

The American position on the city of Jerusalem under President Donald Trump and its implications on the future of the Palestinian cause

Osama M. Abu Nahel

Professor of Modern and Contemporary History

Department of History, Faculty of Arts and Human Sciences

Al Azhar University – Gaza (Palestine)

osamabunahel@hotmail.com

osamabunahel@gmail.com

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0154-7908>

2019

Abstract

Jerusalem is the center of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict, and any change in its political status or demographic structure will ignite the Middle East in the near future in a religious war that will not last. Hence, the American position in the city of Jerusalem since the emergence of the Palestinian issue has played an important role in the international policy towards this holy city. This situation was accompanied by malicious policies that encouraged the Israeli government to take a decision in 1980 to consider Jerusalem as the unified capital of (Israel).

But the decision taken by the current US president Donald Trump in the autumn of 2017 to transfer the US Embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem, and recognize the city as the unified capital of Israel is dangerous, as it will have serious implications for the future of the Palestinian cause with all its files.

Keywords: Donald Trump, the American position, Jerusalem, The Palestinian Cause, Palestinian-Israeli conflict

Introduction

The United States may not have been the first Western country to take care of the establishment of a Jewish homeland in Palestine, preceded by Britain, which undertook to establish this homeland for the Jews; and since the mid-nineteenth century, it has protected Jews in Palestine. Then successive US administrations found their chance to race in this regard to serve the Zionist project; The President of the United States Harry Truman, was one of the most important American presidents who served this project at the end of the Second World War. His administration did all it could to pass UN Resolution (181), Issued by the United Nations General Assembly in 1947, which led to the partition of Palestine into two States, one Arab and one Jewish.

When the Zionist gangs occupied about 78% of Mandatory Palestine, including the western part of Jerusalem during the Palestine War in 1948, the United States did not oppose the annexation of this part of the city of Jerusalem to the State of Israel. But after the occupation of the rest of Mandatory Palestine, including the eastern part of the city of Jerusalem in 1967, the United States refused to officially recognize the annexation of this eastern part of the city to the western part of the city, and to consider it as its unified capital.

However, successive US administrations have colluded with the Israeli project until the US Congress passed a resolution under President Bill Clinton in 1995 to transfer the US Embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem, but some presidents preferred to take a decision to postpone the transfer Embassy every six months. With President Donald Trump took over power in the White House on December 6, 2017, a formal decision was taken to transfer the US Embassy to Jerusalem, and recognize the city as the unified capital of the State of Israel, leading to a wave of reactions On this resolution, because of its negative effects on the overall files of the Palestinian cause.

The importance of study

The importance of the study stems from the seriousness of the American decision taken by President Trump to transfer the American Embassy to Jerusalem and to recognize the city as the unified capital of the State of Israel. This decision is of direct danger to the fate of the Palestinian cause. This decision will be followed by the dissolution of this issue, the liquidation of other files of files and the most important issue of the fate of Palestinian refugees.

Therefore, the study in our hands will serve Palestinian and Arab decision-makers to avoid the dangers of the American decision. It will also serve researchers in the fields of political science and international relations to conduct future studies on this important and sensitive issue for all Arabs.

Problem of the study

As we know, there are several studies that dealt with the issue of President Trump's decision to transfer the US Embassy to Jerusalem and to recognize it as the capital of the State of Israel, but these studies were just articles published on the websites. Therefore, we decided to address this resolution and its impact on the Palestinian cause.

The problem of the study is centered on a main question: What are the implications of the American position on the issue of Jerusalem under President Donald Trump on the future of the Palestinian cause?

Objectives of the study

The study sought to achieve the following objectives:

1. Statement of the American position on the city of Jerusalem after 1948.
2. Stand on the American position from the city of Jerusalem between 1967-1979.
3. Clarifying the beginning of the change of the American position from the city of Jerusalem between 1980-1994.
4. The reasons of the qualitative coup in the American position from the city of Jerusalem between 1995-2016.
5. Statement of the transformation of the American position from the city of Jerusalem under President Donald Trump and his background.
6. Address the reactions to the decision of President Trump.
7. Stand on the implications of the decision of President Trump on the future of the Palestinian cause.

Methodology of the study

The study was based on three main approaches:

- Analytical Descriptive Methodology to interpret and analyze the information related to the American position in the city of Jerusalem and its importance and scientific value.
- The theory of decision-making through a statement of the mechanism followed by successive US administrations to implement the decision to transfer the US Embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem.
- The prospective approach in order to show the future of the Palestinian issue in light of the American recognition of the Israeli city of Jerusalem.

First: the American position on the city of Jerusalem after 1948

The American President Harry Truman (1945-1953) did everything in his power to serve the Zionist project, considering that the next Jewish state would be anti-Soviet in the Middle East and a guardian of the interests of the United States in that region (Polk, 1978: 363). In his reign also became the goal of Zionism is clear and unequivocal, Not limited to the abolition of the White Paper and the promotion of immigration to Palestine but the establishment of the Jewish state. (Tahboub, 1994: 34)

The United States' blatant intervention in the UN General Assembly resolution (181) on 1947 on the partition of Palestine into two states, one Arab and one Jewish, by pressing some countries that were opposed to the issuance of this resolution through economic blackmail, to stop financial aid to it in order to influence their positions, Which it succeeded in. At the time, it was one of the first countries to recognize the State of Israel immediately after the declaration of its establishment in mid-1948. (Marlow, 1959: 244-245; Smith, 1992: 138)

After the occupation of the Zionist gangs for 78% of the land of Mandatory Palestine, and the occupation of the western part of the city of Jerusalem was divided into two parts of the city, where the Zionist gangs took control of the western section, and took over all the Arab neighborhoods located in which were then numbered 12 neighborhoods, and cleared Of its Arab population (Dweik, 2002: 17). Subsequently, on 24 April 1950, Jordan announced the annexation of the West Bank, including the eastern part of Jerusalem, to the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan.

