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Netanyahu is prepared to follow Obama’s lead in peace talks, but to maintain control he must not make big concessions to the US

Stolberg and Landler July 6 (Sheryl, writer for the New York Times, Mark, American journalist and Diplomatic Correspondent of the New York Times, New York Times, July 6, 2010, http://www.nytimes.com/2010/07/07/world/middleeast/07prexy.html?src=me) EH

WASHINGTON — President Obama said Tuesday that he expected direct negotiations between Israelis and Palestinians to begin “well before” a moratorium on settlement construction expired at the end of September, and Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu of Israel pledged to take “concrete steps” in the coming weeks to get the talks moving. The president’s comments, after a 79-minute, one-on-one session in the Oval Office, were the first in which he articulated a timetable for peace negotiations. They also reflected a palpable shift in the administration’s approach to a relationship that has been rife with tension since soon after Mr. Obama took office. The meeting was laden with theatrics as the men shook hands vigorously in front of the cameras after a series of steps by the Israelis over the past few days to reduce tensions with the United States. But it was also deeply substantive, the leaders’ aides said, with Mr. Obama and Mr. Netanyahu touching on a wide variety of contentious issues, including Iran’s nuclear ambitions and Israel’s undeclared nuclear weapons program, as well as the peace process. A single session in the Oval Office is not likely to have resolved a year and a half of deep policy differences, and the two leaders could hit more bumps in the months ahead, especially if Mr. Obama grows impatient with a lack of progress in the peace process. But on Tuesday, they sought to accentuate the positive. After publicly pressing Mr. Netanyahu for months to curb the building of Jewish settlements — an American policy that fanned resentment in Israel — Mr. Obama pointedly did not push Mr. Netanyahu to extend the existing moratorium. Instead, he said that moving from American-brokered “proximity talks” to direct talks would give Mr. Netanyahu the incentive and domestic political leeway to act on his own. “My hope is, that once direct talks have begun, well before the moratorium has expired, that that will create a climate in which everybody feels a greater investment in success,” Mr. Obama said, adding, “There ends up being more room created by more trust.” The Palestinian Authority reacted cautiously to the meeting, saying that it, too, wanted direct talks, but that the onus was on Mr. Netanyahu to halt the building of settlements and to agree on negotiations that would resume where the last direct talks, in 2008, left off. “It is about words not deeds,” said Saeb Erekat, the chief Palestinian negotiator, by phone late Tuesday. “We need to see deeds.” Tuesday’s much-publicized meeting in the Oval Office was in stark contrast to the frosty reception Mr. Netanyahu received during his last trip to the White House in March, when Mr. Obama left the prime minister waiting in the Roosevelt Room while he went upstairs to have dinner with his wife and daughters. The mood was so sour then that Mr. Obama barred news cameras. On Tuesday, photographers clicked away in the Oval Office as Mr. Obama praised the prime minister as someone “willing to take risks for peace” and blamed the press for reports of discord. Mr. Netanyahu loosely quoted Mark Twain, saying, “The reports about the demise of the special relationship aren’t just premature; they’re just flat wrong.” In another gesture to the Israelis, Mr. Obama emphasized that there had been no shift in American policy on Israel’s undeclared nuclear weapons program, despite the United States’ signature on a recent United Nations document that singled out Israel for its refusal to sign the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, binding 189 countries. Israeli officials were alarmed by the American decision to allow Israel to be named, which came at the prodding of Arab states. Some in Israel viewed it as a sign of the unreliability of the United States, Israel’s most important ally. Mr. Obama also tried to soothe Israeli jitters about calls for a regional conference on a nuclear-free Middle East. Any such meeting, he said, would only be a discussion of regional security, not an opportunity to press Israel on its nuclear program. “We strongly believe that, given its size, its history, the region that it’s in and the threats that are leveled against us — against it, that Israel has unique security requirements,” Mr. Obama said, briefly correcting himself in midsentence. “It’s got to be able to respond to threats or any combination of threats in the region.” The source of the friction during Mr. Netanyahu’s last visit was Israel’s announcement, during a visit by Vice President Joseph R. Biden Jr., that it was approving plans for Jewish settlements in East Jerusalem. Now, settlements are again at issue, but the president’s modulated response seemed intended to return the American-Israeli relationship to one in which difficult issues are thrashed out in private, rather than through public lectures. Some analysts suggested that Mr. Obama and Mr. Netanyahu might have reached a private understanding that Israel would extend the construction moratorium in return for direct talks. “This enables Israel to say it didn’t pay for direct talks, but there’s an understanding that once the expiration date rolls around, the moratorium will be extended,” said David Makovsky, a senior fellow at the Washington Institute for Near East Policy. Among the other “concrete steps” Israel is expected to take toward the Palestinians, analysts said, is greater cooperation with the Palestinian Authority on security matters and increased economic aid for the West Bank. Mr. Netanyahu has suggested to aides that he has other steps in mind, Israeli officials said, but he has not yet disclosed them. Mr. Obama’s stance reflected domestic political pressures on both men. Mr. Netanyahu, who is struggling to keep his fractious right-wing coalition together, has been under pressure at home not to appear to pay an additional price to lure the Palestinians to the negotiating table.
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The plan is a signal that Netanyahu is conceding Israel’s security on the Eastern Front

Sofer 10 (Roni, staff writer, Ynetnews is the largest and most popular news source, http://www.ynetnews.com/articles/0,7340,L-3916745,00.html) EH

UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon on Wednesday met with Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu and expressed his support of a move to direct peace talks between Israel and the Palestinians as soon as possible, in order to advance a peace agreement in the region. The UN chief thanked Netanyahu for easing the blockade on the Gaza Strip. Netanyahu thanked his host for his leadership and his friendship and said the Israeli public is willing to take risks for peace. However, the prime minister stressed that any future agreement must ensure but any future arrangement needs to guarantee the cessation of rocket fire into Israel. The two also discussed the Israeli raid on the Turkish flotilla to Gaza, and the implementation of UN Resolution 1701, which ended the Second Lebanon War. Before the meeting, Netanyahu met with US Defense Secretary Robert Gates, and outlined to him Israel's concerns about the rise of an eastern front after the US troops withdraw from Iraq. Netanyahu expressed concern that the withdrawal of troops from Iraq, coupled with the strengthening of Iran might lead to a new "eastern front" against Israel. During his visit, the prime minister is slated appear on a series of interviews with US' leading TV networks.

New concessions will drain all of Netanyahu’s power

Ephron 10 (Dan, Staff Writer for Newsweek, <http://www.newsweek.com/2010/04/04/between-barack-and-a-hard-place.html>, 4/4) dc

It must feel like old times for Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu. At one end of his political tightrope, an American administration is pressing him to make concessions to the Palestinians. At the other end, the super-hawks in his coalition are warning him to stand firm or lose his majority in Parliament. The last time Netanyahu faced such a predicament, in 1998, he agreed to hand over 13 percent of the West Bank to Palestinian control under a deal worked out at Wye River, Md. The result: his right-wing coalition unraveled and Netanyahu lost his grip on power.

Now is the key time to fix the Arab-Israeli conflict – Netanyahu key.

Meixler and Ferziger 10 (Louis and Jonathan; staff writer, *Bloomberg Business Week,* July 8, 2010, http://www.businessweek.com/news/2010-07-08/obama-says-mideast-peace-is-possible-before-his-first-term-ends.html) CH

Obama met with Netanyahu at the White House on July 6 and said direct Israel-Palestinian talks may get started within less than three months. Obama has been trying to persuade Netanyahu and Palestinian Authority President Mahmoud Abbas to move beyond the indirect talks they have been conducting through U.S. Middle East envoy George Mitchell and hold face-to-face negotiations. Netanyahu is interested “in being a statesman,” Obama said in the broadcast. “The fact that he is not perceived as a dove in some ways can be helpful.” Abbas and Palestinian Authority Prime Minister Salam Fayyad are “willing to make the concessions and engage in negotiations that can result in peace,” Obama said. The president said there “is a constant contest between moderates and rejectionists” in the Arab world. Seize Opportunity “We probably won’t have a better opportunity than we have right now and that has to be seized,” Obama said. Obama said time may be running out for Palestinian moderates who are willing to make compromises “if they aren’t able to deliver for their people.” Netanyahu, whose Likud party supports Jewish settlement in the West Bank, said yesterday in New York that Israel is prepared to make “far-ranging concessions” to achieve a political solution. “I intend to confound the skeptics and critics,” Netanyahu said in a lunchtime speech to the Council on Foreign Relations. “ I’m prepared to do something. I’m prepared to take risks.” Obama, who described his two hours with Netanyahu as “excellent” and detailed, described the Israeli leader as “somebody who understands that we’ve got a fairly narrow window of opportunity.”

[Insert Impact Module here]

\*\*\*Uniqueness\*\*\*

Netanyahu strong

Netanyahu can withstand the pressure between the United States and Israeli coalition.

Rothschild 10 (Matthew; editor and writer for The Progressive magazine, *The Progressive,* July 7, 2010, http://www.progressive.org/wx070710.html) CH

As the Israeli newspaper Haaretz commented, “For Netanyahu this was a huge victory. His claim that he can stand against U.S. pressure, making only tactical concessions, has proven true. He leveraged internal U.S. politics in his favor, without weakening the right-wing coalition in Jerusalem. Netanyahu got off easy.” Netanyahu and the designers of the ongoing Israeli occupation of Palestinian land prefer a weak U.S. President. And they have one now in Obama.

Netanyahu’s talk with Obama satisfied coalition members and critics.

Hoffman 7/8 (Gil, Staff Writer for Jerusalem Post,

The Labor Party will have a much easier time remaining in Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu’s coalition if US President Barack Obama succeeds in his goal of bringing the Palestinian Authority to the negotiating table, top Labor officials said on Wednesday. Both Labor chairman Ehud Barak and his critics in the party expressed satisfaction with Netanyahu and Obama’s press conference at the White House on Tuesday. They expressed hope that the meeting would lead to Israeli-Palestinian talks that would begin before the 10-month West Bank housing-start moratorium ends in September and would make enough progress to prevent the resumption of construction from derailing the talks. “We have started on the path,” Barak said in radio interviews. “If direct talks begin, we will be in a much better position to handle the obstacles ahead. We shouldn’t lose hope that there is light at the end of the tunnel and we are entering a significant diplomatic process.

Likud Party members support Netanyahu

Israeli National News 10(3/19, <http://www.israelnationalnews.com/News/Flash.aspx/182893>) dc.

Members of the Likud from Judea and Samaria say they support the Prime Minister and understand his decision to postpone the Likud Central Committee meeting. They express satisfaction with his statements about construction in Jerusalem. That according to Shevach Stern, the head of Judea and Samaria Likud members, in an interview with Arutz Sheva

Netanyahu supports 2 state solution and is strong enough

Netanyahu is strong enough to push the 2 state solution through

Rubin 10 (Barry, Professor and director of the Global Research in International Affairs (GLORIA) Center, Interdisciplinary university, “What Motivates Israeli Policy and Actions,” Global Politician .com, http://www.globalpolitician.com/26451-israel)

--There is no viable alternative. No matter how many people talk about how easy it would be to make a compromise peace or to make radical, openly genocidal Islamists moderate, Israelis know from observation and experience that these things aren't true. They also know what is said in Arabic in places like official Palestinian Authority and Hamas media but never translated by the Western media into English.

It is interesting to note that the opposition has not been able to come up with a single persuasive option for a different policy. Indeed, outside the farther left, even opposition voters generally share in the national consensus outlined above. The basic Israeli view is this: We are ready for a two-state solution, we are ready to turn almost all of the West Bank over to a Palestinian state. But we don't believe there is a real partner for such an agreement.

This government, by the way, is not a right-wing government but a national unity government that includes the main party of the left, Labour. The religious parties are at about the weakest point in power that they've been in Israeli history. And even Avigdor Lieberman, whatever his shortcomings, is not a stereotypical rightist and he does favor a two-state solution.

So this government is very solidly in power and will certainly serve until next year. If elections were to be held today it would win. Indeed, when one sees how unfair and misinformed a lot of the foreign criticism is, and how these same places constantly make demands for concessions and then don't keep their promises, this only solidifies the national consensus supporting the government and understanding the need for continuing-albeit with reasonable changes-the current policy.

Netanyahu/Obama close now

U.S. alliance with Israel is strong now

AP 7/6 (Ben Feller, The Washington correspondent for the Associated Press, *The Associated Press,* 7/6/10, <http://news.yahoo.com/s/ap/20100706/ap_on_go_pr_wh/us_us_israel>) CS

WASHINGTON – Eager to show unity to the world, President Barack Obama and Israeli Prime Minister [Benjamin Netanyahu](http://news.yahoo.com/s/ap/20100706/ap_on_go_pr_wh/us_us_israel) on Tuesday dismissed talk of a rift as wildly unfounded, and Netanyahu pledged concrete, "very robust" steps to revive sluggish Mideast peace efforts with the Palestinians.In a warm, yet carefully choreographed [White House](http://news.yahoo.com/s/ap/20100706/ap_on_go_pr_wh/us_us_israel) embrace, the two leaders took pains to persuade allies and enemies alike that a deeply important relationship is doing just fine.The two nations clearly felt that was necessary. The meeting came five weeks after [Israel's deadly raid](http://news.yahoo.com/s/ap/20100706/ap_on_go_pr_wh/us_us_israel) on a flotilla that was trying to break the Israeli blockade of the Hamas-controlled Gaza Strip. That raid brought international outrage and tested U.S. support for Israel's security steps.But the optics and words of Tuesday's visit all sent one message: unshaken cooperation. Netanyahu emerged with a pile of promises from Obama that the U.S. is both committed to Israel's security and a believer that the prime minister wants peace with Palestinians. For his part, Netanyahu showed the urgency that Obama wants in boosting peace efforts, though he didn't say in public just what he might have planned.

Netanyahu trusts Obama – share a common goal.

Netanyahu 10 (Benjamin; Israeli prime minister, *CBS Interview,* June 7, 2010, http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2010/07/07/eveningnews/main6655668.shtml) CH

President Obama and Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu were all smiles after they met Tuesday at the White House. But is it all for show? Today, CBS News anchor Katie Couric spoke with the prime minister in New York. Couric: Do you trust Barack Obama? Netanyahu: I trust Barack Obama, President of the United States to carry out with me the policies that have joined Israel and the United States. And what Barack Obama has called the "unbreakable bond." We have common goals, common interests. And we now have a job to do to get on with our common goal of achieving peace with security. I trust we'll be able to do that together. Couric: While you want to accentuate the positive, clearly, that's part of your mission here in the United States, surely there have been disappointments with Obama Administration. Can you just be candid with me and tell me how the administration has disappointed you? Netanyahu: You know, you remind me of the Israeli press. They say, "How come you had a good meeting with President Obama?" Well, because I did. Because we actually see eye to eye on some central issues. The quest for peace. The danger of Iran. The need to bolster security- for Israel and the region. That's the truth. We do see it. Have we had differences? Of course we have.

Netanyahu supports Peace Process

Netanyahu is balancing pressures from the left and right by supporting the US peace process

Indyk 10 (Martin; Vice President and Director, Foreign Policy, *Brookings Institute,* July 7, 2010, http://www.brookings.edu/opinions/2010/0707\_obama\_netanyahu\_indyk.aspx) CH

Suddenly, Israelis feel alone in the world and fear for their future. They have always lived with a sense of existential dread, but in recent years, as the Intifada waned and the Israeli economy rebounded from the global recession—beaten only by China—Israelis began to enjoy their newfound prosperity and calm. This growing sense of security has now been punctured, driving them at first into a collective crouch, and an instinctive rallying behind their embattled prime minister. But now the Israeli public is becoming impatient. They sense that their ship of state is no longer on an even keel. In recent times both the Mossad and the IDF have managed to cock up straightforward operations, doing great harm to Israel’s strategic relations with Turkey and its reputation in the Arab world. If Israel faced such international condemnation from intercepting a flotilla, how will it fare if it attacks Iran’s nuclear facilities, or bombs Lebanese infrastructure in retaliation for Hezbollah rocket attacks? Israelis are now contemplating these questions and wondering whether dependence on deterrence and force alone is enough to secure their future. Perhaps their prime minister needs to take the diplomatic initiative? Slipping in the polls, under pressure from his more moderate coalition partners, and needing to avoid a new crisis with Obama when the settlement moratorium expires in September, Netanyahu finally seems willing to move. That is the background for what Netanyahu told Obama in their long private meeting Tuesday, prompting the president to declare publicly that the prime minister is ready to take “risks for peace.” The coming months will determine whether Obama’s newfound confidence in the sincerity of his Israeli partner in peacemaking is justified. But with their Palestinian counterpart and the Israeli public now ready, the time had come for Obama to suspend disbelief, put his arm around Netanyahu, and nudge him forward. Obama’s next stop? Jerusalem and Ramallah.

Brink: Netanyahu on tightrope between US and Israel right wing

**Netanyahu’s power is waning, he needs Obama’s support to sustain US- Israeli relations.**

**Strobel 10** (Foreign affairs correspondent *McClatchy Newspapers* 4/26/10 <http://www.mcclatchydc.com/2010/03/26/91206/with-us-israel-ties-strained-obama.html>) SM

Because of the U.S. political calendar, Obama has limited time to press Israel before it becomes a major domestic political issue during midterm elections. **Netanyahu**, who this weekend confers with his closest allies, **has limited political space in which to operate, if he wants to stay in power.** His coalition at home is populated with Israeli politicians who support Jewish settlements in the West Bank, oppose any concessions on Jerusalem and are skeptical of an independent Palestinian state next door. One irony of the current confrontation is that the administration, which had laboriously organized **indirect talks between Israel and the Palestinians, had planned to use Biden's visit to provide "strategic reassurance" to Israel, in hopes of improving relations with the closest U.S. ally in the Middle East after a year of strains**. **Now, trust between the two sides seems to be** at a **very low** ebb. "There's not a great deal of trust that he believes deeply in the two-state solution," a former senior U.S. official in touch with the White House said of Netanyahu. "**There's a belief that he's a reluctant peacemaker here." The Obama administration is said to believe that Netanyahu has more control over Jewish settlements than he admits, and political flexibility to dump his right-wing partners and form a government with the moderate Kadima party if he chose.** "Fundamentally, **he's going to have to decide between his coalition and his relationship with the United States**," the former official said.

Netanyahu is split between the White House and his Right-wing Coalition

Heller 10 (Jeffery, Journalist, *Jerusalem Post,* 7-2-2010, <http://www.reuters.com/article/idUSTRE6611IQ20100702>) CM

One option Netanyahu and Obama may explore is extending beyond September a 10-month Israeli moratorium on new housing starts in Jewish settlements in the occupied West Bank, a limited freeze agreed under pressure from Obama. But that could put strain on Netanyahu's governing coalition, which includes a key far-right party, and the Palestinians have given no sign publicly that it would be enough to coax them into more intensive statehood negotiations. "We cannot talk about a meaningful peace process and we cannot move to direct negotiations unless there is progress on the issues of borders ... and security," chief Palestinian negotiator Saeb Erekat said. Palestinian officials said that entails shaping the frontiers of a future Palestinian state -- including territorial swaps with Israel -- along lines that existed before the 1967 war in which Israel captured the West Bank and Gaza Strip. For Palestinians, it also means Israeli troops and roadblocks are replaced by international forces in key areas. For his part, Netanyahu was playing to his own right-wing constituents and Likud party colleagues by insisting that East Jerusalem, which Palestinians want as their capital, is not included in the West Bank housing start freeze. He declared defiantly on the eve of his previous talks with Obama, that Jerusalem, which Israel considers its capital, is "not a settlement." But no new Jewish homes have been built in East Jerusalem or Palestinian dwellings demolished in months.

Coalition Tenuous

Israeli government coalition is unstable: Labor is on the verge of leaving.

Hoffman 10(Gil, Staff Writer for Jerusalem Post <http://www.jpost.com/Israel/Article.aspx?id=179119>, 6/22)dc

Livni told the Kadima faction on Monday said she was not interested in saving the current government but in changing its policies and the makeup of the coalition. “Nothing has changed in my stance, which I explain everywhere,” she said. While a Likud source said they sensed a change in Livni, sources close to her denounced recent speculation as political spin. They said Labor chairman Ehud Barak’s recent comments about widening the coalition were tactical efforts to ease pressure on him from inside his party to leave the coalition. Barak was quoted last week saying at an internal Labor meeting that if Kadima was not added to the coalition by the end of the year or substantial progress was not made in the diplomatic process, Labor would quit the government. His spokesman denied the quotes. Labor ministers Isaac Herzog and Avishay Braverman have said that Labor should quit if there is no diplomatic breakthrough by September. Labor MK Amir Peretz has called for giving Likud an ultimatum that if Kadima did not join immediately, Labor would leave. Barak’s political opponents in Labor said he actually opposed Livni joining the government, but he was calling for adding Kadima in order to pressure Netanyahu to make concessions in the diplomatic process and break his promise to renew settlement construction when the moratorium ends at the end of September.

The Israeli Labor party is on the brink of leaving

Bloomberg Businessweek 10 (Gwen Ackerman, Writer for the *Bloomberg Businessweek*, a global business journal, 3/28/10, <http://www.businessweek.com/managing/columnists/>) CS

March 28 (Bloomberg) -- Israel’s Labor Party may consider leaving Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu’s coalition over the government’s policies on peace talks with the Palestinians, including building homes in east Jerusalem, which has strained relations with the U.S. “Labor will reach its moment of truth after Passover when it will have to decide whether or not to stay in the coalition,” Labor Minister Isaac Herzog said in an interview with Israel Radio. Labor, which has 13 seats in the 74-member ruling coalition, is an advocate of ceding land for peace in an agreement with the Palestinians. Herzog made the comments ahead of the weekly Cabinet meeting when Netanyahu was expected to brief ministers on his talks with U.S. President Barack Obama in Washington last week. The premier’s visit was intended to defuse a crisis stemming from Israeli plans to build in east Jerusalem. Israel captured east Jerusalem from Jordan in the 1967 Middle East war and later annexed it in a move never recognized internationally. Palestinians seek the area as the capital of a future state. Herzog said that the government must change its policy and end its disagreement with the U.S. by making clear that there would be no further Jewish housing projects in predominantly Palestinian areas of east Jerusalem.

Labor threatening to leave coalition which could pit Netanyahu and Lieberman against each other.

Yenidunya 10(Ali, PhD Candidate in Israeli-US Relations, Enduring America, <http://enduringamerica.com/2010/06/25/middle-east-inside-line-coalition-changes-in-israel-netanyahus-war-for-legitimacy-israel-warns-lebanon/>, 6/25)dc.

Lieberman-Netanyahu War?: Tension is increasing between Israeli Foreign Minister Avigdor Lieberman and Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu. The latter needs the opposition, “centrist” party Kadima in the coalition, but Kadima’s leader Tzipi Livni wants the Foreign Ministry. Lieberman doesn’t seem to be too receptive. On Tuesday, he told reporters that Kadima could join the coalition as long as Kadima members agreed to support a land and population swap as a solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. He continued: This coalition will not change. We are willing to consider a shift in the coalition only if the entire coalition, including Kadima, supports the concept of a populated land swap rather than the concept of land for peace Lieberman has a second condition as well: Kadima will agree to the continuation of construction when the freeze in the West Bank ends in September. What about Netanyahu? The pressure on his shoulders is increasing day by day. Here is the latest sign: leaders of Netanyahu’s coalition partner Labor have said that, unless Kadima joins the government soon, they may not continue in government. That in turn could start a war between Lieberman’s Yisrael Beiteinu and Netanyahu’s Likud, ending up with an early election

Coalition Tenuous

Israel coalition is isolating allies.

Israel News July 6 (Israel's largest and most popular news and content website, July 6, 2010, http://www.ynetnews.com/articles/0,7340,L-3915981,00.html) EH

Turkey's President Abdullah Gul said on Tuesday that divisions within Israel's coalition were stopping the Jewish state repairing relations ruined by the storming of a Gaza-bound aid ship over a month ago. Speaking to Reuters while returning from an official visit to Kazakhstan, Gul said Israel's apparent readiness to become more isolated by ditching relations with a country that had been its only Muslim ally was irrational. "They don't have many friends in the region," Gul said. "Now it seems they want to get rid of the relationship with Turkey."

Shaky Turkey-Israeli relations led to tensions within Israeli coalition.

AFP July 6 (AFP, July 6, 2010, http://www.google.com/hostednews/afp/article/ALeqM5icJVHfuvyXgrQeLX5W\_oVjA7QBxw) EH

NKARA — Turkey's foreign minister Tuesday insisted on an Israeli apology for a deadly raid on a Gaza-bound aid ship but did not repeat a threat to break off diplomatic ties. Israel must apologise for the May 31 bloodshed and pay compensation for the nine Turkish victims or "Turkey will not stay indifferent," Foreign Minister Ahmet Davutoglu said in a television interview. Stoking tensions between the one-time allies, the minister told the Hurriyet daily Monday that Turkey would sever ties if Israel failed to meet Ankara's conditions to mend fences. "Israel should either apologise and pay compensation unilaterally as a result of its own inquiry ... or if it does not want to do that... it should wait for the results of (a probe by) an international commission," Davutoglu told the TGRT channel on Tuesday. "If those two conditions do not materialise, Turkey is not any country, Turkey will not stay indifferent," he said. Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu has ruled out an apology and a senior government official reiterated Monday that "Israel will never apologise for defending its citizens." Davutoglu said he conveyed Turkey's demands to Israeli trade minister Benjamin Ben Eliezer when the two met secretly in Brussels last week in a bid to find a way out of the crisis. The meeting sparked tensions within Israel's ruling coalition as it emerged that Netanyahu approved the talks without informing Foreign Minister Avigdor Lieberman.

Coalition Tenuous

Members of the Labour Party might leave the coalition due to the growing tensions.

Pfeffer July 8 (Anshel, staff writer, The Jewish Chronicle, July 8, 2010, http://www.thejc.com/news/world-news/34757/israeli-coalition-hit-secret-turkish-meetings) EH

A meeting between Israeli and Turkish ministers last week, intended to be secret, seems to have done nothing to improve the countries' rocky relations, instead causing at least two crises within Binyamin Netanyahu's coalition. Trade and Industry Minister Binyamin Ben-Eliezer has close ties with politicians in many Muslim countries and has undertaken delicate diplomatic missions in the past. Following the breakdown of Israel's relationship with the Erdogan administration after the Gaza flotilla incident last month, Mr Ben-Eliezer tried to use back channels to mend fences. Last Wednesday, he secretly met Turkish Foreign Minister Ahmet Davutoglu in Brussels. The meeting did not yield any result. The Ankara government is still insistent that in order to improve relations, Israel must issue an apology, compensate the families of the nine dead activists and co-operate with an international commission of enquiry. Israel has steadfastly turned down these demands. This week, the Turks turned the crisis up a notch when Mr Davutoglu threatened in a briefing to the Turkish press to break off diplomatic relations altogether if Israel does not accept. Meanwhile, the meeting, which had been personally authorised by Prime Minster Binyamin Netanyahu, leaked to the Israeli media. It turned out that Foreign Minister Avigdor Lieberman had not been informed in advance. Left to discover the existence of a high-level diplomatic encounter from the press, Mr Lieberman issued a statement saying that his omission "was a serious mistake by the Prime Minister". The Prime Minister's Office explained that Mr Lieberman had not been updated due to "a technical glitch". Mr Netanyahu tried to placate his foreign minister over the phone but for an entire day, Mr Lieberman failed to answer his calls, blaming "a technical glitch". Only on Friday did he deign to meet the prime minister, announcing after the meeting that "the matter has been resolved". "Lieberman is worried that too many things are going on behind his back - diplomatic developments, changes in the coalition, more investigations into his financial matters," said a Likud Knesset member. "He is getting jumpy and he tried to send a warning to Netanyahu that he can also act independently." Some coalition insiders believe that Mr Lieberman is looking for the right moment to leave the coalition, preferably on a matter of ideological principle and before the Attorney General decides to press charges against him on allegations of money-laundering. He still hopes to be the next leader of the right wing, supplanting Mr Netanyahu. The Brussels meeting has also caused major friction within Labour, as the party leader, Defence Minister Ehud Barak, was also against the meeting (though he knew about it in advance). A public remark by Mr Barak that "I would not have done it myself" led to an angry encounter behind closed doors between Mr Barak and Mr Ben-Eliezer. Mr Ben-Eliezer used to be one of Mr Barak's main supporters within the party. The current estrangement between the two is another indicator of the growing isolation of Mr Barak within Labour and of the rising prospect that a majority of its Knesset members will vote in favour of leaving the coalition.

