

The Influence of Shimon Peres on the Israel-Palestine Conflict

A research into the creation of the Oslo Accords



**Universiteit
Leiden**
Sociale Wetenschappen

Roos Neven, S1809156

Bachelor Thesis

Subject: Political Psychology in International Relations

Dr. N.J.G. Van Willigen

Second reader: Prof. dr. P. Kopecky

Word Count: 7.791

Index

Introduction	4
Chapter One: Analysing the Israel-Palestine Conflict on an Individual Level	7
Chapter Two: The Oslo Accords	11
Chapter Three: The Case of Shimon Peres.....	14
Conclusion.....	21
Bibliography	24

Introduction

The region of the Middle East can be defined as many things, but not as quiet. For years, multiple conflicts have dominated it. The Israel-Palestine conflict - as it can be called from 1948 onwards - has been ongoing for the past century. Its roots lay even deeper in history. The situation is so sensitive that it is hard to even give a neutral chronological overview of the conflict without it being contested (Caplan, 2010). Precisely this sensitivity is what makes this conflict interesting to research. As it is still ongoing to this day, it is important to take a look into the factors that have influenced this conflict. When realising what factors are of influence, a solution might come closer. Throughout these seventy years of conflict, there have been several moments where it seemed that the conflict might be solved, such as around the creation of the Oslo Accords in 1993 and 1995. However, these accords eventually failed to fully resolve the conflict. So far, the research into this conflict has mainly been on a state level, instead of on an individual level. Byman and Pollack (2001) have shown the importance of researching individuals by looking at five historical cases where individual political figures made a difference. Scholars do not recognize this importance enough and often forget that history is not inevitable and decisions made by individuals can influence international relations (Byman and Pollack, 2001). Thus, for a conflict like the Israel-Palestine conflict, it can be of great importance to shed light on individuals that might have influenced the conflict, instead of looking at state relationships or religion as causes of the conflict.

To properly examine this, the case study of Shimon Peres will be used. Peres was prime minister of Israel from 1984 until 1986 and again from 1995 until 1996. He also served as interim prime minister in 1977. Besides being prime minister, he also served different ministerial posts, namely that of the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Minister of Defense, Minister of Finances and the Minister of Domestic Affairs. He was the Minister of Foreign Affairs from 1986 until 1988, from 1992 until 1995 and again from 2001 until 2002. During his time as foreign minister, the Oslo Accords were created. Peres was involved in the process of creating these accords and later became prime minister, following the assassination of Yitzhak Rabin. Together with Yasser Arafat, leader of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), Peres and Rabin won the Nobel Prize for peace and the Félix Houphouët-Boigny-Peace Prize of UNESCO for the creation of the Oslo Accords. Peres could, therefore, possibly have had

an enormous influence on the conflict by helping create the Oslo Accords. This paper will examine whether his leadership style is in accordance with the creation of these accords and thus examine whether political figures can influence the Israel-Palestine conflict. Of course, for political leaders, one cannot simply interview them or examine them to find out their exact thoughts and base their research on this. For political leaders, the “at-a-distance”-method can be used. By examining publicly available speech records of a political leader and codifying these, one can learn something about their exact leadership style (Kesgin, 2013). Using this form of analysis, a political leader can be analysed without requiring their contribution, so that research can still be performed, even if they are unavailable for the usual research techniques (Hermann, 2005). As stated above, using this “at-a-distance”-technique, the leadership style of a political figure can be found. Leadership style is: “the ways in which leaders relate to those around them – whether constituents, advisers, or other leaders – and how they structure interactions and the norms, rules, and principles they use to guide such interactions” (Hermann, 2005, p.181). Thus, the way a political leader leads his or her country and the way they deal with their environment.

To research whether Shimon Peres has had an influence on the Israel-Palestine conflict, the Oslo Accords will be used to analyse whether he played a big part in creating these and thus determining the course of the conflict. If it is determined that this is indeed the case, it can be stated that at least some Israeli prime ministers have influenced the Israel-Palestine conflict, namely Shimon Peres. It is relevant to specifically research the Oslo Accords since these accords are a great example of an allowance between the two countries. If it does turn out that Peres influenced these, that would mean that political figures can indeed influence the course of the Israel-Palestine conflict. Of course, the case study of one prime minister is not enough to make such a general statement as to say that all prime ministers have had an influence on the conflict. However, it can certainly encourage further research into the influence of individuals on the Israel-Palestine conflict, as this research has rarely been done up until now. The Oslo Accords will be analysed and compared to the leadership style of Shimon Peres. The expectation is that the Oslo Accords can only be created by someone who has trust in others since the accords were made in collaboration with the Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO). This was the first record of

a collaboration between these two parties, as Israeli governments had always been very wary of this collaboration up until the creation of the Oslo Accords. Working together with them for the first time, must point to a grow in trust in the other party. Furthermore, the Oslo Accords are expected to be created by someone who respects constraints and is open to information, since working together with the PLO required Israeli political figures to listen to other parties than just those representing their interests. To analyse whether this is true, the Oslo Accords will be analysed thoroughly to recognize whether any aspects can point to such a leadership style. The first hypothesis is, therefore, that the Oslo Accords were created with trust in the other party, open to their information and respect for constraints. The expectation is that the leadership style of Shimon Peres matches the aspects of the Oslo Accords.

