



**Time to Dump the “Two State Solution”**

The Israel/Palestinian conflict has been a conundrum for so long that many have given up, perhaps out of diplomatic exhaustion. If it were just a real estate dispute, the legalities should have long ago been resolved: the Balfour Declaration (1917), San Remo Agreement (1920), and the League of Nations Resolution of 1922. All affirmed a homeland west of the Jordan River for the Jewish People. Time after time the same piece of land has been pledged or given.

The 1947 UN Resolution gave only a portion, which was not accepted by Israel's neighbors. Again and again, the boundaries were redrawn after wars in 1948, 1955, 1967, and 1973. Neither legalities nor history as documented by the Scriptures has proven to be effective. Even the Koran declares:

### **Surah 5:21**

**<sup>21</sup> God granted the Land of Israel to the Children of Israel and ordered them to settle there.**

The Koran also predicts,

### **Surah 17:104**

**<sup>104</sup> Before the end of days, God will bring the Children of Israel to retake possession of the Land, gathering them from the different countries and nations.**

Yet, there remain unresolved differences over what is a fair disposition of the real estate. So, what is "just" and why can't the world make up its mind about the rightness and wrongness of this matter? Have the vast Middle East oil reserves led to bias? Has geopolitical jockeying for some sort of "edge" skewed the judgement of some politicians and diplomats? Most certainly these have been powerful factors.

It should now be apparent, the *actual* goal of Arab/Islamic detractors of Israel is *the elimination of the one and only Jewish State in the World.*

In 1948, this was the motivation behind the Arab rejection out of hand of the UN partition plan which called for an additional Islamic/Arab State.

This was also the underlying basis for Yasser Arafat and the Palestinian Authority's rejection of 98% of the West Bank (and Jerusalem), when it was offered by Israel's Prime Minister Ehud Barak at the Camp David meeting in July 2000.

In 1947-48 when the UN stated its intention to partition Palestine, clearing the way for the world's first sovereign Jewish State in almost 2,000 years, American Secretary of State George Marshall (Four Star General and Secretary of War during WWII) said that the sliver of land allocated by the UN for the Jewish State was militarily indefensible. Consequently, he strongly recommended President Truman and the USA *not* side with a certain "loser"—the New Jewish State—lest the USA be diminished internationally by siding with a losing military cause.

Since 1948, the only disagreement between Israel's Arab/Islamic detractors is which one of two approaches to take:

1. Never agree to peace with or acceptance of any Jewish State (Hamas/Iran).
2. Concede temporarily the existence of a Jewish State but only if large portions of the Jewish State are ceded with a long term goal of making additional repeated demands for additional land concessions in return for additional peace.

What we have, in fact, are two competing religious narratives:

1. The Jewish narrative: The Land of Israel and Land of Judah are one nation with ownership and biblical title deed to the twelve sons of Jacob (Israel) and his decedents.
2. Arab/Islamic narrative: "Anything but #1."

We must recognize that there is no Islamic imperative for the sons of Ishmael to own the designated Land of Judah, Israel. That is, other than the general tenet of Islam that calls for the conquest of all countries (including European and America) for and on behalf of Allah.

How long must we continue perpetual mediation in futility? We must consider other remedies.

The conflict will only end when the Palestinian authority is induced to make concessions, which they consider in their self-interest. Although the issue has always been shrouded largely in a pretext of religion, the conflict is cloaked in aspirations of nationalism.

America has, for too long, been double minded. We must decide what is ultimately realistic and then work toward that end in smaller, incremental steps. In deciding what is "fair," we must factor in the following:

Is the root of this conflict actually the approximate 10,000 square miles of Israel and Judea (a.k.a. the “West Bank”)?

Or is it really two competing religious narratives? These are the facts:

- There are currently 22 Arab countries in the world.
- There are 1.5 billion Muslims.
- There are 50 Muslim Majority countries.
- There are 27 nations with Islam as the officially, State sanctioned/sponsored, legal religion.
- There are about 16 million Jews in the world.
- Israel is little more than 8,000 square miles (about the size of New Jersey).
- The West Bank area (Judea and Samaria) is 2,262 square miles.

In 1948, there were only two populations considered by the UN with regard to the matter of Palestine—*Jewish and Arab*. There was no “Palestinian” population. In fact, both Jewish and Arab residents were identified by the British mandatory authority as “Palestinian,” which was considered a geographic designator.

Palestine was first used as a *geographic* designation by the Romans. The 14<sup>th</sup> Roman Emperor, Hadrian, after the Bar Kokhba revolt (132-135 A.D.) was determined to wipe out the Jewish identity of Judea-Judah, and thus renamed it “*Syria Palaestina*” (previously “Province of Judea”).

The Anti-Israel critics have attempted to make their case based on moral grounds. So, the non-Jewish population in Israel needed to call themselves something other than Arabs, consistent with the narrative in which they portray themselves as underdogs. This is absurd considering that there are so many Arab countries with so much land, population, and resources. Just who is the David and who is the Goliath in this instance? With so many Arab States, cannot the world tolerate one small Jewish state?

Does there need to be a separate country legitimized, as the result of a large and distinct ethnic and/or religious population dwelling in the midst of a sovereign nation?

