

ANALYZING TRACKS OF DIPLOMACY IN ISRAELI—PALESTINIAN RELATIONS: EXPLORING THE INFLUENCE OF US INTERVENTION AND DIPLOMACY

Rada Cristina IRIMIE, PhD student

Faculty of European Studies

Babeş-Bolyai University, Cluj-Napoca, Romania

radairimie@yahoo.com

Abstract:

The long-standing conflict between Israel and Palestine continues to be a major factor in the diplomatic efforts of both states as well as other significant local and international state actors. The US has historically been a staunch Israeli ally, though in recent years it has begun to take a more supportive stance towards Palestinian statehood. This paper examines the role of different tracks of diplomacy applied to Israeli-Palestinian relations and evaluates them within the framework of empirical research done by Böhmelt (2010) that lays out a theory which suggests the most effective tracks of diplomacy. Within this theoretical framework, it becomes clear that adjustments need to be made by all sides in their approach to the peace process and diplomacy, including a higher emphasis on public diplomacy methods to compliment track one diplomatic efforts. As public sentiment increasingly supports creation of a fully autonomous Palestinian state, all forms of diplomacy will need to be employed in the most productive ways possible, which requires understanding not only the functional elements of the particular dynamics between Israel, Palestine, and significant international actors like the US, but also utilizing a sound theoretical framework based on real-world empirical data. By analyzing the current academic literature and examining some theoretical frameworks for diplomacy, this paper aims to identify weaknesses in the current diplomatic strategies of Israel and Palestine as they relate to each other and to major international actors like the US.

Keywords: *Diplomacy, conflict management, mediation strategy, third party intervention, Middle East*

I. Introduction- Historical context

The Israeli-Palestinian relations have always been a hot topic on the international arena, due to the active implications of the US, which wanted to find a fair settlement for both parties involved in the conflict. Notwithstanding, the stake of this ongoing conflict is the desire of the Palestine Authority, the leadership of the yet non-state Palestine to become a nation state recognized as such. Due to this fact, the historical context of the diplomatic relations between Israel and Palestine is important for the future developments of their diplomatic relations and the influence of the US in the region.

Since the beginning of Islamic history, Palestine, and the city of Jerusalem in particular, have been sacred to Muslims. In contrast to Jews and Christians, Muslims have made their regard for the sacredness of Palestine seeing it as an opportunity to bring peace to the region. Jerusalem is sacred to Muslims for two reasons: it is the first *qibla* that Muslims faced during their ritual prayers, and it is the site of what is considered to be one of the greatest miracles performed by the Prophet Muhammad; *the mi'raj*, which resembles the night journey from al-Masjid al-Haram in Mecca to al-Masjid al-Aqsa in Jerusalem and Prophet Muhammad's heaven ascent and his return to al-Masjid al-Haram (Rodica & Mioara, 1977).

Due to this fact it is important to understand the core essence of the conflict, by presenting the Palestinian facts too. Palestine was part of the Ottoman Empire until the World War I. After the end of World War I and everyone took its toll, Palestine passed under the administration of Great Britain. As it was reiterated in this paper and in other articles and academic works, the Israeli people chose the geographic position between the West Bank and the Jordan River to create a sovereign Jewish state as a counterpart effect to the genocide committed by Hitler in the World War II. So that, 1948 represents the year of founding Israel, but on the geographical part of Palestine's territory. Given these facts, the other states in the region offered credit to the last establisher and Palestine reasserted itself as a state. Provide that, Palestine faced numerous ceasefires, bloodsheds and open armed conflict with Israel disputing the holy territory (Quigley, 2010).

The aim of this paper is to briefly present and explore the US diplomatic ties and intervention into the Israeli-Palestinian relations, being well known that, they were not friendly throughout the time. Firstly, it is essential to establish the historical context of the Palestinian- Israeli problem and to make some theoretical insights regarding diplomacy in order to pursue in exploring the diplomatic influence of the US in the region of the Jordan River. Another point is to analyze, if US is committed to actively participate, together with UN and other important actors to solve these issues, which affect both Israel and Palestine. What could be the possible weaknesses of the diplomatic relations and their sinuous track along the road? A deeper insight will be provided by examining the members of this conflict; in our case Israel and Palestine.

