

Proposal for Funding a Citizens' Diplomacy Workshop
Concerning the Turkish-Israeli Conflict

Hannah Rosenstein
ID#: 209698984

IDC Herzliya Lauder School of Government
In partnership with Sabanci University

Presented to the Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung

Executive Summary

This proposal is for the creation of a Track II negotiation between Israel and Turkey, with the participation of conflict resolution graduate students from both countries, who can contribute innovative ideas that would hopefully restart Track I official negotiations between the two countries. Without the firm boundaries set by official diplomacy, these students would be able to come to a more probable resolution, in a more rapid period of time.

Over the past six decades, Turkey and Israel's relationship has been characterized as having periods of prosperity, and more often than not, periods of hostility and breaks in relations. Israel and Turkey have had much military cooperation, however in recent years especially, relations between the two countries have been strained. Presently, Operation Cast Lead and the subsequent Gaza flotillas sailing from Turkey have caused much unrest between the two Middle Eastern countries. Following the UN Report on the events of the Mavi Marmara flotilla, Turkish leadership has expelled the Israeli ambassador from Turkey.

However, having Turkey as an ally to Israel is necessary, as Turkey is one of the more moderate Muslim-majority countries and maintains values of democracy and modernization. Turkey seems to be torn between maintaining a stable relationship with Israel, and its current position of being a voice for the Palestinian cause. With the many revolutions taking place in the Arab world, the Turkish and Israeli leadership have grown aware of the weakened ties with regional powers such as Egypt (for Israel) and Libya and Syria (for Turkey). Thus, both Israel and Turkey seem to be searching for more reliable allies.

If the situation between the two countries remains the same, thereby maintaining the status quo, relations between Israel and Turkey will not improve. There will be tensions in the region and there will be a further breakdown of relations between the two parties. If the two countries cease to cooperate together in preventing another flotilla mishap, the worst possible situation would be that the Turkish government would support the sailing of another flotilla and Israel would again have to defend its borders in a controversial situation in which international laws and borders would need to be examined. However, if negotiations advance and result in a resolution, the best possible situation would be for Israel to present a formal apology for the flotilla raid of May 2010. After the apology and possible reparations for the families of those killed in the flotilla incident have been accepted by the Turkish government, the two countries can join together and cement their relations during this crucial time period in the Middle East.

Hannah Rosenstein
ID#: 209698984
Herzliya, Israel

Attn: *Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung*
P.O.Box 12235
Herzliya Pituach, 46733
Israel

November 14, 2011

This concept paper outlines a citizens' diplomacy negotiation that would be of great interest to the Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung. It is a proposal for funding a series of two workshops, in which Israeli and Turkish representatives would gain the skills to mend relations between their governments. The German foundation is an ideal choice for assisting in the logistics of the negotiation, as the organization's stated goal is to promote "political and societal education of individuals from all walks of life in the spirit of democracy and pluralism" and it is devoted to working toward international understanding and cooperation (FES, 2011). The organization states that they help enable students to do research through grants, and I am certain they would be keen to contribute financially toward the success of the Track II negotiation.

Conflict Assessment

The most recent conflict between Turkey and Israel regards the flotilla raid of May 2010, in which Israeli naval forces boarded a Turkish ship bound for Gaza. The event caused much controversy and reduced relations between the two governments. Following the UN's September 2011 report of the Mavi Marmara flotilla raid and Israel's refusal to submit a formal apology, Turkish Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdoğan called for the expulsion of the Israeli ambassador to Turkey. Current diplomatic relations between the two countries are severed.

Historically, the conflict between the two countries has been largely affected by outside influence, particularly regional countries and Arab states. In addition, the Palestinian-Israeli conflict has complicated ties, almost becoming a condition for positive relations between Israel and Turkey. Turkey's relations with other countries, particularly Arab states, have caused Turkey to often abandon or hide relations with Israel. Although Turkey was the first Muslim-majority country to recognize Israel's statehood in 1947 and the two countries had productive relations in the 1950's, Turkey's relations with Iraq caused a strain in relations with Israel that did not improve until the 1970's and 1980's. In addition, the issue of Palestinian refugees and Turkey's support of Arab states in the 1967 Six Day War and 1973 Yom Kippur War caused tensions between the two countries (Liel and Yirik, 2010, p.60).