Coalition Tenuous – split on peace talks

The Israeli parties are split and may not unite together soon enough to make progress under the 4 months of session

Reuters 10 (Douglas Hamilton, Middle Eastern Correspondent for Reuters, *abc News, 5/16/10,* [*http://abcnews.go.com/International/wireStory?id=10660970*](http://abcnews.go.com/International/wireStory?id=10660970)*) CS*

[JERUSALEM](http://topics.abcnews.go.com/topic/Jerusalem) (Reuters) - Prime Minister [Benjamin Netanyahu's](http://topics.abcnews.go.com/topic/Benjamin-Netanyahu) six-party, center-right coalition is divided as [Israel](http://topics.abcnews.go.com/topic/Israel) heads into indirect peace talks with the Palestinians, a cabinet minister said on Sunday. "I can't say the coalition is united. That would be a lie if I told you that," said Trade and Industry Minister [Binyamin Ben-Eliezer](http://topics.abcnews.go.com/topic/Binyamin-Ben_Eliezer) of the [Labour Party](http://topics.abcnews.go.com/topic/Labour-Party) -- the only left-wing group in the government and an advocate of conceding land for peace. U.S. [President Barack Obama's](http://topics.abcnews.go.com/topic/Barack-Obama) envoy [George Mitchell](http://topics.abcnews.go.com/topic/George-Mitchell), who is mediating in the "proximity talks," is to resume meetings on Tuesday, in the first substantive sessions since the Palestinians agreed to the indirect negotiations, which have been given a maximum of four months to produce results. Ben-Eliezer did not give a rundown of where the six Israeli coalition partners stand on the peace process, but he said the sceptical views of Foreign Minister [Avigdor Lieberman](http://topics.abcnews.go.com/topic/Avigdor-Lieberman), a hawk who leads the rightwing Israel My Home party, were known. Netanyahu also does not have the wholesale support of his own rightist Likud bloc, the largest in the coalition, according to Ben-Eliezer. "A majority back the prime minister, but not 100 percent," he told reporters at an informal briefing. Netanyahu had the strong support of younger Likud members, he added. The Palestinians are deeply and openly divided about peace with Israel. The Islamist [Hamas](http://topics.abcnews.go.com/topic/Hamas) movement controlling the [Gaza Strip](http://topics.abcnews.go.com/topic/Gaza-Strip), where 1.5 million Palestinians live, rejects outright a peace agreement that would recognize the Jewish state.

Netanyahu Coalition pro-peace process

The Labor party is confident about the peace process negotiations.

Hoffman July 8 (Gil, chief political correspondent and analyst for The Jerusalem Post, The Jerusalem Post, July 8, 2010, http://www.jpost.com/Israel/Article.aspx?id=180763) EH

Both Labor chairman Ehud Barak and his critics in the party expressed satisfaction with Netanyahu and Obama’s press conference at the White House on Tuesday. They expressed hope that the meeting would lead to Israeli-Palestinian talks that would begin before the 10-month West Bank housing-start moratorium ends in September and would make enough progress to prevent the resumption of construction from derailing the talks. “We have started on the path,” Barak said in radio interviews. “If direct talks begin, we will be in a much better position to handle the obstacles ahead. We shouldn’t lose hope that there is light at the end of the tunnel and we are entering a significant diplomatic process. “You have to assume that what happened in Washington was more than just a nice photo-op but the start of a diplomatic process that can succeed.” Barak suggested that just as Israel was able to negotiate with the Palestinians despite ongoing West Bank construction for 16 years, the construction that Netanyahu says will resume on September 26 does not have to hurt the negotiations. “When direct diplomatic talks are taking place, everything else is put in the proper proportion,” he said. Before Tuesday’s meeting at the White House, Labor ministers had threatened to quit the coalition if West Bank construction resumed, because they believed it would prevent the talks with the PA from getting off the ground. The ministers said that Tuesday’s press conference convinced them otherwise. “If there is a significant diplomatic process, we are staying in the government, because that’s why we’re there,” Minorities Affairs Minister Avishay Braverman said. “I saw the positive atmosphere yesterday. Now I want to see action.”

Peace Process will keep Labor in the coalition

The future of the Israeli coalition rests on the Palestinians.

Hoffman July 8 (Gil, chief political correspondent and analyst for The Jerusalem Post, The Jerusalem Post, July 8, 2010, http://www.jpost.com/Israel/Article.aspx?id=180763) EH

At the request of Labor MK Ghaleb Majadle, who heads the party’s Arab sector, Labor will hold a party convention in the first week of September to discuss its diplomatic plans and its future in the coalition. Majadle said he agreed to hold the convention during Ramadan, which this year runs from August 11 to September 9, give or take a day, because of the urgency of the event. “The convention should put pressure on Netanyahu that balances out the pressure from the Right to end the freeze,” Majadle said. “I am optimistic that Bibi and Barak realize the diplomatic process must advance. But if they fail to do it, we won’t remain part of the government.” Coalition chairman Ze’ev Elkin said the future of the current coalition depended on whether the Palestinians come to the negotiating table. He said that if the Palestinians want Labor to stay in the coalition and the diplomatic process to be able to progress, then they should enter into direct talks. But he stressed that if Labor left, the government would go on, with the addition of the National Union or at least part of Kadima.

Peace process necessary to stave off right wing

Israeli settlement decisions put pressure on Netanyahu to act.

Azriel 10 (Guy, writer for CNN World section, CNN, July 4, 2010, http://www.cnn.com/2010/WORLD/meast/07/04/west.bank.settlements) EH

Jerusalem (CNN) -- As the 10-month building freeze in the West Bank settlements comes closer to its end scheduled in September -- and only days before the Benjamin Netanyahu-Barack Obama meeting this week -- tension in Israel over the question of the future status of settlements is rising. Several right-wing groups have joined forces in recent days to pressure Israeli Prime Minister Netanyahu and members of his Likud party to honor their words and resume building in the West Bank. "This is a historical moment for Netanyahu and his government where Israel's international credibility will be tested," says Naftali Bennett of the Yehsha Council, representing West Bank settlers. "This will show whether we are crumbling under pressure as puppets of the United States or do we acknowledge what our existential interests are," Bennett added. In a campaign titled "a word is a word," Netanyahu and his party's members are confronted with quotes they made a few months ago claiming the freeze is only temporary. The nationwide campaign includes both posters carrying quotes of Netanyahu's government and a recorded message in Netanyahu's own voice promising not to extend current building restrictions in the West Bank. A second front Netanyahu faced Sunday was an offer to give lawmakers veto power over a government decision to extend the freeze. Extensive pressure applied by the prime minister's office on the ministerial committee eventually paid off and the offer was turned down by a majority of 8 to 5 votes. Netanyahu wants to maintain the right to extend the freeze as a possible gesture to U.S. President Barack Obama or as a tool in future negotiations. Netanyahu himself chose not to comment on the freeze due to expire on September 26. "The main goal of the talks with President Obama will be to advance direct talks in the peace process between us and the Palestinians," Netanyahu said at the start of Sunday's cabinet meeting.

Labor won’t leave the coalition

Labor won’t leave coalition – they’re useless.

Hoffman 10(Gil, Staff Writer for Jerusalem post, [http://www.jpost.com/Israel/Article.aspx?id=176351) dc](http://www.jpost.com/Israel/Article.aspx?id=176351)%20dc).

The Labor Party will not bring down Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu’s government regardless of whether the peace process progresses, Labor chairman Ehud Barak hinted in an interview with Israel Radio Monday morning. Barak was asked in the interview whether he would still be defense minister next year and about recent statements by Labor Party ministers Isaac Herzog and Avishay Braverman that Labor should leave the government in September if West Bank construction resumes and the peace process does not make substantial progress. “I intend to remain defense minister until the end of the government’s term, and then we will see what the voters say,” Barak said. Barak’s statement angered Labor MKs who believe that the party should never have joined the government. MK Daniel Ben-Simon said Barak had become Netanyahu’s slave and the other Labor MKs the prime minister’s foreign workers. “The Labor faction is a gang of 13 people who have barely any connection,” Ben-Simon said. “Barak has no view on any issue other than security, and we are acting like a fig leaf. We are acting like a sinking ship, and we are making no effort to save it. We lost our identity, and we have become passive observers of the dangerous show passing before our eyes.” MK Eitan Cabel said he was not surprised by Barak’s statement. He called upon Herzog and Braverman to leave the government immediately and stop waiting for the peace process to move forward or Barak to make a move. “

Kadima Joining Coalition

Netanyahu is attempting to bring Kadima into government coalition with or without Livni

Benn 10

Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu once again asked opposition leader MK Tzipi Livni (Kadima) to join his coalition on Thursday - but said if she refused, he would do his best to split her party. Netanyahu told Haaretz that he has wanted to expand his government "from day one." In coalition talks after the election, he said, "we offered her 'unto half the kingdom' and she did not want it. But I'm continuing to try, and if I can, I'll take at least part of Kadima." Netanyahu said he believed there was a chance Livni would join his government - even though today, he is only offering her the job of minister without portfolio. Expanding the coalition is important "in light of the political, security and economic challenges," he said. "The coalition is not always coherent in these matters. Kadima joining, or part of Kadima joining, would create a very large and focused bloc." Netanyahu said he wanted "wider margins" to pursue action on "various fronts," including steps such as those he has already taken on the Palestinian issue: the removal of West Bank checkpoints, his speech at Bar-Ilan University in which he supported a Palestinian state ("words are also important," he said), and the freeze on construction in the settlements. ".

Kadima will join Netanyahu’s coalition if extreme right-wing parties are ousted

Israel News 9 (Attila Somfalvi, chief political [correspondent](http://www.ynetnews.com/articles/0,7340,L-3095106,00.html) and [analys](http://www.ynetnews.com/articles/0,7340,L-3094760,00.html)t at the Israel News, *Y Net News.com,* 5/4/09, <http://www.ynetnews.com/articles/0,7340,L-3482383,00.html>) CS

Despite leveling harsh criticism at [Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu](http://www.ynetnews.com/articles/0,7340,L-3482383,00.html), particularly with regards to the current [crisis](http://www.ynetnews.com/articles/0,7340,L-3862489,00.html) with the US over Israel's plan to build 1,600 housing units in east Jerusalem, senior members of the opposition party are not ruling out the possibility of joining the coalition.   "If Netanyahu ousts one of his partners in the coalition – [Shas](http://www.ynetnews.com/articles/0,7340,L-3499178,00.html) or [Yisrael Beiteinu](http://www.ynetnews.com/articles/0,7340,L-3499234,00.html) (Foreign Minister Avigdor Lieberman's party), we will have no choice but to join," one [Kadima](http://www.ynetnews.com/articles/0,7340,L-3498209,00.html) official said Sunday.   The officials stressed that a change in the coalition is crucial in light of what they called the recent damage caused to Israel's image due to Netanyahu's policies and cabinet's decisions on key issues.   Sources close to Kadima chairwoman Tzipi Livni hinted that the party would consider joining the government under certain conditions.   "Now it is clear that Netanyahu needs Kadima, and only Livni's presence can save Israel's status and fix the damage that has been caused (to Israel) over the past year," one of the sources said.   Despite the statements, it appears that no significant talks are being held regarding the possibility of changes in the coalition.

Netanyahu doing all in his ability to bring the Kadima into his coalition

Mualem & Lis 9 (Jonathan Lis and Mazal Mualem political correspondents for Ha’aretz, *Ha’aretz* , 12/28/09, <http://www.haaretz.com/news/netanyahu-livni-trade-barbs-over-kadima-coalition-offer-1.1242>)

Following the vote, the prime minister's bureau relayed that, "Netanyahu was saddened to hear that the Kadima faction, headed by Tzipi Livni, refused his offer and refused to broaden the national unity government. In light of the challenges Israel is currently facing, the prime minister had hoped that Kadima's stance would be different." After meeting for 90 minutes on Sunday evening, Netanyahu and Livni were no closer to agreeing on whether Kadima would join the government, with each side blaming the other for the failure of the discussion. Netanyahu said following the meeting that Livni was playing for time. Livni said she would consult her faction, but after phoning Kadima MKs on Sunday, she said she felt the meeting had been a political exercise. Netanyahu made Livni a sweetheart offer: two ministers without portfolio, for her and MK Shaul Mofaz, membership in the inner cabinet and for her, membership in the senior forum of ministers. Coalition agreements, to which Kadima would be obligated, would not change. Sources in Kadima said the faction was likely to reject the offer, which could spur a split in the party. Netanyahu and his aides continued yesterday to try to persuade seven Kadima lawmakers to leave the faction, the legal minimum needed to split off.

Obama supports Kadima in the govt

Obama is willing to get Kadima into the coalition because no intelligent peace progress can be made without them

Hoffman 10 (Gil Hoffman, chief political correspondent and analyst for The Jerusalem Post. Quoting: Jeffrey Goldberg, an award winning national correspondent for The Atlantic and a staff writer at the New Yorker, *The Jerusalem Post,* 3/18/10, <http://www.jpost.com/Israel/Article.aspx?id=171259>) CS

US President Barack Obama’s administration’s recent pressure on Israel is designed to force Prime Minister [Binyamin Netanyahu](http://jpost.headup.com/Services/FrontService/Horizon/jpedia.htm?uri=http://schemas.semantinet.com/Person/name/Benjamin%20Netanyahu/displaytype/Office%20Holder/dbpediaSubject/Benjamin_Netanyahu/&name=Binyamin%20Netanyahu) to add Kadima to his coalition instead of [Israel Beiteinu](http://jpost.headup.com/Services/FrontService/Horizon/jpedia.htm?uri=http://schemas.semantinet.com/Info/name/Yisrael%20Beiteinu/displaytype//dbpediaSubject/Yisrael_Beiteinu/&name=Israel%20Beiteinu) or [Shas](http://jpost.headup.com/Services/FrontService/Horizon/jpedia.htm?uri=http://schemas.semantinet.com/Info/name/Shas/displaytype//dbpediaSubject/Shas/&name=Shas), influential American columnist Jeffrey Goldberg wrote in a story published on Tuesday.In a column in *The Atlantic* magazine titled “What Obama is Actually Trying to Do in Israel,” Goldberg, who is close to Obama, said the president wanted to cause a rupture in Netanyahu’s coalition that would necessitate bringing in Kadima. He said he spoke about the matter with officials in the White House. “I’ve been on the phone with many of the usual suspects (White House and otherwise), and I think it’s fair to say that Obama is not trying to destroy America’s relations with Israel; he’s trying to organize Tzipi Livni’s campaign for prime minister, or at least for her inclusion in a broad-based centrist government,” Goldberg wrote.“I’m not actually suggesting that the White House is directly meddling in internal Israeli politics, but it’s clear to everyone – at the White House, at the State Department, at Goldblog – that no progress will be made on any front if Avigdor Lieberman’s far-right party, Israel Beiteinu, and Eli Yishai’s fundamentalist Shas Party, remain in Netanyahu’s surpassingly fragile coalition.”Livni’s spokesman declined to comment about the column, but Kadima MK Shlomo Molla, who is her close ally, warned Obama and his advisers against interfering in Israeli politics. “We don’t need Obama’s help,” Molla said. “But we agree that the current coalition is bad for Israel and for US-Israel relations and that if Livni was working with Obama, there would be much more trust from the White House.” Coalition chairman Ze’ev Elkin (Likud) responded by complaining about Livni’s behavior during the current crisis with the US.

A2: Netanyahu won’t follow Obama’s lead in peace talks

Netanyahu will follow Obama on peace talks

Benn 10 (Aluf; staff writer, *Haaretz,* June 26, 2010, http://www.haaretz.com/magazine/week-s-end/the-four-stages-of-israeli-policy-crisis-pressure-cave-in-and-agreement-1.298264) CH

When the security cabinet decided to ease the civilian blockade on the Gaza Strip this week, the process followed the precise modus operandi Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu has taken with regard to leading Israel's foreign and defense policy this term. Each such incident has had four stages: crisis, pressure, cave-in and agreement. In the first stage, Israel gets entangled in an international crisis over use of force that some consider excessive, or due to new construction in the settlements or in East Jerusalem. "The world" demands that Israel be punished and Netanyahu begs the U.S. administration to rescue him. In the second stage, U.S. President Barack Obama takes advantage of the opportunity, and demands that Netanyahu make concessions to the Palestinians and rein in the settlements in exchange for American help. In the third, and critical, stage, Netanyahu caves in after putting up symbolic resistance to Obama's demands or buying a little time. The result is always the same and apparently unavoidable: Netanyahu changes his policy in a way that goes against the ideology he was raised on at home and his right-wing coalition platform. The premier listens to his father, Benzion, to his wife, Sara, to his colleagues in Likud and to his "natural partners" from Yisrael Beiteinu and Shas. He undoubtedly agrees with them in his heart, but understands intellectually that Israel is totally dependent on U.S. support. Then comes the fourth and most surprising stage: The prime minister's zigzag makes no waves, not even a ripple, in the coalition. No one attacks Netanyahu on the morning radio talk shows. Benny Begin, Moshe Ya'alon, Eli Yishai and Avigdor Lieberman, who certainly oppose the government's frequent policy shifts, cling to their seats in the ministerial septet. Netanyahu treats them with respect, convenes them for worthless discussions that go on for hours and in the end gets what he wants: Everyone is committed to a decision that Obama dictated.

Netanyahu has incentives to follow Obama and the coalition will fall inline

Benn 10 (Aluf; staff writer, *Haaretz,* June 26, 2010, http://www.haaretz.com/magazine/week-s-end/the-four-stages-of-israeli-policy-crisis-pressure-cave-in-and-agreement-1.298264) CH

Now, Netanyahu is presenting his struggle against the left as an essential vehicle in the fight to save Israel from the so-called delegitimization threat. The political message to Barak is also transparent: Anyone who abandons the coalition at this difficult hour, when internal unity is called for, is indirectly abetting those seeking to liquidate Zionism. Netanyahu is right in believing that the international community will reject any political initiative by his current government, just as the Bar-Ilan speech and the settlement construction freeze were disdainfully ignored. Furthermore, the premier is presenting the partnership with Barak as a "unity government," but that message is not being accepted abroad. According to European diplomats, only if Netanyahu brings Tzipi Livni into the government and accepts the Olmert government's peace proposals will they believe he is truly serious. But Netanyahu has not reached that point and neither has Livni. But Netanyahu's conduct in the flotilla and blockade episode, as in earlier crises, suggest he will have trouble rejecting an American policy initiative, if and when one is put forward. He will protest, but if Obama holds firm, the premier will once again cave in and the coalition will fall into line behind him. This will particularly be the case if Israel needs a U.S. life preserver in a confrontation with Iran and its supporters, as happened after the Yom Kippur War, the first Gulf War and the second intifada - events that derailed Israel's self-confidence and led to territorial withdrawals. Netanyahu is a hero against the left-wing scarecrow in Israeli academe. In the face of Obama his roar turns into a whimper. He makes speeches about our historical rights and then does what the Americans dictate.

Peace Process Brink

Now is key time – if results aren’t reached now, Peace Process may fail forever

Lis 7/9 (Jonathan, writer, *Haaretz*, 7-9-2010, <http://www.haaretz.com/print-edition/news/obama-israeli-palestinian-peace-possible-before-end-of-my-first-term-1.300853>) CM

U.S. President Barack Obama said he believed that Benjamin Netanyahu could reach a peace agreement with the Palestinians in his current term and denied having treated the Israeli prime minister with hostility at their first meetings. Obama was speaking with Yonit Levy of Channel 2 News in his first interview with an Israeli media outlet since being elected president. "I think [Netanyahu] is somebody who understands that we've got a fairly narrow window of opportunity," Obama said in the interview that was held on Wednesday and aired last night. "On the Palestinian side, moderates like Abu Mazen [President Mahmoud Abbas] and [Prime Minister Salam] Fayyad are, I think, willing to make the concessions and engage in negotiations that can result in peace. But their time frame in power may be limited if they aren't able to deliver for their people," he said, speaking one day after he described his White House meeting with Netanyahu as "excellent." According to Obama, "There's a constant contest between moderates and rejectionists within the Arab world. And then there's the demographic challenges that Israel is going to be facing if it wants to remain not only a Jewish state but a democratic state .... We probably won't have a better opportunity than we have right now."

There’s a narrow window of opportunity to act on the peace process.

Keinon and Horn July 9 (Herb, journalist and columnist for The Jerusalem Post, Jordana, writer, The Jerusalem Post, July 9, 2010, http://www.jpost.com/Home/Article.aspx?id=180896) EH

One result of the direct talks, he said, would be to build trust between the sides so they would not be “so jumpy or paranoid about every single move being made, whether it is being related to Jerusalem, or any other issues that have to be dealt with.” Obama’s interview came just a week after Abbas also appealed directly to the Israeli public, giving a rare interview to the Hebrew press in which he tried to convince the public of his sincerity about peace. Netanyahu on Thursday gave a number of interviews, including to CNN, ABC and CBS. In these interviews, he tried to convince the American public of the need for direct talks with the PA now, and he also, like Obama, downplayed reports of a crisis over the last year in his ties with the US president. Obama said in his interview that not only was Netanyahu a “smart and savvy politician,” but the fact that “he is not perceived as a dove can in some ways be helpful.” Obama said that just as former US president Richard Nixon had been uniquely positioned to make his groundbreaking trip to China because of his anti-communist credentials, so, too, Netanyahu may be positioned to help shepherd in a peace accord, because “any successful peace will have to include the hawks and doves on both sides.” The president said Netanyahu understood that there was currently a “fairly narrow window of opportunity” because Abbas and PA Prime Minister Salam Fayyad were willing “to make concessions and engage in negotiations that can result in peace, but that their time frame in power might be limited if they can’t deliver for their people.”

Peace Process will succeed

Israel is pushing the peace process.

Berger July 7 (Robert, Voice of America writer on the Middle East, Voice of America, July 7, 2010, http://www1.voanews.com/english/news/middle-east/Israel-White-House-Summit-Boosts-Peace-Process-97934204.html) EH

A day after Israeli and American leaders met at the White House, Israel is expressing optimism about the Middle East peace process. The Palestinians, however, are not as enthusiastic. Israel is hailing as a success Tuesday's White House summit between Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu and President Barack Obama. After more than a year of strained relations over Israeli settlement expansion, both leaders went out of their way to stress that bilateral ties are back on track. Mr. Obama supported Israel's demand to move to direct peace talks with the Palestinians after two months of indirect negotiations. Israeli President Shimon Peres says that is an important step in the right direction. Mr. Peres said that after a long period of stagnation, the peace process is getting a boost. Israel believes that direct talks are the only way to resolve the thorniest issues of the conflict, such as the status of Jerusalem, Palestinian refugees and the final borders of a Palestinian state. Palestinian chief negotiator, Saeb Erekat, though, says direct talks would be premature because of Israeli settlement expansion in the West Bank and East Jerusalem. "The direct negotiation is in the hand of Prime Minister Netanyahu," said Erekat. "It's up to him. He has the choice. If Israel will stop settlement activities, we will have it; we will have direct negotiations." The Palestinians say Israel's partial freeze on settlement construction is not enough. The 10-month freeze is due to end in September, and Mr. Netanyahu is under pressure from hawkish coalition partners not to renew it.

The Peace Process is on track now

[Stephanopoulos](http://abcnews.go.com/ThisWeek/story?id=133369) 7/7 (George, Chief Political Correspondent, ABC News, 7-7-2010, <http://blogs.abcnews.com/george/2010/07/israeli-prime-minister-benjamin-netanyahu-dont-be-so-skepticalwe-can-perform-miracles.html>) CM

In his first interview since a day filled with smiles and handshakes at the White House, the Israeli Prime Minister outlined for the first time some of the "concrete steps" promised to President Obama to advance the peace process. “There are more things we are prepared to do..There are things like additional easing of movements, some questions of economic projects,” Benjamin Netanyahu said. “There are quite a few. The point is we are prepared to do them.” Netanyahu did not specifically include extending the freeze on the settlement construction set to expire in September, but suggested he was open to that possibility if progress is made in the peace talks. “I think once we get there realities may change, but I think the most important reality is that we don’t stick on…all sorts of requirements and grievances, “ he said. Netanyahu told me he wants to put aside all preconditions, excuses and grievances and just start negotiating. “We want President Abbas to grasp my hand, get into a room, shake it, sit down and negotiate a final settlement of peace between Israel and the Palestinians,” he said. The Israeli leader said he appreciated yesterday’s warm reception and dismissed the chill in U.S.-Israeli relations, saying it is "natural" for allies to have disagreements. Netanyahu told me he is confident that he can bring a peace agreement to the region that a majority of Israelis support. “Don’t be so skeptical,” he said. “Raise your hopes. It’s summer time and we can perform miracles if we set our sights to them.”

Peace Process will succeed

With the help of Obama, the Israeli-Palestinian agreement will end in peace.

Baskin July 5 (Gershon, co-CEO of Israel/Palestine Center for Research and Information and elected member of the leadership of the Green Movement political party, The Jerusalem Post, July 5, 2010, http://www.jpost.com/Opinion/Columnists/Article.aspx?id=180525) EH

The entire world knows what an Israeli-Palestinian peace agreement looks like. Our leaders know, most of the Israeli and Palestinian people know, US President Barack Obama, special envoy George Mitchell, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, Quartet envoy Tony Blair, German Chancellor Angela Merkel, UN Secretary- General Ban Ki-moon – they all know it. There are no secrets. This is the most researched conflict in the history of conflicts and there are more detailed plans on how to resolve even the minutest of details in this conflict than any other. Collectively, those of us working for peace over the past 20 years have conducted thousands of hours of meetings between Israeli and Palestinian experts on every aspect of the conflict. The best universities in the world have convened Israeli-Palestinian peace projects and presented their findings to the international community and to the local leaders. Israeli and Palestinian negotiating teams have explored every possible issue in depth and have identified all of the red lines of each side. Time is running out. Options for resolving the conflict that exist today may not be there tomorrow. Our main problem is that until now this has been a failed peace process. One of the ironies is that a majority of Israelis and Palestinians say that they want peace. They say they are ready to make painful compromises. But they also both say there is no partner on the other side. History, thus far has proven them right. Objectively speaking, Israelis and Palestinians have no good reason to trust each other. Both sides have proven to be terrible partners. Both sides have breached, substantively, all of the agreements that they signed. Sure, each side will place more responsibility on the other side than take responsibility for its own breaches. So why should we trust each other? We shouldn’t – is the answer, but that is our challenge and not a curse of a doomed fate. We have no choice but to make peace. Any other option is catastrophic. Our very survival and existence as a nation – both nations – depends on our ability to make peace. The survival of the Jewish people in our land, of the Zionist enterprise in its entirety is based on our ability to extricate ourselves from the occupation of the Palestinian people and to make peace on the basis of two states for two peoples. The fate of the Palestinian people and their survival as a nation is based entirely on their ability to demonstrate that they are responsible members of the community of nations and that they are committed to living in peace with their Jewish neighbors on the basis of two states for two peoples. There is no other solution to the conflict. Whoever says he has another solution is fooling himself and others. Yes, there may be federative or confederative possibilities in the future for varying degrees of cooperation and open borders, but all of those options grow from the two-state solution and not before it or instead of it. SO WHAT must we do now? We must enter this process with the working assumption that we don’t trust each other. We don’t expect each other to fulfill our most basic obligations. That is simply the reality. If this is the case, developing a peace agreement cannot be based on a bilateral process which is predicated on mutual trust, and no amount of artificial confidence-building measures will create that trust. After years of failure, violence and suffering, new trust can only be based on the actual fulfillment of obligations and commitments agreed to in the context of treaties. But if we don’t trust them and they don’t trust us, how can we possibility proceed? We must insist that there be a reliable third party who will monitor implementation and verify that all aspects of all agreements are being fully implemented. We must insist that the reliable third party be able to act immediately when there are breaches. It must be able to call the parties to task, to demand explanations and to insist on implementation. It must act with full transparency so that the public on both sides knows what their governments are fulfilling and what they are not doing. We must insist that the reliable third party has the capacity and the authority to resolve disputes in real time, before they blow out of proportion. Not every single dispute needs to rise to the level of a cabinet decision, as it did in past situations. We need to insist that Obama get directly involved and that direct negotiations mediated by Mitchell take place immediately and intensively. We need to insist that the mediator put bridging proposals on the table because we know each other’s red lines, but we will both wait until the last minute before we expose our own. We need the mediator to conduct cooperation based negotiations, not competition based negotiations where the emphasis is on problem solving and not “your losses are my gains.” We need a good agreement, we need an agreement that both sides can live with, we need an agreement that the leaders of both sides will support enthusiastically and not present as a bad deal to their people. GETTING TO the agreement will be hard work. We need both leaders to look directly into the eyes of their people and to tell them the truth. Netanyahu must state clearly that the Palestinian state will be established in about 96 percent of the West Bank. We will give the Palestinians land inside of Israel to account for the 4% of the West Bank that we will annex as part of the agreement. Some 80% of the settlers in the West Bank and east Jerusalem will remain where they are and will be part of the sovereign State of Israel, but some 20% will have to relocate – either to the annexed lands in Judea and Samaria or to Israel. Netanyahu must say to the Israeli people that Jerusalem will be the capital of both countries. We will have sovereignty over the Western Wall and they will have sovereignty on the Temple Mount, but they will agree not to dig or to build there, nor will we tunnel underneath. We will trust God to change the arrangement, if need be, when He decides to send us the messiah. Until then we will recognize that the Muslims have control there and we do not. Abbas must look in the eyes of his people and say we will not return to our lost homes inside Israel. Our return will be to our state. Our mission is to build our state and to create the first real democracy in the Arab world. Palestine will be a model state using the latest technologies and have the best school system in the Middle East. Palestine will be prosperous and all Palestinians will be invited to share the dream and to build the state. We will share Jerusalem with our Jewish cousins, our Israeli neighbors and we will resolve all disputes through diplomacy not violence. And both states will dwell in peace.

