



Canadian Social Science
Vol. 15, No. 6, 2019, pp. 10-18
DOI:10.3968/11101

ISSN 1712-8056[Print]
ISSN 1923-6697[Online]
www.cscanada.net
www.cscanada.org

Game Theory in Israel's Relation With the Palestinian Authority: Study of Israel's Withdrawal to Borders of the Year 1967, a Model (1993-2018)

Ghaida Al-Biltaji^{[a],*}; Yusra Alkhalailah^[b]; Anoud Al-Habashneh^[c]

^[a]Assistant professor. The Hashemite University, Zarqa'a, Jordan.

^[b]Lecturer. The Hashemite University, Zarqa'a, Jordan.

^[c]Assistant lecturer. The Hashemite University, Zarqa'a, Jordan.

*Corresponding author.

Received 5 March 2019; accepted 3 June 2019

Published online 26 June 2019

Abstract

This study examines the concept of game theory, its objectives and its elements. It also reviews the Israeli Palestinian treaties and the international resolutions related to the issue of the Israeli withdrawal from the Palestinian territories on the basis of borders of 4 June 1967 including Jerusalem, as one of the core issues for reaching a final status agreement between the Palestinian and Israeli sides, the declaration of the establishment of a Palestinian state, ending the state of conflict between the two sides and reaching the stage of peaceful coexistence. The review involves clarifying the instruments and the techniques upon which Israel propped in applying this theory in its relation with the Palestinian Authority, and analysing the extent of gains or less achieved by both sides in this issue, in accordance with the concept of zero theory, or non- zero theory based games. The study had deduced that Israel confined in its strategy to employing the method of zero game with the Palestinian National Authority considering itself the stronger party who is able to exerting its pressures to achieve the greatest amount of gains, but the Palestinian leadership could not, till this moment achieve any gains rather the relinquishment it made by signing the Oslo Agreement were followed by subsequent relinquishment.

Key words: Game theory; Israel; Palestinian national authority; Withdrawal from the Palestinian lands in 1967; Jerusalem; Gaza

Al-Biltaji, G., Alkhalailah, Y., & Al-Habashneh, A. (2019). Game

Theory in Israel's Relation With the Palestinian Authority: Study of Israel's Withdrawal to Borders of the Year 1967, a Model (1993-2018). *Canadian Social Science*, 15(6), 10-18. Available from: <http://www.cscanada.net/index.php/css/article/view/11101>
DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3968/11101>

INTRODUCTION

The theory of the game is considered one of the important strategies of decision- making in stands of international conflicts, and one of the methods followed in studying international relations. Israel is considered one of the states following this method in its international relations, since the mutual recognition between the Palestinian Liberation Organization and Israel, in accordance with Oslo Agreement in 1993, Israel used to lead numerous strategies in its relations with the Palestinian Authority, to devour more of the Palestinian lands and judaizing them and hindering reach to a peaceful settlement toward the Palestinian problem and achieve peace in the region by performing the two- state dissolution, and recognition of the Palestinian state and its capital in East Jerusalem. The Israeli approach in dealing with the Palestinian problem depends on the principle "more land less people", reaching the proclamation of the "Great Israel State" performance in accordance with the Jewish beliefs that its borders stretch from the Nile to Euphrates, the thing that made it seek to establish research centers concerned with how and steps of decision- making. From here comes the significance of this study which is to search in the approach employed by Israel with the Palestinian Authority since signing Oslo Agreement in 1993 until 2018. This study did not receive the attention of the researchers by analyzing the gains or losses achieved by both sides in the issue of Israeli withdrawal from land Occupied Palestinian territory on the basis of the borders of 4 June 1967, including Jerusalem,. The study depends on employing the historical method, the analytical descriptive method, and the legal method to

attain the results of study for analysing the extent of gains, or losses achieved by both parties in the issue of the Israeli withdrawal from the Palestinian lands on the basis of 4 June 1967 including Jerusalem, in accordance with the concept of the zero and the non-zero games theory, considered one of the substantial issues to reach the agreement of the final situation between the Israeli and the Palestinian parties, and announcing the performance of the Palestinian state, ending the conflicts situation between both parties and reaching the stage of peaceful coexisting, then Clarifying the extent of Israel's commitment in carrying out the international resolutions and agreements with the Palestinian Authority and how to direct these resolutions and agreements with what is in harmony with Israeli interests to be the winner party in return for the loss of the Palestinian party.

1. INTRODUCTION TO THE THEORY OF GAMES

Games theory is considered one of the important theories for decision-making in stands of conflicts or international fights (Al-I'qabi, 2010). Despite the researchers' numerous definition of Games theory, we will depend in this study on Martin Shobeck's definition, that it is "A method of studying the decision-making in cases of fights", and Thomas Shelling's definition that it is "A study of situations in which the best behavior of each party is depending on its ability of expecting what the other party will do, this means differentiation between the strategic games and luck games" (Dorthy, 1995).

The theory of games depends on numerous factors; one of them is the players who are the basic elements at analysing the stands that cover conflicts or interests. This is because the player is the basic unit in analysis considering him the activating party in the stand, the player is not conditioned to be an individual or a state, but is meant to be a unit of decision-making in the stand covered by analysis (Abu Amer, 2004), where each of them seeks to achieve better results than others (zero game), or achieving the best result for all (non-zero game), in addition to the necessity of information availability at each player from the other correspondent player, and perceiving the environment in which playing at a good form by the players, and perceiving the other player's movements, for every movement pushes the correspondent party to amend his alternatives (Dorthy, 1995), and recognizing the rules that specify choices and available alternative in front of every player, with the necessity of specifying the strategy and steps in which the player moves during the game in light of his antagonist's movement (Hashem, 1984).