In the past decade, the Turkish government has criticized Israel, calling its actions in Gaza and the Mavi Marmara flotilla raid as "state-sponsored terrorism". Currently, Turkey sees Israel as stubborn, due to the fact that the Israeli leadership has refused to submit an official apology regarding the events of the flotilla raid. Following reports that Prime Minister Erdogan accused Israel of acting like a "spoiled boy" in the flotilla raid of 2010, Turkey suspended defense ties with Israel and expelled the Israeli ambassador (BBC, 2011). On the contrary, Israel's perception of Turkey seems to be more positive and forward-looking. Defense Minister Ehud Barak predicts that the current "coolness" in relations will eventually pass and ties will be mended between the two countries (Ynet News, 2011).

The reason for Israel's more positive outlook on the state of relations with Turkey is due to the fact that Israel needs a strong ally in the region of the Middle East. Turkey, on the other hand, feels freer to criticize and sever ties with Israel because it does not need the partnership as much as Israel does. Granted, Turkey benefits greatly from the military and strategic ties with Israel, but Turkey's existence as a state does not rely on the perceptions of its Arab neighbors. Still, at this period of uprisings in the Arab world and the end of certain

governments, it is of utmost importance and benefit for both Israel and Turkey to strengthen their relations on a level of mutual understanding and codependence.

Although Israel needs Turkey's friendship, it also does not want to make any moves that will jeopardize its dignity and presence as a military and diplomatic power in the region. Due to this non-negotiable human need, Israel refused to submit an apology to Turkey regarding the events of the Mavi Marmara flotilla raid. However, this inflexible stance has ill consequences as it caused the Turkish government to sever ties with Israel completely. Turkey's non-negotiable human need is bringing justice to its citizens and the families of those who were killed during the flotilla raid. Due to the fact that the two countries were not willing to negotiate over an apology from Israel, the Turkish government cut ties.

Official negotiations between the two governments were sporadic, resuming for a period to discuss the rewording of the UN's report of the Gaza-bound flotilla incident of May 2010 and an apology from Israel. Yet, the Israeli leadership felt that an apology would amount to an acceptance of full responsibility for the events that occurred. The most current strain in relations has arisen following the UN's report on the events of the flotilla raid. Due to the fact that Israel did not apologize to Turkey for the deaths of nine Turkish activists prior to the release of the report, and that the report has found Israel's naval blockade of Gaza legal, it has led to a heightening in Turkish demands. Prime Minister Erdogan currently maintains that Israel must end the naval blockade of Gaza. In addition, the Israeli ambassador to Turkey has been expelled, along with a suspension of all military agreements with Israel.

Currently, with the severing of diplomatic and military ties between the two countries, the Turkish leadership is unwilling to talk with its Israeli counterparts. The only communication between the governments has been indirect and it includes Prime Minister Erdogan's threats to challenge Israel's legal right to a naval blockade in the Mediterranean. In September 2011, Erdogan also warned against provocation that would cause him to institute

additional economic sanctions against Israel, which Alon Liel, the former Israeli Ambassador to Turkey, predicts may cause a military confrontation on the seas (Hacaoglu and Heller, 2011). The United States has exerted diplomatic pressure on the Turkish leadership to mend their relations with Israel, yet so far these efforts have proven fruitless.