The conflict between Israel and Palestine began in the 20th century, when the Jews started the Zionist movement and strived to find a holy place of their own to form a state, due to a general discrimination towards the Jewish people. Thus, the Jewish people decided to settle in the holy place of the Levant between the Mediterranean Sea and the Jordan River (usforeignpolicy, 2013). Their decision was backed by the US administration, because the Jewish people were perceived as a discriminated and tortured nation, especially because of its painful ties with the Holocaust. Basically, the balanced changed in the favor of the Jewish people, even though Palestine had stronger historical ties with the holy ground and it was recognized as a state in the Arab world, before 1948, the founding year of the Israeli state (Bockerhalm, 1960).

Besides the fight for the holy land, there are other voices assuming that the core of the conflict between Palestine and Israel were the political reasons behind it, because as we know, Palestine was controlled by the British administration until the World War II, when it tried to obtain its independence by signing the White Paper, although not being taken into consideration after the massive immigration of the Jewish People. The White Paper document was released under the supervision of the British authorities, which claimed that the Jewish people would remain a minority in Palestine.

Nevertheless, the Zionist pressure was high and the Palestinians had to cede their territory, even though the UN intervened, the Zionist movement was so strong and dedicated to construct a homeland for the oppressed Jews.

II. Theoretical framework

The conflict became more and more present between these two peoples, because apparently a viable solution to please both parties has not been found yet. Regarding this, the theoretical approach concerning different diplomacy tracks for conflict resolution have to be explored with fully attention. As part of the empirical evidence, it should be analyzed Böhmelt's view. The author thinks, that there are three types of diplomatic tracks, which could be considered effective, but a multiple track of diplomacy is more efficient than using single track diplomacy in mediating a conflict. The tracks of diplomacy could be defined such as “diplomatic initiatives by outside state or non-state parties to transform a dispute by communicating information, proposing new solutions and directly influencing the crisis using carrots and sticks that can help generate movements towards potentially overlapping bargaining positions” (Böhmelt, 2010).

Thereby, interpreting this theory, it is acknowledged that in the case of US, its role is very important in finding an appropriate solution that can convey both to Israel and Palestine. As many scholars state, a good solution for both parties would be to accept a two nation state, but this thing could be blindsided, because the two nations sharing their supremacy in the region have different ethnic and religious backgrounds. Nevertheless, one enjoys the advantage of being recognized as a sovereign state since 1948, as in for Palestine, the Palestinian Authority managed to convince UN to grant its right as a non-state member.

Böhmelt developed a third party model of track diplomacy, apart the existing one track and two track diplomacy, which refers to the implication of a state and of an official actors. Unofficial diplomacy is based on informal connection between nations and rivals, but to this respect, the third model is accompanied by an empirical theory, which argues that in order for a track of diplomacy to be efficient, it is required to invest many resources, which facilitate the leverage between the diplomatic tracks by assessing the mediation effectiveness. In this case the involvement of the US diplomatic tracks being considered as a third party intervention in both Israel and Palestine (Böhmelt, 2010, p. 3).

There are various interpretations of the role of the mediation of third parties, but according to the literature review in the field of diplomacy, the most efficient way to end a conflict or to influence its faith is represented by the unofficial diplomacy track mediation between state actors. Nevertheless, this could be influenced by different factors. Aside the unofficial negotiations, the official discussions are important, because they are based on official documents such as treaties or resolutions, which can be signed and written only by officials with political power and influence. Given our case, the Israeli-Palestinian peace discussions began in an informal way assisted by Terje Rød-Larsen a Norwegian sociologist, which in the end turned out into the official Oslo Accords. So the importance of third party mediation is strongly required in balancing the Israeli-Palestinian relations (Mapendere, 2005).

