

DOI: <https://www.doi.org/10.36719/2789-6919/08/127-132>

Seymur Teymur Baghirov
ADA University
Master's degree
Sbaghirov10764@ada.edu.az/+

WHY ISRAEL IS OPPOSED TO A TWO-STATE SOLUTION

Abstract

The recent failure of the America-brokered peace dialogs between Palestine and Israel depicts problems in solving the two-state solution. Such efforts have also been witnessed in finding the Israel and Hamas solution. Provided an analysis of some of the previous failures that were characterized with bloody fights, the prevalent impasses can cause desperation in finding the two-state solution between Israel and Palestine. Having come across such issues, this paper seeks to broadly analyze the two-state solution is compromised by the existence of numerous adverse factors. Such factors include the refugee problem or Palestinian Jews residing in Israel, the conflict over Jerusalem, division among the two-state leaders, boundary rivalry, among other problems. The problems that hinder two-state solution between Israel and Palestine is evaluated through a synthetic interactive or comparative case study methodology. The methodology has followed two research designs known as review and correlation research designs. From the discussion, the major finding is that there is much blame game on the ground between the leaders from two nations. Perhaps the division among the Palestinians' leadership is what triggers division to widen. Still, the research has discovered that Israel is not ready to leave Jerusalem, especially the West Bank for Palestine. Hence, my interpretation on this issue is that the nature of confrontation between these countries is likely to continue for a longer period. The problems will continue if third parties do not intervene in the wrangles as defined in the analysis below.

Key words: *Israel, Palestine, conflict, two-state solution, border*

Seymur Teymur oğlu Bağirov

İSRAİL NİYƏ İKİ-DÖVLƏTLİ HƏLLƏ QARŞIDIR

Xülasə

Məqalədə Fələstin və İsrail arasında Amerikanın vasitəçiliyi ilə aparılan sülh dialoqlarının son uğursuzluğu iki dövlət həllinin problemləri təsvir edilir. Bu cür söylər həm də İsrail və HƏMAS-la aparılan sülh danışıqlarında həll yollarının görmək olar. Əvvəlki uğursuzluqlardan bəziləri təhlil edilərsə, dalana dirəniş İsrail və Fələstin arasında iki dövlətli həllin tapılmasında ümitsizliyə səbəb ola bilər. Bu cür problemlərlə qarşılaşan bu məqalə vəziyyəti geniş təhlil etməyə çalışır ki, iki dövlətli həll bir sıra xoşagəlməz amillərin mövcudluğu ilə güzəştə gedir. Belə amillərə İsraildə məskunlaşan qaçqınlar və ya fələstinli yəhudilərin problemi, Qüdsə bağlı münaqişə, iki ölkə liderləri arasında fikir ayrılığı, sərhəd rəqabəti və digər problemlər daxildir. İsrail və Fələstin arasında iki dövlətin həllinə mane olan problemlər sintetik interaktiv və ya müqayisəli nümunə tədqiqat metodologiyası vasitəsilə qiymətləndirilir. Metodologiya icmal dizaynı və korrelyasiya tədqiqatı kimi tanınan iki tədqiqat dizaynını əsaslanır. Müzakirələrdən əsas nəticə odur ki, iki xalqın liderləri arasında bir sıra problemlər var. Fələstin rəhbərliyi arasındakı fikir ayrılığı vəziyyətin gərginləşməsinə səbəb olur. Bununla belə, araşdırma nəticəsində İsrailin Qüdsü, xüsusilə də İordan çayının qərb sahilindən Fələstinə keçməyə hazır olmadığı ortaya çıxıb. Ona görə də bu məsələ ilə bağlı şərh ondan ibarətdir ki, bu ölkələr arasında qarşıdurmanın xarakteri daha uzun müddət davam edəcək. Aşağıdakı təhlildə müəyyən edildiyi kimi, üçüncü tərəflər mübahisələrə müdaxilə etməsə, problemlər davam edəcək.

