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“The Palestinians are starting to see that Israel is not responsible for their problems; it’s their leaders” (Jared Kushner in a conference call with journalists, Globes, July 3, 2019).

Abstract

The Peace to Prosperity Workshop which took place from June 25, 2019 to June 26, 2019 in Manama, Bahrain was an event of major significance. The public statement of the American representative, Jared Kushner, on June 25, 2019, and his implicit messages indicate the “revealed preference” of the American administration. Kushner in his address publicly questioned the legitimacy of the Palestinian Authority and called for regime change. He expressed the rather modern view that the Palestine Authority was not serving its public.

The American position represents a frontal challenge to the Palestine Authority which has designated the destruction of Israel as its main goal. From the founding of the Palestine Liberation Organization in 1964, the Palestinian national movement has firmly rejected the possibility of a compromise that would result in a peaceful settlement with Israel. It has steadfastly rejected the principle of Jewish nationhood and sovereignty.
and practices incitement to hatred and violence. It has also designated the United States as an enemy.

There has been a clash of civilizations taking place for generations which for reasons of expedience has long been denied. The disparity between the true Palestinian goals and their claims to moral superiority has created a “representation gap”, which the Bahrain Workshop has brought into full view.

The modern, western ideas which Jared Kushner articulated in the Peace to Prosperity Workshop and those of the Palestine Authority which fixate on the politicide of Israel remain in direct opposition. Only with time will we learn how this confrontation of ideas and values will play out.
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Introduction: The “Representation Gap”

For more than half a century, the Palestine problem has been on the agenda of the world community. From the founding of the Palestine Liberation Organization in 1964, the destruction of the State of Israel and the pursuit of the “armed struggle” has been its main goal. Ahmad al-Shukeiri [Shuqayrī], who was the first Chairman of the PLO (1964–1967) and the person who drafted the first version of the Palestinian Covenant, proclaimed in his book, Liberation – not Negotiation, that Palestine should be redeemed through armed struggle and not by compromise (Gloria, 2011; Shukeiri, 1956). This fundamental policy has remained constant, although the Palestinian Arabs and their well-meaning sympathizers have tried to disguise this fact. Despite the fact that they adopted a “new look” which has given them the appearance of respectability, terror and violence have remained an essential part of their strategy. Proof of this may be found in the well-publicized program of the PA to subsidize terrorists who have committed violent crimes against civilians as part of the Palestinian struggle against Zionism (Kuperwasser, 2017). In order to support such a project, the PA has adopted a law that defines (incarcerated) terrorists as the fighting sector of the Palestinian society and subsequently launched a program of incentives publicly admitting and taking responsibility for the fact that they sent terrorists to carry out attacks on Israeli civilians. This policy is based on the assumption that the ends justify the means and that Jews have no claim to nationhood and basic human dignity. Until recently, most of the international community did not express opposition to this practice. This permissive attitude brings to mind the protection money which in years past some of its members paid to the Palestinian terror organizations in exchange for a promise not to carry out attacks on their own soil.

As early as 1970, Yehoshafat Harkabi, who had served as the Chief of Israel’s Military Intelligence Branch from 1955 to 1959, and later became a Senior Lecturer on International Relations and Middle East Studies at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, described what he termed the “representation gap”. His view was, that,
despite its claims to moral superiority, the real goal of the Palestinian strategy is the politicide of the “Zionist Entity”:

Why are we not prepared to withdraw in the absence of a settlement which will assure our security? Why do we have some territorial claims? Because we know that the Arabs have malicious intentions toward us which may force them to exploit our withdrawal. But since we do not present the malicious nature of the Arab position, a “representation gap” [authors’ italics] arises between our explanations and our behavior. An information policy which does not conform to behavior is not convincing and is doomed from the outset (Harkabi, 1974, p. 189).

These statements bring us to the problem of the “disconnect” between the publicly proclaimed principles of Palestinian ideology and their real goals. Harkabi recommended that Israel draw the world’s attention to this gap. At the same time, he identified an additional complication: Israel’s governmental élite lacked the necessary knowledge to come to terms with this reality and was unprepared for protracted conflict:

Official Israel has been late in explaining to the people that the conflict may be protracted, in order to prepare them for it. The reason was not negligence; it seems to have been more a lack of knowledge and understanding. It was my impression that a certain ignorance of the basic issues of the conflict and of the Arab position prevails even among the government élite. I think that familiarity with the 1968 Palestinian National Covenant is essential in analyzing the conflict. I wonder how many of our government ministers have read the Palestinian Covenant, how many have been acquainted with its principles, and how long they have known about it (Harkabi, 1974, p.185).