Southern California (i.e., Riverside, San Bernardino, San Diego, and Los Angeles Counties) presently consists of a 39.6% Hispanic population and this percentage is growing. Could one not assert that the density of this population warrants carving out of the map of California a new nation of “*Hispania*”? What if such a militant

demand were made, based upon the earlier presence of Hispanics (the Mexicans were there first)? Who should listen to such “logic”?

The fact is, carving up the one and only Jewish State to create yet another Arab/Muslim state will not resolve the underlying objections the world’s Arab and Muslim nations have with the existence of *any* Jewish state, anywhere in the world. Perhaps it is time to entertain some new ideas. Perhaps we should consider a “One State Solution”?

### ***Old Problem—New Approach***

For 68 years of Israel’s modern day statehood, the working assumption has been that a Jewish State would live alongside a Palestinian Arab state, the “Two State Solution.” It has never worked.

When a policy fails despite study, entreaties, formulations, and resolutions, the time has come to reconsider the theories upon which failure rests.

In the Bible, God bequeaths title for the Land to the Jewish People. The primary fallacy obstructing a solution is that *“the Bible is irrelevant.”* Nevertheless, secular history and archaeology confirm the Bible’s authenticity. When all other Middle East remedies have been examined and proven deficient, why not consider the Scripture as a source document and “Title Deed to the Land” for the Jewish people?

Genesis provides a four thousand year old account regarding the Jewish homeland. Passages such as 12:7; 15:18; 17:8; 28:13, and 35:12 establish the inheritance and bequest to Abraham’s progeny.

Genesis chapter 23 tells of a “West Bank” land purchase in Hebron by Abraham. Second Samuel 24:21-22 records King David’s purchase of the property known today as the Temple Mount. Additionally, the Prophets predict a worldwide ingathering—clearly observable in our generation.

Jeremiah 23:3-6; 32:37-41

Ezekiel 36:22-28; 37:21-28

Zechariah 10:8-12

Isaiah 49:19

Although God designated large areas of the Middle East for the progeny of Ishmael, Esau and other descendants of Abraham, God meticulously designated the borders for the Children of Jacob (Israel) and reiterated this many times.

There are at least 64 Old Testament citations foretelling worldwide Jewish emigration to Israel. These are but a few of the countless references confirming title to a Jewish nation. More to the point, Ezekiel 37:22 specifically precludes dividing of the Land.

Prophetically, the Old Testament Scriptures foretell our current times:

### **Isaiah 49:19-20 TLV**

**<sup>19</sup>For your waste and desolate places and your destroyed land will now be surely too small for the inhabitants, and those who swallowed you up will be far away. <sup>20</sup>The children of your bereavement will yet say in your ears, “The place is too cramped for me! Make room for me to settle in.”**

The Scriptures also speak of the long run regarding the need for additional land for the Jewish homeland.

### **Ezekiel 39:28 TLV**

**<sup>28</sup>Then shall they know that I am the LORD their God, which caused them to be led into captivity among the heathen: but I have gathered them unto their own land, and have left none of them anymore there.**

Eventually, Bible readers will be able to look back and see that worldwide Jewry will have been completely regathered.

As for the “West Bank,” there are over 2,000 Scripture references to this area known as Judea and Samaria, which is designated the “*Mountains of Israel*.” Jerusalem is spoken of 811 times by name. Contrast this to the Koran and Hadith texts of Islam in which the name “Jerusalem” does not appear once.

Secularly speaking, there are two populations—Jews and Arabs—in a supposed nationalistic struggle. Discussion in the West of ownership by Arab inhabitants rarely, if ever, expresses itself in religious terms. Modern Western culture is uncomfortable with absolute values of a rightness or wrongness of anything or anyone (i.e., winners and losers). Splitting the difference is always preferred because it “seems to be fair.”

Sometimes peace is best found through a decisive historical verdict. For example, there is peace today with Germany and Japan, but who alive believes permanent resolution would have occurred after endless conferences and well-intended resolutions? Remember the U.S. efforts to “resolve” the Viet Nam conflict through

the Paris “Peace talks”? How many years were spent discussing the shape of the table? How did that end?

Since 1967, a cornerstone of Middle East Policy has rested on U.N. Resolutions 242 and 338, whereby land for peace would be the guiding principle. Isn't 50 years a sufficient “Good Faith” period of time to invalidate a faulty idea?

In Gaza, in 2005, Palestinians were granted a complete withdrawal of the Jewish population. Did it bring peace or any subsidence of Hamas aggression, determination, or terrorism? Both in 2000 and 2008, the Palestinian Authority was offered virtually all the real estate they claimed, and the offer was rejected out of hand. Yasser Arafat said, according to Ambassador Dennis Ross, that if Arafat accepted, it would be the “death” of him at the hands of his own people.

Another false assumption is recounted in the recent book, *Doomed to Succeed*, written by American diplomat, Dennis Ross. In it there is a detailed history of U.S. Presidents' attitudes and efforts toward the Middle East in general and Israel in particular. The book chronicles how American policy concerning Israel has increasingly emanated from the White House, where new policy will likely originate, as distinguished from the Congress or State Department.