Projected Outcomes

If the situation between the two countries remains the same, which is maintaining the status quo, relations between Israel and Turkey will not improve. There will be tensions in the region and an agreement will not be reached regarding the UN's report of last year's flotilla raid by the IDF. If there is a complete breakdown of relations and the two countries cease to cooperate together in preventing another flotilla mishap, the worst possible situation would be that the Turkish government would support the sailing of another flotilla to Gaza. Israel would again need to defend its borders, resulting in a controversial situation in which international laws and borders would need to be examined once again. This state of affairs seems probable, as negotiations between the two countries have been strained. Recent reports in the Israeli press have shown that negative views of Israel were being projected amongst candidates during the latest Turkish elections (Siebert, 2011).

However, if negotiations advance, the best possible situation would be for Israel to present a formal apology, leading to a resolution. The phrasing would use a word that would "sound like an apology in Turkish, but not in Hebrew", which was the topic of debate in official negotiations that took place prior to the UN's release of its report on the flotilla raid (Bilefsky, 2011). After the apology and reparations for the families of those killed in the flotilla incident have been accepted by the Turkish government, the two countries can join together and cement their relations during this crucial time period in the Middle East.

Possibilities for resolution include agreeing to an apology on the part of Israel in its role in the flotilla events, followed by a renewed economic partnership including exchange of military technology. These are core issues in the conflict between the two states, and the apology by Israel is a pre-requisite to further talks with Turkish officials. An agreement could be reached when each side decides its bottom line- what it is not willing to give up. Right now for Israel, it seems to be dignity, and for Turkey, it is justice.

However, other trade-offs would take place, for example, in exchange for the apology, the Turkish government could first of all, halt any future flotillas scheduled to sail. Second, Turkey could sign a comprehensive trade agreement with Israel with the knowledge that Israel is currently in a trade-deficit with Turkey (Litman, 2011), thereby agreeing to import Israeli technology and products. This trade agreement would ensure an economic and strategic partnership between the two countries. This type of trade-off agreement would appeal to both sides, as Turkey wants justice for those affected by the flotilla incident, and Israel is in a situation where it would value having a close ally in the Middle East, especially a moderate Muslim country. At this time, Turkey has strained relations with previous allies, such as Syria and Libya. Both sides should recognize that this is a “ripe” moment for negotiations, as they both need a strong partnership in the region.

Thus, a Track II or citizens’ diplomacy negotiation is a viable solution for finding a resolution to the conflict between the two countries. In this situation, both parties will be more open to compromise, due to the fact that they do not have the strict constraints of official diplomacy. Each side should prepare a BATNA (Best Alternative To a Negotiated Agreement), which is the standard against which any proposed agreement is to be measured by (Fisher and Ury, 1991, p.100). This standard can protect negotiators both from accepting terms that are too unfavorable and from rejecting terms that would be in one’s best interest to accept. It is flexible enough to permit the “exploration of imaginative solutions”, which is

perfect in Track II negotiations. It is important to think about one's options if an agreement fails to be reached. In addition to a BATNA, negotiators should formulate a "trip wire" in order to give themselves an early warning that the content of a possible agreement is beginning to run the risk of being too unattractive. This way one can identify an agreement that is a better alternative than one's BATNA, which gives one more room to move in a negotiation (Fisher and Ury, pp.101-102).

Turkish-Israeli relations are asymmetric in the sense that Turkey has historically sought to pursue relations with Arab and Islamic countries, while keeping Israel at arm's length, whereas Israel has made serious efforts to develop good relations with Turkey, which is on the periphery of the Arab Middle East, in order to escape the threat of neighboring Arab hostility (Inbar, 2002, p. 165). Turkey has an attitude that it does not need Israel as much as Israel needs Turkey's friendship. Israel will thus have to develop a robust BATNA in order to ensure that it has a strong stance in the negotiations. Participants will have to examine what the best possible situation would be if they do not compromise and come to an agreement, and understand the consequences of a failed negotiation if they fail to cooperate. Israel's BATNA would be to continue defending itself against international criticism, and to rely on the UN's report of the Gaza flotilla episode for justification of any upcoming actions that might take place. Turkey's BATNA would be to isolate Israel, as the leadership is considering, and seek another ally in the region, or repair previous relations with old allies.

