ISRAEL'S RETURN TO SECURITY-BASED DIPLOMACY

Dan Diker

Senior Foreign Policy Analyst, Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs; Adjunct Fellow, Hudson Institute

Diplomacy-Based Security vs. Security-Based Diplomacy

For most of the past 17 years of Israeli peace diplomacy, since the 1993 Oslo Declaration of Principles signed with Yasser Arafat's Palestine Liberation Organization, Israel's vital security requirements have been relegated to a position of secondary importance in the service of reaching a final peace agreement. Israel's traditional "security-based diplomacy" approach to foreign relations that had anchored the Jewish state's defense doctrine since the Six-Day War in 1967 had been reversed. Instead, a doctrine of "diplomacy-based security" had come to dominate Israeli diplomatic thinking, as peace agreements were thought to be the guarantor of Israel's safety.

In service to this new doctrine, Israeli efforts to end the Arab-Israeli conflict, including the Annapolis process in 2008, the Gaza disengagement in 2005, the Lebanon withdrawal in 2000, and the Camp David Summit in 2000, were marked by far-reaching and often unilateral Israeli concessions. At the same time, the Israel Defense Forces were called upon to retrofit Israel's security needs into a political model instead of establishing security "red lines" prior to or in the initial stages of diplomatic initiatives.[1]

Israel's previous policy of making concessions first and trying to enforce its vital security rights and requirements second has raised international expectations that Israel will continue to offer an intransigent Palestinian leadership greater concessions as "sweeteners" to coax them into negotiations. The Palestinians, in contrast, have been sensitizing the international community to what the PA leadership calls "Palestinian rights" underpinning their statehood quest.[2] The public silence of Israeli governments on Israel's own rights-based case for a viable, secure Jewish state with defensible borders has encouraged confusion among allies and exacerbated the antagonism of adversaries.

Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu's foreign policy speech at Bar-Ilan University on June 14, 2009 – the first one of his administration – represented a fundamental restoration of Israel's security- and rights-based approach to the conflict. Netanyahu's sharp break from past policy was his insistence, up front, that reciprocity govern relations between the sides: that Israel be recognized as the nation-state of the Jewish people,[3] that a future Palestinian state be demilitarized, and that Israel's critical security needs be honored.

Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu delivers a major policy speech at Bar-Ilan University, June 14, 2009. Netanyahu called for the Palestinian leadership to recognize Israel as the nation-state of the Jewish people, called for the establishment of a demilitarized Palestinian state, and stated that Jerusalem would remain Israel's united capital city.

Netanyahu was indeed articulating a new Israeli political consensus about the peace process, and at the same time restoring Israel's traditional, "security-first" approach to diplomacy that had been reflected in Israeli policy by every Israeli government from 1967 until the first years of the Oslo peace process.

Israel's return to security-based diplomacy and insistence on Palestinian demilitarization and defensible borders are vital guarantors of Israel's security in the face of the profound uncertainties surrounding both the Palestinians and the rise of Iranian power in the region.

When it came to the West Bank, the security-first approach was guarded by Prime Ministers Yitzhak Rabin and Benjamin Netanyahu. Ariel Sharon would also protect Israel's rights and security interests there, despite his unilateral withdrawal from Gaza. Netanyahu's revival of this approach since his 2009 election seems particularly relevant in the context of Iranian- and Al-Qaeda-backed campaigns to threaten Arab regimes amenable to the West, such as Saudi Arabia, Jordan, Egypt, Lebanon, and the Gulf States. At the same time as the Iranian regime leads a campaign to destabilize the Sunni regimes that have either made formal or de facto peace with Israel, the Iranian regime funds, trains, and arms terror groups on Israel's northern and southern borders, and even in the West Bank.

In this context, Israel's return to security-based diplomacy and insistence on Palestinian demilitarization and defensible borders are vital guarantors of Israel's security in the face of the profound uncertainties surrounding both the Palestinians and the rise of Iranian power in the region.