Ambassador Ross goes to some length to explain a common fallacious assumption made in American diplomatic thought. He asserts that it is commonly assumed Israel's Arab neighbors care a great deal about the future of the Palestinian Authority. In his book, it is pointed out that time after time the Palestinian issues are utilized for leverage, talking points and propaganda, at the same time Israel's neighbors are unwilling to allow this issue to influence the pursuit of their personal national self-interest.

The Ambassador postulates this geopolitical fiction has its 20<sup>th</sup> Century roots in American dependence on Middle East oil. This was somewhat hard wired after the 1973 and 1979 oil embargos. However, the recent emergence of American potential to be a net oil exporter by 2020 has diminished the terror of this fossil fuel oligopoly.

A third assumption that deserves reexamination is the linkage of Gaza and the West Bank when considering new options. Separated geographically from the “West Bank,” they have become separate entities, by election, leadership disputation and the lack of physical proximity. Perhaps it would be productive to consider a West Bank solution and defer Gaza to a future unique remedy.

The scriptural case for Israel's right to Judea and Samaria is quite comprehensive, whereas, the origin of the name “Palestinians” (Philistines) traces back to Gaza. Interestingly, the term originated in the Hebrew *Philashtim*, meaning *invaders* by a seafaring Mediterranean group originating in the Greek and Macedonian region.

The ancient Philistines had long since disappeared as a people from the pages of history. But, in the second century A.D., not long after the destruction of the Temple, the Roman Emperor Hadrian renamed Judea and Samaria “Palestine,” necessitating and reinvigorating the nearly extinct name.

Why must there be an omnibus solution accomplished at one time solving all the complexities of both the West Bank territory and Gaza? Not only does the prospect of a solution for both regions simultaneously come into question, but there is a fourth erroneous assumption that, *“The best answer will be found in a multi-faceted deal with many parties possessing countless conflicting interests.”*

Perhaps instead of the grand, over-arching deal, a more evolving remedy could be envisioned. Why not conceive of progress taking place over a ten year or twenty year period, but with a determined direction?

All of the above suggests it is perhaps time for a fresh look, with a blank page for some unconventional, out-of-the-box, thinking. We allow ourselves some latitude to speculate, while being consistent with the Bible and focusing on the West Bank (not Gaza). Let’s think evolution rather than an expansive deal and be less preoccupied with the “feelings” of Israel’s neighbors.

Another source of unfruitful diplomatic pursuit may be the reliance upon potentially inaccurate and exaggerated population figures regarding how many Arabs reside in Judea and Samaria (the West Bank). The PA asserts the West Bank Arab population to be 2.7 million persons. Other estimates in Israel and elsewhere suggest the true figure is closer to 1.5 million. Critics of the higher figure maintain people leaving the West Bank continue to be counted after their departure. Deaths are not accurately and timely recorded. Birth rates in the area have declined, but new birth projections continue unabated.

Why should we not be surprised at such exaggerations since Arab claims for legitimacy rely so much upon squatter’s rights rather than international law? Since this is the central justification, wouldn’t it be productive to conduct a census for the first time since 1967 within the disputed area? Such a census might be less “provocative” if all residents, Arab and Jewish, were numbered.

One figure that can be relied upon is the Israel tabulation of 400,000 Jewish West Bank residents. This increases at the steady rate of approximately 15,000 per year. This is in addition to the estimated 300,000 Jewish people residing in East Jerusalem. It is conceivable that with continued or increased incentives the number of Jewish residents in these areas could approach 1,000,000 in ten or twenty years.

Suppose there were incentives offered by the United States for PA residents to emigrate to other Arab nations without any coercion or forced migration? To a



person or family earning only \$2,000 per year (assuming employment), a \$25,000 incentive could be meaningful. Figures associated with children might be \$10,000. Over time, there could be many families interested in a fresh start with \$50,000 capital for a new life. Homes and farms of people departing could be purchased by Israel's government and resold.

After a sufficient time, there might be only a million Arabs in residence. Of course, other countries (e.g., Jordan, Egypt, Algeria, Morocco etc.) might be accepting-countries and thus they also might receive economic benefits for welcoming immigrants. Verification safeguards would have to be devised. Israel wouldn't have to accept responsibility—only America. Surely, there are experts that could tweak the above numbers in a more precise manner.

Even a lower figure of a million Palestinians could still muddle the issue of how to annex "disputed" territory and remain a Jewish and democratic state. This pre-supposes citizenship to West Bank non-Jewish residents.

Again, our speculation should not disregard scriptural strictures precluding unkindness or inequity. However, the Bible does provide for the concept of the "*Sojourner in the Land.*" This is somewhat parallel to our modern concept of permanent residency.

In Israel today a permanent resident has most of the privileges of citizenship, including civil rights before the law, the possibility of military service, and application for citizenship under certain restrictive circumstances and screening. They cannot, however, vote in national elections. Thus, the Jewishness and democratic nature of the State of Israel are preserved.

