

# Smoke and Mirrors Diplomacy: Will the US Prevent a Palestinian State for “Israel’s Security”?

By [Timothy Alexander Guzman](#)

Global Research, December 18, 2014

[Silent Crow News](#)

Region: [Middle East & North Africa](#)

In-depth Report: [PALESTINE](#)

Palestinian officials are hoping that a U.N. resolution will receive the votes needed for a Palestinian state. But recent reports on how Washington is reacting to the proposals within the U.N. resolution seem that the dream for a Palestinian state is all but a dream. U.S. Secretary of State John Kerry says that the Obama Administration is undecided on how they will vote on the proposals put forward by the Palestinian Authority (PA) and the Arab league within the U.N. resolution for a Palestinian state with the Security Council before Israel's elections take place in March 2015. Press TV reported that *Agence France-Presse (AFP)* said that “US Secretary of State John Kerry will try to persuade Palestinians not to rush ahead with a draft UN resolution to end the Israeli occupation” it also said that “this comes as Palestinians are set to submit a draft resolution to the United Nations Security Council Wednesday which calls for the recognition of the Palestinian state and sets a two-year deadline for Israel to end its occupation.” The report also mentioned a historical fact that “In 2002, the US announced its support for a Palestinian state, opening the way for United Nations Security Council Resolution 1397, supporting a two-state solution.”

This past Monday, Kerry met with Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu in Rome to discuss issues relating to the U.N. resolution. Netanyahu was adamant when he said “We will not accept attempts to impose unilateral measures upon us by a set date” according to the Press TV report. Reuters published a report titled ‘Washington undecided on U.N. resolution for Palestinian state’ describes Washington’s attitude towards the upcoming vote on Palestinian statehood when “a senior U.S. State Department official said Washington had not yet decided that a Security Council resolution was the right way to go” the report said. “These things are all very much in flux, it’s not as if we’re being asked to take a position on any particular Security Council resolution right now. It would be premature for us to discuss documents that are of uncertain status right now.” The U.S. State Department official is being disingenuous to the media.

First, Palestine’s fate has been sealed when Israel (a Zionist entity) was created in 1948 with European (particularly the U.K) and American support. The essential goal of Zionism was to change the nature of the Jewish people from a religious entity to a political movement that dominates Palestinian lands with Western support. Israeli historian Ilan Pappé wrote an article titled ‘The two state solution died over a decade ago’ which he declares Israel’s intentions following the Oslo Accords, a peace plan signed by both the Israeli government and the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) in 1993. The Oslo Accords which was also known as the ‘Declaration of Principles on Interim Self-Government Arrangements’ described what was in the framework of the two-state solution. It is interesting to note that the Oslo Agreement talks about living in peace and dignity between both sides of the conflict. It says that “it is time to put an end to decades of confrontation

*and conflict, recognize their mutual legitimate and political rights, and strive to live in peaceful coexistence and mutual dignity and security and achieve a just, lasting and comprehensive peace settlement and historic reconciliation through the agreed political process.”* But Pappé has a different perspective on the peace process when he wrote:

The Israeli interpretation was that the Oslo Accords were merely an international as well as a Palestinian endorsement of the strategy the Israelis had formulated back in 1967 vis-à-vis the occupied territories. After the 1967 war, all the successive Israeli governments were determined to keep the West Bank as part of Israel. It was, for them, both the heart of the ancient homeland and a strategic asset that would prevent the bisection of the state into two should another war break out.

At the same time, the Israeli political elite did not wish to grant citizenship to the people living there, nor did they seriously contemplate their expulsion. They wanted to keep the area, but not the people. The first Palestinian uprising, however, proved the cost of the occupation, leading the international community to demand from Israel a clarification of its plans for the future of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip. For Israel, Oslo was that clarification

Ilan Pappé also went on to say that the *“Oslo Accords were not a peace plan for the Israelis; they were a solution to the paradox that had long troubled Israel, of wanting the physical space without the people on it”* He also stated that the goal of Zionism, which was to find a solution on *“how to have the land without its native people in a world that no longer accepted more colonialism and ethnic cleansing.”* The Israeli government is only interested in occupying more land as they continue to build illegal *“Jewish only”* settlements and to control vital natural resources such as water. The Israeli government is also interested in what Mr. Pappé says *“to Ghettoise”* the Gaza Strip. He wrote:

The political elite that took over in this century, however, while employing the discourse on two states, has established, without declaring it publicly, a one Israeli state in which Palestinians in the West Bank will be in the same secondary status as those living elsewhere inside Israel. They also found a special solution for the Gaza Strip: to ghettoise it.

