

# A PROPOSAL TO UNDERTAKE 'PEACE POLLS' IN SUPPORT OF RENEWED ISRAEL/PALESTINE NEGOTIATIONS

## **Briefing paper and outline application for a grant**

**Liverpool, June 22nd, 2009**

### **To:**

The Royal Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs  
7 juni-plassen/ Victoria Terrasse  
PB 8114 Dep. N-0032  
Oslo  
Norway

### **From:**

Dr. Colin Irwin  
Institute of Irish Studies  
University of Liverpool  
1 Abercromby Square  
Liverpool L69 7WY  
United Kingdom

Tel: +44 (0)151-794-3608

Fax: +44 (0)151-794-3836

Mobile: +44 (0)7908398716

E - colin.irwin@liverpool.ac.uk

W - <http://www.peacepolls.org>

## GENERAL BACKGROUND

Nine surveys of public opinion were conducted in support of the Northern Ireland peace process between April 1996 and February 2003. Critically the questions for eight of these polls were drafted and agreed with the co-operation of party negotiators to enhance the peace process by increasing party inclusiveness, developing issues and language, testing party policies, helping to set deadlines and increase the overall transparency of negotiations through the publication of technical analysis and media reports. This activity helped to build support for the Belfast Agreement that led to a 71 per cent 'yes' vote in the 1998 referendum and a subsequent period of increasing stability and peace (Irwin, 2008a, 2006a, 2002a, 2001, 1999). In an effort to internationalise this work a poll was completed in Macedonia and feasibility studies undertaken in Cyprus, Israel and Palestine in 2002 (Irwin, 2002b, 2004), the EC funded a poll in Bosnia in 2004 (Irwin, 2005a) and a consortium of agencies supported a poll undertaken as a prelude to negotiations between Kosovo and Serbia in 2005 (Irwin 2005b). In collaboration with Team CVoter of Delhi similar polls have now been completed in both Indian and Pakistan administered Kashmir (Irwin 2008b, 2008c, 2009a) and most significantly, with the support of grants from the Royal Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs (RNMFA) the working methods used successfully in Northern Ireland have now been reproduced in Sri Lanka through a close working relationship with the Chair of the All Party Representative Committee (APRC), Professor Tissa Vitarana MP, Minister of Science and Technology (Irwin 2008d, 2008e, 2008f, 2009b). Clearly the Northern Ireland methods can be applied elsewhere but regrettably this was done too late to have a positive impact on the last round of UN led Cyprus negotiations<sup>1</sup> and a series of errors with regards to critical issues in negotiation and mediation have led to similar failures in public diplomacy in other conflicts around the world, including Israel and Palestine.<sup>2</sup>

## ISRAEL AND PALESTINE

I first went to Israel in 1968 just after the 67' War and for six months worked as a diving instructor at the Red Sea resort of Eilat. It was largely my experiences as a young man in this country that prompted me to make a career of peace studies. With a post-doctoral fellowship from the Canadian government I returned to Israel in 1987 to complete a comparative study of the processes of social integration amongst Eastern and Western Jewish children who went to school together in Jerusalem and Catholic and Protestant Christian children who went to school together in Belfast (Irwin, 1992). The study was done using a Smallest Space Analysis programme developed for this purpose (Irwin and Bar, 1991) at the Israel Institute of Applied Social Research (IIASR) later known as the Louis Guttman Institute following his death in October of 1987. Given the greater cultural differences of Jewish children migrating to Israel from very different parts of the world we discovered the children in Belfast were integrating better than the children in Jerusalem.

---

<sup>1</sup> See Lordos, (2005); Wilton Park Conference, (2005) and Sir Kieran Prendergast, (2005).

<sup>2</sup> For a review see Irwin, 2005c.

The IIASR/Louis Guttman Institute is worthy of a special mention here as perhaps the first organisation to regularly monitor the state of a peace process using public opinion polls and most of the work still done in Israel and Palestine follows in that tradition of tracking key indicators of inter-ethnic attitudes and values. Indeed much of the peace and conflict monitoring around the world is shaped by this experience. Significantly these questions, for the most part, were designed by social psychologists to achieve objectivity through carefully constructed neutrality while in Northern Ireland politicians designed the questions and neutrality was achieved by working across the breadth of the political and social spectrum with an emphasis on options for policies.