#### **Ezekiel 47:21-23 TLV**

**<sup>21</sup> You are to divide this land for yourselves to the tribes of Israel. <sup>22</sup> So you are to divide it by lot for an inheritance for you and for the outsiders who dwell among you, whoever bears children among you. They will be to you like the native-born of Bnei-Yisrael [Children of Israel]; they will be allotted an inheritance along with you among the tribes of Israel. <sup>23</sup> In whatever tribe the outsider lives, there you will give him his inheritance." It is a declaration of ADONAI.**

This important passage in Ezekiel makes note of a “special” group of inhabitants at a time when the Land of Israel is apportioned to the twelve tribes. There is “you” and there are the “outsiders” who “dwell among you, whoever bears children among you.”

According to this injunction, the category of “outsiders” is to be “like the native-born of Bnei-Yisrael; they will be allotted an inheritance along with you among the tribes of Israel.”

There is no separation of rights, but there is the perpetual preservation of their identity as “*outsiders living among and having children amongst the Children of Israel.*”

It’s clear the separateness is acknowledged, recognized, and preserved, even accommodated. This is not a plan for a merger but a plan for co-existence. Land ownership by this group is permitted and provided for. The key, though, is the recognition of *all* parties that this is the **Land of Israel**. This is not an additional Arab “homeland” nor a distinct nation in any respect.

From this it’s clear these residents are intended to never lose the separate identity as outsiders who have chosen to live “amongst” Israel. They are permitted to own land within the nation. This is a prescription for a “One (Israel) Nation,” not a “Two State Solution.”

Jeremiah 12:14-17 also fortifies this designation. Most of the Arab nations already designate the Palestinians as “outsiders.” No matter how long they have lived in a “host” country, they and their children are never granted citizenship—only residency.

The Bible is essentially a Middle East story centered upon the Jewish people. The drama is now opening new chapters in this ancient saga. Let us channel original thoughts of what would be consistent with biblical truths that are already known.

Let us not stand in the pathway of the steam roller of history. Rather, we can choose to get behind biblical destiny and help bring it to pass, fulfilling the Bible’s “One State Solution.”

Paul Liberman-June 2016  
Executive Director  
Alliance for Israel Advocacy



---

**YOUTH SURVEY ON EMIGRATION: WEST BANK**

**Field work: 31 January - 4 February 2017**

**Sample: 650, male/female, aged 18-30**

**Margin of error: +/- 4%**

**Palestinian Youth**

The Palestinian population in the West Bank is a youthful one. According to the United Nations and Palestinian Central Bureau of Statistics data for 2016, an estimated 70 percent of the Palestinian population is 30 years of age and below, with over half of this number falling into the age group 14 and under. The overall median age of the Palestinian population is 20.8 years, compared to 37.9 in the United States.

For the purposes of this survey, conducted January 31 - February 4, 2017, a sample of 650 (men/women) was drawn from the West Bank population 18-30 years of age (est. 760,650) giving a margin of error of +/- 4% [Note: East Jerusalem is not included in the sample]. The survey examines youth attitudes towards their current living conditions and the issue of emigration. The main findings, including tables and sample information, are below.

**Current Circumstances: Finances, Employment, Daily Concerns**

The majority of youth in this survey are optimistic about the future (67%) with women slightly more so than men at 73% vs. 60%, respectively. These

findings are consistent with other recent polls conducted in the West Bank and Gaza wherein perceptions of future circumstances are more favorable than views towards the present. This is reflected in the current survey by respondents' descriptions of their current financial situation, with 55% stating it as "fair" or "poor" but with 53% believing it will improve in the next year.

Among survey respondents, only 29% stated that they were fully employed, 46% of men versus 13% of women. This finding is consistent with statistics indicating that youth unemployment across the Palestinian territories exceeds 40%. The largest block of unemployed is young women, who make up 50 percent of the sample. 69% of women respondents fall into this category, describing themselves as students or housewives.

Among city residents, who make up 45% of the survey's sample, only 24 percent report full employment; a rate lower than for respondents living in villages or refugee camps [Note: while refugees make up 31% of the sample, only 19% of the sample cite a camp as their place of residence].

Correspondingly, "cost of living" and "employment" topped respondents' replies to the question "what are you most concerned about on a daily basis" at 40% and 20%, respectively. With respect to their leadership having plans to address the aforementioned concerns, respondents are overwhelming negative.

### **The Emigration Option**

In light of the employment situation in the West Bank, it is perhaps not surprising that 48% of respondents say that emigration is "frequently" or "occasionally" discussed among friends or family. And while only 8% of those surveyed state that they are currently pursuing emigration to

permanently reside in another country, 40% of all male respondents (19% of female) say that they have at some point considered it. Additionally, one quarter of respondents says they have family members who have emigrated, of which the majority was for economic reasons. When all respondents are asked under what circumstances they might consider emigrating, a plurality cites receiving a job opportunity and further economic deterioration in the West Bank. Of the 8% of respondents who say they are currently pursuing the emigration option, 71% are residing in West Bank cities, 71% are male, 79% fall into the age group of 23-30, and 57% have family members who have already emigrated.

### **Emigration Challenges**

Respondents point to obtaining a foreign visa and employment as the most significant challenges facing those considering emigration, followed by the personal finances required to start a new life. Most beneficial therefore for respondents who might consider emigration would be a “job opportunity” at 44% followed by “financial support to start new life” at 19% and a “visa to a preferred country” at 17%.

