1

Introduction

> The intellectuals of the left[1] are writing a new chapter: blaming a democracy which is at last defending itself from the Oslo terror regime of mouth shutting for allegedly deteriorating into despotism.
>
> – Amnon Lord (2002)

> There is no real difference between the peace activists who are defending the murderers and the murderers themselves.
>
> Owen (2003)

> Facts seem to have no impact on the left. . . . This is a left that doesn't know when to stop and ask itself questions or to reflect whether perhaps what it said yesterday is no longer correct today. . . . A meeting with them leaves one with the impression that the same [faulty] diskette has been implanted in their brains.
>
> – David Fogel (2003)

> Contrary to what the leftists argue, the price of being one is actually nil. It is even beneficial. You show the entire world that you are not narrow-minded or self-centered. . . . The preaching and nonsense of the left can be found even in food columns in the newspapers. . . . Defeatist remarks appear in the transportation

[1] For those unfamiliar with the local political context, the immediate association between the left and the peace movement should be highlighted here. In the public discourse, these two notions are not only inseparable but also almost identical. In the European context, and to a lesser extent in the American one, the term *political left* pertains to a sociopolitical ideological stream that includes communists, socialists, and perhaps even social democrats, and *right* connotes capitalism or a neoconservative socioeconomic agenda. In Israel, however, the notions of left and right are perceived differently. Thus, *left* most often connotes a preference for a political, not military, solution to the conflict, and readiness to make extensive territorial and other concessions in return for a peace agreement with the Palestinians. *Right*, on the other hand, connotes a noncompromising territorial position based on security and on nationalist/religious grounds. The relevant equation in Israel is left = doves, who do not necessarily hold a socialist outlook, and right = hawks, who do not necessarily endorse a capitalist worldview (see, e.g., Yuchtman-Yaar and Peres 2000).

> section, in by-the-way comments of sports journalists and, of course, much more openly in the lectures of many university professors. After all, that's today's bon ton.
>
> – Uri Orbach (2004)

> The only thing the left, insisting on staying within the parameters of militarism and Zionism and their historical narrative, can offer Palestinians, is peace "from a position of superiority," hoping all the while that "Gaza will sink into the sea," as its beloved martyr Rabin once put it.
>
> – Tel Aviv Critical Mass against the Wall (2004)

> No, there is no peace movement in Israel and unfortunately . . . until you end occupation . . . and the civil society developed in Israel is liberated from Zionist ideology, only then we have a chance for reconciliation.
>
> – Ilan Pappe (2005)

These are only six quotations, yet they represent typical examples of the harsh words aimed at the Israeli peace movement and its activists in recent years. These criticisms come from almost all directions – the political right, the center, and the radical left – as well as from the media: Internet talk backs, newspaper articles, radio programs, public lectures, political speeches, and similar venues. One must work very hard to unearth more gratifying comments on the disposition of peace activists and the movement's achievements. Paradoxically, as the peace movement became smaller and less vocal in the late 1990s and early 2000s, domestic antagonism toward it became harsher and more open. Indeed, international public opinion was actually more benign, which in turn inflamed domestic resentment toward the movement for allegedly collaborating with outside – that is, critical of Israel – forces. An observer unfamiliar with the facts could have easily arrived at the conclusion that all of the nation's troubles – from the security threats that it faces, hostile international public opinion, and even the deepening internal sociopolitical cleavages – were the work of this "demonic," "omnipotent" peace movement. In fact, the movement is so small that a random representative sample of Israel's adult population might well miss it altogether. Such allegations are even more absurd because there is nothing farther from most peace activists' minds than turning their backs on the Israeli national collective. The fact of the matter is that their main desire is to find an acceptable, just, and nonviolent solution to the conflict in order to secure the nation and reduce the bloodshed that has made life in this region intolerable.