To find out what leadership style Peres has, Leadership Style Analysis (LTA) will be used. The program ProfilerPlus has been used to codify different available public verbal records. It has been chosen to use speeches and interview responses to find out whether there is a difference between these forms of public speech. According to Hermann (2005), spontaneity is an important requirement to obtain an accurate leadership style, since speeches can be prepared or written by someone else. It can be interesting to see whether there is indeed a difference between these forms of verbal records. If there would be a difference between these two, it would mean that Peres is influenced by someone else or tries to portray himself differently. The expectation is that the interview records will show a leadership style with a higher distrust of others and a higher need for power. This would mean that his prepared remarks or his speechwriters want to show a different leadership style than Peres has. The second hypothesis is that the leadership style generated based on interview responses will be different from the leadership style generated based on speeches. Meaning that Peres' spontaneous remarks show his leadership style more truly than speeches that might be prepared by speechwriters. The leadership style will be based on 112 interview responses, making up a total amount of more than 25.000 words. The leadership style based on speeches will consist of fifty speeches and almost 90.000 words in total. According to Hermann (2005), at least fifty remarks of at least a hundred words are necessary to create an accurate leadership style. It is expected that Peres' leadership style will be similar to the aspects of the Oslo Accords. The third hypothesis is that Shimon Peres will show a collegial leadership style. Hermann's terminology for

the different leadership styles will be used to determine this, by comparing the leadership of Peres to the comparison group of 122 political leaders made by Hermann (2005). The research question of this thesis is: ‘Have Israeli political figures had an influence on the Israel-Palestine conflict?’

To answer this question, there will first briefly be given a background to the Israel-Palestine conflict. It will be explained why it would be important for specifically this conflict to research it on an individual level. Secondly, the Oslo Accords will be analysed. It will be researched whether the first hypothesis is true, by looking at the content of the accords and to the process of the creation. The focus will lay on the first Oslo Accords, created in 1993, as well as the creation of the second Oslo Accords in 1995. After the aspects of the Oslo Accords have been made clear, the leadership style of Shimon Peres will be analysed. Both the leadership style generated from speeches and the leadership style generated from interview responses will be discussed to examine whether there is a difference between these two. His leadership style will then be compared to the Oslo Accords to see whether Peres has had an influence on this. It can then be concluded whether Israeli political figures have influenced the course of the Israel-Palestine conflict.

Chapter One: Analysing the Israel-Palestine Conflict on an Individual Level

This chapter will give an overview of the Israel-Palestine conflict and sketch the situation around the time of the creation of the Oslo Accords. Furthermore, the importance of analysing this conflict on an individual level will be discussed. The starting point of the Israel-Palestine conflict can be marked as 1948, the year in which the British Empire left Palestine. However, long before this point, there were already tensions between the two peoples. It is important to understand that the politics of building Israel in the Middle Eastern region contributed to the conflict. Peres’ definition of Israeli politics shows that the country is in an entirely different situation than others: “Israeli politics, then, has been concerned not only with building a new land but a new national spirit. It did not set out merely to change an existing reality, which is normally the purpose of politics and politicians, but rather to create – or recreate, after

a two-millennia lapse – a new national entity out of a people fractured and scattered across space and time” (Peres & Landau, 1995, p. 6).

As stated before, the Israel-Palestine conflict can be seen as a very sensitive subject. This sensitivity also applies to the terminology. Different terms are used within the literature to describe the conflict, such as “Israel-Arab conflict” or “Jewish-Muslim conflict” (Caplan, 2010). For this thesis, the term “Israel-Palestine conflict” has been chosen. The focus in this research will lay on the period after 1948, thus after the (re)creation of Israel. It has, therefore, been chosen to use a name that refers to the region, instead of the entity or beliefs of those involved. Since the Oslo Accords were made between Israel and the PLO, without any other countries involved, these two countries are the most important in this research. It is important to point out that this terminology has been chosen for its clarity and convenience and not to take a stance within the conflict, as it can be challenged by Israelis or Zionists (Caplan, 2010). Before giving a quick overview of the history of the conflict, some terms must be defined. Jews can be defined as a group of many ethnic, cultural and linguistic groups that derive a common identity from their belief, biological lineage or the sharing of common ancestry and traditions (Caplan, 2010). The term Zionist refers to: “people (mainly, but not exclusively, Jews) who believe in and support the quest by Jews to “return to Zion” from the lands to which they were last dispersed by the Roman conquerors of Palestine.” (Caplan, 2010, p. 47)

The first group of Zionists emigrated to the then Ottoman Palestine in 1882, in what can be called the first ‘aliya’ (wave of Zionist immigration) (Caplan, 2010). This migration happened even before the publication of ‘Der Judenstaat’ by Theodor Herzl that eventually led to mass immigration to the Middle Eastern area. In 1917 the Balfour Declaration was issued and British troops entered Jerusalem. With the Balfour declaration, British support for a Jewish state in Palestine was confirmed. From this moment on, Great Britain was in power of Palestine and emigration from Jews was supported by them. The period following consisted of protests and riots by both the new and old inhabitants of Palestine. The country remained under British mandate until 1948. After the Second World War, many more Jews immigrated towards their new promised land causing the tensions there to rise. By 1947, between 600.000 and 650.000 Jews resided in Palestine, which was ten times as much as before the First