Peace Process will succeed

The Peace Process solves Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

Pelle 10 (Ratna, writer, *ZioNation,* 5-16-2006, <http://www.zionism-israel.com/log/archives/00000062.html>) CM

A two state solution means Israel is the national home of the Jewish people, and as a sovereign state, it has the right to determine who can become a citizen and under what conditions, just as the Netherlands defines who can be a citizen and who not. We have decided for example that everybody from Surinam can be a citizen automatically, but people from Venezuela or Brazil cannot. This has to do with our historical ties to Surinam, and nobody calls the Netherlands racist for that reason. In the same way, Israel has the right to grant every Jew citizenship automatically, because it defines itself as the national home of the Jews. Palestine will be the national home of the Palestinian people and it is free to determine who gets citizenship under what conditions. The Palestinian state should be contiguous and people should be free to move from the West Bank to the Gaza strip. This means that most settlements should be removed. Also, it should be free to import and export goods and not be dependent on Israeli border control. As Israel will not like a hostile state on its doorstep that imports all kinds of weapons, this is only possible after the Palestinians genuinely have accepted Israel's right to exist, and the Palestinians have dismantled the terrorist factions and keep a monopoly on the use of violence, as normal states do. Probably the Palestinian state will be demilitarized until a stable government exists and the desire to 'liberate all of Palestine' has really faded away. There will be a kind of joint or international control of the borders. The Geneva Accord is quite detailed about things like this.

One might differ about the exact details and borders, but the essence is clear and will be something like the Taba proposal or the Geneva Accord. Peace means that both sides cease violence against each other, in words and in deeds. It means no more incitement and hate speech against each other, as especially happens in the Arab world against Jews and Israel. One has the right to defend himself, as is normal between states that are not at war, but not to murder civilians deliberately or attack the territory of the other state. Peace means acknowledging the right of the other to exist and to live and to be free like oneself. Peace means accepting that one cannot get 100% of one's own rights and wishes because that contradicts the rights and legitimate grievances of the other. Peace means being willing to compromise. Beware of people who want a 'just peace', and don't want to compromise on 'their rights'. It is not possible. It always means they want the other side to surrender.

Peace process will succeed – Palestinians on board

Abbas wants peace – He’s taking actions to gain Israeli support for successful peace process.

Benn 7/1(Aluf, Editor and Foreign Policy Reporter for Haaretz, Mifta.org, <http://www.miftah.org/Display.cfm?DocId=22292&CategoryId=5>, 2010)dc.

Palestinian Authority President Mahmoud Abbas Wednesday launched a direct appeal to the Israeli public to coincide with the upcoming meeting between Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu and U.S. President Barack Obama. The Palestinian leader launched his "popular peace campaign" to explain the PA's positions to Israelis. His aim is to win Israelis' trust and enlist their support for a peace settlement based on the 1967 borders (with minor changes and land swaps. ) At a meeting with six Israeli journalists in his Ramallah office on Wednesday, Abbas spent an hour patiently answering questions, including one about the doubts he expressed over the scope of the Holocaust in his doctoral thesis. He invited the guests to dine with him and shared his impressions of the World Cup games, as well as anecdotes from meetings with Israeli leaders and Obama. After about three hours, Abbas urged the journalists, "don't let me lose hope." Abbas said his family was pressing him to retire from politics due to his age (75 ) and reiterated his pledge not to run in the next presidential election. He warned that in view of the difficulties in the peace process, growing numbers of Palestinians are calling for abandoning the two-state solution in favor of a one-state solution. Abbas said that former Israeli foreign minister Abba Eban was right when he said the Palestinians never missed an opportunity to miss an opportunity. "To this day, I regret our rejection of the Partition Plan in 1947," he said. "Now I tell you Israelis - don't miss the opportunity the Arab League has offered you with its peace initiative." Though that plan requires Israel to withdraw from all the territories it conquered in 1967, Abbas said he was confident Syria would not sabotage a deal to end the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, even if it does not advance the negotiations with Syria (which insists on a complete withdrawal from the Golan Heights ). Abbas said he would not sign a reconciliation agreement with Hamas unless it adopts the Arab peace initiative and the principles incorporated in the road map peace plan. Abbas, who was in high spirits, joked with the Israeli guests and had photos taken with each of them. He told many anecdotes about his smoking habits. Between one cigarette and another, he disclosed that opposition leader Tzipi Livni used to smoke cigarillos and that he had smoked in Obama's company. He spoke proudly about joint receptions that Jewish and Palestinian community leaders in South America had hosted for him. He said that Yasser Abed Rabbo, who is in charge of the PA's television channel, had invited Netanyahu for an interview but received no response. The PA intends to invite President Shimon Peres to a large peace rally in Jericho, he added. Abbas said that despite the absence of direct negotiations with Israel, he has repeatedly offered to resume the work of the joint committee to prevent incitement, which was established 12 years ago after Netanyahu consented to it at the Wye summit. But even to this, Abbas said, Israel has not responded. Responding to the claim that the doctoral thesis he wrote in 1982 for Lumumba University in Moscow had expressed doubts about whether six million Jews really perished in the Holocaust, Abbas said he saw the Holocaust as a crime against humanity, and had meant only that he lacked the tools to determine whether six, five or seven million Jews died in it. As far as he is concerned, he added, the murder of even one innocent person is a crime against the world. Abbas said he has instructed his ambassadors in Poland and Russia to take part in Holocaust memorial days.

Peace process will succeed – 2 state solution good

The Two-State Solution is the only realistic possibility for peace – all other measures fail

Peres 9 (Shimon, former president of Israel, *Washington Post*, 2-10-2009, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2009/02/09/AR2009020902098.html>) CM

The one-state solution has enough intrinsic flaws to render it no solution at all. From Israel's perspective, it is not possible for the Jewish people to accept an arrangement that signifies the end of the existence of a Jewish state. From the Palestinians' perspective, they should not be denied the opportunity to take their national destiny into their own hands. Dissenters from the two-state solution contend -- not without some reason -- that Gaza and the West Bank are too small to absorb the Palestinian refugees. Yet this would also be the case under the one-state formula; it would result in a state that is merely 24,000 square kilometers and that already overflows with a population exceeding 10 million (5.5 million Jews and 4.5 million Arabs). While cynics might question the size of the West Bank and Gaza, optimists should look no further than Singapore for reassurance. The area of the West Bank and Gaza is nine times as large as Singapore's, yet the combined population of Palestinians in both regions is smaller than that of Singapore. This Southeast Asian country enjoys one of the highest standards of living in the world. We have faith that the Palestinians are capable of achieving similar success, and we will continue to work tirelessly with our partners across the negotiating table to establish an autonomous Palestinian state where the people will institute a modern economy based on science, technology and the benefits of peace. Establishing a single multinational country is a tenuous path that does not bode well for peace but, rather, enforces the conflict's perpetuation. Lebanon, ravaged by bloodshed and instability, represents only one of many examples of an undesirable quagmire of this nature. The difficulties of a two-state solution are numerous, but it remains the only realistic and moral formula to end the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Those not committed to this solution argue that, after the creation of a Palestinian state, Israel's waist would be too narrow -- some six miles -- to ensure security for its citizens. Indeed, six miles will be too narrow to guarantee full security, which only reinforces our belief that Israel's safety is not embedded only in territorial defense but in peace. Peace provides breadth of wings, even when the waist is narrow.

**Two-state solution prevents Ethnic Cleansing, Israeli Democarcy, collapse of Israeli-American relations,  and the end of Palestinian-Israeli Conflict**  
Walt ‘9 (Stephen M., Professor of international relations at Harvard University, 2-10-2009  http://walt.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2009/02/10/what\_do\_we\_do\_if\_the\_two\_state\_solution\_collapses) CM

There are only three alternative options at that point. First, Israel could drive most or all of the 2.5 million Palestinians out of the West Bank by force, thereby preserving "greater Israel" as a Jewish state through an overt act of ethnic cleansing. The Palestinians would surely resist, and it would be a crime against humanity, conducted in full view of a horrified world. No American government could support such a step, and no true friend of Israel could endorse that solution. Second, Israel could retain control of the West Bank but allow the Palestinians limited autonomy in a set of disconnected enclaves, while it controlled access in-and-out, their water supplies, and the airspace above them. This appears to have been Ariel Sharon's strategy before he was incapacitated, and Bibi Netanyahu's proposal for "economic peace" without a Palestinian state seems to envision a similar outcome. In short, the Palestinians would not get a viable state of their own, and would not enjoy full political rights. This is the solution that many people -- including Prime Minister Olmert -- compare to the apartheid regime in South Africa. It is hard to imagine the United States supporting this outcome over the long term, and Olmert has said as much. Denying the Palestinians' their own national aspirations is also not going to end the conflict.

Peace process will succeed – 2 State solution good

Two-state Solution only way to achieve piece, anything else causes civil war or Palestinian Oppression  
Hadar 4 (Leon T., research fellow, CATO Institute, 3-23-2004, http://www.cato.org/pub\_display.php?pub\_id=2581) CM

While the Israeli Benvenisti and the Palestinian Buttu each frame their support for a one-state solution as realism in its most basic form, the two seem to be taking part in an escape from reality. It's not only a reality in which bi-national and multinational arrangements are collapsing everywhere, it's also a reality in which, after 100 years of a clash between Zionism and Arab nationalism, there are no signs that the ideological forces of these two movements have been exhausted. If anything, those two secular nationalist movements seem to be taking more radical and atavistic forms that reflect their ethnic and religious sources. As Avnery suggests, the Zionist thrust-expansion, occupation, and settlement-"is in full, offensive swing, while on the Palestinian side, nationalism (including the Islamic version) is deepening and growing from martyr to martyr." It takes real faith to believe that these two nationalistic peoples "will give up the essence of their hopes and turn from total enmity to total peace, giving up their national narratives and being ready to live together as supra-national citizens," says Avnery, who is still committed to the two-state solution and regards the one-state idea as "utopia that is based on the vision that there is a perfect human being or that human beings can be perfected." There is certainly no chance that the present Israeli generation, or its successor, will accept this solution, which conflicts absolutely with the ethos of Israel as it exists today. Nor are there any signs that Arab-Palestinians are ready for such an experiment, especially if one takes into consideration that the only example of bi-nationalism in the Arab world, Lebanon, proved to be a total and bloody disaster. In fact, a bi-national state would only produce an explosive situation in which Jews would dominate the economy and most other aspects of the new state, creating a reality of exploitation. At that point in time, a bi-national state would be a new form of occupation that would only set the conflict on a more violent track. Indeed, it is this scenario that demonstrates why the attempt to apply the analogy of Apartheid South Africa is so misplaced. After all, unlike the Jews of Israel, the members of the Afrikaner tribe lacked the powerful base of support that American Jews will continue to provide Israel. And in contrast to the Afrikaners, Israeli Jews will continue to benefit from the sense of guilt among Western elites that the Holocaust has produced. There is no doubt that the Israeli repression of Palestinians will erode support for Israel among liberal and left-leaning activists in Europe and the U.S. and will polarize Israeli society. But the political power of American Jews, the memories of the Holocaust, and the rising anti-Arab sentiments in the West would allow even a diminishing majority of Jews to dominate the one state, to continue expanding Jewish settlements, and eventually to overpower the Palestinians. To put it differently, the South African conflict ended with the surrender of power by the defeated Afrikaners. There are no signs that Israeli-Jews are about the follow their example. It's the Palestinians, unlike the blacks of South Africa who would become the main losers in this utopian scheme. "In the end," Averny writes, "we shall reach the objective: to live together in peace, side by side. ... But today the propaganda for this utopia diverts attention from the practical, immediate objective, at a time when the whole world has accepted the idea of 'two states for two peoples.'"

A2: Israel won’t end settlements

3/5 of Israelis support Settlement Removal as part of a Peace Process deal

Richman 10 ( Alvin, top public opinion analyst for the State Department , *World Public Opinion,* 4-15-2010, <http://www.worldpublicopinion.org/pipa/articles/brmiddleeastnafricara/659.php?nid=&id=&pnt=659&lb=>) CM

A survey of the Israeli general public and Israeli settlers taken in early March shows three-fifths of the Israeli public (60%) support "dismantling most of the settlements in the territories as part of a peace agreement with the Palestinians." This is eleven points higher than the previous reading (49%) taken in December, 2009, and is the highest level recorded since 2005, during the debate over evacuating the Gaza Strip. Just one-third of the Israeli public (33%) opposes dismantling most settlements, including 13 percent very strongly opposed. This is the lowest level of strong opposition to dismantling settlements recorded by the Truman Institute for the 26 surveys in which this question has been asked since 2001. The survey was conducted by the Harry S. Truman Institute for the Advancement of Peace, at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem.

A2: Jerusalem prevents Peace Process success

Israel is becoming more flexible on Jerusalem in the Israeli-Palestinian peace process.

Heilman July 7 (Uriel, award-winning journalist who is widely recognized today as one of the rising stars among reporters covering Israel, the Middle East and the Jewish world, JTA, July 7, 2010, http://www.jta.org/news/article/2010/07/07/2739964/netanyahu-hints-at-flexibility-on-jerusalem) EH

NEW YORK (JTA) -- It was an otherwise wholly unremarkable stump speech before a friendly audience in New York. On Wednesday evening at Manhattan’s Plaza Hotel, the Israeli prime minister addressed a roomful of more than 300 Jews on the subjects of Iran, his government’s eagerness for direct peace talks with the Palestinians and the swell meeting he had just had with President Obama at the White House. But then, in an off-the-cuff remark to a question on Jerusalem from the audience, Benjamin Netanyahu dropped a hint that his government’s insistence on Israeli sovereignty over all of Jerusalem might not be ironclad. “Everybody knows that there are Jewish neighborhoods in Jerusalem that under any peace plan will remain where they are,” Netanyahu said in response to the question read by the executive vice chairman of the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations, Malcolm Hoenlein. The implication of Netanyahu’s remark -- that other neighborhoods of Jerusalem may not remain “where they are,” becoming part of an eventual Palestinian state -- was the first hint that the Israeli leader may be flexible on the subject of Jerusalem. Until now, Netanyahu has insisted that Jerusalem is not up for negotiation. While the prime minister surely did not intend the gathering under the aegis of the Presidents Conference to serve as his forum for opening up negotiations over Jerusalem, the impromptu remark before an audience of prominent New York Jews and a handful of elected officials cast a slim ray of light on what Netanyahu thinks might be the Israeli capital’s ultimate fate. It was significant as well because Netanyahu’s true intentions regarding the peace process remain largely opaque, the subject of much debate from Washington to Ramallah. Netanyahu was a latecomer to the two-state position -- endorsing the idea of an eventual Palestinian state only a year ago, after much prodding by the United States -- and the governing coalition he has assembled is comprised largely of right-wing parties that do not believe in the current Palestinian Authority as a partner for negotiations. In public, President Obama declared Tuesday that he believes Netanyahu is genuinely committed to seeking a two-state solution. “I believe that Prime Minister Netanyahu wants peace. I think he’s willing to take risks for peace,” Obama told reporters following his Oval Office meeting with Netanyahu. “And during our conversation, he once again reaffirmed his willingness to engage in serious negotiations with the Palestinians around what I think should be the goal not just of the two principals involved but the entire world, and that is two states living side by side in peace and security.”

US-Israel Relations Uniqueness

US- Israel relations good now- The US is Israel’s most important ally

Schanzer 10 (Jonathan, FoxNews.com, <http://www.foxnews.com/opinion/2010/07/07/jonathan-schanzer-obama-netanyahu-peace-israel-united-states-iran-hamas-fatah/>, July 07, 2010) CGW

Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu and President Barack Obama were all smiles in front of a sea of cameras at the White House yesterday. The president's press team was not kidding when it told journalists beforehand that the summit would be significantly warmer than Netanyahu’s March visit, when Obama upbraided Netanyahu over Israel’s Jerusalem policies and refused to snap photographs with him. In a press conference following some quality face time with the Israeli leader, Obama rejected allegations that the U.S.-Israel relationship was strained as "flat wrong," and signaled that he is increasingly optimistic about the prospects of Palestinian-Israeli peace. Netanyahu, for his part, was simply eager to mend ties with Israel’s most important ally.

**US- Israel relations strong now**

Stahl 10 (Julie, Correspondent @ CBN News Jerusalem Bureau, <http://www.cbn.com/cbnnews/insideisrael/2010/July/US-Israel-Mend-Ties-Focus-on-Iran/>, July 08, 2010) CGW

JERUSALEM, Israel - President Barack Obama told Israeli TV that Israel is right to be skeptical about the peace process. Obama is striking a friendlier tone after his meeting this week with Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu. Also, at this pivotal time in U.S.-Israel relations, three U.S. senators also met with senior Israeli and Palestinian leaders this week. The meeting between President Obama and Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu put the strained relations between the U.S. and Israel behind them, according to Sens. Joe Lieberman, I-Conn., John McCain, R-Ariz., and Lindsey Graham, R-S.C. "I think we can say with some encouragement that the relationship between the United States and Israel is back on track," Lieberman said. Despite the difficulties between the White House and Israel, the senators say military and intelligence ties remained strong and Congress was always supportive of the Jewish state. "The Congress has Israel's back and please never misunderstand that, whatever relationship problems we've had in the past, they've never seeped over to the Congress," Graham said. "The Congress has been united in our view of protecting one of our best allies in the world and that's the State of Israel."

US- Israel relations are not in crisis now

Blomfield 10 (Adrian, telegraph.co.uk, http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/middleeast/israel/7857487/US-Israeli-relations-suffer-tectonic-rift.html, 27 Jun 2010) CGW

Michael Oren, Israel's ambassador to Washington, told foreign ministry colleagues at a private briefing in Jerusalem that they were facing a long and potentially irrevocable estrangement. Sources said Mr Oren told the meeting: "There is no crisis in Israel-US relations because in a crisis there are ups and downs. [Instead] relations are in a state of tectonic rift in which continents are drifting apart." Mr Oren's privately-voiced pessimism stands in stark contrast to public declarations in both Jerusalem and Washington that differences between the two states amount to nothing more than "disagreements" between allies. The ambassador told the Jerusalem Post newspaper last week that US-Israel ties were stronger than many observers believed.

US-Israel Relations Uniqueness

The U.S. and Israel have a rich and very profound relationship

Ward 10 (Jon, The Daily Caller, http://dailycaller.com/2010/07/06/netanyahu-says-reports-of-chill-in-u-s-israeli-relations-are-flat-wrong/ 07/06/2010

Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu said Tuesday that reports over the last year of a growing rift between the U.S. and Israel are “flat wrong,” following a meeting with President Obama at the White House. “The reports about the demise of the special U.S.-Israel relationship aren’t just premature. They’re just flat wrong,” Netanyahu said, sitting in the Oval Office to Obama’s left and speaking to reporters in English. “There’s a depth and richness of this relationship that is expressed every day. Our teams talk. We don’t make it public.” Netanyahu’s trip to Washington comes a week after Israel’s ambassador to the U.S., Michael Oren, was quoted by Israeli news outlets as having said that there is a “tectonic rift” between the two countries. Oren disputed the report. Obama also downplayed disagreements between himself and the Israel leader, though he did not deny that there have been some. “The press … enjoys seeing if there’s news there, but the fact of the matter is that I trusted Prime Minister Netanyahu since I met him before I was elected president,” Obama said. “There are going to be times when he and I are having robust discussions about what kind of choices need to be made. But the underlying approach never changes. And that is, the United States is committed to Israel’s security. We are committed to that special bond.”

\*\*\*Links\*\*\*

Iraq Withdrawal --> Vulnerable Israel

Netanyahu fears that the Iraqi withdrawal will threaten Israel.

AFP and EJP July 8 (AFP, EJP is the sole online Jewish news agency in Europe, European Jewish Press, July 8, 2010, http://www.ejpress.org/article/44885) EH

The officials said that Netanyahu also told Gates that he feared that once US troops leave Iraq, Israel could once again face threats from the east for the first time in the past decade. Saddam Hussein fired several Scud missiles into Israel during the first Gulf war, but the comment was also seen as a reference to Israel's wish to remain in the Jordan Valley as part of a final peace deal, with the Israeli military acting as a buffer between the eastern flank of a Palestinian state and Jordan. The officials said that Netanyahu had also discussed with Gates the possibility of Israel buying unspecified "defense products" from the United States in order to maintain its strategic advantage over its neighbors. Gates's press secretary, Geoff Morrell, said the "conversation focused largely on our efforts to help Israel continue to bolster its security in the face of regional threats. "In addition to ongoing efforts to assist Israel's deployment of systems to protect against ballistic missile and rocket attacks, Secretary Gates committed to also help Israel develop new defenses against emerging threats to its security," said Morrell, without elaborating. An Israeli official said on Wednesday that the US administration had also indicated willingness to cooperate with Israel on civilian nuclear power projects.

Israel is concerned about the Iraq withdrawal creating a war on the eastern front

Palestine Note 10 (*The Palestine Note,* a Palestinian news site, “Israel worried about Iraq pullout”*, 7/7/10, http://palestinenote.com/cs/blogs/topnews/archive/2010/07/07/israel-worried-about-iraq-pullout.aspx)* CS

New York - Israel's Prime Minister, Benjamin Netanyahu told US Defense Secretary Robert Gates that [Israel is concerned](http://www.ynetnews.com/articles/0,7340,L-3916691,00.html) about the consequences of the US' planned drawdown of troops from Iraq next year.Netanyahu, who met with Gates during his [visit to Washington](http://palestinenote.com/cs/blogs/topnews/archive/2010/07/06/obama-netanyahu-reaffirm-ties.aspx), said he is concerned about the creation of an "eastern front" in the wake of the Iraq pullout. The two officials met at Blair House, the official presidential guest house.According to Israel's Ynet news site, "Gates and Netanyahu discussed Israel's security measures in the frame of a permanent agreement with the Palestinians, and addressed ways to prevent the infiltration of rockets, missiles and other weapons into the territory of the future Palestinian state."Officials traveling with Netanyahu [told AFP](http://www.google.com/hostednews/afp/article/ALeqM5jGB4GNnmdKnkgsa5Qgr8wojDPa-A) that in the event of direct peace talks with the Palestinians, "Israel would want assurances that a Palestinian state would not be able to smuggle in heavy weaponry, such as rockets."News reports also also state that US officials also handed Netanyahu a letter permitting civilian nuclear cooperation between the two countries, even though Israel has not signed on to the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT**).**

Israel is worried about their security following American withdrawal from Iraq.

Benhorin 10 (Yitzhak; Washington correspondent, *Y-Net News,* July 7, 2010, http://www.ynetnews.com/articles/0,7340,L-3916691,00.html) CH

Israel fears the rise of the eastern front amidst changes occurring in the region, Iran's strengthening and the American forces' scheduled withdrawal from Iraq next year, the prime minister told the defense secretary of the United States. Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu met with US Defense Secretary Robert Gates on Wednesday and the two discussed the Israel Defense Forces' ability to prepare to face a renewed eastern front. Gates and Netanyahu discussed Israel's security measures in the frame of a permanent agreement with the Palestinians, and addressed ways to prevent the infiltration of rockets, missiles and other weapons into the territory of the future Palestinian state.

Iraq Withdrawal --> Vulnerable Israel

Israel believes American withdrawal will undermine stability in the Middle East.

Rosner 7 (Shmuel; staff writer, *Haaretz,* August 8, 2007, http://www.haaretz.com/news/top-democrat-our-policy-on-iraq-won-t-imperil-israel-leave-chaos-1.227046) CH

U.S. House Majority Leader Steny Hoyer (D-Md) told Haaretz on Wednesday that the Democrats would seek to avoid a policy on Iraq that "will leave chaos and will endanger Israel." Hoyer made his comments ahead of a planned trip to Israel, starting next Sunday, in which he accompanies a group of 20 other Democratic legislators. A similar number of Republican legislators from the House are visiting Israel this week. Hoyer was responding to statements by Prime Minister Ehud Olmert some months ago, in which he expressed opposition American withdrawal from Iraq. Olmert warned against a hasty withdrawal that may undermine the balance of power in the Middle East and endanger the moderate regimes in the region. "Those who are concerned for Israel's security, for the security of the Gulf States and for the stability of the entire Middle East should recognize the need for American success in Iraq and responsible exit," Olmert said in remarks to the American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC) in March 2007. Hoyer now says he doesn't think that "the current policy" in Iraq is "sustainable," but considers Israel's position on the matter of a withdrawal to be of "great importance." He predicts that this subject will come up during next week's trip to Israel. More specifically, Hoyer says he'd want to understand the position of the newly appointed Defense Minister Ehud Barak on this matter, and also mentioned General Amos Gilad of the Defense Ministry as someone whose position on this matter he would invite.

Netanyahu can’t give in to US pressure

Netanyahu is torn between the right wing and the U.S.

Saunders July 6 (Edmund, Los Angeles Times writer, Los Angeles, July 6, 2010, http://articles.latimes.com/2010/jul/06/world/la-fg-israel-gaza-20100706/2) EH

The release of the list was part of an effort by Netanyahu to smooth the way for his much-anticipated White House visit with President Obama on Tuesday. Israel's defense minister, Ehud Barak, on Monday held a rare face-to-face meeting with Palestinian Authority Prime Minister Salam Fayyad to discuss resuming direct peace talks. Palestinians have refused to return to the negotiating table with Israel, but they agreed two months ago to U.S.-brokered "proximity" talks. A resumption of direct peace talks and an easing of the Gaza blockade have been high priorities for Obama. At his meeting with Netanyahu, Obama is also expected to pressure him to extend Israel's 10-month moratorium on new settlement construction in the West Bank, a policy that is set to expire in September. Under one proposal, Israel would extend the construction moratorium in return for Palestinian agreement to resume direct peace talks. But Netanyahu is facing strong political pressure at home from settler groups and right-wing politicians to resist U.S. pressure. On Monday, one settler group ran large newspaper ads reminding Netanyahu that he was elected partly on a pledge to expand Jewish construction in the West Bank. "A promise is a promise," the ad read. "There are many issues converging toward September," said Edward Rettig, acting director of the Israel chapter of the American Jewish Committee, an interreligious advocacy group, noting that Palestinians said they would evaluate the progress of proximity talks that same month. "Netanyahu has a real dilemma." Several Israeli analysts predicted that Netanyahu and Obama would make a secret deal under which Israel would not publicly agree to extend the freeze, but would ensure privately that construction in the West Bank would be limited and include only Jewish settlements that are expected to remain part of Israel under a peace deal.

Israel wants strong Obama-Netanyahu ties

If Netanyahu is perceived to be at odds with the US, his domestic support will evaporate

Avni 10 (Benny, Washington Post, <http://www.nypost.com/p/news/opinion/opedcolumnists/pals_for_now_qfWoL5JX0gC8CqJgkKj20J>, July 7, 2010) CGW

This exercise in what shrinks call "projection" was born out of the need, on both sides, to shore up political support at home. On the heels of stinging criticism from formerly staunch supporters like Ed Koch and Elie Wiesel, Obama knows he's losing Jews and other supporters of Israel, a strong voting constituency, as November approaches. Netanyahu, although popular now, is keenly aware that Israelis rarely re-elect a leader who's at odds with America. But the two come from diametrically opposed philosophies: Bibi, an ex-commando in an elite army unit, often cites Winston Churchill as an inspiration. Bam, the former professor and community organizer, learned policy-making in politically correct academia. Bibi is strongly attuned to the gathering clouds of war. Bam nurtures peaceful visions of diplomatic breakthroughs.

Israeli people think US-Israel relations are still weak.

Mitnick 10 (Josh; correspondent, *The Christian Science Monitor,* July 7, 2010, http://www.csmonitor.com/World/Middle-East/2010/0707/Obama-Netanyahu-make-show-of-mending-US-Israeli-ties) CH

Are Israeli-US ties on the mend? After the worst diplomatic crisis in recent memory earlier this year, President Obama and [Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu](http://www.csmonitor.com/World/Middle-East/2010/0617/Beyond-the-Gaza-blockade-What-drives-Israel-s-Benjamin-Netanyahu) used a White House summit Tuesday to demonstrate warmth and a commitment to continuing the [“special” ties](http://www.csmonitor.com/World/Middle-East/2010/0322/Briefing-Strains-in-US-special-relationship-with-Israel) between the allies. But in [Israel](http://www.csmonitor.com/World/Topics/Israel), where many fault the Obama administration for the estrangement between the two sides and a chilly reception during the prime minister’s last visit in March, there is uncertainty as to whether the rapport in Washington will translate into a more harmonious foreign policy. “Israelis are relieved to learn that the administration feels it’s necessary to show a friendlier face when Netanyahu is in town,” says Shmuel Rosner, a columnist for the Jerusalem Post. But “I don’t think Israelis were convinced that everything that Americans officials and Netanyahu said was the whole truth. They all realize this was some kind of a show."

Israel wants strong Obana-Netanyahu ties

New Issues that make Netanyahu look out of step with the US will undermine his support in Israel

Petras 10 (James, former Professor of Sociology at Binghamton University, New York, owns a 50-year membership in the class struggle, is an adviser to the landless and jobless in Brazil and Argentina, and is co-author of Globalization Unmasked (Zed Books). Petras’ most recent book is Zionism, Militarism and the Decline of US Power, “Major Jewish American Organizations Defend Israel’s Humiliation of America”, Pacific Free Press .com, April 8, http://www.pacificfreepress.com/news/1/5983-defending-israels-humiliation-of-america.html)

Can the ZPC be defeated? They are the “most powerful lobby in Washington”, to whom Presidents, Administration officials, Generals and Congress people must submit or risk having their careers ruined and being ousted from public office. Meanwhile,outside of the United States, the international community openly despises Israel as a brutal, racist colonial state, a war criminal and chronic violator of human rights and international law. The Middle East Quartet, made up of the United States, the European Union, Russia and the United Nations, has condemned Israel’s plan to build another 1,600 homes exclusively for Jewish extremist settlers in Arab East Jerusalem. The Quartet demanded “the speedy creation of a Palestinian state and the end to provocative actions”. But the ‘Quartet’ is powerless to stop Israeli plans. The Presidents of the Major American Jewish Organizations tell their followers that global “anti-Semitism” motivates the ‘Quartet’. The huge AIPAC “Hail Israel” Conference in Washington D.C. in late March celebrated the triumph of unfettered Israeli expansionism.