The United States influence in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict resolution, in the context of different tracks of diplomacy concerning third party mediation resides in the findings of Bercovitch and Schiff, who speak about the second type of diplomacy tracks present in the Middle East. Provide that, the unofficial discussions took place between Israeli and Arab scholars or intellectuals and other political or press factors, who could determine a certain influence in the region of Jordan. Moreover, these types of unofficial discussions are ongoing since the end of the Six Day War and have been considered a fruitful opportunity for opening official discussions. So, the third party mediation was present since 1967, but probably the most important achievement was signing the Oslo Accords as a first step for a conflict resolution (Agha & Shai Feldman, 2003).

Moreover, in Böhmelt work we can acknowledge that a multifaceted track of diplomacy is preferred, rather than the classical model of one track diplomacy (T1), meaning that a combination between T1 and two track diplomacy (T2) would be more efficient. (Böhmelt, 2010, p. 169). Another theoretical approach is described in the work of Bercovitch, Gartner and Melin, who present the third party mediation of being the key to a successful mediation in conflict resolution. They describe mediation in the realm of a “madness mediation theory” that is based on several indicators such as the nature of the mediator, the mediation strategy, history and identity. According to their studies, the third party intervention or the mediator has a difficult role regarding mediating an important conflict which could not be solved by the implications of a

two tracks of diplomacy (Bercovitch Jacob, *Empirical Studies in International Mediation. Introduction to a Special Issue of International Interactions*, 2006).

The thought mediation is time consuming and costly by involving a third party, usually its presence high up the percentage of a conflict resolution. Usually, the presence of third party mediation is more effective in cases of conflicts lacking a central authority like in the case of Israel and Palestine, because the second one it is not recognized as a sovereign state, this being made by individuals, states, regional organizations or international institutions. In our case, the third party is represented the United States of having direct implication in this conflict (Bercovitch, Gartner, & Melin, 2005) .

Besides the aforementioned characteristics of the third party mediation in conflict management with a focus on the international mediation, which suffers a certain mediation behaviour being very well explained in the work of Amira Schiff and Scott Gartner in conflict management studies. The mediation behaviour is influenced by three most important mediation strategies: a) communication-facilitation, b) procedural and c) directive strategies which were constructed on the theoretical background of Sheppard from 1984 focusing on the “*content process and procedural aspects of conflict management*” (Bercovitch Jacob, *Is There Method in the Madness of Mediation? Some Lessons for Mediators from Quantitative*, 2006).

The practice of mediation in conflict management started to be used more often in the 20th century. “*Mediation is not a random process. Mediators make choices that maximize the likelihood of achieving outcomes given their situation. Developing a better understanding of the processes that link mediator attributes to conflict management outcomes allows us to understand the madness behind the method of mediation*”(Bercovitch Jacob, *Empirical Studies in International Mediation. Introduction to a Special Issue of International Interactions*, 2006, p. 323).

Other important points in developing effective diplomatic strategies is to use public diplomacy, because you have the chance to be perceived as honest and reliable as part of the strategic communication. This part of the public diplomacy theoretical approach became a difficult thing

to implement, because of states loss of credibility on the international stage. The author Mor Ben discusses about the rethorical theory, the impression management theory and the account theory as prerequisites for building up the credibility of the degree of accountability of the states in comparison with their opponents. This article presents the interesting way of how the states , which are legal entities to solve and to dispute certain interests, in our case Israel's conduct over a debate with the human rights activits groups over the Qana bombing incident in 2006 showing the effects of strategic communication (Mor, 2012).

All in all, the theoretical framework presents to the reader a mere view of how diplomacy changed its importance and how it has developed throughout the decades in becoming more powerful and more dangerous than armed conflicts or revolutions.