Following the conclusion of the Belfast Agreement in 1998 and the ‘Mitchell Review’ of the Agreement in 1999 Atlantic Philanthropies awarded me a two-year fellowship in 2000 to explore the possibilities of applying the methods developed there internationally. This was on the recommendation of Senator Mitchell and with the assistance of this grant I made arrangements to visit Jerusalem again in 2002 and as my research there had previously been done through Jewish institutions I now made a point of affiliating myself with a Palestinian institution. The PLO in London asked me to work with the Palestinian Academic Society for the Study of International Affairs (PASSIA) in Jerusalem and they in turn arranged for me to give seminars there and at their offices in Ramallah. Through these and other meetings it soon became clear that a group of suitable people could be brought together to design and run polls similar to those undertaken in Northern Ireland. Naomi Chazan, who was then the Deputy Speaker of the Knesset and a past Director of the Truman Institute for the Advancement of Peace as well as Ghassan Khatib, Director of the Jerusalem Media and Communication Centre (JMCC) and who later become the Minister of Labour in the Palestinian Authority cabinet, both expressed a keen interest in such a project. The Director of PASSIA, Mahdi Abdul Hadi, was particularly interested in running a poll that explored the possibilities for elections in the Occupied Territories. Some questions were drafted and with the support of the French government he was to fly to Paris to examine these issues further but when his colleagues were stopped at Israeli check points and prevented from joining him at the airport the project was brought to a close and elections were not held until after Arafat’s death in 2004. Freedom of association and freedom of expression is a minimum requirement for this kind of peace research and this condition could not be met at that time.

Regrettably the public opinion polling and peace research is not as well coordinated between the two communities in Israel and Palestine as it needs to be, or even between the academics and the politicians within each community. These omissions lead to results that fail to realise their full potential by frequently examining only one side of what may be a common problem and/or leaving out what may be the most critical or important questions that need to be addressed. Here are three such examples that deal with some of the most difficult issues in the Israeli-Palestinian peace process: the future of the city of Jerusalem, refugees and the right of return, and public support for a negotiated settlement.

### *The Future Of The City Of Jerusalem*

I was invited to attend The International Conference on Jerusalem organised by the Arab League at the Royal Institute of International Affairs (Chatham House) in December of 1999. At that conference a very moderate and clearly pro-peace with the Palestinians American Jewish researcher from Maryland University, Dr. Jerome Segal, gave a very good paper on public opinion and which communities considered which districts of Jerusalem to be of particular importance to them (Segal, 1999). This programme of research was undertaken with a view to building a consensus around an eventual division of the city as part of a final settlement. Now this is probably the only realistic solution to this particular problem but unfortunately, at that time, the negotiating position of the Palestinians was for an open shared city along the lines of UN resolutions 181 and 303. But Dr. Segal had neglected to test his options against this particular scenario so all of his findings were dismissed as irrelevant. I suggested to Dr. Segal that he should now repeat his research but this time he should engage with both Israeli and Palestinian politicians and negotiators but, perhaps understandably, Dr. Segal was very disappointed with the reception his research received and decided to move on to other topics. His already low opinion of politicians sank to newfound depths. But politicians have to deal in the real worlds of their electorates and if events had followed similar experiences in Northern Ireland, and if Dr. Segal's proposals for the future of Jerusalem had proven the lesser of other evils when considered alongside the unworkable ideal of an open and shared city then the politicians just might have reluctantly accepted Dr. Segal's conclusions. Indeed, an earlier poll undertaken in 1995 by the Israel Palestine Centre for Research and Information (IPCRI) indicated that this would be the case (IPCRI, 1996). An opportunity was lost because the policies of Campbell's *adversarial stakeholder[s]* were not included in the research design (Campbell, 1984).

### *Refugees And The Right Of Return*

All wars create refugees and Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs). Sometimes they get to return to their homes when hostilities are ended but all too frequently they do not. Most of the conflicts I have worked on have generated refugees and IDPs, sometimes generation on generation only to become pawns in the politics of peace negotiations. International law is clear on this point. In Cyprus, across the new Balkan states, created from the break up of the former Yugoslavia and in Israel and Palestine all the refugees and IDPs have the right to return to their former residences but, in practice, only a minority percentage will ever get the opportunity to do so. In all these conflicts a path has to be found between the ideal of international law and the pragmatism of a negotiated settlement. Unfortunately, in Palestine, these two perspectives on the refugee problem have been researched independently of each other. For example an IPCRI poll undertaken in 2001 has a strong focus on the legal right to return with a little over 90 per cent of refugees interviewed not willing to accept compensation in place of the right of return (IPCRI, 2001). On the other hand a poll undertaken by Khalil Shikaki of the Palestinian Centre for Policy and Survey Research (PCPSR) explores various pragmatic options for negotiation and comes to the conclusion that a majority of refugees, as much as 90 per cent, would accept compensation in place of the right to return (Shikaki, 2003). These very different results precipitated a fierce debate in Palestine and the Palestinian press around the world (Sitta, 2003; Nashashibi, 2003). Shikaki's questions were condemned as

misleading by the NGOs who represented Palestinian refugees. From a public diplomacy perspective the Northern Ireland experience suggests all such options need to be tested together in the same research instrument, across all populations sampled, in an effort to avoid such criticisms. In this case a joint project between these various '*adversarial stakeholder[s]*', to use Campbell's term, would have helped to solve this problem.

