković, Libijska kriza i njene posledice, *Međunarodna politika*, God. LXII, br. 1142, april–jun 2011, IMPP, Beograd 2011, pp. 30–51.

[12] More about the reasons of the Western role in Twitter revolution in Egypt and Tunisia see in: Слободан Јанковић, „Промене на Блиском истоку и у Северној Африци — Ка постсувереном светском поретку", (Changes in the Middle East and in North Africa – Towards post-sovereignty order), *Национални интерес* бр. 2/2011, Година VII vol. 11, Београд, pp. 261–315.

[13] See for more: Slobodan Janković, Libijska kriza i njene posledice, op., cit.

differences among different factions opposing the government were stark and they result in occasional exchange of gunfire and different armed and political clashes.

Western governments and their regional allies (Turkey, Persian Gulf states) foment civil and armed unrest in Syria and protests elsewhere. Where the protests do not comply with the Western agenda they are being suffocated, as was the case with Bahrain, Saudi Arabia and as is the case with Yemen.

All these MENA (Middle East and North Africa) *Islamic awakening* or *Arab Spring* events disclose traits of a master plan to include all countries in the belt that stretches from Casablanca to Karachi in NATO and USA security arrangements. Neil Smith in an article in 2006 noted that behind grand anti-terrorist strategy is a careful project: "More than any obsession with terrorism, this larger ambition concerning global geo-economic power underlies the war in Iraq and the continued sabre-rattling in the Middle East, *aimed especially at Syria and Iran*. Spearheaded by one branch of the US ruling class, and not at all popular with others, *US elites are driving an attempt to complete a project of global economic and political power* that has not only long dominated its sense of its own destiny, but also coincides with its material interests around the globe. Peaking in two prior moments, that longstanding ambition has been revived since the 1980s under the rubric of 'globalization.' *It is a project that combines the domination and suppression of real or potential rivals abroad with the necessity of heightened social control at home* (Fox-Piven, 2004; Harvey, 2003). *Its proposed 'endgame' is the victory of a global power* which, for all the fact that it *is surely centered in Washington and New York, really is a global project spanning elites the world over*, not just in Europe and Japan, but in the capitals of some of the world's poorest countries as well. *Globalization in its present guise is a class project as much as a national one.*"[14] (Italic by S.J.)

Indeed, at the beginning of the 21st century five countries were disrupting the chain of NATO friendly countries from Atlantic Ocean to China. Those were Libya (regime destroyed by NATO military intervention and local opposition forces), Saddam's Iraq, Syria, Iran and Afghanistan. In the meantime, Afghanistan and Iraq were occupied with lucrative oil and mineral exploitation contracts for primarily Anglo-American corporations, same is expected for Libya. Of the countries on the Arabian peninsula (Saudi Arabia and minor Persian Gulf countries) that already had U.S. Military bases, four will subsequently join the *Istanbul Cooperation Initiative* (NATO program that involves Kuwait, Bahrain, Qatar and UAE), while Oman, Saudi Arabia and Yemen are still out of the formal cooperation with NATO. Yet, neither Oman nor troubled Yemen show proclivity toward anti-USA policies, not to speak of Saudi ruled Arabia – ever-faithful to Washington and London.

Regarding the global vision behind these policies, we may quote former British Prime Minister Tony Blair: "The war on terrorism is not just about security or military

---

[14] Neil Smith, "The endgame of globalization", Political Geography 25 (2006) 1–14, p. 3.

tactic. It is a battle of values, and one that can only be won by the triumph of tolerance and liberty. Afghanistan and Iraq have been the necessary starting points of this battle. Success there, however, must be coupled with a bolder, more consistent, and more thorough application of global values, with Washington leading the way."[15]

But, before resulting in (dreamed) universal values, revolutions, violent demonstrations and chaos may destabilize borders in the region heading with Iraq that would trigger reactions from both Turkey and Iran. Israel has been public enemy number one in the region for many decades. It came again in the focus with the Freedom Flotilla management to be less visible with the latest revolutions. However, electoral results brought about domination of political forces less inclined to peace dialogue with Israel or the perception of Islamic voters is such.

What is going on with Israel? What is the nature of it borders and are they subject to changes?