III. The US Diplomatic influence and intervention in the region

As it is well known on the international arena, the United States have been a great ally for the Israeli people by supporting the Jewish state with both financial and military aid. Nevertheless, the United States of America acted like a mediator in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, because of its interest in the area.

The unofficial diplomacy concerning one of the most debated and analyzed conflicts between Israel and Palestine had the effect of the Geneva Accords signed in 2000, but presented to the general public in 2003. The Geneva Accords represented the outcome of the unofficial diplomacy being defined as an “act of track two or specifically hard track two diplomacy (Amira, 2010). The Geneva Accords represented in their essence a written agreement between the state of Israel and the Palestianian Liberation Organization to put an end to the conflict, to live in peace among each other and to communicate and they comprised more articles, which regulated the relations between the Israelian state and the PLO in order for both parties to be satisfied (Geneva & The Geneva Accords, 1998). “*The Parties shall cooperate in areas of joint economic interest,*

to best realize the human potential of their respective peoples. In this regard, they will work bilaterally, regionally, and with the international community to maximize the benefit of peace to the broadest cross-section of their respective populations. Relevant standing bodies shall be established by the Parties to this effect”(Geneva & The Geneva Accords, 1998).

The numerous international efforts to come up with a conflict resolution in the case of Israel and Palestine proved to be effective in the sense of implementing the 2011 United Nations Program of Palestinian Statehood. In issuing this favourable track of diplomacy, the US played a major role, no matter the fact if at the beginning of the Keeping in mind the international efforts of the mediators to find a proper solution to this conflict the US supported the Jewish people by backing up their desire to found their homeland on Palestinian ground. The US Israeli support consisted of military assistance in the numerous ceasefires in the Gaza strip or in the West Bank and of intelligence and financial aid.

Different voices argue, that a peace treaty was not possible, because of the well known interest of the US in the region of the West Bank and that, the US failed to comply with its diplomatic tracks of acting as a third party mediator, especially after the European Union gave its full support to grant Palestine the right to self determination (Baumgartner, Francia, & Morris, 2008). Moreover, the path of US influence in the Middle East, especially in managing the conflict in the Gaza Strip was somehow contradictory, because of the discrepancy in the mediation behaviour of the United States in the Middle East and at the White House.

The first change in the US foreign policy towards the issue of public diplomacy regarding conflict resolution between Palestine and Israel came in late 2000, when Bush President argued that Palestine should have the right to become a state and that a certain level of cooperation and peace are essential in achieving the desired statehood. This type of discourses were often present in the US diplomatic policies. The speech held by President Bush to welcome the Palestinian President Mahmoud Abbas at the White House reiterates the changes in the US diplomacy. *We meet at a time when a great achievement of history is within reach, the creation of a peaceful, democratic Palestinian state* (Anne, 2005, p. 911). So, the first mediation behaviour was perceived as a directive strategy towards making up a Peace Plan. Despite US efforts in the

region of Jordan River in becoming just an international donor for Israel and later on for Palestine by pumping up capital to increase the social and economic development of the region, it proved to have been effortless in establishing an effective diplomatic track.

Also, the effects of public diplomacy for the US administration meant the changing of an era, when it came to the diplomatic development. Since Obama took over the presidency, the US became eager to put an end to this conflict. The support of the Palestinian people was more intense, but the track of diplomacy changed to the extent, that if the possibility of creating a Palestinian state is low, the other possibility could be the friendly cooperation of both Jewish and Muslim people in living together in one state. President Obama made a statement in supporting these arguments: *It is a vital national security interest of the United States to reduce these conflicts, because whether we like or not, we remain a dominant military superpower, and when conflicts break out, one way or another we get pulled into them. And that ends up costing us significantly in terms of both blood and treasure* (Aronson, 2013, p. 250).