#### *Public Support For A Negotiated Settlement*

With the winding up of the IIASR/Louis Guttman Institute in 1996 Professor Tamar Herman and the Tami Steinmetz Centre for Peace Research at Tel Aviv University took the program of monitoring the Israel Palestine peace process forward. They do excellent work in the best traditions of the IIASR/Louis Guttman Institute and I made a point of visiting them when I was there in 2002. Herman gave me a copy of a then soon to be published paper 'Divided yet United: Israeli-Jewish Attitudes Towards the Oslo Process' which she co-authored with Yuchtman-Yaar (Hermann and Yuchtman-Yaar, 2002). It is a very good paper in terms of its analysis of the extensive time-line data collected at the Tami Steinmetz Centre and they conclude that:

These shared values mark the red lines that policymakers cannot cross without risking the total loss of public support, as occurred in summer 2000 when Barak's far-reaching peace proposals were rejected by the majority including many in the pro-Oslo camp, leading to his government's collapse. (Hermann and Yuchtman-Yaar, 2002)

They go on to say that similar properties of public opinion may be found elsewhere and in this they are also right. A few days later Ghassan Khatib at the JMCC<sup>3</sup> showed me very similar time-line data for the Palestinian population from which it was possible to conclude that if Arafat had gone any further at the 2000 negotiations then he would also have crossed red lines that would not have been supported by his followers. In this case there was nothing wrong with the research design or the questions asked in either Israel or Palestine. In this case, unfortunately, Campbell's '*adversarial stakeholder[s]*' did not co-operate to jointly participate 'in the interpretation of results.' If peace negotiations are to be successful then realism is required on both sides and all parties need to know where everyone's red lines are. Israeli and Palestinian public opinion researchers must do this if they genuinely want to make a contribution to the achievement of peace.

---

<sup>3</sup> These data are available from the Jerusalem Media and Communication Centre. Retrieved August 6, 2006 from <http://www.jmcc.org/index.html>

## PUBLIC OPINION AND PUBLIC DIPLOMACY FAILURES

Co-operation between public opinion and peace researchers in Israel and Palestine has improved in recent years. For example the Tami Steinmetz Centre and the JMCC do joint projects<sup>4</sup> as do the PCPSR and the Truman Institute,<sup>5</sup> but when it really mattered, as noted above, that co-operation can break down. The research is often superficial when looked at alongside the Northern Ireland work and although the public opinion research done there does suggest people do want an agreement around security and a two state solution (Shikaki, 2006), most critically the research is not done as an on going collaborative enterprise with party negotiators in an effort to pin down the finer details of an acceptable accommodation. The 'people' are not brought along in and with negotiations in a pro-active public way so that when deals are attempted they tend to fail for lack of public preparation. Regrettably President Clinton's efforts may have failed because of this lack of pre-negotiation problem solving and 'stage setting' and it seems very likely that future efforts may similarly fail if negotiating practices are not improved (Klein, 2002).

With this point in mind, after presenting a paper on these issues in Jerusalem in May 2006, I invited the major Palestinian and Israeli polling and peace research organisations if they would like to engage in a joint project to introduce best practice from Northern Ireland into their work (Irwin, 2006b). All the Palestinian organisations welcomed such an opportunity, some even offered funding, but all the Israeli institutions declined. Negotiations, of any kind, it would seem, were not then part of their agenda. In June of that year Israel invaded Gaza and in July they invaded Lebanon. I repeated the offer again in 2007 with similar results (Irwin, 2007).

## ONEVOICE, PEACE POLLS AND THE NEW US ADMINISTRATION

This situation changed radically with the end of the Bush Administration and the election of Barack Obama to the White House in 2008. On the recommendation of Professor Tamar Herman OneVoice invited me to undertake a 'peace poll' in Israel and Palestine using the Northern Ireland methods. The interviews to develop the questionnaire(s) were completed in late 2008 prior to Israel's most recent invasion of Gaza. This invasion, however, delayed the fieldwork for the poll until after the Israeli elections in February of 2009 by which time Senator George Mitchell had been appointed the Presidents Special Envoy to the Middle East. I wrote to Senator Mitchell explaining that I was now conducting a peace poll in Israel and Palestine and he requested that the results and any information I might have could be sent to him 'in a timely manner'.