### **Country Preferences**

The UAE, Turkey, United States, Germany and Sweden are the top five destination preferences of approximately 46% of respondents, in that order. While Arabic-speaking and Islamic tend to be preferred characteristics for countries of destination, these aspects vie with economic prosperity and opportunity, and access to social services.

### **Cost of Emigration**

With respect to the minimal level of personal finances estimated as required to settle in the preferred country selected, responses range from less than \$1,000 to \$100,000 with the median approximately \$5,040. Factors likely affecting these estimates include: 1) whether having a job opportunity is the number one prerequisite for emigration; 2) proximity of country selected; 3) knowledge of the cost of living in selected country; and 4) respondents' seriousness regarding the issue of emigration at the present time, among others.

### **Views Towards Emigration**

According to respondents, the majority views those who emigrate positively (40%) or do not view them any differently (35%). Those who take a negative view (21%) likely do so as a result of the belief that those who do emigrate eventually begin to lose touch with home, focusing on life in their new country.

### **The Deciding Factor**

For the majority of respondents (63%), economic factors are the most decisive in determining whether they would ever seriously consider emigration. Deterioration of the political situation was cited by just over 11%, followed by educational opportunity abroad.

\*\*\*\*\*

**1. When you think of the future, are you optimistic or pessimistic?**

	<b>Male</b>	<b>Female</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Optimistic</b>	60.4%	73.1%	66.8%
<b>Pessimistic</b>	37.2%	24.5%	30.8%
<b>Don't know</b>	2.5%	2.4%	2.5%

**2. What is your current employment status?**

	<b>Male</b>	<b>Female</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Fully employed</b>	45.8%	13.1%	29.4%
<b>Part time</b>	18.6%	8.0%	13.2%
<b>Seasonal</b>	2.8%	1.8%	2.3%
<b>Unemployed (looking for fulltime work)</b>	8.4%	5.8%	7.1%
<b>Unemployed (day laborer looking for work)</b>	7.7%	2.8%	5.2%
<b>Unemployed (student, housewife)</b>	16.7%	68.5%	42.8%

**3. If unemployed, have you looked for work in the past 6 months?**

	<b>Male</b>	<b>Female</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Yes</b>	67.6%	23.6%	36.5%
<b>No</b>	31.4%	74.8%	62.1%
<b>Don't know/No answer</b>	1.0%	1.6%	1.4%

**4. How would you rate your financial situation today?**

	<b>Male</b>	<b>Female</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Excellent</b>	4.6%	4.3%	4.5%
<b>Good</b>	35.3%	46.2%	40.8%
<b>Fair</b>	38.7%	35.2%	36.9%
<b>Poor/ Not good</b>	21.1%	14.4%	17.7%
<b>Don't know</b>	0.3%	0.0%	0.2%

**5. Do you believe your financial situation will improve or worsen over the next year?**

	<b>Male</b>	<b>Female</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Improve</b>	51.4%	53.8%	52.6%
<b>Stay the same</b>	27.9%	31.4%	29.6%
<b>Worsen</b>	15.8%	6.2%	11.0%
<b>Don't know</b>	5.0%	8.6%	6.8%

**6. On a personal level, what are you most concerned about on a daily basis?**

	<b>Male</b>	<b>Female</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Employment</b>	25.4%	15.1%	20.2%
<b>Cost of living</b>	40.6%	40.3%	40.4%
<b>Housing</b>	8.0%	6.5%	7.3%
<b>Education</b>	9.0%	16.6%	12.8%
<b>Health</b>	3.7%	8.6%	6.2%
<b>Marriage</b>	10.8%	6.5%	8.6%
<b>Other</b>	1.5%	3.1%	2.3%
<b>Don't know</b>	0.9%	3.4%	2.2%



**7. In your opinion, does Palestinian leadership have strategies to address the concerns of Palestinian youth?**

	<b>Male</b>	<b>Female</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Yes</b>	10.8%	12.3%	11.6%
<b>No</b>	79.3%	74.7%	77.0%
<b>Don't know</b>	9.9%	13.0%	11.4%

**8. Do you have family members who have emigrated to permanently reside in other countries?**

	<b>Male</b>	<b>Female</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Yes</b>	27.4%	25.2%	26.3%
<b>No</b>	72.6%	74.8%	73.7%
<b>Don't know</b>	27.4%	25.2%	26.3%

**8.2 If yes, why did they emigrate?**

	<b>Male</b>	<b>Female</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Economic reasons</b>	63.3%	54.2%	59.0%
<b>Personal reasons</b>	10.0%	6.0%	8.1%
<b>Political reasons</b>	6.7%	9.6%	8.1%
<b>Education (then decided not to return)</b>	12.2%	13.3%	12.7%
<b>Marriage</b>	7.8%	15.7%	11.6%
<b>Other</b>	0.0%	1.2%	0.6%

**9. Is emigration something discussed in your family or among your friends?**

	<b>Male</b>	<b>Female</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Yes, frequently</b>	19.5%	9.5%	14.5%
<b>Yes, occasionally</b>	36.2%	29.8%	33.0%
<b>No, never</b>	44.3%	60.6%	52.5%