As noted above, the United States made a significant contribution to the adoption of a resolution by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 29 November 1947, the so-called "Future Government of Palestine". It voted in favor of the resolution establishing the city of Jerusalem as a separate entity under a special international regime overseen by the United Nations through its Trusteeship Council. But the development of the events of 1948, and the resulting occupation of the Zionist gangs for a large part of the territory of Mandatory Palestine, and the occupation of the western part of the city of Jerusalem has imposed a new reality on the city, and led to a new direction of the United States towards the Palestinian issue in general, and the city of Jerusalem in particular, Where the United States voted in favor of General Assembly Resolution (194) on 11 December 1948, calling for the unity and internationalization of the city and the formation of the International Conciliation Commission. As a member of the International Conciliation Commission in September 1949, the United States proposed a joint Arab-Israeli council for the administration of the city and the appointment of a United Nations commissioner for the administration of holy sites. (Saad, 1995: 149)

Thus, we note here the decline of the American position on the idea of internationalization of the city, and the call to keep it united, and the internationalization of the holy places only, On 9 December 1949, it voted against General Assembly Resolution (303,) which affirmed the status of Jerusalem under a permanent international system. And reaffirming the partition resolution (181) on the establishment of a separate entity for Jerusalem under special international rule administered by the United Nations. In the meantime, Israel was moving its institutions to the western part of the city of Jerusalem, meaning implicit approval by the US administration. (Al-Shanti, April-June 1997: 170)

After the United States voted on the partition resolution in 1947, it called for maintaining the status quo in the city of Jerusalem, applying the special status of the city under the partition resolution, and protecting the holy sites based on mutual acceptance between Jordan and Israel. The United States refused to recognize Israeli or Jordanian sovereignty over Jerusalem,

did not favor the transfer of official Israeli headquarters to it, and refrained from transferring the US embassy to Jerusalem. (Ayoub, Dec. 2017: 12)

It can be said that the American political support for Israel in this period was manifested in many areas, and the most prominent manifestations: ([The United States of America's Position](#), 19/12/2017: Net)

1. Maintaining the status quo in Palestine and securing the armistice lines within the city of Jerusalem are the focus of US policy toward the city until the completion of its occupation -later in 1967.
2. Focus on the issue of refugees, and the decline of US interest in Jerusalem
3. Issued a statement tripartite: American / British / French in 1950, which pledged to ensure the security of Israel, and to protect against any threat to it, and the seriousness of this statement that it came after the occupation Israel for the western part of Jerusalem.
4. A protest by the US State Department led by Minister John Foster Dulles in 1953 over Israel's decision to relocate its foreign ministry from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem for reasons of US foreign concern that would enable the Soviet Union to Luring some influential Arab countries such as Egypt to its areas of influence.
5. The United States abstained from recognizing Jerusalem as the capital of Israel. However, that position does not mean approaching the Arabs or supporting their right; the American administration has remained faithful to its commitments to Israel and is more inclined and biased towards it. There has also been no pressure on countries that have recognized Jerusalem as the capital of Israel to discourage it.
6. The United States is keen to ensure that the decisions of the United Nations concerning Jerusalem are consistent with its policy of advocacy and respect for its vital interests in the Arab region and the Middle East, including Israel.

Thus, after the end of the Palestine War in 1948, the Zionist gangs were able to seize the western part of the city of Jerusalem. The United States did not object to that event; it even followed the Israeli plans towards that part later, until 1967, when Israel occupied the eastern part of City.

Second: the American position on the city of Jerusalem between 1967-1979

After the occupation of the eastern part of the city during the 1967 war, the United States did not take a stand in favor of annexing that part of the western part of Jerusalem and considering united Jerusalem as the capital of the State of Israel; it considered it part of the occupied territories. After this year, it continued to support the idea of internationalizing Jerusalem and declared its opposition to any unilateral action in the city. It did not recognize Israeli measures aimed at changing the status quo in Jerusalem, including the decision to apply Israeli law to the eastern part of Jerusalem, and to expand the city's borders. In the beginning of July 1969, the United States representative to the United Nations, Charles Yust, declared that his country considered the eastern part of Jerusalem an occupied territory. (Ayoub, Dec. 2017: 13)

However, the repercussions of the 1967 war were very serious; they were even more dangerous than the repercussions of the Palestine war because they established the Israeli presence in Palestine and some other Arab regions. This prompted the Arabs to accept the status quo in 1967 and to merely remove the effects of the 1967 aggression, the withdrawal of Israel only from the territories it occupied that year, during the Arab summit in Khartoum two months after the same year. With the issuance of international resolution no. (424) in the same year, and the acceptance of the Arabs by the Arabs no longer care much about the Palestinian issue in general, and the issue of Jerusalem in particular.

