The Oslo Agreement: A Study of the Conflict Peace Process Arabic-Israel

Fatih Soleimani
Centre of King Hussein Education, Jordan
Email: f.soleimani73@yahoo.com

Abstract

The Oslo Agreement is one of the most important peace processes between Israel and Palestinians aimed at resolving the prevailing conflict. Although this agreement can be seen as an ongoing process, the conflict remains the most troubling issue in the Middle East. This article describes the conflict identification and literature review related to the Declaration of Principles on Interim Self-Government Arrangements (DOP) and the process of formalizing the Oslo Agreement. The conversation between the two parties involved, among others, interpreting rights, boundaries, housing and others. There are different perspectives and views regarding this agreement. Instead, this article analyzes the Oslo Accords including Oslo I and II which were signed in 1993 and 1995 to achieve security in the Middle East.

Keywords: *Oslo Agreement, Peace Process, Middle East Conflict, Arab-Israeli, Palestine.*

– – – – – – – – – – ◆ – – – – – – – – – –

A. INTRODUCTION

The Oslo Agreement is a peace process that includes diplomatic and political relations to harmonize Arab-Israeli relations with Palestine. The process involves seven different agreements in various international economic and political conferences focused on the "settlement" of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict to meet the demands of both parties through peace negotiations or soft diplomacy. To ensure the success of the agreement, the 'Peace Plan' was sponsored by the United States as a 'mediator' between Israel and the Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO) on behalf of Palestine, and supported by the European Union (EU), Russia and the United Nations. The United Nations (UN), in addition to the Arab League which is also involved in the Arab-Israeli peace process. The matter is seen as an effort to produce a comprehensive peace plan to ensure the continuation of the peace process between Arab-Israel.

September 13, 1993, was an important date in the history of the Middle East. Following several conferences and negotiations between Israel and Palestine, the two sides reached an agreement on US support to agree on a peace plan known as the Oslo Accords. The agreement is a different agreement from previous negotiations, based on a decision made by both parties between Israeli representatives and PLO political representatives to hold face-to-face meetings recorded as historical events throughout the Arab-Israeli conflict. This agreement leads to a face-to-face meeting for the first time "face to face" and has significant implications for both parties, this is because the Oslo agreement is a framework to ensure future relations between Israel and Palestine regarding final status, settlement, refugees, settlement, water, relations of neighboring countries and most

importantly the right of return of the Palestinian people as well as the position of Jerusalem as a holy place in the three religions of Islam, Christianity and Judaism.

Although previously history recorded negotiations or peace routes between Israel and Palestine have never borne fruit. Therefore, research needs to be done on the whole Oslo peace process due to the high expectations placed on the agreement. Eventually it caused frustration among the Palestinian people and all parties involved.

Therefore, this paper presents a review of the Oslo agreement. Some claim that this agreement is a failed agreement and no less also say that this agreement is a great success achieved by Israel for successfully changing the Palestinian stance acknowledging the existence of Israel. Even so, the history of the Middle East proves that this agreement is incapable of reaching any solution to the problems in Palestine, especially regarding the final status which includes the position of Jerusalem, refugees, and some that have never been mentioned in previous peace talks. Thus the study - made based on the background of the Oslo peace process and previous studies, regarding their allegations against the Oslo agreement.

B. METHOD

This research is a type of descriptive research that uses literature to get data, and then analyzed based on the theoretical basis used to frame the analyzed data. The theoretical foundation used is The Oslo Agreement.

C. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

1. Historical Background of the Oslo Peace Process.

Recalling the history of the establishment of the state of Israel on May 14, 1948 declared by the first Prime Minister of Israel-David Ben Gurion caused political change and an imbalance of power. The result of the first Arab-Israeli war of 1948, brought great success to Israel while being a catastrophe to the Palestinians known as al-Nakba. The defeat of the Arab army in the war caused Israel to take control of the Palestinian territories by expelling hundreds of Palestinians and later the existence of the State of Israel was confirmed through the 1949 Rhodes Armistice treaty.