Modern Israel without borders

Not only are the legal sanctity of the borders and delimitation between authorities claims upon which Israelis make case for the Israel territory, but also upon history, cultural and religious tradition. One might argue that Israel was founded in 1948, which is historically right. But, it is also the product of a much older religious, political and state tradition that refers to the ancient history.

Israel is formally in conflict with some of the Arab and Muslim dominated countries (Lebanon, Syria, Saudi Arabia, and Iran). It is occupying part of the territories of two other countries Lebanon and Syria and is controlling or occupying also the West Bank, territory mostly inhabited with Palestinian Arab Muslims. Since neighbouring countries were not willing to recognise the state of Israel there was no possibility for the delimitation of the borders. After 1967, when Israel occupied parts of territories of all its neighbours, except for the Saudi Arabia, this was utterly complicated. Peace agreements with Egypt (1979) and with the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan (1994) defined precisely borders, where the division between two authorities among Transjordan (Jordan) and Cisjordan (West Bank–Judea, Samaria and part of Galilee) is defined as follows "This line is the administrative boundary between Jordan and the territory which came under Israeli military government control in 1967. Any treatment of this line shall be without prejudice to the status of that territory."[16]

---

[15] Tony Blair, "A Battle for Global Values", *Foreign Affairs*, January/February 2007, Интернет, http://www.foreignaffairs.org/20070101faessay86106/tony-blair/a-battle-for-global-values.html ?mode= print, скинуто: 30/01/2007.

[16] "Treaty of Peace Between The Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan And The State of Israel, October 26, 1994, Annex I (a) International Boundary, art. 2 (G).

Referring to the issue of peace and therefore of the definition of the borders and not of the armistice boundary lines, literature of post modern authors of liberal leaning tries to present borders as a problem, "just as nations are 'imagined' (Anderson, 1991), borders are imagined."[17] Proponents of global governance (government) use this sort of argumentation. Going this line, we can say that art, industry, economy, democracy and so many things are imagined so we can simply discharge them. Post modern intellectuals tend to imagine complex or simplistic models and theories without any possibility of application, where they can opine on this and that and present it as a scholar research. Theoretical models such as those of a democratic peace waste much of the forests for paper to prove something that is at best better known and understood with a common sense. Same is with literature on contiguity and the "likelihood of war in dyads."[18] Is there a need to prove with tons of papers that territorial issue among neighbouring states is more likely cause of war than among countries without shared border? Of course not. Therefore, we do not try to beat the elusive and misguiding literature on borders and territoriality, but we emphasize historical meaning and current treatment of border. Douglas M. Gibler, from Alabama University, argues that democracy is possible outcome of border stability. While this may be partially right, it is not complete since he did not treat democracy as a product of a certain culture and tradition but merely as a possible result of some mathematical model.[19]

On the other hand Barzilai and Peleg (1994) show that ethnic imperative (to distance itself from other ethnicities) in the definition of Israeli border prevails over territorial (imperative to expand). They cite Cohen (1986) who back in 1980s envisaged two directions of Jewish *state-idea*: "the goal of coexistence with the Palestinian Arabs and the Jordanians through territorial compromise and mutual national recognition.[20] Or on the other hand, it can pursue the ideal of Eretz Yisrael HaShlema (the Whole Land of Israel, S.J.) through creeping or outright territorial annexation."[21] Politics of pursuing either of two state-ideas belong to modern state policies of national interest and these coupled with Israeli internal policies on citizenship, political freedoms, respect of private property belong to the nature of modern (19th and mainly the first half of 20th century) policies of Western democracies. Despite Israel is one of the rare examples of democracies in the Middle East it differs from European or North American democracies due to its religious or ethnic peculiarity (religious or ethnic depends on whether Jew is a primary religious or ethnically based identity) – it is ethnic democracy. This peculiarity goes with the fact that it has

---

[17] In: Gad Barzilai and Ilan Peleg, "Israel and Future Borders: Assessment of a Dynamic Process", *Journal of Peace Research*, vol. 31, no. 1, 1994, pp. 59-73, p. 59.

[18] See: Douglas M. Gibler, "Bordering on Peace: Democracy, Territorial Issues, and Conflict", *International Studies Quarterly* (2007) Volume 51, Issue 3, pp. 509-532.