**10. At the present time, are you personally pursuing emigration to permanently reside in another country?**

	<b>Male</b>	<b>Female</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Yes</b>	10.8%	4.3%	7.6%
<b>No</b>	87.9%	93.8%	90.9%
<b>Don't know</b>	1.2%	1.8%	1.5%

**10.2 If yes, why?**

	<b>Male</b>	<b>Female</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Economic reasons</b>	82.4%	61.5%	76.6%
<b>Personal reasons</b>	14.7%	7.7%	12.8%
<b>Political reasons</b>	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>Education</b>	2.9%	0.0%	2.1%
<b>Marriage</b>	0.0%	30.8%	8.5%
<b>Other</b>	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

**10.3 If no, have you previously considered emigrating?**

	<b>Male</b>	<b>Female</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Yes</b>	33.1%	16.1%	24.3%
<b>No</b>	66.2%	81.9%	74.3%
<b>Don't know</b>	0.7%	2.0%	1.4%

**11. Under which of the following circumstances might you consider emigration? [1<sup>st</sup> choice]**

	<b>Male</b>	<b>Female</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>If I received a visa to a preferred country</b>	14.9%	11.3%	13.1%
<b>If I received a job opportunity</b>	32.5%	18.3%	25.4%
<b>If the economic situation further deteriorated here</b>	22.9%	22.6%	22.8%
<b>If the political situation deteriorated here</b>	6.2%	7.0%	6.6%
<b>If I had an educational opportunity (admission or scholarship)</b>	8.7%	19.3%	14.0%
<b>If I received financial assistance that would allow me to settle in another country</b>	5.6%	6.1%	5.8%
<b>Don't know</b>	9.3%	15.3%	12.3%

**11.2 Under which of the following circumstances might you consider emigration? [2<sup>nd</sup> choice]**

	<b>Male</b>	<b>Female</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>If I received a visa to a preferred country</b>	6.2%	3.4%	4.8%
<b>If I received a job opportunity</b>	16.4%	19.6%	18.0%
<b>If the economic situation further deteriorated here</b>	28.2%	20.5%	24.3%
<b>If the political situation deteriorated here</b>	13.3%	14.1%	13.7%
<b>If I had an educational opportunity (admission or scholarship)</b>	8.7%	10.4%	9.5%
<b>If I received financial assistance that would allow me to settle in another country</b>	13.9%	11.9%	12.9%
<b>Don't know</b>	13.3%	20.2%	16.8%

**12. For people who might be considering emigration, what do you believe are the most significant obstacles/challenges? [1<sup>st</sup> choice]**

	<b>Male</b>	<b>Female</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Obtaining visa to preferred country</b>	29.1%	21.7%	25.4%
<b>Guaranteed employment opportunity</b>	31.3%	21.7%	26.5%
<b>Personal finances/money to start new life</b>	10.2%	11.3%	10.8%
<b>Not knowing anyone in another country</b>	4.0%	6.1%	5.1%
<b>Concern about being welcomed in new country</b>	4.3%	5.8%	5.1%
<b>Leaving family behind</b>	7.4%	10.4%	8.9%
<b>Leaving friends behind</b>	0.9%	0.6%	0.8%
<b>Other</b>	11.1%	20.2%	15.7%
<b>Don't know</b>	1.5%	2.1%	1.8%

**12.2 For people who might be considering emigration, what do you believe are the most significant obstacles/challenges? [2<sup>nd</sup> choice]**

	<b>Male</b>	<b>Female</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Obtaining visa to preferred country</b>	11.8%	5.8%	8.8%
<b>Guaranteed employment opportunity</b>	22.9%	14.1%	18.5%
<b>Personal finances/money to start new life</b>	12.7%	13.8%	13.2%
<b>Not knowing anyone in another country</b>	9.6%	8.9%	9.2%
<b>Concern about being welcomed in new country</b>	7.1%	10.7%	8.9%
<b>Leaving family behind</b>	10.8%	10.7%	10.8%
<b>Leaving friends behind</b>	2.2%	1.5%	1.8%
<b>Other</b>	18.3%	27.8%	23.1%
<b>Don't know</b>	4.6%	6.7%	5.7%

**13. If you were contemplating emigration, for any reason, which of the following would you find most beneficial? [Choose one]**

	<b>Male</b>	<b>Female</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Visa to preferred country</b>	20.1%	13.5%	16.8%
<b>Guaranteed employment opportunity</b>	47.6%	41.1%	44.4%
<b>Financial support to start new life</b>	16.8%	21.7%	19.2%
<b>Knowing someone in the country I am emigrating to</b>	8.7%	11.5%	10.1%
<b>Other</b>	2.6%	3.9%	3.3%
<b>Don't know</b>	4.2%	8.2%	6.2%

**14. If you were to emigrate, for any reason, in which country would you prefer to live? [open-ended, responses less than 1% of total not shown]**