Netanyahu's Bar-Ilan Speech

When Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu stood before a packed auditorium at the Begin-Sadat Center for Strategic Studies at Israel's Bar-Ilan University, it was a defining moment. Several months earlier, he had established a strong center-right coalition that reflected a 30 percent rise in public support for right-of-center parties.[4] The Israeli public was looking to move away from the policies of former Prime Minister Ehud Olmert, whose unsuccessful bid to negotiate a peace accord and establish a Palestinian state had brought him to offer unprecedented concessions to Palestinian leader Mahmoud Abbas.[5] Despite Abbas' public admission of Olmert's far-reaching concessions, the Palestinian leader noted that there remained "wide gaps between the sides" that had led to the collapse of peace talks.[6] Newly-elected President Barack Obama had placed exceptional pressure on the Netanyahu government for additional concessions, including a full freeze on Jewish building in the West Bank and parts of Jerusalem that contradicted firm understandings reached with the Bush administration and even collided with the Oslo Accords and the policies of the Clinton administration.[7]

Netanyahu accepted the notion of a future Palestinian state,[8] but insisted that the Palestinians would need to make reciprocal gestures and accept two principles: recognition of Israel as the nation-state of the Jewish people; and demilitarization of a future Palestinian state and accession to additional security guarantees, including defensible borders for Israel.[9] He also stated that Jerusalem would remain a united city under Israeli sovereignty.

Netanyahu placed Israel's national rights and vital security needs first, and only then accepted Palestinian demands. This was a major shift away from the Olmert approach at Annapolis, where many of the fundamental security requirements that Israel had insisted upon in the past were dropped in the context of far-reaching concessions he had offered to Mahmoud Abbas.[10]

Prime Minister Netanyahu's commitment to a security-first paradigm has been well-received by Israelis because nearly two decades of concession-driven diplomacy not only failed to yield security or earn international goodwill, but led to broad public understanding that Israel's security situation had become perilous.

During the first three years of the Oslo process, more Israelis were killed by Palestinian terror attacks than during the fifteen years prior to the signing of the Oslo accords in 1993.[11] The collapse of the Camp David Summit in 2000 and the ensuing suicide bombing war claimed the lives of more than 1,100 Israelis.[12] Israel's withdrawal from southern Lebanon in 2000 led to an emboldened Hizbullah firing more than 4,000 rockets at Israeli cities in the 2006 Second Lebanon War. Furthermore, Israel's withdrawal from Gaza in 2005 multiplied the rocket and mortar attacks from there on southern Israel – more than 12,000 since 2001 – and resulted in Israel's defensive operation in Gaza in December 2008 and January 2009 that was condemned around the world.[13] The failure of Oslo, Annapolis, and territorial withdrawals to improve the prospects for peace did not deter Israelis from yearning for peace. But they did offer a sobering lesson to the Israeli public about the dangers of indulging in wishful thinking. The public today is in no mood for unrealistic plans that

are long on hope and short on credibility. They want security first, and a united Jerusalem. Netanyahu's Bar-Ilan speech was so well received in Israel because it articulated this broad public consensus.[14]

Netanyahu's approach won the support of more than 70 percent of the Israeli public, according to a poll conducted by *Ha'aretz* the day after the speech.[15] *Ha'aretz* columnist Ari Shavit called the speech "Netanyahu's Revolution," compared the prime minister to Theodor Herzl – the founder of modern Zionism, and noted: "With the seven-word formula – a demilitarized Palestinian state alongside a Jewish Israeli state – he changed the discourse on the conflict from its very foundations. He set an unprecedented challenge before the Palestinian nation and the international community."[16]

Elaborating on his thinking, Netanyahu noted in a November 2009 speech, "We have to ensure that weapons do not flow into the Palestinian areas of the West Bank, which overlooks Tel Aviv and surrounds Jerusalem."[17] On March 3, 2010, Netanyahu told the Knesset Foreign Affairs and Defense Committee that the Jordan Valley's strategic importance along the eastern border of the West Bank made it impossible for Israel to withdraw from there.[18]

This was not the first time that Netanyahu stressed the security-first paradigm for peacemaking. In early 1997, during his first term in office, Netanyahu was asked by the Clinton administration to agree to a "further re-deployment" (FRD), in accordance with the Oslo Agreements, that required Israel to make a new withdrawal of an unspecified size in the West Bank.

Instead of engaging in a debate with the administration over the terms of a "credible" re-deployment, including specific percentages of territory, Netanyahu asked the IDF to provide him with a security map delineating Israel's vital territorial needs in the West Bank that would be required for the country's defense. The IDF map came to be known as "The Interests Map," and Netanyahu took a version of it to Washington to present to President Bill Clinton.[19] Netanyahu's decision-making at the time illustrated an important principle of his approach to peacemaking on which he insisted then and still embraces today: Israel's formal diplomatic positions on the peace process must be derived by first establishing its security needs, rather than the reverse.