It should be noted that on November 10, 1975, the United Nations General Assembly passed Resolution 3379, “Zionism equals Racism”, and the Soviet
Union in cooperation with Arab world launched an aggressive campaign of
deleigitimization and dehumanization against the State of Israel. At the time,
official Israel did not comprehend the danger of a propaganda war and did not
respond (Fishman, 2001, 2011).

When Yehoshafat Harkabi described the “representation gap”, he did not
include the efforts of the Palestine Liberation Organization to fill an empty
space with its mendacious myths and falsehoods. Nature abhors a vacuum,
and this space which the Israeli side left undefended became a type of “lost
territory”, a “no-go zone”, which must be reconquered. We tend to overlook
the Palestinian myths, but if truthful history will regain its rightful place and
peace-making will ever become possible, they must be brought into discredit.
As early as 1990, Robert Wistrich analyzed the methods of PLO propaganda and
its willful falsification of history:

In the late 1960s the PLO began to grasp the utility of projecting the
Nazi horror directly onto Israel and utilizing the prestige of the European
anti-Nazi resistance for their own cause. For western consumption,
PLO propaganda now stressed the similarities between the Palestinians’
condition in the Middle East (as a result of Israeli “oppression”) and that of
the Jews of Europe under Hitler’s rule. Were not they (the Palestine Arabs),
too, a homeless, persecuted people, evicted from their lands, defenceless,
stateless, refugees deprived of independence and basic human dignity?
One can recognize the factual elements in this presentation without
necessarily sharing the extremely one-sided and demonological view of
Zionism as the sole and even main culprit responsible for this state of
affairs. What is more important for our purpose […] is the real impact of
this inversion of traditional images of persecutors and victims on western

Much has remained unchanged since the founding of the Palestine Liberation
Organization and the drafting of the original Palestinian Covenant in the 1960s.
For more than a half-century, the Palestinian myths and goals have remained unchanged. Nearly a decade ago, Yosef Kuperwasser and Shalom Lipner revisited this problem. According to them, the fact that Palestinian Authority refuses to recognize Israel the Jewish State, precludes the possibility of both parties’ ever making peace, and it is the other side which bears the responsibility for this state of affairs (Kuperwasser & Lipner, 2011).

The “Peace and Prosperity Workshop” in Bahrain and Jared Kushner’s Address

Unexpectedly, a conjuncture of events would disrupt this ideological logjam and expose the negative effects of PA rejectionism. Recently, Jared Kushner, President Trump’s advisor (and son-in-law), went far to reduce the “representation gap”. In his address June 25, 2019, to the “Peace to Prosperity Workshop” in Bahrain, Kushner politely but firmly suggested that the Palestinian Authority was not serving its people and had lost its legitimacy. Some of Kushner’s points were as follows:

For too long the Palestinian people is trapped in an inefficient framework of the past […] I hear the same broken record of negativity about why progress is not possible […] The Palestinian people has been “left behind”, and there is a “need for a solution” […] [There is] a need to view the problem in a new way […] The Palestinians have become the highest per capita donor-aid recipients with no plan and no end in sight. I believe that this can change.

Prosperity is not given to people. It is earned […] President Trump and America have not given up on you [the Palestinians] […] The Palestinian people has been badly served by their leaders […] The PA let the Palestinian people down; Instead of blaming others for their misfortune, they should address the real problems of governance. Money was wasted on corruption,
munitions and conflict [which could have been better used for civilian purposes] […] We need the right plan and the right environment. A good plan offers the prospect of dignity, prosperity, and opportunity. Examples of Singapore, South Korea, Japan, Peru, Poland, China and America […] Shall we move from the status quo to a real peace that leads to prosperity? In short, the Palestinian people has been badly served by their leaders (Kushner, 2019).

In a separate conference call to journalists of July 3, 2019, Kushner declared:

[…] It is unclear what the Palestinian leadership is trying to do for its people […] The Palestinians are starting to see that Israel is not responsible for their problems; it’s their leaders (Schneider, 2019).