	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>United Arab Emirates</b>	72	11.1%
<b>Turkey</b>	71	10.9%
<b>USA</b>	65	10.0%
<b>Germany</b>	47	7.2%
<b>Sweden</b>	47	7.2%
<b>Saudi Arabia</b>	32	4.9%
<b>Canada</b>	29	4.5%
<b>France</b>	24	3.7%
<b>Italy</b>	20	3.1%
<b>Norway</b>	18	2.8%

<b>Spain</b>	15	2.3%
<b>Jordan</b>	12	1.8%
<b>UK</b>	12	1.8%
<b>Australia</b>	11	1.7%
<b>Gulf states</b>	11	1.7%
<b>Malaysia</b>	11	1.7%
<b>Kuwait</b>	10	1.5%
<b>Algeria</b>	7	1.1%
<b>Egypt</b>	7	1.1%
<b>Russia</b>	7	1.1%
<b>Don't know</b>	42	6.5%

**15. In your estimation, what is the minimal amount (dollars) you would need to resettle in the country that you chose above? [open-ended]**

<b>Amount (US\$)</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Under \$1,000</b>	50	8.8
<b>\$1,000 - \$1,999</b>	86	15.1
<b>\$2,000</b>	111	19.5
<b>\$2,001 - \$2,999</b>	19	3.4
<b>\$3,000</b>	80	14.0
<b>\$3,001 - \$4,000</b>	58	10.1
<b>\$5,000</b>	55	9.7
<b>\$6,000 - \$6,500</b>	20	3.6

<b>\$7,000 - \$8,000</b>	22	3.9
<b>\$9,000 - \$1,0000</b>	28	4.9
<b>More than \$10,000</b>	40	7.0

**16.1 If you were to emigrate, what characteristics of a foreign country would you prefer? [1<sup>st</sup> choice]**

	<b>Male</b>	<b>Female</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Arabic speaking</b>	15.5%	16.5%	16.0%
<b>Middle Eastern culture</b>	2.2%	4.0%	3.1%
<b>Islamic</b>	22.3%	28.4%	25.4%
<b>European/Western</b>	9.9%	6.1%	8.0%
<b>Liberal, democratic</b>	3.4%	5.5%	4.5%
<b>Conservative values</b>	5.3%	7.0%	6.2%
<b>Economic prosperity and opportunity</b>	30.7%	16.5%	23.5%
<b>Social services (free education and healthcare, for example)</b>	6.8%	12.8%	9.8%
<b>Other</b>	.6%	.3%	.5%
<b>Don't know</b>	3.4%	2.8%	3.1%

**16.2 If you were to emigrate, what characteristics of a foreign country would you prefer? [2<sup>nd</sup> choice]**

	<b>Male</b>	<b>Female</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Arabic speaking</b>	9.9%	10.1%	10.0%
<b>Middle Eastern culture</b>	3.7%	3.7%	3.7%
<b>Islamic</b>	10.2%	10.7%	10.5%

<b>European/Western</b>	5.9%	2.8%	4.3%
<b>Liberal, democratic</b>	6.2%	2.4%	4.3%
<b>Conservative values</b>	10.5%	11.0%	10.8%
<b>Economic prosperity and opportunity</b>	23.8%	28.1%	26.0%
<b>Social services (free education and healthcare, for example)</b>	23.8%	26.0%	24.9%
<b>Other</b>	1.2%	2.8%	2.0%
<b>Don't know</b>	4.6%	2.4%	3.5%

**17. How does your community view those who have emigrated?**

	<b>Male</b>	<b>Female</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Positively</b>	44.3%	36.1%	40.2%
<b>Negatively</b>	22.0%	21.1%	21.5%
<b>No difference</b>	29.7%	39.1%	34.5%
<b>Don't know</b>	4.0%	3.7%	3.8%

**18. In your opinion, how are immigrants viewed in the country that you selected above?**

	<b>Male</b>	<b>Female</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Positively</b>	47.6%	41.2%	44.3%
<b>Negatively</b>	18.4%	16.2%	17.3%
<b>No difference</b>	25.3%	31.1%	28.3%
<b>Don't know</b>	8.7%	11.5%	10.1%



**19. From your experience or knowledge, once someone emigrates...**

[Choose one]

	<b>Male</b>	<b>Female</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>He/she keeps in close contact with home</b>	32.5%	30.7%	31.6%
<b>He/she wants to return home</b>	19.2%	21.5%	20.3%
<b>He/she loses contact/connection with home</b>	7.1%	6.7%	6.9%
<b>He/she focuses on new life in new country</b>	16.7%	12.0%	14.3%
<b>He/she eventually embraces life and culture of new country</b>	23.2%	26.4%	24.8%
<b>Don't know</b>	1.2%	2.8%	2.0%

**20. What would be the most decisive factor in making you seriously consider emigration? [open-ended, responses totaling 1% and above]**