[19] Douglas M. Gibler, "Bordering on Peace: Democracy, Territorial Issues, and Conflict", op., cit.

[20] They wrote the article prior to the announcement of Jordan that it repudiates claim for Cisjordan and their recognition of Israel in 1994.

[21] Gad Barzilai and Ilan Peleg, "Israel and Future Borders: Assessment of a Dynamic Process", op., cit, p. 61, 62.

military and partly civilian authority over the territory that is not explicitly part of the Israel and of the population that has no right to Jewish citizenship.

Any spring in Israel and Palestine?

Changes of presidents and rulers, popular and less popular uprisings, protests and demonstrations that started as bread revolutions turned to political protests in a large part of the Middle East represent the latest, but not yet finished regional reconfiguration. This regional turmoil interpreted in mass media (on the global and local scale) as push for democracy and (political) freedom seems to give new impetus for the stalled peace process. Arab Spring as a first visible result brought about electoral victories of Islamic parties (those who call upon society based on Quran teachings and Sharia–Islamic law) in Morocco, Tunisia and Egypt. Although announced by Assad Palestinian Spring did not yield any since paradoxically, it was invoked by a holder of power. If Arab revolution brings about more of Islamisation than all we could expect in Palestinian Autonomy is further strengthening of Hamas and other radical religious paramilitary and terrorist organisations. They are paramilitary because in Palestine these organisations advocate 'freedom from Zionist (Israeli) occupation' with clearly military means. Even though there is no mathematical formula, or such established rule that says Arab Revolution equals to more of Islam in society, strong oppositions in all Arab countries are not secular or radical leftist groups but those who advocate for Islamic society. Up to now, only elections organised for the constituency of Palestinian Arabs resulted with the victory of Hamas in January 2006. This may seem as a pattern according to which subsequent elections in Arab world proceeded. On the one hand one might argue that radicalisation of Palestinians will eventually pressure Israel more and bring about some concession, but short history might prove this either wrong (outcome of terrorist attacks and pressure was West Bank Security fence and operations inside Gaza and Lebanon) or right (withdrawal from South Lebanon in 2000 and from Gaza in 2005).

Coloured revolutions across region have coincided with unprecedented social unrest in Israel over rising prices that affect ordinary Israelis and with more and more often conflicts between Jewish settlers and army. Jewish settlers and the army are clashing over another set of problems — evacuation of some of the not authorised outposts. Street protesters are mostly secular or just religious Jews that procreate much less than Orthodox and Ultra–Orthodox. Segregation between sexes, segregation between Jewish communities alienates secular and Ultra-Orthodox Jewry in Israel that for the moment sparks only occasional frictions. Segregation becomes more and more geographical in Israel as seculars are moving toward Cost, while haredi are becoming more and more dominant in Jerusalem and in West Bank settlements.[22]

---

[22] Nicolas Pelham, **"**Israel's Religious Right and the Peace Process", *MERIP* October 12, 2009, Internet, http://www.merip.org/mero/mero101209, retrieved on 06/02/2012.

Israeli Jewish society sees fast growth of ultra-orthodox and orthodox population that mostly refuses to meddle in politics and refuse to serve the army. In 2011, 1,282 haredi men enlisted in the army, which is largest number in history. Still, tens of thousands avoid joining the army, what creates tensions with the rest of the Israeli Jews.[23] Since they claim the protection of Israeli army and police from Arabs, as they take more and more significant portion of the Israeli population, they will necessarily have to step in more into security apparatus since they are mostly reluctant to the Palestinian state.[24] Position of radical Shas party and United Torah Judaism best reflects the existing Israeli political parties' position of this part of population (currently around 10 percent) on the two state solution.

The Israeli-Palestinian and broader Arab-Israeli peace process, as a dialogue aimed at achieving solution that would make sort of compromise acceptable to all interested parties, is stalled since Annapolis (2007).

Having in mind Islamisation of Arab political elite in countries that either have recognised (Egypt) Israel or are not inimical toward it (Tunisia and Morocco) we will witness more support for the Palestinian state and more aggression if Israel do not accepts revival of peace talks.

