

# Justice and Peace in Israel and Palestine

## AGENDA

### WELCOME AND OPENING

By Bertus Hendriks, Chairman of the meeting

1

### OPENING REMARKS

By: Peter Idenburg, Executive Chairman of IDF

2

### SPEECH

By: Geoffrey Aronson  
Executive Director of Foundation For Middle East Peace

3

### SPEECH

By: Menachem Klein  
Senior lecturer Bar Ilan University

4

### SPEECH

By: Mouin Rabbani  
Institute for Palestinians Studies

4

### COMMENT

By: Sumaya Barghouti  
Ambassador General Palestinian Delegation

5 & 6

### QUESTIONS

To: speakers

7

### CLOSING WORDS

By: Gerben Meihuizen  
Board Member of IDF

7

### STUDENT PARTICIPATION

By: Tatiana Jacques  
Chair of Student Coordinating Group

## INTERNATIONAL DIALOGUES FOUNDATION

### ROUNDTABLE MEETING

11th OF DECEMBER 2008 AT NIEUWSPOORT, THE HAGUE

On the 11th of December, International Dialogues Foundation (IDF) in cooperation with the Student Coordinating Group (SCG), organised a roundtable meeting to discuss the prospects of the negotiating process on the Israeli/Palestinian question as a consequence of Barack Obama becoming President of the United States. As the reader will notice, the speakers were not overoptimistic. The developments that took place shortly after this meeting in and around Gaza, have shown that there is certainly no reason for easy optimism. The more reason to go on in the spirit of shared responsibility and open-mindedness they have shown, and which we consider as the hallmark of our project.

Peter Idenburg (IDF) & Tatiana Jacques (SCG)

### Geoffrey Aronson

...'It is a sophisticated dialogue between Israel and Hamas, they

are fighting each other, killing each other, [...] have negotiators. It is a new language we need to adjust to because it is the future.'

### Menachem Klein

...'Ethnicity matters more than citizenship, and Palestinians are now less than B-class citizens. Israeli Palestinians are gradually excluded from public life on the basis of ethnicity, not citizenship. Therefore we have riots in ethnically mixed cities'.

### Mouin Rabbani

...'Unless the Palestinian leadership can find a way to reconcile Palestinian leadership, Israeli leadership, international opinion, the dying due to violence, leukemia and medieval circumstances in Gaza will continue for some time. Palestinians need to get their house in order so they can build their own political system.'

## Opening remarks

After apologising for the absence of [Dr.] Dick de Zeeuw, - chairman of the board of IDF - and Prof. Dries van Agt, - co-chairman of the International Council of IDF - who were unable to attend, we would like to say a few words on the background and the perspectives of this meeting. Last year, IDF organised a conference under the title 'To Be on Speaking Terms' regarding the relations between Israel and Palestine. These words were inspired by the so-called 'Baker report' and it expressed exactly what we had in mind when organising this conference. Namely, the necessity to be on speaking terms not only with those with whom one basically agrees, but also with those with whom there is not such an agreement. That is what lead us to decide to organise this meeting dealing with the question: 'What can be expected for the peace negotiations under Barack Obama's presidency?' It is the fact that, whatever one might think of the ideas that Obama has on this issue, the willingness to be on speaking terms exists. More than anybody else, we can imagine that Obama can be expected to take the advice of the Baker report seriously.

During these preparatory discussions, two elements, regarding our approach, have crystallised: partnerships and roundtables. For the organisation of this conference, the partnership with the students will be considered an essential aspect. Secondly, the Palestine Israel Journal (PIJ), which has already played an important role for many years as a forum for Israeli-Palestinian experts to present their ideas,

is one of our most valued partners. I would also like to mention the important role that the Municipality of The Hague has played in the last few years. In supporting activities and focusing on the position of the migrant and non-migrant youth concerning issues dealing with the relationship between Europe and the Muslim Society. One can say that the active student involvement in this project was a logical consequence of these earlier conferences.