---

<sup>4</sup> For example the JMCC and Tami Steinmetz Centre for Peace Research, 2000.

<sup>5</sup> For a time line review of recent polls done by the PCPSR and Truman Institute, in Palestine and Israel see their web site. Retrieved August 6, 2006 from <http://www.pcpsr.org/survey/polls/2006/p20ejoint.html#thisjointasterike>

As he was familiar with using my work in Northern Ireland I couriered him a copy of the questionnaire(s) as this would indicate to him what the range of current issues were, based on my extensive interviews with the political representatives of the major parties both in and out of government in Israel and Palestine (this was normal practice in Northern Ireland). Critically the questionnaires dealt with matters of both ‘substance’ and ‘process’. Unfortunately, when I was ready to send him my report and analysis his staff at the State Department in Washington informed me that he had not been given the package I had sent him which was waiting for him on his arrival back in Washington a week hence and some three weeks after I had sent it. So I then contacted his law firm in New York and emailed my report to him there directly. He was grateful to receive it and later told me in a telephone conversation that he found the report most useful and hoped that the work could be continued in the future. So far as I can ascertain none of the recent policy statements made by the White House are at variance with the findings of this poll and report (Irwin, 2009c).<sup>6</sup>

## RESEARCH PARTNERS

There are a lot of problems with doing this kind of research in Israel and Palestine created and aggravated over the past 8 years by way of the occupation and the restrictions this places on Israeli and Palestinian researchers. For example Professor Tamar Herman used to undertake collaborative projects with Ghassan Khatib (now Professor and Vice President at Birzeit University). But Khatib had to close his Jerusalem JMCC office when he was not allowed to travel there any more and as Israelis can’t freely enter the West Bank, Jerusalem was no longer a convenient place for them to meet and thus their collaboration was brought to an end. The occupation has strained all such relationships.

The longest lasting research partnership in this regard is now between Yaacov Shamir and Khalil Shikaki. Their work is highly regarded in Israel but unfortunately, due to some of the public diplomacy errors of Shikaki, he is regarded as a collaborator by many Palestinians. This reputation is unfounded in my view but real non-the-less so it is not possible to use this pair of researchers for public diplomacy activities in Palestine. I was able to work with Dr. Mina Zemach of DAHAF on the OneVoice project. She enjoys the highest possible reputation in Israel. In Palestine I was able to work with Dr. Nader Said-Foqahaa of AWRAD. He also enjoys a very good reputation as an independent researcher who does work to the highest possible standards. He used to work for Ghassan Khatib but left to set up his own research institution when Khatib declined to ‘sign up’ to the US requirements for not working with ‘terrorists’ (he felt his University could not do this). Khatib was my first choice for working on this project but given a long-standing relationship with OneVoice I agreed to work with Nader Said. Said and Zemach have now developed a good working relationship, which can be built upon but I am still being advised by Mahdi Abdul Hadi of PASSIA to work closely with Khatib. Abdul Hadi

---

<sup>6</sup> Mitchell also made it clear to me that he does not use the ‘in house’ polling services available to him at the State Department which have become more ‘insular’ during the years of the Bush Administration.

considers him to be a more experienced political analyst (Khatib edits BitterLemons). Bearing all these points in mind I have asked Zemach and Said to provide me with quotations for the ongoing polling work in Israel and Palestine. But I do not want to 'burn my bridges' with Khatib in case I need his advice and services in the future.

At the present time 'partisan polling' is being used to distort and polarize public opinion, making a negotiated settlement more difficult to achieve (e.g. Smith Research, Jerusalem Post, 19 June 2009 with coverage also available on line at [aljazeera.net](http://i.aljazeera.net/stories/2009619123023621752.html) retrieved June 22<sup>nd</sup> 2009 at: <http://i.aljazeera.net/stories/2009619123023621752.html>). As the negative impact of such polling needs to be countered it will be important to give the parties to negotiations the impression that a well funded programme of 'peace polling' is in place so that they will better come to terms with the idea that such polls will be an integral part of a successful process. However, in the short to medium term it will be sufficient to fund just another poll or two to see how the work can best fit into the developing process environment.

At first it would be advisable to just invite the negotiating representatives of the Palestinian and Israeli governments to participate in such an exercise. But if this does not 'work out' then it would be prudent to 'cast my net' a little wider and include some opposition parties. I have discussed this with Mitchell and he leaves it to my discretion (we have done both in the past). In fact he was reluctant to give me any advice. He wants me to be independent and work on my own initiative as I did in Northern Ireland, but as in Northern Ireland, as much as possible in consultation with the negotiating parties (also as now in Sri Lanka).