Proposed Structure of a Second-Track Initiative

As leaders in the expertise of conflict resolution, specifically in the region of the Middle East, the IDC Herzliya Lauder School of Government has recognized an immediate need to provide an additional track to assist in overcoming the impasse in the official negotiations between Turkey and Israel. Our partners at the Sabanci University in Istanbul

have expressed interest in formulating a workshop in which students from both universities will participate in non-official negotiations in order to offer an alternative to the current breakdown in official relations. We are requesting the help of a third party, in order to witness and evaluate the progress made and financially support the required budget for this negotiation process.

It is important to support Track I peacemaking with the more flexible collaborative problem-solving process of Track II IPSWs (Kaufman, 2002, p.187). IPSWs, or Innovative Problem Solving Workshops, are designed to facilitate resolution of a conflict based on transformation of the parties' perceptions and attitudes through a reconstruction of the relationship between the parties. An IPSW between graduate students from both Turkey and Israel would be a great first step in aiding the breakdown of the official negotiations that were taking place between the two countries, due to the fact that the IPSW would welcome the development of fresh ideas and foster open-mindedness.

The participants of the workshop would be students of conflict resolution and diplomacy studies at both the Interdisciplinary Center (IDC) in Herzliya, Israel, and the Sabanci University in Istanbul, Turkey. The students, or "Partners in Conflict", share a common attribute: they are all students majoring in conflict resolution, possess leadership skills, and are motivated to find a solution to the conflict between the two countries. These shared commonalities will contribute to the success of the workshop as the partners will see themselves as equal players and will respect one another's opinions. The selection of the "Partners in Conflict" should not only be based on their position as "future influentials" or based on their strong leadership skills, but they should be chosen based on their standing within their own communities; and given that they are close enough to power centers and have access to decision makers, political elite, and public opinion. Because the partners are participating without any official capacity and instead, with independence of mind, the

partners in conflict will not feel constrained in their actions while negotiating. Both the Israeli and Turkish organizers of the workshop (from both universities) will choose the participants through in-depth interviews after they receive a spoken or written presentation displaying the students' interest in participating in the workshop.

The students should have proven leadership skills and display a strong interest in resolving the conflict between the two countries. In order to get participants involved, notices should be posted on both the IDC Herzliya and Sabanci campuses, as well as email notices promoting the workshop. This will ensure that individuals who are truly interested in the workshop and feel they have a lot to offer will apply for candidacy. Preferably, seven students should be chosen from each country, totaling fourteen in the workshop. This is a very nice size for a group, because there will be an assortment of opinions and a group this size can bond and get to know one another and share ideas. Yet, it is not too big that participants will feel overwhelmed. The partners will find that such a unique experience will benefit them and will give them a lot of hands-on experience that they can reference later on.

The facilitator should be someone who, first, has experience in leading workshops of this kind before. Second, the facilitator should have lived or spent extended amounts of time in a few countries, being either Turkey and/or Israel. This would show that the candidate understands the dynamics of the conflict and both cultures. He or she would possess characteristics of un-bias, credibility, trustworthiness, and empathy toward the conflict. The facilitator should be very organized and able to manage large groups by encouraging dialogue and thought. It would be best to have two co-facilitators, possibly those who have been teaching or training in both universities within the field of citizen diplomacy.

An interesting dynamic for the IPSW workshop is the active-passive approach, in which one facilitator acts in a traditional role leading the discussions and activities, and the second facilitator (from the other country) takes on a more passive role, "mainly identifying

with the Partners and thus providing necessary feedback” (Auvine, Polzer in Kaufman, p.191). This method is very advantageous due to the fact that the facilitators are not viewed by participants as “teachers” but rather as partners in the negotiation. They can interact with the students and understand their opinions by being able to question their actions without appearing unapproachable. It is also helpful if the facilitators relate previous experiences through anecdotes to exemplify the process of the workshop to the participants. The two committees from the universities promoting the workshop would elect the facilitators, and the facilitators would meet with representatives from the Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung regarding their goals and plans for the workshop.