We consider this year as the first in a three year programme. The programme will focus on Economy in the second year, and on the question of the Refugees, which is the hardest nut to crack, in the third year. All the activities will be based on the same formula: partnerships and roundtables with 'innovative experts' as well as students, working side by side on the formulation of constructive proposals to promote Justice and Peace in Israel and Palestine. The solution of the problem is in the first place the responsibility of Israelis and Palestinians themselves. But we are convinced that third parties can play an important role in this process. As it has been the case during this meeting, we put our cards on the specific role which can be played by youth and also on the new perspective we expect from the policy of the United States under Barack Obama.

**By:** Peter Idenburg

Executive chairman of International Dialogues Foundation

## Geoffrey Aronson

### Policies:

Geoffrey Aronson points out that Obama overtly showed to have the right instincts regarding his positions towards the region, especially concerning Iraq. For a president of the USA it is basically important to have the right instincts to begin with, instead of having a clear agenda for foreign policy in the region. During the campaign trial, Obama did not present a very clear picture of the policies he will be pursuing. Therefore, Aronson bases his views on the direction of foreign policy of the region, on the views expressed by Rachid Khalidi, (former Chicago University, current Columbia University expert on Middle East Policies) Obama shows no particular determination to change the Middle East. Washington supports or is in consensus about the Annapolis process. Washington is under the impression that the Palestinian economy is currently growing. Democrats and Republicans seem to agree that the current policies make sense. These positions are strengthening Fayyad and Fatah against Hamas.

## Geoffrey Aronson

In his speech, Geoffrey Aronson addresses the following three subjects regarding the coming Obama Administration, Israel and Palestine:

What has the Obama Administration indicated so far that their Foreign Policy will be focussing on, particularly concerning the Middle East and therefore Israel and Palestine as well?

What are the policies they will be pursuing with regard to the region?

As for the failures of the Bush Administration in their policies on Israel and Palestine, a democrat like John Kerry holds the same position as Condoleezza Rice. There is however, a change among the foreign policy elite. During the Bush era, foreign policy on the Middle East was conducted within the regional contextual paradigm. The region was regarded as incapable of organising itself, therefore the US and its allies had free range to interfere within the region. Now the approach to the regional context seems to be, that the Israeli-Palestinian conflict is linked to both Iraq and Iran as well as being linked to the wider regional context. This may lead to the approach towards Israel and Palestine as a problem addressed as a result of regional considerations. The consensus in Washington is, that there is a need to solve problems. One of the many influential Washington think-tanks issued an editorial that was strongly in support of the Arab League Plan, which they regarded as an interesting way to address these issues.

However, the Israeli-Palestinian issue will need to fight for the attention of the president. Obama will not have top-level attention for the issue, which has to do with the imminence of issues he will face during his presidency.

Iran is one of these issues such a problem in which Obama may need to change in willingness to change the terms, meaning he will need to allow Iran to address its security interests. Bob Gates, current and future US Secretary of Defense, appears to think that granting legitimacy to Iranian security concerns is a long delayed step towards an Iran Security Structure West (of Israel) and East (of Iran). We should not forget that an important rationale in Israel's West-Bank occupation is, that it addresses a security response to the East in which the Jordan Valley has always been considered a natural barrier to invasion from Jordan by Arab armies and a natural tank trap.

If the US is to address the security concerns of Iran and the region as a whole, it is helpful to address the strategic West-Bank concern. As an added effect of addressing security issues in the region, inherently speaking of the threat from the East for Israel, the defense paradigm driving Israel's control of the West-Bank may be changed. As for Israeli-Syrian interactions, Israel's Security System is in full support of a deal with Syria, whom they consider to be a strong, trustworthy deal-keeper. This relationship offers a greater prospect to success.

Israel and Syria have already engaged in diplomatic talks with help from Turkey.

It now needs bilateral support to go any further, but Israel's advantages largely outweigh the disadvantages of a deal.