Restoring Israel's Security-First Approach

Netanyahu's insistence on a demilitarized Palestinian state and defensible borders did not represent a new strategy. Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin had presented his vision for defensible borders at the height of the Oslo peace process, on October 5, 1995, during the Knesset ratification of the Oslo II interim agreement. He said of the final-status arrangement with the Palestinians: "The borders of the State of Israel, during the permanent solution, will be beyond the lines which existed before the Six-Day War. We will not return to the 4 June 1967 lines."[20] In fact, Rabin told the IDF leadership that Israel would need to retain approximately 50 percent of the West Bank in any future settlement.[21]

Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin, like Netanyahu today, insisted on retaining the Jordan Valley, telling the Knesset in 1995: "The security border of the State of Israel will be located in the Jordan Valley, in the broadest meaning of that term."

Rabin, like Netanyahu today, insisted on retaining the Jordan Valley, telling the Knesset at the time: "The security border of the State of Israel will be located in the Jordan Valley, in the broadest meaning of that term."[22] Rabin meant that the Jordan River alone was an inadequate defensive barrier to prevent hostile forces and weaponry from reaching the West Bank's high ground, and that Israel would need to rely on the eastern slopes of the 2-3,000-foot-high West Bank mountain ridge that rises from the Jordan riverbed, constituting the Jordan Rift Valley. This was clearly Rabin's intention when he stipulated that Israel needed this zone in "the broadest meaning" of the term. Rabin also insisted on

maintaining a united Jerusalem under Israeli sovereignty.

Rabin had rejected a fully sovereign Palestinian state, telling Israeli lawmakers in 1995, "We would like this to be an entity which is less than a state, and which will independently run the lives of the Palestinians under its authority."[23]

On April 14, 2004, Prime Minister Ariel Sharon exchanged letters with President George W. Bush in which Israel committed to withdraw from Gaza and the United States endorsed defensible borders for Israel.[24] A week later, Sharon explained the language of the U.S. letter to the Knesset, noting that the U.S. guarantees included two territorial components: Israel would retain the major settlement blocs in the West Bank and would also obtain defensible borders. In the midst of his Hebrew address, Sharon repeated "defensible borders" in English to emphasize the American presidential commitment. Implicit in Sharon's review of the U.S. letter was that beyond the large settlements close to the pre-1967 lines, there was also recognition of a vital geographic zone in the West Bank, namely the Jordan Valley.[25] Sharon told *Ha'aretz* on April 24, 2005, "The Jordan Rift Valley is very important and it's not just the rift valley we're talking about [but]... up to the Allon road and a step above the Allon road. In my view, this area is of extreme importance."[26]

Defensible Borders: Historical Context

The 1949 armistice lines, which stood as Israel's de facto eastern border from the end of the War of Independence until the 1967 Six-Day War, left the Jewish state with critical vulnerabilities and were therefore unsuitable as permanent borders. Israel's former foreign minister, Abba Eban, referred to these lines in 1969 as "Auschwitz borders that must not be restored."[27]

Yigal Allon, a commander of the pre-state Palmach and foreign minister under Rabin, was the architect of the defensible borders doctrine. In a 1976 essay in *Foreign Affairs*, he wrote:

One does not have to be a military expert to easily identify the critical defects of the armistice lines that existed until June 4, 1967....The gravest problem is on the eastern boundary, where the entire width of the coastal plain varies between 10 and 15 miles, where the main centers of Israel's population, including Tel Aviv and its suburbs, are situated, and where the situation of Jerusalem is especially perilous. Within these lines a single successful first strike by the Arab armies would be sufficient to dissect Israel at more than one point, to sever its essential living arteries, and to confront it with dangers that no other state would be prepared to face. The purpose of defensible borders is thus to correct this weakness, to provide Israel with the requisite minimal strategic depth, as well as lines which have topographical strategic significance.[28]

In Allon's view, which was shared by successive Israeli prime ministers, the concept of defensible borders means that Israel has a right and a responsibility to establish boundaries that provide for its citizens' basic security requirements, as opposed to accepting a geography that invites attack. This has always meant that Israel would retain some territories east of the 1949 armistice lines as part of any peace agreement with the Palestinians, especially in the largely unpopulated Jordan Valley.[29]

Allon's plan for defensible borders has been a key point of reference for Netanyahu over the past 14 years. Netanyahu's former foreign policy advisor, Dr. Dore Gold, noted that in 1997 Netanyahu proposed a plan for a final agreement with the Palestinians based on what he termed "Allon plus."[30]

Israel's Confused Diplomatic Messages

The international criticism of Netanyahu's security-first posture is more comprehensible when considered in the context of the heightened expectations that were created by the willingness of previous Israeli governments to make deep concessions first, and only then attempt to retrofit Israeli

security requirements. The following three cases illustrate the perils of concession-driven diplomacy:

Ehud Barak at Camp David in 2000

Prime Minister Ehud Barak's determination to reach an "end of conflict" agreement with Yasser Arafat at Camp David in July 2000 and again at Taba in early 2001 was the driving force behind his idea of creating a new concept of security arrangements in the territory of a future Palestinian state. Barak's proposals reflected the first abandonment by an Israeli government of defensible borders in the West Bank. He apparently believed it possible to keep Israel safe by settling for Israeli control of 12 percent or less of the West Bank,[31] as opposed to the 33 to 45 percent required by a defensible borders strategy.[32] Barak may have made his proposal in order to "unmask" Yasser Arafat, but his ideas would shape the intellectual legacy of the peace process for years to come.

Barak also proposed a sovereign Palestinian state with the proviso that the West Bank be demilitarized and Israeli early-warning stations and IDF troops be placed on Palestinian soil. However, despite Barak's unprecedented offer, then-Palestinian security chief Mohammed Dahlan, who has again reemerged as a major force in Fatah, categorically refused to accept the proposed Israeli security arrangements. As former U.S. Middle East envoy Dennis Ross wrote, "Dahlan was dead set against any Israeli or foreign presence in the West Bank border crossing and rejected the idea that the Israelis should have guaranteed access routes into the West Bank."[33]

Barak's seeming abandonment of defensible borders and his acquiescence to security arrangements in their stead whittled down and even undermined Israel's long-standing insistence on retaining the Jordan Valley and other vital security areas in the West Bank. Despite the fact that during the Bush administration, the Clinton parameters and the Camp David proposals were off the table, the Palestinians pocketed the concessions and would always be able to insist on them as a starting point for future negotiations. As Vice Prime Minister Moshe Yaalon notes

in the Introduction to this study, "from that point on, Israel was expected to live within the curtailed borders that Barak had proposed. Even more far-reaching, the Palestinian leadership succeeded in establishing in the minds of Western policymakers the idea that the 1967 lines – that is, the 1949 armistice lines – should be the new frame of reference for all future negotiations."

Sharon's Unilateral Gaza Withdrawal

Ariel Sharon, too, would whet the international appetite for a full return to the 1949 lines stemming from his decision to withdraw from the Gaza Strip. Sharon conceded the Gaza Strip in 2005, believing that he would provide security for Israelis and win international praise and goodwill for handing the Palestinians their first mini-state.[34] However, Israel's generosity did not earn durable support from Europe and even provoked fears that the Gaza pullout was a ploy to avoid further territorial concessions.[35]

Israel's concession of Gaza has been minimized internationally as organizations such as the United Nations, Amnesty International, and Human Rights Watch continue to refer to Gaza as "occupied territory."[36] Europe's expectation of future Israeli withdrawals reflects the degree to which Israel's unconditional unilateral pullout in Gaza undermined its territorial rights in the West Bank. This was the central reason that Israel's former Deputy Chief of Staff and National Security Council head Maj.-Gen. Uzi Dayan had publicly opposed full withdrawal from Gaza. He noted on June 4, 2007, that Gaza established an "immoral and dangerous diplomatic precedent for the West Bank."[37]

Olmert's Unprecedented Concessions Backfire on Israel

The idea that Israeli concessions only drive international expectations for further concessions was best illustrated by former Prime Minister Ehud Olmert during the Annapolis peace process that collapsed in late 2008. Olmert went beyond any other

prime minister in the concessions he was willing to make to strike an agreement with the Palestinians. He offered between 93.5 and 97 percent of the West Bank, half of Jerusalem including an international regime for the "Holy Basin" containing the Temple Mount and Muslim shrines, and expressed a willingness to allow 10,000 Palestinian refugees to resettle in Israel on humanitarian grounds.[38]

Olmert's negotiation team, headed by Brig.-Gen. Udi Dekel, an author in this study, also tried to retrofit security demands into the final agreement, such as the demilitarization of a Palestinian state, special security arrangements in the Jordan Valley, and Israeli security control of the Gaza coast, all of which were rejected by the Palestinians.[39] It was also clear to Palestinian and Israeli negotiators that nothing was agreed until everything was agreed.[40] However, when negotiations collapsed, the pattern from the Barak proposals re-emerged: Israel's unprecedented

concessions were rejected by the Palestinians but simultaneously pocketed, so as to form the basis for the next round of negotiations.

