

The Right of Return

Between the One-state Solution and the Two-states Solution

Introduction:

Many Palestinian, Arab and international researches and studies contributed in presenting adequate explanations and details in several aspects about the right of return, and the mechanisms of its implementation in accordance with the visions, projects and enormous decisions since Nakba in 1948 hitherto. Overall, they concentrated about the description, analysis and providing Forward-looking insights for the future. With regard to the topics about the right of return within the framework of the two-state solution and the one-state solution, writings' shares arose newly, but they did not take mighty at the side of the Palestinian community because it is on the one hand still a matter of dispute between the Palestinian political components in light of the Israeli concerns which consider both solutions as red lines especially that they conduce to the enforcement of the right of the refugees' return. On the other hand, the comparison between the two solutions is governed by the conditions and matters actually.

We have tried in this study to search in the implementation of the right of return for the Palestinian refugees in the framework of the "two-state solution and "one state solution" by discussing a range of questions and problems i.e. associated with the destiny of the refugee's issue in the framework of these solutions.

The matter of fact of the Palestinian refugees in the homeland and Diaspora:

Hundreds of thousands of Arabs of Palestine emigrated after the catastrophe of 1948 " Nakba" to the West Bank, Gaza Strip, Jordan, Lebanon, Syria, Egypt, Libya, the Gulf states, Iraq and other countries. After the setback in 1967, thousands fled to those countries. The Palestinian researchers estimated their number between 1000.000-1.300.000 where the number was estimated by

UNRWA as 900.0000 refugees i.e. about 65% of the overall Palestinians in 1948. The total number of Palestinians at home and abroad expanded since 1948 and until the beginning of 2013 more than 8 times to become about 11.3 million people.

The political and social reality of the Palestinian refugees varies in the Arab countries according to the attitudes of these countries where all Arab countries didn't comply with Al Rebaat Convention in 1969 which identified the legal status of the Palestinian refugees with them:

In Lebanon, which occupied a unique position amid the Arab countries in terms of strict procedures against the Palestinian refugees on several fronts, refugees were classified i.e. more than 400 thousand refugees into three sections: the first was granted travel documents (passports) for 1948 refugees who are registered with UNRWA and the General Directorate for Refugees where they are benefited from the services of both. The second section came to Lebanon from other countries at the end of the forties and early fifties of the last century where they have pass documents (passports) that enable them to travel and return, yet they are not registered with UNRWA, but they are benefited from its services. The third section is suffering the most since its members don't have any identification documents where their stay is considered illegal i.e. the refugees of 1967.

In Syria, more than 467 thousand Palestinian refugees live and are subjected to the supervision of the authorities closely through a directorate redirected by the Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs where the Palestinians received in Syria a great deal of economic and social integration except political one. After the Syrian internal crisis, which began in 2011, Palestinian refugees have been exposed to attacks which led to the displacement of large numbers of them to the neighboring countries of Syria.

In Jordan, where the refugees have a large portion of the right of citizenship and full nationality based on the decision of the unity of the two banks in 1950

and under the Jordanian Constitution in 1952, more than 81% of the total Palestinian refugees live outside the camps. Jordan hosts 40% of the Palestinian refugees in the region. Jordan welcomed the major half of post-1967 displaced. Although the Jordanian policy calls for non-resettlement of Palestinian refugees like all other Arab host countries, they resorted to integrate refugees and some displaced people in the internal structure of the state including all aspects as we pointed out to obtain nationality and citizenship especially after the separation of the West Bank from Jordan in 1988.

In Egypt, there is no official accurate report of the numbers of the Palestinian refugees. In 1948, about 10,000 Palestinian refugees displaced to it where their numbers have increased over the years slowly as a result of the continued migration of the Palestinian refugees from Egypt towards the Gulf States and Saudi Arabia searching of a living as statistics in 2013 indicated that their population is estimated of 60 thousand Palestinians.

As for Iraq, Iraq was considered as one of the least Arab countries hosting Palestinian refugees where in 1948 between 4000-5000 refugees displaced to it. Their numbers reached prior US occupation of Iraq in 2003 between 35 and 40 thousand Palestinians. After the bloody events which the Palestinian Refugees suffered from in Iraq, the number reached as a result of escape from Iraqi situation to about 15,000 Palestinian refugees.