The conflicts with their natters are divided into two primary groups; competitive conflicts (zero games), they are in a condition of permanent conflict unplayable to reconciliation, interests of their parties are discordant, or unplayable to reconciliation, here is the benefit achieved

by the party (a) represents in the same time and the same degree of the party (b) loss (Dorthy, 1995), each player is a participant in an international issue seeks to achieve the farthest limit of gains, corresponding the farthest limit of losses for his antagonist, but will reach to the lowest limit of gain if had found that this what he can achieve (Abu Amer, 2004) and the player resorts to employ this strategy at his perception of possibility of achieving success and great returns deserve entering such this type of games, he had guaranteed, before hand, non-existence of highest authority controls his behaviour or directed by a punishment at giving up his future commitments (Makki, 2013). But the non-competitive (non-zero games) the interests among players are non-concordant, but they are interpenetrated to an extent that allows bargaining and submitting mutual relinquishments, to reach a medium agreement point, the thing that assists transformation with relations of parties of those stands from the situations of conflict to the situation of cooperation. Thereupon, the consequence of these bargainings do not be zero as the case in the competitive conflicts (Mokled, 1991), for the rational players perceive that in cooperation will lead to the loss of all parties, so they prefer cooperation more than nullity especially if there was a higher authority, or punishments guaranteeing non-retreating of parties from their stands; here we are in front of non-zero playing (Makki, 2013).

The theory of games considers rationality the basis of decision-makers behaviour, and the rational player behaves as he is able on decision-making if faced a group of choices, and proceeds to classify the available choices from the best to the worst, and always takes the same choices (Abu Amer, 2004), and the player in the contest will choose the most preferable return that achieves the greatest possible return and the least possible losses, and in return his antagonist will do the same thing, and rationality in the theory of games supposes on the player before entering in any game to count the size of the actual power he owns as counts the size of his antagonist's power and so specifies his choices in their light. He should not enter a confrontation with his antagonist without having the ability and the will, because he will follow un-rational policy here, and on the contrary of the theory of games that supposes rationality, and so he will lose the confrontation (John, 1969).

In accordance with the logic of the game theory, each party in the conflict is free in choosing the behaviour that he imagines it is able to reach victory on his antagonist in the end. This is necessary to recognize the antagonist's intentions. he is supposed to enjoy some intelligence not less than the other party in his contest that prevails between them both, thereupon all possible replacements of behaviour are meant to be a group of strategies that one of them can be prepondered on the other due to consequences expected, where benefits and losses of the conflicting parties confronting each other are observed. This theory can assist each party of the conflict to imagine the stands,

understand the dimensions and move in them to serve his interests in light of what he expects from other parties of actions and contradictory reactions (Mokled, 1991).

2. THEORY OF GAMES IN ISRAEL'S RELATION WITH THE PALESTINIAN NATIONAL AUTHORITY

"Robert J. Aumann" the Israeli scientist obtaining the Nobel prize in the theory of games had given an accurate descriptions to Israel's strategy with Arabs called it "Blackmailers' Contradiction", for he describes two persons put in one room with a bag in it (100,000) dollars, the owner of the bag said that he will give them both the money if only they negotiated and reach to a cordial solution between them on dividing it, or else he will give them anything, at that the first one whom he describes the "rational" initiates and says to the second one; each of us takes (50,000) but to his astonishment the second one rejects, and says that he does not care to his stand and he will not depart the room with less than (90,000), either you take the rest or no, and I am ready to go home without anything. Here, the first one attempts to make him change his view and says: "be rational, we are in this equal, and both of us want the money let us divide it", but this dividing does consent the second who insists on his view seriously, and says there is nothing to negotiate upon, either (90,000 to 10,000) or nothing this is my final offer, therefore the first one will not have except to take the ten and leave the ninety to the second one, and then both of them leave the room. Aumann wanted, in his descriptions, that the first party is Israel and the second party is Arabs (Aumann, 2010).

Aumann's description is applied on Israel's strategy in its negotiation with the Palestinian part and conclude the different peaceful settlement agreements with it, but by changing the nominations of the parties, that is the first party is the Palestinian party and the second is Israel, so the truth at Aumann is what suits their objectives even if contradicted the incidents. Reality indicates that Israel is the blackmailing party that rejects rationality (Makki, 2013), it is the party that pushed the Palestinian liberation Organization to believe in non-usefulness of armed strife in attaining rights and restoring lands and made it follow a new strategy leans on believing that peaceful settlement is the successful instrument to restore the Palestinian rights, the thing that pushed it to enter in unbalanced settlement, in time Aumann gave an imagination to the world that the Palestinian part is that who seeks to hinder the track of negotiations by insisting on his demands, and clinging to a piece of land without care of the peace process, pretending to have forgotten that Israel is the part that originally did agree on the Palestinian lands and occupied them, considering them Jewish lands depending on the diving promise with Canaan land, because God

distinguished them from other peoples and made them "God's Chosen People", and showed that the Palestinian part is the blackmailer who rejects rationality, and Israel is the rational party, in spite of the fact that Israel is the party, who clings during negotiation with them in the principle either "everything or nothing", and could achieve victory on the expense of the Palestinians. Israel rejects withdrawal from the occupied lands in 1967, and rejects relinquishing Jerusalem, for it considers them both from the props of the Jewish creed, which is performed on preserving the Judaism of the state in Palestine, and the absolute sovereign authority on it.