Reconsidering Israel's Legal and Diplomatic Rights

One of the basic sources of tension between the Obama and Netanyahu administrations regarding the peace process is that the U.S. has grown accustomed to a concessions-based Israeli diplomacy that sidelines Israel's legal and diplomatic rights. Israel's return to security-based diplomacy is both rooted in and protected by international resolutions such as UN Security Council Resolution 242 of November 1967, which was unanimously approved and protected Israel's rights in the West Bank as a result of having fought a war of self-defense there.[41] For the past four decades, Resolution 242 has governed all Arab-Israeli diplomacy and has been the

Former Prime Minister Ehud Barak and Palestinian leader Yasser Arafat, July 11 1999. Barak's adoption of a new concept for security arrangements on the territory of a future Palestinian state, essentially on the 1967 lines, would recalibrate international expectations of Israel.

legal backbone upholding Israel's right to "secure and recognized boundaries" – that is, defensible borders – that the Security Council recognized as part of its determination that the Arabs, not Israelis, were the war's aggressors.[42]

Resolution 242 would also form the legal infrastructure for future peace processes, such as the 1979 peace treaty with Egypt, the 1991 Madrid conference, the 1993 exchange of letters with the PLO, the 1994 peace treaty with Jordan, and the 2004 presidential letter commitment from Bush to Sharon.[43]

The U.S. has grown accustomed to a concessions-based Israeli diplomacy that sidelines Israel's legal and diplomatic rights. Yet Israeli concessions only drive expectations for further concessions.

A major challenge for Israel's return to security-based diplomacy is that the Obama administration seems to have broken sharply from past U.S. agreements. It has been virtually silent on Resolution 242 and has apparently disregarded Bush's 2004 presidential letter guarantee to Israel that was overwhelmingly approved by bipartisan majorities in the House and Senate. President Bush had quoted the exact language of Resolution 242 for emphasis and reassured Sharon: "As part of a final peace settlement, Israel must have secure and recognized borders, which should emerge from negotiations between the parties in accordance with UNSC Resolutions 242 and 338....The United States reiterates its steadfast commitment to Israel's security, including secure, defensible borders, and to preserve and strengthen Israel's capability to deter and defend itself, by itself, against any threat or possible combination of threats."[44]

As the Obama administration breaks from the traditional practices and understandings that have governed Middle East diplomacy for decades, the Israeli government will have to adjust its practices and understandings. As the administration weakens its commitment

to Resolution 242 and other guarantees, the Israeli government must insist even more on the salience of these legal precedents and diplomatic guarantees.

Regional Threats and Israel's Return to Security-Based Diplomacy

Regional threats both to Arab states and Israel from a nuclearizing Iran, its Syrian ally, and regional terror proxies, as well as the ongoing activities of Al-Qaeda ever closer to Israel's borders, further justify Israel's insistence on a security-first, diplomacy-second approach to the Palestinians. While Al-Qaeda first emerged in Afghanistan in 1989, it has moved its subversive activities closer to Israel's borders and has inspired new followers in Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Lebanon, and Gaza. Jordan has been the repeated target of Al-Qaeda assaults, and today Hamas is having difficulty preventing Al-Qaeda groups in Gaza from firing rockets at Israel.[45]

Every Israeli territorial withdrawal since 2000 has created a security vacuum that has been exploited by Iran-backed forces in Lebanon and Gaza to improve their position against Israel.

These developments – especially the rise of the Iranian-backed "resistance bloc," consisting of Syria, Hizbullah, and Hamas – have shattered the illusion that the Israeli-Palestinian conflict could be isolated from larger regional trends and that a stable territorial settlement could be reached without considering these regional developments.

Every Israeli territorial withdrawal since 2000 has created a security vacuum that has been exploited by Iranian-backed forces in Lebanon and Gaza to improve their position against Israel. The 2006 Israel-Hizbullah war and the 2008-2009 Israel-Hamas war have underscored the threat of short-range rockets and highlighted the importance of territorial protection for Israel.[46]

Conclusion

By all indications, President Barack Obama continues to make the Palestinian-Israeli peace process and the establishment of a Palestinian state along the 1949 armistice lines a centerpiece of his agenda. He may even present an American plan, perhaps forcefully, if the peace process does not progress to his liking, and despite intense opposition to the idea in Israel.[47] This new U.S. diplomatic approach has put the Netanyahu government on the defensive, and has allowed the Palestinians to harden their positions on the core issues even beyond their demands at Annapolis. It has also provided succor to Palestinian hopes for a unilaterally-declared Palestinian state, which the PA leadership has referred to as their "Kosovo strategy."[48]

Under these adverse conditions, a security-first diplomatic posture is needed more than ever. Israel will continue to find itself under intense pressure to make concessions to the Palestinians; frequently, no reciprocal gestures will be demanded from them, and Israel's failure to comply with Washington's demands will likely be met with criticism and punishment. In this environment, the Israeli government must stake out its position on a rock-solid foundation. The only foundation that provides the strength and solidity to resist U.S. diplomatic pressure for additional concessions and Palestinian plans for a unilaterally-declared state along the 1949 armistice lines is a confident insistence on Israel's fundamental and non-negotiable security requirements, whose centerpieces are defensible borders in the West Bank and a demilitarized Palestinian state.