The policy of US President Lyndon Johnson (1963-1969) towards Jerusalem can not be seen, apart from the political principles that governed his foreign policy toward the Arab region, the Israeli-Arab conflict and their impact on the policy of polarization. At this stage, the United States returned to the issue of Jerusalem, which constituted a fundamental shift in its policy in favor of Israel. It focused on the eastern part of Jerusalem after Israel completed its control of both parts of the city. This interest was demonstrated by: ([The United States of America's Position](#), 19/12/2017: Net)

1. The new direction of US policy towards Jerusalem, through more than a statement to President Johnson. In a June 19, 1967 speech, he stated: "There must be sufficient recognition of the three special interests in the holy places".
2. The danger at this stage is that the administration of President Johnson did not consider the issue of Jerusalem as a political issue; it is merely a religious issue centered on the holy sites in Jerusalem, and the granting of free access to all the followers of the three divine messages. Which President Johnson is referring to in the eastern part of Jerusalem, we quickly realized that the eastern part of Jerusalem would only be the subject of negotiations between the parties to the conflict. As for the western section, it is certain that the United States is moving towards recognition of the de facto policy.
3. It did not stop at the end of negotiations to swallow Israel's western section of the city. President Johnson took his subsequent remarks as a sign of US willingness to accept Israel's annexation of the two parts of the city and to declare it a united capital for Israel. , After which the administrative procedure does not change the illegality of the occupation of the territory of others by force.
4. The United States Administration and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs decided to abstain in favor of General Assembly resolutions (2253) on 4 July 1967 and (2254) on 14 July 1967, which stipulated that Israel should abolish its Judaization procedures Of Jerusalem, and its ineffectiveness on the status of the city.
5. It can be said that the American position on Jerusalem under President Johnson was centered on two main goals: the maintenance of unified Jerusalem and the Arab side's illusion that Israel's actions, both legislative and practical, are no more than temporary administrative procedures, Legal Center for Jerusalem.

In the era of US President Jimmy Carter (1977-1980), the United States maintained its position on the city of Jerusalem; in September 1978: President Carter confirmed that the United States still considers Jerusalem occupied. But these statements were limited to the formal character, without taking any practical steps to show a serious will to deter Israeli practices. ([Ayoub](#), Dec. 2017: 13)

This is illustrated by the question posed by Senator Paul Sarbanes to US Secretary of State Cyrus Vance before the US Senate Committee: "Is our government's current position of East Jerusalem an occupied territory?" "Yes, this is our position." But as the end of the Carter administration approaches, American policy toward Jerusalem has shifted to a similar position to that of Israel, where Washington has focused on keeping the city of Jerusalem united without division. Carter on March 3, 1980, saying: "As for Jerusalem, we firmly believe that Jerusalem must remain united with free access to the holy sites of all religions, and that the status of Jerusalem must be determined through negotiations for a lasting and comprehensive peace". ([Report on Israeli Settlement in the occupied territories](#), Feb. 1994: 6)

It seems that this developed position was based on the weakness of the Arab position in that period, especially after the Arab necklace was broken into direct negotiations with Israel. The latter was able to avoid the Jerusalem issue from the discussions and negotiations at Camp David between Israel and Egypt.

Third: The beginning of the change of the American position from the city of Jerusalem between 1980-1994

In 1980, Israel made a decisive decision to have unified Jerusalem as its capital, exploiting Egypt's final exit from the Arab solidarity equation after signing the Camp David Accords with Israel in 1978 and then signing the 1979 Egyptian-Israeli peace treaty. The Israeli decision through Security Council resolution (478), considering the eastern part of the city of Jerusalem as occupied territory, and the United States could not at that time depart from the international consensus. Later as a result of the growing Arab weakness with the decline of the importance of the Palestinian cause and the issue of Jerusalem in the Arab world, successive American administrations began to gradually disavow the issue of the eastern part of Jerusalem as occupied territory and were consistent with Israeli claims that unified Jerusalem was the capital of Israel. ([Abu Nahel](#), Feb. 2017: 2-3)

The Security Council appealed to all States Members of the United Nations to support resolution (478), and called upon States with diplomatic missions in Jerusalem to withdraw them, which led all States with diplomatic missions in the city to withdraw them ([Ayoub](#), Dec. 2017: 12). Until 2006, Costa Rica and El Salvador were the last two to move their embassy from Jerusalem to Tel Aviv. ([Trump's Recognition of Jerusalem as Israel's Capital: Background and Ramifications](#), 25/12/2017: Net)

In the era of President Ronald Reagan (1981-1988), American policy toward Jerusalem was based on two principles: the continued existence of Jerusalem and the determination of its future in final status negotiations, in the sense of postponing it to negotiations for the final settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict, This principle is one of the constants of American policy toward Jerusalem, and the goal is to enable Israel to devote one unified and eternal capital to it. ([The United States of America's Position](#), 19/12/2017: Net)

In 1990, President George Bush on several occasions issued contradictory statements, including: the status of the Jewish neighborhoods in the eastern part of Jerusalem as the status of settlements in the occupied territories, the need for Jerusalem to remain a united city, and the refusal to return to the status quo Prior to 1967, the final status of Jerusalem through negotiations between the parties, the opposition of the US administration to apply Israeli law to the eastern part of Jerusalem to annex it, and to consider Israeli settlements as an essential obstacle to peace. The United States understands the importance of Jerusalem for the Palestinians. ([Ayoub](#), Dec. 2017: 14)