The coup d'état behind diplomatic talks can be seen since the United Nations accepted the United Nations Special Committee on Palestine (UNSCOP) proposal on territorial divisions and passed resolution 181 of which 55% of Palestinian territories were handed over to Jewish illegal immigrants. The matter became more difficult when on May 11, 1949, Israel joined the United Nations.1 This shows that the establishment of the State of Israel was strongly supported by the UN. It can be referred to resolutions 181 (II) and 194 (III).

Later, the occupation of Palestinian territory became more intense as a result of the 1967 war. This war had great implications throughout the Middle East in general and Palestine in particular. Following the Israeli invasion of Egypt, Jordan

and Syria led to Israel's success in seizing Sinai, the Gaza Strip, the Golan Heights (Syria), the West Bank and Jerusalem in the Six Day Wars war.

Following the war, 2424 UN security resolutions emerged as an effort to achieve peace and security. Security resolution no. 242 (1967) 5 and resolution no. 338 (1973) did not allow Israel to occupy Palestinian land by war and ordered the withdrawal of their troops. The resolution also emphasizes and guarantees traffic freedom in the international waters of the Middle East. Security resolution 242 became the basis and was applied in several peace negotiations including the Oslo agreement. However, Israel often violates the resolutions put forward resulting in a bilateral process that seems to be very difficult to find a solution and even more complicated.

After withdrawing the Israeli army from Lebanon, Ehud Barak (formerly Prime Minister of Israel 1999-2001) offered an offer that had two options to negotiate with Palestine, but the offer was not a realistic option. The election, among others, stated that, either they accepted the leader's "red line", especially in relation to the occupied territories, relinquished the right to return for 3.7 million Palestinian refugees and surrendered their religious and state symbols (Jerusalem) or they remained under occupation. Israel. The conflict escalated when the Palestinians reacted to Ehud Barak's assumption that he was able to end the conflict through the offer. So, of course, the Palestinians chose the third alternative, which is to rebel. The uprising was aimed at giving a clear message to Ehud Barak and as a reminder to Yaser Arafat, 7 that they would no longer accept restrictions on freedom, threats on religious and national symbols or pose their future in a precarious peace process.

The first intifada On December 8, 1987, reflecting the stand of the Palestinian people as a manifestation of dissatisfaction with Israel's treatment of the Palestinian people over the years, it was further fueled by the car accident incident deliberately planned by the Zionists resulting in the death of 4 Palestinian workers. The news spread quickly and sparked the rise of the first Intifada (1987-1993) which really threatened the position of the Israeli side in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip. The *Intifadah* came as a big shock, as the youths began to oppose the Israeli troops in an extreme way by throwing stones, throwing homemade bombs and boycotting Israeli products. As a result, Israel received a great blow both politically and economically. It also invited a counterattack by the Israeli army by dropping bombs on the Gaza Strip and the West Bank. In this regard, a peace plan was formulated to bring Israel and Palestine to the peace talks table known as the 1993 Oslo treaty.

The reconciliation process was taken seriously on the pretext of guaranteeing the integrity of the Israeli leadership in Palestine at the urging of a third party, the United States. The United States, as the main defender and supporter of the Israeli Zionis le aim, seeks to lobby the Arab countries to be ready to negotiate with Israel. The United States, Arab and Israeli peace have been able to unravel the problem in the Middle East. With the existence of peace and the willingness of the Arab countries to live peacefully with the Jews.

Peace talks began after the end of the Cold War, during which the United States took over and headed International Affairs, and after the fall of the Soviet Union, Francis Fukuyama published an article entitled "The End of History." He hopes that after the end of the cold war, a new international law will begin. President George HW Bush, in a speech on September 11, 1990, said that a rare opportunity was given to a "rare opportunity" leading to the "Order with barg" where countries in the world, East and West, North and South, could progress and live in harmony". In addition, Bush once stated that peace would be born from the Gulf War 1 which ended in 1991.