Former Israeli Prime Minister Ehud Olmert and PA Chairman Mahmoud Abbas, August 28, 2009. Regarding his unprecedented offer of 93.5% of the West Bank and a shared Jerusalem, Olmert recalled in a November 2009 interview: "I told him (Abbas) he'd never get anything like this again from an Israeli leader for 50 years."

Notes

1 Former Prime Minister Ehud Barak's attempts to concede territories to reach a peace agreement with Palestinian leader Yasser Arafat and then negotiate Israeli security arrangements during the Camp David and Taba summits in 2000 and early 2001 respectively are good examples of this strategy. See Dan Diker, "A Return to Defensible Borders," Azure, no. 21 (Summer 2005), http://www.azure.org.il/article.php?id=174.

2 See, for example, Arafat's address to the World Economic Forum in Davos, January 28, 2001, http://www.gamla.org.il/english/article/2001/jan/ler4.htm.

3 See Netanyahu's speech at http://www.mfa.gov.il/MFA/Government/Speeches+by+Israeli+leaders/2009/ Address_PM_Netanyahu_Bar-Ilan_University_14-Jun-2009.htm. Netanyahu's insistence that the PA recognize Israel as a Jewish state had also been raised by former Prime Minister Ehud Olmert as part of the Annapolis peace process. However, the Palestinian leadership refused to accede on this issue. See http://www.haaretz.com/hasen/spages/923076.html.

4 In the 2009 elections for the 18th Knesset, Israeli center-right parties increased their strength from 50 to 65 seats (out of 120), representing, among other issues, the public's displeasure with Olmert's unprecedented concessions to the Palestinian Authority, including the concession of defensible borders in the strategically vital West Bank and the division of Jerusalem.

5 Greg Sheridan, "Olmert Still Dreams of Peace," *The Australian*, November 28, 2009, http://www.theaustralian.com.au/news/opinion/ehud-olmert-still-dreams-of-peace/story-e6frg76f-1225804745744.

6 See Jackson Diehl, "Abbas' Waiting Game," *Washington Post*, May 29, 2009, http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2009/05/28/AR2009052803614.html.

7 Elliot Abrams, "Hillary is Wrong about the Settlements," *Wall Street Journal*, June 26, 2009, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB124588743827950599.html. The insistence of the Obama administration that Israel undertake a full cessation of building in the West Bank and east Jerusalem had no precedent in U.S. policy in the Middle East peace process. The 1995 Oslo interim agreements, which still govern Palestinian-Israeli relations pending a final agreement between the sides, do not prohibit either Palestinian or Israeli building in the West Bank or Jerusalem, whose final status was to be negotiated between the sides. See Dan Diker, "Does the International News Media Overlook Israel's Rights in the Palestinian-Israeli Conflict," *Jerusalem Viewpoints*, no. 495, Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs, April 2003, http://www.jcpa.org/jl/vp495.htm.

8 Ari Shavit, "Netanyahu's Revolution," *Ha'aretz*, June 19, 2009, http://www.haaretz.com/hasen/spages/1093877.html.

9 Netanyahu insisted on Israel maintaining defensible borders, Israeli control of a unified airspace over the Palestinian state, and electromagnetic security. He stated that a future Palestinian state would be prohibited from engaging in military covenants with foreign armies, and that no foreign forces would be allowed in Palestinian territory. Netanyahu also declared that "Jerusalem, the capital of Israel, must remain undivided with continued religious freedom for all faiths." Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu, Speech at Bar-Ilan University, June 14, 2009, http://www.pmo.gov.il/PMOEng/Communication/PMSpeaks/speechbarilan140609.htm.

10 Abbas acknowledged to the *Washington Post*'s Jackson Diehl after the failure of Annapolis that Olmert's offer of between 93.5 and 97 percent of the West Bank, eastern Jerusalem, a special custodial regime for the "Holy Basin," and the recognition of the right of return (that included the return of 10,000 refugees to Israel for humanitarian reasons – according to a senior official on Olmert's negotiating team) was more generous to the Palestinians than the offers of either George Bush or Bill Clinton, and yet Abbas said: "The gaps were wide." See Jackson Diehl, "Abbas' Waiting Game," *Washington Post*, May 29, 2009, http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2009/05/28/AR2009052803614.html.