On March 31, 1990, President Bush sent a letter to the mayor of Jerusalem, Ted Kollek, in which he said: "Jerusalem should not be divided again, as was the policy of the United States that is my policy" ([Al-Asadi](#), July 1995: 158). This came after US Senator Daniel Patrick Moihan and a number of senators stepped up a draft resolution calling on the US Congress to recognize Jerusalem as the capital of Israel. On March 22, the US Senate passed a resolution stipulating that Jerusalem should remain the united capital of Israel, while preserving the rights of others. Two days later, the US Congress passed a similar resolution. ([Abdullah](#), August 1990: 91)

President Bush then reiterated his position on the future status of Jerusalem when he declared again on August 11, 1992 "Let me say: Jerusalem remains unchanged, it must never be divided, and its final status should be determined by negotiations" He said. ([Report on Israeli Settlement in the occupied territories](#), Feb. 1994: 6)

Fourth: the qualitative coup in the American position of the city of Jerusalem between 1995-2016

During his election campaigns in 1992, President Bill Clinton (1993-2002) promised that Jerusalem is still the capital of Israel, and it will remain united forever and open to all", as well as to President George W. Bush. (2002-2008), who announced when he assumed the presidency it will begin the process of transferring the US Embassy to Jerusalem because it is the capital of Israel the President Barack Obama (2009-2016) announced in 2008 "Jerusalem will be the capital of Israel. I said this in the past and repeat it again". He confirmed on another occasion in the same year: "Jerusalem will remain the capital of Israel, and it is necessary not to divide". ([Ayoub](#), Dec. 2017: 13-14)

In 1995, the US Congress decided to move the US Embassy in Israel from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem, but since the adoption of this resolution, successive US presidents, from President Clinton to Presidents W. Bush and Obama, to take a decision to postpone the transfer of the US embassy to Jerusalem every six months. The American administrations have been Argument the postponement decision to protect US national security interests. On the one hand, it has wanted to maintain a balanced tactic in the strained and fragile relations between Palestinians and Israelis. (Rica and El Salvador were the last two to move their embassy from Jerusalem to Tel Aviv. ([Trump's Recognition of Jerusalem as Israel's Capital](#), 25/12/2017: Net)

Fifth: The American position on the city of Jerusalem under President Donald Trump and his background

US policy toward Jerusalem under President Donald Trump (2017-present) has become apparent and bolder. One year before Trump came to power in the White House, on December 6, 2017, he said, "The administration recognizes that Jerusalem is the capital of the State of Israel". He also announced that he had given his administration instructions to begin preparing for the transfer of his country's embassy to the city of Jerusalem, but at the same time signed a decree to postpone the transfer of the embassy six months. Trump boasted of the irony and cynicism that he had kept his promise during his election campaign, While the other presidents who had preceded him had promised but did not have the courage to carry out what they had promised. ([Trump's recognition of Jerusalem as the capital of Israel](#), 6/12/2017: Net; [Defiant Donald Trump confirms US will recognise Jerusalem as capital of Israel](#), 7/12/2017: Net)

President Trump said that recognition of the role of Jerusalem in the State of Israel would have a positive impact on the negotiations and said that this is a long-awaited step to advance the peace process and work towards reaching a permanent agreement. But he did not say how the negotiations would help In a confrontation the angry reaction of the Palestinians and their supporters. ([Defiant Donald Trump confirms US will recognise Jerusalem as capital of Israel](#), 7/12/2017: Net)

However, President Trump's step to recognize Jerusalem as the united and eternal capital of the State of Israel contradicted the decision of the United States representative of 1967, which recognized that the West Bank, including the eastern part of Jerusalem and the Gaza Strip, was occupied territory and contradicted General Assembly resolution (181), which placed holy sites under international trusteeship, and is contrary to UN Resolution (242), which considered the West Bank, including the eastern part of Jerusalem and the Gaza Strip, as occupied territory. ([The United States of America's Position](#), 19/12/2017: Net)

However, President Trump in his support for Jerusalem as the capital of Israel did not explicitly support this idea, but he did not reject it, nor did he say: Jerusalem must become the future Palestinian capital. This means that the United States is increasingly supporting the Israeli position - full annexation - although this certainly would kill any applicable peace agreement. ([Fisher](#), 9/12/2017: Net)

A. The context of President Trump's decision

Trump's step to take this decision has been expected since he won the presidential election at the end of 2016. His election program included a basic promise to transfer the US Embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem if he arrived at the White House. In June 2017, President Trump, like his predecessors, postponed the process of transferring the embassy for six months, but as soon as the six-month deadline expired, Months, instead of renewing, he decided to fulfill his promise and already took the decision to transfer the embassy.

A combination of complex factors has played an important role in President Trump's decision, whether at the domestic level or at the external level:

1. At the American internal level

For decades, the United States has established itself as a major intermediary between Israelis and Palestinians. This neutrality ostensibly allowed it to remain a reliable provision, keeping both sides at the negotiating table. American diplomats tend to view neutrality as a fundamental and necessary principle of peace, and see President Trump's announcement of the transfer of the US embassy to Jerusalem as a worrying break, but this policy of neutrality has become controversial in US politics since the 1980s with the rise of the Evangelical Christian right as a political force. The pro-Israeli positions - strongly supportive of Israeli control of Jerusalem - have roots in millennial theology, as well as more visible identity policies. However, there are a number of Palestinians themselves Christians and Christian leaders of Jerusalem have objected to President Trump's decision.