What is more interesting for the subject is that two main Palestinian-Arab political factions have come to the terms (May 2011) over common strategy in UN devised at seeking the recognition of the State of Palestine in UN. Although reconciliation deal was signed in Cairo in May 2011, two sides are still exchanging accusations over why it is not functioning.[25]

State of Palestine was proclaimed in 1988, by the PLO in Algiers. It is recognised by 129 countries. Still, it does not posses even basic traits of a sovereign country: territory and independent judicial authority. When it comes to the criterion of a permanent population, one might argue that it is fulfilled. Palestinians do not even have financial autonomy, what is not among the essential prerogatives of the state, since non-state public entities may also have it. Many budget revenues of the Palestinian Authority are provided from the taxes and customs collected by Israelis.[26] Israel actually governs

---

[23] Internet, http://www.jewishtimes.com/index.php/jewishtimes/news/jt/israel_news/pressure_building_on_haredi_army_exemption_law/29724.

[24] Ultra-orthodox families contributed to rising over-all fertility of Jews with families having usually 5-6 children, many of them even more. See, for example: "Population Forecast: More Hareidim by 2059", Internet, http://www.israelnationalnews.com/News/Ne ws.aspx/150670#.Ty_TzTVAYQF, retrieved on 02/02/2012; and Jewish Birth Rate in Israel at Record High, Internet, http://www.israel nationalnews.com/News/News .aspx/139547#.Ty_SrDVAYQF, retrieved on 02/02/2012.

[25] Internet, http://www.maannews.net/eng/ViewDetails.aspx?ID=454101, retrieved on 30/01/2012.

[26] "Palestinian Authority faces financial collapse", September 21, 2011, Internet, http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/def11be0-e46c-11e0-844d-00144feabdc0.html#axzz1kf6b7Rhn, retrieved on 27/01/2012.

territory of the proper State of Israel and Occupied territories with the exception of Gaza Strip and parts of the West Bank where Israeli permitted Palestinians to be responsible entirely for the security such as Hebron, Tulqarem and Ramallah. Therefore, although community of countries recognising Palestine is increasing it actually do not exist.

Land for peace

Israel has no fully defined borders. Its representatives have proclaimed the State of Israel "*within frontiers approved by the General Assembly of the United Nations in its Resolution of November 29, 1947*".[27] It is also true that The Jewish Agency for Palestine in the name of the proclaimed State of Israel had mentioned on May 22nd 1948 which territories it control, beside those mentioned in UN SC Resolution 181.[28] Still, the Israeli authorities have not defined or demarcated the border with (all of) their neighbours. That is why its borders fall into category of frontiers — open to expansion (or withdrawal).

First peace agreement was based on principle, still one of the most prominent in the negotiations – *land for peace*. Last big conference that marked the Israeli-Arab peace process significantly was held in Annapolis, USA in November 2007. It turned out to be a failure and the past four years produced almost nothing in terms of further appeasement, fruitful dialogue having direct impact on the ground. All that happened afterward was continuation of the construction of Jewish settlements in the West bank and in Eastern Jerusalem, continued isolation of Hamas and protraction of the inner Palestinian conflict among Western and Israeli backed Fattah on the one side and supported by Syria and Tehran, Hamas on the other. There were two major set of obstacles: a) two confronted Palestinian governments (of Hamas in Gaza strip and of Fattah in the Palestinian governed territories of West Bank – Jericho, Ramallah...), and b) unimpeded construction of Jewish houses in the West Bank and in the East Jerusalem. Both issues are strictly tied to the control of territory and thus to the delimitation of authorities. Hamas criticised PLO of negotiating only freeze of the building while they should insist on end of the (Israeli) constructions. Demographic growth of 6 percent among ultra-orthodox Jewry and constant building of new housing units are typical examples of territorial conquest by procreation and military takeover of previously Arab owned land, strategy partly (procreation) pursued by Arabs. Meanwhile Hamas and Fattah managed to find at least temporary agreement in

---

[27] "Letter From the Agent of the Provisional Government of Israel to the President of the United States", May 15, 1948, in: *A Decade of American Foreign Policy 1941-1949*: Independence of Israel, Internet, http://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/decad169.asp, retrieved on 09/09/2011.