Açar sözlər: *İsrail, Fələstin, konflikt, iki-dövlətli həll, sərhəd*

Introduction. Finding of two-state solution would set up Palestine as an autonomous country alongside Israel. Each part would be operating freely without interference from each other. The two-

state solution factor is a controversial issue as both Israel and Palestine offer genuine reasons when arguing over the issues affecting their people. In practice, the solution would permit Israel to enjoy her security by letting the nation hold the Jewish population majority as its people. At the same time, Palestine would be granted her sovereign autonomy as opposed to the current supervision by the Israeli forces, especially in the West Bank region. Nations such as the U.S. need to be commended over her efforts to restore peace between Israel and Palestine on their crisis. Partaking in peace compromise for 16 years requires patience and persistence. For instance, the debate on why Israel is against the two-state solution can be traced back in 1993 when PLO and Israel established an Oslo Accord for peaceful co-existence [Lerner, 2018, pp.3-5]. However, the Oslo Accord has not materialized since numerous issues have arisen between the two countries.

While evaluating the situation between Israel and Palestine, one would readily state that the problem might last even more that it has existed. Even though there is a prospect to find the solution, more expertise is needed to strike an agreement over the matter. The porous borders of the two nations have set in disputes overextension of both nations. This has also resulted in a security dilemma that compromises the lives of many citizens. Other factors that are presented as major dilemmas in the case scenario between Israel and Palestine comprise of settlements factor, the refugee problem, the nature of Jerusalem, and the rights to access some basic human needs. The efforts of the third-party participation in the issues, America in particular, have been futile. Therefore, this research paper focuses on these parameters to establish why Israel is against the two-state solution with Palestine.

Conceptual Framework

The issue over Israel and Palestine has posed numerous questions that remain unanswered. One would ask, why is the answer to the two-state factor quite hard to be settled? As most people view Israel as a problem in establishing the solution, there is also an urge to assess whether or not Palestine is genuine in her argument. Firstly, the issue of border dispute is a renowned factor that has led many nations into skirmishes. Before assessing how the two countries struggle over the border factor, it is vital to find a theory that describes the border issue. The international relation theories or the IR theories are known for handling territorial disputes [Lustick, I.2019, p.1-5]. IR models often provide factors that trigger confrontation and approaches to be applied while solving territorial aspects. In this case, the IR theories try to find suggestions and insights that the IR theories can provide during border uncertainties [Bao H. 2018, p.328-341]. The common territorial theories in the modern world comprise of neorealism, conventional, and neoliberalism.

Israel and Palestine have shown that both the IR models need to be applied in finding a solution to their problems. Today, an observer will readily identify that the territorial dispute is a major factor that hinders the two-state solution to be achieved. For many years, the U.S. has tried to use neorealism, conventional, and neoliberalism theories to develop a borderline between Israel and Palestine. Why is the solution not found? Such a question triggers historian scholars, humanitarian agencies, and other professionals to question the ability of these IR models. Nonetheless, territorial theories have a limit under which they must be applied. Such limits entail economic, social, and political factors of nations. In this case, the paper looks back in 1967 when a border was drawn during the Arab-Israeli skirmishes that caused more harm than good. As Israel keep on constructing structures in the land where Palestine claims to belong to them, there is a need to establish the historical, political, and economic factors behind the practice. Historians such as Bao Hsiu-Ping [2018, pp.328-340] blame Israel for putting up border barriers in the West Bank. This is a de facto border issue that compromises the sovereignty of independent Palestine. As time pass, the future of Palestine expanding remains futile since it is divided into non-contiguous sectors. Now, Israel is highly infringing on the Palestine space at the expense of her poor citizens.

From the above analysis, the IR theories such as neoliberalism emerge as a dominant factor in this case. Neo-liberalism happens as a 20th-century model that copies insights from the 19th-century resurgence of economic liberalism. The pathway can be used to solve the border dispute in the Israel-Palestine two-state solution by highlighting the economic interest of each party. However, there is a multifaceted aspect of the border dispute that requires synthetic interactive methodology. The

methodology has to be grounded on a series of factors in the international relation models such as constructivism, liberalism, and neo-liberalism [Shaver et al. 2019, pp.115-138]. This is because border disputes have turned out to be the riskiest global flashpoint in terms of causing deaths, loss of wealth, and hatred. They often associate with the militarized inter-state issues that have prospects of causing uncertainties.