IV. The diplomatic relations and their weak points between Israel, Palestine and the US diplomatic influence

Whitall argues that the “peace process” concerning the actual situation in the West Bank, with a special emphasis on the PA security forces addressed a clear message to the military and government officials by underlining the gaps or the black spots of the US diplomacy regarding Israel-Palestine issue. The US is accused to have different positions concerning the situation in disputing Israel’s and Palestine conflict and what is pictured on the Washington arena. At utmost importance is the critical view of the American military chief commander towards the diplomatic policies followed by the State’s Department Middle East diplomacy with a strong focus on the US operations in the West Bank (P.J, 2010). However, the US Administration started to create its diplomatic influence in the region in criticism and doubt, because of the tension there.

The deficiencies of the US diplomatic track have been harshly criticized by some international actors, because the blame of the bloodshed and armed conflict was put on the US shoulders too, because of the US endorsements of Israel. The Washington Administration was offering besides the financial and diplomatic support, military and informational support too. This type of diplomacy was not in the interest of the USA, which had friendly relations with most of the Middle East countries. Most likely, the change of attitude in the diplomatic tracks and the mediation behaviour came after international critiques and change of the political colour at the White house (Martin, 2000).

However, White House's ties with Jerusalem were closer than with the Arabs living in the non-state Palestine, even if the intention of US was to create a balance in the region. A change of track in the United States foreign policy was influenced by the discrepancy of Israel's negative reputation on the international arena and the program of public diplomacy issued to combat the negative reviews about the Holy Country. Regarding the effects of public diplomacy on Israel foreign policy, it is a modern concept of establishing cultural economic and communication relationships with a country (Gilboa E 2006). According to UN, the issue of Palestine and its right to self-determination has been brought to UN's Council attention since 1947 outburst in support of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian citizens (www.un.org).

In spite of all the efforts, Palestine did not benefit of the same endorsement and support as Israel, because they did not have the support of the US and the historical context of the Jewish people and because the public diplomacy of the US was functioning only in the respect of Israel's needs. Due to this fact, the diplomatic efforts of the US were determined to be considered a weak point in the relation of Israel with Palestine, because in the region was needed an emphasis on the cultural communication strategy in order to conduct an international public diplomacy effort in both Israel and Palestine (Dutta-Bergman, 2006).

Throughout the time framework of the conflict, the Israel Palestinian relations were obsolete, but yet influenced by the state mediators, in this case the US. Firstly, the Israeli diplomacy did not focus on strengthening its relations with the PA by signing different official documents or press

releases with regard to the 2005 elections in Gaza. The Israeli officials did not take into account the non-speaking Hebrew population pointing out a weak strategic communication part of the public diplomacy policy. The incoherence of Israel's public policy when it comes to establishing diplomatic ties with the PA is perceived as one of the core weak point of Israeli diplomacy. Due to this inconsistency and the ongoing dispute with the settlers, Israel tends to be disregarded by other state actors (Shenhav, Sheaffer, & Gabay, 2010).

This disengagement of the Israeli authorities towards the PA shows another weak point of the Israeli foreign policy. When it comes to the cultural diplomacy, we could argue that the United States revived its public diplomacy and its role as a third party intervention. Scham presented in his article some desired pasts of both Israel and Palestine. The Israeli desired past consists of the institutions they support such as the Israeli government, the Jewish Organization in the United States. On the other hand, the Palestinian desire past is symbolized by the Palestinian rights organizations and by the intellectuals and the "diplomatic desired past" is guided by the US State Department. These desired diplomatic consist of document reviews, speeches, cultural interviews, intellectual work and everything that could be categorized as cultural diplomacy (Scham, 163-199).

So far, we have mentioned the weaknesses of Israel and Palestine relations by emphasizing their diplomatic ties in different ways, but we should not forget that diplomacy is made by politicians and not by bureaucrats or office clerks. Perhaps another reason behind cooperation and recognizing Palestine's statehood could lie within the political instability, because the less time a politician spends in office the less knowledge he/she has about how to shape the political agenda. Keeping this in mind, diplomacy is a very important aspect of a state's foreign policy and some authors like Rosenthal argued that a weak diplomacy is given by the multi party system, Israel has. This type of system encourages instability and bureaucratic ties, which are not beneficial for the tracks of diplomacy (Rosenthal, 2012).