The right of return in the light of the resolutions of the United Nations:

The refugees' issue and the right of return activated the political and diplomatic circles in the United Nations since the emergence of the Palestinian refugees' issue in 1948 as the United Nations issued several resolutions, which talk about the return of the Palestinian refugees or compensation, most notably: the General Assembly of the United Nations' Resolution No. 194 i.e. issued in 11/12/1948 which states the return of the refugees and compensation. Under this resolution, the United Nations established a specific political framework and a mechanism to follow up the implementation of this resolution. UNCCP is

assigned to facilitate the return of refugees, resettlement, and rehabilitation of them economically & socially and the payment of compensation to them.

With a closer look at the text of this decision, we note that it was limited to the call of the return of refugees as soon as possible for those wishing to return to their homes and live with peace with their neighbors. It hasn't been based on the resolution's partition No. 181 i.e. issued in 29/11/1947 which came on the basis of establishing two states: the Arab and Jewish states. While the refugees' issue arose because of the Zionist war against the Palestinian people, their country, homeland and powers which means that the United Nations has separated between the content of the two resolutions.

Since then, the Palestinian refugee's issue has become an item employing the priority's rank on the agenda of meetings of the General Assembly of the United Nations. A series of the United Nations resolutions proceeded after Resolution No. 194 which affirm the refugees' right of return. More than 150 resolutions were issued by the United Nations calling for the return of the refugees to their homes from which they were displaced in 1948.

The right of return in the Palestinian positions:

Since Nakba in 1948 and the absence of the Palestinian national movement, a clear vision of the right of return did not stand out as Arab states sought to dominate the Palestinians and loot their rights in self determination and the struggle to reclaim their homeland. The Kingdom of Jordan annexed the West Bank and East Jerusalem to it in 1950 and put Gaza Strip under the supervision of the Egyptian administration. This situation has remained intact until the defeat of June 1967, and Israel's occupation of the rest of the Palestinian Arab territories.

The Palestinians have sought with all strength and determination to take over the reins of their political issue by themselves. With the support of Arab countries, the Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO) was established in 1964 where it drafted a national charter in 1968 which draw the features of the

Palestinian national project based on the liberation of the whole of Palestine through armed struggle. It raised the slogan of "liberation and return." Palestinian Commando factions practiced armed struggle against the Israeli enemy inside and outside the occupied territories in order to achieve the slogan, build a Palestinian state on the entire Palestinian national soil, and return the refugees to their homes from which they were displaced in 1948.

Palestinians continued in the national struggle on the political and militant level till October war came in 1973 which brought about changes in the regional, international and political scene. Thus, the Palestinians cause political changes in their vision of the Palestinian national project where the leadership of the PLO launched what was known as "The Project of ten Points" in 1974 which in its essence expressed the Palestinian position on the national struggle in the next phase.

The project called for the "establishment of any national authority on any land that is released aiming to start liberating the rest of the soil of the homeland" i.e. the national project turned into a phased solution. This interim solution is based on the National Charter i.e. liberation is through armed struggle, and without recognition of the Zionist enemy. As a result of the growing strength of the Palestinian national struggle in the seventies, the United Nations called the Martyr president :Yasser Arafat to deliver a speech from the rostrum of the United Nations. In this historic speech, which addressed the world explaining his issue and the fair matters of the Palestinian people from the world lifting in one hand the gun and an olive branch in the other hand telling the world that "The right of the Palestinian people is to return to their lands from exile."

After Abu Ammar's speech at the United Nations, Palestinian diplomacy and redeemer action have been activated in order to have a clear message to the world that the Palestinian people want to return to their homeland i.e. It's enough for homelessness and immigration. Many initiatives were posed at that time which call for finding a solution to the Palestinian issue, but Israel always fizzle

out the international and regional efforts to resolve the Palestinian issue since the invasion of Lebanon in 1982 as an Israel's response to all these efforts.

The Palestinian revolution strived in the defense of Lebanon and the refugees' camps for more than 88 days of steadfastness and challenge, but the Palestinian revolution came out of Lebanon eventually and distributed in Arab exile. Later, massacre of Sabra and Shatila camps was in Beirut and Palestinian division in Tripoli in 1983; all have pushed the Palestinian leadership to launch new initiatives in the Palestinian national project.

The sixteenth session of National Council in Algeria in 1988 has identified the features of the new national project by the proclamation of the State of Palestine in exile, the Declaration of Independence, the launch of the Palestinian peace's initiative based on the two-state solution, the recognition of the two resolutions: 242 and 338, and the start of peace negotiations in 1991 at Madrid conference.