Jerusalem

Furthermore, Jerusalem is a city that scholars such as O'Malley Pdraig view as a factor that curtails an establishment of a two-state solution. In their article "Israel and Palestine: The Demise of the Two-State Solution," it is hard to establish peace using either the constructivism, liberalism, or neo-liberalism IR theories to find a lasting solution. As most historian scholars depict, Israel has placed claim over Jerusalem as their capital, a place of worship, and a region where most cultural endeavors ensue. The situation, in this case, can be equated to a winner takes it all practice where the country with a stronger army occupies a larger space in another nation. From most analyses, it is predictable that the two-state issue is fundamentally advocating for a division of the Palestinian East region and an Israeli West state in Jerusalem. However, diplomacy might fail to convince Muslims, Jewish, and Christian believers that Jerusalem can be divided. Religious rivalry can be worse than either political, social, or economic factors. Since religion is grounded on the spiritual beliefs and faith, the condition can activate wrangles between Israel and Jerusalem than before. What does "undivided capital" as put by Jerusalem mean? Such issues have Israel to annex the Eastern part of Jerusalem where most structures have been erected.

Other issues that are outlined under this conceptual framework regards the refugee problem and the security dilemma. Firstly, the refugee problem has seen numerous Palestinian people settling in Israel due to internal wrangles. Although the mass movement of Palestine people from their region in 1948 aimed at keeping Palestinians safe, these refugees have a right to choose where to reside. However, Israel views the demographic majority of the Jews as being vital to their development. Massive movement of this population out of their nation will cause uncertainties to the nation. The factor turns out to be a non-starter for the Israeli nation. On the other hand, the security dilemma has caused problems on the foreign military occupation and people in Palestine. As much as Israel avoids the takeover of the West Bank region, the situation causes unpredictable events in this region.

Liberalism. Based on the two analyses above, the concept of liberalism best fits the IR on this perspective. Liberalism, as seen in most cases, looks at the consent, liberty of the governed, and parity of law. Liberals present a broad array of viewpoints based on their comprehension of economic principles. While outlining the economic principles, liberal theory as used in the Israel-Palestine two-state solution looks at free trade, free markets, personal liberty, among other factors that are beneficial to the two states. Other factors that arise between Israel and Palestine in their two-state solution are freedom of religion, racial parity, capitalism, internationalism, among other issues. The two-state solution should use the principle of liberalism by analyzing the moral argument that focuses on the right and freedom of all citizens. Here, it is vital to evaluate the wellbeing of humans as essential aspects of enhancing a just political structure. A just political structure is associated with checked power that does not entail dictatorship or monarchy. Here, establishing political, social, and economic structures that offer human freedom is fundamental in assessing the issue being presented. Even though these factors have more features of domestic politics, the reality of the international relations between Israel and Palestine is helpful to liberals since a nation's actions can also impact its overseas relations. The two nations are majorly troubled by two factors; political uncertainties and materialistic foreign affairs. These are the factors that can trigger Israel and Palestine to partake in feuds. One of the nations might experience adverse effects since it lacks military autonomy. But then again, the establishment of a strong military power by either Israel or Palestine can be applied in causing conflicts in other foreign states. This is a major concern of the influential nations such as the U.S. at some point, this power will be applied in oppressing the country's people. The political authority that is constructed in liberalism as seen in the Israeli-Palestine conflict has limited the military strength of the two nations as seen in the above description. The situation is also devastating as there is a likelihood to experience civil control over the military.

Terrorism

More so, the wrangle over territorial imperialism and expansion in Israel and Palestine is a risky factor to the liberals. This happens when nations want to build their empires in other nations as seen between Israel and Palestine. For the case scenario of Lewis Jr Kenneth, the expansionist war threatens the livelihood of people. Still, it is procedural and requires a long-term commitment from both nations. Here, the occupation and control of Israel in Palestine as a foreign land necessitates Israel to establish definite bureaucracies that have targets to keep or enlarge her powers. As presented in the liberal theory, such matters have a dilemma of fashioning a political structure that permits countries to safeguard themselves from foreign powers without subverting their people to problems. Protecting the rights of the majority is regarded as the rights of the citizenry. Although liberals that reside in Palestine have a right to vote out incompetent leaders, the problem remains on how to drive away Israel autonomy from their territories.