The main conundrum that this book addresses is, thus, how it is that such a small movement, with a benign cause, has been politically ostracized and has in fact come to be perceived by many Israelis as "the enemy of the people." Scapegoating is a well-known – and admittedly sometimes useful – technique for strengthening collective unity, particularly when national solidarity is eroded by external or internal pressures. The question to be considered here, however, is why so many Israelis (and, as we shall see, also many Palestinians)

chose the peace movement and not any other political actor as their scapegoat. To put it differently, why do so many like to hate the peace movement or – even more destructive politically – to ignore it altogether. The question is particularly compelling because only a few would deny that a significant number of the peace groups' predictions and prognoses came true over the years. For example, consider the prestate activists' exposure of the connection between the creation of a Jewish majority in mandatory Palestine and the maturing of the Jewish-Arab conflict; the argument of post-1967 peace groups regarding the highly destructive implications of the expansion of the Jewish settlement project in the territories on the prospects of Israeli-Palestinian peace negotiations; or, in the mid-2000s, the warning that the unilateral disengagement from Gaza would contribute to the dangerous rise of Hamas. Furthermore, some of the peace movement's major recommendations and ideas, mainly the "two states for two peoples" formula, have, in practice, been adopted by various Israeli governments since 1993. These ideas also have been incorporated into the state's formal policy as well as into the prevailing public outlook on the conflict and the ways to manage and perhaps even resolve it.

Being widely vilified is indeed bad for a political actor; however, being sweepingly overlooked by relevant political individuals and bodies is no less problematic. Such disregard by the mainstream was the predicament of the Israeli peace movement, as exemplified in four recent books by people involved in the Oslo process that, although presenting different political readings of that process, have one common denominator: complete lack of interest in peace activism and the role played by the peace movement. The first book, *Oslo: A Formula for Peace*, was written by Yair Hirschfeld, an academic of the left and one of the two "architects" of this strategic move in the early 1990s (Hirschfeld 2000). Written in the late 1990s, the book was still fairly optimistic about the possibility of reaching a permanent Israeli-Palestinian peace agreement. The second book, *A Sad Story*, a collection of essays from the 1990s by right-wing Knesset member (MK) Ze'ev Benyamin Begin, was, as its name suggests, pessimistic. The book basically states that the entire Oslo process was doomed to fail because there has never been, nor will there ever be, a Palestinian partner for peace (Begin 2000). The third book, *Manual for a Wounded Dove*, was written by Yossi Beilin, then a Labour party politician and later leader of the left-of-center Meretz party, founding father of *Yozmat Geneva* (the Geneva Initiative), and one of the Israeli politicians most closely associated with the Oslo process and its predicament (Beilin 2001). Beilin focuses on the highly negative impact of the hard-line policies of Likud-led governments on the chances that the process will bear fruit. The fourth book, *Within Reach*, by Gilead Sher, a lawyer and close aide of Labour Prime Minister Ehud Barak in the late 1990s who accompanied Barak throughout the Camp David fiasco of July 2000, places most of the blame for the collapse of the negotiations on the Palestinians (Sher 2005). As mentioned previously, however, irrespective of their different interpretations of the reasons why Oslo did not lead to a permanent Israeli-Palestinian peace, a closer look at all these books (and many

others that discuss the process)[2] reveals that none of them mentions the Israeli peace movement when telling its "Oslo story."[3] The movement that took as its banner peace with the Palestinians and strove for years to achieve this goal is not given a single line in all of these authoritative accounts of the process, as if the movement had never existed.

This disregard for Israeli peace activism is not confined to written histories. More important, this kind of exclusion was manifested by most Israeli decision makers prior to the signing of the Oslo Declaration of Principles (DOP), throughout the 1990s, and after the collapse of the process. Not one peace activist as such has ever been invited to join the many Israeli delegations to the peace talks. No representative of the movement participated in the signing ceremonies of the various agreements along the way, although several Israeli citizens representing groups relevant to peacemaking, including veteran soldiers, bereaved parents, and diplomats, were invited to join the formal Israeli entourage. Furthermore, none of Israel's prime ministers who were in office during the relevant era – Rabin, Peres, and Barak of the Labour party, or Netanyahu and Sharon of the Likud party – ever initiated contacts with the peace movement, let alone used the movement's open channels of communication to the Palestinian side to push the process forward. None of them publicly recognized the movement's activity or acknowledged any contribution that it might have made to the passage from armed conflict to peace negotiations.

The majority of the Jewish-Israeli public – most of whom have never been involved in peace activism of any kind[4] – by and large followed their leaders' dismissive view of the peace movement. At best, the movement is widely considered politically naïve and hence irrelevant, and at worst, peace activists' patriotism, motivation, and loyalty to the state are questioned. People with right-wing political views often openly accuse the peace activists of encouraging Palestinian violence and being responsible for their excessive demands (e.g., Nissan 1994, Zidon 1994). On the other hand, left-wing radicals (e.g., Ofir 2001, Pappe 2005) hold the movement accountable for tacitly collaborating with the mainstream political establishment's anti-peace policies and creating a façade of opposition while in practice, by adhering to the Zionist creed, serving as a fig leaf for the atrocities of the Israeli occupation.