The Oslo accord, and the Declaration of Principles have come in 1993 to deepen the concept of the two-state solution: the state of Palestine on the borders of the fourth of June with the recognition of the right of Israel in existing. National Council was held in Gaza Strip to announce the change of the items of the National Charter relating to the armed struggle, and the state over the entire national territory. As a result of Oslo accord, the Palestinian National Authority in 1994 continued negotiating with Israel for the establishment of a Palestinian state. Those negotiations took place at Camp David, Clinton Initiative in 2000, Taba talks in 2001, Sharm Al-Sheikh negotiations, and Annapolis negotiations in 2007. Several possibilities are still open till now.

The right of return in the Israeli positions:

The Israeli position regarding the issue of Palestinian refugees' return to homes from which they were expelled in 48 both at the official level or at the popular level. All refuse their return persistently and with severe stubbornness

refusing the acknowledgment of their responsibility for their displacement and loading the responsibility to the Arab armies that entered Palestine in 48.

From the Israelis' point of view, the return of refugees would end the Jewish state and the future of the Jews in the establishment of their state ;thus, they refuse the decrees of the international legitimacy regarding refugees. They see through their own views that there are major developments which have taken place since 1948 i.e. Nakba where the resolutions of the international legitimacy have become outdated and non-viable. Therefore, the issue of the Palestinian refugees in the Israeli vision is a humanitarian issue, not a political one . It's an issue which needs the kindness, care, rehabilitation, relief, economic solutions and not solutions of historic and strategic nature.

Thus, the Israeli positions were based on the intransigence and rejection of what came by UN resolutions calling for the return of refugees despite all the appeals made to it by the international community which called it for the implementation of what came in resolution No. 194 issued by the United Nations General Assembly except what was shown by Ben-Gurion in 1949 when he was a president of the Government of Israel i.e. acceptance of the return of one hundred thousand refugees to their homes knowing that the decision of Israel's admission as a member of the United Nations was stipulated by the acceptance of resolution No. 194 setting the return of refugees to their homes.

Israeli positions are still under rigid settlement process. This has been shown obviously through a paper submitted by the Israeli delegation to the refugee's committee in the multilateral negotiations which raised the issue of Jewish immigrants from Arab countries who were estimated with 800 thousand people. Benjamin Netanyahu reconfirmed these attitudes i.e. the return of the Palestinians threatens the security of the Israelis and the Jewish character of the

state where there is no space for millions of them, and the Arab countries shall accommodate them.

The right of return in the light of the one-state solution and two-state solution:

The Two-state solution as a generic term refers to a settlement of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict on the basis of the division of the area of historic Palestine into two states: Palestine and Israel. It is based in its political marketed form currently on the basis of the establishment of a Palestinian state on the borders of June, 4th 1967 including parts of the West Bank, Gaza Strip and East Jerusalem which constitute 22% of the historic Palestine establishing "side by side" on the basis of mutual recognition with the State of Israel that has already existed since 1948 on about 78% of historic Palestine. The mentioned settlement is usually connected with adding a vague statement about finding a fair solution for the Palestinian refugee's issue where this settlement is usually associated with the United Nations resolutions No. 242 and 338.

From the Israeli side, the acceptance of the option of the two-state solution was associated with the demographic concern about the low number of Jews in the land of Palestine against the population density either within land of 48 or in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip which means that the establishment of a Palestinian state can exempt Israel from the issue of refugees through loading the responsibility upon the new state to resettle its refugees while the absence of a Palestinian state would mean that these refugees will still looking to get back into Israel as their right. With the establishment of a Palestinian state, this right will become doubtful since according to international understanding that the one shall be back to the state which he holds its nationality where he is a citizen there. Accordingly, this will facilitate the marketing of these ideas internationally for Israel to convert the external pressure on the new state to hold its responsibilities towards the refugees while the two-state solution itself will not be enforced without final arrangements to end the refugee's portfolio

while all other solutions will not solve this knotty issue. In terms of the Palestinian. The two-state solution theorists started by the motive of establishing an independent Palestinian state within the project of national liberation from occupation and colonization for the occupied Palestinian territories in 1967.

Palestinians see that a state in the West Bank, Gaza and East Jerusalem couldn't resolve the conflict because of Israel's rejection of the right of return of Palestinian refugees on the one hand, and the minor size of the state's lands in a manner that couldn't bear many refugees on the other hand. There are about five million people in the West Bank and Gaza who suffer from the population's density which is estimated with more than a million and a half on an area of 365 square kilometers. In addition, the possibility of establishing a viable state on a divided weak geographical site i.e. left by Israel for the Palestinians such as "bantustans" in South Africa is excluded. From another side, deportation and expulsion of the Palestinians of 48 whose number was estimated with a million and a half people to enhance the purity of the Jewish state.