OneVoice brought my-self, Zemach and Said to Washington for meetings in the Senate, House and at a number of think tanks this past week (see Appendix 1). I had a meeting scheduled with Senator Mitchell in New York for Monday the 14<sup>th</sup> but moved it to 17<sup>th</sup> in Washington so that I could attend the meeting in the Senate and chair the meeting in the House. Mitchell was very pleased that I did this as he made it clear that as well as winning a public diplomacy 'battle' in Israel and Palestine it was also important to win the same 'battles' in Washington. With this point in mind, although the peace polls work can progress without direct participation from OneVoice it will be important to place the results of the peace polls into the public domain whenever possible so that organizations such as OneVoice can take such lobbying and other grassroots activities forward. However the RNMFA may also wish to consider a role for their own Embassy in Washington in this regard.

## COSTS

My budget for my present year of funding is provided in Appendix 2. It comes to £43,238 for both my salary (half post) and expenses. I could continue to operate on this basis but it should be born in mind that I am now working full time on these projects (in fact I always have been). The allowance for expenses should also probably be increased to reflect additional time away from my home base in Liverpool. Finally it would also be

helpful to consider budgeting for Business Class travel instead of Tourist which can be quite tiring.

With regards to the costs of the polls, related support for the public diplomacy and qualitative engagement with the negotiating parties, quotations are also given from DAHAF and AWARD in Appendix 3 and 4. However we may additionally wish to consider getting competitive bids, for example from JMCC.

## THE NEXT STEPS

The recent meetings in Washington (Senate, House, think tanks and with Mitchell) followed on directly from Obama's speech in Cairo and Netanyahu's 'two state but with preconditions' speech at Bar Ilan University. I pointed out at all of these meetings that such preconditions could probably be dealt with in much the same way as they were in Northern Ireland. Namely that the people wanted real negotiations rather than 'hanging up' on preconditions and that given the support for real negotiations in both Israel and Palestine (according to our poll) a positive result could be expected in both Israel and Palestine in this regard. Hopefully this point has been taken 'on board' (a representative of the Israeli Embassy asked specifically about this and took notes at the Wilson Centre event). The point to be made here is that simply by exploring and drafting these kinds of questions with the negotiating parties it is sometimes possible to have an impact on negotiations even without running such questions in a poll. In other words, in my view, such drafting and exploring options should be started without further delay. Mitchell hopes negotiations will start in a matter of weeks rather than months and Mitchell would be pleased to take a call from the RNMFA to answer any questions your Minister or Ministry may have about my-self and my work.

In all my recent correspondence to Tore Hattram and his colleagues I have been stressing, after two years of working with the RNMFA, the need for me to visit Oslo, to discuss my work and where it is going. At the moment, given my good working relationship with Professor Vitarana, it would be wrong to terminate the project in Sri Lanka too abruptly. He may, for example, want me to return to Colombo to help with problems of implementation. I have also been asked by the UN and UNDP/Interpeace to work in Cyprus where they hope to reach an agreement by early next year. Given the fact that the Norwegian government are presently my main sponsors I should like to make any decisions as to priorities with their input. However, given all my experience and my established working relationship with Senator Mitchell and the importance of finding a solution to the Israel/Palestine conflict I would personally place this work as my number one objective. The time has probably come for me to take on an assistant and organize my work in a more systematic way. I would welcome an opportunity to discuss this and any other relevant matters with the appropriate persons at the RNMFA. Following the benefit of such discussions I will be able to submit a finalised proposal and budget as I have done in the past.

## APPENDIX 1

### Washington, D.C. Visit June 13-16

#### Saturday, June 13

Dr. Colin Irwin arrives 8:05 pm

Check in Beacon Hotel, 1615 Rhode Island Ave NW, Washington, DC - (202) 296-2100

#### Sunday, June 14

Dr. Nader Said and Dr. Mina Zemach arrive 2:29 pm (Depart New York 11:05 am)

Check in Beacon Hotel, 1615 Rhode Island Ave NW, Washington, DC - (202) 296-2100

7-9 pm *Event: Public “Peace Café” at Busboys and Poets*

Title: The Two-State Majority: Israeli and Palestinian Public Opinion on Peacemaking  
Busboys and Poets, 14<sup>th</sup> and V St. NW

Return to Beacon Hotel

#### Monday, June 15

**(SUV Car Service all day)**

9:30 am American Sedan pick-up at Beacon Hotel

10:30-11:30 am *Event: Closed-door Senate briefing*

Title: The Two-State Majority: Israeli and Palestinian Public Opinion on Peacemaking  
Dirksen 419, Constitution and First, Second, or C St. NE