There are four stages in the IPSW workshop: trust building, skill building, consensus building, and re-entry. A series of two workshops should take place- one in Israel and one in Turkey. The first workshop would take place in Israel for a period of 40 hours to be accomplished within five days, approximately an eight-hour “workday”. The second workshop would take place in Turkey for a period of three days, as a follow-up of the first negotiation.

The IDC Herzliya would be a good location for first part of the negotiation to take place. IDC prides itself on being a university that will “cultivate freedom of thought, research and self-realization”, and will “help remove the walls of hostility in the Middle East, will serve students of all religions from this region and the rest of the world... and will advance the principles of peace...open as a house of study, research, guidance, and learning for the residents of Israel and the region” (taken from the Founding Statement of IDC).

Following is a proposed schedule for the IPSW in Herzliya, Israel:

Day 1- Sunday

On the first day of the workshop, the Turkish partners will arrive in Israel. A private shuttle will transport them to the homes they will be hosted at in Herzliya. After settling in, they will meet the Israeli group at the IDC campus around noon. The group will be given a tour of the campus grounds, followed by a lunch sponsored by the university, in which the Turkish and Israeli partners will meet informally with the facilitators. They will be given time to mingle and introduce themselves, and see each other as fellow students of the same age before they begin the workshop as partners in negotiation. Later in the evening the participants will have the chance to explore Herzliya and Tel Aviv together.

Day 2- Monday

On the second day, the students will reconvene at IDC and the facilitators will introduce some icebreaker exercises, or “Getting to Know Each Other”. The participants should sit in a circle based on their birthdays, which will encourage them to communicate, and they will go around the circle sharing the meanings of their names. This would be interesting because many of the students are Muslim or Jewish, and their names may have common meanings (such as relating to personal attributes). Another good exercise to build unity between the group is called “Ups and Downs”, in which the facilitator will make a statement, such as “Please stand up if you are an only child”. All of the only children will stand up, and the rest of the group will applaud them (while remaining seated). This allows the participants to feel a sense of unity when they are recognized together by other members of the group.

Next, the facilitators will introduce the IPSW itself, explaining the details of it, the format, and the importance of the negotiation. Afterwards the partners will begin trust-

building exercises, in which they will gain the confidence of the team members and begin feeling like a group. The partners will go around the room and discuss their shared experiences with the Turkish-Israeli conflict, and explain their reasons for wanting to participate in the workshop. The documentary “Faces of the Enemy” by Sam Keen will be shown in order to introduce to concept of state-run propaganda and demonization of one’s enemy. Following the film there will be a discussion regarding different types of propaganda coming from both Turkish and Israeli media, and how this affects the populations’ opinions.

The day will close with a One-Minute Evaluation, in order to get the partners’ feedback and remaining questions (this evaluation will be completed at the end of each day, and reviewed by the facilitators every night to discuss the following morning). That night the students will attend a dinner and performances at the Arkadas Association cultural center sponsored by the Arkadas Association, an Israel-Turkey friendship organization located in Yehud (south of Herzliya). The association’s goals are to preserve Turkish Jewish heritage and promote friendship and tolerance between Israel and the Turkish people. This could be exciting for the partners to experience a little taste of Turkey in Israel, as well as understand the bonds between the two countries.

Day 3- Tuesday

On the third day of the workshop, facilitators will lead the partners in a process of de-escalation, where participants will explore case studies and discuss conflicts in which the situation got out of hand, as well as how to prevent the situation from getting to this point. Afterwards, the facilitators will zero-in on the Turkish-Israeli conflict. A series of clips from documentaries and excerpts from books will be presented in order to familiarize the participants with all aspects of the conflict. Next, the partners will practice their expression skills through a series of exercises in which they will come up with a list of generalized

statements, and then reword them in order to clarify and focus on their true feelings without oversimplifying. Another exercise to improve inter-personal communication would be to explore each side's "hot buttons". These words or phrases have negative connotations to the other side and should be called to the attention of the partners. Thus, the group will be able to avoid using these phrases in conversation and debate (such as comparing Israeli behavior to "Nazi behavior").