Nevertheless, some Israelis are beginning to express unease. After their initial euphoria over Netanyahu’s slap-down of Biden and face-up to Clinton, there is growing fear of Israeli being ‘weaned’ away from the American treasury and losing their unfettered access to the US latest military technology. A poll published on March 19 in Yedioth Ahronoth, one of Israel’s biggest dailies, revealed that 46% of their readers responded that the government should freeze settlement building in East Jerusalem, much to the chagrin of the US Israel Firsters, who might in other circumstances, have labeled these Jews anti-Semites.

Fissures in the Zionist monolith are beginning to appear. These would deepen if and when the American public realizes that Israel’s’ dispossession of Palestinians is raising havoc with American lives and with American interests in a vital part of the world populated by 1.5 billion Muslim. As more issues arise, the critical choice between following the lead of the ZPC in pledging unconditional allegiance to Israel and enduring its provocations and humiliations, or standing up for the dignity, basic interests and integrity of America, will have to be made. More fissures will appear and the AIPAC and other members of the ZPC will be seen for what they are: Swaggering bullies acting on behalf of a foreign power.

Netanyahu walking tightrope, threatens coalition

Netanyahu trapped between US and Israeli right wing pressure

Benn 10(Aluf, Israeli Journalist for Haaretz, Lexis-Nexis, 3/12)dc.

Previous prime ministers built more than Netanyahu in East Jerusalem, but they were careful to tie it in with positive developments in the peace process to avoid American anger. Lacking peace negotiations, Netanyahu's rightwing coalition could not enjoy the American blind eye like its predecessors. Time and again in the past year there were diplomatic clashes over Israeli plans to settle Jews in Arab neighbourhoods, to build new homes for Jews, or to demolish Palestinian homes in East Jerusalem. Each time Netanyahu argued that he was not in the loop, but backed the decisions. His coalition partner Eli Yishai, the interior minister and leader of the rightwing Shas party, has made the settling of more Jews in East Jerusalem his cause celebre - to prevent a future partition of the city, and to deliver cheap housing to his ultra-Orthodox constituents. In November the Americans tacitly agreed to the exemption of East Jerusalem - the most contested spot in the Holy Land conflict - from the settlement freeze announced by Netanyahu. But they expected not to be publicly embarrassed. When Israel couldn't keep the deal, snubbing its senior American guest, the administration exploded. Biden called Obama, who told him to condemn the Israeli decision in the strongest terms - an unprecedented step in a high-level visit. Netanyahu apologised for the timing. The vice president accepted the apology, and delivered a staunchly pro-Israel speech at Tel Aviv University. The Palestinians were less satisfied, withdrawing their agreement to renew talks. Netanyahu's constant zigzagging between his rightwing ideology and political partners and his craving for American support has turned the vice president's visit into a diplomatic fiasco. Ultimately Netanyahu could not please both sides without paying a price. Biden's face-saving remarks aside, "Bibi" is left with no friends in America's highest echelons - when he needs all the support he can get vis a vis Iran's threats and the Palestinians' quest for independence. America will not abandon Israel, but its patience for its leader is running out.

Making concessions to Arabs undermines Netanyahu

Netanyahu is tightrope walking – mending US-Israel relations hurts his political standing.

USA Today 10(4/27, <http://www.usatoday.com/news/world/2010-04-26-Israel_N.htm>) dc.

Israel's prime minister has effectively frozen new Jewish construction in east Jerusalem, municipal officials said Monday, reflecting the need to mend a serious rift with the U.S. and get Mideast peace talks back on track. The move comes despite Benjamin Netanyahu's repeated assertion he would never halt construction in east Jerusalem and risks angering hard-liners in his government. One lawmaker from Netanyahu's Likud Party warned the governing coalition could collapse over the issue. Still, the de facto freeze appeared to offer the promise of reviving peace efforts derailed after Israel announced plans for a major Jewish housing development during a visit by Vice President Joe Biden last month. That set off the worst diplomatic dispute between the U.S. and Israel in decades and prompted the Palestinians to call off a new round of U.S.-brokered peace talks. The quiet halting of east Jerusalem housing approvals coincides with signs that those talks are now about to start and could help explain recent U.S. statements stressing America's close ties to Israel. Palestinian President Mahmoud Abbas signaled Monday he was ready to start indirect talks with Israel after weeks of hesitation. Washington has stepped up efforts in recent days to coax Abbas to agree to the talks, with President Barack Obama's envoy as go-between. Speaking to Israel's Channel 2 TV, Abbas said he would present the U.S. proposal to the Arab League this week and the Palestinians "hope that the reply will be positive."

\*\*\*Impacts\*\*\*

Labor departure collapses the coalition

The Israeli coalition is threatening to fall apart over the settlement issue.

Shulman 10 (Richard; NY Israel Conflict Analyst, *The Examiner,* July 7, 2010, http://www.examiner.com/x-7095-NY-Israel-Conflict-Examiner~y2010m7d7-Israeli-Right-and-Left-make-demands-about-West-Bank-freeze) CH

Labor Party officials threaten to bolt the Israeli governing coalition if PM Netanyahu keeps his word and ends the temporary freeze on schedule. Right wing Party officials threaten to do likewise if Netanyahu breaks his promise that the freeze is temporary. MK Katz, head of the National Union, a right-wing Party outside the coalition reminds us that his Party would have entered the coalition, if Labor had not made keeping it out the basis for its own entry. If Labor bolts, National Union would negotiate taking its place.

Barak has used his power to influence Netanyahu’s decisions concerning Israel policy.

Glick 10 (Caroline; Senior Fellow for Middle East Affairs of the Washington, DC-based Center for Security Policy, *The Jerusalem Post,* June 21, 2010, http://www.jpost.com/Opinion/Columnists/Article.aspx?id=179088) CH

Barak has used this control to force the government to accede to every American demand. So far, he has convinced Netanyahu to take a back seat to Obama on Iran; to end Jewish construction in Judea and Samaria at least until September; to effectively ban Jewish construction in northern, southern and eastern Jerusalem; to embrace the cause of Palestinian statehood; to accept US mediated indirect negotiations with Fatah; and to pretend that the Obama administration is a credible ally to Israel. Before heading to Washington, Barak reportedly gave Netanyahu an ultimatum: Either make massive concessions to Fatah that will allow Obama to claim victory in the peace process, or Labor will bolt the coalition. So too, Barak is reportedly behind Netanyahu’s latest bid to bring Kadima, led by Tzipi Livni into his government. Netanyahu and his spokesmen defend both Barak’s primacy in the government, and their interest in bringing Kadima into the coalition by noting that the Left’s partnership ensures political stability. If Labor were to bolt from the coalition, the government would be less likely to survive until the next scheduled election in 2013. There is certainly truth to this assertion. With Labor inside the coalition, Kadima has no relevance. So too, rightist parties are unable to bring down the coalition. This would be a decisive argument if coalition stability enabled Netanyahu to govern more effectively. But the opposite is true. Netanyahu knows the folly of his decisions. He recognizes Obama’s hostility to Israel. He also knows that the US president is not going to do a thing to prevent Iran from becoming a nuclear power. Stability should be a means to an end, not an end unto itself. Netanyahu did not seek the premiership to achieve the goal of overseeing a stable government. He sought to lead the country to secure and strengthen it. As his latest concession to Barak makes clear, the price of governing stability is the abandonment of his leadership goals.

Kadima key to avoid coalition collapse

Netanyahu says that unless the Kadima joins the Coalitions he will personnaly attempt to dispand the party

Benn 9 (Aluf Benn, the diplomatic editor of the Israeli daily newspaper Ha’aretz., *Ha’aretz,* 12/25/10, <http://www.haaretz.com/print-edition/news/netanyahu-i-ll-divide-kadima-if-livni-won-t-join-coalition-1.1417>) CS

Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu once again asked opposition leader MK Tzipi Livni (Kadima) to join his coalition on Thursday - but said if she refused, he would do his best to split her party. Netanyahu told Haaretz that he has wanted to expand his government "from day one." In coalition talks after the election, he said, "we offered her 'unto half the kingdom' and she did not want it. But I'm continuing to try, and if I can, I'll take at least part of Kadima." Netanyahu said he believed there was a chance Livni would join his government - even though today, he is only offering her the job of minister without portfolio. Expanding the coalition is important "in light of the political, security and economic challenges," he said. "The coalition is not always coherent in these matters. Kadima joining, or part of Kadima joining, would create a very large and focused bloc." Netanyahu said he wanted "wider margins" to pursue action on "various fronts," including steps such as those he has already taken on the Palestinian issue: the removal of West Bank checkpoints, his speech at Bar-Ilan University in which he supported a Palestinian state ("words are also important," he said), and the freeze on construction in the settlements. "What is Kadima's problem with joining?" he asked. "The diplomatic plan has very broad national consensus today." "Today, after the Bar-Ilan speech, everyone knows we do not reject peace," he added. Netanyahu said he foresaw no problem working with Livni. "She'll come in as minister without portfolio," he said, "like [Menachem] Begin in 1967," in the run-up to the Six-Day War. He rejected the claim that he wanted Kadima in the government in case Foreign Minister Avigdor Lieberman (Yisrael Beiteinu) is indicted on the corruption charges for which he is being investigated, and Yisrael Beiteinu subsequently leaves the coalition. Netanyahu is set to meet with Livni on Monday evening to continue discussions on Kadima joining his coalition.

**N**etanyahu **needs Kadima in the coalition to achieve a breakthrough in the peace process**

Lerner 10 (Dr. Aaron Lerner, IMRA, Independent Media Review analysis 3/4/10) http://www.imra.org.il/story.php3?id=47384 JVT

Peres has expressed concern over the prospect of a sharp decline in Israel's international standing if the current diplomatic stalemate continues. He says bringing Kadima into the coalition will enable the prime minister to achieve a breakthrough in the peace process, which will improve Israel's standing in the world. The president has said Netanyahu must make a serious offer to Kadima "with respectable terms."

Kadima is key to end settlements

The United States clearly doesn’t support the building of settlements on the West Bank.

Staff Writer 10 (*The Daily Star,* July 3, 2010, http://www.dailystar.com.lb/article.asp?edition\_id=10&categ\_id=17&article\_id=116659#) CH

Two major events which just took place are deeply interwoven, and yet none of the major actors have voiced any awareness of the relationship between the two phenomena. In Washington, US President Barack Obama signed into law new US sanctions against Iran, trying to dry up investment in the Islamic Republic’s energy sector and funding for the Revolutionary Guard Corps. In the occupied West Bank, Jewish settlers demanded that Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu continue with the illegal construction of settlements in the West Bank and Jerusalem after a building moratorium expires in September. The connection between the two is simple: it must be stressed that sanctions against Iran will never succeed – and the crisis over Tehran’s nuclear program never defused – as long as Israel pursues its wrongheaded erection of illegal settlements, which only strengthens the anti-Israel elements in this region. Obama and his political allies say they are enacting sanctions beyond those approved by the UN Security Council in order to convince Iran to come to the negotiating table. With the construction of settlements unabated, however, sanctions against Iran – or against anyone else in this region, one could add – will never lead to the result the US desires. This is not a question of appearances, as many have postulated. It is not simply the perception that the US gives Israel carte blanche to flaunt UN resolutions; while we are on that topic, we would like to say that perception here corresponds to reality – the US has not taken any meaningful step against settlement construction, aside from hollow rhetoric. No, the construction of settlements harms US interests because it creates irresistible popular pressure on US allies, from Egypt to the Gulf, to denounce the US and Israel – and in so doing echo much of the Iranian agenda. Another variable in this settlement-Iran equation is the internal political situation in Israel – indicators persist that Netanyahu might abandon his radical-right coalition in favor of a more centrist cabinet which includes Kadima; such a government could more easily tamp down the settlers who have warped the Israeli political scene, as well as be a more realistic partner for negotiations with the Palestinians. Meanwhile, midterm elections in the US could also force Obama to modify his approach to Israel and Iran; the president already this week chose the swing state of Wisconsin for a speech to defend his economic policies and slam Republicans. In any case, we see a new phase coming soon. The standoff over Tehran’s disputed nuclear program is coming to a head, and all signs point in the same direction: there will be no peaceful settlement of the US-Iran showdown as long as Israel keeps adding settlements in Palestine.

Netanyahu is key to Peace Process

Netanyahu is willing to take risks to achieve peace in the Middle East.

Crichton & Kershner 10 (Kyle & Isabel; staff writers, *The New York Times,* July 8, 2010, http://www.nytimes.com/2010/07/09/world/middleeast/09mideast.html) CH

Declaring that he intended to “confound the critics and the skeptics,” an upbeat Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu of Israel told an audience of foreign policy experts in New York on Thursday that he was ready to begin direct peace talks with the Palestinians “next week” or even sooner. “Just get on with it,” he said. Mr. Netanyahu acknowledged in an address to the Council on Foreign Relations that “skepticism is warranted,” given the dismal record of such negotiations and the precariousness of his own position at the head of a fractious coalition dominated by pro-settler parties. But he vowed he was “prepared to take risks, political risks,” to achieve peace.

**Netanyahu is key to Arab-Israeli peace**

The Israel Project 10 (news blaze, http://newsblaze.com/story/20100701130631zzzz.nb/topstory.html, July 01, 2010) CGW

In a major push to restart peace talks, Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu on Wednesday (June 30) invited Palestinian Authority President Mahmoud Abbas to Jerusalem, even offering to travel to Ramallah to get the peace process underway. "I call on president Abu Mazen to come to Jerusalem," said Netanyahu. "I'm prepared to go to Ramallah." Netanyahu, speaking about his upcoming trip to Washington, added, "I hope and I believe that a main part of my conversations with President Obama in Washington next week will be focused on how to start direct peace talks between Israel and the Palestinians right away. I think that this is the only way that we'll solve the intricate problems that we're discussing between us." Netanyahu's offer to Abbas followed a meeting with Obama's Middle East negotiator George Mitchell, who has mediated talks between Israel and the Palestinians during the last five months. Also on Wednesday (June 30), Israeli Defense Minister Ehud Barak announced that he is scheduled to meet soon with Palestinian Prime Minister Salam Fayyad, marking the first such high-level meeting between the Israeli and Palestinian leaders - without a mediator - in more than five months.

Netanyahu is key to Peace Process

Netanyahu Key to peace talks – he is more willing to compromise than hard-liners in his coalition.

Levinson 7/9(Charles, Staff Writer @ Wall Street Journal, <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703609004575355123804765694.html>, 2010)dc.

Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu appears to be trying to soften his image as unwilling to compromise on the peace process, portraying himself as a peacemaker in a series of recent appearances, although he hasn't offered any new concessions. In a speech to the Council on Foreign Relations in New York on Thursday, Mr. Netanyahu used some of his most forceful language yet to portray himself as a leader in the tradition of celebrated Mideast peacemakers. He evoked former Egyptian President Anwar Sadat and former Israeli Prime Minister Menachem Begin, who concluded the Camp David Peace Accords in 1978, as well as Yitzhak Rabin, the Israeli prime minister who signed the Oslo Peace Accords in 1993. Remember that moment when Sadat came to Jerusalem," Mr. Netanyahu told an overflow crowd gathered at the council's headquarters on Manhattan's Upper East Side. "Remember that just a few years earlier Israel and Egypt fought a terrible war. People dismissed Begin, and people dismissed Sadat. I intend to confound the critics and the skeptics." He compared himself to Mr. Rabin who, he reminded the audience, returned to a second stint as prime minister and concluded a historic peace deal. Mr. Netanyahu is similarly serving as premier for the second time. "When you get to be my advanced age you don't come back to spend time in office," the 60-year-old Mr. Netanyahu said. "You come back to do something. I'm prepared to do something. ...I'm prepared to take political risks." Despite the charm offensive, Mr. Netanyahu has been vague about what concrete steps he intends to take to advance the peace process, and has repeatedly dodged questions about whether he intends to extend a 10-month partial moratorium on building in West Bank settlements when it expires in September. The Palestinians remain skeptical. Chief Palestinian negotiator Saeb Erekat said the Palestinians hear Mr. Netanyahu talk but don't see him backing it with actions, such as completely stopping building in Jewish settlements and in East Jerusalem. On Tuesday, the Israeli prime minister's meeting with President Barack Obama at the White House showcased mended ties between the two leaders after their relationship got off to a rocky start due to disagreements over the peace process. In the 48 hours since his meeting with Mr. Obama, the Israeli leader has dropped other hints that suggest a greater flexibility on some of the core issues in the conflict than some had previously expected. The recent comments by Mr. Netanyahu, who heads the conservative Likud Party and leads a coalition dominated by even-more-conservative parties, represent a significant change of tone. Mr. Netanyahu is widely regarded as a hard-liner on issues dealing with the Palestinians, but he has kept his true intentions close to his chest, rarely revealing how far he may be willing to go for a peace deal. In an interview Wednesday on CNN's "Larry King Live," Mr. Netanyahu pledged to tackle the issue of Jewish settlements in the West Bank "right away" once direct talks begin. During the early rounds of indirect peace talks, which began in May, U.S. and Palestinian officials voiced frustration over Mr. Netanyahu's preference to begin negotiations with more peripheral issues. That fed Palestinian fears that Mr. Netanyahu wasn't prepared to address the conflict's most sensitive issues, such as Jewish settlements, and that he may instead simply be seeking to stall and delay a peace deal while winning kudos from the international community for participating in direct peace talks. The comments from the prime minister that piqued the greatest interest, however, came Wednesday evening in a speech to American Jews at Manhattan's Plaza Hotel, where, according to the Jewish Telegraphic Agency, Mr. Netanyahu made comments that suggested he could agree to divide Jerusalem, a move that has long been off-limits for Israel's right-wing parties. "Everybody knows that there are Jewish neighborhoods in Jerusalem that under any peace plan will remain where they are," Mr. Netanyahu said during the question-and-answer session, the agency reported. "The implication of Netanyahu's remark—that other neighborhoods of Jerusalem may not remain 'where they are,' becoming part of an eventual Palestinian state—was the first hint that the Israeli leader may be flexible on the subject of Jerusalem," the influential Jewish Telegraphic Agency concluded.

Netanyahu coalition key to Israeli moderates ending settlements

**Netanyahu is key to ending Israeli settlements and pushing through the Peace Process**

Levy 10 (Daniel, Senior Fellow and Director of the Prospects for Peace Initiative at The Century Foundation and a Senior Fellow and Director of the Middle East Initiative at the New America Foundation, Prospects for Peace, March 17, http://www.prospectsforpeace.com/2010/03/)

Mainstream Israeli commentators were apparently shocked to discover the power of the settler momentum. Pundits such as Ari Shavit, known for their staunch nationalism and vilification of human rights groups working in the territories, had a rude awakening. In Ha'aretz he described "the settlements in the West Bank that serve the centrifuges in Natanz [Iran]. If sane Israel does not wake up, it will be defeated by the metastasising of the occupation and the lack of the central government's ability to stop it."

And that, in a nutshell, is why Benjamin Netanyahu may be our last, best chance for a two-state peace deal.

The extremism and excesses of his government may finally open enough eyes and lead to enough local and international action to roll back this settler behemoth. More moderate Israeli governments, even those perhaps sincerely committed to a variation on the de-occupation, two-state solution theme, have definitively failed to halt the settlements march. When Ehud Barak and Ehud Olmert were negotiating on paper potential Israeli withdrawals, the settlements and the occupation were being expanded and entrenched on the ground. Even when Ariel Sharon was removing 7,500 settlers from Gaza, he was adding a greater number to the West Bank and East Jerusalem. But under Netanyahu, what you see is what you get.

And perhaps this clarity and this exaggeration is exactly what is needed. Everything else, all the relevant actors, were stuck in an ugly paralysis. The Palestinians remain divided and devoid of strategy. For 20 years the Fatah-led PLO had been waiting for the US to deliver Israel for an equitable two-state outcome. The only alternative to negotiations to gain any traction had been indiscriminate and unjustifiable violence. The Arab states had produced a breakthrough peace initiative in 2002 but it never translated into a programme for public diplomacy or even pressure to be brought to bear on Israel, America, or the Quartet. The US and EU continue to place their faith in confidence-building measures and unmediated negotiations between the parties, hoping against hope that a formula which had failed for over a decade would produce a breakthrough and that rational argument might prevail.

Not surprisingly, none of this was going anywhere. It has taken a Netanyahu-led extreme right, religious government in Israel (the defunct Labor party of Ehud Barak can be justly ignored as window dressing) to send a signal strong enough to perhaps pierce this paralysis. Israelis and Palestinians, it is clear, are in an adversarial relationship, talk of partnership is premature, talk of confidence-building is naive. Transparently run Palestinian institutions and well-groomed Palestinian security forces will not remove the settler-occupation complex. And neither will gentle persuasion. The naked extremity of the Netanyahu government is producing new international initiatives and new coalitions.

Netanyahu coalition key to Israeli moderates ending settlements

Only the extreme right nature of the Netanyahu government can create space for moderate Israelis to end the settlement-occupation complex

Levy 10 (Daniel, Senior Fellow and Director of the Prospects for Peace Initiative at The Century Foundation and a Senior Fellow and Director of the Middle East Initiative at the New America Foundation, Prospects for Peace, March 17, http://www.prospectsforpeace.com/2010/03/)

In Jewish diaspora communities, there is a determination to reclaim a more moderate and progressive vision of what it means to be pro-Israel and to apply Jewish ethics and Jewish values, that helped guide civil rights struggles in the past, to contemporary Israeli reality. Such efforts are gaining ground – notably the emergence of J Street in America. Inside Israel, a new progressive discourse, still lacking real parliamentary representation, is struggling to make its voice heard in civil society—notably in weekly demonstrations at Sheikh Jarrah. On the Palestinian side, alternative strategies to the negotiation dependency or violence that dominated the past are gaining ground – especially in non-violent resistance to land confiscations and the separation barrier. Prime Minister Fayyad's plan for statehood by mid-2011 could become a significant hook if it develops some teeth.

European actors have been toying with initiatives of their own in adapting to this new reality. All 27 member states achieved a remarkable consensus in endorsing the most powerful and comprehensive statement of EU policy last December. Lady Ashton, at least declaratively, has gotten off to an impressive start and will be visiting the region next week, and crucially Gaza will be on her itinerary. Britain is taking the lead in imposing labelling on settlement products, and the French and Spanish governments are exploring options for advancing Palestinian statehood even in the face of peace process stalemate.

None of this would likely have happened if the government in Israel was nice-sounding and well-intentioned, but ultimately hapless in the face of the settler-occupation complex. Nothing is also likely to really come to fruition without the US assuming leadership. These new developments may serve to create an environment in which there is more political space for the US to operate in.

US administrations have helped generate moments of decision for Israel in the past and not only in the Egyptian peace deal and full evacuation of the Sinai brokered by President Carter. President Bush confronted Yitzhak Shamir with the withholding of loan guarantee monies, leading to the election of Yitzhak Rabin in 1992 in a campaign in which settlements and opposition to them featured prominently. Benjamin Netanyahu's first term in office ended abruptly when President Clinton challenged him to sign, and then implement, the Wye River Memorandum of 1998, something his coalition could not sustain and which led to the election of Ehud Barak, ushering in at the time a moment of great hope.

The realities today are no longer the same. The Israeli inability to confront its own settler-occupation demon is more deeply entrenched. Israel will have to be presented with clear choices, clear answers to its legitimate security and other concerns, and clear consequences for nay-saying. A successful effort will also have to be more comprehensive and more regional in its scope, almost certainly involving Syria and bringing Hamas into the equation. No one should expect this to be easy. But if one person can generate American will to lead such an effort and an international alliance to see it through, then surely that person is the Israeli leader who we saw on display in all his glorious stubbornness this week.

Impact Module – Escalation

Gaza represents a new era in Middle East conflict. It will only escalate

Barry Rubin, Jan. 5 (“The bigger Middle East war: It's moderate Arabs against radical Islamists,” Daily News, <http://www.nydailynews.com/opinions/2009/01/05/2009-01-05_the_bigger_middle_east_war_its_moderate_.html>)

The war in Gaza is the first chapter of a new era in the Middle East. The Arab-Israeli conflict is far from the region's dominant dispute. The Arab-Islamist conflict now overwhelms it - by a large margin. Increasingly, Arab regimes know Hamas isn't their friend and, though they won't say so publicly, don't see Israel as an enemy. No wonder: Israel is politically stable and economically prosperous. It doesn't threaten to take over their countries, overthrow their regimes and stand them in front of a firing squad. Radical Islamism, Iran-style, does. That's right. Arab nations' prime 21st century enemy is Iran and its allies: Syria, Hezbollah, Hamas and Iraqi terrorists. After destroying their own countries, they want to do the same to everyone else.

Israel/Palestine conflict will escalate rapidly without successful talks

TMO 9 (Kamal Nawash, Writer for TMO and appointed by the white house to speak before the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, *The Muslim Observer, 1/15/09,* [*http://muslimmedianetwork.com/mmn/?p=3501*](http://muslimmedianetwork.com/mmn/?p=3501)*) CS*

Once again the Palestinian/Israeli conflict spirals out of control. However, this particular battle has produced circumstantial evidence that the conflict has become more dangerous than ever before. Unless a permanent solution is found soon, the violence may increase in severity until the conflict ends tragically. In the latest fighting, Israel has bombed the HAMAS controlled city of Gaza for the stated reason of neutralizing HAMAS and stopping them from firing rockets into Southern Israel. As of the date of this article, approximately 900 Palestinians and 15 Israelis have been killed. HAMAS’ stated reasons for firing the rockets is to end the siege of Gaza by Israel which HAMAS alleges is preventing the free movement of people and goods and causing a humanitarian crisis. Israel denies the existence of a humanitarian crisis and refuses to end the siege of Gaza unless HAMAS recognizes Israel or is out power. In general, what makes the Palestinian/Israeli conflict so dangerous is that half the world, (three billion people (Jews, Christians & Muslims)) are emotionally, historically and religiously attached to the land known as Israel/Palestine. This fact was demonstrated in the last few days as demonstrations erupted in more than 95 countries around the world.

Impact Module – Escalation

Current Israeli methods of dealing with the Palestine conflict only create a cyclical war, they must achieve some control over Gaza in order to succeed

Singer 9 (Max Singer, *a Senior Fellow and Trustee Emeritus at Hudson Institut,.Besa Center for Strategic Studies,*  6/7/10, <http://www.hudson.org/index.cfm?fuseaction=publication_details&id=5936>) CS

We need to start with a simple view of the Gaza problem. The problem was that Palestinians were firing rockets from Gaza to nearby Israeli cities and settlements. Israel needs to stop the firing – or else it will get worse. That’s why Israel went to war last Saturday. Israel will have won the war if after it is over there is no further steady stream of rocket attacks. On the other hand, if when the war is over the rocket firing soon continues it will mean that Israel lost.   Many people have had the correct insight that Israel cannot achieve victory over the Palestinians, but they are confused into thinking that Israel cannot win any victory. Israel cannot win a complete victory over the Palestinians like the victory the US achieved over Germany and Japan in 1945; mainly because Israel cannot usefully occupy and rule the Palestinians for the long run, nor for long enough to be able to change their society into one that is ready to live in peace with Israel. And of course Israel cannot destroy the Palestinians.   Therefore after any war, Palestinian enemies will still be there seeking ways to attack Israel, and Israel will have to live with the continued existence of the Palestinians on our borders. That is the correct insight about no possibility of victory.   However, there are three ways Israel can win an important and critical victory over the Hamas. One is if Hamas is being hit so hard that it does not think it can accept further losses and therefore calls for a ceasefire and agrees that it will see that there are no more missile attacks on Israel from Gaza. This is very unlikely, especially because Hamas does not appear to be troubled by the pain of the citizens of Gaza. But if they did this it would be a victory even if it only stopped the missiles for six months, provided that Israel was prepared to attack Gaza again as soon as they started firing missiles again.   We often will have to make do with temporary victories. Our basic task is to defeat each and every kind of attack that the Palestinians devise. Each of our victories will lead, some time later, to a new Palestinian attack which must be defeated in turn. This will not continue forever, but it will continue until the Palestinian society or politics changes and/or the political environment that now supports the Palestinian war against us changes. Those changes will happen and when they do there will be a chance to achieve peace. In the meantime we must go from victory to victory.   A second way Israel can win this battle is if its attacks so weaken and embarrass Hamas that it loses its control over Gaza. This is too difficult an objective to be used to guide Israel’s policy. It may be a by-product of Israel’s pursuit of victory; it should not be the goal.   The third way Israel can achieve victory, the one that is the only practical goal for Israel, is to fight until we achieve enough control in Gaza so that missile attacks from Gaza are as difficult for the Gazans as suicide bombings from Judea and Samaria are for West Bankers.   Israel does not occupy Judea and Samaria, but it operates there enough so that it prevents almost all suicide bombing attacks – despite continued Palestinian attempts. This kind of victory will be very difficult to achieve in Gaza. It will require many months with intermittent hard fighting and many casualties on both sides. These great costs are only justified because this victory is necessary for Israel’s survival.