[28] "Letter dated 18 may 1948 From the Assistant Secretary-General for Security Council Affairs addressed to the Jewish Agency for Palestine, and reply dated 22 may 1948 addressed to the Secretary-General Concerning the Questions Submitted by the Security Council", S/766, 22 May 1948. Answers to the questions a, b and c contain explanation and view over what was at the moment considered as the State of Israel and was part of the Palestine (referring to the mandate territory).

order to push more effectively for the independence of Palestine. First significant achievement of this common policy was the acquisition of the membership in UNESCO (October 2011).[29]

Land for peace as an Israeli strategy to win peace prevents it from the definition and clear demarcation of the borders. This is one of the reasons Israel has no fixed borders with all of it neighbours. It is widely known that proponents of the two-state solution on the Jewish side for years argued along ethnic imperative lines, expressing demographic concerns. Therefore, they support land-for-peace approach. Latest example is J Street lobby in USA.[30] They also embrace the swap of territories in order to include the major Jewish settlements in the West Bank without defining the Jerusalem issue and absenting any mention of Golan Heights.

Another reason for the lack of the clear borders is the definition of Israel that is perceived by many if not most of the Jews as Promised by God Land as is said in the Bible. Yet Bible only mentions areas and not exact borders.[31] Map on the site of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the State of Israel lacks any visible mark of the international boundary with Syria except for the lines of separation of forces in 1974.[32]

Although the information on this MFA site offers data on the size of the Israel (22,145 square kilometres) which includes portion of the territories gained in 1967, every map shows entire territory controlled by Israeli forces since 1967, which covers 27,799 square kilometres.[33] Bible is cited in the introduction about the Land, on this official site, but the

[27] "Letter From the Agent of the Provisional Government of Israel to the President of the United States", May 15, 1948, in: *A Decade of American Foreign Policy 1941–1949*: Independence of Israel, Internet, http://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/decad169.asp, retrieved on 09/09/2011.

[28] "Letter dated 18 may 1948 From the Assistant Secretary-General for Security Council Affairs addressed to the Jewish Agency for Palestine, and reply dated 22 may 1948 addressed to the Secretary-General Concerning the Questions Submitted by the Security Council", S/766, 22 May 1948. Answers to the questions a, b and c contain explanation and view over what was at the moment considered as the State of Israel and was part of the Palestine (referring to the mandate territory).

[29] Internet, http://www.aljazeera.com/news/middleeast/2011/10/2011103172551498181.html, retrieved on 15/11/2011.

[30] See, for example: "The Urgency of a Two-State Solution", *Jstreet*, Internet, http://jstreet.org/policy/issues/the-urgency-of-a-two-state-solution/, retrieved on 01/02/2012.

[31] "Why the land of Israel has a border problem", *The Jewish Chronicle*, September 2, 2009, Internet, http://www.thejc.com/judaism/judaism-features/19245/why-land-israel-has-a-border-problem, retrieved on 01/02/2012.

[32] © 2006 Copyright Carta, Jerusalem, © 2008 Israel Ministry of Foreign Affairs – The State of Israel; Israel within Boundaries and Ceasefire Lines – 2006, Israel Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Internet, http://www.mfa.gov.il/MFA/Facts+About+Israel/Israel+in+Maps/Israel+within+Boundaries+and+Ceasefire+Lines+-+200.htm, retrieved on 01/02/2012.

[33] "THE LAND: Geography and Climate", 29 Nov 2010, Israel Ministry of Foreign Affairs, http://www.mfa.gov.il/MFA/Facts+About+Israel/Land/THE+LAND-+Geography+and+Climate.htm, retrieved on 01/02/2012.

passage is not one of those referring to territories but to"... a land flowing with milk and honey... (Exodus 3:8)."[34]

In many nations there are fringe group advocating greater one or another country or having aspirations to establish one own country. What counts mostly is official policy or the one endorsed by the elite. Cartographic representation of Israeli land shows open territorial aspirations but also possibility for the continuation of the principle land for peace with the exclusion of Jerusalem of which we will explain after. Map of the Palestine submitted by the Word Zionist Organization soon after the end of WWI represents 'the Whole Land of Israel'.[35] Of course in that case it was the maximum they asked but except for the Jordan for some periods Israeli army was holding all or much of depicted territories in Egypt (1956, 1967–1982), Lebanon (1978–2000) and in Syria (since 1967).