From here we show some items of the signed agreement between both parties; the Israeli and the Palestinian connected with the issue of withdrawal from the Palestinian lands, occupied in 1967, and Jerusalem issue, considering them both from the sustainable issue of the Palestinian problem, and clarification how Israel employs the theory of the games in those issues, and the how of formulating items of those agreements in a from it will be the winner, corresponding the Palestinian party to be the loser, either the Palestinian part did sign optionally, or by pressure from the Great Power, from them: Oslo One Agreement 13 September 1993; Cairo Agreement (Gaza- Jencho) Fourth May 1994; Oslo Two Agreement (Taba) 28 September 1995; Wye River One (Wye Plantation) 23 October 1998; Sharm Al- Sheikh (Wye River Tow) 7 September 1999; and Geneva Initiative for peace 1 December 2003 (Nawfal, 2015).

3. THE ISRAELI WITHDRAWAL FROM THE PALESTINIAN LANDS ON THE BASIS OF JUNE 4TH, 1967 BORDERS

3.1 Israeli Withdrawal From the West Bank on Gaza Strip

Oslo Agreement held "Document of Declaration of the Israeli Palestinian principles concerning arrangements of the Interim Self-Government" between both parties; the Israeli and the Palestinian on 13 September 1993. The agreement had included performance of a Palestinian interim self-government authority in the west Bank and Gaza Strip to an interim period, its period does not exceed the five years, leads to a permanent settlement is performed on the basis of both resolutions of the security council No. (242)¹ and (338)², and the Authority to be

¹ security council resolution No. (242) issued on 22/11/1967; it words on determining principles of permanents and just peace in the Middle East, and withdraw the Armed Forces from the lands occupied by Israel in the conflict (1967 War), terminating all claims or cases of war. achieving just settlement to refugees problem.

² security council resolution No. (338) issued on 22/10/1972 that calls all parties (Egypt and Israel) to promptly begin after ceasefire to execute the security council resolution No, (242) (1967) with all parts to more information see :UN, 'The 1967 & 1973 Wars', 2.

given the right of ward ship on the territory of the west Bank and Gaza strip, except for the issue that will be negotiated upon on the negotiations of the permanent situation, related to issues of Jerusalem refugees, settlements, security arrangements, borders, relations and cooperation with other neighbors, and other matters with mutual interest (UN, 1993).

Since signing Oslo Agreement and recognition of the Palestinian Liberation Organization Israel's right in living peacefully within peaceful limits and accepting both resolutions of the security council (242) and (338), corresponding Israel's recognition for the first time of the Palestinian Liberation Organization a representative of the Palestinian people. The organization relinquished its right in the rest of the occupied Palestinian lands in 1948, and was content with restoring the occupied lands in 1967 to perform the Independent Palestinian State. This indicates that Israel could blow up items of the antagonist covenant, and the articles that call for the right of the Palestinian people in their self- determination, and liberate the complete Palestinian soil or call for the armed strife accredited in 1998 (*Program of the Palestinian*, 1994).

Israel views that the resolution No. (242) does not apply on lands of the West Bank and Gaza Strip, but talks about Israeli withdrawal from occupied territories and not all occupied territories in return for peaces wants to give up part of lands (Khalifa, 1991), it occupied in 1967 with high population intensity in the form of a self- government of the Palestinians without leaving the actual sovereignty on land. It does not want to actually relinquish its security, political and economical domination, but wants to get rid of the legal and ethical burden of occupying the Palestinian lands (Al-Husseini, 2014), for Oslo One Agreement in 1993, and Cairo Agreement in 1994 did not word on Israel's withdrawal from the complete occupied Palestinian lands in 1967, but guarantees redeployment of the Israeli forces in the West Bank and Gaza strip, and the withdrawal would be from Gaza strip and Jericho first in accordance with procedures cleared in the subsequent protocol in the second attached from the agreement (UN, 1993; UN, 1994).

But Taba Agreement (Oslo Two) in 1995 included dividing the occupied Palestinian lands into three territories; (a) it is the territory which will be security and administrative in the hand of the Authority, and in it locates the main Palestinian cities, that enjoy high population intensity, territory (b) security in Israel's hand and administratively in the hand of the Authority and covers the Palestinian villages and the surrounding ways, connected with the Palestinian cities (UN, 1995), but the territory (c) will be from both sides administrative and security are in Israel's hand and cover the Israeli settlements in Therefore, Israel dominated three quarters of the West Bank area, and from the security side on more than nine tithes of its area (Al-Jarbawi, 2009). in addition, the Agreement of Wye River in 1998 that