Thus, the signing of the Oslo agreement on September 13, 1993 reflects the seemingly pure United States' efforts to drive the world towards peace through the resolution of the Palestinian conflict. The peace plan is capable of changing the stand of Israel and Palestine. Israel recognizes Yasser Arafat as the official representative of the PLO. While Palestine agrees and recognizes the existence of the State of Israel. Despite the fact that Palestine has a very clear stance on the matter before. The proof is, on December 29, 1988, the PLO executive committee members reiterated their policy to destroy the Zionists and in 1989 Arafat represented Fatah clearly saying he would not accept resolution 242, would not accept the existence of Israel on the Palestinian side and would not accept any peace talks. 10 Thus, it clearly shows that Palestine so firmly denies the existence of such an illegal State.

However, due to the reasons and intrigue played by the United States to safeguard the interests of Israel, Palestine and Israel agreed to enter into a peace treaty. However, the matter proposed in the agreement is real and seems to be biased towards Israel. This clearly shows that the United States and Israel have their own agenda in creating Palestinian-Israeli peace that has never shown significant results.

2. Negotiation Process 1991-1993

After the collapse of communism and radicalism and the defeat of the Arabs in the Gulf War in 1991, new efforts arose to resolve the Arab-Israeli dispute through peace and rights sharing. Therefore, the time period 1991-1993 should be emphasized due to the short period of discussion in discussing complicated peace negotiations. The process began as early as the Madrid conference in October 1991, leading to the declaration of the Oslo Agreement (DOP).

The negotiations were conducted in secret and were not known to anyone except a few parties involved in the Oslo negotiations. Indications and suspicions were felt by other high-ranking officials such as a question posed by US Special Representative Denis Ross to Hanan Ashrawi about a secret meeting between Israel and Palestine, but Ashrawi did not know about the problem and did not give any answer.

When Ashrawi reports to Yaser Arafat about the Gaza-Jericho project in Tunis, with a different smile Yaser Arafat tells the good news to Ashrawi that Israel will withdraw directly from Gaza and Jericho and Palestine will uphold its own

sovereignty. Despite this, Yaser Arafat has not yet told Ashrawi that there is actually a negotiation between Israel and Palestine in Oslo, Norway.

It was reported that the Israeli government and the Palestinian representative (Yasser Arafat), agreed that it was time to end the problems and conflicts. Recognize each other's existence and political rights. In addition to striving to live in a state of peace maintain mutual honor and security to achieve a comprehensive peace settlement through an agreed political process.

During that period, in addition to discussing the issue of recognition, the discussion focused more on the construction of an independent Palestinian government, namely the transfer of PLO power to the PNA (Palestine National Authority) and the border of the state of Israel. However, from another angle it can also be said that the Oslo talks are an attempt to establish two countries in one territory through the "Two State Solution" in resolving the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Despite the fact that these secret negotiations were not so much agreed upon by the PLO. The PLO itself wants another option or solution other than agreeing to an agreement that does not have a clear solution and mortgages Palestinian land. However, on the assurance given by Israel (Rabin) to the PLO (Arafat) in the meeting, the PLO had to agree to the Oslo negotiations.

The matter can be referred to in the peace plan dated 1 September 1992 namely “Draft Proposal: Framework Agreement on Arrangment for Palestinian interim self-government. In the conference it was mentioned about the framework for the preparation of self-government by the Palestinians. Contains ten articles and demands, among them related to the concept of the agreement, the position of Jerusalem, the withdrawal of the Israeli army, power, security, resolution goals and the duration of the agreement.