Peace Process failures are the most serious scenario treating Israel

Haaretz Service 10 (Haaretz.com, <http://www.haaretz.com/news/barak-peace-process-failures-greater-threat-than-iran-nukes-1.265796>, 26.01.10) CGW

Defense Minister Ehud Barak on Tuesday said that Israel's failure to strike a peace deal with the Palestinians was a greater threat to the country than a nuclear Iran, Army Radio reported. "The lack of a solution to the problem of border demarcation within the historic Land of Israel - and not an Iranian bomb - is the most serious threat to Israel's future," Barak told a Tel Aviv conference. Barak called on the Palestinian President, Mahmoud Abbas, to return to the negotiating table. Abbas has so far refused to restart talks until Israel freezes settlement building in the West bank, including in east Jerusalem. Abbas recently complained to Saudi King Abdullah over heavy pressure on him, particularly from Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak, to renew talks with Israel, the London-based Arabic newspaper Al-Quds Al-Arabi reported on Tuesday. Mubarak told Abbas that Egypt would "wash its hands" of the Palestinian issue unless the Palestinians backed down from demands for a total freeze, the newspaper said. Palestinian media reported on Monday that Abbas has continued to insist on a complete freeze but may accept a new proposal by U.S. envoy George Mitchell that would build trust between Israel and the Palestinians and improve the quality of life for Palestinians in the West Bank.

Impact Module – Iran

Middle east peace is key to solve Iran prolif

David Williamson, 1/3/2009 (staff writer, <http://www.walesonline.co.uk/news/wales-news/2009/01/03/opportunity-for-obama-to-provide-leadership-91466-22595734/>)

The constant sense of insecurity and danger only helps hard-liners and makes discussion of compromise seem like talk of surrender. If the present levels of violence and human suffering are permitted to routinely flare up it will be impossible to pursue other long-term goals towards peace in this vital region.

Hezbollah’s forces in Lebanon retain the ability to rain rockets on Israel and any confrontation in Gaza has the potential to unleash such an attack from the north. Obama has put forward the bold foreign policy goal of negotiating with Iran with the aim of persuading the Islamic republic to abandon any nuclear programme and to stop sponsoring terrorist groups. This breakthrough will not happen if television screens are filled hourly with images of wounded and dead Palestinians.

Iranian prolif risks nuclear attack against Israel:

Nile Gardiner, 2006 (Bernard and Barbara Lomas Fellow @ Heritage Foundation, April 24, <http://www.heritage.org/Research/MiddleEast/wm1047.cfm>)

If Iran succeeds in building a nuclear weapon, which it may do within three to ten years, there can be no doubt regarding the regime’s willingness and intent to use it against Israel or other close U.S. allies. Nor is there any doubt regarding Iran’s potential to arm a terrorist organization such as Hezbollah or Al Qaeda with nuclear material. Significantly, a senior Iranian spiritual leader recently issued a fatwa sanctioning the use of nuclear weapons.[4]

Impact Module – Terror

Middle East Peace key to solve terror

Claude Salhani, 1/2/2009 (<http://www.metimes.com/International/2009/01/02/_consequences_of_the_gaza_war/1435/>)

Regardless, of who did what first, the end result is detrimental to the national interests of the United States, Western Europe and allied Arab regimes. The explosive situation in the Middle East today has the potential of changing the current dynamics of the region. The Gaza war is going to severely hamper the West's efforts in gaining the trust of the Arab and Muslim worlds as the West continues to fight the global war on terror. That alone should provide al-Qaida mastermind, Osama bin Laden, the ability to recruit a few dozen more followers (at the very least).

Terrorism Causes Extinction

Yonah Alexander, Inter-University for Terrorism Studies Director and Professor, WASHINGTON TIMES, August 28, 2003, p. A20.

Last week's brutal suicide bombings in Baghdad and Jerusalem have once again illustrated dramatically that the international community failed, thus far at least, to understand the magnitude and implications of the terrorist threats to the very survival of civilization itself. Even the United States and Israel have for decades tended to regard terrorism as a mere tactical nuisance or irritant rather than a critical strategic challenge to their national security concerns. It is not surprising, therefore, that on September 11, 2001, Americans were stunned by the unprecedented tragedy of 19 al Qaeda terrorists striking a devastating blow at the center of the nation's commercial and military powers. Likewise, Israel and its citizens, despite the collapse of the Oslo Agreements of 1993 and numerous acts of terrorism triggered by the second intifada that began almost three years ago, are still "shocked" by each suicide attack at a time of intensive diplomatic efforts to revive the moribund peace process through the now revoked cease-fire arrangements [hudna]. Why are the United States and Israel, as well as scores of other countries affected by the universal nightmare of modern terrorism surprised by new terrorist "surprises"? There are many reasons, including misunderstanding of the manifold specific factors that contribute to terrorism's expansion, such as lack of a universal definition of terrorism, the religionization of politics, double standards of morality, weak punishment of terrorists, and the exploitation of the media by terrorist propaganda and psychological warfare. Unlike their historical counterparts, contemporary terrorists have introduced a new scale of violence in terms of conventional and unconventional threats and impact. The internationalization and brutalization of current and future terrorism make it clear we have entered an Age of Super Terrorism [e.g. biological, chemical, radiological, nuclear and cyber] with its serious implications concerning national, regional and global security concerns.

Impact Module – Economy

Middle east peace key to solve oil shocks

Peter Cooper, 1/4/2009 (<http://seekingalpha.com/article/113032-gaza-war-expect-a-spike-in-oil-gold>)

Strangely, economic commentators have missed the most obvious impact of the tragic Gaza War on the global economy: Oil prices are going to rise, and will go sharply higher if the war widens into a regional conflict. So too will precious metal prices. Perhaps this perception will change now that a serious ground offensive has started. Higher oil prices will be the death knell for the recent modest rally in global stock markets and the impact of higher energy costs on a weakened world economy would be nasty. This is back to 1973 and the oil embargo years, and the horrendous stock market slump of 1974.

Rising oil prices would undermine the recovery in the global economy:

Peter Cooper, 1/4/2009 (<http://seekingalpha.com/article/113032-gaza-war-expect-a-spike-in-oil-gold>)

Some might argue that with the S&P down 38 per cent last year, stocks have seen their annus horribilis. But sadly stocks are still over-valued in historic terms and not near to the level required for a stock market bottom. On the Q-formula they still have a 55 per cent downside. Oil price shock Rising oil prices are just the kind of shock the global economy and stock markets could do without now as they struggle to rally. There does not seem the political will among Arab leaders for an oil boycott like in 1973 but the popular feeling against Israel’s disproportionate response to rockets fired from Gaza is mounting.

Economic decline causes war

Walter Russell, Mead, 1992 Senior Fellow – Council on Foreign Relations, New Perspectives Quarterly, Summer, 1992, p. 30

The failure to develop an international system to hedge against the possibility of worldwide depression- will open their eyes to their folly. Hundreds of millions-billions-of people around the world have pinned their hopes on the international market economy. They and their leaders have embraced market principles-and drawn closer to the West-because they believe that our system can work for them. But what if it can't? What if the global economy stagnates, or even shrinks? In that case, we will face a new period of international conflict: South against North, rich against poor. Russia. China. India-these countries with their billions of people and their nuclear weapons will pose a much greater danger to world order than Germany and Japan did in the 1930's.

Peace Process key to Israel Security

Peace process is the only way to keep Israel secure.

JTA June 25 (JTA, in-depth coverage of political, economic and social developments affecting Jews in North and South America, Israel, Europe, Africa and Australia, June 25, 2010, http://www.jta.org/news/article/2010/06/25/2739785/barak-israeli-peace-initiative-would-guarantee-security) EH

WASHINGTON (JTA) -- Israeli Defense Minister Ehud Barak said an Israeli peace initiative was the only way to secure the country. Barak spoke to reporters June 24 following a short tour of the United States that included meetings with U.S. Defense Secretary Robert Gates, Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton and James Jones, the national security adviser, as well as United Nations Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon. "They want to see an Israel that takes its security seriously but is ready to take risks to advance an assertive peace process," he said. An Israeli initiative was necessary "to prevent our descent into isolation. It is the only way to achieve real freedom to act when there are security events," Barak said. Barak, who heads the Israeli Labor Party in an otherwise right-wing coalition led by Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu, in recent week has pressed the coalition to take the initiative with a peace plan as a means of drawing the Palestinians into direct talks. Among other issues, Barak and his interlocutors discussed allowing Palestinian Authority personnel to man crossings into the Gaza Strip. The relatively moderate Palestinian Authority was driven out of Gaza in 2007 by Hamas, a terrorist group. The United States and other Western powers are seeking avenues to reintroduce the moderates into the strip.

Arab-Israeli peace could lead to political, economic, and social increases.

Djerejian 6 (Edward, founding director of the James A. Baker III, Institute for Public Policy at Rice University, U.S. Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern Affairs, Ambassador to Syria, and Ambassador to Israel, 85 Foreign Affairs 41) EH

THE RECENT fighting in the Levant presents a fundamental challenge for U.S. policy toward the Middle East-but also an opportunity to move from conflict management to conflict resolution. The United States should seize this moment to transform the cease-fire in the Hezbollah-Israeli conflict into a step toward a comprehensive Arab- Israeli peace settlement. Doing so would facilitate the marginalization of the forces of Islamic radicalism and enhance the prospects for regional security and political, economic, and social progress. The Hezbollah-Israeli confrontation has further proved what should already have been painfully clear to all: there is no viable military solution to the Arab-Israeli conflict. Even with its military superiority, Israel cannot achieve security by force alone or by unilateral withdrawal from occupied territories. Nor can Hezbollah, Hamas, Palestinian Islamic Jihad, and similar groups destroy Israel. Peace can come only from negotiated agreements that bind both sides. Hezbollah may have ignited the spark that set off this latest confrontation, but it is not the root cause. The fighting was the combined result of the unresolved Arab-Israeli conflict and the struggle between the forces of moderation and those of extremism within the Muslim world-two issues that are linked by the radicals' exploitation of the Arab-Israeli conflict for their own political ends. U.S. policy in the region should thus focus both on trying to promote a peaceful settlement of the Arab-Israeli dispute and on helping Muslim moderates by facilitating political and economic reform across the Middle East.

Peace Process Turns the Case

Resolving Arab-Israeli peace talks solves Iraq and Afghanistan conflicts

CNS 7/7 (Fred Lucas, Staff writer and Whitehouse Correspondant for the CNS, Jonhnathan Schanzer Jonathan Schanzer, former counterterrorism analyst at the Treasury Department, *The CNS News, 7/7/10,* [*http://www.cnsnews.com/news/article/69071*](http://www.cnsnews.com/news/article/69071)*) CS*

The White House sees Israeli territorial concessions to the Palestinians, and the ultimate settling of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict as really key to solving all of the problems that the United States faces,” Schanzer said. “The White House has been linking the solution to that conflict as the silver bullet to solving all of the ills in Afghanistan and Iraq and the war on terror. We even hear recently rumors, unconfirmed, the president has been talking to foreign leaders that if he was able to deliver this Israeli territory, then he might be able to get some Muslim countries to cooperate,”

Peace Process stops Israel first strike on Iran

U.S. empirically fails at solving Arab-Israeli conflicts and Obama lacks the popularity to achieve his peace goals

CNS 7/7 (Fred Lucas, Staff writer and Whitehouse Correspondant for the CNS, Jonhnathan Schanzer Jonathan Schanzer, former counterterrorism analyst at the Treasury Department, *The CNS News, 7/7/10,* [*http://www.cnsnews.com/news/article/69071*](http://www.cnsnews.com/news/article/69071)*) CS*

But Schanzer said this could be an “unwise” strategy.“These problems are not necessarily going to go away if Israel gives its enemy everything it has been asking for,” he said. “To put this in context, radical Islam and the rise of al Qaeda occurred during the 1990s when the U.S. was the most heavily engaged in the Arab-Israeli peace process. “If that’s any indication, I don’t believe that these forces can be appeased by more U.S. engagement. Ultimately, what we’re doing is gambling with the security of an ally,” Schanzer added. Obama has a very low approval rating in Israel, and will need some support from the citizenry in that country if the Israeli political leadership is to follow Obama’s peace goals, Schanzer said. Meanwhile, Netanyahu hopes to have “political cover if not military cover,” should he choose to make a preemptive strike against Iran’s nuclear sites, Schanzer said.The threat of a nuclear Iran must unite the two countries, Stern said. Back in 2005, Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad said, “Israel must be wiped off the map.”  “This is a threat not just to Israel, the survival of Israel, but to the entire free world as we know it,” Stern said. “This is not just about Israel. This is about the entire West. We’re talking about people that have an apocalyptic vision on how they will bring the messiah. They are willing to die, and Ahmadinejad has said he doesn’t care if he has to sacrifice a million of his own people.”

Peace Process stops Israel first strike on Iran

Israeli Palestinian peace would neutralize Middle East Hostility towards Israel and prevent Israeli-Iranian War

Yehoshua ’10 (A.B. Yehoshua, professor at University of Haifa and award winning Israeli Novelist, “Israeli-Palestinian peace would neutralize Iran threat Attempting to destroy Iran's nuclear potential militarily is liable to drag Israel into a drawn-out war.”, Haaretz, 10.02.10, http://www.haaretz.com/print-edition/opinion/israeli-palestinian-peace-would-neutralize-iran-threat-1.265944) ACW

Tags: Iran Israel news Since the end of World War II the world has been rife with bloody conflicts in which, or after which, entire population groups have been murdered. One could cite the slaughter of millions by the Khmer Rouge in Cambodia, or the horrific tribal war in Rwanda, or the brutality in the former Yugoslavia, or the devastation in southern Sudan. But despite all this, the United Nations decided to devote a special memorial day only to the Holocaust of the Jews in Europe. How was the Jewish Holocaust unique? Not only due to its scope and cruelty, but also due to the complete lack of the circumstances that caused other massacres. The Jews were not exterminated to enable the Nazis to take over their territory, because the Jews had no territory. They were not exterminated for belonging to a different faith, because the Nazis and their partners were avowed atheists. They were not exterminated as part of an ideological struggle, because the Jews had no particular ideology. Nor did the extermination stem from lust for money: Most of the Jews were poor, and the wealthy ones would have willingly handed it over to the Nazis if this could have saved their lives. Rather, the Nazis viewed the Jews as "a virus" - that's why their extermination was so brutal and thorough. Despite its uniqueness, the absurd mechanism that led to the Holocaust of the Jews did not disappear with the Nazis' defeat, and we must be on guard lest it rise up once again. Sixty-five years after the liberation of Auschwitz, it is possible to discern frightening signs of this same human mechanism that manufactures false and even hallucinatory accusations against the Jews or others. That is why the UN decided to mark the memory of the Holocaust instead of establishing a general memorial day for all human catastrophes. Israel's leaders, who traveled to Europe for International Holocaust Remembrance Day, did not go there only to strengthen the antibodies against modern-day manifestations of anti-Semitism. Rather, they went to muster political support for opposing the acquisition of nuclear arms by Iran, which openly threatens Israel with extermination. Iran is not Nazi Germany - not with respect to its political regime, not with respect to its ideology, and certainly not with respect to its economic and military capabilities. Nor does Israel resemble the weak Jewish communities that lived in Europe at that time. But for all the differences, the Iranian regime has adopted the same total opposition to Israel's existence. It is therefore liable to slip into the same human mechanism that created the infinite hatred for Jews of the Holocaust era. And when Iran has nuclear weapons, it might be dragged, as Nazi Germany was, into mad aggression. What can be done? No one can promise that the sanctions planned by the international community will persuade Iran to desist from its race for nuclear weapons, yet an attempt to destroy its nuclear potential militarily is liable to drag Israel into a drawn-out, exhausting war against the Iranian nation and its regional allies. But there is another way to neutralize the Iranian threat, one that is both more appropriate and more moral - a peace agreement with the Palestinians. Last month, the Palestinian minister of the Waqf religious trust, Mahmoud Habash, made a speech that inspired hope at a public prayer session in Ramallah. In the presence of the Palestinian Authority's senior leaders, he lambasted Iran's involvement in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Essentially, what he said was this: What do you have to do with us? We don't need your patronage. You are only making the conflict worse, instead of helping us and the Israelis solve it via the method now accepted worldwide - two states for two peoples. By encouraging Hamas' extremism, you merely provoke a harsh response from Israel and thereby distance the solution for which we all yearn. Not one single Iranian soldier has ever shed his blood for our people the way the soldiers of Egypt and Jordan did, yet these countries later signed peace agreements with Israel. Peace between Israel and Palestine would neutralize the poisonous sting of Iran's hatred for Israel and shatter the political-imaginative mechanism that makes it see Israel as "the little Satan" that must be destroyed at all costs. A joint peace front by Israelis and Palestinians could cause the Iranian people to recoil from the madness that has taken over the religious leadership of this great and honored nation. Therefore, the end of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict would have a much greater impact than any Israeli or American military operation. That would only perpetuate this region's pain and suffering.

A2: Peace Process Bad

Israeli-Palestinian peace process is not correlated to terrorism.

Schachter July 8 (Research fellow at the Institute for National Security Studies at Tel Aviv University, The Jerusalem Post, July 8, 2010, http://www.jpost.com/Opinion/Op-EdContributors/Article.aspx?id=180792) EH

For reasons both good and misunderstood, efforts at Israeli-Palestinian peace are strongly associated with terrorism. The resumption of peace talks, this time through US envoy George Mitchell, makes it imperative to appreciate the relationship between negotiations and violence in order to prevent a return to the bloody days. One of the most commonly believed myths regarding the Oslo days is that Hamas opposed the process and consistently tried to torpedo it through the use of terrorism. This understanding is largely unsupported by the historical data, which show that after early 1996, peace process activity was inversely correlated with Hamas attacks. It was only after the process collapsed in late 2000 that Hamas and its political rivals sought to outdo each other in terms of terrorist violence , leading to record numbers of both attacks and casualties. The reasons for this are straightforward, if somewhat counterintuitive, given Hamas’s hard - line public statements and documented positions. However, the use of terrorism was and remains a matter of short- and long-term interests and incentives. In the 1990s Hamas had much to gain from the peace process at little cost. From its perspective, Israeli withdrawals from and redeployments in the West Bank and Gaza were highly desirable (if insufficient), and its leaders never had to betray either their principles or positions by deigning to sit down and negotiate with their Israeli rivals. Moreover, once Israel conditioned progress on the cessation of violence (after the then-unprecedented wave of attacks in February and March 1996), not only was Hamas terrorism disincentivized, but the nascent Palestinian Authority also had a stronger interest in keeping Hamas in check.

A2: Israel won’t really commit to peace process

Israel sees the need for enhanced stability and diplomacy and is pushing to solve the Palestinian Crisis

Indyk 7/7 ([Martin S. Indyk](http://www.brookings.edu/experts/indykm.aspx), Vice President and Director, [Foreign Policy](http://www.brookings.edu/foreign-policy.aspx) at the Brookings institute, *The Brookings Institute,* 7/7/10, <http://www.brookings.edu/opinions/2010/0707_obama_netanyahu_indyk.aspx>) CS

Suddenly, Israelis feel alone in the world and fear for their future. They have always lived with a sense of existential dread, but in recent years, as the Intifada waned and the Israeli economy rebounded from the global recession—beaten only by China—Israelis began to enjoy their newfound prosperity and calm. This growing sense of security has now been punctured, driving them at first into a collective crouch, and an instinctive rallying behind their embattled prime minister. But now the Israeli public is becoming impatient. They sense that their ship of state is no longer on an even keel. In recent times both the Mossad and the IDF have managed to cock up straightforward operations, doing great harm to Israel’s strategic relations with Turkey and its reputation in the Arab world. If Israel faced such international condemnation from intercepting a flotilla, how will it fare if it attacks Iran’s nuclear facilities, or bombs Lebanese infrastructure in retaliation for Hezbollah rocket attacks? Israelis are now contemplating these questions and wondering whether dependence on deterrence and force alone is enough to secure their future. Perhaps their prime minister needs to take the diplomatic initiative? Slipping in the polls, under pressure from his more moderate coalition partners, and needing to avoid a new crisis with Obama when the settlement moratorium expires in September, Netanyahu finally seems willing to move. That is the background for what Netanyahu told Obama in their long private meeting Tuesday, prompting the president to declare publicly that the prime minister is ready to take “risks for peace.” The coming months will determine whether Obama’s newfound confidence in the sincerity of his Israeli partner in peacemaking is justified. But with their Palestinian counterpart and the Israeli public now ready, the time had come for Obama to suspend disbelief, put his arm around Netanyahu, and nudge him forward. Obama’s next stop? Jerusalem and Ramallah.

U.S.-Israeli talks indicate that with a strong alliance the Palistinian Conflict can be solved

Indyk 7/7 ([Martin S. Indyk](http://www.brookings.edu/experts/indykm.aspx), Vice President and Director, [Foreign Policy](http://www.brookings.edu/foreign-policy.aspx) at the Brookings institute, *The Brookings Institute,* 7/7/10, <http://www.brookings.edu/opinions/2010/0707_obama_netanyahu_indyk.aspx>) CS

[The meeting](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/07/06/AR2010070601889.html?hpid=moreheadlines) was bound to succeed. In the run-up to mid-term elections, President Obama needed to calm Jewish voters offended by his previous backhanded treatment of America’s Israeli ally. Prime Minister Netanyahu needed to reassure his public that he could right the ship of state after the bungled flotilla interception highlighted Israel’s isolation. But beyond the “confounding of cynics” trumpeted by Bibi in Tuesday’s remarkable Oval Office press availability may lie a more subtle development: a mood shift among Israelis and Palestinians that may signal an opportunity for serious movement toward peace. That was the conclusion I reached after visiting Ramallah and Israel last week. On the Palestinian side, the flotilla crisis seems to have bolstered the sense among the West Bank leadership that it is time to try to strike the deal with Israel. Abu Mazen, buoyed by his own meetings at the White House and with American Jewish leaders, appears to be ready to move into direct peace negotiations with Netanyahu. He intends to continue a campaign of public diplomacy designed to convince Israelis and their American Jewish supporters that they have a Palestinian partner for peacemaking. He is even ready to address the Knesset. This newfound peace activism is not so much because the Palestinian president believes the Likud PM has had a change of heart as it is confidence that the American president is in the Palestinian corner when it comes to establishing a viable state. He is now flexible about the necessary fig leaf to make direct negotiations possible: a credible explanation he can give to his people and the Arab League, which mandated his participation in the current “proximity talks.” If Netanyahu were willing to permit Palestinian police to resume control of “B Area” villages (where the Israel Defense Forces retain overall security control), and declare that there would no longer be IDF incursions into “A Area” cities (where the Palestinian Security Forces are supposed to have full responsibility), that would probably do it.

Settlements key to peace talks

Palestine won’t enter peace talks without Israel calling off settlement building.

Chick 10(Kristen, Israel Correspondent @ Christian Science Monitor, <http://www.csmonitor.com/World/terrorism-security/2010/0311/Mahmoud-Abbas-Israel-Palestinian-peace-talks-off-unless-new-settlements-canceled>, 3/11)dc.

Palestinian Authority President Mahmoud Abbas said Wednesday he would not move forward with proposed peace talks with Israel unless a newly announced settlement in East Jerusalem was canceled, according to Arab League Secretary General Amr Moussa. His decision brings the possibility of talks to a halt just four days after the two sides agreed to begin negotiations. It came after US envoy George Mitchell had worked for more than a year to bring the Israelis and Palestinians back to the table, and during US Vice President Joseph Biden’s visit to Israel this week, embarrassing the Obama administration, which has made renewing peace talks a key goal. "The most important thing is for these talks to go forward and go forward promptly and go forward in good faith," Biden said in a speech Thursday at Tel Aviv University. But Secretary General Moussa said Mr. Abbas was not ready to negotiate “under the present circumstances,” Reuters reports. Israel’s Interior Ministry unexpectedly published plans Tuesday to build 1,600 new homes in East Jerusalem, which Palestinians claim as their territory and where they hope to establish the capital of their future state.

Settlements in the West Bank prevent the Peace Process

Freedman 10 (Seth, writer and author, *Guardian*, 7-6-2010, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2010/jul/06/israel-settlement-west-bank-palestinian>) CM

There are plenty of thorns in the side of the peace process, but none as sharp and intractable as Israel's settlement programme. For decades, successive Israeli governments have persisted in their obstinate policies in the West Bank to the detriment of civilians on both sides, despite knowing full well that no lasting peace deal can ever be reached without an end to the settlement enterprise. Although the settlements are deemed illegal under international law, Israeli officials continue to cling to their belief that Israel has every right to settle its citizens in expropriated land over the Green Line. One line of argument employed by settlement supporters is that no settlement is built on private Palestinian land – though such a claim appears to be based largely on settler fiction rather than hard facts. According to a new report by the Israeli human rights group, B'Tselem, over a fifth of built-up settlement areas are constructed on privately owned Palestinian land, giving the lie to the assertions of settler leaders that their actions are entirely above board. B'Tselem's figures are based on official government records which reveal a state-wide complicity in the wholesale violations of local and international law – and the deception has been going on for years.When sanctioning early settlement construction in the West Bank, the report says:

Palestine will leave indirect peace talks without stop to Israeli settlements.

Barker 10(Anne, Middle East Correspondent for ABC News Australia, <http://www.abc.net.au/news/stories/2010/03/11/2843515.htm>, 3/11)dc.

Palestinian leaders are threatening to pull out of planned peace talks with Israel unless it reverses a plan to build 1,600 new homes for Jewish settlers in east Jerusalem. Palestinian leaders had agreed to take part in indirect talks with Israel, with the US to act as a mediator. But within days Israel announced plans to build more homes in east Jerusalem, which Palestinians claim is their rightful capital in a future state. Palestinian president Mahmoud Abbas says he can no longer go through with the talks unless the project is cancelled. United States vice-president Joe Biden, who has been in Israel this week, has condemned its leaders over the decision. There are also signs the Israeli Labour Party may pull out of Benjamin Netanyahu's ruling coalition in protest.

Settlements key to peace talks

Removal of settlements is key to the Peace Process

Freedman 10 (Seth, writer and author, *Guardian*, 7-6-2010, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2010/jul/06/israel-settlement-west-bank-palestinian>) CM

There is little point in expecting the settlers themselves to up and leave their cushy, state-subsidised homes as long as there is no official pressure on them to do so. A dogged and dogmatic commitment to illegal settling of the West Bank is the nature of the settler beast: to expect a volte face to come from within the settler community is wildly unrealistic. Instead, the onus is on the Israeli government to pull the rug from beneath the settlers' feet, in order to demonstrate serious commitment to the peace process and to prove to the Palestinians that Israel is prepared to make painful concessions in the name of ending the conflict. While it is all well and good for Israelis to demand an end to Palestinian violence and sabre-rattling, there has to be goodwill shown from the Israeli side too – and no amount of words can speak as loudly as the action of a large-scale pull-out from West Bank settlements. Without such a step forward, the region is doomed to forever stagnate in a cycle of stalled road maps and failed efforts, and there will be no peace for both the wicked and good alike, on either side of the divide.

Building settlements hurts peace negotiations between Israel and the Palestinians.

Friedman 10 (Matti; staff writer, *Associated Press,* July 6, 2010, http://www.google.com/hostednews/ap/article/ALeqM5ioi\_0jtO9RjMwPNRoXNCndRPRq3gD9GPL3484) CH

Jewish settlements control more than 42 percent of the West Bank, and much of that land was seized from Palestinian landowners in defiance of an Israeli Supreme Court ban, an Israeli human rights group said Tuesday. The group's findings echo what other anti-settlement activists have claimed in the past: That settlements have taken over lands far beyond their immediate perimeters, sometimes from private Palestinians. Israel's settlements have been a much-criticized enterprise throughout the decades and a major obstacle to peacemaking with the Palestinians. "The extensive geographic-spatial changes that Israel has made in the landscape of the West Bank undermine the negotiations that Israel has conducted for 18 years with the Palestinians and breach its international obligations," the B'Tselem group said in a summary of its report. Settlers disputed the figures and said the report by the B'Tselem group was politically motivated. Israeli officials had no comment. The report was based on official state documents, including military maps and a military settlement database, the B'Tselem said. Although the actual buildings of the settlements cover just 1 percent of the West Bank's land area, their jurisdiction and regional councils extends to more than 42 percent, the group added. Twenty-one percent of the land for these settlements was seized from Palestinian landowners, much of it after Israel's Supreme Court outlawed the practice in 1979. Dani Dayan, chairman of the settlers council, said settlements control just 9.2 percent of the West Bank, not 42 percent. "It's a political report by an organization that has been taken over the most radical anti-Israel elements," Dayan said. "The whole point is to sabotage the meeting between (Israeli Prime Minister) Benjamin Netanyahu and Barack Obama." Netanyahu was en route Tuesday to Washington, where he was due to meet with Obama later in the day to discuss advancing peacemaking and other regional issues. Some 300,000 Jews live in West Bank settlements and an additional 180,000 live in Jewish neighborhoods in east Jerusalem. Israel captured both territories from Jordan in the 1967 Mideast war, along with the Gaza Strip. The Palestinians envision all three areas for a future state.