The Washington sentiment generally is that things are going relatively well in Palestine, and the issue is therefore not crying out for attention.

(Due to time restraints, Geoffrey Aronson was not able to address the third subject of his speech, which was to give an indication and account of the persons expected to be on the Obama team. However, Aronson himself considered this to be the least interesting subject to be addressed in the context of this conference.)

## Menachem Klein

He comments on the Annapolis 2008 conference(s) that he was convinced that it would not produce an agreement. The gap between the Palestinian (National) Authority (PA), the Israeli government and Hamas, is simply too wide. The proposals Israel made during Annapolis are the same as those that were offered at Camp David in 2000-2001, and in some sense even worse.

Presently, the situation is substantially far beyond (sic) reconciliation. The 'on the ground' situation is, that the Israeli-Palestinian joint territories have only one state regime: the Israeli regime. The conflict has changed from an ethnic conflict into a border conflict and now, back again into an ethnic conflict between two ethnic groups under one (Israeli) regime. There is no room for moving from one state to a two-state solution, before the one-state regime has been abolished.

The one-state (Israeli) regime is basically an 'ethnic security regime'. Israel dictates movement, the rule of law, Palestinian control. The PA operates along the lines that Israel allows it to follow. There is a permission system in order to control the Palestinian, which is dividing them. The Israeli Security Regime is in place to control the Palestinians and to combat the Palestinian Intifadah. Israel approaches the problem by interpreting demographic data: 55% of the population living in territory between Jordan and the Mediterranean Sea are Jewish. In a couple of years, these Jews will be a minority in these territories. And in an ethnic conflict demographic numbers matter. Ethnicity matters more than citizenship, and Palestinians are now less than B-class citizens. Israeli Palestinians are gradually excluded from public life on the basis of ethnicity, not citizenship. Therefore we are seeing riots in ethnically mixed cities. There simply is no Green Line in the ethnic perspective, except for as set out in law textbooks. In the Knesset, Palestinian and Arab citizens are discriminated in every respect except for their right of free speech.

There is no appetite nor need or pressure for change in Israel, except for the danger of becoming an ethnic conflict. At the moment no one shakes the system, neither internal nor external pressure exists. On the ground there have been big changes for the worse since 2000. The PA has been practically destroyed as an effective authority by Israel and both the PA and Abbas accept this fact. In this way, the Palestinians are helping Israel by supporting the regime, by the divisions between Gaza and the West-Bank,

## Menachem Klein

Menachem Klein starts his speech by commenting, that it will be easier for Obama to go for an Israeli-Syrian reconciliation than to continue the Israel-Palestine policy of conflict management introduced by the Bush Administration eight years ago.

Fatah and Hamas and by Abbas, who is all talk, but has no tools to cause pressure.

We are caught in between a *Two-state solution*, which is not realistic in the foreseeable future, and a *One-state solution* (one man, one vote), that simply will not happen, since neither Israel nor the Palestinians want this.

Security should not be considered as a technical issue, but as a fundamental issue. If a one- or two-state solution is supposed to work, Israel should change its security concept. A 100% security is an impossible aim in a two-state solution. Foreign diplomacy as well as Israelis should realise that a sovereign Palestinian state can only be realised when the regime that considers security as a fundamental issue has been changed. That because of the fundamental status of the issue of security, one has to accept that to create a sovereign Palestinian state will mean a sacrifice of a part of Israeli security. Unless the important practical issues (borders, costs, refugees, land swap) are addressed, a final status agreement can not be realised.

A US involvement in the security of Israel is both a US-Israeli debate, and an American domestic debate through the right-wing Israeli lobby in the US, who will put great pressure on the Administration. The US president must be willing to go all the way, but unfortunately, Klein sees no evidence of such a political will in Obama.

## Mouin Rabbani

The first draft of history on Bush has been very unfortunate concerning his change in foreign policy. This inspired to pose Obama as a change bringing Saint.