World War. However, the number of Arabs doubled towards 1.300.000, also seeing an enormous increase (Caplan, 2010). Great Britain then decided to return the Palestinian mandate to the United Nations (UN), so that a solution for the situation could be found. The Special Committee on Palestine (UNSCOP) was appointed to make recommendations for the future of the country. They proposed a partition of the country into an Arab and a Jewish state. Jerusalem would turn into an international enclave. Resolution 181 on a partition of the country passed, even though the Arab Higher Committee (AHC) rejected it. The AHC was unhappy with the borders assigned and also shared the opinion that the UN should not be able to decide something against the will of inhabitants of a country involved (Caplan, 2010). In 1948 Britain left Palestine and the state of Israel was proclaimed by Ben-Gurion. The Arabs attacked the Jewish state and the first Arab-Israeli war began. From May 1948 until January 1949, Israel and Palestine fought over the country, with forces from Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, and Lebanon supporting Palestine. The situation remained troubled. In 1964 the Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO) was founded. In 1967 the Six-Day War started. Lasting only six days, Israel managed to defeat Egypt, Jordan, and Syrian troops. After this, Israel captured Sinai, the West Bank, and Golan Heights. Israel started building settlements in these areas. In 1973, the Yom Kippur War started. This was an attempt by Syria and Egypt to win back the lost territories of the Six-Day War. The conflicts in the region go on for twenty years, albeit without another war, but with mutual attacks. The early nineties can be seen as a period of hope in an everlasting conflict (Caplan, 2010). In 1993, the First Oslo Accords are signed. In 1995, the Second Oslo Accords are signed, meant as an interim agreement that should lead to a final peace agreement. Unfortunately, this never happened. After the signing of the Oslo Accords, some of the agreements made in the accords were broken and to this day, the situation is still troubling. However, for this thesis, the focus will lay on the period around the time of these accords.

During the beginning of the twentieth century, when the first Jews started their move to Palestine, the Arabs developed a new form of self-determination and self-awareness. They began to develop increasingly and separately as a group (Caplan, 2010). This only contributed to the conflict, since the immigration of Jews clashed with the newly found self-determination of the Arabs. The conflict is feasible in everything, even terminology as was stated above. One of the most important examples of

this is the naming of the 1948 Arab-Israeli war. This war has been named the “War of Independence” by Israelis, while Palestinians call it “al-nakba”, which means “The Catastrophe” (Caplan, 2010). Furthermore, Jews saw themselves as returning to their home country, while Palestinians saw their arrival as intruding. These differences show how deep-rooted the conflict is. As described by Shamir (1982), former prime minister of Israel, there are two trends within the Middle-Eastern region: those not accepting Israel at all and refusing to acknowledge its existence and those slowly starting to recognize the country. One more important note is that even though the territorial focus lays in Israel and Palestine other countries are involved on both sides. Already in the early twentieth century, a pattern of attracting international support started, making the conflict only more complicated (Caplan, 2010).

There have only been a few moments within this long conflict where it seemed a solution would come closer. One of these instances was the creation of the Oslo Accords. Precisely because these instances have been so rare, it is important to find out what factors influenced them. Byman and Pollack (2001) showed the importance of researching the individual level by looking at five instances in international relations where an event would have played out differently, had there been a different leader in power. Political scientists do not research individuals enough because, among other reasons, that type of research is not as suited for the generalization they seek (Byman & Pollack, 2001). According to Kaarbo (1997), researchers have failed to take personality into account due to misunderstanding of the concept of personality, focus on the prime minister as the dependent variable and methodological difficulties. One way of researching individuals within international relations that has been used is by looking at the constraints political leaders can face. However, these constraints are not necessarily fixed and they mainly depend on the leaders themselves and how they view them (Keller, 2005). The constraints itself are not the defining factor, but how political leaders react to these constraints is, which is in turn based on personality differences (Cuhadar, Kaarbo and Kesgin 2015). Another aspect that could be seen as an influencing factor within international relations is the position of a political leader itself. Cuhadar, Kaarbo, and Kesgin (2017) researched whether personality or role could be of influence within international relations and concluded that personality does not change due to a change of position. It can, therefore, be concluded that the personality of leaders can be of influence

in international relations and thus that political figures could have influenced the Israel-Palestine conflict.

Chapter Two: The Oslo Accords

In the past chapter, an outline of the Israel-Palestine conflict has been given and the importance of research on an individual level has been emphasized. To examine whether Shimon Peres influenced the Israel-Palestine conflict, the Oslo Accords will be analysed. The expectation is that Peres played a big role in the creation of these accords, thus influencing the conflict. To investigate whether this is the case, qualification of the Oslo Accords should be made in such a way that it can be coupled to a certain leadership style, to which the leadership style of Peres should be compared. This chapter will focus on such qualification by first analysing the Oslo Accords and its content and then looking at the main characteristics of its creation. By examining the Oslo Accords, an expectation of by what the accords were influenced by can be drawn up.