The evangelical Christians joined a subset of American Jews and other right-wing politicians in saying that the United States should publicly support Israel in the conflict. This situation was reinforced during the second Palestinian intifada, a period of brutal Israeli-Palestinian conflict in the early 1990s. This debate was often about Jerusalem; therefore, the presidential candidates were promising to transfer the US Embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem and thus recognize the city as the capital of Israel. But as soon as the new president took office, he was trying to thwart this step. Give a chance to peace, but Trump has already implicitly supported the transformation of the United States from a neutral to a public bias to Israel. (Fisher, 9/12/2017: Net; [Trump's Recognition of Jerusalem as Israel's Capital](#), 25/12/2017: Net)

But was the United States neutral? Many in the world have considered the United States to be a biased and unhelpful party to the peace process and to promote Israeli interests in a way that perpetuates the conflict because of the imbalance of power between Israelis and Palestinians, and because the Israelis are much stronger and the United States is a sponsor of the conflict, Right or wrong - responsible for this defect. Partly because of the domestic policies that prompted American leaders to express themselves as superiors for Israel, they tried to pursue tactical policies aimed at neutrality. The last three administrations (Clinton, Bush, and Obama) thought they needed concessions to make Israeli leaders feel safe and comfortable enough to make concessions for peace. Therefore, President Trump's step, though not described in this way, can be consistent with the previous US strategy and seen abroad as confirming the long-standing doubts about the US leadership, not as entirely new. (Fisher, 9/12/2017: Net)

The American and Israeli supporters say the US embassy is transferring forward: there is no urgent need for US national security that requires such a concession. The US diplomatic representation in Israel must be at the seat of government in the country (in the western part of Jerusalem), especially as the ambassador and the embassy staff often do their jobs there; they also argue that the United States recognizes almost universally any capital it chooses And Israel must not be an exception. In addition, the diplomatic implications of such a step

could be contained by locating the embassy in the western section of Jerusalem that is supposed to remain part of Israel under any reasonable negotiated settlement. Therefore, the transfer of the embassy should not preclude the establishment of two states. A solution to a Palestinian capital in the eastern part of the city of Jerusalem, which the Palestinians insisted on.

Such arguments are accepted by the two main parties in the United States, Martin Indyk and Daniel Shapiro, both of whom served as US ambassador to Israel under democratic administrations, say that moving the US embassy could move the peace process forward. If coupled with the recognition of Palestinian claims to the eastern half of the city. ([What's At Stake with the U.S. Recognition of Jerusalem](#), 6/12/2017: Net)

And internally as well, investigations into the Russian intervention in the US elections are slowly approaching the Trump crew and some members of his administration. Former national security adviser Trump, Michael Flynn, was indicted for making a statement to the FBI on Russia's intervention in the presidential elections held at the end of 2016. Investigations could also include his brother-in-law Joucher Kouchner, who is close to Israel and some of his administration, which means that Trump is in an increasingly fragile internal situation. He may want to distance the suspicions from him or at least postpone the debate around them, under these circumstances: Trump most likely seeks to accumulate support from influential Zionist lobbies in Washington. Another factor is Trump's desire to satisfy the Republican Party's support for the transfer of the embassy, especially the conservatives and evangelicals, as well as the figures it has financially, politically and media supported to reach the White House. For example, billionaire Sheldon Adelson donated \$ 20 million to a political committee in favor of President Trump, if the United States recognizes Jerusalem as the capital of Israel; thus, Trump's position on the relocation of the embassy. His popularity among these circles. ([Trump's Recognition of Jerusalem as Israel's Capital](#), 25/12/2017: Net)

2. on the external level

Not only did the internal situation in the United States define the Trump option, but also the current Arab and regional situation, which continues to suffer from civil strife and wars, and a collapse in national states. The GCC, which for a long time maintained a relatively stable political and economic situation, especially after the siege of Qatar in mid-2017 by Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates, Bahrain and Egypt. Under these conditions, Trump and his administration have been absorbing the anger of its major allies from the Arab regimes, especially Egypt and Saudi Arabia, who need American support amidst internal tensions. While Saudi Crown Prince Muhammad bin Salman needs US support to contain his internal opponents and inaugurate his leadership in Saudi Arabia, Egyptian President Abdul Fattah al-Sisi would like to renew his legitimacy and leadership in 2018 by winning a second term. Thus, the challenge of the Trump decision does not appear it is among the papers that these systems can loom.

It is not only trouble and disruption of the Arab reality; it extends to the regional powers, namely Turkey and Iran, reducing their options in dealing with the Trump decision. Iran is preoccupied with the Syrian crisis alongside the forces of the Syrian regime and suffers from a fragile negotiating position with regard to its nuclear program agreement with the US administration that Trump threatened to cancel. This was actually done later in 2018, which is supported by Saudi Arabia and the UAE. Turkey is also not at its best; it suffers from many internal troubles, the most important of which is the Kurds' aspirations to create an independent state on its southern border (Kurdistan), which could strengthen Kurdish separatist forces in southeastern Turkey. ([Trump's Recognition of Jerusalem as Israel's Capital](#), 25/12/2017: Net)

But what about this long-term US change? The warnings tend to long-term shift to rely on the idea that the loss of American neutrality means the loss of American influence on Israelis and Palestinians to achieve peace, but the fact that American power is firmly established makes the United States an indispensable neutral intermediary. American influence with Israel also comes from securing Israel's security absolutely and providing it with a lot of military equipment. However, because Israel got something for nothing from President Trump's announcement, it has no good reason to make difficult concessions. US influence on Palestinian leaders is also important, because these leaders rely mainly on US support to keep their administration financed and stable. But these leaders are not very popular among their people. The real risk here is that one-day people will become increasingly popular with them so that their administration collapses. This will risk chaos and violence in the short term. In the end, Hamas is likely to control what is in the hands of the Palestinian Authority.