Since January 20, 1993, serious negotiations have been conducted for five months, to reach an agreement to draft the final draft of the Peace Plan, "Declaration of Principles on Interim Self-Government Arrangements". Discussions aimed at formulating future relations between the two parties were followed by several memoranda. Among them are Faisal Husseini, Memorandum to Sec. Warren Christopher, Jerusalem on February 3, 1993, Israeli Delegation, draft of Agreed Statement of Principles Washington, D.C. On May 6, 1993, the Palestinian Delegation, Draft Proposal for a Declaration of Principles, took place in Tunis, on May 9, 1993, United States of America, Draft of the "Israel-Palestinian Joint Statement" Washington, D.C. on May 12, 1993, Palestinian Delegation, “Ten-Point Statement on The Peace Process. Washington, D.C. on May 28, 1993, and United Stated of America, draft of the "Israel-Palestinian Joint Declaration of Principles" Washington, D.C., on June 30, 1993.12

As a result of these negotiations, a successfully scheduled agreement was born, containing six pages, 15 provisions (clauses) and 4 appendix-demands that mention the position of Jerusalem and the Palestinian elections, the economy and economic development area. Because of this agreement more open, vague and

unambiguous with regard to the final status of Jerusalem, settlements, refugees, etc., so it requires some follow-up negotiations.

Through the draft agreement reached, Makovsky looked at it from the perspective of the Isreal party, stating that in the Oslo I agreement there are five elements that are out of Israeli state policy. Among them are Israel agreeing to withdraw from Gaza and give Palestine rule in its own territory, Israel agrees to negotiate Jerusalem status on final status, settlement and borders in future negotiations, and Israel agrees Palestinians can vote in elections for self-government. East Jerusalem will be part of the Palestinian territories. Finally, it is remarkable that the Israeli agreement in considering the dispute between Israel and Palestine has failed in previous negotiations.

From these statements shows Israel's willingness to handle the Oslo peace deal. However, for the Palestinian community, it considers that it is a planned agenda of the Israeli side to control and acquire all their interests in the Palestinian territories through the Oslo agreement as stated by User in Palestine in Crisis that "it is not a peace treaty but an agenda for negotiations". Whereas the Palestinians especially Hamas and the Islamic militant movement do not fully support this Oslo agreement and reject the existence of Israel as a legitimate state as stated in the article Peace Now or Hamas Later by Khalil Shikaki.18

3. Recognition in the Olso Agreement

The whole world is watching closely as the willingness of both Israel and Palestine to meet, to shake hands with each other and the recognition given by Palestinian representatives to Israel as a nation. Whereas before this, Palestine vehemently denied the existence of Israel. Israel, meanwhile, has not wavered in its stance, will not hand over the land taken during the Six Day War to Palestine.

Thus, the right to recognition was a key issue discussed between Palestine and Israel at the beginning of the Oslo agreement. The peace talks took place as early as January 20, 1993 as a series of meetings between two Israeli representatives and three representatives from the PLO, including Ahmed Qurei (Abu Ala) in Oslo, Norway in the first term. After 5 months Israel included Uri Savir from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Yoel Singer as the representative from Israel. The meeting aims to exchange letters between the PLO chairman Yasser Arafat as the Palestinian representative and Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin as the Israeli representative. The letter read "Letter Exchanged between PLO Chairman Arafat, Israeli Prime Minister Rabin, and Norwegian Foreign Minister Holst, Tunis and Jerusalem." Arafat as the chairman of the PLO signed a letter of mutual recognition on 9 September 1993 in addition to this he as the President of the PLO had signed a letter in 1988.

The letter explains the PLO recognizes the right and existence of the state of Israel to live together in peace, free from violence and all actions that could endanger peace and stability. In addition to receiving Resolutions 242 and 338 of the UN Security Council. In another statement in Arafat's letter to Rabin stated the PLO's

intention to hold a peace process in the Middle East, and hold peace talks on the conflict between the two parties and state that all issues related to the final status will be resolved through negotiations.