Nearly a quarter of a century on the Palestinian National Council's decision in Algeria in 1988 fledged by announcing the option of an independent Palestinian State with its capital: Jerusalem on the borders of 1967 and the return of refugees. After nearly two decades on Madrid & Oslo accords and the expiration of ten years from the first international adoption of the term of two states for two peoples, Palestinian leaders began, especially who participated in the negotiations with the Israeli side on the basis of the two-state solution, calling for a rethinking of the one-state solution for the Palestinians and the Israelis instead of the two-state solution.

Ahmed Qurei, member of the Executive Committee of the PLO, has attributed the failure of the two-state option to the increase in the pace of demolition, confiscation of land and expansion pursued by the Israeli governments since the start of the peace process. While Dr. Sari Nusseibeh - Official of Jerusalem portfolio in the Palestinian Authority earlier said: that the two-state solution has

become sterile, and he called for a solution rising on the type of shared and joint control, or two states' federation noting that this idea is not new since it has been discussed in 1948 at the United Nations over two proposals that addressed the fate of Palestine: the first sought in the division which is the majority, and the second made by three countries: India, Yugoslavia and Iran. In addition to the knowledge of the parties negotiating about the two-state solution that it is impossible to be applied; the large number of the Palestinians agree today that this solution had been depleted and the facts on the ground eliminated it. The positions of the Palestinian factions may have lost hope in the two-state solution as a result of settlement's expansion and the American bias in favor of Israel, but they did not seek a major effort to deepen the concept of the one-state option in the Palestinian political scene.

As for the Israeli vision of the two-state solution and one-state solution after the end of the 1967 war, Israel was unable to implement its plans in the displacement of Palestinians from their land as happened in 1948 making it impinged with the obstacle of the Palestinian residents of the West Bank and Gaza Strip which is a dilemma formed, by its interaction with the Palestinians in 48, a significant risk threatening the existence of Israel and its future since the Zionist settlement aims to occupy the land without people as an evacuative settlement. In order to face this case, the occupation leaders rushed to think of finding ways to create facts on the ground to help them get rid of the burdens resulting from the occupation which reflected them negatively.

To get around any project leading to the establishment of the State that gathers Palestinians on a part of the land of Palestine, Israeli governments dealt since 1967 with the Palestinians of the West Bank and Gaza who have been under occupation as an overflowing population that must be get rid, so many Israeli leaders presented projects of the settlement with Jordan including: Dayan project who is serving the adoption of the West Bank and Gaza residents on the Israeli economy, Alon project which provides for granting the West Bank to

Jordan for the establishment of civilian rule and Yitzhak Rabin's opinions which require solving the Palestinian problem either by giving them autonomy within Israel or by incorporating them in the Jordanian state.

In the midst of research and working to end the Palestinian-Israeli conflict, talking about the establishment of a Palestinian state has taken place in the framework of verbal discourse in order to cover up the Israeli settlement plans and justify the establishment of the Jewish state on the basis of ethnicity that involves the exclusion of anyone who is not a Jew, so we see that Israel found its match in the verbal text of Security Council resolution No. 242 that requires them to withdraw "from territories" and not from all the territories occupied by it in 1967 which means that the withdrawal will be to the extent determined by the United States & Israel, and not to the situation which was before the occupation. The Palestinians oppose decision No. 242 in particular because it did not address their subject as a national issue, but it merely referred to them by the expression : "Refugee's problem."

With regard to the solutions initiated by the Israeli parties to announce their intention to commence with negotiations about the heavily populated Palestinian geographical areas, they come from dealing with the formed reality imposed by the necessity through the adoption of an interim formulas to help them address the demographic crisis in a manner consistent with the strategy of the Zionist project. These solutions are presented in the form of a reasonable stages and flexible positions called by the occupation as painful concessions in order to extort the Palestinians, press, force them to make concessions, prove their involvement of extremism and consider their positions terrorist or supportive of terrorism.

The Palestinians' autonomy project emerged in the occupied territories controlled by Israel i.e. 20 percent of the land in the occupied territories in 1967 which is a new version of the partition of Palestine so that the concept of autonomy implies the existence of an accidental Palestinian people in the Israeli

framework where that people do not have the same rights gained by the settlers. The autonomy deals with human beings and not with the land where the Jewish rights are absolute while the rights of Palestinians are not genuine because their existence is accidental and temporal where they can be given some powers to manage the population and not for the purpose of sovereignty over the land which is more like an Israeli Protectorate serving the Zionist interests.