included items about redeployment in order to enable the Israeli part, in both stages; the first and second of deployment, tom transfer to the Palestinian part 13per cent; from the territory "c", so as to be 1per cent 'from the territory "a" and) 12% (from territory "b" (UN, 1998), The Sharm Al-Sheikh Agreement in 1999 included items about complete redeployment and transferring areas from the occupied Palestinian lands in 1967 to the Palestinian Authority, in addition to items about carrying out the previous agreements to resume negotiations of the final situation to attain final peace lands to carry out both international of the security council (224) and (338) (UN, 1999), Nuseibah Aloun Agreement in 2002 included items about performing two states for two peoples so as the two parties announce that Palestinian is the only state of the Palestinian people, and Israel is the only state of the Jewish people, and being agreed upon permanent borders between both states, on the basis of 4June1967; borders, resolutions of the united Nations, and the Arab Initiative for peace, known as the Saudi Initiative. However, borders amendment should be valid and acting on equal exchange of lands (1:1) to go together with the essential needs of both parties, including security and demographic considerations (Nuseibah Ayalon Agreement, 2003). But Geneva Initiative in 2003 indicated to perform the line of borders between both states of Israel and Palestine, in accordance with both resolutions of the International Security Council (242) and (338), on the basis of 4 June 1967 borders, with some mutual borders amendments due to the rule of one Unum corresponding one dunum in accordance with the map described as international fixed, peaceful recognized borders, between them (Geneva Initiative, 2003).

The Palestinian leadership had accepted to be a state with incomplete land (toward about 23% of Palestinian land) in accordance with Oslo Agreement and subsequent agreements. It accepted to be an authority of incomplete interim self-government except on a limited part of the West Bank and Gaza strip. In the best situations of this agreement and what emerged of arrangements as its consequences is the fact that the Palestinian Authority in the year 2000 entrusted the administrative and security responsibility on (18%) from the area of the West Bank and Gaza strip (2.4%) from the historical area of Palestine and only the administrative responsibility entrusted on)22%) from the area of the West Bank and Gaza strip ((51%) from the area of the historical Palestine). Meanwhile, the area of the West Bank amounts about (5,646) square kilometers and Gaza strip about (360) square kilometers, that is what equals (22%) from the area of Palestinian amounting to 27,000) square kilometers. Israel wanted the settlement with the Palestinian organization without specifying anytime limit or machinery to carry out the items within the provided period of time, with an interminable machinery of negotiations and without the Palestinian party to have

any effective tool to press on it, and also issued solutions without existence of any machinery imposed on Israel obliging commitment with those solutions.

Thus 24 years post (and not five years) without a serious solutions. Meanwhile the Israeli party was enlarging by occupying and Judaizing what is possible of the Palestinian lands in the West Bank. The Palestinian party had to fulfill its commitments reaching the dream of the Palestinian state (Mohammad, 2017). This dream emerged when the organization believed that Oslo Agreement will make 90 per cent from the total area of the West Bank and Gaza strip in the hand of the Palestinians and the Authority, but the above mentioned numbers indicate that land existing under the sovereignty of the Palestinian Authority became divided into separated squares from each other, and each square is encircled with forces of occupation and settlement that does not cease, and became in lack of unity of the geographic seignior. So the great struggle of the Palestinian people in the West Bank is against land robbing, house destruction, building settlement, Judaism and ethnic-cleansing in Jerusalem (Hawatmeh, 2000).

Concerning the Israeli thinking about withdrawal from the occupied Palestinian lands and declaration of the Palestinian state performance, different Israeli prime Ministers had assured the impossibility of its existence. For example, Benymin Nitinyaho indicated that he recognizes a Palestinian National state overlooking its competence. But this matter demands from the Palestinian state to pay an exorbitant price being a state that occupies a part of "the Jewish people's Native land and one of his rights". He also indicated that he "Does not reject compromise with the Palestinians, not because Israel occupies a land not belonging to her, history, archeology and the correct logic clear that Israelis connect with his land since three thousand years". He also declared in a special session in the kinkiest in March 2014 "we want peace with our neighbors, the Palestinians, but this peace obliges the Palestinians' recognition with the historical link that connects the Jewish people with his native land in Israel's land and his rights in it". Since the year, 2003 Israel insists, in the frame of settlement, on the condition of Arabs and Palestinians' recognition of the Judaism of the state. This entails that the Arabs and Palestinians' recognition of real occurrence became the recognition of it with its historical legitimacy. This means that it was right historically. This matter denies the complete right of refugees' return home, or compensating them (Faud, 2008).

Nitinyaho also announced that "There no Palestinian partner exists, and withdrawal from Gaza is the First and Final one" ("A'bbas: Nitinyaho", 2015), He also said: "I believe that granting the Palestinians absolute self-determination right means that we are facing a Palestinian army equipped with heavy arms, and a state can conclude military agreements with states like Iran and Iraq... ". He

adds: "Israel will not transform herself into a bare fragile Jewish quarter on the shores of the Mediterranean Sea" (The opening Statement, 2017).

By that, Israel could play on the Palestinian part by transforming the occupied lands in 1967 into conflicting lands with the Palestinians promptly at obtaining recognition from the organization. Israel started to have the right to determine the fate of the West Bank lands with the Palestinian part as Geneva Agreement Verdicts do not apply on these lands. This is because the Agreement tackles the occupied lands not the conflicting ones. In accordance with the Israeli perspective, the West Bank and Gaza strip are not applied upon them both by the resolution (242), because they are two liberated zones, and they are Israel's historical land (Al-Hasan, 1993), Israel also rejects till now the recognition of 4 June 1967 borders as a basic of negotiation, and the organization did not obtain, in accordance with Oslo Agreement and the different subsequent Agreement withdrawal of the Israeli Forces from the complete occupied lands in 1967, but in each new agreement Israel was following a new machinery in postponement and hindrance of withdrawal and without declaration of the Palestinian state performance, in accordance with 4 June, borders (Al-Jarbawi, 2009).