In its July 4th report of the call, Globes, a respected Israeli journal of business affairs, reported that “The US often sounded as though it was hinting that the current Palestinian leadership should be replaced” (Zaken, 2019). From the text of Jared Kushner’s address, we may understand that the United States challenged the legitimacy of the Palestine Authority. As mentioned above, Kushner repeatedly made the point that the PA was not serving its public. According to the analysis of Globes, he was calling for regime change.

It is not generally remembered that the United States in the past has successfully supported regime change. Under the Reagan administration, Prof. Richard Pipes drew up NSDD [National Security Defense Directive]-75, the “only formal presidential directive […] on U.S. strategy, goals, and objectives vis-à-vis the Soviet Union” (Schweizer, 1994, p. 131). Pipes explained:

NSDD-75 said our goal was no longer to coexist with the Soviet Union but to change the Soviet System. At its root was the belief that we had it in our power to alter the Soviet system through the use of external pressure (Schweizer, 1994, p. 131).
One need only compare the logic of NSDD-75 with the actual text of Jared Kushner’s address (NSDD, 1983). It is evident that the framers of American policy built on this precedent. They found “behavior modification” inadequate, because the problems posed by the Soviet Union were inherent in their system. One cannot dismiss the content of Jared Kushner’s address as idle talk. His position has a precedent in American foreign policy, and one time his words could be supported by forceful persuasion.

The Bahrain Workshop in Perspective

In order to appreciate the American position, we must also view this subject from the perspective of the other side. Although the Palestinian Authority rejected the “Peace to Prosperity Workshop” out of hand, the ideas which it placed into circulation resonated. By attacking the foundational assumptions of the Palestinian myth, the American administration practiced disruptive diplomacy. Not the least, it took a firm stand against the PA paying pensions to terrorists and their families as well as the United States subsidizing UNRWA with an annual contribution of $360 million. The fact that Israel is also withholding tax proceeds intended for the PA has also placed it in a financial crisis. At the same time, New York Times reported that, “The Israeli agency for Palestinian civilian affairs [The Coordinator of Government Activities in the Territories (COGAT)] had issued 86,000 permits for West Bank laborers to work in Israel, the highest number ever”. It also suggested “that rather than inspiring violent protests, a resolutely pro-Israel administration in Washington inspires Palestinian Arab quietude” (Kershner, 2019). Yoni Ben Menachem of the Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs, reported that –

The Palestinians are saying that Mahmoud Abbas showed a lack of leadership and political weakness, and that, in the light of the PA leadership’s severe corruption, the Palestinian public did not take to the
streets as he urged. The Bahrain conference ended with a clear American victory over Palestinian Authority Chairman Mahmoud Abbas who boycotted the conference but was unable to convince the Arab states and the Islamic world to stay away from it (Ben Menachem, 2019).

We must also consider the impact of the Bahrain Workshop on the Arab world, which also includes the administrative or intellectual class of the Palestinian Authority. Summing up the impact of the Bahrain Workshop, Dan Zaken of Globes wrote:

The main victim is the Palestinian leadership, which heard from all sides that it was a bone in the throat of very influential parties in the region and was preventing progress in security, technological and economic cooperation. The US often sounded as though it was hinting that the current Palestinian leadership should be replaced [authors’ italics]. These statements are very disturbing to Ramallah and the Gaza strip, and as of now are deepening the rift. This state of affairs has not escaped the Palestinians in both the street and the leadership […] In Bahrain, these [pragmatic Sunni] countries made it clear to the Palestinians: “We are in favor of a political solution, but you had better hurry, because we have other important interests, and we will not wait for too long” (Zaken, 2019).

We may tentatively suggest that the greatest impact of American diplomacy may be found in Arab society in the region as well as the Palestinian Authority. When we focus our attention on the “representation gap” – the gap between the idealized image that the Palestinian Authority projects and reality. We have noted an awareness of this problem among the “moderate Sunni countries”, but this same awareness extends to Palestinian Arab society where an increasing respect for the truth has taken hold. The same Globes article addressed this subject frontally:
What does popular opinion among the Palestinians say? A new survey by Dr. Khalil Shikaki’s Palestinian Center for Policy and Survey Research [PCPSR] shows that more than half of the Palestinians think that the PA is a burden on the Palestinian citizen, and that 57% of the Palestinian public wants Abbas’ leadership to end (Zaken, 2019).

Not surprisingly, this report contains some jewels, such as:

A large majority, more than two-thirds, views the sudden discovery that the former government has illegally increased the salaries of its ministers as an indication that PA corruption is deep-rooted while only a quarter believes that PA corruption is limited and subject to accountability (PCPSR, 2019).