There was nothing clearly refers to a Palestinian state in the future with the signing of Oslo Accord in 1993 which resulted in the beginning to the establishment of a Palestinian self-management i.e. self-rule in Gaza and Jericho which was followed by an Israeli withdrawal from cities in the West Bank while all core issues were postponed in the conflict which is the most important including the refugees' right of return to final status negotiations.

As a result, the Israeli intransigence in discussing final status issues including the issue of refugees led to the collapse of Camp David negotiations in July 2000 coming out that the Palestinians are responsible for the failure. Here, the phrase came i.e. "there is no Palestinian partner for peace" which became the Israeli justification of the one-sided choice that was practically transposed in the construction of the apartheid wall, and named as: withdraw unilaterally from Gaza Strip in 2005. After the changes that the world has seen in light of the US war on so-called "terrorism", the United States launched a new peace plan as the "Road map", the adoption of US President, George W. Bush's adoption of the vision of Israeli Prime Minister at that time, Ariel Sharon, to consider Israel a "Jewish state"; the road map has stipulated per se a plan which is based on performance, achieving the "two-state solution," the existence of a Palestinian leadership capable of ending the so-called "terrorism" and decisiveness against it. The subject of the "Palestinian state" will not be searched but in the second stage after making sure that the performance of the power to meet the conditions required by them.

Talking about the "two-state solution presents a great service for marketing the concept of the "Jewish state" and imposing it on reality. The rest of the Palestinian rights are still under discussion until PA conditions be matured sufficiently to meet Israeli security requirements. For this purpose and despite the constant talk about the lack of Palestinian partner to negotiate in the settlement process, invitation came to participate in Annapolis conference in 2007 which states the need for the "two-state solution" in order to establish the "Jewish state", the protection of the settlement's parties in the region and working on constricting opponents of the settlement in an attempt to circumvent the legitimate right of return.

The right of return in light of the two-state solution:

There are three linked circles which remained unclear in the context of the two-state solution: the first: the Jewish character of Israel, the second: the right of refugees' return, and permanent solution of their cause centered originally on returning to their homes in 1948 and not in the Palestinian occupied territories in 1967, and the third is about the fate of the 48 Palestinians. In this context, the Palestinian current justifies its support for the option of the two-state solution as it's a temporary solution by liberating any part of the Palestinian national soil, and a realistic solution in the short and medium term leading to the solution of the one democratic state. This trend, i.e. represented by the PLO leadership through the seventies and eighties where this option puts a foothold in the Palestinian home after bloody conflicts with neighboring countries such as Jordan and Lebanon, felt that the international and regional changes imposed more or less the possibility of this option.

Supporters of the two-state solution proceeded from the importance of the liberation of the Palestinian people in the West Bank and Gaza from the Israeli occupation which has continued its aggression, barbarity and practices by

killing, imprisoning and destruction in addition to the Judaization of the land by settlement and obliterating Arab and Islamic landmarks especially in the city of Jerusalem. This trend boosted its positions by the achievements gained by major uprising in 1987 subsequent by Jordanian announcement of disengagement from the West Bank leading to the Declaration of Independence to confirm the two-state solution option.

Supporters of the two-state solution considered Palestine's getting an observer state at the United Nations an important positive process and a victory of the diplomatic efforts made by the Palestinian leadership in order to form a broad international front to press on Israel to implement the entitlements of the peace process and agreements signed between the Palestinian and Israeli sides especially the final status issues: Jerusalem, refugees, borders; therefore, the State of Palestine by its new international situation might be a member of many humanitarian and legal institutions, and this will positively reflect moving the refugees' case in the international community. According to this view, the right of return of the Palestinian refugees to their homes through the two-state solution will be a step in a series of steps and not a final solution of the right of return.

Despite this, the two-state solution does not guarantee the implementation of the right of return for the Palestinian refugees especially that what is suggested now revolves around the state before the final solution to the issues of refugees, Jerusalem, settlements, borders, security and water. In addition, American-Israel efforts is heading toward making the proposed state a substitute for the final status not a solution within the framework of a comprehensive settlement of the Palestinian - Israeli conflict as negotiative outputs.