1:00-2:15 pm *Event: Public House briefing*

Title: United for the Two-State Solution: The Popular Mandate for Israeli-Palestinian  
Peace

Rayburn 2200, Independent and First Street, SW

3:00-5:00 pm *Event: Public Wilson Center Special Event*

Title: The Two-State Majority: Polling for Peace in Israel and Palestine

Wilson Center, One Woodrow Wilson Plaza  
1300 Pennsylvania Ave., NW

\*\*\*For Wilson Center: A/V will provide the laptop and projector. All we need to bring is the presentation either on a flash drive or (as a back-up) attached in an e-mail that can be pulled up onto the computer if the flash drive fails. Come a little early so they can load it in a test it out before we start.

6:30-8:30 pm *Event*: Two-State Solution: A special evening with pollsters Drs. Colin Irwin, Nader Said, and Mina Zemach  
Home of Alain Chetrit  
2814 Upton St NW (at Connecticut Ave)

9:00 pm- Return to Beacon Hotel

## **Tuesday, June 16**

**(SUV pick-up at Case at 11:30, return to Beacon at end of day)**

10:30 am *Meeting*: Case Foundation  
1717 Rhode Island Avenue, NW Seventh Floor

12:30-1:45 pm *Event*: Viewpoints and Counterpoints: Opinion Trends Amid Changing Mideast Policy  
New America Foundation  
1899 L St., N.W., Suite 400  
Phone: 202-986-2700

3:00 pm *Interview*: Washington Post  
1150 15<sup>th</sup> St. NW

Approximately 4:30 Return to Beacon Hotel

## APPENDIX 2

Budget for Dr. Irwin in 2009.

Budget Item	Year One 2008	Year Two 2009
In 2008 a Fellowship at Spine Point 35 on the University salary scale - £31,840 per annum or £38,695 including pension and National Insurance contributions all calculated at 50% for a half post. Recalculated at Spine Point 41 on the University salary scale for 2009 to give £25,447 including pension and National Insurance contributions for a 50% half post.	£19,348	£25,447 <sup>7</sup>
Subsistence calculated at a per deem of £70 per day for 100 days in the field	£7,000	£7,000
Travel to London airport and return air fares for 5 return flights at £600 each	£3,000	£3,000
Two international conferences per year at £1000 each for registration fees, travel and hotel	£2,000	£2,000
Internet mobile phone purchase	£269	
Monthly line rental at £55 per month	£660	£660
Replacement Apple MacBook Pro with AppleCare	£1,992	
All other incidental expenditures and consumables including maintenance of the peacepolls.org website and overseas internet connections and mobile calls at £100 per month	£1,200	£1,200
Sub Total	£35,469	£39,307
University overhead at 10% <sup>8</sup>	£3,547	£3,931
Total	£39,015	£43,238 <sup>9</sup>

<sup>7</sup> The amount budgeted for Dr. Irwin's fellowship (for year 2) in last year's application was £19,928, calculated at last year's salary plus 3 per cent. However Liverpool University staff received a number of pay rises since then and Dr. Irwin is now being paid at Spine Point 41. But if this increase in salary is unacceptable then I have been told by my Research Office that I can take a drop in my pay to Spine Point 36 which would cost £21,932 for a half post for 2009. A saving of £3,515 for a total of £39,371 when the 10% overhead is recalculated (£3,579).

<sup>8</sup> This includes Dr. Irwin's support and accommodation in the Institute of Irish Studies at the University of Liverpool and his travel/medical insurance while in the field.

<sup>9</sup> This can be reduced to £39,371 if required. See footnote above.

APPENDIX 3

**From:** [mina@dahaf.com](mailto:mina@dahaf.com)  
**Subject:** Research budget  
**Date:** 21 June 2009 14:55:20 BST  
**To:** cirwin@liverpool.ac.uk

Dear Colin,

It was good talking to you. As for the budget (I had problems with the budget for the PR work and the meetings with politicians, as it is usually not a part of a poll's work. Let me know what you think about it):

- Poll, covering a representative sample of all Israeli citizens, age 18+ (Sample will be drawn using strata sampling method, strata are defined by the following criteria: Sector ( Israeli Arabs, Jews from the former Soviet Union immigrated to Israel since 1990, Settlers, Ultra orthodox, Kibutz residents, other Jews); Characteristics of town of residence (Size and geographical area), Gender.