The US is a fairly stable industrialized modern democracy, steered by a vast bureaucracy, lobby institutions and opinion power centres. A US president has limited room for maneuvering, unless there is unified consensus among the key power centres. To illustrate this, the example of the withdrawal from Vietnam shows, that it was not because of the decisive position of the president, but as a result of the consensus among power centres in the US. Bush's policies in the Middle East are a continuation and or a result of the Clinton years. The policies of the Bush Administration

are aligned with movements that were already set in motion. Israel's settlement acceleration already took place under the Clinton Administration, despite of the peace initiative, Camp David and the likes. Barrack Obama is therefore hardly the change we need, he simply could not make that change. Policies are orchestrated by institutions, lobbying and other forces within the political society. Rabbani does not expect to see any fundamental change on any Middle East subject, including Iran. He will most likely speak to Iran, but Obama will initially take the existing foreign policy and expand it, build on it, which is not a good thing at all.

When the Palestinian government keeps negotiating simply for the sake of negotiating in order to keep getting support (economic etc.), it is sending a message to the world that everything is fine. Will the new Administration make any real effort to stop settlement expansion, than it will eliminate a threat to the solution of the problem. The acceptance by the US and the EU of settlement expansionism has caused the biggest

supporters of the two-state solution doubting its viability.

People have attached to much hope on and importance too a change in administration. It is a grave mistake to look to Washington for hope. The Palestinians are on a dead-end road. The internal Palestinian division between Hamas and the PA is a purely Palestinian problem and not at all helpful for finding any solution. National reconciliation is for Ramallah a concern to lose international support, and for Hamas to loose power in Gaza. Unless the Palestinian leadership can find a way to reconcile Palestinian unity in an acceptable way to the Palestinian leadership, Israeli leadership and international opinion, the dying due to violence, leukemia and medieval circumstances in Gaza will continue for some time into the future. Palestinians need to get their house in order so they can build their own political system. Here outside help could be of use. The price paid by the Palestinian civilians is that of past/present/future healthcare, education, etc.

### Comment

by: Sumaya Barghouti

Ambassador, General Delegation of Palestine

First I would like to comment on the question what change can be expected from the new US president Barack Obama. It is not the US president but the US institutions that make the policies and therefore evoke the change. So far there has been no indication of change in the US perspective on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

To come to a settlement is only possible when both sides believe that there actually exist disputable areas. This calls for a change of attitude in order to agree there are in fact occupied territories. The majority of Palestinians want a withdrawal of Israeli Defense Forces from the occupied territories, including East-Jerusalem. Without formally calling it an 'occupation' and act upon that on the basis of International Law, there a shift cannot be expected on these issues nor the approach for solutions, including the establishment of a truly sovereign Palestinian government.

Another issue that needs to be addressed are the 2 for 1 land swap, which should be decided upon through a referendum.

This is the official Palestinian position.

# Questions to speakers

---

**Emma Morrison - Leiden University**

**On Hamas: Can the US be flexible on Hamas and see it as a viable political force and not only as a terrorist organisation?**

**Menachen Klein**

Hamas has changed significantly as an organisation since its inception. Israel failed to create a Palestinian revolt against Hamas, which is the intent of the boycott or blockade against Gaza.

**Geoffrey Aronson**

Currently Israel is thinking more about Hamas in Gaza than Abbas in Ramallah. It is simply forced to do so. Both Israel and Hamas are forced to compromise. Concerning the U.S., the U.S. never leads the parade, but follows far behind. For example, in the case of Israel and Egypt, Sadat came to Israel after receiving insurance by Begin on the withdrawal. The U.S. was not happy about this, but after a while reconciled itself with that agreement. E.g. In 1993, the U.S. modified the principles, the parties were themselves willing to accommodate to.