When the accords were first signed in 1993, Oslo I was still called the “Declaration of Principles” (DoP). This document contained new rules and regulations that were eventually supposed to lead to the solution of the conflict. However, this solution never came about. Nevertheless, the accords are important to take into account. Rabin, at the time prime minister, and Peres decided to look into the options for a possible accord in 1992. In the beginning, it was not the intent to work together with the PLO. Their favoured negotiation partners were Jordan and local Gaza and West Bank Palestinians (Rynhold, 2007). However, they were unable to deliver an agreement. Especially Rabin was opposed to working with the PLO. Previous Israeli governments had refused to cooperate and by taking in a more centrist position than Peres, Rabin was successfully elected as prime minister. He had ruled out an independent Palestinian state and complete withdrawal from the Golan Heights and did not want to lose the centrist voters he had gained by taking this position (Rynhold, 2007). However, Peres was in favour of following the European Community model for creating an agreement, influenced by the France-German collaboration within the European Union. This approach required a negotiating partner (Rynhold, 2007). Therefore, it was not possible to create an agreement without some sort of collaboration with the Palestinians. Peres did not see working together with the PLO as a zero-sum

game, but as something that both parties could benefit from. It was important to him that the other party could also gain something from collaborating (Ziv, 2014). Besides this, Peres avoided dichotomies and did not talk about “they” and “us”, but about “we” when discussing the collaborations, in contrast to Rabin, who was, at first, opposed to the collaboration (Ziv, 2011). Israel thus collaborated with the PLO for the first time, after years of refusing to do so. By working together, the ‘legitimate and political rights of the Palestinian people’ were recognized by Israel for the first time. Even though Rabin was opposed to an independent Palestinian state, collaborating with the PLO hinted at some sort of Palestinian independence or statehood (Rynhold, 2007).

The Oslo Accords declared that Israel would withdraw itself from Gaza and Jericho and eventually the West Bank. In the first instance, Peres adopted a “Gaza-first” approach, but collaborating with the PLO, this turned into a “Gaza-plus” approach, meaning that besides withdrawing from the Gaza strip, Israel should also withdraw from Jericho and later the West Bank (Peres & Landau, 1995). Besides this, the Oslo Accords promised five years of limited autonomy for the Palestinians living in the Gaza strip, Jericho, and the West Bank. The Second Oslo Accord led to the division of the West Bank in three different areas and built further upon the first Oslo Accord. It superseded the Gaza-Jericho Agreement signed in 1994, the Agreement on Preparatory Transfer of Powers and Responsibilities Between Israel and the PLO also signed in 1994 and the Protocol on Further Transfer of Powers and Responsibilities signed in 1995. Both Accords were interim agreements, meaning that they were not meant as a final agreement, but as a step eventually leading to a peace agreement. That is the reason why the Second Oslo Accord was created and superseded the other agreements. However, a final peace agreement never came.

The Oslo Accords were a major change in Israel’s foreign policy. They could even be seen as one of the most promising decisions ever taken by Israel (Rynhold, 2007). It did remain evident that Rabin was not the one in favour of collaborating with the PLO, but that Peres was the instigator for this. Rabin did see it as fortunate that the withdrawal of the Gaza Strip, Jericho, and the West Bank would ensure that Israel could become both more democratic and keep its Jewish character since these regions were dominated by Palestinian inhabitants, but besides this one benefit, he was not too pleased with it

(Rynhold, 2007). Rabin had, on multiple occasions, stated that he would never want to collaborate with the PLO (Shlaim, 1994). There are even accounts of him calling the collaboration impossible (Lieberfeld, 2008; Peres, 1995). The collaboration with the PLO thus displays the new and changed character of Israel's foreign policy. Former governments had firmly rejected this, but in 1993 it became possible for the first time. The Oslo Accords, therefore, point to the open-mindedness that had grown within the Israeli government. Working together with a party that was formerly rejected, shows that the trust in the other party had grown. Collaborating with the PLO had not always been the plan, but Peres thought that an agreement without them would be impossible (Shlaim, 1994). On multiple accounts, he tried to convince Rabin of working together, but it took some time before he agreed (Peres, 1994). By downplaying the significance of collaborating with the PLO, Peres managed to eventually convince him (Ziv, 2011). Working together was, in contrast to what Peres told Rabin, indeed very significant. By granting some (temporarily) autonomy to the Palestinian people and making the promise to leave the occupied areas, Israel's foreign policy displays a different character than before. Still, after the decision had been made to collaborate with the PLO, there were some differences in Peres' stance towards this collaboration and Rabin's stance. Peres saw it as an absolute benefit that the first talks with the PLO happened without media-coverage, so that the two parties could talk directly without being influenced by their surroundings, whereas Rabin was sceptical that something would come of the talks (Peres, 1993). Furthermore, Peres had a very clear idea of what should come out of these talks and what his vision was, but Rabin did not (Shlaim, 1994). For these reasons and the fact that Peres had to convince Rabin to negotiate with the PLO, this collaboration can be seen as largely initiated and thus influenced by Shimon Peres.