When we access the complete findings of this poll, we find mixed results: some reveal definitely negative feelings toward the workshop in Bahrain and also a deep distrust of America (PCPSR, 2019).

The Bahrain Workshop and the Real Goal of the Palestinian Authority

We have devoted extensive attention to the policy of the Trump administration, which Jared Kushner articulated. Needless to say, the views of the American administration represent a challenge to the Palestinian Authority. There is a clash of ideas, and it is necessary to appreciate its significance. On the one hand, the American administration has decided to apply ideas of modernity to the Palestinian problem. On the other, the Palestinian Authority remains steadfast in its struggle against Israel.

It is most important to name the immediate and real reason why the Palestinian Authority under the leadership of Mahmud Abbas rejected the American invitation
to come to Bahrain and intimidated Palestinian businessmen who dared to accept their invitations.

Yosef Kuperwasser explains that a “representation gap” had obscured the real reason for Abbas’ refusal to attend the “Peace to Prosperity Workshop” in Bahrain. The real purpose of the PA is to destroy the Jewish State, a goal which continues to attract strong support among the Palestinian public. For the PA, raising the standard of living and making life more pleasant for its public is not a priority. In fact, the PA leadership fears that normalization would weaken the struggle against the Zionist enemy and hasten the end to the conflict (which also keeps them in power and attracts political and material patronage).

Mahmud Abbas follows his present policy because he does not want to end the conflict by compromising on his commitment to destroy Zionism. Symbolically, the real goal for the PA is Haifa and all that this means. Any compromise on this commitment is unacceptable – even if it is clear at present that Haifa is out of reach.

While many Palestinians dislike Abbas and the PA leadership because they are corrupt and fail to provide good government, and many – especially in the Gaza strip – believe that taking care of their quality of life is a very pressing issue, they remain faithful to the basic narrative. It is simplistic for westerners to explain this counter-intuitive behavior as the result of corruption, but this is only part of the story. The real problem is that in the shame-driven Palestinian culture, Abu Mazen and the Palestinian leadership reject the prosperity for peace equation because they cannot afford to compromise on the basic purpose (raison d’être) of their political existence. They conceal their real goal by speaking about “Justice for Palestine”, exploiting the willful blindness of many in the West, including Israel.

The real challenge is to destroy the myth of the Palestinians, to convince them to give up their dreams of politicide and to choose to live in peace with the Jewish State.
Long-term Developments and the Desertion of the Intellectuals

From the historian’s point of view, the spread of ideas over time and their potential impact belongs to what the distinguished French historian, Fernand Braudel, called “slow-moving history”. In Braudel’s view, there are two poles of time: one is the instant, the other is the long time span, *la longue durée* (Braudel, 1980, p. 27). Braudel contrasted “event-driven history”, or *l’histoire événementelle*, to history which takes place over a longer time-span. He explained that the short time-span is the most capricious and delusive of all (Braudel, 1980, p. 28) and considered the approach of the social scientists, such as sociologists and psychologists, as making a bet on the irreplaceable value of the present moment (Braudel, 1980, p. 36). According to his approach, everything begins and ends with time (Braudel, 1980, p. 48). This observation brings us to a new way of looking at the subject, the clash of fundamental ideas in which some members of the educated Palestinian public have fearlessly chosen to defy the leadership of the Palestine Authority. We cannot know the potential outcome. Nevertheless, the expression of modern ideas, combined with critical views of the present, may have material consequences.

Bassam Tawil, who identifies as a “Muslim based in the Middle East”, dealt directly with the issue of priorities and the *raison d’être* of the Palestinian Authority. When the “Peace to Prosperity Workshop” took place in Bahrain, the PA decided to stay away and terrorize businessmen who went there in their personal capacity to develop new business contacts. On July 5, 2019, Tawil published an article, “The Palestinian war on businessmen”, with the Gatestone Institute and he wrote:

> The Palestinian Authority’s crackdown on Palestinian businessmen who participated recently in the US-led “Peace to Prosperity” economic conference in Bahrain signals strongly how Palestinian leaders act directly against the interests of their own people (Tawil, 2019).
Confronting the PA leadership frontally, he wrote:

These leaders’ biggest fear is that economic prosperity might divert Palestinians’ attention from the fight against Israel. Like his rivals in Hamas, Abbas seems afraid that once Palestinians start enjoying the fruits of a strong economy, they will stop thinking of killing Israelis or abandon the Palestinian dream of destroying Israel (Tawil, 2019).

