

In Search of a Viable Option

Evaluating Outcomes to the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict

Based on a report by Dr. Shira Efron and Evan Gottesman, with a foreword by Ambassador Daniel B. Shapiro

Despite critiques of the two-state solution, and concerns over waning support for it, a two-state outcome remains the only implementable plan that safeguards Israeli security while maintaining Israel as Jewish and democratic.

The new study, “In Search of a Viable Option” examines several proposed outcomes to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict: These options were rigorously analyzed and assessed on 18 criteria (see reverse), including:

| | |
|---|--|
| Maintenance of Israel as a Jewish state | Domestic and international political viability |
| Maintenance of Israel as a democracy | Ease of implementation |
| Provision for Israeli security | Direct and indirect costs |
| Fulfillment of Palestinian self-determination | Timeframe to implementation |

Each model has some advantages, but most have significant drawbacks. They either do not maintain Israel as both Jewish and democratic, create overwhelming security risks, or face severe challenges to implementation.

| Outcome | Evaluation |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| Two-state solution | The only option that maintains Israel as Jewish and democratic; implementable, yet faces significant logistical and political challenges. |
| Maintaining the status quo | Rates at or slightly above the midpoint in a majority of the criteria, explaining its durability, yet far more unstable than it seems; annexation, deterioration in the security situation, or political upheaval could quickly make current trends unsustainable, quickly shifting assessments of the status quo. |
| An Israeli-Palestinian confederation | Maintains Israel as Jewish and democratic, but creates security and implementation challenges that are nearly insurmountable, with little support from Israelis and Palestinians. |
| A Jewish non-democratic state | Unable to maintain Israel as both Jewish and democratic, rejected in whole by one of the two parties to the conflict. |
| A democratic binational state | Unable to maintain Israel as both Jewish and democratic, rejected in whole by one of the two parties to the conflict. |
| The Jordanian Option | Maintains Israel as Jewish and democratic but creates security and implementation challenges that are nearly insurmountable, and is wholly rejected by Jordan as the main stakeholder. |
| The Trump Plan | Unable to maintain Israel as both Jewish and democratic, and is rejected in whole by one of the two parties to the conflict. |

It is critical to keep the two-state option viable and hold other proposals up to scrutiny.

| Criterion | Two-State Solution | Continuation of Status Quo | Isr-Pal Confederation | One Democratic State | One Jewish State | Jordanian Option | Trump Plan |
|----------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|------------------|----------------------|-----------------|
| Jewish | Strong | Relatively poor | Slightly less strong | Extremely poor | Midpoint | Strong | Midpoint |
| Democratic | Strong | Relatively poor | Strong | Strong | Extremely poor | Strong | Relatively poor |
| Palestinian Self-determination | Strong | Relatively poor | Slightly less strong | Relatively poor | Extremely poor | Extremely poor | Relatively poor |
| Security | Midpoint | Relatively poor | Relatively poor | Relatively poor | Relatively poor | Relatively poor | Relatively poor |
| Ease of Implementation | Relatively poor | Slightly less strong | Relatively poor | Extremely poor | Midpoint | Relatively poor | Relatively poor |
| Israeli Public Support | Slightly less strong | Midpoint | Relatively poor | Extremely poor | Midpoint | Slightly less strong | Strong |
| Israeli Government Support | Extremely poor | Strong | Extremely poor | Extremely poor | Strong | Slightly less strong | Strong |
| Palestinian Public Support | Slightly less strong | Extremely poor | Relatively poor | Relatively poor | Extremely poor | Relatively poor | Extremely poor |
| PA Support | Strong | Relatively poor | Relatively poor | Extremely poor | Extremely poor | Extremely poor | Extremely poor |
| Hamas Support | Extremely poor | Extremely poor | Extremely poor | Midpoint | Extremely poor | Extremely poor | Extremely poor |
| Acceptance by Jordan and Egypt | Strong | Midpoint | Midpoint | Relatively poor | Extremely poor | Extremely poor | Extremely poor |
| Acceptance by Arab World | Strong | Midpoint | Slightly less strong | Midpoint | Extremely poor | Extremely poor | Midpoint |
| U.S. Acceptance | Slightly less strong | Strong | Midpoint | Midpoint | Midpoint | Relatively poor | Strong |
| Acceptance by Russia and China | Strong | Midpoint | Strong | Midpoint | Midpoint | Midpoint | Relatively poor |
| Acceptance by EU and Int'l Orgs. | Strong | Midpoint | Strong | Midpoint | Extremely poor | Extremely poor | Extremely poor |
| Direct Costs | Relatively poor | Midpoint | Relatively poor | Extremely poor | Extremely poor | Relatively poor | Extremely poor |
| Indirect Costs | Strong | Midpoint | Midpoint | Extremely poor | Relatively poor | Relatively poor | Midpoint |
| Timeframe to Implementation | Relatively poor | Strong | Relatively poor | Extremely poor | Strong | Relatively poor | Relatively poor |

Color Explanation

-  Strong performance against criterion
-  Slightly less strong performance yet above the the midpoint
-  Midpoint performance
-  Relatively poor performance
-  Extremely poor performance

All of the information contained in this fact sheet and the full report is current as of February 2020.