One of the core components of the principle Land for Peace (beside the question of the legitimacy of Israel to exist – questioned by many or most of Islamic countries in the past and in present time) was the definition of the borders and in particular of the borders of the Jewish state. Problem of the delimitation was and in minor measure still is in different perspective whether you look at it as a Muslim statesman or as an Israeli or outsider. Since most of the Muslim countries still do not recognise Israel, definition of its borders seems not to be the issue. Today, the question of the recognition of the State of Israel by the Muslim states (aside those who have recognised it) are mostly connected to the definition of its borders and its demarcation with Palestinian Autonomy (PA), aspiring to become a state. Israel does not have fixed borders. Not only with Lebanon and Syria, also with Saudi Arabia and in particular the status of the Palestinian autonomy is upholding the issue as subject to further complications. But, the status of Jerusalem is at least regarding to values, culture and tradition, all that makes and constitutes one nation the most important bone of contention. Jerusalem is the most important site for the Jewishness because it is the city of the Temple. Jordanian King, officially the guardian of Jerusalem Al-Aqsa Mosque (third most holy site for the Islam), managed to maturate peace agreement with Israel.

Annexation of old city (of Jerusalem in 1981) and ongoing building of Jewish hoses and neighbourhoods around it are testing fragile calm between Jordan and Israel not to speak about the prospect of the Arab-Israeli peace. Land for peace is increasingly obstructed with growing ultra-orthodox and orthodox Jewish population now joining anti-peace camp[36] on the one hand and Islamisation of Arab political elites in the region are promising new clashes and shallowness of this principle — when it comes to Jerusalem at least. Because being Haredi Jew who does not want to serve the army but wants to live

---

[34] Internet, http://www.mfa.gov.il/MFA/Facts+About+Israel/Land/THE+LAND.htm, retrieved on 01/02/2012.

[35] Internet, http://www.palestineremembered.com/Acre/Maps/Story1045.html.

[36] Nicolas Pelham, Israel's Religious Right and the Peace Process, op., cit.

in Jerusalem and settlements in Cisjordania do not makes them out of the conflict with Arabs who claim at least old Jerusalem and at least West Bank for themselves.

Dire conclusions

Globalisation as a process of economic, cultural and subsequently even political networking and in final instance of world governance goes beyond and despite borders and sovereignties. Current globalisation as globalisation sees borders as traditional delimitations of authorities and therefore of political systems as limitation. Modern Israeli politics of staunch sovereignty, acquisition of territory through war, open border as frontier (bordering area prone to expansion), and ethnocratic imperative in policy all goes against globalisation and integration of governance, cultures and finances. Not only Israel, but the whole region, with religious and tribal identities resurrecting, belongs more to the modern and even traditional society than to that of Post modern embraced by the West. Not only in this region, delimitation of authorities and bordering will remain topical, but in the short run, they promise to challenge even the globalist West.

Regional turmoil with heavy involvement of Western governments (most visibly in Libya, in Syria and in Iran) that at the same time promote globalisation, fruited with Islamic renaissance. Pressure on Israel to accommodate Palestinian Arab claim for the state will grow now even from neighbouring Egypt. On the other hand, war winds over Syria and Iran distract attention of public opinion from the issue of the peace process and from the settlement of the Israel's borders, giving time and space to current government in Jerusalem to continue seizing land by building new housing units in and around East Jerusalem and in the Samaria and Judea. Border issue remains open, unresolved and given demographic trends, tide of Green revolutions and prospect of border changes in the region, announced with the Sudan division and Iraqi internal political divisions along ethnical and sectarian lines promises new mapping of the region. Land for peace principle is more and more at odds with growing settlements population and importance of East Jerusalem for both sides. Jerusalem and internal Israeli divisions will add new challenges to the possibility of finding peaceful solution for the aspiration of Palestinian Arabs to have a state.

References:

Documents
1. "A Clean Break: A New Strategy for Securing the Realm", Internet, *The Institute of Advanced Strategic and Political Studies* 1996, Internet, http://www.iasps.org/strat1.htm, retrieved on 27/11/2011.