Following this, the partners will engage in an exercise called "Bridging the Gap", in which they will choose a topic of debate (such as torture). The group will be split into two polarized sides- either for or against the issue, and then a third group will emerge, and try to convince the other sides of alternative solutions.

Day 4- Wednesday

Today the students will role-play in the context of the Turkish-Israeli conflict. Each side will come up with five concessions they are willing to make, and five demands they have of the other side in a negotiation. The goal of the exercise is to come up with a shared resolution, as part of the minimal common denominators technique. Next, the ARIA method will be introduced (Adversary, Reflexive, Integrative, and Action). It is a technique that facilitates a transition by the parties from an adversarial stance in the conflict to an integrative one (Rothman in Kaufman, p.226). For the Adversarial stage, the partners will engage in a debate, which will reveal each party's positions on the major issues of the conflict. They will also participate in role reversal, followed by a reflection of the process. This exercise will reveal each party's key needs and interests in the conflict, which is a beginning step in understanding the nature of the conflict, thus enabling partners to reach an agreed resolution.

After this the partners will engage in an exercise based on the Haitian "notebook diplomacy" referred to by Kaufman in Second Track/Citizens' Diplomacy (p.217). The group

will split into a Turkish group and an Israeli group, and a laptop will be passed between each side, giving the Turkish side the chance to draft an apology letter from Israel regarding the Mavi Marmara incident, and the Israeli side can review it and refine the terms of the apology. This process will continue for an hour until both sides can come to an agreement on the terms of an apology, which Turkey is currently demanding as a prerequisite to furthering relations with Israel. In this exercise each side could propose and add in what it feels should be addressed, and the other side can take it out or revise it to suit its own needs. Without the confrontational nature of discussing the wording of the apology out loud as a group, each side can really absorb all the words and information and weigh the opinions proposed by the other side as well as amongst its team members. This can eventually lead to a more detailed solution. It gives the participants the chance to come up with even more creative ideas and leaves room for discussion, as opposed to confrontation.

After this, the partners will begin the Reflexive stage, where they will practice active listening in groups of three, paraphrasing their partners' statements. Following this, the participants will begin the Interactive stage, in which they will discuss "expanding the cake" solutions and engage in "thinking outside of the box" exercises. Later, they will partake in a brainstorming session where each participant shares a solution to the conflict, without having to state his justification. The solutions will be written down on a flip chart, and afterward partners can rank which solutions they prefer, leading to a joint statement between the two parties. This exercise will aid the partners in building a medium-term strategy for resolution because they will begin to structure the peace process, which they will later propose to people influential in both the Turkish and Israeli governments.

Day 5- Thursday

Due to the heaviness of the day before, the participants will take a day trip to Ataturk Forest near Hof HaCarmel next to the Kinneret in the north of Israel. Along with enjoying the scenery and appreciating the history of Turkish relations with Israel, the partners will discuss concrete recommendations to policy makers in both Israel and Turkey. Upon their return to IDC in the late afternoon, they will discuss the end of the workshop and each student's plan for the interim period before the next workshop in Istanbul. They will also discuss their re-entry into their communities after this special experience. Many of the partners will feel they have gone through an important transition and will want to share their feelings. An overall evaluation of the workshop will take place. The Turkish partners will fly out late Thursday night or the following morning (Friday).

During the interim period, the participants will keep in touch with their new friends through video-conferencing technology, as well through a shared blog, in which they will be able to post relevant articles and stay updated on the current relations of the two countries.