Collaborating with a party with whom collaboration was always rejected, points to a lesser need for power and a greater ability to understand the other party. The first hypothesis can, therefore, be seen as correct: the collaboration shows a trust in the other party and respect for constraints, by accepting the withdrawal of not only the Gaza Strip but also Jericho and the West Bank. The fact that previously an agreement like this could not have been possible due to the collaboration with the PLO and the fact that the European Community Model was adapted, two major differences can be seen in the situation in

Israel around the time of the creation of the accords. Due to Peres' inspiration by the European system and the willingness to do concessions and work with a different party, there is a good reason to believe that this situation was influenced by an individual, namely Shimon Peres, personally. If he had not been the foreign minister at the time the Oslo Accords might not have been made. Peres had always made his position on the conflict clear and his willingness to work with the PLO was known within his environment (Peres, 1994). Furthermore, during the time of the creation of the Oslo Accords, Rabin was seen as being on the hawkish side of the Labour Party and Peres as having moved to the dovish side (Shlaim, 1994). It can, therefore, be expected that Peres is the one that influenced the Oslo Accords. However, to draw this conclusion, Peres' leadership style should firstly be analysed to examine whether this indeed matches the characteristics of the Oslo Accords.

Chapter Three: The Case of Shimon Peres

This chapter will focus on Shimon Peres and analyse his leadership style. As stated in the introduction, to analyse Peres' leadership style the method of Leadership Trait Analysis (LTA) will be used. This "at-a-distance"-method makes it possible to analyse political figures that would normally not be accessible (Kesgin, 2013). LTA uses verbal records of political figures to get an insight into the characteristics of that figure. The more frequently certain words are used, the more noticeable these words are to the leader. A percentage of how often a leader is in a situation where he or she could use a certain word and does so can then be drawn up. This, in turn, refers to certain personality traits (Hermann, 2005). The leadership style generated by LTA is based on three questions:

- 1) How do leaders react to political constraints in their environment – do they respect or challenge such constraints?
 - 2) How open are leaders to incoming information – do they selectively use information or are they open to information directing their response?
 - 3) What are the leaders' reasons for seeking their positions – are they driven by an internal focus of attention within themselves or by the relationships that can be formed with salient constituents?
- (Hermann, 2005, p. 181).

The answers to these questions can be found with the help of LTA and, taken together, define the leadership style of a certain political leader. Whether a leader is open or closed to information, challenges or respects constraints and focusses on problems or relationships, determines whether his or her leadership style is expansionistic (challenges constraints, closed to information, and problem focus), evangelistic (challenges constraints, closed to information, and relationship focus), actively independent (challenges constraints, open to information, and problem focus), directive (challenges constraints, open to information, and relationship focus), incremental (respects constraints, closed to information, and problem focus), influential (respects constraints, closed to information, and relationship focus), opportunistic (respects constraints, open to information, and problem focus), or collegial (respects constraints, open to information, and relationship focus) (Hermann, 2005). These questions are supported by seven traits. Whether the traits apply to a certain leader can be determined by LTA. The seven traits are the following:

- 1) the belief that one can influence or control what happens, 2) the need for power and influence,
- 3) conceptual complexity (the ability to differentiate things and people in one's environment),
- 4) self-confidence, 5) the tendency to focus on problem solving and accomplishing something versus maintenance of the group and dealing with others' ideas and sensitivities, 6) general distrust or suspiciousness of others, and 7) the intensity with which a person holds an in-group bias. (Hermann, 2005, p. 184).

The belief in the ability to control events and the need for power are related to whether a leader respects or challenges constraints: if a leader's belief in the ability to control events and the need for power are high, he or she will challenge constraints. Self-confidence and conceptual complexity are related to whether a leader is open to information. If these are high, a leader is open to information. Focus on problem-solving, general distrust of others and in-group bias relate to whether the leadership style of a leader is problem or relationship focus (Hermann, 2005).

In 2001, ProfilerPlus was introduced. This online program makes the computerised analysing of verbal records possible. The introduction of computerised analysing not only makes generating a leadership style easier and more time-efficient, but it also ensures more objective and replicable results

(Kesgin, 2013). Therefore, this thesis will make use of ProfilerPlus. Hermann (2005) made a distinction between different types of data that can be used to generate a leadership style. Online available materials are often speeches or interviews. Speeches might be written for the leader by speechwriters and are generally very well-prepared and thought-out beforehand. Interview responses are therefore listed as the preferred material since, usually, these are more spontaneous. Even interviews can be prepared, by for example listing several subjects where questions can be asked about or by having interviewers sent in the questions beforehand. However, generally, these are still more spontaneous and, therefore, more suited to generate a leadership style based on the personality traits of a leader since leaders are less in control and will show their personality traits more (Hermann, 2005). It can be interesting to see if there is indeed a difference in leadership in interview responses and speeches since this would indicate whether a leader is consistent in his leadership style or not. If a leader is not consistent, it would mean that he or she either portrays themselves as different to the public than they are, by putting work in creating speeches that portray them a certain way. Or it could mean that the leader is surrounded by political advisers or speechwriters that try to emphasize different characteristics by influencing a leader's speech. Even if interviews are the preferred material, it can still be worth it to compare these two leadership styles, since it would be interesting to discover that a leader portrays himself or herself differently in different occasions. To find out whether this is the case for Shimon Peres, both speeches and interview responses will be used to generate a leadership style of Shimon Peres.