On Hamas and Israel: They involved in a debate, that is however different from what we know in Europe. It is a sophisticated dialogue between Israel and Hamas; they are fighting each other, killing each other, have negotiators. It is a new language we need to adjust to because it is the future. Hamas as an authority in Gaza, as is only dreamable in the West-Bank. Civilians have freedom of movement in Gaza that does not exist anywhere in the West-Bank, a centralised authority leadership that answers to no-one, a police force, an army in command which is fighting Israel. These are indicators of where the future is going, and Israel has difficulties adjusting to these facts. I am amazed by the degree of dis-attention in Washington. Washington cannot effectively ignore facts on the ground when it wants to draw policy based on the factual situation. But U.S. diplomats do not travel to the West-Bank nor Gaza. If you cannot make contact officially it has to be

done covertly. That is where security bureaus are for, to obtain information. This is happening on a small scale in a way that is easy to deny. However, the relation between Hamas and Israel is expanding.

**Mouin Rabbani**

The real question is, if the U.S. is willing to deal with a new Palestinian regime that has been democratically elected. The Quartet led by the U.S. wanted Hamas to get down on their knees, which is not going to happen. However, it is less important to watch what the U.S. is doing than seeing what Europe will do on a formula to deal with Hamas and the PA. There is fear that Europe will continue to toe the line, synchronising policies with the U.S. During the years 2005-6 the E.U. policy concerning the Middle East was in harmony with the U.S. in order to moderate the transatlantic ruptures. Obama will be concerned with restoring international cooperation. If the U.S. is not prepared to talk to Hamas, than Europe will also not talk to Hamas, to accommodate Obama.

**Tatiana Jacques - Chair SCG**

**Three issues: municipal authority, sovereignty and holy places. Does each side want absolute sovereignty or agree to a partly shared, transition for Palestine?**

**Menachem Klein:**

There is no way to have an agreement on Jerusalem, it is physically impossible. There can be no agreement on Jerusalem by a transitional or interim period, because of the close proximity of Jewish and Palestinian houses in the city. One cannot jump directly to divisions in two parts either, since it needs to be transitional. It needs an interim period to build physical borders, that should be agreed upon in a referendum or election.

## Question and comments

---

### **Klein**

#### **David Bacci Maastricht University**

We need a new alternative approach, to the one and two state solution. Perhaps one based on the case of Belgium or the relationship between Finland and Russia...

Ethnicity is important. We both want our ethnic nation states, we do not want to see any Palestinians, and they do not want to see us. We do not want to share government, we want a 100% ethnic Israeli state. We are crazy. Jordan is crazy as well, and Egypt is obsessive about some religious strips as well. We will not become the United Arab States, we are different people, have a different history. Why should we have the same governmental system?

### **Rabbani**

Innovative proposals or ideas are not productive for this conflict, when they are based on more conductive regions in the world to bypass the two-state solution.

#### **Laurens Jan Brinkhorst**

"Europeans have become unused to leading, and no initiative will come from the US. Europeans can, however, appeal to Americans on certain issues. We have our own instruments as well. We have the Association Agreement. We should make appeals to EU governments for an application of the Association Agreement (AA), resulting in suspending the further deepening of the relationship between Israel and European countries. For as long as Israel continues its policies towards Palestinian territories that are in conflict with the basic principles of the AA considering respect for human rights and democratic principles as a guide for internal and international policy. Human Rights seem to exist everywhere but in Israel and Palestine. In an open letter to the Dutch Minister of Foreign Affairs it was questioned what the Dutch support of Human Rights is worth, when it is not applied to Israel and Palestine. Israel bombed the harbour and hospital in Gaza that were built by Europeans with European money. How acceptable is that?."

#### **Mouin Rabbani:**

Obama has to lead a country faced with two wars, a financial meltdown, nuclear proliferation in Iran and a Israeli-Palestinian problem worse than ever sine Truman. The Israeli-Palestinian problem will be on the back-burner and not a priority on the Obama agenda. Besides all this, addressing this problem will make powerful enemies domestically for Obama. Something he will not do in his first period in the office.