Another highlighting point in our discussion is the role of public opinion in influencing diplomatic relations in the context of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Thus, the public opinion is a great mean of debating sensitive issue concerning both Palestinians and Jewish people

(recognizing by the Palestinians the Jewish identity and recognizing by the Jews, the Palestinian refugees). The idea is that the public opinion can influence and overturn the events and the politics in one country by contributing in a negative or in a positive way to frame policies and laws (Shamir & Shikaki, 2005).

Moreover, apart from the domestic factors such as the Israeli and Palestinian public opinion, the US played and still plays a very important role in the region of the Golan Heights. It is well known that US is a super power and its influence in the region hardened the things for Palestine in the realm of humanitarian diplomacy, because its continuous endorsement for the state of Israel facilitated the emergence of new political crisis, which UN has to restore (Whitall, 2009).

Despite the different types of diplomacy and mediation madness in conflict management, another key factor is religion. Religion had all the time a great importance in the Middle East and most of the conflicts started out as religious. The religious belief played an interesting role in attracting American's public opinion interest on foreign policies issues in the Middle East. In America, there are many religious groups, but the most influential, the Christians endorse Israel in favor of Palestine. This appealing religious conduct could be determined by a general perception of the Muslim people, not only in the case of Palestine (Baumgartner, Francia, & Morris, 2008).

The Bush Administration stated clearly that Israel represented an ally and a strategic liability in the American fight against terrorism. This kind of statements provoked even more the public opinion to retract its attention from the Palestinian issue, focusing more on the idea that the US has an important strategic advantage on behalf of Israel. Actually this type of communication could be seen as a weak point of the US diplomatic relation as a strategic mediator. Fortunately, the United States realized that their failing with this kind of diplomatic policy and turned its face to Palestine too (Handley, 2010).

In the context of improving the diplomatic relations and mediating the conflict, it is important to state that the Palestinian statehood by 2011 program created by the neoliberal institution building reasserts and redefines the Palestinian fight to become recognized as a sovereign state. However, the neoliberal program of economic and social development can be proved not to be very

efficient for a non-state entity, because even if neoliberal doctrine encourages economic development, the importance of granting some national rights and human rights for the Palestinians cannot be replaced just by the idea of a statehood program (Khalidi & Samour, 2011).

The issue of statehood is discussed in the work of Elgindy, who claims that the Palestinian proposal for statehood in the UN 2011 membership. The Palestinian leader Abbas reiterated the failure of signing a peace agreement with Israel during the negotiations mediated by the US, but also the internal problem of Palestine, which resides in power struggle between the Palestine Authority and the Palestine Liberation Organization.

Thus, the Palestinian leader asked for statehood in an attempt to gain international support and to make the first step in settling the situation with Israel. These type of actions could be interpreted as multifaceted tracks of diplomacy to obtain peace in the region of the Jordan River (Elgindy, 2011).

Thereby, the unbalanced diplomatic policy of the US, when it comes the Palestinian-Israel issue make the object of the statehood program accepted by the UN. On one hand, the United States declared its engagement in mediating the conflict and on the other hand it showed reluctance towards the self-determination of the muslim Palestinians: *The U.S. opposition to the PA's renewed bid could alienate the Arab and Islamic world on an issue of central political significance and at a time of great political upheaval. The opposition could isolate Washington, exposing it to criticisms of hypocrisy (e.g., supporting a rebellion in Libya and Egypt, but opposing the self-determination of Palestinians) and impair its ability to mediate the Israeli-Palestinian peace and cultivate alliances with nascent Arab democracies* (<http://www.cfr.org/>).