The wish to maintain the status quo as a permanent reality became a full-blown Israeli strategy with the rise of Ariel Sharon to power in the early part of this century. The only hesitation he had was about the future of the Gaza Strip; and once he found the formula of ghettoising it, instead of ruling it directly, he felt no need to change the reality on the ground elsewhere in any dramatic way

The Obama administration will most likely back Israel as they did in 2011 when *The Telegraph* based in London reported what Ben Rhodes, a White House National Security Spokesman had said *“after Mr Obama met Mr Abbas in New York: “We would have to oppose any action at the UN Security Council including, if necessary, vetoing.”* It went on to say that *“Benjamin Netanyahu, the Israeli premier, said Mr Obama deserved a “badge of honour” for his defence of Israel.”* Obama can just add his *“badge of honour”* along with the Nobel Peace prize when the vote on the U.N. resolution is presented to the Security Council because it is possible that the U.S. will use its Veto power against any recommendation for a Palestinian State. The U.S. has used its veto power to prevent the international community from condemnation of Israel’s policies that that has continued to violate international law.

The U.S. says that a unilateral vote against Israel is misguided. If the Palestinian bid to become a state fails due to a US veto then the two-state solution will be less feasible. The only possibility left would only benefit Israel, and that is a one-state solution. If Israel were to become a single state, Palestinians would essentially become second class citizens because Israel wants it to be recognized by the international community as a *"Jewish State."* Online Israeli news site [www.ynetnews.com](http://www.ynetnews.com) published a report titled *'Palestinians to submit draft resolution to UN later this week'* on what the Israeli government is expecting from the upcoming vote:

Jerusalem estimates that if the Palestinians demand a vote on the resolution by the end of December, they won't have the necessary majority (nine out of the 15 member states) to pass the resolution, and in such a case the Americans won't need to veto the decision. But if the vote is held after January 1, it's likely the Palestinians can reach the necessary majority, putting the Americans in a dilemma on whether or not to use their veto power

However, the report quotes Yuval Steinitz, a Strategic Affairs Minister as saying *"I assume an anti-Israeli proposal will draw a US veto. That's how it's always been, and that's what we hope will happen."* And he is right. The U.S. has vetoed 42 resolutions that were directly against Israel's atrocities since 1972. *"But Foreign Minister Avigdor Lieberman, speaking on Army Radio, said it appeared the United States "is not eager to use its veto" on the Palestinian statehood issue but was seeking "maximum coordination" with Netanyahu."* The report also mentioned that an unnamed US official was suggesting that Washington thinks that the Palestinian draft was unacceptable:

The Palestinian draft through the Jordanians contains a hard deadline for the withdrawal from the West Bank of two years, so that is not the way we would look at handling a very complicated security negotiation by simply mandating a flat deadline of two years," the official said

Palestinian Statehood will not happen as long as the Zionist elements in Tel Aviv and in Washington D.C. including congress members who support Israel (several congress members have Israeli passports as dual citizens) and the political power of the American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC) who still remains highly influential. Former Prime Minister of Israel Ariel Sharon once said *"Every time we do something you tell me Americans will do this and will do that. I want to tell you something very clear, don't worry about American pressure on Israel. We, the Jewish people, control America, and the Americans know it."* The U.S. will use its veto to protect Israel, it always has. What Israel wants it usually gets from Washington, no matter who is the President. If Hillary Clinton or Jeb Bush were to become the next President whom both pledge allegiance to Israel, then you can expect the same results for any future U.N. resolution that would lay the groundwork for a Palestinian state.

The international community needs a binding vote that would allow a new Palestinian state which the majority of nations including members of the European community are in favor of. However, since the U.S. is still considered a major power on the Security Council, a Palestinian state will not happen. The only chance for the Palestinians to have their own state is when the U.S. Empire experiences a total collapse due to its reckless political, financial and military policies that has only made the world a dangerous place, and then the Palestinians can once again have a country of their own.

[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Timothy Alexander Guzman](#)

#### About the author:

Timothy Alexander Guzman is an independent researcher and writer with a focus on political, economic, media and historical spheres. He has been published in Global Research, The Progressive Mind, European Union Examiner, News Beacon Ireland, WhatReallyHappened.com, EIN News and a number of other alternative news sites. He is a graduate of Hunter College in New York City.

**Disclaimer:** The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: [publications@globalresearch.ca](mailto:publications@globalresearch.ca)  
[www.globalresearch.ca](http://www.globalresearch.ca) contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: [publications@globalresearch.ca](mailto:publications@globalresearch.ca)