Number of interviewees:	1,200.	<b>Cost:</b>
Length of questionnaire:	Same as part 1 in previous poll.	<b>\$ 31,000</b>
Discussion group (if you decide to use discussion group):		
The cost of 1 group (including presents to participants):		<b>\$1,590</b>
-P.R. work with the media:		<b>\$ 3,200</b>
-Meetings with politicians:		<b>\$ 8,000</b>

Yours,  
Mina

---

מצא אהרוני איריס

דחף מחקר מכון

68181 מיקוד 49 ירושלים 'שד פינת יפו 2 צבי בן 'רה דחף בית

טלפון: 5127744-03

פקס: 5127756-03

eMail: [mina@dahaf.com](mailto:mina@dahaf.com)

APPENDIX 4

**From:** [nader@awrad.org](mailto:nader@awrad.org)  
**Subject:** Re[2]: Research budget  
**Date:** 21 June 2009 19:30:13 BST  
**To:** cirwin@liverpool.ac.uk

Dear Colin,

In fact I sent you the detailed methodology and price for one poll yesterday, I hope that you have received it. The suggested budget format is hereunder:

One average poll (1200 sample)... \$30,000  
One discussion group ... \$2,500  
One PR media work ... \$4,000  
One round of support for meetings with politicians...\$5,000

I hope this is ok and that all will be all right. Let me know about any other needs as they arise. Good day, Nader

## REFERENCES

- Campbell, D., (1984) Can we be scientific in applied social science? In R. Conner, D. G. Altman, and C. Jackson, eds., *Evaluation studies review annual* 9.
- Hermann, T. and Yuchtman-Yaar, E., (2002) Divided yet United: Israeli-Jewish Attitudes toward the Oslo Process, *Journal of Peace Research*, vol. 39, no. 5, pp. 597-613.
- IPCRI (2001) Israel Palestine Centre for Research and Information (IPCRI), *Palestinian Refugees and the Negotiations for Permanent Status, Survey Report, August 2001*. Retrieved August 6, 2006 from <http://www.ipcri.org>
- IPCRI (1996) Israel Palestine Centre for Research and Information, *Israel and Palestinian Public Opinion on the Future of Jerusalem*. Retrieved August 6, 2006 from <http://www.ipcri.org>
- Irwin, C. J., (2009a) PaK v IaK: Getting beyond a referendum. Retrieved June 22, 2009 from <http://www.peacepolls.org>
- Irwin, C. J., (2009b) The APRC Proposals and 'Winning the Peace' (unpublished)
- Irwin, C. J., (2009c) Israel and Palestine: Public Opinion, Public Diplomacy and Peace Making. Retrieved June 22, 2009 from <http://www.peacepolls.org>
- Irwin, C. J., (2008a) Research Ethics and Peacemaking, in *The Handbook of Social Research Ethics*, Eds., Mertens, D. and Ginsberg, P., Sage, Thousand Oaks.
- Irwin, C. J., (2008b) Peace in Kashmir: Myth and Reality, *Peacepolls.org*, June.
- Irwin, C. J., (2008c) Peace in Kashmir: Myth and Reality, *WAPOR Annual Conference, New Orleans*, 13-15 May.
- Irwin, C. J., (2008d) Peace in Sri Lanka: From Symbols to Substance, *Peacepolls.org*, June 2008.
- Irwin, C. J., (2008e) Peace in Sri Lanka: From symbols to substance, (Part 1) *Daily Mirror*, Colombo, Saturday June 21<sup>st</sup> and (Part 2) Monday June 23<sup>rd</sup>.
- Irwin, C. J., (2008f) Peace in Sri Lanka: Negotiating with Northern 'Separatists'? *Groundviews.org*, August 14<sup>th</sup>.
- Irwin, C. J., (2007) The Belfast Agreement: How to win a referendum and the next election, WAPOR Regional Seminar *Public Opinion, Communication, and Elections* Jerusalem and Haifa, Israel, June 25-29.