To conclude this part, we could argue that, the US reshaped its diplomatic tracks in the relation with Israel and Palestine after 2005, by realizing that the previous strategies represented a set of failures for the US foreign policy and if the US wants to protect its own interests it must act as a liaison in settling the Israel and Palestine relations. As the Obama administration claimed, the United States should create a firm environment for developing peace and mutual security

between Israel and Palestine, but in the same time the US hypocrisy is harshly judged within the United Nations (Aronson, 2013).

V. Conclusion

The diplomatic tracks regarding the US influence in the Palestinian-Israel conflict could be described as two-sided coin, because the relations between the Jewish people and the Palestinians suffered throughout the decades, but every attempt of regulating the things was driven away by the political instability in Israel and the internal struggle in Palestine. As far as it is concerned the international support, the only certain thing is that the US regards its influence in the region and wants to keep this statute, in spite of the recent events of the Arab Spring.

The negative thing about US diplomatic tracks and third party intervention is their lack of maintaining a strong position and of not being so hypocritical in relations with the outside world, especially the European Union and China. We all realized that China develops fast and sooner or later may undermine the supremacy of the US in the region due to the “end of the cheap oil” and “the rise of the energy prices”. In a few years, China will develop stronger national companies, which could take place of the international oil companies. These changes are more than likely to affect the strategic relationships US-Middle East; US-China and Europe-Russia- US determining all the superpowers to start reconsidering their foreign policy (Harris, 2010).

Other important aspects that should be discussed refer to the changing trend of the diplomatic relations between countries and developing of new communication strategies as part of the public diplomacy. The state actors search for valid strategies to ensure their place on the international arena, but also to settle important diplomatic ties. Most probably, the diplomatic relations between these three parties (US, Israel, Palestine) would be subject to change, but in the meantime we should not be part of the geopolitical and economic interests of the superpowers.

Many people have died during this long lasting conflict and the international actors should have intervened more to prevent it from happening. Whilst a major stepping stone in reshaping the diplomatic tracks could be considered the general endorsement of Palestine to become a sovereign state. As Gilboa described in one of his articles, that some interactions between the media and the field of secret diplomacy exist. This context of secret diplomacy does not allow the media to participate in the negotiations and every settlement is made with closed doors. This model of secret diplomacy engages in finding out ethical implications and outcomes for the state officials and for the government. It is not a secret that US offered informational support to Israeli authorities, which were used by Israel in their discussions with Palestine (Gilboa E. , 1998).

In my opinion, the Israel-Palestinian relations have to be supervised more careful than before and the US should improve its mediation strategy. The United States does not afford to lose its supremacy in the West Bank and for this reason new diplomatic approaches should be taken into consideration.

Bibliography

- usforeignpolicy*. (2013, May 20). Retrieved May 20, 2013, from <http://usforeignpolicy.about.com/>: <http://usforeignpolicy.about.com/od/middleeast/a/The-U-S-And-Palestine.htm>
- Agha, H., & Shai Feldman, A. K. (2003). *Track- II Diplomacy: Lessons from the Middle East*. Cambridge: MA:MIT Press.
- Amira, S. (2010). “Quasi Track-One” Diplomacy: An Analysis of the Geneva Process in the Israeli–Palestinian Conflict. *International Studies Perspective*, 93-111.
- Anne, L. M. (2005). Killing with kindness: funding the demise of a Palestinian State. *International Affairs* 81, 981-999.
- Aronson, G. (2013). Policy Options in a Time of Transition: The US and the Israel-Palestine Conflict. *Middle East Journal*, 67, 250-259.
- Baumgartner, J., Francia, P., & Morris, J. (2008). A Clash of Civilizations? The Influence of Religion on Public Opinion of U.S. Foreign Policy in the Middle East. *Political Research Quarterly* 61, 171-179.
- Bercovitch Jacob, G. S. (2006). Empirical Studies in International Mediation. Introduction to a Special Issue of International Interactions. *International Interactions*, 319-328.
- Bercovitch Jacob, G. S. (2006). Is There Method in the Madness of Mediation? Some Lessons for Mediators from Quantitative. *International Interactions*, 329–354.
- Bercovitch, J., Gartner, S., & Melin, M. (2005). The Method in the Madness of Mediation: Some Lessons for Mediators. *Annual Meeting of the Political Science Association* (pp. 1-36). Washington DC: American Political Science Association.
- Bockerhalm, C. (1960). History of the Islamic peoples. In C. Bockerhalm, *History of the Islamic peoples* (pp. 487-488). Chicago: Capricorn Book Press.
- Böhmelt, T. (2010). The effectiveness of tracks of diplomacy strategies in third parties interventions. *Journal of Peace Research*, 167-178.
- Dutta-Bergman, M. (2006). U.S. Public Diplomacy in the Middle East. *Journal of Communication Inquiry* 30, 102-124.