Settlements key to peace talks

**Settlements cause violence between Arabs and Jews.**

Staff writer 10 (staff writer; *The World Tribune,* July 2, 2010, http://www.worldtribune.com/worldtribune/WTARC/2010/me\_israel0603\_07\_02.asp) CH

Officials said the Defense Ministry has directed the Army and security forces to train for the prospect of Arab and Jewish unrest in the West Bank. They said the ministry has assessed that violence could erupt amid Jewish efforts to renew construction in the region following a 10-month government ban scheduled to expire in September 2010. Netanyahu had pledged to approve new construction upon expiration of the freeze. "There is rising tension in the area — both Arab and Jewish," an official said. "We must have more and better-trained forces." On July 1, the Israel Border Police conducted a major exercise in the West Bank in an effort to enhance anti-riot capabilities. The exercise was said to have consisted of more than 400 border officers in scenarios that included Israeli demonstrations and Palestinian attacks. In one scenario, troops raided a Jewish community and confiscated weapons. Many Jewish residents of the West Bank have been licensed to carry firearms, including those issued by the military. Officials said the Defense Ministry plans to assign another 600 border police officers to the West Bank by October 2010. They said the units would come from inside Israel as well as along the border with Jordan. The Border Police was expected to be the lead force in battling Jewish unrest in the West Bank. In April 2010, the military's Central Command established a task force comprised of border officers in an effort to rapidly respond to Palestinian complaints of Israeli vandalism around Nablus.

Major controversy about the peace process revolves around the settlement freeze.

BBC July 8 (BBC News, July 8, 2010, http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/world/middle\_east/10560688.stm) EH

"It simply makes no sense that on one hand the American government says the settlements are one of the primary obstacles to peace, and on the other hand gives tax credits for funding the settlements," said Ghassan Khatib, head of the Palestinian Government Media Center, in a statement. President Obama has called for a halt to Israeli settlement building, saying it undermines efforts to restart peace talks. Palestinian President Mahmoud Abbas has said there can be no direct talks without a full settlement freeze. According to the New York Times report, the American donations mostly go to schools, synagogues, recreation centres and other legitimate expenditures under US tax law. But the money has also paid for housing, guard dogs, bulletproof vests, rifle scopes and vehicles to help secure outposts deep in occupied areas, the newspaper reported following an investigation of public records. Close to 500,000 Jews live in more than 100 settlements built since Israel's 1967 occupation of the West Bank and East Jerusalem. They are considered illegal under international law, although Israel disputes this.

Israel’s construction in Jerusalem is illegal and causes risks stopping the Peace Process

Khoury 10 (Jack Khoury, Ha’aretz correspondent, *Ha’aretz,* 3/22/10, <http://www.haaretz.com/news/un-chief-ban-in-ramallah-settlements-undermining-peace-1.266552>) CS

Israeli settlement building anywhere on occupied land is illegal and must be stopped, UN chief Ban Ki Moon said Saturday after getting a closer look at Israeli enclaves in the West Bank. From a hilltop observation post on the outskirts of the Palestinian city of Ramallah, the UN secretary-general saw the sprawling West Bank settlement of Givat Ze'ev, home to 11,000 Israelis who live in rows of red-roofed houses. The panorama included Jewish neighborhoods in traditionally Arab east Jerusalem, the Israeli-annexed sector of the city that Palestinians claim as a future capital. The brief geography lesson came a day after Ban, U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton and other major Mideast mediators - known as the Quartet - met in Moscow to try to find a way to restart Israeli-Palestinian peace talks. The mediators urged Israel to halt all settlement construction, which has emerged as a key obstacle to renewing talks. Israel has agreed to curb settlement construction in the West Bank, but not in east Jerusalem, claiming the entire city as Israel's eternal capital.

Settlements key to peace talks

East Jerusalem constructions nullify the effects of the settlement freeze and become the main obstacle in the way of Peacetalks

Slavin 7/2 (Barbara Slavin, Assistant Managing Editor for World and National Security of The Washington Times and a member of the Council on Foreign Relations, *Foreign Policy,* 7/2/10, <http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2010/07/02/unsettled>) CS

Settlements were the cause of the Obama administration's last big blowup with the Netanyahu government, during Vice President Joe Biden's trip to Israel in February, and are likely to remain the biggest obstacle to restarting Israeli-Palestinian peace talks. Netanyahu, due to meet with President Barack Obama July 6 to make up for a session canceled after the May 31 Gaza-bound flotilla fiasco, announced a 10-month moratorium on new settlement construction last November in large part due to U.S. pressure. But the moratorium permits completion of projects already started as of Nov. 25 and excludes the Golan Heights and East Jerusalem, both of which Israel has annexed but whose status in international law remains that of land occupied during a war. According to a [report](http://peacenow.org/entries/settlements_moratorium_six-month_accounting) by Peace Now and its American sister organization, Americans for Peace Now, there was a "33% spike in building starts" in occupied territories on the eve of the moratorium, "effectively inoculating the settlers in advance so that they would feel little or no effect." Unless the moratorium is extended beyond its scheduled expiration on Sept. 26, Peace Now states, "these past 10 months will have had no significance on the ground -- either in terms of settlement construction (which never stopped) or political impact.... Worse still, the moratorium may actually end up having laid the groundwork for a major increase in settlement construction, with settlers working hard, in advance of the expiration, to gain approval for new projects to be implemented as soon as the moratorium ends."

Palestine peace talks unlikely to happen if Israel keeps building settlements

Slavin 7/2 (Barbara Slavin, Assistant Managing Editor for World and National Security of The Washington Times and a member of the Council on Foreign Relations, *Foreign Policy,* 7/2/10, <http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2010/07/02/unsettled>) CS

Michael Herzog, a retiring brigadier general in the Israel Defense Forces, says Netanyahu will not extend the moratorium -- even with all its loopholes -- unless the Palestinians agree to move to direct negotiations from the proximity talks begun in May by U.S. envoy George Mitchell. A veteran of failed negotiations in 2000 and at Annapolis in 2007, Herzog wants new talks to begin and succeed. "We cannot afford a third failure," he told an audience at the Washington Institute for Near East Policy on July 1. Palestinian leaders say they have little incentive to begin direct negotiations while Israel continues to subsidize settlement growth. Given the choppy pattern of U.S.-Israel relations under Obama and the dynamics of Netanyahu's right-wing coalition, it wouldn't be a surprise if Israel announced some new housing activity just before, during, or after the Obama-Netanyahu meeting: perhaps some digging around the old Shepherd Hotel in East Jerusalem. Plans to demolish the hotel and build Jewish housing in its place are particularly controversial because it would be the first time since 1967 that such construction would occur in Sheikh Jarrah, a predominantly Arab neighborhood north of the Old City. "It seems as though Bibi [Netanyahu] believes it is easier and less costly to fight with Obama than his [Netanyahu's] interior minister or the mayor of Jerusalem," says Lara Friedman, director of policy and government relations for Americans for Peace Now. Stephen Hadley, a former national security advisor under George W. Bush and now part of a Middle East study group at the U.S. Institute of Peace, says he thinks the Obama-Netanyahu summit will go relatively smoothly after months of friction. "This visit is doomed to succeed," Hadley told the Washington Institute crowd. But that doesn't mean all is roses. "The crunch time will come in September" when the settlement moratorium and Arab League approval for proximity talks both expire, he said. Meanwhile, a host of benefits beckons for American Jews who decide to move to Israel at a time of high unemployment in the United States.

Iraq withdrawal forces Israeli military in the Jordan Valley

US withdrawal from Iraq means Israel will force military stations along the Jordan Valley in any peace with the Palestinians

Mozgovaya and Ravid 10 (Natasha and Barak, Haaretz.com, July 9, http://www.haaretz.com/news/diplomacy-defense/netanyahu-to-u-s-jews-direct-mideast-talks-will-begin-very-soon-1.300641?localLinksEnabled=false)

Following a meeting in Washington earlier Wednesday with U.S. Defense Secretary Robert Gates, Netanyahu said said that a final status agreement must provide for the possibly of renewed hostilities on Israel's eastern border following an American withdrawal from Iraq.

The prime minister's comments appear to indicate that even after a withdrawal from Palestinian territory, he would insist on maintaining an Israeli military presence along the Jordan Valley, which forms the border between Jordan and the West Bank.

Israeli Troops on the Jordan Border tank the Peace Process

Palestine wants control over the West bank-Jordan border; Israeli forces must leave in order for the peace process to work

Reuters 9 (Ari Rabinovitch, Journalist for Reuters, edited by Louise Ireland, an editor for Reuters, *Reuters,* 12/28/09, <http://www.reuters.com/article/idUSTRE5BR1V820091228>) CS

Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu on Monday raised publicly for the first time the prospect of maintaining Israeli forces along the eastern border of a future Palestinian state to prevent arms smuggling."The problem of demilitarization must be resolved effectively and this entails effectively blocking unauthorized entry, first and foremost from the east, wherever the border is defined," Netanyahu said in a speech to Israeli ambassadors. "I doubt whether anything except a real presence of the State of Israel, of Israeli forces, can accomplish that," he said, expanding on his vision of a nation with only limited sovereignty. Netanyahu has said the state Palestinians want to establish in the occupied West Bank and the Gaza Strip must be demilitarized, but he had not made specific reference until now to the stationing of Israeli forces on its Jordanian frontier. Israel and Egypt maintain control over the borders of the Gaza Strip under interim peace deals. Israel imposed a blockade after Hamas Islamists seized the territory in 2007 from forces loyal to Palestinian President Mahmoud Abbas's Fatah group. His comments about an Israeli presence along the border echoed a policy advocated by previous Israeli governments and spelled out new terms in any future negotiations with the Palestinians on statehood. Palestinians want a contiguous state in the West Bank and Gaza Strip, and were granted limited self-autonomy in the 1993 Oslo Accords. They have said they want full control over the entire border with Jordan in any future deal, but have not ruled out the presence of an international force. Netanyahu said an "international arrangement" for the borders of a Palestinian state, similar to the deployment of a U.N. force in southern Lebanon after Israel's 2006 war with Hezbollah guerrillas, would not suffice. Israeli-Palestinian peace talks have been frozen for the past year. Abbas has said they could resume only if Israel halted all settlement activity.

Palestine is ready to resume peace talks if Israel alters border control

AFP 7/7 (*American Free Press,* 7/7/10, <http://news.yahoo.com/s/afp/20100707/wl_mideast_afp/mideastisraeldiplomacyabbasethiopia>) CS

ADDIS ABABA (AFP) – [Palestinian president Mahmud Abbas](http://news.yahoo.com/s/afp/20100707/wl_mideast_afp/mideastisraeldiplomacyabbasethiopia) said Wednesday he wanted an Israeli "signal" on the key issues of security and borders before heeding US calls for a resumption of direct peace talks. "We are ready to go for direct talks if we receive any signals from the Israeli side on two issues, the borders and the security," Abbas said in English during an official visit to Ethiopia. "We have presented our proposals to both the Americans and the Israelis and we are waiting for an Israeli impression and reaction," he told [reporters after meeting](http://news.yahoo.com/s/afp/20100707/wl_mideast_afp/mideastisraeldiplomacyabbasethiopia) Ethiopian Prime Minister Meles Zenawi. US President Barack Obama this week expressed hope that direct talks would start before the end of September after a White House meeting with Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu. Netanyahu says he is ready to meet Abbas at any time and [Israeli Defence Minister Ehud Barak](http://news.yahoo.com/s/afp/20100707/wl_mideast_afp/mideastisraeldiplomacyabbasethiopia) said Wednesday he could see direct negotiations getting under way "within a few weeks". But the Palestinians have yet to commit to direct talks, accusing Israel of undermining the atmosphere with continuing settlement activity on occupied Palestinian land. Obama said he hoped progress towards direct negotiations from [indirect US-brokered proximity talks](http://news.yahoo.com/s/afp/20100707/wl_mideast_afp/mideastisraeldiplomacyabbasethiopia) between Israelis and Palestinians would render an October 1 deadline for ending a partial Israeli settlement freeze irrelevant. "My hope is that once direct talks have begun, well before the moratorium has expired, that that will create a climate in which everybody feels a [greater investment in success](http://news.yahoo.com/s/afp/20100707/wl_mideast_afp/mideastisraeldiplomacyabbasethiopia)," he said.

Israeli Troops on the Jordan Border tank the Peace Process

Peace Process must involve Israeli withdrawal from Palestinian Borders

JTA 6/21 (*Jewish Telegraphic Agency,* 6/21/10, <http://jta.org/news/article/2010/01/21/1010258/israel-wants-troops-on-palestinian-states-eastern-border>) CS

JERUSALEM (JTA) -- Israel wants to keep troops on the West Bank's border with Jordan even after the formation of a Palestinian state, its prime minister said. Benjamin Netanyahu made the statement during a news conference with foreign reporters Wednesday, just hours before the arrival in Israel of U.S. Mideast envoy George Mitchell. The Israeli leader said the presence was necessary to prevent weapons being smuggled into the new state and to prevent rockets from being fired at Israel. Chief Palestinian Authority negotiator Saeb Erekat rejected the idea Thursday during an interview on Israel Radio. "The borders of the state of Palestine will be Jordan," he said. "The Jordan Valley is ours, is Palestine. Why do they insist on being on our territory?" "The Palestinian leadership will not accept the presence of a single Israeli soldier in the Palestinian territories after the end of the occupation," Nabil Abu Rudeina, a spokesman for PA President Mahmoud Abbas, told the French news agency AFP. "We will not accept anything less than a completely sovereign Palestinian state on all the territories with its own borders, resources and airspace." Israeli Defense Minister Ehud Barak and Mitchell in a meeting Thursday in Tel Aviv talked about advancing the political process with the Palestinians. Mitchell was scheduled to meet later in the day with Netanyahu and Foreign Minister Avigdor Lieberman. Erekat also denied news reports that the Palestinian Authority had asked the United States to negotiate a final peace settlement with Israel on its behalf.

Jordan Valley troops violate international law

Israeli occupation of the Jordan Valley violates International and Israeli law, the Geneva Convention, is colonialist, and aims to ethnically cleanse the area of Palestinians, all to benefit Israeli settlers

ARIJ 9 (Applied Research Institute-Jerusalem, 7-11-2009, <http://www.poica.org/editor/case_studies/view.php?recordID=2196>) CM

However, and regardless of the motivation behind this change of Israeli attitude, the master plans presented by the Israeli civil administration for the selected Palestinian communities located in area “C” did not even meet the minimum needs of Palestinian communities. Furthermore, the Israeli civil administration did not take into consideration the current status of the communities or its future needs. Moreover, and despite the fact that the threatened Palestinian houses and barracks in Fassayel village are located in the area of the new proposed master plan adopted by the Israeli Civil Administration, Israel is going on with its colonial practices to ethnically cleanse Fasayel village and the rest of the Palestinian villages and communities in the Jordan Valley in order to serve the Israeli colonial and expansionist agenda. On the other hand, Israel made sure that the master plans assigned to Israeli settlements in the OPT are well and sufficient to cope with anticipated future growth of settlers’ population, in addition to easily formulated procedures for building and development plans. Al Jiftlik & Fassayel Communities at a glance Al Jiftlik, a Palestinian village located to the north of Jericho city, in the central part of the Jordan Valley and has a population of 5,124 (PCBS 2008) The village is bordered by military bases and settlements from its northern, western and southern directions, and bypass road number 90 from its eastern side. While Fassayel village, is inhabited by 1048 citizens (PCBS 2008) and is set on a built-up area of 194 dunums. The village is bordered by Peza'el sentiment from its north, Tomer, Gilgal, Netiv Hagdud and Niran settlements from its south; bypass road 90 from its east and open spaces from its western side. The fact that Al Jiftlik and Fasayel villages lie in area identified by the Israeli Army as closed military area has a lot in what is happening there. More than that, the fact that the entire West Bank territory is occupied and administered by the Israeli Civil Administration, which is basically the Israeli Army makes any decision issued from any Israeli court, including the Supreme Court irrelevant and insignificant, the Israeli Army has the power to override and discard any decision from any Israeli court under the pretext of “security” and “the well being of the state and people of Israel.” On the ground, there are military courts and they are the ones entitled to issue any decision that is binding to the Israeli Army. Legal & International Status The systematic Israeli campaign of house demolitions is carried out by the Israeli Army and flagrantly violates International humanitarian law, International conventions and various United Nations resolutions. According to the Fourth Geneva Convention Israel is prohibited to demolish Palestinian houses under Article 53 of the Convention which provides that: 'Any destruction by the Occupying Power of real or personal property belonging individually or collectively to private persons, or to the State, or to other public authorities, or to social or cooperative organizations, is prohibited, except where such destruction is rendered absolutely necessary by military operations'. Under the same convention, Article 147 provides that 'extensive destruction and appropriation of property, not justified by military necessity and carried out unlawfully and wantonly' is a grave breach of international law. Moreover, the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (1965) Article 5 provides that: 'States' or Parties must undertake to prohibit and eliminate racial discrimination in all of its forms and to guarantee the right of everyone, without distinction as to race, color, or national or ethnic origin, to equality before the law, notably in the enjoyment of the following rights: (e) in particular ... (iii) the right to housing'. In the year 2004 the United Nations Security Council called on Israel to stop demolition of Palestinian homes under Resolution No. 1544-(2004), the resolution states: 'The Security Council called on Israel to respect its obligations under international humanitarian law, particularly the obligation not to undertake home demolitions contrary to that law'

Impact will be large – lots of WMDs

Military Advances on both sides of the Arab-Israeli conflict which increase the impact of any attack

Nerguizian & Cordesman 6/28 (Anthony H. Cordesman, the Arleigh A. Burke Chair in Strategy at CSIS and national security analyst for ABC News, and Aram Nerguizian, a visiting fellow with the Arleigh A. Burke Chair in Strategy at CSIS, *Center For Strategic and International Studies,* 6/28/10, <http://csis.org/publication/arab-israeli-military-balance-2010>) CS

Israel retains a major advantage in long-range missiles, long-range air strike capabilities, nuclear weapons, and missile/land-based air defenses. Syria and Iran are, however, improving their missile strike capabilities – albeit largely in terms of deploying systems that could be little more than inaccurate terror weapons, unless armed with a highly effective chemical or biological warhead, or with nuclear weapons. Iran is a declared chemical weapons power, and Syria almost certainly has been developing and producing some chemical weapons for several decades. Iran and Syria have at least unitary warheads and bombs that can be armed with nerve gas, and may have warheads and bombs with cluster munitions. If so, the effectiveness and lethality of such weapons is unknown. Israel probably has at least some munitions with nerve gas, and Egyptian stocks of such weapons are possible. The status of the biological weapons efforts in Israel, Syria, Egypt, and Iran is unclear. It is probable that all four countries have at least conducted major research and preliminary development of such weapons – even if this is only part of a necessary defense effort.

\*\*\*AFF Answers\*\*\*

Netanyahu is weak now

Credibility of Netanyahu is low in Israel.

Mitnick 10 (Josh; correspondent, *The Christian Science Monitor,* July 7, 2010, http://www.csmonitor.com/World/Middle-East/2010/0707/Obama-Netanyahu-make-show-of-mending-US-Israeli-ties) CH

Though the two administrations have been at odds over how to advance the Israeli-Palestinian peace process and how to confront Iran’s nuclear ambitions, President Obama insisted the differences had been exaggerated by the American and Israeli media. The president also said that he believes Mr. Netanyahu wants peace, echoing similar praise that former President George W. Bush bestowed on former Israeli Prime Minister Ariel Sharon in 2002. Both leaders smiling, Obama responded to reporters questions about the leaders’ chilly relationship by saying, “I’ve trusted Prime Minister Netanyahu since I met him” – a compliment that many Israelis might find ironic because of the domestic credibility deficit often ascribed to the prime minister by politicians and analysts. The summit was complemented by a meeting between First Lady Michelle Obama and Netanyahu’s wife, Sara. “They really bent over backwards to make it seem like business as usual,” says Mitchell Barak, who runs the Israeli polling firm, Keevoon. “But it doesn’t lend credibility when the leaders don’t acknowledge that there was a crisis and [pretend that] everything was fine all along... Israelis already have a problem with credibility of politicians.”

The Israeli right wing have lost their confidence in Netanyahu.

Shamir 10 (Shlomo, staff writer, Haaretz, June 20, 2010, http://www.haaretz.com/print-edition/opinion/quiet-over-brooklyn-1.297141) EH

As soon as Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu's right-wing government took office in Jerusalem, it seems the American Jewish right fell asleep. The fierce controversy over construction in East Jerusalem, U.S. President Barack Obama's harsh statements about Israel, the Goldstone report accusing Israel of war crimes, the torrent of international condemnations in the wake of the flotilla raid - all failed to draw rabbis and community activists out in mass demonstrations of support for Israel. In fact, one can confidently say that Israel's political problems have been taken off the agenda of Orthodox synagogues and rabbinical organizations like the Rabbinical Council of America and Young Israel and were ushered out of the public discourse of the community's right wing. "I can't explain the silence of the Orthodox community," admits Dov Hikind, a former aide to Meir Kahane, who today serves as a New York State assemblyman for Boro Park and parts of Flatbush. "It's not laziness or tiredness," says a veteran community activist in Brooklyn, who asked to remain anonymous. "Some from the generation of rabbis and politicians who led the struggle against the Oslo Accords have died, and others are in retirement homes. Israel's political elite does not have a single figure with whom they can identify and use as an example of dedication and loyalty to values." There has not been a consensus about any Israeli issue since the long-gone days of protest on behalf of the Soviet Jews. But the right always loved controversy that stirred the enthusiasm of rabbis, politicians and the rank and file. The Oslo Accords, for instance, prompted protests against the government of Israel and especially against then-prime minister Yitzhak Rabin. But it seems the last time the right wing had an opportunity to actively protest was against the Gaza disengagement. Recent studies have claimed that many in the Jewish community, especially its liberal wing, are distancing themselves from Israel and feel alienated by its current policy. It now transpires that the Orthodox, who constitute the majority of the right-wing camp and who once would have seen neglecting to support a right-wing Israeli government as nothing short of heresy, have lost their trust and confidence in the Netanyahu government.

Netanyahu is weak now

Mistakes by Netanyahu weaken his status.

Debkafile 10 (Debkafile provides an intelligence and security news service, July 1, http://www.debka.com/article/8882/) EH

The "Turkish flotilla effect" continues to plague Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu, leading him into one misstep after another with the result that he arrives in Washington on July 6 for talks with President Barack Obama with a divided government. debkafile's Jerusalem sources report that Thursday, July 1 finds Netanyahu scrambling to stabilize his cabinet lineup and recover from the fallout of his disastrous decision to let infrastructure minister Binyamin Ben-Eliezer meet Turkish Foreign Minister Ahmed Davutoglu for supposedly secret talks in Brussels to try and narrow the widening rift between Ankara and Jerusalem. It was leaked that same day, causing a huge uproar in Jerusalem - both because the initiative which failed was seen to be a crass error at a time that the Turkish prime minister Recep Erdogan's anti-Israel campaign was in full flight, and because the prime minister neglected to update foreign minister Avigdor Lieberman of the event. Lieberman, who heads the right-wing Israel Beitenu, publicly accused Netanyahu of breach of trust. All day Thursday, he refused to answer the prime minister's phone calls. The result: total disconnect between the head of government and his foreign minister less than a week before the Israeli prime minister meets the US president. Another key member of the Netanyahu cabinet, defense minister Ehud Barak, leader of the Labor party, is suspected by broad political circles of engineering the Israeli minister's rendezvous with Davutoglu - not just for a reckless bid to melt the Turkish wall of hostility, but to edge the foreign minister and his party out of the government coalition. He has denied this charge - according to debkafile's sources, to avoid being associated with a second fiasco after the fumbled Israeli commando raid of the Turkish Mavi Marmara ship heading for Gaza on May 31. The defense minister understands that his complicity in the Brussels encounter could weigh against him when he testifies before the public inquiry commission Israel established to find out how the flotilla incident came to end with nine Turkish activists dead and six Israeli soldiers injured. Its findings could damage Barak's career irretrievably. The panel, headed by ex-justice Jacob Turkel with two foreign observers, is to be given a broader mandate and real teeth. Instead of preparing calmly for a hardheaded discussion with the US president on a long list of tough issues, Netanyahu must now concentrate all his efforts on hauling his government coalition out of a morass. It is hard to see him managing this uphill job in the four days left before he boards a flight to Washington. He will therefore arrive at the White House with his government in disarray and his personal standing uncertain.

Netanyahu is weak now

Netanyahu is weak, his policies are being overturned by EVERYONE.

Kaufman 10(Amy, Israeli Journalist and contributor to the Huffington Post, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/ami-kaufman/everyone-except-obama-kno_b_470792.html>, 2/21)dc.

Over the past year, Netanyahu has succumbed to pressure from coalition members and from his own party that has made him renege on so many of his initiatives, it's hard to keep count. Here are just a few examples: Value added tax on fruits and vegetables Netanyahu backed down from a plan to impose a Value Added Tax on fruits and vegetables after he met strong opposition from the ultra-Orthodox Shas party, a partner in his coalition. Shas Chairman Eli Yishai said that the tax would harm the weaker sectors of society. Eventually, Netanyahu claimed that "A central part of my job is to listen to the will of the people. I've reached the conclusion that now is not the time to impose this tax." The drought tax The government had a great idea to hike up water prices to make people use less of this disappearing resource. But the huge public outcry meant that Netanyahu had to let this initiative go down the drain. Expulsion of the children of foreign workers Netanyahu's government isn't exactly known for its tolerance of minorities and foreigners. So, when he and his Interior Minister Yishai decided it was time to kick out the children of foreign workers in Israel, the public outcry worked once again. The deportations won't begin until August 2010, assuming he sticks to his guns this time... The Highway and Railroad Plan Just two weeks ago, Netanyahu unveiled his plan to spend over 80 billion shekels ($20 billion) on new highways and railroads connecting the Galilee to the Negev. But officials in the Treasury got up on their hind legs and seem to have derailed this plan, as well. 1/2 National Heritage Sites And just this morning, Netanyahu added two controversial sites to a list of sites that would be granted 400 million shekels (100 million dollars). After pressure from right-wingers, Netanyahu added the Cave of the Patriarchs in Hebron and Rachel's Tomb in Bethlehem to the list. The "Jobs" Law This would have allowed municipalities across the country to appoint dozens of deputy mayors to public offices at a huge cost to the public coffers. The huge public outcry did it again (thank G-d for Israeli public outcry...). The Absorption Budget When Foreign Minister and head of the extreme right-wing Yisrael Beitenu party Avigdor Lieberman heard that the Absorption Ministry's budget would be cut along with all the other ministries, he called a press conference and announced his party wouldn't be voting with the coalition. Bibi quickly put in a call, and invited him in for a chat at his office to promise it wouldn't happen. Right to vote for Israelis living abroad Netanyahu's initiative to allow all Israelis abroad to vote will probably change drastically, if not vanish totally into thin air. The goal, of course, was to strengthen his fan base, since most of the several hundred thousand Israelis living abroad are known to lean to the right. Netanyahu has met strong opposition from his coalition partners, mainly Ehud Barak and the Labor Party. It now seems the privilege will be given only to those who left the country one year before elections. And this is just a partial list, from one year in office. So, why is it that small-town politicians, officials and public outcry can twist Bibi's arm, but the leader of the free world can't even beat him in a thumb-wrestling match? Simple. Everyone knows Bibi is "Lachitz", and everyone knows his weak spots. Everybody knows he cares what people think of him, that he can't take the pressure, and most importantly: all he wants is to do what most prime ministers never do - finish a full term without going to elections. You might ask then, "Why is it that when it comes to Iran and the peace process he doesn't give in"? Well, that's because those are precisely the areas where he has no pressure to do otherwise - not from abroad, and not at home. U.S. administrations have rarely put any pressure on Israeli governments

Netanyahu weak - Obama demanding huge concessions

The alliance with Israel is on the brink

CBS 10 (Dan Raviv, The national Correspondent for CBS, *The CBS News, 3/28/10,* [*http://www.cbsnews.com/8301-503543\_162-20000509-503543.html*](http://www.cbsnews.com/8301-503543_162-20000509-503543.html)*) CS*

Foreign policy analysts who constantly take the pulse of America's alliance with Israel are using the word "crisis," and some believe that President Obama seems intent on making it even more bitter -- not less -- in what seems like an effort to change the government coalition in Jerusalem. Trying to meddle in a foreign country's internal politics is like playing with fire, but in the cause of pushing for progress toward Israeli-Arab peace it looks to many as though Obama is brandishing a big box of matches and a large jerrycan of gasoline. Instead of calming suddenly choppy seas between Washington and Jerusalem, he is demanding that Israel instantly make some concessions that Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu may consider politically impossible.The State Department spokesman, P.J. Crowley, today confirmed that Secretary of State Hillary Clinton asked Netnayahu for specific commitments - but Crowley refused to say what is being requested. This follows the annoying timing of Israel's government announcing an expansion of a Jewish neighborhood in the captured eastern half of Jerusalem -- just when Vice President Joe Biden was visiting Israel last week.

Netanyahu’s Coalition is collapsing – Obama working to delegitimize

World Tribune 10 (Newspaper, 4-28-2010, <http://www.worldtribune.com/worldtribune/WTARC/2010/ss_israel0350_04_28.asp>) CM

WASHINGTON — The administration of President Barack Obama has launched what officials termed a psychological warfare campaign meant to topple Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu. Sources in the administration and Congress asserted that the White House and State Department have sought to destabilize Netanyahu's government by forcing him to agree to an indefinite freeze on Jewish construction in the West Bank and most of Jerusalem as well as the establishment of a Palestinian state by 2012. They said the campaign sought to replace Netanyahu with opposition leader and former foreign minister Tsipi Livni. ”Bibi is extremely vulnerable to pressure," a source familiar with the White House effort said. "We know this from his first term in office and believe he will collapse this time as well." The sources said the administration's strategy aimed to de-legitimize Netanyahu in his government and right-wing constituency, Middle East Newsline reported. They said Obama and his aides have sought to portray Netanyahu as a weak and unstable politician who will destroy relations with Washington as Israel seeks U.S. support for a military option against Iran. "There seems to be a general belief in the circle around the president that the democratically-elected government in Israel is drunk at the wheel," Steven Rosen, a veteran pro-Israeli lobbyist now with the Middle East Forum, said. "They clearly will use pressure tactics to bring Israel around." In April 2010, former U.S. ambassador to Israel Martin Indyk began a series of attacks on Netanyahu in the Israeli media. Indyk, a former assistant secretary of state under then-President Bill Clinton, has called for the toppling of Netanyahu while his right-wing partners accept a more pliant prime minister.