To generate a leadership style, at least fifty responses of at least a hundred words are needed, but dependability on the leadership style will only increase if more responses or more words are used (Hermann, 2005). A database of 112 interview responses composing of a total of more than 25.000 words has been used to generate a leadership style for Peres based on his behaviour during interviews. Besides this, fifty speeches have been used, making up almost 90.000 words in total, to generate a leadership style for Shimon Peres based on his speeches. All speeches and interview responses used have been spoken in English, so no data needed to be translated. Using translations can be problematic since important subtleties in texts can be lost when translating them to English (Hermann, 2005). When using ProfilerPlus scores for each of the traits will be generated. These scores can then be compared to

a comparison group of leaders. Hermann (2005) generated a norming group of 87 heads of state from 46 different countries and a norming group of 122 political leaders from 48 different countries and also include, for example, members of the cabinet. For this research, the norming group of 122 political leaders is the most interesting to compare to, since data from Peres during his time as Foreign Minister is also used. In most research using LTA, presidents have been analysed. Israel knows prime ministers, but LTA can still be applied to Peres. Kaarbo and Hermann (1998) showed in their research that LTA can be applied to prime ministers and that actions of prime ministers are also of influence on the foreign policymaking process. Therefore, LTA is also useful to study the influence of Peres on the Israel-Palestine conflict. However, it is necessary to use the comparing group of 122 political leaders, instead of the 87 heads of state. To compare the norming group, the scores for each trait generated by ProfilerPlus should be analysed. If the score on a trait is one standard deviation higher than the norming group, the leader scores high for that trait. If a leader's score on a trait is one standard deviation lower than the norming group, the leader scores low for that trait. If the score lays within this range, then the leader scores moderately on that trait (Kesgin, 2013). Table 1 shows the results of the comparison groups as made by Hermann (2005).

Table 1.

Comparison groups by Hermann

Personality Trait	87 Heads of State	122 Political Leaders
Belief can control events	Mean = .44 Low < .30 High > .58	Mean = .45 Low < .33 High > .57
Need for power	Mean = .50 Low < .37 High > .62	Mean = .50 Low < .38 High > .62
Self-confidence	Mean = .62 Low < .44 High > .81	Mean = .57 Low < .34 High > .80
Conceptual complexity	Mean = .44 Low < .32 High > .56	Mean = .45 Low < .32 High > .58
Task focus	Mean = .59 Low < .32 High > .71	Mean = .62 Low < .48 High > .76
In-group bias	Mean = .42 Low < .32	Mean = .43 Low < .34

	High > .53	High > .53
Distrust of others	Mean = .41 Low < .25 High > .56	Mean = .38 Low < .20 High > .56

Note: Reprinted from “Assessing leadership style: A trait analysis.” by Hermann, 2005, In J.M. Post (ed), *The psychological assessment of political leaders* (178- 212), p. 204.

Peres’ score based on speeches and his score based on interview responses on the seven different traits will thus be compared to the results listed above, with the second category of the 122 political leaders. The second hypothesis was that his leadership style based on speeches would differ from the leadership style based on interview responses. Therefore, a distinction between these two instances has been made, which lead to the following results:

Table 2.

Leadership style of Shimon Peres

Personality Trait	Interview responses	Speeches
Belief can control events	.34	.36
Need for power	.23	.29
Self-confidence	.56	.44
Conceptual complexity	.63	.61
Task focus	.59	.55
In-group bias	.08	.14
Distrust of others	.12	.17

Note: The scores on interview responses are based on 112 interview responses (a total of more than 25.000 words) and the scores on the speeches are based on 50 speeches (a total of almost 90.000 words).

As can be seen in table 2, Peres does not score very differently on his traits during interviews than during speeches. His self-confidence is higher during interview responses, meaning the words such as “me” and “mine” were used more often in comparison to during speeches. However, both the score on self-confidence during interview responses and during speeches fall within the moderate category. During his speeches, Peres scores higher on his belief in his ability to control events, need for power, in-group bias and distrust of others, while he scores lower on his self-confidence, conceptual complexity, and task focus. For all scores, there is no difference between whether they fall under the category high, low or moderate if compared to Hermann’s norming group. This means that the eventual leadership

style of Peres, based on Hermann's categories, is the same for both instances and that the differences within the categories have no effect on the leadership style. It can, therefore, be stated that there is no real difference in leadership style for Peres between his speeches and interview responses. The second hypothesis can thus be rejected. Peres does not show a different leadership style in prepared remarks, then in spontaneous ones, meaning that he does not try to portray himself differently or does not let his speeches be influenced by speech writers in such a way that they do not represent himself anymore.

The third hypothesis was that Peres would show a collegial leadership style. To see whether Peres respects or challenges constraints, the traits for belief in the ability to control events and the need for power need to be analysed. On the need for power, Peres scores low. A low score means that Peres does not need to be at the forefront when making decisions and does not mind not getting the credit. He does not need all the power for himself and focuses on the group around him (Hermann, 2005). On his belief in the ability to control events Peres scores moderately. Even though the score is not low enough to be considered 'low', the difference is very small. It can, therefore, be expected that Peres is a more reactive type of leader, less likely to take initiative and preferring others to take the responsibility (Hermann, 2005). The combination of scores on these two traits shows that Peres will respect constraints and that consensus and compromise are important to him (Hermann, 2005).