And so Israel recognizes the international resolutions and both resolutions (242) and (338) with what agrees its beliefs, interests and its objectives, and discarded all international resolutions variant to their objectives, and is still continuing in committing violations and breaches of the international legitimacy laws being completely perceived that the united states of America saves protection and the security umbrella to it considered the greatest power in the international community. It owns the right of veto in the Security Council, and completely perceives in case the USA does agree on some resolutions that view it is not for Israel's interest absolutely, it from one side agrees and act on hindering carrying out from other side.

3.2 The Israeli Withdrawal From the City of Jerusalem

Since the beginning of the first formal meeting with the Palestinian responsible in Oslo, the Israeli conditioned that Jerusalem to be outside Oslo Agreement and outside the self-agreement. The Palestinians agreed upon that and negotiation about Jerusalem was postponed to negotiations of the permanent final situation, which was supposed to start in accordance with Oslo Agreement at the beginning of the third year of the interim period with the five years (Al-Majali, 2009), Israel still rejects that Eastern Jerusalem to be a capital to the Palestinians, and seeks to exclude some quarters in the West Bank to include them, and continue clinging its accounts and stabilities represented in dominating united Jerusalem and its right in biggest part of the West Bank (Thabet, 2002). Also,

the Israeli governments, after signing Oslo Agreement, actually assured that Jerusalem is the complete and united capital of Israel continuing during that in changing the reality. Oslo Agreement was not a factor of freezing to stop settlement projects in Jerusalem and change the milestones of the city, but on the contrary, the schemes of quarrelsomeness Judaism had increased. Israeli government continued in embarrassing the Palestinian institutions that act in Jerusalem and closing numerous of them (e.g. the House of the East, The Highest Palestinian Council for Health, the Institution of Land and the Institution of Water. It continued in excavations that the Israel Department of Archaeology performs in the zone of the Sacred Mosque of Jerusalem. This matter threatens destroying it. So, the stand of the consecutive Israeli governments toward the issue of Jerusalem was a united stand that depended on the idea that the united Jerusalem is the eternal capital of Israel, and it will not be a place of negotiation with the Palestinians, and Israel will continue in building settlements in Jerusalem, and there will never dislocate and never evacuate the settlements (Al-Majali, 2009).

The Nuseibah Ayalon Agreement (Declaration of Internationals) in the 2002s contained other relinquishments from the Palestinian part for the interest of Israel, considering Jerusalem an open city capital of both states, and Israel entrusts the guardianship on the Wailing Wall for the interest of the Jewish people (UN 2003). Despite the fact that the Buraq Wall (Gleaming Wall) (Wailing Wall at the Jews) is an impartial part of Aqsa Mosque, for the records of Shariah Courts and documents of the Ottoman state that the Wall belongs to Moslems & not the Jews. This was determined by the organized committee during Buraq Revolution (Shaw Committee) in 1929 (Al-Natour, 1996).

The United Jerusalem, which is considered the capital of Israel, consists of Eastern Jerusalem and Western Jerusalem and lands added to Jerusalem from the West Bank. Nearly (64.3%) of the area of the united Jerusalem are lands Israel did confiscate and built settlements on, or considered security zones. The Palestinians are forbidden from approaching them after being confiscated by the military rules. Nearly 70per cent of the real estates and lands of Western Jerusalem are Arabic Property Israel had conquered (Nawfal, 2015).

Israel had kept permanence of its actual sovereignty on Jerusalem City for it was agreed to exist an administrative Palestinian Authority on the Palestinian quarters off-side the wall of Jerusalem. But inside the wall authority and sovereignty will be under Israel conquer, with giving a special rank to Aqsa Mosque and rejecting the Palestinian domination inside the sacred Jerusalem Mosque (Al Hussini, 2014). Statistics indicate that the number of the Jewsliving in Jerusalem doubled twice approximately since the occupation of the Eastern part of the city in 1967, where raised from 197700 to

542000 Jews, spreading all over the sacred city eastern and western altogether amounting to 865 thousand persons. This in turn forms two doubles of population in the second greater city (Tel Aviv-Java) (*Number of Settlers*, 2017).

Israel also made a decision in the American in Congress inthe1995s that contains a recognition of Jerusalem as the eternal capital of Israel. It also calls for transferring the American Embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem (Nawfal, 2015). Trump had announced on Dec 2017 the executive recognition of the occupied Jerusalem capital of Israel and commence procedures of transferring the American Embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem (*Trump Formally Recognizes*, 2017). He inaugurated it on 15 May 2018. It is the date of declaration of performing the state of Israeli Occupation on 14May 1948. That is after passing seventy years of occupation. Then the decision of the Israel Keneisit was made to amend the Article (2) of the Basic Law about Jerusalem (Falling Jerusalem from issues of the final situation), and decision of Al-Lecod party of giving up peace and negotiations by replacing them with the policy of imposing reality of occupation. These decisions are considered executing the sentence of death to any opportunity to achieve peace, and verdict peoples of the region to continue the roundabout of violence, extremism and blood-shed (*Trump and Nitinyah*, 2018).