If a Palestinian state rises without recognizing the right of return, the refugees will be considered as citizens of the Palestinian state even if they live abroad so that the issue of refugees will be turned to the issue of immigrants or foreign nationals followed by the caused entity. The refugees will practically remain at

the host countries with the possession of Palestinian passports, but their return remains a theory to their homeland if they wish so. By assuming the rise of a state in Gaza and half of the West Bank as suggested by some Israeli leaders, the issues related to the occupation will disappear by changing the terminology. Accordingly, these serious things impose new facts in the Palestinian-Israeli conflict where the statement: "Conflict between two states" is replaced by: "occupation" and "the migrants" replace "the refugees" while the settlements remain in the West Bank i.e. allocated to the Palestinian state in preparation for creating a situation that is represented in an expanded Israeli state including a large connected areas of the West Bank versus isolated, not geographically connected and fragmented islands where the Palestinians are distributed under the name of a state.

The right of return in the light of the one-state solution:

Returning to stating the topic of the one-state on the different implications and denominations either bi-national or secular democratic state was based on individual citizenship which is not a new idea as put forward by Britain since the thirties of the last century to resolve the Palestinian issue where its government called in February 1939 to hold a conference where Palestinians and Jews representatives, representatives of governments from Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Egypt, and east of Jordan participate in to discuss a solution of the Palestinian issue. Despite the failure of the conference, the British government issued a "Fourth White Paper", and its essence is the establishment of a democratic Palestinian state including all Mandatory Palestine where its government is represented by its population of Arabs and Jews on the base of proportional representation, and are linked by a treaty with the state of Britain for ten years. Since British government derives its legitimacy of ruling Palestine from the League of Nations, it has decided to show it on the league meeting scheduled in

September for approval, but it did not come about as a result of the occurrence of the Second World War.

However, the idea of one-state solution strongly, systematically and seriously came by Arabs and Jews leftist as a result of a set of variables: the balance of power, the condition of the peace process, the policy of imposing the status quo pursued by the Israeli far-right politics especially the expansion of settlements and the construction of the apartheid wall. These variables imposed many Palestinian, Arab and Israeli writers, journalists and academics to consider the idea of establishing a Palestinian state in the borders of sixty-seven impossible to be achieved in the near term, and does not represent a radical and practical solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict calling for a bi-national state on all land of historical Palestine like the experience of South Africa, or a unified democratic state where Jews and Arabs coexist without persecution or racial discrimination; thus, this one-state solution ensures breaking-up or the settlement of the conflict by creating a political system that combines the Palestinian - Israeli people on the entire land of historic Palestine.

So there are multiple forms stating the image that the one-state solution will be with, and the nature of the form is important for this solution because it states a vision about the concept of citizenship in one-state and the foundations that will be based on as well as the political system i.e. related to individuals, so will the relationship be based on individual citizenship, or will it be dealt with two National minorities sharing one political system, and each has its privacy?

Palestinian positions varied regarding the one-state solution where the Palestinian national movement has refused at the end of the thirties of the last century Britain's statement of the option of bi-national state because it aimed to grab international approval on a tangible formula for the implementation of "Balfour Declaration" implicating the establishment of a Jewish homeland in Palestine which explains the opposition of the Palestinian national movement in that period to the solution of a bi-national state followed by the partition

resolution as they canceled the right of the Palestinian people in self-determination through the construction of their free and independent state with sovereignty over its entire national territory.

In 1969, the PLO launched the option of the Palestinian, democratic and secular state on the entire Palestinian territory and the ruins of the Zionist entity where they adopted its national charter as national invariant i.e. get consensus by the factions of the organization which reflects strategic and political awareness of the dangers of the solution on the basis of two-states for two peoples, or a bi-national state which are the risks that the Hebrew state transposed through its expansion over the entire land of Palestine displacing of two-thirds of its people and converting them into refugees.

PLO leadership did not continue its policy to revive the thesis of "one-state" as an option to resolve the Palestinian issue, but political, civic, party, academic, cultural, Palestinian and journalistic figures & institution heavily called for it. The same view itself is shared by political, Zionist, marginal "leftist" figures and parties.