The letter further states that the PLO considers the signing of this agreement a historic event in the Middle East, marking a new era of peaceful coexistence, freedom from violence and all other actions that threaten peace and stability. In addition, the PLO also guarantees security, non-violence, compliance with agreements and discipline, as well as being responsible for Palestinian acts of violence against Israel.

While in Rabin's letter to Arafat, Rabin replied to Arafat's letter in just one paragraph, saying that: In light of the PLO commitments included in your letter the government of Israel has decided to recognize the PLO as the representative of the Palestinian people and commence negotiations with the PLO within the Middle East Peace Process. Thus, Israel has officially agreed and decided to recognize the PLO as a representative of the Palestinian people and negotiations began with the PLO in the Middle East peace process.

Rabin in a statement at the time of signing the letter to Arafat that this was the first agreement between Palestine and Israel since the establishment of the state of Israel. "It's a historic moment," he said, adding that he hoped the agreement would lead to the end of 100 years of bloodshed, suffering, between Palestinians and Jews, between Palestinians and Israelis.

In general, cooperation between the two parties in the Oslo agreement is a "historic" event as they reconcile the two main parties in the Arab-Israeli conflict. The conflict has two dimensions, one is the conflict between the state of Israel and the neighboring Arab countries with Palestine, the other is the clash between Jewish and Palestinian state rights. This agreement became the lifeblood of Israel because Palestinian representatives were more willing to accept it. This is due to the Israeli claim that previously planned agreements were often rejected by the Palestinians. The Oslo Accords awarded Yaseer Arafat the Noble Prize for the peace he wanted to share with Shimon Peres and Yitzhak Rabin. His tolerance for "recognized the right of the state of existence" is the recognition of the existence of the State of Israel.

4. Oslo I (1993-1995): Preparations for Self-Government

The Oslo I Agreement was signed in Washington D.C. in the presence of the President of the United States acting as mediator and chairman of the council. This Agreement is formally referred to as the Declaration of Principles on Intern Self-Government Arrangements. Also known as the "Oslo Peace Agreement" or the "Oslo Agreement" in conjunction with the final agreement reached in Oslo, Norway.

As previously noted, the Oslo I Agreement was held in two stages of meeting. In the first stage, before the signing of the agreement, a closed-door consultation was held to reach a final decision, it took place in Oslo, Norway on August 20, 1993. In the second stage, it was officially signed in a public ceremony in Washington DC on September 13, 1993 in before the Chairman of the Palestinian Liberation

Organization (PLO), Yasser Arafat, the Prime Minister of Israel, Yitzhak Rabin 25 and the President of the United States, Bill Clinton26, the agreement was signed by Mohmoud Abbas representing PLO and Shimon Peres representing Israel. The event was witnessed by US Secretary of State Warren Christopher and Russian Foreign Minister Andrei Kozyrev.

In general, the Agreement was built on the basis of the formation of the PNA for self-government or the formation of an independent Palestinian state. Palestine will have the responsibility for the administration of the territory under its own control. The Oslo Accords also demanded that Israel recognize the PLO, withdraw from the Gaza Strip and Jericho and a number of additional areas not specified during the five-year treaty. In exchange, the PLO will recognize Israel and promise to stop "violence". Final status for key issues in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict over Jerusalem, water, borders, settlements, refugees, and the future of Palestinian entities is postponed as "final negotiations".

Among the important contents discussed in the Oslo agreement is that the Palestinians will be given authority in the Gaza Strip and the West Bank for five years. Before the start of the third year of autonomy, the last border will be set for the Gaza Strip and also the West Bank. It will be a permanent border based on Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338. In addition, within two months from the date of the agreement, both parties must agree to withdraw the Zionist regime from the Gaza Strip and Jericho. After nine months of autonomy, an election should be held to elect a PA government in power in the autonomous region. Before the elections can take place, the Zionist regime (IDF) forces must withdraw from Palestinian settlements. The Palestinian autonomous government is only in power in the Gaza Strip and the West Bank. However, they can't interfere in the affairs of external relations and also can't build strength to fend off threats from outside. They are also powerless in the Zionist settlement areas of the Gaza Strip and the West Bank. Furthermore, the PA also has no rights over Jerusalem. The Zionist regime or the Israeli government has the veto power to overturn any decision made by the PA Legislative Council. Moreover, matters that cannot be resolved through a peace agreement, will be resolved through other mutual negotiations.