Although the impact of such statements cannot be measured with accuracy, they represent a type of independent political expression which can spill over into the streets. Public opinion, as such, is generally passive. It does not necessarily result in political action, although it did, for example, find expression in the passive refusal to participate in a general strike.

When taken cumulatively, the ideas of the intellectuals, or what George Orwell called “the administrative class”, can be formidable. This dynamic is significant because it is a symptom of what Crane Brinton termed, “the desertion of the intellectuals”:

In seventeenth-century England, eighteenth-century America and France, late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Russia, the bulk of those who were at the higher levels of culture wrote, taught, preached, acted on the stage, wrote and played music, practiced the fine arts – and the bulk of their audience – clearly felt that the government, the political, social, and economic institutions under which they lived were so unjust that a root-and-branch reform was necessary. To put it simply, these intellectuals were disloyal toward existing legal authority (Brinton, 1955).

Although one may find more expressions of this type, we have two contemporary essays which challenge the basic legitimacy of the Palestinian Authority. We refer to “The Palestinian war on businessmen”, of July 5, 2019 by Bassam Tawil. In addition, Khaled Abu Toameh wrote the article, “Why Palestinians do not
trust their leaders” (Gatestone published both; see Abu Toameh, 2019; Tawil, 2019). These articles present a listing of specific grievances against the regime of the Palestine Authority. There can be no doubt that they do call for “root and branch reform”, which in simple language means regime change. In the study of revolutions, recognizing the nature of this type of grievance is a matter of basic importance. The student of the French Revolution will remember the importance of the cahiers de doléances or lists of grievances organized in notebooks which were drawn up between March and April of 1789 and addressed to the États généraux, the Estates General. Not all of the events of history are comparable, and for sure the culture of the Middle East is different. Nonetheless, these are primary sources which reliably reveal spirit of the times.

Both authors make some of the same points. Let us cite a few passages from Bassam Tawil and from Khaled Abu Toemeh. Both agreed that the Palestine Authority does not care about the good of its people; that it is corrupt; and that it fears economic prosperity as it might divert the public’s attention from the fight against Israel. Some of Bassam Tawil’s grievances are as follows:

Abbas and his old guard officials are evidently hoping that the US and international community will continue pouring millions of dollars on them without holding them to account [...] They want the conflict to continue for as long as possible so that they can continue receiving funds from Americans, Europeans and others [...] Palestinian leaders want to continue blackmailing the international community into giving them unconditional and unlimited financial aid, while at the same time depriving Palestinians of any opportunity to improve their living conditions. They want their people to continue living in misery so that Abbas and his officials can blame Israel and the rest of the world for the “suffering” of the Palestinians (Tawil, 2019).

It is noteworthy that Tawil bitterly accuses the international community of “willful blindness” by ignoring the sharp practices of the Palestinian Authority:
Under the *willfully unwatchful* [authors’ italics] eyes of the international community, the Palestinian leaders continue their longstanding double-dealing. On the one hand, they denounce Trump and his senior officials, specifically US Ambassador to Israel David Friedman and presidential advisers Jared Kushner and Jason Greenblatt, by dubbing them “Zionist settlers”. On the other hand, the Palestinian leaders demand that the same US open its pocketbook wide to Palestinians. For how long will the Palestinian leaders choose to cheat their own people by insisting on playing with a marked deck? (Tawil, 2019).

For his part, Khaled Abu Toemeh presented a complementary set of grievances. The title of his essay was, “Why Palestinians do not trust their leaders”, and his observations fit within the same framework. Some of his points are as follows:

The Palestinian leaders do not grasp that the Palestinian public cares a great deal more about being treated like human beings by their own leaders than about anti-Israel and anti-US rhetoric. This incitement is [the] Palestinian leaders’ way of distracting attention from problems at home. They want their people to be busy hating someone else – in this case Israel, the US and pro-US Arab leaders. Otherwise, these people might wake up one fine morning and demand reform, transparency, and democracy from their leaders in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip.