All this points to a future in which a solution to the peace process and the establishment of a Palestinian state are less likely. One day Israel will have to choose between the two main components of its national identity: Jewish and democratic, or it will assert its permanent control of the Palestinians without granting them full rights, A kind of state that critics sometimes compare to apartheid South Africa, or give Palestinians full rights, to establish long-term pluralistic democracy that is not officially Jewish. President Trump's announcement is likely to make Israelis and Palestinians closer to that future, and things may already be moving in that direction. (Fisher, 9/12/2017: Net)

So, President Trump who pledged in his presidential campaign to transfer the US Embassy to Jerusalem if he won the election more bold than his predecessors, arrived at a dangerous precedent that had not happened before not only by taking the decision to transfer his embassy to Jerusalem; The capital of Israel, some called to consider the decision of President Trump as a new Balfour Declaration.

But President Trump's decision has no similarity to the Balfour Declaration of about 100 years ago in 1917. If we analyze the Balfour Declaration politically, we have carried it above what is likely; the Balfour Declaration guarantees the wish of His Majesty's Government that the Jews - the future - a national homeland in Palestine, and that this government will work to help them to achieve this goal. But the statement did not talk about the nature of this homeland, nor the mechanism of its establishment and did not explicitly mention the need for a state for the Jews in Palestine. There is a fundamental and legal difference between the two terms: the national homeland and the state; the first is that people are allowed to reside there without the right to possess power, while the other is a land, a people and an absolute sovereignty. And most importantly, if Britain had made the Balfour Declaration binding force in its Palestine Mandate of 1922, what did the Arabs in general, and the Palestinians in particular, have offered to counter it? Definitely nothing.

The decision of President Trump is a clear and binding decision of his government towards Israel regardless of the date of its actual implementation on the ground. Overall, the danger of this decision comes in the shadow of a suspicious Palestinian, Arab and Muslim silence, except for some criticism of the media, and the use of terms such as condemnation that will change nothing from reality.

On the background of President Trump's decision, the decision to recognize Jerusalem as the capital of Israel began with two basic dimensions. First, after institutionalization, American institutions adopted this decision gradually, starting with the agreement to buy the embassy land in 1989, The American Senate in 1995, allowing the US president to postpone it on the basis of considerations of his executive powers, and to try to strengthen it by implementing the punitive measures stipulated by the law to reduce the budget allocated to US embassies across the world by half if the transfer is not implemented by 31 May 1999. Beginning with

the President Clinton And through President Bush, Obama and even President Trump, the transfer of the US Embassy to Jerusalem was a permanent election promise, used to bring the voices of American Jews and the voices of Christian evangelicals and extremists who are interested in this matter, but among all of them was It is Trump who effectively implements this law. (Abhays, 2018: 8)

The second is that President Trump is a Republican who came from outside the sources of the usual American political elite. He comes from two cross-cutting worlds: the world of economics, specifically the real estate market, the media world and in particular the reality television programs, which enabled him to present a populist speech aimed primarily at the white, Saxon Protestants, or what is known as WASP. Perhaps his coming after two periods of a black president helped him to provoke everything in this human component from a knots to strangers and others, and enabled him to attract the voices of his most extreme sectors, led by the evangelical voters, who voted for 80% of them. At the same time, this background has created the antagonism of Trump by the usual political elites who come from law and political science graduates who enter political work as senators, senators, or governors, or begin as part of the bureaucracy of the state's policymaking industry before they run for office. To the position of the presidency, and these elite along with the military elite is the one that forms the deep American state or the so-called institution.

Another consideration was the decision to recognize Jerusalem as the capital of Israel that was outside of the United States. The regional reality and the resulting erosion and destruction of the Arab official regime, and the redrawing of doctrines of sectarianism, seemed an opportunity that had not been seen for 100 years Year period of conflict over Jerusalem, and try to assess the weight of each of these considerations in decision-making; the personal consideration of President Trump seems to be the most important, followed by the regional historical opportunity, and third is the direction of the American institution. (Abhays, 2018: 8-9)

Whatever the case, Washington quickly promised to transfer the US Embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem and made it a reality on May 14, 2018, during a large ceremony prepared for the occasion, attended by many ambassadors of foreign countries in Israel. (What does it mean to transfer the US Embassy to Jerusalem, 14/5/2018: Net)

The Trump decision seems to ignore the fragility of coexistence in the eastern part of Jerusalem between its Israeli and Palestinian populations ignores the importance of Jerusalem in the Palestinian national identity and national aspirations, and the devastating impact on the future of the already moribund peace process. It has the potential to affect not only the political environment of the place where history is a matter of life and death, but it can also cause far-reaching damage. It could destabilize the already de facto Palestinian Authority, as well as a host of fragile Arab regimes. The hostility between Israel and Iran is likely to increase, as Iran sees it as a "violation of Islamic sanctities," as well as a revitalized Trump alliance with Saudi Arabia, a clear sign of the US president's anti-Iranian stance. Finally, it can fuel the flames of Islamist anti-Western movements in both the Muslim world and the West, placing Jerusalem and the Palestinian cause always in a central position. (Sofos; Felci, 6/12/2017: Net)