We find that the Palestinian scholar: Edward Said poses that Oslo agreement with its results did not give a solution to the Palestinian - Israeli conflict, and this is a proof of the end of the two-state solution where both the Palestinian and Israeli peoples are more closely related to each other despite the announcement of both of them to their need to their separate state; the challenge is to find a peaceful way to coexist as equal citizens in the land itself. The researchers As'ad Ghanem, and Sarah Ozaki Lazar agreed with this opinion where they expressed their perceptions of an alternative solution to the two-state solution, rejected the idea of two separate states, and said that the Palestinian and Israeli societies can live side by side, and exercise their own historical ruling requiring power-sharing and leadership on all Palestinian territories. From his part, the intellectual: Azmi Bishara called for a bi-national state where the Palestinians in the West Bank, Gaza, and Palestinians of 48 constitute one political entity

within the national, largest, binary and political entity in which the Jewish political entity and Arab political entity together constitute a Jewish-Arab entity with two parliaments on the one hand and a joint parliament on the other hand. Ahmed Qurei, former Palestinian prime minister, threatened Israel that the Palestinians will ask for one state unless Israel gives the Palestinian people their rights rather than calling for the establishment of an independent Palestinian state in the West Bank and Gaza Strip.

The possibility of establishing one- state whether it's one-state for two people or a secular democratic state with the slogan of one person and one vote solving a lot of issues: refugees, Jerusalem, the separation wall, borders, democracy, coexistence and equal rights.

Palestinian arena has started to witness today movement on the ground in favor of the adoption of the one-state option since the authority referred to it repeatedly but didn't adopt it once. As activists, politicians and intellectuals formed a popular movement under the name : "People's Movement for one Democratic state on historic Palestine" adopting the solution of one-state and calling for a radical and definitive change in the Palestinian leadership's position calling for a two-state solution.

In the new movement project, which reflects the position of 30 officials, intellectuals and academics who have signed together on a document of honor in Ramallah to convert the idea to a political force i.e. capable of influence and change, came "That the most appropriate option, which stays in front of the people in Palestine, is the option of the solution of one democratic and historic Palestine: a democratic state for all its residents based on a democratic constitution on the basis of the values of Universal Declaration of Human Rights values and ensures freedom, democracy and equal rights without any discrimination on the basis of race or religion or sex, color, language, or nationalism or political or non-political opinion, national or social origin or wealth, or place of birth or other status. "

The Israeli vision of the one-state solution is based on outright rejection to its desire to keep Israel a state for all Jews anywhere in the world, but not a state for all its citizens. This means that Jews have only the right to return to Israel while the Palestinian refugees have no right of return because this would threaten the Jewish demographic predominance.

In order to break down the idea of a bi-national state, Ariel Sharon faced a major problem which Israel failed to resolve since its occupation of the West Bank and Gaza in 1967 which is caused by the contrast between the removal of the Zionist character of the expansion and the need to maintain the Jewish character of Israel. This means that the annexation of the occupied Palestinian territories practically eliminates the Jewish character of Israel and makes it a bi-national state with the Arab majority with Palestinian population's growing. On the other hand, withdrawal contradicts with Sharon basic doctrine on Greater Land Israel. As a result of these demographic problem, Sharon sought to establish a system of separation from one side at a time when he refused withdrawal to the 1967 borders, so the withdrawal from Gaza was in 2005.

Although Israel signed with the Palestine Liberation Organization the Oslo Accords where the opinion polls showed that the majority of Israelis support the two-state solution, but the "ideological right" in Israel recently returned to state the solution of a bi-national state which was expressed by Uri Elitzur, one of the prominent persons in the camp of right-wing, where he is a former president of the Council of settlements. Elitzur presented a lecture in 2009 in which he said: "The worst solution is apparently the right solution: a binational state, on the basis of full annexation of the West Bank and making the Palestinians full citizens."

It is noted that there is a confusion in the Israeli leaders declarations on the one-state where the declarations of Abraham Burg, former Speaker of the Knesset, at the end of June 2008 created a big tumult about Israel's position on the idea of the two-state solution as he pointed out in the declarations that the

two-state solution is a temporary settlement, and it is natural that the two countries shall become in the future one-state where the two peoples live in peace and fine. As Moshe Arens, former Minister of the Israeli army, has called for the annexation of the West Bank of the State of the occupation, "Israel", giving the Palestinians Israeli citizenship, equalizing them with the citizens of the State of Israel in rights and duties, the removal of the apartheid wall, and other matters consequently; it is a proposal even it has excluded the rest of the Palestinians in Gaza, the Diaspora and the 48 but it is close to the details of one-state solution.

While other Israeli leaders considered that the one-state solution, which Palestinians started referring to, is a disaster for Israel; for example, Israeli President, Shimon Peres, refused this option describing it as the biggest danger to the state of Israel where he warned the extreme right that the settlement monster is more dangerous to the future of the state, because other - the one state - is the end's paper of the state of Israel, and that the number of Palestinians approached to Israel's population noting that in less than 20 years the number of Palestinians will be two-thirds of the population.