#### **Wim van Eekelen**

What is the perspective now, with the incoming Democratic Administration in the U.S. after eight years of post 9/11 pro-Israel Republican rule in U.S. foreign policy in the Middle East region? Even though the U.S. is the only country in the world with leverage on both sides of the conflict, the U.S. does not have the same status in the world it had until some years ago. However, the picture painted by the speakers seems to be too negative, too gloomy. This is a chance after eight years to make an appeal to Obama's message of hope and change.

#### **Geoffrey Aronson**

Americans do not think of European views on the Middle East. The view the European approach as too lame, a disdain the Europeans have earned for themselves. When the EU is not willing to step into the room and use its sticks on the economic level and wants to consciously change the problem, but no political power. People who support the settlements to freeze, support the evacuation of settlements, which is politically very difficult. The evacuation of Sinai was not conducted through a 'freeze' period, but through direct evacuation, neither has Gaza gone through such a period. Therefore, also Jerusalem and The West Bank will be settled by a decision without a freeze moment to evacuate.

---

## Closing Remarks

By: Gerben Meihuizen

In closing this roundtable gathering I would like first of all express on behalf of IDF and our audience today our gratitude to the speakers, Mr. Geoffrey Aronson, Menachem Klein and Mouin Rabbani. Mr. Aronson, you enjoy the reputation of having been able to forge contacts between Syria and Israel. This already alone plus the vast experience of your foundation made you the ideal person to enlighten us on the prospects of the Middle East peace process upon the election of Barack Obama as the next President of your country. It was good to hear you talk as an insider of both American and Middle Eastern politics and after all; are we Europeans not sitting still too much on the side fence of the problem in question

Menachem Klein is an old friend of IDF and we met him already four years ago in the The Hague speaking at the Peace Palace and he certainly

has not lost since then his talent for creative and original thinking.

Mouin Rabbani is likewise over the years an intimate associate of IDF and having his roots in Palestine and working in Amman makes him one of the most qualified to give us his side of the story. The speeches by our guests have prompted an animated exchange of views on an extensive range of themes and sub themes and our time was of course too short to delve into them as profoundly.

On the other hand a meeting of minds like this one lends itself ideally to follow it up with themes which tend to be neglected or ignored in political processes like this. We also realise not always enough that the future of dealing with such an enormous problem will probably rest in the hands of a younger generation and that less veterans than most of us here present must have a chance of acquainting themselves with it. May I now close with this note and invite you for drinks.

A comment on the missing of the theme of Justice in the discussion is responded to by Rabbani by underlining that diplomacy has already taken the front seat in the relations between Israel and Palestine. Klein differentiates between two sorts of justice, being absolute justice, which he considers unachievable. The politicised justice, concerning Jerusalem e.g., which should be approached by reaching an agreement on sovereignty and who can enter when and where only, and leave cultural, religious and historical issues out of the equation. Otherwise, identity is called in to support the arguments, and that is insolvable. Aronson ends the discussion with his observation, that the evolving relationship between Israel and Hamas is one of the most hopeful aspects of the issue today.

## Tatiana Jacques

Chair of SCG on student participation

At the simulation game of December 2007, "To be on speaking terms" one of the toughest problems to resolve was Jerusalem. That is the reason why we, as students, decided to work on that issue. In order to develop a follow-up, IDF chose to collaborate closer with the students involved in the project of 2007. Therefore, the upcoming conference could be shaped with our involvement in both the organisation of the meeting and the participation of the students, who are taking on an active role. To create this format, IDF has set up a board of students called "Student Coordinating Group", known as "SCG". SCG is now organising in conjunction with IDF a student Roundtable meeting to discuss possible solutions for Jerusalem

which will take place in May, 2009. For this project, we will bring together students from Israel, Palestine, other neighbouring countries, The Netherlands and other European countries. This gathering of 11th December 2008 is a preparatory meeting for the May student roundtable. Through this conference, IDF is giving the students a platform and a formula on how to organize the Roundtable by preparing us with contents and giving us guidelines on organisational matters. Please refer to the 'calendar' to have an insight on the further activities being formulated and planned by IDF and SCG.