	<b>Male</b>	<b>Female</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Desire to improve my economic situation</b>	33.3%	27.9%	30.6%
<b>Finding a job</b>	34.0%	17.2%	25.5%
<b>Deteriorating political situation</b>	11.2%	11.7%	11.5%
<b>Scholarship/education</b>	3.0%	12.0%	7.5%
<b>Deteriorating economic situation</b>	6.9%	6.8%	6.9%
<b>Deteriorating security situation</b>	1.7%	2.9%	2.3%
<b>High cost of living</b>	1.3%	2.3%	1.8%
<b>Marriage</b>	0.3%	2.6%	1.5%
<b>Social situation</b>	0.3%	2.3%	1.3%
<b>No answer</b>	3.0%	4.9%	3.9%
<b>Don't know</b>	0.3%	3.2%	1.8%

### Sample Distribution

District	%	Gender	%
Jenin	10.8	Male	49.7
Tulkarm	8.2	Female	50.3
Qalqilya	2.5	Assessment of household income relative to surrounding community	%
Nablus	13.5	Better than average	13.9
Salfit	2.5	Same as surrounding community	70.6
Tubas	2.5	Less than average	15.6
Ramallah & Al Bireh	13.5	Marital Status	%
Jerusalem	16.2	Single	57.7
Jericho	2.5	Married	40.8
Bethlehem	7.5	Other	1.5
Hebron	20.5	Educational level	%
Residence	%	Less than 9 years	8.6
City	45.4	9-12 years	39.5
Village	35.8	More than 12 years	51.8
Refugee Camp	18.8	Refugee status	%
Age	%	Refugee	30.7%
18-22	37.2	Non-refugee	69.3%
23-26	32.5		
27-30	30.3		

## Show Me The Money

There are some 750,000 people registered in refugee camps in the Palestinian Authority (PA) West Bank. However, it is estimated only 380,000 actually live in these squalid locations.

This situation after 50-75 years had taken on a permanency and hopelessness for this great mass of people. There is a political divide between those suffering and the PA leadership who hold these victims hostage to the world. Well intended funds funnel into corrupt government bureaucracy and individuals never see the benefit.

As would be expected, this has bred an active antipathy towards the Palestinian bureaucracy for receiving contributions and aid that does not find its way into benefit for individuals. Perhaps there has been an unwitting donor complicity in allowing the Abbas administration to continue in the corrupt pattern established by Yasser Arafat.

The terrorist Hamas organization has won an allegiance to its struggle by funding a variety of social programs and has gained a popular majority. Western nations, however, see a necessity of propping up the Abbas regime to counter Hamas.

Unfortunately, this has resulted in large sums given to a corrupt government, to subdue the more virulent terror organization, Hamas, with little of these donated funds finding their way to West Bank suffering individuals.

Reimbursement for individual relocations costs would be potentially a direct help to many West Bank residents in camps, villages and cities throughout Judea and Samaria. Providing an emigration possibility could over a sustained period, reduce the number of Palestinians in the area, thereby being a real help to both Israel and many Arabs seeking new economic opportunities.

The Abbas Administration could recognize an eroding of their number of squatter constituents and thereby hopefully be more open to negotiating with Israel, rather than doing so from a weaker position in the future. The proposal herein potentially benefits Israel and Palestinian individuals. Only the corrupt Abbas government would experience a diminishment in their interests.

Included is summary data showing tabular amounts of funds given to the PA, for one year (2014), as well the identity of those nations participating. Cannot some of this aid and donations be channeled in a way of actually helping individuals?

## TOP 20 GOVERNMENT DONORS TO PALESTINIAN AUTHORITY IN 2014

United States of America	\$408,751,396
European Commission	\$139,402,221
Saudi Arabia	\$103,519,499
United Kingdom	\$95,328,127
Sweden	\$79,975,260
Germany	\$54,838,742
Norway	\$35,911,782
Japan (Including JICA [Japan International Cooperation Agency])	\$28,278,535
Switzerland	\$27,158,461
Australia	\$23,707,542
Netherlands	\$22,474,045
Denmark	\$22,339,767
Kuwait	\$17,000,000
France	\$16,800,000
Italy	\$10,775,259
Belgium (Including Flanders)	\$10,772,636
Finland	\$8,865,753
Ireland	\$8,464,730
Palestine	\$8,453,349
Turkey	\$8,129,618

## TOP 20 NON-GOVERNMENT DONORS TO PALESTINIAN AUTHORITY IN 2014

UN Agencies	\$43,083,888
UAE Red Crescent	\$42,953,021
Islamic Development Bank	\$9,790,000
Islamic Relief USA	\$6,600,000
OPEC Fund for International Development	\$3,100,000
Islamic Relief Canada	\$3,099,063
American Friends of UNRWA	\$3,088,137
Dubai Cares	\$3,000,000
Tkiyet Um Ali	\$1,617,487
Khalifa Bin Zayed Foundation	\$1,600,000
International Committee of the Red Cross	\$1,228,700
Dubai International Humanitarian City	\$1,058,958
International Islamic Relief Organizations, Saudi Arabia	\$1,000,000
Mohammed Bin Rashid Al Maktoum Humanitarian Foundation and Charity Est.	\$803,357
Islamic Relief Worldwide	\$753,665
Jordan Hashemite Charity Organization	\$652,575
UNRWA Spanish Committee	\$607,113
Saudi Committee	\$540,000
Mercy USA for Aid and Development	\$510,000
Muslim Relief Coalition	\$500,000

\*Contribution data is accurate as of 31 December 2014