

DRAFT LANGUAGE ON SECURITY ISSUES

I. Military Capacity:

“Palestine will be an independent sovereign state with [limited] / [defensive] armament and a strong internal security force with ground, air and naval elements, [and will have credible defence guarantees from a third party]”

Alternative wording:

- The terms “limited”, “defensive” (or inversely, “non-offensive”) are acceptable as long as it is clearly stated that Palestine will have a “strong” internal security force, or at least one “capable of meeting all its security needs”
- Specification of components of the force (ground, air, naval) may be omitted as long as no restriction is stated.
- The reference to guarantees may be omitted if it is dealt with in language on third party role.
- The term “demilitarized state” is not acceptable.

Comment on “demilitarized state”:

This is likely to be the Israeli position. It is unacceptable because it would fundamentally undermine the sovereignty of Palestine. Furthermore, (a) demilitarization does not apply and has never been applied to whole states, only to specific or zones or territories; (b) a demilitarized state *stricto sensu* would not be able to exercise its basic sovereign functions – the monopoly on the use of force to maintain public order and protect its borders.

Argument:

- Focus should be on interests, in order to find a formula acceptable to both sides.
- Obviously Israel does not expect Palestine to have no arms whatsoever – therefore the term “demilitarized”, which is normally used to describe zones where no weapons may be located, is inappropriate.
- “A state with limited arms” allows for detailed negotiations in the treaty on the type and degree of limitation that suits the interests of both sides.

II. Alliances and security cooperation:

“Neither Palestine nor Israel will enter into military alliances [against one another] / [with a party hostile to the other], or allow their territory to be used for military operations against each other.”

“Palestine and Israel will establish security cooperation arrangements, in which international forces will play a central role. In addition, the two states will strive to establish a regional security regime.”

Comment on alliances and neutrality:

The essential element of the text is that neither party will enter into an alliance or “close security relationship [of a military character]” with a party/ies hostile to the other. This does not mean that Palestine should commit to “neutrality”.

Argument:

- There is no need to require any form of “neutrality” from Palestine in the agreement.
- Rather, as Palestine is expected to participate in regional security arrangements which would include Israel, it is inappropriate to apply “permanent neutrality” to it.

III. Residual Israeli presence / control:**Comment:**

It is Palestinian interest that no Israeli presence or control remains on its territory by agreement. **Therefore we should not raise any issues relating to this matter nor should we propose any draft language.**

Israel has demanded the following in the past:

- Early warning stations
- Military Presence and right to deploy in emergencies in the Jordan Valley
- Control over airspace
- Control over electromagnetic sphere

Argument:

- **Process** – we are now discussing core principles. Technical arrangements for limited presence for temporary period may be worked out in the treaty.
- **Substance** – Re EWS and Jordan Valley presence: there is no military rationale for such presence, given technology and the nature of any potential threat from the east.
- **Re airspace:** There is no need for military use by Israel of Palestinian airspace, whether from training or conducting operations. Any Israeli demands in this respect should be discussed in the framework of bilateral and regional security cooperation.
- **Re civil aviation:** We agree to work together in the framework of the Chicago Convention and the ICAO to come up with workable air traffic management and control arrangements that satisfy all our interests.
- **Re electromagnetic sphere:** Any Israeli need of Palestinian EMS to undertake agreed Israeli security needs in the West Bank will be managed by the Palestinians. No Israeli sovereignty or control should be granted to Israel over the Palestinian EMS.