This thing was accompanied by declaration of the Palestinian Central Council entrusting the Executive Committee of the Palestine Liberation Organization to suspense recognition of Israel till it recognizes the State of Palestine on borders of 1967 It also canceled the decision of adding the Eastern Jerusalem, stopped settlement, and the interim period worded on in the signed agreements in Oslo, Cairo and Washington and what they implied of commitments are not valid or acting. The declaration came after a month past since the executive recognition by the present American President, Trump that Jerusalem is the capital of Israel (*Palestinians Suspend*, 2018). This made Trump threaten the Palestinian Authority, being the Palestinians do not want to talk about peace by stopping the financial aids to the Palestinian Authority and UNRWA (United Nations Relief and Working Refugees Agency). This is because America is considered the greatest granting party alone to the Relif Agency. The size of the American aids since founding the Agency in the1950s amounted to about (5.8) Billiards and amounted about (395.5) million dollars in 2016 at the time in which the UNRWA suffers the decrease of its financial resources for the year 2017. The American procedures covered the delay in the expenditure of aids and temporary rejection of Israel to transfer what it collects of due money on behalf of the Authority. This matter will lead to more of Palestinian relinquishments, especially that the Authority suffers from lack in its financial resources (*Washington Mortgages*, 2017)

By that Israel could, since signing Oslo Agreement, postpone discussion in the subject of Jerusalem till the final stage of negotiation. When the time of the final stage approached, Israel took the strategy of the postponement, delay, and crisis management instead of solving it aiming at a settlement with the Palestinians with what achieves its interests and far away from the issue of Jerusalem considering it the eternal and the united capital. The Palestinian leadership's relinquishment, since the beginning of negotiations with non-clinging to discuss the issue of Jerusalem, and relinquishing sovereignty on it had opened the domain to Israel to add more lands from the West Bank to Jerusalem, more settling the Jews in Jerusalem, more building settlements in Jerusalem, pressure on the Palestinians in Jerusalem and attract their identities, and do violate the piety of the Holy Aqsa Mosque. But the idea of Eastern Jerusalem capital of the expected Palestinian State after the Jewish Knesset Declaration of the Jewish State Law in July 2018, and declaration of United Jerusalem an eternal capital of Israel far away from achieving it became dedicated to search for a capital to this expected state in one of Jerusalem suburbs, such as: Silwan, Abu Dees, and As-Samo', and else of other proposed zones.

CONCLUSION

The study made crystal clear that the theory of games is one of the important strategies to decision making in stands of the international conflicts. Israel is one of the states that excelled in employing the zero games with the Palestinian part. It was clever in doing games, deceiving and camouflaging counting returns, and choosing the best replacements that yield with the best results from one side, and obtaining support of the United States of America from other side. Meanwhile the Palestinian Authority suffers from the non-existence of players in the international community. The regional or local community who is able to support it at a form of preponderating balances of powers for its interest and press on Israel and push to change its strategy in to a non-zero game so as to allow both parties to submit some relinquishments and obtain a permanent and comprehensive solution to the Palestinian problem. There is a Palestinian partition between both movements "Fatah and Hamas". At the regional level, there is an Arab partition and a situation of boiling in the region. At the international level, the authority does not obtain the American support or the support of the effective states in the international community. This preponderates the pan to Israel's interest and makes her able to achieve her objectives in disconnecting the Palestinian problem.

Showing and analysing some items of the signed agreements between both sides in the issue of withdrawal from the occupied lands in the 1967s and the issue of Jerusalem, since signing Oslo Agreement in 1993 till

2018, it is evident that Israel could, in accordance with the zero games, achieve great possible amount of gains on the expense in the track of negotiations and concluding agreements. Therefore, the greatest relinquishment was represented by the signature of the Palestinian party of Oslo Agreement in time they do not have the ability to press and save a group of self-data to force Israel to carry out its pledges and commitments toward the Palestinians. This dedicated the Palestinian subordination afterwards for the Israel demands in the different issues as these agreements were in lack of the existence of a united referentialism and stable rules agreed upon from both parties. This also made each party explains things according to their perspective, objectives and interests. Since the strongest party is the one who can impose his choices, and the method of his explaining things on the other party, Israel could impose all her conditions and demands obtaining the support of the international community, and preponderating balances of powers for her interest. The Palestinian leadership did not take into consideration the size of the actual power of Israel at concluding agreements with her, and did not lay its choices due to this power. This made Israel employ the zero games considering itself to be the strongest party which is able to practice its pressures to achieve her gains. But the Palestinian party could not, till this moment, achieve any of gains. On the contrary, the relinquishments offered by the Palestinian leadership since signing Oslo Agreement in the 1993s till now 2018 was followed by more and more relinquishments. This made Israel go on in the process of pressure on the Palestinians to submit more relinquishments, and made the negotiations between them both move in the same spot. This means that the Palestinian part put its self at the losing party since the beginning, Israel is still imposing its security and administrative domination on about 85 per cent from the complete Palestinian lands. It rejects withdrawal from the occupied land in the 1967s in accordance with both resolutions of the Security Council 242 & 338 considering them liberated lands. Also, it rejects to relinquish one span of the hand from the city of Jerusalem considering it the eternal capital of Israel, and considered from the most important primary permanents in the Jewish creed and Israeli policy. The Israeli prime Minister, Rabin, was assassinated, because of his dare hood on commencing a semi-peaceful process and offering some relinquishments with the Palestinians.