- Elgindy, K. (2011). Palestine goes to the UN: understanding the new statehood strategy. *United Nations Foreign Affairs* 90.
- Geneva, T., & The Geneva Accords, T. (1998). <http://www.nationsonline.org/>. Retrieved May 21, 2013, from http://www.nationsonline.org/oneworld/geneva_accord.htm
- Gilboa, E., & Gilboa, E. (2006). Public Diplomacy: The Missing Component in Israel's Foreign Policy. *Israel Affairs* 12, 715-747.
- Gilboa, E. (1998). Secret Diplomacy in the Television Age. *Gazette*. 60,, 211-225.
- Handley, R. (2010). Cascading activation: Bush's war on terrorism and the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. *Journalism*.11, 445-461.
- Harris, S. (2010). Global and regional orders and the changing geopolitics of energy. *Australian Journal of International Affairs* 64, 166-185.
- <http://www.cfr.org/>. (n.d.). Retrieved May 21, 2013, from <http://www.cfr.org/palestinian-authority/palestinian-statehood-un/p25954>
- Khalidi, R., & Samour, S. (2011). Neoliberalism as Liberation: The Statehood Program and the Remaking of the Palestine National Movement. *Journal of Palestine Studies* 40, 6-25.
- Mapendere, J. (2005). Track One and a Half Diplomacy and the Complementarity of Tracks. *Culture of Peace Online Journal*, 66-81.
- Martin, G. (2000). *The Arab-Israeli Conflict-Its History in Maps, 5th edition*. Great Britain: Steimatzy Press.
- Mor, B. D. (2012). Credibility Talk in Public Diplomacy. *Review of International Studies*, 393-422.
- P.J, D. (2010). Trip Notes on a Return to Israel and the West Bank: Reflections on US Peacemaking, the Security Mission and What Should be Done. *Journal of Palestine Studies* 39, 66-81.
- Quigley, J. (2010). *The statehood of Palestine: International Law in the Middle East Conflict*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rodica, G., & Mioara, G. (1977). *Dosarul problemei palestinienne [The file of the Palestinian Issue]*. Bucharest: Politic Press.
- Rosenthal, M. (2012). Agenda Control in an Unstable Multiparty Parliamentary Democracy: Evidence from the Israeli Public Sector. *Constitutional Political Economy*, 22-44.
- Scham, S. (163-199). Diplomacy and Desired Pasts. *Journal of Social Archaeology* 9, 2009.

Shamir, J., & Shikaki, K. (2005). Public Opinion in the Israeli-Palestinian Two-Level Game. *Journal of Peace Research* , 311-328.

Shenhav, S. R., Sheaffer, T., & Gabay, I. (2010). Incoherent Narrator: Israeli Public Diplomacy During the Disengagement and the Elections in the Palestinian Authority. *Israel Studies* 15, 143-162.

Whitall, J. (2009). It's like talking to a brick in tha wall. *Progress in Development Studies*, 37-53.

www.un.org. (n.d.). <http://unispal.un.org>. Retrieved May 21, 2013, from www.un.org:
<http://unispal.un.org/unispal.nsf/home.htm>