11 "The number of people killed by Palestinian terrorists in the five years immediately after the Oslo Accord (256), was greater than the number killed in the 15 years preceding the agreement (216)." See "Terrorism and Oslo," *Daily Forward*, September 19, 2003, http://www.forward.com/articles/8161/.

12 http://www.mfa.gov.il/MFA/Terrorism-+Obstacle+to+Peace/Palestinian+terror+since+2000/Victims+of+Palestinian+Violence+and+Terrorism+sinc.htm.

13 Dore Gold, "Israel's War to Halt Palestinian Rocket Attacks," *Jerusalem Issue Brief*, vol. 7, no. 34, March 3, 2008, http://www.jcpa.org/JCPA/Templates/ShowPage.asp?DBID=1&LNGID=1&TMID=111&FID=283&PID=0&IID=2049.

14 Yossi Verter, "Sharp Rise in Support for Netanyahu Following Speech," *Ha'aretz*, June 16, 2009. Regarding the Israeli public's support for a united Jerusalem, see Dore Gold, *The Fight for Jerusalem: Radical Islam, the West, and the Future of the Holy City* (Washington: Regnery, 2007), pp. 277-8.

15 Verter, "Sharp Rise."

16 Shavit, "Netanyahu's Revolution."

17 Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu, Speech to the Jewish Federations of North America General Assembly, November 11, 2009, http://www.haaretz.com/hasen/spages/1127027.html.

18 Jonathan Lis, "Netanyahu: Israel Will Never Cede Jordan Valley," *Ha'aretz*, March 2, 2010.

19 Dennis Ross, *The Missing Peace: The Inside Story of the Fight for Middle East Peace* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2005), p. 327.

20 Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin at the Knesset, October 5, 1995, http://www.mfa.gov.il/MFA/MFAArchive/1990_1999/1995/10/PM+Rabin+in+Knesset-+Ratification+of+Interim+Agree.htm.

21 Meeting with former senior IDF official in Jerusalem, April 4, 2010.

22 Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin at the Knesset.

23 *Ibid.*

24 http://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2004/04/20040414-3.html.

25 Diker, "A Return to Defensible Borders," pp. 52-53.

26 Dan Diker, "Sharon's Strategic Legacy for Israel: Competing Perspectives," *Jerusalem Issue Brief*, vol. 5, no. 15, January 12, 2006.

27 Interview with *Der Spiegel* magazine, November 5, 1969.

28 Yigal Allon, "Israel: The Case for Defensible Borders," *Foreign Affairs*, vol. 55 (October 1976), pp. 41-42.

29 Specifically, the Allon Plan, which has guided the thinking of Prime Minister Netanyahu since his first ad-

ministration from 1996 to 1999, holds that Israel's new defensible borders would mean "retaining absolute control of the 700-square-mile strategic Jordan Rift Valley east of the major Arab population centers," a zone that lies between the Jordan River to the east and the eastern slopes of the Samarian and Judean mountains to the west, as well as greater Jerusalem and certain relatively unpopulated sections of the Judean Desert. Allon's recommendation for annexing the Jordan Valley was supported by the fact that this area was – and continues to be – largely unpopulated, aside from the approximately thirty thousand Arab residents of Jericho, which would not be part of the annexed territory. This demographic reality and the need for control of the Jordan Valley would remain true over the following years and would be a key benefit for Israel, as reflected in President George W. Bush's presidential letter in exchange for Israel's 2005 withdrawal from Gaza. It has also been noted in recent interviews with Netanyahu, preserving the plan's relevance for today.

30 Dore Gold, "Defensible Borders for Israel," *Jerusalem Viewpoints*, no. 500, June 15, 2003, http://www.jcpa.org/jl/vp500.htm.

31 Barak was reported to have approved an offer of between 93 and 95 percent at Camp David and 97 percent at Taba in line with the Clinton bridging proposals. He also was believed to have offered the Palestinians at the Taba talks a compensatory 3 percent land swap from pre-1967 Israel, although this was denied by MK Danny Yatom, Barak's national security adviser, during a Knesset conference on defensible borders on October 19, 2004, sponsored by the Knesset Foreign Affairs and Defense Committee.