Following is a proposed schedule for the IPSW in Istanbul, Turkey:

Day 1- Sunday

After three or four months, the Israeli partners will arrive in Istanbul, and be transported to the homes of their Turkish counterparts, or other homes in which they will be hosted. Representatives of the Sabanci University, which prides itself on embracing diversity and freedoms, will give the Israeli students a tour of the campus. The partners will reunite as a group and they will have a late lunch or early dinner. In the evening, the students and facilitators will explore Istanbul together.

Day 2- Monday

The partners will engage in some short icebreakers to begin the day, in order to allow for airing the many grievances that may have accumulated in the interim period since the last negotiation (Kaufman, p.202). The facilitators will lead the partners in a structured discussion regarding the events that have ensued in the past few months (such as the UN vote regarding a Palestinian state). These issues will shape the partners' focus for the next two days. The participants will go around the circle and report on their efforts during the time spent apart since the last workshop. The group will discuss their shared vision for a resolution, as it may be different given the changes in the international arena. If possible, the group will invite an influential player in the conflict to sit in on their discussion, which will give the negotiation added legitimacy. This person's main role will be to passively monitor the way in which the negotiation is conducted. The partners will then brainstorm and come up with revised solutions, as they did with the flip chart at IDC, and record their new, shared goal.

The partners will take a short trip to the Gulhane Park in the center of Istanbul. This park is one of the oldest in Istanbul and displays many aspect of the country's history under the Ottoman Empire. There, the partners will discuss Turkey's historic shift to democracy under Ataturk, and connect it with Israel's stable democratic past. Both parties should realize that although many nations in the Middle East have totalitarian regimes or lack democratic values, Turkey and Israel need a strong relationship in order to promote stability in the region. Both countries want to play a role in world peace and stability, as well as seek justice. This exercise will stress the commonalities between the two countries and help the negotiation process.

Day 3- Tuesday

If possible, the Sabanci University could host a conference at the school regarding Turkey's relations with Israel (and other regional nations). Members of the community, families, students, and members of the Turkish government would be invited to the presentation in which the participants from the IPSW workshop would speak and share their experiences from the Track II negotiation. Following the conference, the partners will discuss options for publishing their shared vision and distributing this conceptual framework for an agreement to members of both the Turkish and Israeli governments. As with the Oslo Peace Process, the partners can begin the agreement as an economic cooperation, and then broaden it to a joint declaration of principles.

To close the last section of the workshop, the partners will again discuss how to get their communities more involved in understanding the conflict and taking action. They are now armed with a vast amount of knowledge and experience, which will guide them when they return to their regular lives as students. Hopefully, with their strong interest in diplomacy and resolving the conflict, the participants of the IPSW will continue their efforts in educating and spreading awareness among their communities and leaders. They will be a voice for peace, and with the right tools, may grow to be influential leaders themselves. The friendships they have nurtured throughout this negotiation process will remind them of their duty to promote the peace that they truly believe in.

The Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung is requested to aid the Track II negotiations by helping make the means of travel, transportation, and other expenditures possible. If by the end of the workshop the partners have come to a solid agreement, then the foundation could pass along the students' agreement to members of the German government, in an attempt to get a third party involved in repairing the nearly-severed relations between Turkey and Israel. Germany would act as an intermediary between the two countries and encourage them to negotiate. The

damaged relations between Israel and Turkey need a strong third party like the Germany, which can act as the United States did in the Oslo Peace Process.

The partners' effort to find a structure for a peace process between Turkey and Israel is very significant at this time, due to the fact that they will take steps to get influential diplomats interested in their plan. At this crucial moment in the bilateral relations between the two countries, the outcome of the partners' negotiation could inspire an official negotiation between representatives from Turkey and Israel. As with the Oslo Accords, this process could be an opening to negotiations and produce a framework by which officials can conduct the negotiations. The Track II aspect of the Oslo peace process was very successful, and we believe that our students' participation could greatly influence the official peace process. Although there is a current breakdown of relations between the governments of Israel and Turkey, this is a ripe moment for Track II negotiations to take place.