Sixth: reactions to the decision of President Trump

A. Palestinian reaction

Experts say the Trump decision is likely to compound a broader crisis of confidence among Palestinians that President Mahmoud Abbas, who has been in office for many years after his election term, could achieve a state. Fatah and Hamas have called for a three-day protest in

response to Trump's decision. Palestinian officials say they does not intend to sponsor a third uprising, but there may be violent resistance at the grassroots level to maintain the Palestinian people's confidence in further erosion. President Abbas and the PLO have cut off security cooperation with Israel or withdrawn Palestinian recognition of Israel. "By doing so, the United States is disqualified from any role in any initiative to achieve a just and lasting peace," said Palestinian negotiator Saeb Erekat.

In the absence of negotiations, Palestinians can also seek membership in various UN agencies. US law requires Washington to cut off funding for any UN agency that recognizes the Palestinians as a full member. Thus, the United States can find itself without voice in such bodies as the League International Atomic Energy Agency or the World Trade Organization. ([What's At Stake with the U.S. Recognition of Jerusalem](#), 6/12/2017: Net)

Thus, what Fatah is undermining and the PA is in the interest of Hamas. The Palestinian street remembers that in the process of exchange for the release of the Israeli soldier Gilad Shalit in 2011, Hamas succeeded in liberating 1027 Palestinians from Israeli prisons, while the Fatah movement was able to free only 78 prisoners in the framework of peace talks with Israel in 2013-2014. The Palestinians also remember that Hamas and other resistance organizations in Gaza pushed former Israeli Prime Minister Ariel Sharon, one of the most hawkish prime ministers in Israel's history, to withdraw from the entire Gaza Strip in 2005, following a series of bombings and martyrdom attacks against Settlements in the Gaza Strip. (Miller, 12/12/2017: Net)

But with the knowledge of the Palestinian leadership in advance of the American decision, was required to respond to this resolution is no less than to finalize the agreements signed with Israel, as these agreements no longer any political or moral meaning or value, after the final elimination of the most serious issue The final solution, which will certainly be followed by another decision to settle the Palestinian refugees in their places of residence; and thus the Palestinian cause has been completely liquidated. Even the recommendations of the PLO Central Committee on January 15, 2018, are not binding on the Executive Committee and will not be implemented. To this day in June 2019, none of these recommendations has been implemented on the ground. This confirms our convictions that the official Palestinian leadership is not ready to confront the decision of President Trump regarding the city of Jerusalem either temporarily or in the future.

While the position of the Palestinian factions as a whole was not acceptable at the minimum, as it was not very different from the official Palestinian position of condemnation of the issuance of this resolution. And we cannot find them doing a job to try to disrupt the implementation, and perhaps because the fact that these factions have become a heavy burden on the Palestinian cause with all its files. None of these factions has a real agenda to confront President Trump's decision or to face the Israeli decision to annex much of the West Bank to Israel. The truth is that we have said that these factions have reached the point of political adolescence, political and moral immorality and that they are afraid of harsh retaliation if they try to provoke a reaction contrary to the will of the dominant forces on the Palestinian scene. Thus, the Palestinian factions are no less in their political bankruptcy than the bankruptcy of the Palestinian Authority, each according to its program and ideology.

The current Palestinian position, both formal and partisan, is similar to that of the Byzantine Emperor and the Orthodox clergy on the eve of the fall of the city of Constantinople in 1453, when they engaged in a senseless argument behind it: Are they using Catholic Rome to confront the Ottoman Muslim army or not? The inevitable consequence of this controversy was the fall of their capital and the collapse of their long-standing empire. Today, the Palestinian position is not very different from the Byzantine position. The Palestinians are

preoccupied with characterizing the Palestinian national principles and legitimacy. Each Palestinian party claims to be the legitimate party without the other.

B. Arab reaction

Unfortunately, the Arab positions did not live up to the morally acceptable level. No country was able to take steps against President Trump's decision to cut ties with Washington; they even kept silent about the graves until it was said that some Arab countries had prior knowledge. With this resolution and approved it, and it seems that the reactions of some of these countries confirm what we went to. ([Abu Nahel](#), Feb. 2017: 3-5)

Analysts say that if Saudi Arabia is seen as unable to protect the interests of the Palestinians, it could benefit Iran. Iranian President Hassan Rohani said: "Muslims must unite against this big conspiracy." The public opposition to the American recognition of Jerusalem as the capital of Israel could restrict Saudi Arabia, which is quietly seeking to establish relations with Israel. The two sides have a common interest in containing Iran's regional influence. Saudi popular support for a Palestinian state has so far prevented Saudi Arabia from normalizing relations with Israel. ([What is At Stake with the U.S. Recognition of Jerusalem](#), 6/12/2017: Net)