- Irwin, C. J., (2006a) The Northern Ireland 'Peace Polls', *Irish Political Studies*, Vol. 21, No. 1, 1-14, February.
- Irwin, C. J., (2006b) Public Opinion and the Politics of Peace Research: Northern Ireland, Balkans, Israel, Palestine, Cyprus, Muslim World and the 'War on Terror', Palestinian Centre for Policy and Survey Research and the Harry S. Truman Research Institute for the Advancement of Peace joint conference: *Public Opinion, Democracy and Peace Making*, Notre Dame of Jerusalem Centre, Jerusalem, May 22-23.
- Irwin, C. J., (2005a) A People's Peace process for Bosnia and Herzegovina? *Ethnopolitics*, Vol. 4, No. 3, September.
- Irwin, C. J., (2005b) Coming to Terms with the Problem of Kosovo: The Peoples' Views from Kosovo and Serbia, October. Retrieved August 6, 2006 from <http://www.peacepolls.org>
- Irwin, C. J., (2005c) Public Opinion and the Politics of Peace Research: Northern Ireland, Balkans, Israel, Palestine, Cyprus, Muslim World and the 'War on Terror'. WAPOR 58th Annual Conference: Search for a New World Order – the Role of Public Opinion, Cannes, France, September 15-17.
- Irwin, C. J., (2004) Using Public Opinion Polls to Support Peace Processes: Practical Lessons from Northern Ireland, Macedonia, Cyprus, Israel and Palestine, in Guelke, A. (Ed.), *Democracy and Ethnic Conflict: Advancing Peace in Deeply Divided Societies*, Palgrave MacMillan, Basingstoke and New York.
- Irwin, C. J., (2002a) *The People's Peace Process in Northern Ireland*, Palgrave MacMillan, Basingstoke and New York.
- Irwin, C. J., (2002b) Forum Macedonia: An Opinion Poll and its Implications, *Ethnopolitics*. Vol. 2, No 1, September.
- Irwin, C. J., (2001) How Public Opinion Polls Were Used In Support Of The Northern Ireland Peace Process, *Ethnopolitics*. Vol. 1, No 1, September 2001.
- Irwin, C. J., (1999) The People's Peace Process: Northern Ireland and the role of Public Opinion Polls in Political Negotiations, *Security Dialogue*, Vol. 30, No. 3, September, p. 105-117.
- Irwin, C. J., (1992) How Integrated Education Works, in *Education Together for a Change: Integrated Education and Community Relations in Northern Ireland*, Ed. C. Moffat. Fortnight Educational Trust. Belfast. p. 68-84. 1993. Irwin, C. J., Integrated Education: From Theory to Practice in Divided Societies, *Prospects, UNESCO Quarterly Review of Education*. Vol. XXII, No.1, p. 67-79; (English Edition, ISSN 0033-1538, UNESCO; French Edition, ISSN 0304-3045, UNESCO; Spanish Edition, ISSN 0304-3052, UNESCO; Arabic Edition, ISSN 0254-119-X, UNESCO; Russian

Edition, ISSN 0207-8953, Moscow; Chinese Edition, ISSN 0254-8682, Beijing).  
UNESCO Paris, January.

Irwin, C. J., and Bar, H., (1991) 'Israel and Northern Ireland' in Irwin, C. J., *Education and the Development of Social Integration in Divided Societies*, Northern Ireland Council For Integrated Education. Belfast. August.

Klein, M., (2002) Bar-Ilan University, Israel, *Failed Israeli and Palestinian Interactions*, Royal Irish Academy, Friday, 22 November.

Lordos, A., (2005) *Civil Society Diplomacy: A New Approach for Cyprus?* Available online at: <http://www.help-net.gr/download.htm>.

Nashashibi, I. M., (2003) member Arab Media Watch and US Director of Deir Yassin Remembered, *Shikaki's rigged survey – Palestinians and the right of return*, Monday 25 August. Retrieved August 6, 2006 from <http://www.counterpunch.org/nashashibi08222003.html>

Segal, J. M., (1999) *A Solution for Jerusalem Grounded in the reality of the Attitude of the Israeli and Palestinian Publics*, The International Conference on Jerusalem, The Royal Institute of International Affairs (Chatham House), London, December 13, 14, 15.

Shikaki, K., (2006) Willing to Compromise, Palestinian Public Opinion and the Peace Process, *United States Institute of Peace*, Special Report 158, Washington, January.

Shikaki, K., (2003) *Results of PSR Refugees' Poll in the West Bank/Gaza Strip, Jordan and Lebanon on Refugees' Preferences and Behavior in a Palestinian-Israel Permanent Refugee Agreement*, Palestinian Centre for Policy and Survey Research, January – June. Retrieved August 6, 2006 from <http://www.pcpsr.org/survey/polls/2003/refugeesjune03.html>

Sir Kieran Prendergast, (2005) Under-Secretary-General For Political Affairs, Briefing To The Security Council On The Secretary-General's Mission Of Good Offices In Cyprus, 22 June.

Sitta, S. A., (2003) President Palestine Land Society (London), Right to return of Palestine refugees, *Al-Ahram Weekly*, 2 September 2003 and *Al Ahram Weekly English Issue* No. 651 14-20 August. Retrieved August 6, 2006 from <http://weekly.ahram.org.eg/2003/651/op11.htm>

Wilton Park Conference, (2005) *Cyprus: The Way Forward*, Report on Wilton Park Conference WPS05/24, Larnaca, Cyprus, Monday 7 – Thursday 10 February.