Whether Peres is open or closed to information, can be analysed based on his score on self-confidence and conceptual complexity. Peres scores moderate on his self-confidence. This means that his behaviour is expected to be consistent, but that he is not immune to incoming information from his environment (Hermann, 2005). Peres scores high on his conceptual complexity. Conceptual complexity is "the degree of differentiation that an individual shows in describing or discussing other people, places, policies, ideas, or things." (Hermann, 2005, p. 195). A low score indicates that a leader is always looking for more information and does not make decisions too quickly (Hermann, 2005). Peres scores higher on his conceptual complexity than on his self-confidence, this means that he is open to contextual information. He is responsive and open to those around him (Hermann, 2005).

Finally, it should be analysed whether Peres is motivated by problems or relationships. Therefore, it will be analysed what Peres' motivation for seeking office is by looking at the score on

task focus. This will be compared to his motivation towards the world, based on the scores on in-group bias and distrust of others. Peres scores moderate on the trait of task focus. This means that he can be seen as problem and as relation focus, depending on the context. Peres will both use interactions with others to focus on the tasks that need to be done as well as to look at the feelings and needs of others. In-group bias is the view of the leader's group as the centre of the world. Peres scores low on the trait of in-group bias. He is interested in his group as a separate entity, but more willing to interact with other groups (Hermann, 2005). Peres scores low in the distrust of others. He can still distrust other groups, but the distrust will then be based on the current situation or experience. He will not automatically distrust a group, solely because they do not belong to his group (Hermann, 2005). Peres does not see the world as a threatening place. He acknowledges constraints and sees cooperation as possible. His focus is on taking advantage of opportunities and relationships.

Peres thus respects constraints, is open to information and focuses on relationships. Using Hermann's (2005) division, Peres' leadership style can be seen as collegial. This means that "the focus of attention is on reconciling differences and building – consensus on gaining prestige and status through empowering others and sharing accountability" (Hermann, 2005, p. 185). This means that the third hypothesis can be accepted. Peres is open to information and has a low distrust of others, he has a low in-group bias meaning that he is willing to cooperate with other groups, which he showed by adapting the European Community Model and by being willing to work together with the PLO and does not see this collaboration as a zero-sum game. All these traits were necessary for the creation of the Oslo Accords. It can, therefore, be assumed that Peres had a great influence on the creation of these accords and thus on the Israel-Palestine conflict. As a prime minister and as a foreign minister, he has promoted cooperation with other parties and has continuously strived to solve the conflict. Completely in line with his leadership style, he was the first to work together with the PLO, something that previous governments were opposed to. The cooperation with the PLO was the sole reason the Oslo Accords were possible (Rynhold, 2015). The Oslo Accords were of influence in the situation and for a while seemed to lead to a solution to the conflict. Therefore, it can be stated that Shimon Peres influenced the Israel-Palestine conflict

Conclusion

In the previous chapters a background of the Israel-Palestine conflict has been given and the importance of researching international relations on an individual level has been emphasized. The Israel-Palestine conflict started even before the creation of Israel in 1948, with tensions running higher as more Jews immigrated to Palestine from the beginning of the twentieth century. From 1948 onwards, there have been multiple wars between the two countries and Israel has occupied several parts of Palestine. In the early nineties a hopeful period arrived with the creation of the Oslo Accords. Both accords meant as interim agreements, these eventually should have led to a solution for peace. The Accords, among other things, granted the Palestinians limited temporarily autonomy and ensured withdrawal from the Israeli's of the Gaza strip, Jericho, and eventually the West Bank. Especially since this conflict is still ongoing, it is important to find out what factors influenced the conflict. The importance of research on an individual level has been shown by previous research, so it is useful to apply this to this conflict. To research whether Israeli political figures could have influenced the Israel-Palestine conflict, one case was used. The Oslo Accords were analysed and the creation of these accords was qualified. Thereafter, the leadership style of Shimon Peres was investigated using the technique of Leadership Trait Analysis. 112 interview responses and 50 speeches, both during his time as prime minister and as Foreign Minister, were analysed to find out what leadership style Shimon Peres had and whether this leadership style differed based on the context of a speech or during interviews. In total, more than 25.000 words from interview responses and almost 90.000 words from speeches were analysed to generate his leadership style, using the program ProfilerPlus.

To answer the research question: "Have Israeli political figures had an influence on the Israel-Palestine conflict?" three hypotheses were composed. The first hypothesis was that the Oslo Accords were created with trust in the other party, openness to their information and respect to constraints. This hypothesis could be accepted. During the creation of the accords, Israel collaborated with the Palestinian Liberation Organisation for the first time. Previous governments had rejected this possibility, but due to Peres' inspiration by the European Community Model, they now did agree with collaborating. It can, therefore, be expected that Peres has influenced the accords, which in turn influenced the Israel-Palestine

conflict. The second hypothesis was that the leadership style generated based on interview responses will be different from the leadership style generated based on speeches. This hypothesis can be rejected. Even though there were minor differences between the scores on different traits, these scores still fell into the same category in Hermann's categorization, meaning that both scores generate the same leadership style. Peres scored higher in interview responses on self-confidence, conceptual complexity, and task-focus, while he scored lower on his belief in his ability to control events, the need for power, in-group bias, and distrust of others. But all differences were minimal and did not make a difference in the eventual leadership style. Therefore, the second hypothesis is rejected. The third hypothesis was that Shimon Peres will show a collegial leadership style. Peres's scores on the different traits were compared to the comparison group of 122 political leaders, as drawn up by Hermann (2005). Peres scored low on his distrust of others, moderately on task-focus, moderately on his belief in the ability to control events, low on in-group bias, moderately on self-confidence, high on his conceptual complexity, and low on his need for power. From the analysis of his trait scores, it became known that Peres respects constraints, is open to information and focuses on relationships. This does indeed point to a collegial leadership style and the third hypothesis can be accepted. Peres focuses on consensus-building and relationships and is open to information around him.