No Peace Process - Palestinian Refusal

Palestinians might say no to direct peace talks.

Mitnick July 8 (Joshua, Christian Science Monitor commentator, Christian Science Monitor is an international news organization, July 8, 2010, http://www.csmonitor.com/World/Middle-East/2010/0708/Palestinians-brace-for-US-pressure-after-Netanyahu-s-White-House-visit) EH

After the Obama administration pushed Mr. Netanyahu over the past year to rein in West Bank settlements, there are signals in the wake of Netanyahu's White House visit on Tuesday that US pressure could shift to Palestinian President Mahmoud Abbas. Mr. Abbas has refused to engage in face-to-face peace talks with the Israelis without a permanent freeze on Jewish settlements in the West Bank and East Jerusalem, but Mr. Obama may now ask him to compromise on that point. "People are upset…. We doubt the potential to change Israeli policy regarding the peace talks, regarding the settlements, and lifting the curfew in Gaza,'' says Nashat Aqtash, a communications professor at Bir Zeit University in the West Bank. "They are going to put pressure on us, not the Israelis, to start direct negotiations without any assurances.… We are starting negotiations without anything.'' Palestinian officials held firm following the meeting, insisting that Israel's 10-month building moratorium must remain in place and that Netanyahu must be more forthcoming about a deal on borders and security. While Palestinian analysts and columnists were disappointed that Obama seemed more friendly toward Israel, a government spokesperson said this was not a surprising development. "Palestinian officials are aware of the nature of Israel-American relations, and they don't expect a break,'' says government spokesman Ghassan Khatib. "The problem is that in the indirect talks, the Israelis didn't show any seriousness at all. We presented full-fledged negotiating proposals on these two issues – borders and security – and the other side didn't bother to present anything or react to our proposals.''

Israel committed to building settlements, kills peace

Israel’s will to continue to building hurts relations with U.S. and Palestine

Ravid & Mualem 10 (Barak Ravid, staff writer for Ha’aretz, Mazal Mualem, Political correspondent for Ha’aretz, *Ha’aretz,* 3/15/10

Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu on Monday said that Israel would continue to build in Jerusalem in the same way that it has over the last 42 years. "The building in Jerusalem - and in all other places - will continue in the same way as has been customary over the last 42 years," said Netanyahu at a Likud party meeting. Israel drew angry reactions from the U.S. and the Palestinians by announcing last week the construction of 1,600 new housing units in the East Jerusalem neighborhood of Ramat Shlomo during a visit by U.S. Vice President Joe Biden last week. Netanyahu did not specifically address the [diplomatic crisis with the U.S.](http://www.haaretz.com/hasen/spages/1156467.html)over Israel's announcement about the East Jerusalem construction. However, when asked by MK Tzipi Hotovely what would happen in September, when the 10-month settlement freeze ends, Netanyahu responded that construction would continue unabated. Under U.S. pressure, Netanyahu imposed a limited moratorium on new housing starts in West Bank settlements in November but excluded Jerusalem from the 10-month partial freeze.

Israel’s secret building construction in West Bank could endanger peace talks

BBC 10 (*BBC News,* 3/8/10, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/middle_east/8555300.stm>) CS

The planned apartments are in the settlement of Beitar Illit, which has a mostly Orthodox Jewish population. Israeli ministers said the buildings would be allowed to go ahead because of what they termed called "safety issues". A statement from the defence ministry said the building was needed to plug a potentially dangerous 40-yard gap between two existing buildings. "Beitar Illit is an exceptional permit that came about following safety problems in the infrastructure," the statement said. The building permits were issued under the previous government of Ehud Olmert and before the settlement pause was announced. The Palestinian leadership in the West Bank had demanded a complete stop to settlement building as a precondition to re-engaging in talks which broke down more than a year ago. They agreed "grudgingly", reports said, and came after many months of shuttle diplomacy from Mr Mitchell. The talks should be limited to four months, Palestinian officials said. Under heavy US pressure, the Israeli government agreed in November to a temporary and partial pause in building. It said that work which had already started on 3,000 homes should be allowed to continue, and further exceptions to the pause were possible. Israel has refused to stop building in East Jerusalem, which the Palestinians say they want as the location of a future capital of a Palestinian state. In February, the Israeli government revealed that work had been continuing in many settlements despite the promise of a pause. Palestinian negotiator Saeb Erekat said the move put the talks at risk. US Vice President Joe Biden arrives in Israel "If the Israeli government wants to sabotage Mitchell's efforts by taking such steps, let's talk to Mitchell about maybe not doing this if the price is so high," he was quoted by the Associated Press as saying. Israeli Environment Minister Gilad Erdan said the settlement was "an exception" to the building pause. "At the end of last year the government decided to freeze construction, but this decision provided for exceptions in cases of safety problems for infrastructure projects started before the freeze," he told Army Radio. Peace Now, an Israeli group, said the announcement raised questions about Israel's commitment to the peace process. "The Israeli government is welcoming the US Vice-President by demonstrating, to our regret, that it has no genuine intention to advance the peace process," the group's settlement expert Hagit Ofran told AP. All settlements in the the West Bank, including East Jerusalem, are considered illegal under international law, although Israel disputes this.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

Netanyahu committed to settlements, kills peace

Netanyahu is sticking to building plans – he is killing peace talks possibilities and setting Israel up for conflict.

Cole 10(Juan, Professor at University of Michigan, Juancole.com, <http://www.juancole.com/2010/04/netanyahu-commits-to-colonizing-east-jerusalem-first-palestinian-expelled-under-new-policy.html>, 4/23)dc.

Netanyahu, an Israeli hawk and expansionist, slapped President Barack Obama in the face again Thursday when he confirmed that he refused to halt construction of new homes in Palestinian East Jerusalem, which is militarily occupied by Israel. Netanyahu’s announcement is probably the nail in the coffin of any two-state solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict (in which the Israelis have thrown most Palestinians now living beyond the Green Line off their land and deprived them of citizenship in a state and all the rights that go with such citizenship). Palestinians are so despairing that only 57 percent even believe in having an independent Palestinian state any more. The rest are resigned to becoming Israelis in the distant future, when demographic realities and perhaps world-wide boycotts of Israel for its Apartheid-style policies toward the occupied Palestinian will force Israel to accept them. At the same time, Netanyahu tried to throw sand in peoples’ eyes by talking about recognizing an ‘interim’ Palestinian state with “temporary” borders. Palestinian leaders reject this formulation, which is intended to allow the Israelis to continue aggressively to colonize Palestinian territory while pretending that they are engaged in a ‘peace process.’ The Palestine Authority, established in the 1990s, was already a sort of interim state then, and Palestine’s borders were then ‘temporary.’ So temporary that Israel has made deep inroads into them through massive colonies and building a wall on the Palestinian side of the border, cutting residents off from their own farms and sequestering entire towns and cities. Netanyahu’s various moves this week, from illegally expelling a Palestinian from the West Bank to Gaza– to blowing off the president of the United States and hitching his wagon to massive increased colonization of Palestinian land– all of these steps are guaranteed to mire Israel in violent disputes for years and perhaps decades. And the US, which has already suffered tremendously in Iraq and elsewhere from its knee-jerk support of illegal and inhumane Israeli policies toward the Palestinians, will suffer further. Meanwhile, in the wake of a vicious attack on Barack Obama by New York senator Chuck Schumer, Steve Clemons of the Washington Note frankly wonders whether Schumer understands he is in the US Senate or whether he is under the impression he is serving in the Israeli Knesset.

Netanyahu won’t renew the settlement “Freeze”

Reuters 7/8 (Jeffrey Heller, editor-in-charge in the Jerusalem bureau of UPI, Doina Chiacu, Journalist and sub-editor at Reuters, *Reuters,* 7/8/10, <http://www.reuters.com/article/idUSTRE66709920100708>) CS

Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu signaled on Thursday he would not extend beyond September a 10-month moratorium on new housing starts in Jewish settlements in the occupied West Bank. "I think we've done enough. Let's get on with the talks," he said, when asked in an appearance at the Council on Foreign Relations whether he would extend the limited freeze he put in place to coax the Palestinians into peace negotiations. At the forum, Netanyahu repeated a call to the Palestinians to move from indirect talks that began in May under U.S. mediation to face-to-face negotiations on statehood. But he gave no details of the "concrete steps" he promised, during White House talks on Tuesday, to take within weeks to encourage Palestinian President Mahmoud Abbas to upgrade the peace process. "I think we should seize the moment. And it is a challenging moment and an important moment. We have the ability to negotiate a peace," Netanyahu said at the international affairs think tank in New York. "And I'm prepared to take risks," Netanyahu added, while stressing that would not entail any move that could jeopardize Israel's security. "But we have to get on with it. We should just stop all the delays and start now, next week, in two weeks - get the talks going. Because only if we start them, we can complete them." Netanyahu said he intended "to confound the skeptics and critics." But he added: "I need a partner." The future of settlements, he said, would be addressed in the so-called final status talks with the Palestinians. Netanyahu said in a U.S. television interview on Wednesday that Israel intended to deal with that issue "right away" once direct negotiations got under way. Extending the limited freeze could pose significant political risks for Netanyahu, whose coalition government is dominated by pro-settler parties, including his own Likud**.**

Netanyahu Continuing Settlements

Netanyahu confirmed the continuation of Jewish settlements.

Heller July 8 (Jeffery, editor-in-charge in the Jerusalem bureau, Reuters, July 8, 2010, http://www.reuters.com/article/idUSTRE66709920100708) EH

(Reuters) - Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu signaled on Thursday he would not extend beyond September a 10-month moratorium on new housing starts in Jewish settlements in the occupied West Bank. "I think we've done enough. Let's get on with the talks," he said, when asked in an appearance at the Council on Foreign Relations whether he would extend the limited freeze he put in place to coax the Palestinians into peace negotiations. At the forum, Netanyahu repeated a call to the Palestinians to move from indirect talks that began in May under U.S. mediation to face-to-face negotiations on statehood. But he gave no details of the "concrete steps" he promised, during White House talks on Tuesday, to take within weeks to encourage Palestinian President Mahmoud Abbas to upgrade the peace process. "I think we should seize the moment. And it is a challenging moment and an important moment. We have the ability to negotiate a peace," Netanyahu said at the international affairs think tank in New York. "And I'm prepared to take risks," Netanyahu added, while stressing that would not entail any move that could jeopardize Israel's security. "But we have to get on with it. We should just stop all the delays and start now, next week, in two weeks - get the talks going. Because only if we start them, we can complete them." Netanyahu said he intended "to confound the skeptics and critics." But he added: "I need a partner." The future of settlements, he said, would be addressed in the so-called final status talks with the Palestinians. Netanyahu said in a U.S. television interview on Wednesday that Israel intended to deal with that issue "right away" once direct negotiations got under way. Extending the limited freeze could pose significant political risks for Netanyahu, whose coalition government is dominated by pro-settler parties, including his own Likud.

Netanyahu confirmed that the 10-month settlement freeze has come to an end.

Press TV July 9 (Press TV is the first Iranian international news network, July 9, 2010, http://www.presstv.ir/detail.aspx?id=134032&sectionid=351020202) EH

Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu has signaled that he will not extend a 10-month freeze on illegal settlement activities in the occupied West Bank. The Israeli premier, who was addressing the influential US foreign policy think tank, the Council on Foreign Relations in New York on Thursday, said that a freeze put in place in August 2009 has so far failed to spur the Palestinian Authority to enter direct peace talks, Reuters reported. Netanyahu had earlier told a US television network that the future of the illegal settlements would be addressed in the so-called final status talks with the Palestinians. The Israeli prime minister's remark on the potential resumption of settlement activities came on the final day of a three-day visit to Washington. The Palestinian Authority (PA) froze direct negotiations in December 2008 when Israel launched a deadly offensive against the Gaza Strip. The PA says Israel must end the occupation of Palestinian territories before any negotiation. Recently, Tel Aviv revealed plans to build 2700 new settlements in the West Bank immediately after the existing settlement freeze expires on September 27. This comes despite the latest UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon's criticism of Israel, in which he said that Israel has violated international law by expanding its settlements in the occupied Palestinian land, including al-Quds (Jerusalem).

Netanyahu Continuing Settlements

The Israeli coalition will stay the same following the end of the settlement freeze.

Sofer 10 (Roni, Israeli News writer, Ynetnews, June 22, 2010, http://www.ynetnews.com/articles/0,7340,L-3909157,00.html) EH

Counting the days until the end of the freeze – Israel's governing coalition will not be changing after the end of the settlement freeze in September, Foreign Minister Avigdor Lieberman says. Lieberman, who spoke during a meeting with political correspondents in Jerusalem, added that "The real test for the country will take place in September, upon the end of the temporary construction freeze in the settlements. "However, there is no alternative to the coalition in my view. This coalition won't be changing," he said. Also in September, Turkey will become the rotating president of the Security Council, during which the General Assembly of the UN will meet to discuss the Secretary-General's interim report over the Goldstone Report, which he will submit during the second half of July. "Everything is happening in September, it won't be boring over here," said a senior government source. The source added that he does not see Palestinian President Mahmoud Abbas as a viable partner: "He does not represent Judea and Samaria, or the residents of Gaza. The presidential campaign is still taking place and as of today there are 110 streets named after Palestinian 'martyrs' – from Dalal Mughrabi to Yahya Ayyash. This whole song of praise for terror is unreasonable," he said.

Lieberman confirmed the end of the settlement freeze.

Ackerman July 6 (Gwen, writer, Bloomberg Business Week, July 6, 2010, http://www.businessweek.com/news/2010-07-06/lieberman-says-israel-won-t-extend-settlement-freeze.html) EH

July 6 (Bloomberg) -- Foreign Minister Avigdor Lieberman said there was “no chance” Israel will extend a partial freeze on West Bank construction. “It is important that direct talks resume and the government supports this but will not agree to pay for this,” Lieberman said in comments sent from Helsinki by text message. His remarks came as Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu prepares for talks in Washington with President Barack Obama later today. Netanyahu announced the 10-month halt in West Bank settlement construction in November. Palestinians, the U.S. and the European Union say the communities are an obstacle to a peace agreement that would establish an independent Palestinian state in the West Bank and Gaza Strip. The U.S. is mediating indirect talks between Israelis and Palestinians, and Netanyahu has called on Palestinians to agree to face-to-face meetings. Palestinian Authority President Mahmoud Abbas has linked participation in such talks to a freeze on construction in the settlements. Speaking on Army Radio earlier today, Culture and Sport Minister Limor Livnat, a member of Netanyahu’s Likud party, also said that West Bank construction will resume when the freeze expires. About 300,000 Israelis live in West Bank settlements, and the population growth rate in those communities in 2008 was almost three times faster than in Israel as a whole, the Jerusalem-based human rights group B’Tselem said.

Netanyahu won’t extend the settlement freeze.

Amayreh 10 (Khaled, Al-Ahram Weekly newspaper writer, Al-Ahram, June 8-14, 2010, Issue No. 1006, http://weekly.ahram.org.eg/2010/1006/fr1.htm) EH

Abbas is reported to have refused to move from indirect to direct talks with Israel unless three conditions are met: an Israeli undertaking to restart talks from the point where they were left off during the term of the previous Israeli government; a recognition by Israel that a Palestinian state would have to encompass an area equal in size to the territories occupied in 1967, and a general freeze of settlement expansion. It is unlikely that Netanyahu will accept these conditions, especially the settlement freeze. His coalition partners, supported by some Likud cabinet ministers, are already demanding that the half-hearted settlement expansion moratorium, due to expire in September, not be extended under any circumstances. The Hebrew press reported this week that at least 2,700 settler units are scheduled to be built in the West Bank as soon as the freeze ends. Haaretz newspaper also reports that settler councils throughout the West Bank are making preparations to step up settlement construction ahead of 27 September, when the current partial freeze is due to end.

**Settlement Freeze Fail**

Netanyahu said that the settlement freeze didn’t encourage peace talks with the Palestinians.

Weizman July 8 (Steve, AFP staff writer, AFP, July 8, 2010, http://www.google.com/hostednews/afp/article/ALeqM5iT-ciIuyrKrOoJdlJ4mBrfnWNTaw) EH

NEW YORK — Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu said Thursday that a freeze on Jewish settlement construction in the occupied West Bank had so far failed in its objective of spurring Palestinians to enter direct peace talks. But he did not say specifically that there would be no restraints on building after the moratorium expires in September. "I decided, unlike any previous government, to freeze the construction in new settlements for a 10-month period to encourage the Palestinians to enter peace talks," he told foreign policy experts in New York. "So far seven months have passed and they haven't come in," Netanyahu said in an address to the Council on Foreign Relations. "They should have come in 12 months ago, seven months ago," he said. "We should not waste any more time." Netanyahu was speaking on the final day of a three-day US visit, during which he had a publicly upbeat meeting with President Barack Obama in Washington and gave a slew of media interviews in which he constantly emphasized his willingness to meet the Palestinian leader immediately. "I don't think we should wait any longer," he said in his speech on Thursday. "I think we should seize the moment." While the Palestinians and the United States describe Israeli settlements as obstacles to peace, the freeze is deeply resented among members of Netanyahu's Likud and other hawkish parties on which his coalition government leans. Netanyahu indicated that he could be willing to make concessions to the Palestinians that could cause a political backlash in Israel. I'm prepared to take risks," he said. "I'm not prepared to take security risks but I'm prepared to take political risks.

Kadima won’t join the government

Kadima is not interested in saving Netayanhu’s government – they want to form a new government

Hoffman 10 (Gil, chief political correspondent and analyst, *The Jerusalem Post,* 6-22-2010, <http://www.jpost.com/Israel/Article.aspx?id=179119>) CM

The sources denied reports that Kadima was en route to the government or that progress had been made in talks behind the scenes. They said neither Netanyahu nor Livni had changed their original positions that have prevented a government between them in the past. Kadima still opposes joining the current government without setting new coalition guidelines in favor of taking steps to expedite the diplomatic process, and Netanyahu still opposes showing the door to any of his current coalition partners. “There is no chance that Netanyahu has changed his mind,” Hanegbi said. “He asked us what we thought about widening the government. We said we cannot join the coalition as-is, but Kadima would have no problem with going back to square one and forming new guidelines. If the other parties want to stay, they can.” Livni told the Kadima faction on Monday said she was not interested in saving the current government but in changing its policies and the makeup of the coalition. “

Coalition will collapse – Settlement Freeze

The Settlement Freeze Issue will inevitably collapse Netanyahu’s Coalition

Berkman 7/6 (Matt, researcher for a Middle East policy institute in New York. , *Human Rights,* 7-6-2010, <http://humanrights.change.org/blog/view/as_tensions_escalate_in_east_jerusalem_netanyahu_gets_a_heros_welcome>) CM

The uncharitable interpretation is that Obama is again sacrificing principle on Israel/Palestine for short-term political gain. But, more charitably, Shiffer’s article also suggests that, once the cameras have departed, Obama plans to put the screws to Netanyahu in private, urging him to fully lift the siege on Gaza. Other sources have reported that he will also push Netanyahu hard on the issue of renewing the 10-month settlement freeze set to expire in September. This would put Netanyahu in an uncomfortable position: his own party has already voted to oppose such a move (a vote from which Netanyahu conspicuously absented himself), and just yesterday, Netanyahu’s right-wing coalition partners issued a joint declaration warning that any attempt to renew the freeze would imperil the “preservation of Israel as an autonomous state.” For their part, members of the “left-leaning” Labor party have threatened to withdraw from Netanyahu’s coalition if the freeze is not renewed. The best we can hope from Obama is that his backroom pressure will heighten the contradictions that already plague Netanyahu’s government, bringing about either a reconfiguration that will shift the coalition to the center-left, or a full-scale collapse resulting in new elections.

The United States and the Coalition government of Israel disagree on the building freeze.

Gedalyahu 10 (Tzvi Ben; staff writer, *Arutz Sheva: Israel Nation News,* July 7, 2010, http://www.israelnationalnews.com/News/news.aspx/138475) CH

Defense Minister Ehud Barak tip-toed closer to the coalition government policy Wednesday and called on Abbas to resume direct talks without pre-conditions for a building freeze. He told visiting Senators Joe Lieberman, John McCain and Lindsey Graham that he believes direct talks will resume in several weeks. Speaking on Army Radio, the Defense Minister and Labor party chairman brushed aside the demands for an extension of the temporary freeze, saying that obstacles can be worked out once direct discussions resume. The Labor party has been the lone holdout from coalition leaders’ insistence that Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu uphold his promise that the 10-month freeze on building for Jews in Judea and Samaria will not be extended. If Barak and the Obama administration were hoping for cracks in the coalition, they were sorely disappointed. Prime Minister Netanyahu avoided a difficult session with U.S. President Barack Obama Tuesday by leading a successful campaign against an initiative to require Knesset approval for a building freeze. However, the Prime Minister and president got a clear message from the will of coalition party whips, all of whom—except Labor—signed a letter opposing any extension of the freeze.

Netanyahu Internal Link Turn

Splitting from Obama when the US undermines Israel’s interest is key to Netanyahu’s credibility

Glick 10 (Caroline, senior fellow for Middle Eastern Affairs at the Center for Security Policy and Deputy Managing Editor of JPost, The Jerusalem Post, 5/28, <http://www.jpost.com/Opinion/Columnists/Article.aspx?id=176741>)

Second, Netanyahu must not become Obama’s spokesman. As part of his unsuccessful bid to convince Obama to change his policies towards Israel, Netanyahu and his advisers have gone on record praising Obama for his support for Israel. These statements have stymied attempts by Israel’s US supporters to pressure Obama to change those policies.

The Israeli official who has been most outspoken in his praise for Obama and his denial that Obama’s policies are hostile towards Israel has been Ambassador Michael Oren. Oren has repeatedly praised Obama for his supposedly firm support for Israel and commitment to Israel’s security – most recently in an appearance on Fox News on Wednesday. Moreover, according to eyewitness reports, in a recent closed-door meeting with American Jews, Oren criticized the Republican Party for attacking Obama for his animosity towards Israel.

This quite simply has to end. As foreign officials, Israeli diplomats should not be involved in US partisan politics. Not only should Israeli officials not give Obama undeserved praise, they should not give Republicans undeserved criticism.

At the end of the day, American Jews have the luxury of choosing between their loyalty to the Democratic Party and their support for Israel. And in the coming months, they will choose.

The government of Israel has no such luxury. The government’s only duty is to secure Israel and advance Israel’s national interests in every way possible. Netanyahu must not permit Obama’s public relations campaign to divert him from this mission.

Turn: Removing troops give US moral ground to pressure Israel

TURN: The aff reduces US human rights violations in Iraq, which gives us leverage to pressure Israel over incursions into Gaza

Bowers 10 (Chris, Co-Founder OpenLeft.com, fellow at the New Organizing Institute and Commonweal Institute, OpenLeft.com, June 1, <http://www.openleft.com/diary/18926/us-withdrawal-from-iraq-on-schedule-but-total-number-of-troops-overseas-the-same-for-now>)

Whenever talk of Israel flares up in the media, my first reaction is to think about Iraq and Afghanistan. Sure, what Israel is doing is really bad (I will write more about that in a bit), but it terms of numbers it is utterly dwarfed by what we have done in Iraq and Afghanistan. Just in Iraq, there were a minimum of 110,000 violent deaths through only April of 2009. This compares to about 1,400 in the latest large-scale Israeli invasion of Gaza. It is certainly crass and morbid to compare body counts this way, as it trivializes very real human suffering. However, the discrepancy is pretty eye-popping., none the less

I guess what I am saying is that while it would be nice if the U.S. wasn't issuing statements on Israel that are entirely out of step with international opinion, the first priority of making the United States a better player in international diplomacy is to stop engaging in conflicts that result in the violent deaths of hundreds of thousands of people. Somehow, none of that ends up in the news anymore, as it just can't seem to draw headline the same way that Israel-Palestine can.

Netanyahu Coalition Prevents Peace

Israeli coalition is an obstacle to the peace process.

JTA June 29 (JTA in-depth coverage of political, economic and social developments affecting Jews in North and South America, Israel, Europe, Africa and Australia, June 29, 2010, http://www.jta.org/news/article/2010/06/29/2739824/erdogan-turkey-is-still-israels-friend) EH

(JTA) -- The government of Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu is “the biggest barrier to peace” in the Middle East, Turkey's prime minister said in a television interview. Recep Tayyip Erdogan, speaking Monday night with PBS's Charlie Rose, reportedly said he thought Israel's government impeded Middle East peace attempts and that "at the moment, the problem in Israel is the coalition government. The coalition government is the biggest barrier to peace." "Israel hasn’t really accepted a two-state solution," Erdogan added, according to Haaretz, saying that "while Israel's governments spoke about it, they in fact did nothing to advance it." The Turkish leader called on Israel to lift its blockade of Gaza, to apologize for "recent events" and to pay compensation to the families of those killed in the Gaza-bound flotilla violence and the people of Gaza. Erdogan called for the United States to "take ownership" of the aftermath of Israel's interception of the flotilla on May 31 in which nine people were killed "because there was an American involved.” Eight of the dead in the raid of a ship attempting to break Israel's blockade of Gaza were Turks; the ninth was a dual Turkish-American citizen. Erdogan said that despite recalling its ambassador from Israel, cancelling several planned military exercises and preventing Israeli military planes from using its airspace, Turkey remains “a friend to Israel."

Peace process Fails – Palestine

Peace Process Fails – Palestine will not have self-determination.

Nafaa 8(Hassan, Professor and Chairman of Political Science Department at the University of Cairo, Global Research, <http://www.globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=va&aid=8058>, 2/12)dc.

Obviously, there can be nothing remotely resembling equality in a relationship between such disparate states. A Palestinian state so encumbered by restrictions and conditions can only be an Israeli dependency subjected to total Israeli control. This is not a situation conducive to lasting peaceful coexistence, because the very conditions of dependency and subordination to Israeli must inevitably continue to fire the Palestinian urge for true national independence and expression. At the same time, it is difficult to perceive how such a state, so crippled at birth that it is little more than an Israeli protectorate, could eventually evolve into a fully-fledged viable state capable of safeguarding Palestinian rights and fulfilling their aspirations. There are several reasons for this. First, Israel has given no indication of a willingness to set aside its policy of imposing de facto realities by force of arms in favour of the search for a historic compromise, which means that Israel will perpetually seek to sustain its qualitative superiority -- military superiority in particular -- not only over the Palestinians but over all Arab and Islamic nations combined. Second, the US can no longer maintain even a façade of impartiality now that its positions on the Middle East conflict have become virtually identical to those of Israel. In fact, some powerful and influential forces in the US are more pro-Zionist than Israeli Zionists and have pitted their weight behind the most extreme forces in Israel, which reject out of hand a settlement founded upon a historic compromise with the Palestinians. It is, therefore, impossible to envision an American government willing and able to pressure Israel into accepting the conditions for a just and lasting settlement. Third, joint US-Israeli efforts have succeeded in excluding the UN from any involvement in the peace process, with the result that this process has been effectively stripped of any framework of international legitimacy. It is patently obvious that all relevant international resolutions and instruments have been discarded as bases for negotiations, with the sole exception of Resolution 242, which favours Israel's negotiating position and paves the way for a settlement that reflects the actual balance of powers on the ground as opposed to the principles of justice and fairness enshrined in all other UN resolutions and instruments. Fourth, the Palestinian cause no longer occupies the priority it once had on the agenda of the official Arab order. What was once a central and unifying Arab- Islamic cause has been effectively reduced to a local problem that primarily concerns the Palestinians alone. Arab governments hide behind the current Palestinian rift, which they played no small part in precipitating, to conceal their shift in stance, and they have thus effectively become accomplices in Israel's criminal blockade of the Palestinian people, which is intended to force the Palestinians to their knees and to accept Israeli conditions for a settlement. Again, there are no signs that this situation is about to change in the near future. Clearly, then, the so-called Palestinian state that is supposed to arise from the current "peace process" is never going to lead to a just and lasting solution to the conflict. Indeed, that conception of a state has been specifically designed to help Israel ward off what it regards as the foremost threat, which it unabashedly terms the "Palestinian demographic bomb". With considerable perseverance and dexterity, Israel managed to steer negotiations currently taking place with the Palestinian Authority into a long, dark tunnel, the only glimmer of light at the end of which is a congenitally disfigured state that will ultimately prove a means for inflaming tensions rather than ending them.