The transfer of power will take place in stages as stated in the agreement. PLO and P.A. no longer labeled as "terrorists" as long as their power is only to keep the Palestinian people safe. They are also responsible for preventing any armed efforts against the Zionist regime from any Palestinian people.

Basically, this "self-governing" power transfer framework will take place in two phases of implementation. In the first phase is for 5 years the transfer of power to self-government by the Palestinians and in the second phase is expected a permanent agreement. The first 3 years were temporary and 2 years later the Gaza-Jericho permanent status issue.

5. Oslo II Agreement

The Oslo II Agreement took place on September 28, 1995 and it covers much of the follow-up process for the implementation of peace negotiations in the Oslo I deal. Like the Oslo I Agreement, the United States plays a role as the organizer of the Oslo II agreement.

This agreement is broader and more complicated than Oslo I because it is more open and more detailed in the issue of the division of territory between Israel-Palestine. Among the key provisions scheduled in the agreement was to form and reassign Israeli troops outside the Gaza Strip and Jericho.

The Oslo II Agreement also states that the PNA is not responsible for foreign relations and the Israeli side of the West Bank and Gaza Strip even under the PNA. In addition Israel has twice instructed that the PNA should form a strong police force to be responsible for security and public order, which Israelis are exempt from. Israel is also demanding that Palestinian representatives ensure security for Israel from terrorism perpetrated by Hamas, parties fighting for Islamic jihad and several other series of Islamic uprisings (*intifadah*).

Apart from that, Oslo II also stated that Israel and the PNA should work together in combating criminal activities in the Gaza Strip and the West Bank. The agreement divides the West Bank and Gaza into three provinces, regions A, B, and C to detail the terms of reference and powers of both parties.

Area A: placed under the full authority of the Palestinian Authority. all areas formerly occupied by the Israeli army shifted power to the PNA, including the Gaza Strip and Jericho provinces, including the seven largest Palestinian settlements in the West Bank such as Nablus, Calcutta, Tulkarem, Ramallah, Bethlehem, Jenin and Hebron. Thus the PNA, has full responsibility for the internal security and public order in the region, as well as full responsibility for public affairs. However, area A actually only covers about 3% of the West Bank.43 While for the Hebron area only, it has khgsgs negotiations which will be included in the "Protocol Concerning The Redeployment in Hebron" on 17 January 1997.

Area B: Palestine holds civilian power and Israel holds military power. Covers 450 Palestinian cities and villages in the West Bank. This region differs from area A. The Palestinian Authority has only hovered within the public sphere, while the Israeli military powers cover key security defenses to protect its citizens and to combat terrorism.

Area C: Israel has full power and is responsible for security in this area, including settlements, roads, military bases and several Palestinian villages. The fact is that Area C is the least populated area in the West Bank.

However, special negotiations were held on the Hebron area, as it had problems in dividing the territory created by Israel. The Protocol Concerning The Redeployment in Hebron Record also states will stipulate the implementation of all remaining provisions in the Oslo II agreement through three stages ending no later than the end of 1998, which was signed on 15 January 1997.

The Hebron Protocol is therefore considered to be the culmination of a US-sponsored peace effort to save the Oslo peace deal or more generally the peace

process in the Middle East that has hardly found a solution. This follows the assassination of Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin at the end of 1995. It worsened especially after the May 1996 election, in which there was a revolt by anti-Oslo groups against the Israeli government. The group protested through an intifada at the end of September 1996. Indirectly, this action brought the Oslo peace process to the brink of destruction. Nevertheless, negotiations are ongoing to ensure the Israeli agenda succeeds. The final negotiations for this Oslo peace process series are aimed at redistributing Israeli power in areas densely populated with Palestinians. This is because, there are 400 Israeli settlements in the capital of the West Bank.

