

Dear Congressman,

It has come to our attention that House Resolution 326 ("Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding United States efforts to resolve the Israeli-Palestinian conflict through a negotiated two-state solution.") will be going to the floor for a full house vote. We believe that you should vote NO.

Before going into the resolution itself, it is our position that the notion of a "Two-State Solution" is:

- A. Language which is disingenuous.
- B. Ahistorical.
- C. Not official US foreign policy.
- D. Contrary to international law.

It is disingenuous in that it uses language claiming to support the "Two-State Solution" as an ideal. What is really being discussed is a "Three-State Solution". The English Mandate of Palestine was indeed split into two states, Israel and Jordan. What was to be a 50-50 split never materialized. Thus, to ask Israel to give up whatever land it now has is not only dangerous, which is why the armistice lines drawn in 1947 are widely known as Auschwitz Borders, but immoral and unjust.

It is ahistorical, due to the undisputed fact that the land of Judea and Samaria is the historic homeland of the Jewish Nation. In all the archaeological digs throughout the State of Israel, specifically in Judea and Samaria, relics have proven, time and time again, the thousands of years of Jewish civilization in that region. With that said, not a remnant of an Arabic "Palestinian" culture has ever been found there. It goes without saying, the term Palestine itself is not Arabic but Roman. The Romans renamed the Land of Israel after the Phoenician enemies of the Jewish Nation, the Philistines, as a way to crush the Jewish spirit of the era. The name they gave was "Syria Palaestina". This is the entire historical reason for the land ever being named Palestine.

It is not official US foreign policy, as Secretary of State Mike Pompeo recently, at the direction of President Donald Trump, looked into the matter. The decision was made that Jewish cities and neighborhoods in Judea and Samaria are not "per-se illegal under international law". Foreign policy is a power reserved for the Executive Branch, and as such, the House of Representatives should not be signaling to our enemies that we have dual foreign policies with regard to Israel and its borders.

In expansion of the above-mentioned directive, the reasons that Israel sovereignty in Judea and Samaria is not illegal under international law is because in any territorial dispute, land reverts to its original occupants. Before Israel, Transjordan illegally occupied the region after rejecting the initial "Two-State Solution". In 1967, Israel won back its territory in a defensive war, and started moving its citizens back into what was historically part of the State of Israel according to the United Nations binding vote. Before the



Transjordanians illegally occupied that land, it was under the control of England, who had no legal claim to the land, and in fact were only given the mandate to oversee the region until the completion of the partition. Their mandate was given in 1917, after the Ottoman Empire lost World War I, and as a result, relinquished the area they controlled since 1517. For four hundred years the Ottoman Empire never claimed the land to be anything of importance to their kingdom or to their Muslim faith.

The same goes for those who occupied the land before the Ottomans. From the Mamluks dating back to the Roman Empire, the land was left desolate. One of the few times you see a historic connection to Judea and Samaria is during the crusades, but it is our opinion that Europeans from France, England, and Germany have no historic right or claim to Judea and Samaria.

It is undisputed that the Jewish people were expelled from their homeland in the year 136 by the Romans. The Jewish people never relinquished the desire to return to their historic homeland, thus have retained their right to that land ever since. It is an undisputed fact that Jewish people, though in small groups, have remained in Judea and Samaria throughout the millennia, up until the Jordanian expulsion in 1948.

### Due to these factors we believe that US House Resolution is flawed and should be given a NO vote.

It states that "the United States has long sought a just, stable, and lasting solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict that recognizes the Palestinian right to self-determination and offers Israel long-term security and full normalization with its neighbors", yet ignores the fact that the Palestinian Authority rejected Israel's multiple attempts at peace, where it had offered to give up over 90% of Judea and Samaria. It does not acknowledge the reality that when Israel left the Gaza Strip, all they received in return is its citizens living under the constant threat of rocket fire, kite bombs, and terror tunnels.

It states as fact that for more than "20 years, Presidents of the United States from both political parties and Israeli Prime Ministers have supported reaching a two-state solution that establishes a Palestinian state coexisting side by side with Israel in peace and security" and "have opposed settlement expansion, moves toward unilateral annexation of territory, and efforts to achieve Palestinian statehood status outside the framework of negotiations with Israel", yet ignores the fact that there were many prime ministers who disagreed, and that we are technically, with regards to the legality of the settlements, only talking about 2 presidents. Only Presidents Carter and Obama believed them to be illegal.