**Editor: Bert Jan Mom,**  
Maastricht University

## CALENDAR:

### MARCH 2009

Inter-religious Dialogue on humanization

### APRIL 2009

Trip to Jerusalem

### MAY 2009

Student Roundtable Conference

### FALL 2009

Roundtable on Security

## Justice and Peace in Israel and Palestine - List of participants

1	Aarts, Paul - I	University of Amsterdam
2	Abassin, Nassar	Leiden University
3	van Asselt, Evert Jan	Vice-Chair CDA- Research institute
4	Aronson, Geoffrey	Speaker - Director of Foundation for Middle East Peace
5	Bacci, David - T	SCG Maastricht University
6	Barghouti, Sumaya	Palestinian Delegation
7	Brinkhorst, Laurens Jan	University of Leiden; Former Vice- Prime Minister of The Netherlands
8	Bogaard, Judith - T	University of Amsterdam
9	Dennert, Rick	IDF
10	Duim, Feije - I	Kerk in actie; ICCO
11	van Eekelen, Willem	Former Minister of Defense of The Netherlands
12	Elshout, Jan	Middle East Consultant
13	Falls, Eric - T	US Embassy
14	van der Feltz, Jeanine - T	SCG Social Academy Utrecht
15	van de Griend, Christian - T	University of Leiden
16	Hamburger, Jaap	Chair EAJG: A Different Jewish Voice
17	Heijkoop, Gert	Ministry of Foreign Affairs
18	Hassoun, Tomador -T	Chair ANVK: Arab Dutch Women Circle
19	Den Hertog, Jan - I	Friends of Sabeel
20	Hendriks, Bertus - I	Chair of the meeting
21	Heynen, Rolf - T	University of Leiden
22	Idenburg, Peter	Coordinator; IDF
23	Jacques, Tatiana	Chair SCG
24	Kailani, Abu Zeid - I	Imam Utrecht
25	Keizer, Eddy - I	EAJG
26	Kemble, Oscar	IDF
27	Kemble, Sarita - T	University of Utrecht
28	Klein, Menachem	Speaker - Professor Bar-Ilan University
29	Lanceman, Scott - T	US Embassy
30	Meihuizen, Gerben	IDF
31	Morrison, Emma	Leiden University
32	Mom, Bert Jan	Maastricht University
33	Mulder, Eildert - I	Trouw Journalist
34	Najjar, Maha -	Free University Brussels
35	Niewold, Michael - T	School of Journalism, Utrecht
36	Nina Koevoekts	University of Amsterdam
37	van Nispen tot Sevenaer, C.I	Tabitha Ministries Foundation - Category - Inter-religious dialogue
38	Peters, Lilian - I	IDF
39	Rabbani, Mouin	Speaker - Institute for Palestine Studies
40	Rabbani, Salim - R	Rabbani Foundation
41	Rabbani, Anissa - R	Rabbani Foundation
42	Rogel-Fuchs, Hamutal - T	Diplomat for Press, Culture and Public Affairs of the Embassy of Israel
43	Rutgers, Bram - I	Chair of Tabitha Ministries Foundation - Inter-religious group
44	Shawa, Maha -	Palestinian Delegation
45	Slomp, Jan -	Chair of SIVMO - Inter-religious
46	Stienen, Petra - I	Ministry of Foreign Affairs - Monday
47	Veldhuis, Ana-Maria	Project Co-ordinator Assistant, The Hague University
48	Verheuveld, Gerdien - I	Ministry of Education
49	Verwey, Dunya - T	IDF
50	Vitalis, Rugiero - T	SCG, University of Amsterdam