The study views that Israel will not submit any relinquishments in the present time or in the future for the Palestinian Authority. This is because a balance in powers does not exist between both sides. Israel does not view any justification to push her offer any type of relinquishments to withdraw from the complete occupied Palestinian lands in 1967, and recognition of the independent Palestinian State and its capital is Eastern Jerusalem so as both sides coexist peacefully and in

security. It views that the continuation of the Palestinian Authority following the same open way in its relationship with Israeli gains to throw legitimacy on Judaism of the Palestinian lands.

Due to the previous results, the researchers recommend with the necessity of the Palestinian do change their strategy, tools, and choices in dealing with Israel. they also recommend the Palestinian authority to search for strategies, and new tools and choices allow them to attempt a maneuver faraway avoiding political bargains and submitting relinquishments. This way would make Israel forced to bargain the Palestinians and submit some relinquishments and change her strategy from the zero game into the non-zero game. This should be done in a way which enatils that submitting relinquishments should not be confined to the Palestinians alone, but also the Israeli side should submit relinquishments to attain acceptable solutions to both parties, that is through the following:

- Building the international unity through the Palestinian reconciliation between both movements (i.e. Fatah and Hamas) and getting rid of the Palestinian partition. This matter will form a pressing tool on Israel and generate a feeling for Israel that this reconciliation threatens their security, existence and stability which are considered some of the priorities of the Israeli policy.

- Going on freezing the Israeli Palestinian negotiation, and retract the Palestinian Authority her recognition of Israel until Israel accepts commitments with all resolutions of the Security Council, resolutions of the international legitimacy. In addition, and commitment with stable rules about the mutual version of the substantial issues is also important to attain a final solution of these issues in conflict and reject the Israeli techniques of postponement and trickery.

- The researchers also recommend the Palestinians to hold tight on the whole Western Bank territories and Ghaza Strip as occupied land not disputed over. The Palestinians should also insinuate to the use of power and individual or group –based resistance in all the Palestinians lands. This could be done through strengthen the mutual bonds between the Palestinians and the Security Guards. This will make Israel realise that the negotiations are not the only available choice to achieve their intended aims.

REFERENCES

A'bbas: Nitinyaho and Liberman's Declarations are Racial. (2015, Mar. 20). Al-Dustour Newspaper

Abu Amer, A. (2004). *Apparent international relations and education: Diplomacy and strategy* (pp.145-146). Dar Al-Shorouq for Publication and Distribution. Amman.

Al-Hasan, B. (1993). The lost and the required in the Israeli-Palestinian Peace Negotiations. *Journal of the Palestinian Studies*, 13(4), 55-70. DOI: <https://www.palestine-studies.org/ar/mdf/abstract/34517>

Al-Husseini, S. (2014). The Israeli-Palestinian Peace Process between two approaching contradictories. *Journal of the Arab Future*, 426, 116-131. DOI: <https://caus.org.lb/product/%d9%85%d8%ac%d9%84%d8%a9-%d8%a7%d9%84%d9%85%d8%b3%d8%aa%d9%82%d8%a8%d9%84-%d8%a7%d9%84%d8%b9%d8%b1%d8%a8%d9%8a-%d8%a7%d9%84%d8%b9%d8%af%d8%af-426-%d8%a2%d8%a8%d8%a3%d8%ba%d8%b3%d8%b7%d8%b3-2014/>

Al-Jirbawi, A. (2009). The Arab and the Palestinian Negotiations with Israel: The dilemma and the solution. *Journal of the Palestinian Studies*, 78(20), 20-35. DOI: <https://www.palestine-studies.org/ar/mdf/abstract/37628>

Al-Majali, A. (2009). *Jerusalem in peace negotiations: Thirty years of attractions 1979-2009* (pp.201-205). Ministry of Culture, Amman.

Al-Natour, A. (1996). *The Palestinian Problem: the land and the man*. (3rd ed., pp.70-71). Amman: Dar Al-Kindi for Publication and Distribution.

Al-O'qabi, A. (2010). *International relations: Analytical study in fundamentals, foundation, history and theories* (p.205). Baghdad.

Aumann, R. (2010, Jul. 3). *Game theory and negotiations with Arab countries: The black mailers paradox*. Retrieved from: <http://www.aish.com/jw/me/97755479.html>

Dorothi, J. (1995). *The contradictory theories in the international relations* (pp.229-339). Amman: Ahmad Yassin Technical Center.

Fuda, A. (2008). *The Palestine problem and features of the current stage* (p.61). Damascus: Dar Kanaan for Studies and Publication and Distribution.

Geneva Initiative. (2003). *A model Israeli Palestinian Peace Agreement*. Retrieved from: <http://www.geneva-accord.org/mainmenu/english>

Hashem, H. (1984). *Theory of games and its role in analyzing the international struggles with application on the Arab-Israeli conflict*. Cairo, p.z.: Dabouli Library.

Hawatmeh, N. (2000) *Further than Oslo: Where Palestine is going* (p.23). Damascus and Beirut: Al-Ahali Houses for Publication.