It states that "United States administrations from both political parties have put forward proposals to provide a framework for negotiations toward a two-state solution, including the parameters put forward by President Bill Clinton in December 2000, the Road Map proposed by President George W. Bush in April 2003, and the principles set forth by President Barack Obama and Secretary of State John Kerry in December 2016". We are not sure why John Kerry is being mentioned, though the *current* Secretary of State, Mike Pompeo, has come to a different conclusion after looking into the actual international laws at the behest of



the *current* President of the United States, Donald Trump. This begs the question: why the one person seemingly missing is the *only* one to whom foreign policy rests under the laws of our Constitutional Republic, the *current* president?

It states that "ending the Israeli-Palestinian conflict is vital to the interests of both parties and the leadership of both parties must negotiate in good faith in order to achieve peace" and that neighborhoods and cities in Judea and Samaria "delays to a political solution to the conflict between Israelis and Palestinians [and] pose a threat to the ability to maintain a Jewish and democratic state of Israel and the establishment of a viable, democratic Palestinian state". It is our opinion that such language is both hyperbolic and reeks of patronization to the rights of Jewish self-determination. We believe those whose children need to run to bomb shelters while attending playgroup and nursery have more of a vital interest in achieving peace than those sitting comfortably in the United States.

It goes on to resolve that "only the outcome of a two-state solution that enhances stability and security for Israel, Palestinians, and their neighbors can both ensure the state of Israel's survival as a Jewish and democratic state and fulfill the legitimate aspirations of the Palestinian people for a state of their own", once again ignoring the record of the Palestinian Authority and the Arab population being offered land for peace, while also ignoring that in Gaza the Palestinian Authority was provided full autonomy, yet nonetheless have done nothing but create a terror state and educate their young to hate and kill Jews.

It also resolves that "while the United States remains indispensable to any viable effort to achieve that goal, only the Israelis and the Palestinians can make the difficult choices necessary to end their conflict" which calls into question the entire notion of this Resolution, as it is pushing a goal that is clearly no longer supported by a vast majority of Israelis, that of the supposed "Two-State Solution".

It continues, after stating previously that "only the Israelis and the Palestinians can make the difficult choices" that "the United States, with the support of regional and international partners, can play a constructive role toward ending the Israeli-Palestinian conflict by putting forward a proposal for achieving a two-state solution that is consistent with previous United States proposals to resolve the conflict's final status issues in ways that recognize the Palestinian right to self-determination and enhance Israel's long-term security and normalization with its neighbors" which again negates that only the Israelis and Arabs can make these decisions. This comes after ignoring the fact that only **AFTER** the US Embassy was moved to Jerusalem, and only **AFTER** the Golan Heights was recognized by the United States as sovereign territory of Israel, did we start to see actual normalization between Israel and its neighbors, specifically on combating the Iranian threat. We also agree with Secretary Pompeo that recognizing the communities in Judea and Samaria as not being illegal "creates the political space for a more likely resolution" to the issues at hand.

For all these reasons we disagree with the final statement of resolve, that "a United States proposal to achieve a just, stable, and lasting solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict should expressly endorse a two-state solution as its objective and discourage steps by either side that would put a peaceful end to the



conflict further out of reach, including unilateral annexation of territory or efforts to achieve Palestinian statehood status outside the framework of negotiations with Israel" because it is our belief that as the current president is from the Republican Party, he should follow that which the party voted for in their platform. The Republican Party Platform states "We reject the false notion that Israel is an occupier". As such, if it is not an occupier, Israel can build and locate its citizens anywhere it deems fit, as any country would, and Israel is doing. We recognize that this is the position of the current White House and applaud their courage and determination to seek justice, dignity, and freedom for all people of the region, as this is in line with international law.

The platform also states that "[t]he United States seeks to assist in the establishment of comprehensive and lasting peace in the Middle East, to be negotiated among those living in the region. We oppose any measures intended to impose an agreement or to dictate borders or other terms, and we call for the immediate termination of all U.S. funding of any entity that attempts to do so." The spirit of the Resolution is completely contrary to the platform.

Due to these arguments, we believe that no member of the House of Representatives, especially those in the Republican Party, should vote for H. Res. 326.

Sincerely,

Nachman Mostofsky Executive Director

## We sign on in agreement,

Rabbi Pesach Lerner President *Coalition for Jewish Values* 

Sara Stern Founder & President Endowment for Middle East Truth (EMET)

John Lindberg Executive Director Memphis Friends of Israel

Rabbi Dr. Joseph Frager Founder & Chairman

Rabbi Yechezkel Moskowitz President

Laurie Cardoza Moore President Proclaiming Justice to the Nations

Rabbi Mendy Mirocznik Executive Vice President Rabbinical Alliance of America

Robert Mawire President WRNO Worldwide Radio Rabbi Yitzchok Tendler Founder & Director Young Jewish Conservatives

Morton Klein National President Zionist Organization of America