2. "Fact Sheet: Broader Middle East and North Africa Initiative", *U.S. State Department, The White House Office of the Press Secretary*, Georgia June 9, 2004, Internet, http://www.state.gov/e/eb/rls/fs/33380.htm, 20/09/2006.

3. "Letter From the Agent of the Provisional Government of Israel to the President of the United States", May 15, 1948, in: *A Decade of American Foreign Policy 1941-1949*: Independence of Israel, Internet, http://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/decad169.asp, retrieved on 09/09/2011.

4. "Letter dated 18 may 1948 from the Assistant Secretary-General for Security Council Affairs addressed to the Jewish Agency for Palestine, and reply dated 22 may 1948 addressed to the Secretary-General Concerning the Questions Submitted by the Security Council", S/766, 22 May 1948.

5. "ORSAM Report 102: How and under what circumstances could Iraq be split up? Being ready for the worst", 31 January 2012, Internet, http://www.orsam.org.tr/en/showArticle.aspx?ID=1561.

6. "Treaty of Peace Between The Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan And The State of Israel, October 26, 1994.

Book and articles

1. Barzilai, Gad, and Peleg, Ilan, "Israel and Future Borders: Assessment of a Dynamic Process", *Journal of Peace Research*, vol. 31, no. 1, 1994, pp. 59–73.

2. Blair, Tony, "A Battle for Global Values", *Foreign Affairs*, January/February 2007, Internet, http://www.foreignaffairs.org/20070101faessay86106/tony-blair/a-battle-for-global-values.html ?mode= print, скинуто: 30/01/2007.

3. Enginsoy, Ümit, "US senator urges Kurds to stay in Iraq to avoid Turk invasion.", TDN, March 6, 2007, Internet, http://www.turkishdailynews.com.tr/article.php?enewsid=67556, retrieved on 06/03/2007.

4. Gibler, Douglas M, "Bordering on Peace: Democracy, Territorial Issues, and Conflict", *International Studies Quarterly* (2007) Volume 51, Issue 3, pp. 509–532.

5. "Is the US State Department still keeping April Glaspie under wraps?", *Information Clearing House* 12/25/05, Internet, http://www.informationclearinghouse. info/article11376.htm. retrieved on 30/01/2012.

6. Janković, Slobodan, "National, Cultural and Civilisation Borers in the Balkans", in: *On Borders: Comparative Analyses from Southeastern Europe and East Asia*, Lingua-Culture Contextual Studies in Ethnic Conflicts of the World (LICCOSEC), Vol. 17, Osaka 2011, Proceedings of Round Table Conference, Belgrade, September 17–18, pp. 34.

7. Janković, Slobodan, „Libijska kriza i njene posledice", *Međunarodna politika*, God. LXII, br. 1142, april–jun 2011, IMPP, Beograd 2011, pp. 30–51.

8. Јанковић, Слободан, „Промене на Блиском истоку и у Северној Африци — Ка постсувереном светском поретку", (Changes in the Middle East and in North Africa – Towards post-sovereignty order), *Национални интерес* бр. 2/2011, Година VII vol. 11, Београд, pp. 261–315.

9. "Palestinian Authority faces financial collapse", September 21, 2011, Internet, http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/def11be0-e46c-11e0-844d-00144feabdc0.html#axzz1kf6b7Rhn, retrieved on 27/01/2012.

10. Peters, Ralph, "Blood borders: How a better Middle East would look", *Armed Forces Journal* – June 2006.

11. Pelham, Nicolas, "Israel's Religious Right and the Peace Process", *MERIP* October 12, 2009, Internet, http://www.merip.org/mero/mero101209, retrieved on 06/02/2012.

12. Smith, Neil, "The endgame of globalization", Political Geography 25 (2006) 1–14.

13. "The Urgency of a Two-State Solution", *Jstreet*, Internet, http://jstreet.org/policy/issues/the-urgency-of-a-two-state-solution/, retrieved on 01/02/2012.

14. "Why the land of Israel has a border problem", *The Jewish Chronicle*, September 2, 2009, Internet, http://www.thejc.com/judaism/judaism-features/19245/why-land-israel-has-a-border-problem, retrieved on 01/02/2012.