Many questions arise from the Israel-Palestine two-state solution. For instance, what might ensue if the two nations do not find a lasting solution to their problem? This is a common guess that can be brought out as presented by Mr. Kerry, the U.S. presidential aspirant. Failure to get a solution to this matter might force Israel to decide whether it wants to enjoy her democratic right or retain the Jewish population. Other factors such as boundary problems, security matters, among other factors will also be exposed to contentious grounds. The decisive nature of the two nations, especially Palestine, exposes them to a continual disagreement process that might be devastating. In 2015, about 74% of the Jewish in Israel accepted that “decisions vital to the state on issues of peace and security should be made by a Jewish majority [Waxman D. 2011, pp. 68-82].” Here, it seems that the Jewish community is already dominating Israel in major areas, including political and economic endeavors.

Methodology: The methodology that is applicable in this scenario is known as synthetic interactive or comparative case study methodology. The methodology has to be grounded on a series of factors in the international relation models such as constructivism, liberalism, and neoliberalism as presented in the discussion. A synthetic interaction method is sometimes called the difference-in-difference (DID) approach [Ben H., 2019, pp.177-203]. This approach is applied in time-series when cross-sectional data is used to analyze factors in research as seen between Israel and Palestine war. Also, synthetic interaction methodology has power over the most vital innovation in policy assessment. Previously, this method has been used to research the impact of “right-to-carry laws” of a given state. Matters are synthesized before law makes decisions on the best approach of solving existing disputes. The synthetic interactive methodology can best fit in the Israel-Palestine wrangles, especially on the settling of the refugee problem. The reason is that this method looks at an in-depth issue that affects refugees (refugee policy) by highlighting fundamental rights and freedoms of people [Lewis Jr, 2018, p.251]. Other factors that the methodology can use to solve include economic policies that entail Jerusalem City, corporate political policies, solving of the targeted criminology, and other oversea problems. Today, these policies are used elsewhere as the primary data evaluation tools in diverse regions.

Also, the comparative case study or the synthetic approach is helpful because it can be used beyond social sciences, economic factors, engineering, and biological disciplines. In this case, the method can be well used in the Israel-Palestine case scenario while comparing factors that hinder the two-state solution between these countries. Initially, the comparative case analyses have been used to assess large-scale actions or sometimes aggregate interventions among the conflicting regions. The method was successfully used to solve the problem of unemployment in Miami in the U.S. during the 1980 [Lerner, 2018, p.3]. The approach was applied by comparing the rate of joblessness in Miami during the boatlift period and then compared it to the average emergence of the native unemployment in other major four city-states of America. Consequently, scholars such as Shaver and Guy have used this method to compare Pennsylvania to find the rate of minimum wage rate on employment with states like New Jersey. The analysis was majorly done in fast food restaurants where employees have frequently complained over low wages.

Therefore, a downside of comparative case studies methodology in the research is that the choice of the evaluation units is not formalized and often depends on casual reports of attraction or empathy between

the groups affected by the series of actions. Besides, when the elements of observation are a small number of cumulative entities, such as in Palestine and Israel cases, such units might fail to a proper comparison for the regions affected by the intervention. Thus, the placement of major embargoes on the movement between persons and property between Israel, Gaza, and West Bank limits the use of an interactive or comparative case study methodology to find lasting answers on the two-state solution factor [Malley O. 2017, p.12]. The problem has existed since the period of Oslo and possesses major economic predicaments to the two nations. For example, the per capita income of Palestine in Gaza and the West Bank region has undergone inflation as compared to the per capita income at the time of the second intifada. Between 2008 and 2009, the per capita income was slightly over \$1000. The figure is lower as compared to the period between 1997 and 2000 where per capita income of Gaza and the West Bank ranged from \$1200 to \$1500 [Habib S. 2016, pp.193-204]. The economy of Palestine is likely to worsen if the status quo is not changed as it largely relies on foreign and goods that move in and out of the nation, including into and out of Israel. Some of the sponsors of food to Palestine is Egypt [Muslih, M. 1990, p.14]. In the above analysis situation, the prescribed Gazan economy has been greatly affected to a virtual standstill, and illegitimate sneak in from tunnels between Gaza and Egypt's Sinai Peninsula has boomed. Such issues present problems when using a comparative case study approach to assess the relationship between Israel and Egypt and the probability to establish a two-state solution [Ilan P., 2010, p.424].