[2] Other such examples are Peres 1995, Horovitz 1996, Makovsky 1996, Peleg 1997, Savir 1998, Rabinovich 1999, Rothstein, Ma'oz and Shikaki 2002, Enderlin 2003, Ben Ami 2004, Meital 2006, Ben-Porat 2006, Grinberg 2007, and Kurtzer and Lasensky 2008.

[3] Ben-Porat does mention *Shalom Achshav* (Peace Now); however, he says nothing about its activities but relates to its human and socioeconomic composition in the context of his discussion of the effects of globalization processes over Israeli society (Ben-Porat 2006, 157). In Kurtzer and Lasensky's (2008) book, "designed as a guidebook for future U.S. negotiators," not even one peace activist is included in their list of Israeli interviewees, apparently an indication of their assessment of the movement's minor political and diplomatic relevance (p. xvi).

[4] According to the Peace Index survey of April 2001, only 1.5% of the Israeli Jewish population was ever involved in any Israeli-Palestinian meetings. An even smaller number – 0.5% – is given in the Israel/Palestine Center for Research and Information (IPCRI) report on participation in people-to-people activities in the 1990s (Baskin and al Qaq 2002, 4).

For different reasons, which are discussed at length below, the Palestinians, who in theory should have been highly supportive of Israeli peace activism, have also been quite critical of the peace movement. Apparently, in the early 1990s, when the peace talks moved from the extraparliamentary level to the formal one, the limited political weight of the peace activists in Israeli society made them less attractive and too "easy to get" for the Palestinians. Since the mid-1990s, after Rabin's assassination and the electoral defeat of Peres, when no one close to the peace movement held any formal position in the government or in the high ranks of the civil service, the movement became politically redundant. This made it – from the Palestinian point of view – a much less rewarding target audience compared with the perhaps much resented and feared but more "valuable" and respected right-wing bodies and politicians. Thus, particularly after the collapse of the Oslo process in the late 1990s and the outbreak of the second Palestinian *Al-Aqsa intifada* in 2000, the Israeli peace movement was not only bashed by Israelis but also became a favorite target of the Palestinians, even those who had been its counterparts. The latter blamed the peace movement for not sufficiently protesting the Israeli government's rejectionist and uncompromising positions, and for not fiercely disputing, and perhaps thereby preventing, the reoccupation of Palestinian territories in the early 2000s. This Palestinian position was highly damaging because it both discouraged many Israeli peace activists and made the movement the target of sardonic reactions from its Israeli rivals.

If mainstream records and typical Israeli and Palestinian informants are the only sources of information available to those who, in the future, will try to understand the essence of the Oslo decade, then all of the peace movement's initiatives – hundreds of anti-occupation demonstrations, sit-ins, weekly protest vigils, numerous pro-peace petitions and flyers, joint dialogue groups, and secret and overt Israeli-Palestinian gatherings forbidden by written and unwritten law – are probably doomed to oblivion. This book is meant partly to compensate for this "collective amnesia" by describing and analyzing the movement's ideological, organizational, and operational points of strength and weaknesses.

In a classic first-rate thriller, the mystery is not solved until the very end. In this case, however, particularly against the background of the gloomy exposé described previously, it seems important to reveal at this early stage the bottom line of this investigation of the peace movement's long and, in many respects, unrewarding journey, to point the reader to the tiny light at the end of the tunnel and make it somewhat less frustrating to follow its protracted course. As is discussed in great detail in the concluding section, it seems that despite the peace movement's ongoing low visibility and political marginality and its undisputed failure to gain influence over the national decision-making processes, and without turning a blind eye to its acute structural, ideological, organizational, and strategic flaws, a close examination reveals a growing proximity between the "traditional" agenda of the peace movement and the prevailing attitudes toward the conflict and its resolution. In other words, although the peace

movement usually failed to change the concrete policies at which it was aimed, it was more successful at changing the overall "climate of opinion" in the country and challenging some previously unchallenged national myths and narratives. This is true on both the elite and the general public levels in Israel today. However, most of the people whose views on these matters have changed over time would never admit to any connection between these changes and the ongoing but seemingly infertile peace activism.