John, C. (1969). Game theory and the analysis of international conflict. *International Politics and Foreign Policy* (p.370). USA.

Khalifah, A. (1991). Arab Negotiations: The Israeli on the Eve of Madrid Conference. *Journal of the Palestinian Studies*, 8(2), 164-179. DOI: <https://www.palestine-studies.org/ar/mdf/abstract/34484>

Mikki, D. (2013). Theory of games in Israel's international relations in light of its relation with state of the neighborhood. *Journal of the Palestinian Studies Center*, 17, 35-48. DOI: <https://www.iasj.net/iasj?func=fulltext&aId=77259>

Mokled, I. (1991). *The international political relations: A study in the fundamentals and theories* (4nd ed., pp.249-349). Cairo: The Academic Library.

- Nawfal, A. (2015). *Specialized studies in the Palestinian problem* (pp.132-143). Amman: Dar Wael for Publication and Distribution.
- Number of Settlers in Jerusalem Doubled Nearly Twice. (2017, May.14). *Newspaper of the Middle East*.
- Nuseibah Ayalon Agreement. (2003, Sep. 3). *State of Palestine*. Negotiations Affairs Department. Retrieved from: <https://www.nad.ps/en/publication-resources/agreements/nusseibeh-ayalon-agreement>
- Palestinian National Charter. (1968, July. 1-17). *U.S. Resolutions of the Palestine National Council*. Retrieved from: <https://2001-2009.state.gov/p/nea/rls/22573.htm>
- Palestinians Suspend Recognition of Israel as a response against the Deal of the Century. (2018, Jan. 20-26). *Echo of the Homeland*.
- Program of the Palestinian Authority issued by the Palestinian National Authority. (1994). *Journal of the Palestinian Studies*, 19(5), 241-243.
- Saleh, M. (2017, Nov. 30). *Running after the mirage of the Palestinian state*. AlZaytonah Center for Studies and Consultations, Retrieved from: <https://www.alzaytouna.net/2017/12/01/%d9%85%d9%82%d8%a7%d9%84-%d8%a7%d9%84%d8%ac%d8%b1%d9%8a-%d9%88%d8%b1%d8%a7%d8%a1-%d8%b3%d8%b1%d8%a7%d8%a8-%d8%a7%d9%84%d8%af%d9%88%d9%84%d8%a9-%d8%a7%d9%84%d9%81%d9%84%d8%b3%d8%b7%d9%8a%d9%86%d9%8a/>
- Thabet, A. (2002). *Peace Negotiations and Dynamics of the Israeli-Arab Struggle* (pp.16-23). Emirates Center for Studies and Strategic Researchers. United Arab Emirates.
- The opening Statement. (2017). Settlement and Reconciliation in the Israeli Political Thinking. *Journal of the Middle Eastern Studies*, 79(21), 7-12.DOI: <http://mesj.com/new/ArticleDetails.aspx?id=762>
- Trump and Nitinyaho do sentence all opportunities of achieving peace to death. (2018, Jan. 2). The formal Site of Palestine Liberation Organization. Retrieved from: <https://www.nad.ps/ar/media-room/press-releases>
- Trump Formally Recognizes Jerusalem Capital of Israel and Irritates a storm of Anger and International Criticisms. (2017, Dec. 9-15). *Echo of the Homeland* (p.17).
- U.S. (1968) *Resolutions of the Palestine National Council*. Department of State, Retrieved from: <https://2001-2009.state.gov/p/nea/rls/22573.htm>
- UN. (1993, Qct.11). *Declaration of principles on in lerim self-government arrangements (Oslo Accords)*. Report of Secretary General, UN Doc. A/48/486, Retrieved from: https://peacemaker.un.org/sites/peacemaker.un.org/files/IL%20PS_930913_DeclarationPrinciplesnterimSelf-Government%28Oslo%20Accords%29.pdf
- UN. (1994, May 4). *Agreement on the Gaza Strip and the Jeicho Area (Cairo Agreement)*. Retrieved from: <https://peacemaker.un.org/israelopt-cairoagreement94>
- UN. (1995, May 5) *Israeli-Palestinian Interim Agreement on the West Bank and the Gaza Strip (Oslo II)*. Report of Secretary General. UN Doc. A/51/889, Retrieved from: https://peacemaker.un.org/sites/peacemaker.un.org/files/IL%20PS_950928_InterimAgreementWestBankGazaStrip%28OsloII%29.pdf
- UN. (1998, Qct.23). *Wye River Memorandum*, Retrieved from: https://peacemaker.un.org/sites/peacemaker.un.org/files/IL%20PS_981023_The%20Wye%20River%20Memorandum.pdf
- UN. (1999.Sep.4). *Sharm El Sheikh Memorandum on Implementation Timeline of Outstanding Commitments of Agreements Signed and the Resumption of permanent Status Negotiations*, Retrieved from: https://peacemaker.un.org/sites/peacemaker.un.org/files/IL%20PS_990904_The%20Sharm%20el%20Sheikh%20Memorandum.pdf
- UN. The 1967 & 1973 Wars. *UN Security Council Resolution 242 & 338*. Retrieved from: <http://www.un.org/Depts/dpi/palestine/ch3.pdf>
- Washington Mortgages the Palestinians Aids with the Authority's Return to the Peace Negotiations. (2017, Dec.30; 2018, Jan.12). *Echo of the Homeland*