Conclusion. Despite scholars assessing the notion of boundary issues, there is still a huge research gap to be solved. For example, there are no exact issues that make one nation to have an interest in another country's territory. Here, scholars put that Israel has structured buildings in Palestine without providing the logic behind this problem. Most likely, the prevalent literature has rarely focused on the socially-constructed aspect of boundaries. This is a research gap that needs to be evaluated in length. Still, the aspect of casual import of domestic politics ought to be reconsidered. While assessing domestic politics, Israel and Palestine dispute will have to focus on the institutional-statist theory that looks at how war is caused by the inter-state disputes. When this theory is applied to solve the Israeli-Palestine wrangles, other factors such as the 1947/1948 Indo-Pakistan border issues will be brought into limelight [Farsakh L. 2011, pp.55-71].

As seen in the research, some people view the idea of a two-state solution as non-functional. There is much blame game on the ground. Perhaps the division among the Palestinians' leadership is what triggers division to widen. For example, the kind of leadership exercised in the West Bank has failed to attain political legitimacy that can achieve a far-reaching but proper two-state solution. The situation seems to worsen as the governance practiced in Gaza has failed to recognize the efforts of Israel to establish mutual co-existence among them. As much as the U.S. is trying to find a lasting solution to the problem, Israel and Palestine ought to agree amongst themselves before letting intruders or external players into their security matters [Habib S. 2005, p.48]. One might see Israel leadership as one that supports the two-state solution in theory. Practically, the deal is dead on arrival due to the steps that leaders have taken towards finding a lasting solution to the problem.

References

1. Bao, Hsiu-Ping. (2018) "The One-State Solution: An Alternative Approach to the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict?" *Asian Journal of Middle Eastern and Islamic Studies* 12, no. 3? 328.
2. Ben Hagai, Ella, and Eileen L. Zurbruggen. (2019) "Bridging Narratives: Predictors of Jewish American and Arab American Support for a Two-State Solution to the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict. (2019) *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy* 19, no. 1,177-203.
3. Edward, S. (2005) *The Only Alternative, 'From Oslo to Iraq and the Road Map* (New York: Vintage, p. 48.
4. Farsakh, L. (2011) "The one-state solution and the Israeli-Palestinian conflict: Palestinian challenges and prospects." *The Middle East Journal* 65, no. 1 (2011): 55-71.
5. Habib, S. (2016) Too late for two states: The benefits of pivoting to a one-state solution for Israel and Palestine." *Journal of International Affairs* 69, no. 2 (2016): 193-204.

6. Ilan, P. (2010) 'One-State Palestine: Past, Present and Future', in Ilan Pappé and Jamil Hilal ed., *Across the Wall: Narratives of Israeli-Palestinian History* (London: I.B. Tauris, p. 424.
7. Lerner, R. M. (2018) 'Two-State Solution Dead? Time for One Person/One Vote.' *Tikkun* 33, no. 3
8. Lewis Jr, Kenneth L (2018) 'Peace in Israel and Palestine: Moving from Conversation to Implementation of a Two-State Solution.' *Sw. J. Int'l L.* 24 ?251.
9. Lustick, I. S. (2019) *Paradigm Lost: From Two-State Solution to One-State Reality*. University of Pennsylvania Press/
10. Muslih, M, (1990) 'Towards Coexistence: An Analysis of the Resolutions of the Palestine National Council', *Journal of Palestine Studies* 19(4), p.14.
11. Malley, O.Padraig. (2017) 'Israel and Palestine: The Demise of the Two-State Solution.' *New England Journal of Public Policy* 29, no. 1?12.
12. Shaver, Benjamin L., and Guy Z. (2019) 'A Near-consensus: Israel's Security Establishment and the Two-state Solution.' *Survival* 61, no. 3 (2019): 115-138.
13. Waxman, D.(2011) 'Israel's Palestinian minority in the two-state solution: The missing dimension.' *Middle East Policy* 18, no. 4, 68-82.

Reviewer: s.ü.e.f.d Eldar Jafarov

Göndərib: 12.03.2022

Qəbul edilib: 18.04.2022