Thus, as is explained in the methodology section, because of the informal and unofficial character of the subject of inquiry as a social movement, it is almost impossible to categorically establish causal linkage here. It is equally difficult, however, to empirically refute the argument made here, that the peace movement has contributed considerably to the change in the Jewish-Israeli climate of opinion about the conflict and the ways to manage, if not resolve, it. It is argued here that today's wide acceptance, on both the leadership and the grassroots levels, of the "two states for two peoples" formula, an idea that has been the main pillar of the peace movement agenda since the 1970s and that less than 20 years ago was accepted by only a tiny outcast minority of "disloyal" Israeli Jews, is but one example of this suggested effect. This is the solution preferred by an absolute majority of Jewish Israelis and is in fact a cornerstone of Israel's formal policy today. This even seems to be true for many groups whose dream used to be Greater Israel. Thus, in December 2001, one of the bloodiest low points of Israeli-Palestinian relations, a leading figure in the dovish orthodox party Meimad, when announcing that in his own view the Oslo process was dead and buried, also asserted: "Today, the majority of the orthodox public consider the option of Greater Israel as no longer plausible. . . . Furthermore, the basic assumption that resolution of the conflict should be based on the establishment of a Palestinian state as the basis for a permanent solution – if a suitable partner is found – is today shared by a majority in the country" (Brin 2001). Even the former secretary general of the right-wing Tzomet party acknowledged, "One of the false and strange myths that prevails in the political arena today is that the Israeli right defeated its rivals of the left, while in fact, nothing could be further from the truth. In the final test, the right has been trounced by the leftist camp. . . . Amazingly enough, instead of taking the repeated invalidation of the left's forecasts as evidence of its error . . . the leaders of the right have done the unbelievable and the incomprehensible: . . . they have adopted precisely this defective and detested policy and are dedicating themselves to its implementation" (Sherman 2001). In 2007, Moshe Arens, former minister of defense of the right-wing Likud party, when calling for the replacement of the "two states" paradigm with a new and more suitable one (which he actually did not specify), confirmed the influence of the peace movement without any qualifications: "This pattern for the resolution of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, which was raised first by the extreme left, who adored and cherished Yassir Arafat, and by the supporters of *Shalom Achshav*, has inculcated into the cognition of most Israelis and was also adopted even by those who had formerly strongly opposed it, like Ariel Sharon" (Arens 2007).

One of Israel's leading journalists, however, posed an intriguing question that is also at the core of the discussion here: "How is it that when the basic solutions to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict offered by the left have become the property of a solid majority of Israelis, the left itself, as an entity, as a political culture . . . is still detested and denounced by such large segments of the public, including those who wholeheartedly agree with it?" (Dankner 2003). This apparent discrepancy between the prevalent disregard or disdain for the peace movement on one hand and assessments of its significant influence on Israeli politics and politicians on the other takes us beyond this specific case study. It raises the crucial question of the necessary conditions and relevant criteria for measuring the success or failure of social movements and civil initiatives, particularly those that concern national security policy–related issues. This question has major significance today with the mushrooming of citizen and grassroots activities relating to foreign policy matters, and the prevailing view that peace and war are no longer matters to be handled only by the formally authorized decision makers and generals (e.g., Bell and O'Rourke 2007). It is of extreme importance therefore to understand under which conditions citizens and grassroots organizations can or cannot influence the making of national foreign and security policies and public opinion, and what the relevant indicators are for measuring their success or failure.

The goal of this book is therefore two-fold: first, in the context of the Israeli case, it aims to introduce the peace movement into the picture of the events and processes of the Oslo process and its aftermath, based on the premise that the peace movement did make a political difference. It is argued here that, despite long being located on the political periphery, the movement has been a significant factor in influencing the climate of opinion in Israel by persistently putting forward some unconventional and much-contested alternative readings of the conflict, thereby cultivating the ground for the transformation from armed conflict to peace negotiations,[5] that is, for the strategic policy shift that the Oslo process embodied. Later, when this process collapsed and the Israeli-Palestinian dialogue became imbued with heavy layers of destruction and blood, it was apparently the only political body in Israel, perhaps in the region, that continued to keep the ashes of the hope for peace in the future warm.