The Hebron Protocol is not a new treaty but it is part of a provision in a previous agreement that does not touch on details of Palestinian independence and sovereignty on a permanent basis, in addition to the final status of the West Bank area where Jerusalem is located. It explains two things that are considered "meaningless dreams", namely about Palestinian independence and the future of the West Bank which has been broken down into several parts. Later this agreement also officially confirmed the Palestinian settlement based on the previous agreement and Israel controlled 20% of the Hebron area.

In fact, the breakdown of these settlements has a "double standard" gnsgr that gives an advantage to the Israeli army. In addition to strengthening Israel's responsibilities in internal security issues, it further separates military jurisdiction from civilian powers. Thus, it is concluded that the Palestinian power actually only hovered within the scope of the civil power in the Jewish district only, so that Palestine does not have full power over the land.46 Moreover, Palestine cannot question the laws and jurisdiction set by Israel .

Following the postponement of all previous implementations in the Oslo agreement, the Wye River Rally was signed, signed in October 1998 by Israeli Prime Minister Binjamin Netanyahu. The memorandum aims to complete a series of temporary agreements between Israel and Palestine before final negotiations are held. Key components of this agreement include the reassignment of Israeli troops in the West Bank and the Palestinian additional commitment to Israeli security.

These negotiations were then continued in an agreement, namely Sharm al-Sheikh, which was signed by Ehud Barak in 1999. It involved the negotiation of all clauses contained in the Wye River agreement and further strengthened security. These negotiations divide the reassignment process into smaller stages without touching on many other issues.

Next, it led to the Camp David II agreement that ended Oslo's peace process held without any preparation, aimed at resolving the conflict over a century old in a matter of days. The shadow of failure was clear from the beginning when every agreement or negotiation that took place over the seven years only gave the Palestinians a choice whether to accept the Jewish proposal by "accepting all or not accepting at all". This means that if the Palestinians reject all of Barak's proposals, they will remain in a precarious state with no hope of development and no more reassignment as stipulated in the Oslo agreement. The two words given cause the

Oslo agreement to face considerable problems and lead to the failure of the planned peace efforts.

Thus, if the Oslo I and II agreements are examined comprehensively, there are many problems related to the issues arising in the agreement that are not explained and are still unclear in terms of the final decision. The distribution of power is unfair and there is inequality in terms of the division of territories, while Israel gained almost the entire territory of Palestine while the Palestinians gained only two areas, namely the Gaza Strip and the West Bank. Even the West Bank-acquired area of Palestine is a narrow area, yet unable to have full power in its own territory and is still under Israeli military control. Clearly, it shows the Palestinian people are unable to live in freedom and sovereignty in the Palestinian territories. Here it can be proved that Israel's goal is not to maintain peace and curb terrorism but to control the entire Palestinian land by presenting a false agreement.

D. CONCLUSION

Through the research done on the Oslo agreement documents and some perspectives from various parties, it can be said that the Oslo agreement has a hidden agenda. In other words it is not only an agreement, but it is a form of negotiation that has an element of coercion in submitting clauses for each document. In addition, this agreement clearly shows the non-transparent attitude displayed by the United States and its Israeli ally to conquer Palestine which is considered a historic success during the seven years of the peace process.

It can be proved through the negotiation process, from the very beginning Israel often delayed the implementation of the Oslo agreement, for example, regarding the withdrawal of Israeli troops from the Gaza Strip and Jericho scheduled for December 13, 1993, held only on May 4, 1994. Scheduled Palestinian election 13 July 1994, postponed to January 21, 1996. Then can also be seen in the Hebron Agreement signed after the May 1996 election, postponed until January 1997. Negotiations on final status especially regarding refugee rights and the position of Jerusalem should begin in the third year of the agreement, has not been discussed until the end of the Oslo peace process.