32 The Allon Plan was based primarily on Israel retaining the Jordan Valley, a full third of the West Bank. The "Allon-plus" doctrine adopted by Prime Ministers Rabin and Netanyahu would also include other strategically vital settlements that would constitute approximately 45 to 49 percent of West Bank land. This assessment is based exclusively on Israel's defense needs and does not include other national security interests such as the West Bank aquifers from which Israel draws a third of its potable water. A former IDF official told the author that in the beginning of the Oslo process in 1994, Prime Minister Rabin had determined that Israel would need to retain 63 percent of the West Bank, which he had seen as a security red line. Meeting in Jerusalem, April 4, 2010.

33 Ross, *The Missing Peace*, p. 703, cited in Dore Gold and David Keyes, "What If Bush Invited Sharon and Abu Mazen to Camp David?" *Jerusalem Viewpoints,* no. 526 (January 2, 2005), p. 10.

34 Dan Diker, "Why Israel Must Now Move from Concessions-Based Diplomacy to Rights-Based Diplomacy,**"** *Jerusalem Issue Brief*, no. 554, June-July 2007, http://www.jcpa.org/JCPA/Templates/ShowPage.asp?DBID=1&LNGID=1&TMID=111&FID=582&PID=2225&IID=1607.

35 Spanish Foreign Minister Javier Solana warned at the time that the European Union would not support the Gaza disengagement if it did not lead to a full Israeli pullout from the West Bank. Solana called that scenario "nightmarish." Diker, *ibid*.

36 See, e.g., John Dugard, *Report of the United Nations Special Rapporteur on the Situation of Human Rights in the Palestinian Territories Occupied Since 1967*, A/HRC/4/17,

January 29, 2007 (esp. paragraphs 1, 6 and 22 referring to Gaza as part of the "Occupied Palestinian Territory" and applying the Fourth Geneva Convention regarding "occupied" territory).

37 Speech by Maj.-Gen. Uzi Dayan at the conference on "40 Years of UNSC Resolution 242," Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs and Konrad Adenauer Foundation, Jerusalem, June 4, 2007.

38 Jackson Diehl, "Abbas' Waiting Game." The number of Palestinian refugees Olmert offer to accept is a matter of debate. Arab diplomatic sources have indicated that Olmert would accept 100,000 over 10 years. However, an IDF official involved in the Annapolis peace negotiations told the author that the number did not exceed 10,000. Meeting in Jerusalem, April 17, 2010.

39 Udi Dekel, *Demilitarization – Preventing Military and Terrorist Threats from Within and By Way of the Palestinian Territories,* Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs, 2010.

40 Aluf Benn and Barak Ravid, "Olmert's Negotiator: Full Mideast Peace Impossible," *Ha'aretz*, January 25, 2010, http://www.haaretz.com/hasen/spages/1144854.html.

41 Yehuda Blum, "The Territorial Clauses of Security Council Resolution 242," in *Israel's Rights to Secure Boundaries: Four Decades Since UN Security Council Resolution 242*, Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs, 2009, pp. 32-33.

42 Gold, "Defensible Borders for Israel"; *Israel's Rights to Secure Boundaries: Four Decades Since UN Security Council Resolution 242;* and *Defensible Borders for a Lasting Peace*, Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs, 2008. http://www.defensibleborders.org/db_introb.pdf.

43 Gold, *Defensible Borders for a Lasting Peace*, Introduction.

44 http://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2004/04/20040414-3.html.

45 Dore Gold and Lt. Col. (res.) Jonathan D. Halevi, "Al-Qaeda, Zarqawi, and Israel: Is There a New Jihadi Threat Destabilizing the Eastern Front?" *Jerusalem Viewpoints,* no. 538, Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs, January 1, 2006, http://www.jcpa.org/jl/vp538.htm.

46 Lt.-Gen. (ret.) Moshe Yaalon, "The Second Lebanon War: From Territory to Ideology," in *Iran's Race for Regional Supremacy*, Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs, 2008, p. 33, http://www.jcpa.org/text/iran2-june08.pdf.

47 Gil Hoffman, "Poll: 91% Against Obama Imposing Deal," *Jerusalem Post*, April 14, 2010, http://www.jpost.com/Israel/Article.aspx?id=173093. Notably, the numbers were similar for the Jordan Valley, where 90 percent opposed relinquishing Israeli control and 10 percent were in favor.

48 Dan Diker, "The Palestinians' Unilateral 'Kosovo Strategy': Implications for the PA and Israel," *Jerusalem Viewpoints*, no. 575, Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs, January 2010, http://jcpa.org/JCPA/Templates/ShowPage.asp?DBID=1&LNGID=1&TMID=111&FID=443&PID=0&IID=3271.