When fighting an unseen peace plan becomes a greater priority than bettering the lives of your people, one can only say that, with failed leaders such as these, the time has come for the Palestinian public to raise its collective voice and demand its rights from its unelected leaders in the West Bank and Gaza Strip. Until this happens, Palestinian leaders will continue to enjoy the good life on the extremely burdened backs of its people (Abu Toameh, 2019).
Revolutions can be launched as a consequence of grievances such as these. The points which Bassam Tawil and Khaled Abu Toemeh raised are noteworthy and they are nearly the same as those which Jared Kushner openly expressed. This would indicate that the American team did careful research.

It is clear that the “representation gap”, however it may have existed, will not be the same, and that critical world opinion will no longer lend mindless political and financial support to the Palestinian cause. More leaders abroad as well as domestic opinion in the Palestinian Authority and the region are now asking hard questions. Indeed, an incipient consensus is beginning to emerge: 1) that the real goal of the PA is malicious; and 2) that it does not serve its public.

Clifford May, the President of the Foundation for Defense of Democracies, wrote in the *Washington Times* that the rejection of the Palestine Authority of the “Peace to Prosperity Workshop” calls into question a number of fundamental assumptions. He wrote:

> Virtually everyone ever involved in what is optimistically called the “peace process” has taken for granted that the primary goals of Palestinians – or at least those who lead them – are peace, prosperity and self-determination. What if that’s wrong? What if the Palestinians – or at least those who lead them – really want something else? Would that not guarantee that “opportunities” offered by those seeking to end the Palestinian-Israeli conflict will be missed – or, more precisely, dismissed? (May, 2019).

May stated that the PA had missed out on the possible deal that they could have secured in Bahrain; that their intentions were out of touch with the enlightened world, and that Jared Kushner had shown them up for what they really are. His last sentence succinctly sums up the situation:

> So Palestinians have been missing opportunities for an unsurprising reason: The opportunity to wipe Israel off the face of the earth may yet present itself. It’s not an impossible dream (May, 2019).
Conclusion

Was the Bahrain Workshop a success? Yosef Kuperwasser takes the view that the purpose of the Bahrain summit was to convince the Palestinians to change their narrative and replace it with one that makes as its main goal the betterment of the lives of the Palestinians and reaching a real peace agreement with Israel which recognizes Israel’s identity as the democratic nation state of the Jewish people. He argued that only international and Israeli pressure on the Palestinians to give up their long-range objectives can prepare the ground for a stable and lasting peace arrangement. Such pressure must include a political cold shoulder as long as the Palestinians keep their narrative and their goals. The international community and Israel should even make aid to the Palestinian Authority conditional upon their preparedness to undertake the necessary changes in their position. This is the approach of the international system toward Hamas, despite the fact that there actually is no essential difference between their ideas and those of Fatah, and even of the Palestinian Authority with regard to everything pertaining to their vision of a “Greater Palestine” from the River to the Sea, to the legitimacy of the use of violence to advance Palestinian objectives and the need to adapt the policy of terrorist attacks to cost-benefit considerations (Kuperwasser, 2017).

To the extent that the real policy of the Palestinian Authority has been exposed, the international community, including Israel, have adopted measures of pressure, such as the Taylor-Force Act (2016), the withholding of funds from UNRWA, and the application of strong measures of moral and financial persuasion, particularly against incitement to terror.

It is evident that the framers of the present American policy have borrowed from the precedent of the Reagan administration and its policy with regard to the Soviet Union. The Reagan administration found “behavior modification” inadequate, because the problems posed by the Soviet Union were inherent in their system (Schweizer, 1994, p. 131).

The public declarations of Jared Kushner and his implicit messages indicate the “revealed preference” of the American administration. Kushner in his
address of June 25, 2019 publicly challenged the legitimacy of the Palestinian Authority and called for regime change. From the information accessible in the public domain (and from the original text of NSDD-75) we may gather that the American administration has essentially reached the conclusion that since the basic flaw of the Palestinian Authority is systemic, the best solution will be to hasten regime change. It has decided to act on this view, hoping eventually to advance the prospects of peace and prosperity in the Middle East. Time will tell whether this policy will succeed.

References


Fishman, J. (2011). “A disaster of another kind”: Zionism=racism, its beginning,


About the Authors

Dr. Joel Fishman is a historian and Fellow of the Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs. He received his doctorate in modern European history from Columbia University and served as the editor of *The Jewish Political Studies Review*.

Brig.-Gen. (res.) Yosef Kuperwasser is Director of the Project on Regional Middle East Developments at the Jerusalem Center. He served as Director General of the Israel Ministry of Strategic Affairs and head of the Research Division of IDF Military Intelligence.