The second aim of this book is of wider scope. Based on an analysis of this specific case study, the book endeavors to show the significant explanatory potential of combining two theoretical schools of thought that rarely converge: social movement theories and theories that involve public opinion and national policy making. As is shown here, these two bodies of knowledge are traditionally located in different disciplinary domains: the former in political sociology and social psychology, and the latter mainly in political science and international relations. Even a superficial examination of the references in the numerous books and articles of both schools shows that, probably owing to the prevailing tendency to safeguard academic disciplinary boundaries,

[5] For the potential influence of grassroots actors in this realm, see, e.g., Lederach 2003, 34–35.

students of social/peace movements and students of public opinion and its relevance to national policy making completely ignore each other's work. This is the case even when their subject matter is in many respects almost identical: peace movements are clearly part of the "public" and influenced by it, and there is little doubt that they promote a kind of "public opinion." Nevertheless, when discussing the public's input and interest in national security policy making, theories and empirical studies that originate in international relations almost always ignore peace activism – the most highly elaborated form of organized and distinctive public opinion in this realm. Instead, they portray the "public" as a faceless and shapeless collection of individual persons, putting forth poorly constructed, often inconsistent, and ill-informed "public opinion." Social movement students, conversely, because of their analytical framework, tend to focus on specific movements – their human composition, organizational structure, networking, resources, and relations with the authorities. They pay limited attention, if any, to their wider operational context – unorganized general public opinion, which is critical to the movement's ability to gain momentum and mobilize activists and supporters, a capability that actually determines such movements' political effectiveness.

The book is divided into five sections. The first section, "Exploring Peace Activism – a Roadmap," presents the theoretical framework of this study and the key concepts that are used to analyze the Israeli case. Special attention is paid to the concept of "political opportunity structure" (POS). This section also includes the reasons for suggesting a synthesis of the two theoretical bodies mentioned previously and describes the methodology employed in the study.

"Mapping the Israeli Sociopolitical Terrain" briefly discusses the historical-ideological legacies and the structure of sociopolitical cleavages against which background Israeli peace activism developed. This section also reviews the changes in the POS that Israeli grassroots activism in general faced between the formative era of the Israeli polity and the present.

"Paving the Road to Oslo – Israeli Peace Activism through 1992" outlines in brief the features of Israeli peace activism prior to 1993, when the Oslo process was launched, with special reference to the effects on the peace movement of the changes in the local POS during these years. The discussion in this section relates to the ideological, structural, and operational features of Israeli peace activism until the launching of the Oslo process and outlines the peace movement's internal and external networking.

"The Path Strewn with Obstacles (1993–2008)" is the core of the book. The focus here is on perhaps the most frustrating 15 years of Israeli peace activism, at the beginning of which peace seemed to be almost at hand, whereas now, at the end of this era, it is out of sight for most Israelis,[6] Palestinians, and external

[6] Not everyone, however, is utterly pessimistic. For example, Kurtzer and Lasensky (2008) claim that wiser U.S. diplomacy can still bring about a breakthrough: "Fortunately, this is not where the story ends. Despite the setbacks of recent years, Washington still has an enormous reservoir

observers. This part of the trail is divided into five subsections: The rest area zone – 1993 to late 1995; the bumpy zone – early 1996 to mid-1999; the check point zone – mid-1999 to summer 2000; the dark tunnel zone – summer 2000 to early 2003; and the dead-end point – early 2003 to mid-2008.

The first subsection discusses the ways in which the peace movement responded – ideologically, structurally, and operationally – to the dramatic change (paradoxically, mainly for the worse) in the POS created by the electoral victory of the Labour party in 1992 and then the signing of the Oslo DOP in 1993. Apparently, the very adoption by the government of certain pillars of its agenda cast some doubts on the movement's raison d'être.

The second subsection describes the various ideological, structural, and operational responses of the peace movement to the gradual shattering of the Oslo dream that occurred following Rabin's assassination, the first massive wave of terror shortly afterward, and the electoral triumph of the Likud party, led by Netanyahu, until Labour's short-lived comeback in 1999. During that period, it is maintained, the movement had to come to grips with not only the fact that the Oslo process had come to a halt and perhaps to an end but also with the grim reality that the peace camp, in its widest definition, was considered the party guilty of this allegedly defective strategic move.