From here, they can do everything from changing the state's name, its flag, and direction where history shall get back to before 1948 and in the Palestinian state there shall be a Jewish minority; this vision is being talked about by experts in Jewish Demography. Even on the level of security, head of the National Security Research Institute, the former head of Military Intelligence, General: Amos Yadlin warned that the PA might trigger a diplomatic war against Israel if the negotiation process fails. He added that Israel should prepare a substitute plan of the negotiations to avoid stirring towards the solution of bi-national one-state which represents a target for the Palestinians in the long term in the event of a third Palestinian uprising despite the exclusion of its occurrence now.

One-state solution leads to end the Israeli-Palestinian conflict rather than the two-state solution on the basis of rights because it presents a solution to the dispersion of the Palestinian people in its three sectors away from the fractional solutions and the possibility of applying their right of self-determination on the ground considering that this proposal deals directly with the origin of the conflict and its consequences i.e. represented by the Palestinian Nakba in 1948. Accordingly, the one-state solution provides a clear response to all sectors of the Palestinian people, in particular the 48 Palestinians, who suffer from racial discrimination, and the Palestinian refugees abroad to achieve their return and self-determination as people on the entire territory of their home without limiting them to a part of it which promotes the Palestinian national identity by linking its parts since 1948 on the entire homeland: Palestine.

In contrast, the one-state solution despite its clashing with the Jewish character of Israel, but it provides a formula for the enforcement of the right of Israeli Jewish in self-determination as well. Theorists of the one-state solution presents another issue which is represented in the inapplicability of the two-state solution as a settlement of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Israel's policies on the ground lead unintentionally to the establishment of the one-state on the ground. In other words, even if Israel doesn't mean it directly, the possibilities of the regional division have become impossible. The imbalance of power in favor of Israel and locking the prospects for the peace process dashed a number of the Palestinian Arab, and Israeli researchers to consider the idea of an independent state impossible in the foreseeable future where it doesn't represent a practical solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

A reading of the current political reality in the Palestinian territories in light of the decline of the armed struggle, failure of the negotiations' option, ongoing invitations and appeals which are in progress to mobilize civil methods of resistance like economic, political and cultural boycott, failure of the State option in the borders of 1967, and returning to the option of one democratic state

strongly in the Palestinian political and academic parties suggest that the general atmosphere tends to embrace the possibility of the Palestinians' adoption of the option of civil resistance aiming at ending racial policy in the West Bank , Gaza, the land of 48 and coexistence in one state with the Israelis.

Finally, the idea of the one-state solution does not necessarily mean solving the problems of the Palestinian people automatically even if it is on the basis of equal citizenship. If we talk about the theoretical side, the solution may solve the Palestinian people's problems as a society while on the theoretical level, possibilities of not solving will appear if balances of power and steering clear of the international law interven in practice which is one of the gaps in Oslo accord where the one-state solution may perpetuate the control of ethnic group over other.

CONCLUSION:

Perhaps, followers of debating about the issue of the right of return for the Palestinian refugees that are being negotiated in the parts of Palestinians and Israeli intellectuals would see it directly in the discussion of this topic in recent years especially in the aspect of the right of return in the light of the two-state solution and one-state solution. Accordingly, the most important findings and results of this study are as follows:

1. The two-state solution option has witnessed during the last ten years a big dilemma because Israel continued to break it up on the ground towards the imposition of isolated state and islands unilaterally for a long-term based on the tendency of favoring balance of powers towards it increasingly.
2. The return of the one-state solution option despite stating it previously and being adopted by different sides as a Palestinian response to Israeli practices and inapplicability of the two-state solution.

3. One-state solution option harmonizes with the option of the right of return of the Palestinian refugees and the Palestinians of 48 more than the two-state solution on the ground.
4. The return of the Palestinian refugees forms a challenge to Israel's attempts to maintain a "dominant Jewish majority" and not the state of Israel itself, or the right of Jews to live in it.
5. The one-state solution option is the only solution i.e. capable of reuniting the Palestinians back into one national identity at home before 1948 while the implementation of the two-state solution will not respond to the rights of a quarter of the Palestinians to about a fifth of the area of Palestine perpetuating the crisis of other sectors towards anonymous fate in particular i.e. the issue of refugees.
6. The Palestinians in the framework of the two solutions :two states and one state – are armed with their rights which are unconvertible i.e. ensured within the conventions of the international law and related United Nations resolutions. Also, International law and the United Nations call Israel to be obliged by the adoption of the return of the Palestinian refugees and displaced.