The Oslo Agreement was not as expected as a framework for the resolution of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict, but rather as a long-running new form of conflict. What is clear is that it did not promise an independent Palestinian state at the end of the peace process as Israel betrayed the Oslo agreement by continuing its illegal settlement construction activities in East Jerusalem and the West Bank. This agreement is considered rhetorical to achieve the ideals of Israel. This is clearly seen in the pretext of giving excuses by giving various reasons to continue to negotiate to reach a consensus to achieve peace. The matter is unlikely to be achieved as long as Israel acts in violation of all the agreements that have been agreed in a series of negotiations that are more appropriate to be referred to as a series of Israeli tricks.

REFERENCES

1. Aburish, S. K. (1998). *From Defender to Dictator*. New York: Bloomsbury Publishing.
2. Ashrawi, H. (1995). *This Side of Peace: A Personal Account*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
3. Behrendt, S. B. (2007). *The Secret Israeli-Palestinian Negotiations in Oslo: The Success and Why the N Process Ultimately Failed*. New York: Routledge.
4. Bishara, M. (2007). *Palestine/Israel: Keamanan atau Apartheid: Pendudukan, Keganasan dan Masa Depan*. Kuala Lumpur: Pts Publication.
5. Churchill, R. S. (1967). *The Six Day War*. Boston: Houghto Miflin.
6. Editor, (1994). *The Palestinian-Israel Peace Agreement: A Documentary Record*, Rev. 2nd Ed. Washington, D.C: Institute For Palestine Studies
7. Flamhaft, Z. (1996). *Israel on the Road to Peace: Accepting the Unacceptable*. Boulder, Colo: Westview Press.
8. Hogopian, E. C. (1997). Is the Peace Process a process for Peace? A Retrospective Analysis of Oslo. *Arab Studies Quarterly*, 19(3): 1-28.
9. Makovsky, D. (1995). Peres Talk Next Week. *Jerusalem Post*, 28.
10. Makovsky, D. (1996). *Making Peace with The PLO*: *The Rabin Government's Road to The Oslo Accord*. United Stated: The Washington Institute For Near East Policy, Westview Press. Inc.
11. Mcmahon, S. F. (2005). *The Discourse of Palestinian-Israeli Relation and the Oslo Process*: *Persistent Analytic and Practices*, (Ph.D. Thesis: University of Alberta, Canada).
12. Peres, S., & Arye, N. (1993). *The New Middle East*. New York: Henry Holt.
13. Said, E. W. (1996). *Peace and It's Discontents: Essays on Palestine in the Middle East Peace Process*, New York: Vintage Books.
14. Savir, U. (1998). *The Process: 1100 Days That Changed the Middle East*. New York: Random House.
15. Shaath, N. (1993). The Oslo Agreement: An Interview with Nabil Shaath. *Journal of Palestine Studies*, 23(1), 5-13.
16. Shikaki, K. (1998). Peace Now or Hamas Later, *Foreign Affairs*, 77(4), 29-43.
17. Shlaim, A. (1994). The Oslo Accord. *Journal of Palestine Studies*, 23(3), 22-40.
18. Shlaim, A. (2000). *The Iron Wall: Israel and the Arab World.* New York: W. W. Norton.
19. Skronski, K. F. (2001). "*The Making Peace: The Role of Leaders in the Implementation of Peace Agreement*," (Master Dissertation: McGrill University Montreal).
20. United Nations. (1990). *The United Nations and The Question of Palestine*, New York: United Nations Department of Information.
21. User, G. (1995). *Palestine in Crisis: The Struggle for Peace and Political Independence after Oslo Transnational Institute Series,* London: East Haven, Con: Pluto Press.
22. Watson, G. R. (2000). *The Oslo Accord: International Law and the Israeli–Palestinian Peace Agreements*. New York. Oxford University Press.