The discussion in the third subsection focuses mainly on the unexpectedly malevolent POS created by Barak's Labour government, which – contrary to the expectations and hopes of many – failed to break the deadlock in the peace talks that culminated in the July 2000 fiasco of the Camp David summit, and gave life to the powerful and long-lasting "no partner" concept.

The fourth subsection attempts to assess the effect on the movement of the outbreak of the Palestinian *Al-Aqsa intifada* in fall 2000, with its extreme violence, and the Israeli reoccupation of the Palestinian territories. This deterioration led to the first (2001) and second (2003) electoral victories of Prime Minister Sharon, apparently based on what was considered by a majority of Israelis his potential and then seemingly proven skills in fighting Palestinian terrorism. For the same reason, the relevance of the peace movement in the public sphere declined, and its POS contracted dramatically. The movement reacted to that by structural reorganizing and agenda reformulating.

of influence with the parties. . . . The steep decline in relations between Israel and the Palestinians may be reversing. . . . The test will not be easy, however. Success will depend on heeding the lessons of the past . . . and will also require U.S. negotiators to have a clear sense of the changing context that surrounds Arab-Israeli peacemaking on the ground, across the region, and within the broader strategic environment" (Kurtzer and Lasensky, 6). Another example is Golan's assessment that "the two sides will opt for realism – leaving the issue of trust to a later stage – and adopt something quite close to the peace plans that have emerged" (Golan, 142). Last but not least, in their research report, the Aix group members state: "The current widespread pessimism seems to choke any initiative that dares to think about a permanent arrangement and to present an alternative to the continuation of the violent conflict. We should not surrender to the pessimists and should not accept their vision of 40 more years of death and suffering" (Arnon and Bamya, 20).

The fifth and last subsection opens with Ariel Sharon's second term, which started with acceleration in the construction of the separation barrier and all of the legal and other complications this entailed and culminated with the introduction and then implementation of his Disengagement from Gaza plan. The plan rested on the notion of unilateralism, the complete antithesis to the bilateral rationale that stood at the basis of the peace movement agenda, as well as that of the Oslo process. This strategic shift created another rift within the movement, between the supporters and the opponents of the plan. It also once again changed the POS in terms of the movement's position vis-à-vis the Israeli public and authorities, as, similar to the early days of Oslo, the moderate parts of the peace movement stood on one side of the fence with the government and the mainstream, whereas the radicals found themselves on the other side, with the right-wing opposition and the settlers. This internal rift, and the bitter disappointment with the political chaos and accelerating violence that followed Israel's disengagement from the Gaza Strip and later the electoral victory of Hamas in early 2006, led to a complete halt of peace activism in Israel. Not even the highly contested and militarily apparently rather unsuccessful Second Lebanon War in the summer of 2006 and the soldiers' protest in its aftermath, nor the Annapolis peace initiative of late 2007, were successful in revitalizing the movement, which is admittedly a historical remnant today and no longer a relevant political actuality.

Beyond telling the story of the movement and analyzing the ideological and organizational changes that it underwent in the relevant years, its various external relations are also explored: between the various peace groups that together make up the peace movement, and between the movement and the Israeli authorities – the government, the military, and the political parties. Special attention is devoted to the complicated and painful interactions between the movement and its activists on one hand and, on the other, the general Israeli public and other civil society actors, such as the media and other types of citizens' initiatives. Another set of contacts of interest to this analysis is that between the movement and non-Israeli bodies – the Palestinians, the Jewish Diaspora, international foundations and other donors, the international media, international public opinion, and foreign peace movements.

The conclusion, "A Path Finder – Getting Lost or Paving New Roads?," is an effort to assess the accomplishments of the Israeli peace movement in the years under investigation here. Only time will tell if the Oslo process was indeed a turning point in the protracted conflict between Israel and the Arabs or merely a mirage, a transient episode of hope that left no real mark on the bloody history of the Middle East. The answer to this riddle is critical from the point of view of the peace movement, in a rather complicated way. At the time of this writing, the Oslo process is widely considered to have been a monumental fiasco. If this is indeed the case, it is important to find a reliable answer to whether the Israeli peace movement was in any way responsible for this tragedy; that is, did it manage to influence the political decision-making process to the extent that its recommendations were actually adopted? If so, the current bleak state