This research has tried to prove that Israeli political figures have influenced the Israel-Palestine conflict. It can be stated that Peres has done so, due to his collaboration with the PLO, the Oslo Accords were possible. The Oslo Accords made the early nineties a hopeful period and gave limited autonomy to Palestinians. Even though it is evident that Peres influenced these conflicts, it is important to realise that he might not be the only factor of influence. There were more parties involved that influenced the course of the creation of the Oslo Accords. According to Peres' leadership style, he has been important, but other factors should not be overlooked. There were more people involved in the creation of the accords and the timing or international factors could have influenced the creation of these accords as well. It can thus be stated that Israeli political figures can have an influence on the Israel-Palestine conflict, however, just one case is too little to draw the general conclusion that all Israeli prime ministers have influenced the conflict. This research has tried to lay the foundation for future research in other Israeli prime

ministers or other factors of influence on the Israel-Palestinian conflict so that a better image of this conflict can be shaped. If Peres has influenced the Israel-Palestine conflict, then other leaders can be expected to have done so as well. This research has, therefore, tried to show how important the research of individuals within international relations is. Especially within a conflict such as the Israel-Palestine conflict that is still ongoing, it is important to know what the conflict is influenced by and what consequences political figures can have to get a full understanding of the conflict. Then, careful predictions about the conflict could be made. Future research should focus on other political leaders or factors of influence, but this research has laid the foundation for researching individuals within the Israel-Palestine conflict. By researching cases such as the case of Shimon Peres, a greater understanding of the Israel-Palestine conflict can be achieved and the factors of influence of this conflict can be discovered. Eventually, this might even lead to understanding the conflict better.

Bibliography

- Byman, D. L., & Pollack, K. M. (2001). Let us now praise great men: Bringing the statesman back in. *International Security*, 25(4), 107-146.
- Caplan, N. (2010). *The Israel-Palestine conflict: Contested histories* (Contesting the past). Chichester, U.K.; Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Cuhadar, E., Kaarbo, J., Kesgin, B., & Ozkececi-Taner, B. (2015). Examining leaders' orientations to structural constraints: Turkey's 1991 and 2003 Iraq war decisions. *J Int Relat Dev*, 20(1), 29-54.
- Cuhadar, E., Kaarbo, J., Kesgin, B., & Ozkececi-Taner, B. (2017). Personality or role? Comparisons of Turkish leaders across different institutional positions. *Political Psychology* 38(1), 39-54.
- Hafner-Burton, E. M., Hughes, D. A., & Victor, D. G. (2013). The cognitive revolution and the political psychology of elite decision making. *Perspectives on Politics*, 11(2), 368-386.
- Hermann, M. (1986). *Political psychology* (The Jossey-Bass social and behavioral science series 810799146). San Francisco, CA [etc.]: Jossey-Bass.
- Hermann, M.G. (2005). Assessing leadership style: A trait analysis. In J.M. Post (ed), *The psychological assessment of political leaders* (178- 212). Michigan: University of Michigan.
- Kaarbo, J. (1997). Prime Minister Leadership Styles in Foreign Policy Decision-Making: A Framework for Research. *Political Psychology* 18(3), 553-581.
- Kaarbo, J., & Hermann, M. (1998). Leadership styles of prime ministers: How individual differences affect the foreign policymaking process. *Leadership Quarterly*, 9(3), 243-263.
- Keller, J. W. (2005). Constraint respecters, constraint challengers, and crisis decision making in democracies: A case study analysis of Kennedy versus Reagan. *Political Psychology*, 26(6), 835-867.

- Kesgin, B. (2013). Leadership Traits of Turkey's Islamist and Secular Prime Ministers. *Turkish Studies, 14*(1), 136-157.
- Lieberfeld, D. (2008). Secrecy and "Two-Level Games" in the Oslo Accord: What the Primary Sources Tell Us. *International Negotiation, 13*(1), 133-146.
- Peres, S., & Arye, N. (1993). *The New Middle East*. New York: Holt.
- Peres, S., & Landau, D. (1995). *Battling for peace : Memoirs*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson.
- Rynhold, J. (2007). Cultural shift and foreign policy change; Israel and the making of the Oslo Accords. *Cooperation and Conflict, 42*, 419-440.
- Shamir, Y. (1982). Israel's role in a changing Middle East. *Foreign Affairs, 60*, 789.
- Shlaim, A. (1994). The Oslo accord. (Declaration of Principles on Interim Self-Governing Arrangements for Palestinians in the Gaza Strip and Jericho). *Journal of Palestine Studies, 23*(3), 24-40.
- Ziv, G. (2011). Cognitive Structure and Foreign Policy Change: Israel's Decision to Talk to the PLO. *International Relations, 25*(4), 426-454.
- Ziv, G. (2014). *Why hawks become doves : Shimon Peres and foreign policy change in Israel*.