Peace Process Fails – Too complex

The Nature of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict is complex, making solution unlikely

Nafaa 8(Hassan, Professor and Chairman of Political Science Department at the University of Cairo, Global Research, http://www.globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=va&aid=8058, 2/12)dc

Is there truly hope for the establishment of a viable, sovereign Palestinian state living side-by-side with Israel in peace? Sadly, I doubt it very much, at least in the foreseeable future, in view of current local, regional and international conditions. The creation of a Palestinian state should not be regarded as an end in itself, but rather as a means for resolving a long and complex historical conflict. Accordingly, our judgement on a formula for a proposed state should rest not so much on whether it complies with necessary formal and legal conditions as whether it meets that overriding criterion: will it serve to draw to a close, once and for all, that protracted conflict? After all, the concrete existence of a Palestinian state with certain specifications could, in itself, become an instrument in the conflict as opposed to a step towards its solution. The conflict between the Palestinians and the Zionist movement is not over disputed borders or material interests and, therefore, resolvable by merely coming to an agreement over permanent borders and a give-and-take over material interests. Rather, it is a conflict between two identities, each of which claims sole propriety right over a given territory. Such a conflict cannot be solved by the same means that are brought to bear on conventional international conflicts. Identity conflicts can only be solved by two means, either by the overwhelming defeat of one side by the other, or through compromise, after both sides finally reach the conviction that continuing the zero-sum game, whereby a gain for one side must result in an equal loss for the other, will not result in victory over and elimination of the other side. I believe that in identity conflicts compromise is only possible when there is mutual recognition of the other party's equal rights. If we were to apply this concept to the Palestinian- Zionist conflict, a compromise solution would require that both sides commit themselves fully to two indispensable, mutually complementary conditions. The first is for them to accept the fair and equal partition of the territory under dispute. The second is for them to agree to complete equality in rights and duties in the process of building peaceful, friendly, mutually beneficial relations. Unfortunately, there are no signs that these conditions can be met today or even in the foreseeable future. The total land area designated for a Palestinian state, as a proposed solution to the conflict, amounts to no more than 10 per cent of the actual territory under dispute, which is historic Palestine. Moreover, that designated area is not geographically contiguous, but rather consists of disconnected and isolated patches of territory. If and when that state is founded, it will not have an army or any autonomous means to defend itself and its borders will be subject to constant surveillance by land, sea and air. But if it is to be founded at all, that phantom state will first have to recognise Israel's right to 90 per cent of the disputed territory, the purely Jewish character of that state and, hence, its right to remain eternally open to Jews from around the world, along with the right of that state to an immensely powerful army equipped with every available type of weapon, including nuclear missiles.

Peace process will fail – Damage done to Palestine by Israel is incorrigible.

Roy 10(Sara, Harvard Scholar on Gaza, Huffington Post, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/noam-chomsky/a-middle-east-peace-that_b_554178.html?view=print>, 4/27)dc.

Gaza is an example of a society that has been deliberately reduced to a state of abject destitution, its once productive population transformed into one of aid-dependent paupers.… Gaza’s subjection began long before Israel’s recent war against it [December 2008]. The Israeli occupation — now largely forgotten or denied by the international community — has devastated Gaza’s economy and people, especially since 2006…. After Israel’s December [2008] assault, Gaza’s already compromised conditions have become virtually unlivable. Livelihoods, homes, and public infrastructure have been damaged or destroyed on a scale that even the Israel Defense Forces admitted was indefensible. “In Gaza today, there is no private sector to speak of and no industry. 80 percent of Gaza’s agricultural crops were destroyed and Israel continues to snipe at farmers attempting to plant and tend fields near the well-fenced and patrolled border. Most productive activity has been extinguished.… Today, 96 percent of Gaza’s population of 1.4 million is dependent on humanitarian aid for basic needs. According to the World Food Programme, the Gaza Strip requires a minimum of 400 trucks of food every day just to meet the basic nutritional needs of the population. Yet, despite a March [22, 2009] decision by the Israeli cabinet to lift all restrictions on foodstuffs entering Gaza, only 653 trucks of food and other supplies were allowed entry during the week of May 10, at best meeting 23 percent of required need. Israel now allows only 30 to 40 commercial items to enter Gaza compared to 4,000 approved products prior to June 2006.

Peace Process Fails – Israel

Peace Process will fail – Empirically denied, Israel doesn’t really want an agreement and Palestine doesn’t believe a deal will actually be made

Ephron 10 (Dan, Jerusalem-based correspondent, *Newsweek,* 3-23-2010, <http://www.newsweek.com/2010/03/22/death-by-proximity.html>)CM

Are Israelis and Palestinians heading back to the bargaining table? That might be the upshot of President Obama's meeting in Washington with Prime Minister "Bibi" Netanyahu. If so, the two sides will be seated at different tables this time, in different cities, for what the parties are calling "proximity talks." Proposed by the United States as a way of getting around Palestinian objections to face-to-face negotiations, the talks will be begin next month, with American mediators shuttling back and forth between the two sides. The good news is that the Middle East peace process is finally recommencing, after a 14-month impasse. The bad news: these talks are probably doomed from the start. Here's why. 1. Proximity talks have never worked. Israel and Syria tried them during 2008, with the Turks acting as message carriers (Turkish officials are now offering to do so again). The two delegations actually stayed in the same hotel in Istanbul during four sessions but never interacted in person. The result was a series of interesting exchanges but no concrete decisions, not even the obligatory confidence-building measures. Israel and the Palestine Liberation Organization have also engaged in indirect talks, but not since the early 1990s, when the two sides had no formal relations; they never went anywhere. Former Israeli pol Yossi Beilin, the architect of the Oslo peace process and the man most identified with Middle East negotiations, says moving away from direct engagement is a huge regression. "We were married and now you're asking the matchmaker to introduce us?," Beilin told NEWSWEEK recently. "Who is the idiot who suggested it?" (Apparently, it was U.S. envoy George Mitchell.) 2. Israeli leaders don't really want an agreement—at least not one involving the deep compromises Palestinians are expecting. Yes, Netanyahu apologized for the timing of the announcement earlier this month—just as Vice President Biden began his visit to Israel—that 1,600 new homes would be built in East Jerusalem. And yes, the White House rewarded him by scheduling a meeting with President Obama. But Netanyahu remains a hardliner whose coalition partners include the most hawkish figures in Israeli politics. Appeasing them requires the kind of statements Netanyahu made just before a flight to Washington this week: "As far as we are concerned, building in Jerusalem is like building in Tel Aviv," he told his cabinet, according to the Israeli newspaper Yedioth Ahronoth. "Israel's position is very clear, and it will also be clear during my visit to the U.S. capital." What does Netanyahu want? A drawn-out negotiation that will keep the Americans off his back and Palestinians off the streets but won't actually test his coalition; in short, more process than peace. 3. Palestinian leaders don't believe a deal is possible—at least not the deal they want. President Mahmoud Abbas negotiated for more than two years with Netanyahu's predecessor, Ehud Olmert, who at one point showed him a map of a proposed Palestinian state on 96 percent of the West Bank (plus 4 percent in land swaps). Palestinians say the offer was never officially tendered and became moot once police indicted Olmert for graft. But the proposal, well beyond what Netanyahu would presumably offer, now stands as the baseline for Palestinian expectations—anything less will be scoffed at. Far from pinning his hopes on the negotiations, Abbas is hoping that once they break down, the Obama administration will offer its own plan and compel the Israelis to accept it. According to an Israeli official involved in the process who did not want to be named discussing behind-the-scenes contacts, Palestinians asked Washington to promise it would assign blame in that case, but they were rebuffed.

Peace Process Fails – Israel

Israel not ready for peace process

Slater 10(Jerome, Professor Emeritus of political science, SUNY Buffalo, Huffington Post, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/jerome-slater/the-israeli-palestinian-c_b_499010.html>, 3/16)dc.

The prospects for a settlement of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict have never been worse, primarily because of the rightward shift of the Israeli government and public opinion and, secondarily, because of the end of any expectations that the United States would help "save Israel from itself." Is there any hope at all? The best chance for peace would be a sea-change within Israeli public opinion. However, Israeli peace groups have not succeeded in convincing mainstream opinion in their country that Israel's policies are both a moral and a long-term security disaster. For this reason, many on the Israeli left have long hoped that the U.S. would bring serious pressures to bear on their government to agree to a just and viable peace settlement. However, the Obama administration's abandonment of its mild initial efforts to persuade Israel to change its policies has now dashed those hopes: in the absence of a major shift in public and congressional attitudes, there is no chance of change in the traditional US policies of near-unconditional support of Israel. Consequently, the primary function of the leading U.S. peace groups -- Americans for Peace Now (APN) and, more recently, J Street -- must be to persuade American opinion that those traditional policies are detrimental to the best interests of Israel and, for that matter, of the U.S. itself. Even those who deny the existence of an Israel lobby that dominates U.S. policies towards Israel are not likely to deny that the Jewish community is the most important sector of American public opinion on all issues pertaining to Israel. Consequently, domestic politics ensures that there will be no change in American government policies in the absence of strong Jewish support for sustained pressures on Israel. And if they are to have any chance of success, those pressures must include making U.S. diplomatic, economic, and military assistance of Israel conditional on major changes in its policies. While there has been increased dissent within the U.S. Jewish community over Israel's policies, the dominant majority still supports them -- even despite the much-criticized Israeli attack on Gaza last year and the subsequent Goldstone report (hereafter referred to as Gaza/Goldstone). In light of mainstream opinion in this country, it is undeniable that APN and J Street confront a strategic dilemma. On the one hand, an open acknowledgment of the true depth of Israel's moral collapse and even its capability of recognizing and acting on its rational self-interest might backfire: if the peace groups move too far to the left of the mainstream they may well be seen as illegitimate and lose even more influence. On the other hand, the situation is desperate, requiring a more forthright strategy, whatever the risks: if the peace groups continue to be too timid in their criticisms of Israeli policies and the complicity of the United States in them, they will become increasingly ineffectual and irrelevant.

Peace Process Fails – US involvement Bad

US backing of Israel prevents peace process – Israel leaving Gaza and Palestinians desolate making peace unlikely.

Chomsky 10(Noam, Institute Professor emeritus in the Department of Linguistics and Philosophy at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Huffington Post, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/noam-chomsky/a-middle-east-peace-that_b_554178.html?view=print>, 4/27)dc.

After its formal withdrawal from the Gaza Strip, Israel never actually relinquished its total control over the territory, often described realistically as “the world’s largest prison.” In January 2006, a few months after the withdrawal, Palestine had an election that was recognized as free and fair by international observers. Palestinians, however, voted “the wrong way,” electing Hamas. Instantly, the U.S. and Israel intensified their assault against Gazans as punishment for this misdeed. The facts and the reasoning were not concealed; rather, they were openly published alongside reverential commentary on Washington’s sincere dedication to democracy. The U.S.-backed Israeli assault against the Gazans has only been intensified since, thanks to violence and economic strangulation, increasingly savage. Meanwhile in the West Bank, always with firm U.S. backing, Israel has been carrying forward longstanding programs to take the valuable land and resources of the Palestinians and leave them in unviable cantons, mostly out of sight. Israeli commentators frankly refer to these goals as “neocolonial.” Ariel Sharon, the main architect of the settlement programs, called these cantons “Bantustans,” though the term is misleading: South Africa needed the majority black work force, while Israel would be happy if the Palestinians disappeared, and its policies are directed to that end

Peace Process Fails – Palestinian rejection

Peace Process Fails – Palestinian Rejectionism

Foxman 10 (Abraham H., National Director, Anti-Defamation League, 3-28-2010, <http://www.nytimes.com/2010/04/02/opinion/l02israel.html>)

One doesn’t have to agree with every action and policy of the government of Israel to recognize that the fundamental problems that have surfaced are far more a product of Palestinian rejectionism and extremism than alleged Israeli intransigence. It is the Palestinians, not Israel, who have refused to return to negotiations. Unfortunately, the Obama administration gave the Palestinians an excuse not to come to the table by making settlements the central issue. In fact, over the years there have been negotiations despite the settlement issue. Had the Palestinians accepted Israel’s generous offers under two prime ministers for a Palestinian state, the issue of settlements would have been resolved. The Obama administration has gone off track not only in its excessive focus on settlements and its overreaction to Israel’s faux pas in announcing new construction while the vice president was in Israel, but also by suggesting that Israel is harming American interests in the region. This is a misguided and counterproductive view. Ultimately, America’s interests in the region will rise or fall on its willingness to support its true friends there and its ability to distinguish between moderates who want peace and rejectionists who want to undermine it. There is no doubt that Israel is a true ally and peacemaker.

Peace Process Empirically denied – Palestinians more interested in attacking Israel than their own state

Jacoby ‘9 ( Jeff, Global Columist, Boston.com, 5-20-2009, <http://www.boston.com/bostonglobe/editorial_opinion/oped/articles/2009/05/20/peace_isnt_arab_goal/>) CM

International consensus or no, the two-state solution is a chimera. Peace will not be achieved by granting sovereignty to the Palestinians, because Palestinian sovereignty has never been the Arabs' goal. Time and time again, a two-state solution has been proposed. Time and time again, the Arabs have turned it down. In 1936, when Palestine was still under British rule, a royal commission headed by Lord Peel was sent to investigate the steadily worsening Arab violence. After a detailed inquiry, the Peel Commission concluded that "an irrepressible conflict has arisen between two national communities within the narrow bounds of one small country." It recommended a two-state solution - a partition of the land into separate Arab and Jewish states. "Partition offers a chance of ultimate peace," the commission reported. "No other plan does." But the Arab leaders, more intent on preventing Jewish sovereignty in Palestine than in achieving a state for themselves, rejected the Peel plan out of hand. The foremost Palestinian leader, Haj Amin al-Husseini, actively supported the Nazi regime in Germany. In return, Husseini wrote in his memoirs, Hitler promised him "a free hand to eradicate every last Jew from Palestine and the Arab world." In 1947, the Palestinians were again presented with a two-state proposal. Again they spurned it. Like the Peel Commission, the United Nations concluded that only a division of the land into adjacent states, one Arab and one Jewish, could put an end to the conflict. On Nov. 29, 1947, by a vote of 33-13, the UN General Assembly adopted Resolution 181, partitioning Palestine on the basis of population. Had the Arabs accepted the UN decision, the Palestinian state that "the whole world wants" would today be 61 years old. Instead, the Arab League vowed to block Jewish sovereignty by waging "a war of extermination and a momentous massacre." Over and over, the pattern has been repeated. Following its stunning victory in the 1967 Six Day War, Israel offered to exchange the land it had won for permanent peace with its neighbors. From their summit in Khartoum came the Arabs' notorious response: "No peace with Israel, no negotiations with Israel, no recognition of Israel." At Camp David in 2000, Ehud Barak offered the Palestinians virtually everything they claimed to be seeking - a sovereign state with its capital in East Jerusalem, 97 percent of the West Bank and Gaza Strip, tens of billions of dollars in "compensation" for the plight of Palestinian refugees. Yasser Arafat refused the offer, and launched the bloodiest wave of terrorism in Israel's history. To this day, the charters of Hamas and Fatah, the two main Palestinian factions, call for Israel's liquidation. "The whole world" may want peace and a Palestinian state, but the Palestinians want something very different. Until that changes, there is no two-state solution.

A2: Peace Process

Peace process is all talk and no action.

Schmidt July 8 (Christophe, writer for AFP, AFP, July 8 2010, http://www.google.com/hostednews/afp/article/ALeqM5hhYvXu-9gjp-ZKdtcaj91sYtsTOQ) EH

WASHINGTON — A resumption of long-stalled direct talks between Israel and the Palestinians could be on the horizon, but swift progress towards sealing a peace deal remains a long way off, analysts say. After months of US-hosted proximity talks which have seen US envoy George Mitchell shuttling between the two sides, direct talks are likely to resume "within the next two months," said former US diplomat Aaron David Miller. But, he cautioned: "It's not a blessing, because direct negotiations will only reveal how large the gaps are between the two sides." Hopes of new talks have been spurred by the visit to the United States this week of Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu, who emerged from White House talks with US President Barack Obama pledging he wanted a deal. Obama said he hoped direct talks would start before an Israeli freeze on settlement building in Arab east Jerusalem expires on September 25. Netanyahu said there were concrete measures the Israelis were willing to make to pave the way, but he has not yet promised to extend the freeze. "Unlike any previous government" he had decided "to freeze the construction in new settlements for a 10-month period to encourage the Palestinians to enter peace talks," Netanyahu said Thursday in a speech to a US think-tank. "We should not waste any more time," he added. In an interview with CNN, the Israeli premier also renewed a call for Palestinian president Mahmud Abbas to enter negotiations "right now, we don't need any pretext or precondition." The United States and Jordan both voiced hope Thursday that Israelis and Palestinians would start direct negotiations soon. "We both believe that moving to direct talks as soon as possible is in the best interest of Israelis, Palestinians, the region and the world," Secretary of State Hillary Clinton said alongside Jordan's Foreign Minister Nasser Judeh. "If the Obama administration wants direct talks, he probably will get them," agreed Nathan Brown, a Middle East expert with the Carnegie Institute. "The larger question is what will happen in those talks." "There is no indication that the fundamental conditions working against a negotiated two state solution right now -- the opposition of the Israeli government and the impotence of the Palestinian government -- has changed." Jordan's Judeh said he believed the signs emerging from the proximity talks "seem to be encouraging." "But I think what we need to refrain from now is unilateral action and provocation, whether it is in the form of deportations or evictions or demolitions," he said referring to the settlement constructions. The White House meeting this week -- which took place in a warmer atmosphere than Netanyahu's frosty visit to the US earlier this year -- was seen as a major step towards kickstarting direct talks. It was "critical for trying to coordinate how to avert there being a September crisis, and a September breakdown in negotiations," said Robert Danin, former Jerusalem bureau chief for the Middle East Quartet. September is set to be a key month in the stagnant peace process. Abbas is due to report to the Arab League on the results of the proximity talks. And the Quartet -- comprised of the European Union, Russia, the United Nations and the United States -- will meet on the sidelines of the UN General Assembly to discuss the peace process. Many thorny issues remain unresolved, despite decades of negotiations. Chief among them are the right of return for Palestinian refugees left homeless after the creation of Israel in 1948, and the final status of the holy city of Jerusalem claimed by both as their capital. To reach a deal, both sides will need to make significant compromises on long entrenched positions which are likely to prove unpopular among their people. "I don't believe Israelis and Palestinians are prepared to pay the price," said Miller, adding a resumption of direct talks would "put the Palestinians in a very difficult position." "Even if the settlements moratorium continues, Israelis will be doing other things on the ground in East Jerusalem that will likely embarrass Mahmud Abbas," he said. And he warned the peace process is likely to bedevil the US administration in the same way that a long trail of broken deals has frustrated successive American presidents. "If the direct talks don't produce, it's going to mean that the administration will be expected to save the peace process," Miller said.

Peace Process causes terrorism and Civil War

The Peace Process would allow terrorist infiltration of the West Bank, which causes terrorist attacks on Israel, collapse of the Palestinian State, and a Civil War in Jordan

Gold 10 (Dore, former Prime Minister of Israel's Foreign Policy Adviser and later as Ambassador to the United Nations, *Dore Gold,* 3-20-2010, <http://www.dore-gold.com/2010/03/what-happened-to-the-jordan-valley.php>) CM

IT IS now well-understood by the Israeli public that the most crucial error of disengagement was abandoning the Philadelphi Corridor between the Gaza Strip and Egyptian Sinai, which allowed Hamas to build a vast tunnel network, with minimal Israeli countermeasures, and smuggle a huge arsenal into the Gaza Strip. From 2005, when Israel left Gaza, to 2006, the rate of rocket fire increased by 500%. New weapons, like Grad missiles, were fired for the first time at Ashkelon after the pullout. It does not require much imagination to understand what would happen in Judea and Samaria if Israel left the Jordan Valley - which should be seen as the Philadelphi Corridor of the West Bank. For example, up until now, Israel has not had to deal with SA-7 shoulder-fired rockets that could be aimed at aircraft over Ben-Gurion Airport, because it is difficult to smuggle them into the West Bank as long as the area is blocked by the IDF in the Jordan Valley. Nor has Israel had to face Islamist volunteers who reinforce Hamas and could prolong a future war, like those who joined the jihad in Iraq, Afghanistan, Yemen or Somalia, because Israel can deny them access to the West Bank. In fact, in its annual survey for 2009, the Shin Bet (Israel Security Agency) noted that while there has been a decrease in the terrorist threat to Israel, the only exception to this positive trend is the increasing involvement of global jihadi groups, who at present are building up a presence in the Gaza Strip. Clearly they would be in the West Bank if they could get there. The fact of the matter is that if Israel withdrew from the Jordan Valley and it became known among the global jihadi groups that the doors to the West Bank were open, the scale of the threat would change and the Jordanians would find it difficult to effectively halt the stream of manpower and weaponry into their territory. Clearly Jordan itself would be destabilized by this development. This is exactly what happened in 2005 when al-Qaida in Iraq set up an infrastructure in Jordan and attacked hotels and government buildings. This is also what happened during Black September in 1970, when the Jordanian army had to confront a massive Palestinian military presence and a civil war ensued. Besides, should Jordan have a common border with a Palestinian state, Palestinian irredentism toward the East Bank would undoubtedly increase.

Peace Process Bad – 2 state solution prolongs conflict

Two-state Solution prolongs the Israeli-Palestinian conflict

Nafaa 8 (Hassan, professor of political science at Cairo University, *Weekly Al Ahram*, 2-12-2008, <http://www.globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=va&aid=8058>) CM

After all, the concrete existence of a Palestinian state with certain specifications could, in itself, become an instrument in the conflict as opposed to a step towards its solution. The conflict between the Palestinians and the Zionist movement is not over disputed borders or material interests and, therefore, resolvable by merely coming to an agreement over permanent borders and a give-and-take over material interests. Rather, it is a conflict between two identities, each of which claims sole propriety right over a given territory. Such a conflict cannot be solved by the same means that are brought to bear on conventional international conflicts. Identity conflicts can only be solved by two means, either by the overwhelming defeat of one side by the other, or through compromise, after both sides finally reach the conviction that continuing the zero-sum game, whereby a gain for one side must result in an equal loss for the other, will not result in victory over and elimination of the other side. I believe that in identity conflicts compromise is only possible when there is mutual recognition of the other party's equal rights. If we were to apply this concept to the Palestinian- Zionist conflict, a compromise solution would require that both sides commit themselves fully to two indispensable, mutually complementary conditions. The first is for them to accept the fair and equal partition of the territory under dispute. The second is for them to agree to complete equality in rights and duties in the process of building peaceful, friendly, mutually beneficial relations. Unfortunately, there are no signs that these conditions can be met today or even in the foreseeable future.

Peace Process Fails – 2 State Solution won’t work

Two-state peace process won’t solve – won’t see results.

Black 10 (Ian; Middle East editor, *Guardian,* April 28, 2010, http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2010/apr/28/middle-east-meron-benvenisti-peace-process) CH

Meron Benvenisti has been talking, writing and arguing about the Israel-Palestinian conflict for much of the last 40 years. Now aged 76 he is as forceful, articulate and unconventional as ever – and convinced that President Barack Obama is doomed to fail in his attempt to cajole the two sides to hammer out a solution at the negotiating table. Benvenisti, the Cassandra of the Israeli left, has long held the view that the occupation that began after the 1967 Middle East war is irreversible and that Israelis and Palestinians need to find an alternative to the elusive two-state solution that has dominated thinking about the conflict in recent years. Controversial and iconoclastic when he first advanced it, his thesis is gaining ground. "The whole notion of a Palestinian state now, in 2010, is a sham," he told the Guardian at his Jerusalem home as the US intensified efforts to get the long-stalled peace process moving again. "The entire discourse is wrong. By continuing that discourse you perpetuate the status quo. The struggle for the two-state solution is obsolete." George Mitchell, the US envoy charged with launching "proximity talks" between Binyamin Netanyahu and Mahmoud Abbas – in the absence of direct negotiations – does not agree. Nor do Israelis who believe that without an end to the occupation and the creation of a Palestinian state the Jewish majority and democratic character of their own state cannot survive. Abbas and his technocratic prime minister, Salam Fayyad, are working towards independence, though Palestinian opinion seems increasingly sceptical about the prospects. Benvenisti's book, Sacred Landscapes, is one of the very best written on the conflict, interweaving the personal and the political. It is also deeply sympathetic to the Palestinians and their attachment to the land. He defines the Zionist enterprise bluntly as a "supplanting settler society" but also warns that using labels is a way of shutting down debate. He is wary of Holocaust-deniers and antisemites who try to recruit his dissident views to serve their anti-Israel goals. Benvenisti, a political scientist by training, served as deputy mayor of Jerusalem after the 1967 war and was heavily influenced by his academic research on Belfast, another bitterly divided city. In the 1980's his West Bank Data Project collated and analysed the information that showed how the settlers were becoming fatefully integrated into Israeli society – under both Likud and Labour governments. Israel's domination, he says, is now complete, while the Palestinians are fragmented into five enclaves – inside Israel, in the West Bank, East Jerusalem, the Gaza Strip, and the diaspora. In this situation, the concept of two states is misleading. "What does it mean, a state? It's a solution for less than one quarter of the Palestinian people on an area that is less than 10% of historic Palestine." Palestinian leaders who are ready to accept this "are a bunch of traitors to their own cause". Ramallah, prosperous headquarters of Abbas's Palestinian Authority and the recipient of millions of dollars in foreign aid, is a "bubble in which those who steal the money can enjoy themselves". Benvenisti's territorial assumptions are not based on the 2000 "Clinton parameters" which Yasser Arafat turned down, nor proposals submitted by Ehud Olmert to Abbas – which talk of Israel withdrawing from some 97% of the West Bank with compensating land swaps – but a far smaller area hemmed in by Jewish settlements, settler-only roads and military zones. "For the last 20 years I have questioned the feasibility of the partition of Palestine and now I am absolutely sure it is impossible," he says. "Or, it is possible if it is imposed on the Palestinians but that will mean the legitimisation of the status quo, of Bantustans, of a system of political and economic inequality which is hailed as a solution by the entire world – unlike in South Africa. "The entire paradigm is wrong. We are doing this because it is self-serving. It is convenient for us to stick to the old slogan of two states as if nothing has happened since we began advocating it in the 1980s." Taken the salience of the settlement issue in the peace process – rows over Netanyahu's temporary freeze in the West Bank and new building in East Jerusalem triggered the recent crisis in US-Israel relations – it is startling to find that Benvenisti is so dismissive of it. "Israel's domination of the West Bank does not rely on the numbers of settlers or settlements," he argues. "The settlements are totally integrated into Israeli society. They've taken all the land they could. The rest is controlled by the Israeli army." Benvenisti relishes overturning conventional wisdom. "The Israeli left would like to make us believe that the green line (the pre-1967 border) is something solid; that everything that is on this side is good and that everything bad began with the occupation in 1967. It is a false dichotomy. The green line is like a one-way mirror. It's only for the Palestinians, not for Israelis." He avoids speculating about future scenarios and makes do with the concept "bi-nationalism" – "not as a political or ideological programme so much as a de facto reality masquerading as a temporary state of affairs … a description of the current condition, not a prescription." And he sees signs that the Palestinians are beginning to adjust to the "total victory of the Jews" and use the power of the weak: demanding votes and human rights may prove more effective than violence, he suggests. "The peace process," Benvenisti concludes, "is more than a waste of time. It is an illusion and it perpetuates an illusion. You can engage in a peace process and have negotiations and conferences - which have no connection whatsoever to reality on the ground."

2 state solution fails - discriminates against Palestinians

Two-State Solution allows for human rights abuses

May 9 (Todd, Professor of Philosophy at Clemson University, *Counterpunch,* 9-9-2004, <http://www.counterpunch.org/may09092004.html>) CM

To privilege a single people on a land that supports others as well is to create two intertwined problems. First, it implicitly accords a greater moral worth to that people. We who live in the United States should be viscerally aware this, given our history with native Americans and people of African descent. Second, according this greater moral worth erases the moral limits that any person or people should enjoy relative to others. Once those moral limits are erased, the door is open to abuses of the kind that are rife in Israel's history. Think, for example, of the recent issue of terrorism. How many of us are ready to ascribe terrorism to suicide bombings but not to the destruction of homes with people still in them or the enforced starvation of towns and villages or the indiscriminate firing on nonviolent protestors? This imbalance is never far to seek, and even those of us who support the Palestinians find ourselves on the defensive. However, we who have supported a two-state solution have negligently endorsed the framing of the issue that allows this to happen. We endorse a "right to exist" that seems to apply to a particular nation but in fact applies only to a particular people within that nation: Jewish people. Furthermore, that right is exercised at the expense of others whose rights, as the Bush administration does not cease to remind us, must be earned by renouncing their struggle against occupation. The core of the problem lies here. To privilege politically a single people is to lay the foundation for all subsequent abuses. This is not to say that those abuses follow logically from this privileging. Nor is it to say that they were historically inevitable. Rather, it is that the struggle against such abuses concedes at the outset what it should not: that there is a certain privilege legitimately accorded to Israeli Jews. We should deny this privilege, and anything that follows from it. One of the things that follow from it is a two-state solution in which Jews enjoy privilege in one of those states (and, presumably, non-Jews in the other one). We should endorse what we should always have endorsed: a single state that privileges nobody, a state where the primary address from one of its members to another is that of "citizen."

Israel will stay in Jordan Valley permanently

Israel will never withdraw from the Jordan Valley

Lis 10 (Jonathan, writer, *Haaretz*, 2-3-2010, <http://www.haaretz.com/news/netanyahu-israel-will-never-cede-jordan-valley-1.266329>) CM

Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu said Tuesday that Israel would never agree to withdraw from the Jordan Valley under any peace agreement signed with the Palestinians. Netanyahu told the 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, according to a meeting participant. Netanyahu also told delegates to the meeting that he was set on preventing the smuggling of rockets into the Palestinian Authority, attacking opposition leader Tzipi Livni for what he called her inability to secure Israel against such a threat. "I see that for you, a piece of paper is enough to make sure that rockets don't enter the Palestinian territory," Netanyahu said, his words directed at Livni. "I was elected to make sure that this actually happens."