To illustrate the weakness of the Arab position on the American decision, Kouchner, the adviser to President Trump and his close associate at the Haim Sabban Forum, named after a well-known American-Israeli billionaire for his support of Israel, said that both the Israeli and the Palestinian sides were aware of what had been done. Discussing with them, he added: You should focus on resolving the big issue. The dynamic regional movement plays a big role in what we consider opportunities, because a large number of these countries seek economic opportunities and peace for their peoples. Kouchner was referring to Saudi Arabia in particular, Saudi Crown Prince Muhammad bin Salman, with whom he has strong ties. The young crown prince is trying to carry out intellectual and economic reforms in his country and is trying to get closer to Israel in order to confront the Iranian tide in the region. The allies of Tehran are winning victories in Lebanon, Syria and Yemen, not least the killing of former Yemeni President Ali Abdullah Saleh. The group of Huthi, as was reviewed by Saad Hariri before his resignation, which he gave from Riyadh under Saudi pressure. ([Trump's recognition of Jerusalem as the capital of Israel](#), 6/12/2017: Net)

The Jordanian government described the US decision as a violation of international legitimacy, and Muhammad al-Momani, minister of state for media and government spokesperson in a statement: Jordan rejects the resolution, which he said is fueling tension. Even before the Trump decision, the step prompted condemnation from regional and global figures. King Abdullah II, who spoke in Ankara alongside Turkish President Erdogan, said: "There is no alternative to a two-state solution. The key to any peace agreement". "We reaffirm our concerns about the recognition of Jerusalem as the capital of Israel", King Abdullah said. "It is necessary to work quickly to reach a final solution and a peace agreement". He added: Any such agreement must allow an independent Palestinian state, and that ignoring Palestinian Islamic and Christian rights in the holy city can fuel terrorism. ([Smith-Spark; Carey](#), 7/12/2017: Net)

In the worst case, the Jordanian government could suffer from its large Palestinian population and its historic role in protecting Islamic sites in Jerusalem under pressure to reduce its cooperation with Israel. While most Arab states seem to have lost patience with the Palestinians and President Abbas in particular, they are also aware of the emotional power of this issue among their citizens and will be wary of appearing on the wrong side of the escalating conflict. In short, the stupid Trump decision could offer years of strenuous work to ensure Israeli and regional security. ([KUMAR](#), 17/5/2018: Net)

The fragility of the Arab official position here is visible through two parts; first, the Secretary-General of the League of Arab States claims that President Trump's decision will be a painful blow to American-Arab relations. This has not happened to a minimum to this day. On the contrary, That some Arab countries have strengthened their relations with the United States before, and increased its close alliance with them as do Saudi Arabia, Qatar, the UAE and Egypt, and the agreements signed between Riyadh and Doha specifically with Washington to conclude arms deals at high prices, the largest evidence of the development of Arab-American relations in the last Period. And some of the Gulf academics and journalists have been flirting with Israel without any ambiguity, and they would not have done so without their green light of their governments. Thus, the Arabs no longer regard Israel as their traditional enemy, and they have taken Muslim Iran as their number one enemy. The second is that the report on the future of Jerusalem is one of the topics of negotiations on a final settlement, in which we see the possibility of the Arabs abandoning the city if Israel can impose its will during the negotiations. This will certainly be the result of the imbalance of power between the Arabs and Israel in favor of the latter. ([Trump's recognition of Jerusalem as the capital of Israel](#), 6/12/2017: Net)

The above confirms to us beyond a shadow of a doubt that several Arab parties were aware of the step before President Trump, and that these Arab parties did not oppose on the ground this step, but only by opposition to the media so as not to accuse the Arab public opinion of failure and abandonment of the right fixed of Arab and Islamic rights.

And confirms what we went to the fragility of the official Arab position the Secretary-General of the League of Arab States, Ahmad Abul Gheit, criticized the intention of the United States to recognize Jerusalem as the capital of Israel, stressing that this step would be a painful blow to US-Arab relations and would undermine the confidence of the Arab parties in neutrality The American Party. Stressing that the future of the city is one of the topics of negotiations on the final settlement, and cannot be dictated by any situation or change its legal or political status in a way that prejudices the outcome of the negotiations. ([Abul-Gheit](#), 6/12/2017: Net)

Overall, the official and partisan Palestinian positions, on the one hand, and the Arab side on the other, towards President Trump's decision were not serious and reliable positions, but rather positions that are merely painkillers aimed at absorbing the anger of the peoples. Later - under de facto policy. Thus, these positions in the final analysis is nothing more than a complicity with the American decision, and not in the face of the confrontation for fear of angering the US administration, and exposure to its Indignation.

If we analyze the Palestinian position from President Trump's decision, Hani al-Masri, director of the Palestinian Center for Policy and Strategic Studies (Masarat), said that the Palestinian policy observer observes that it is suffering from improvisation and confusion and is controlled by a reaction without a forward-looking vision capable of confronting the present, And progress confidently towards the future, and this shows by adopting a policy based on two elements: stay and wait. The survival of the Palestinian Authority and the Palestinian leadership and the renewal of their legitimacy is the ultimate goal, while the waiting is the master of the situation without a real act, which explains why the policy continued to depend on the Oslo process and its commitments despite the threat of years to get out of it. ([Hani al-Masri](#), 31/1/2017: Net)

The American decision also undermined the legitimacy of the Oslo agreement after it reached its inevitable end, as a liquidation project on the Palestinian entity's dream of a functional administrative authority that runs the civilian centers on behalf of the occupation and fails to fulfill any of the promised principles and achievements. There is no state or the city of Jerusalem. The ceiling on which the Palestinian Authority has moved has been

pressure on the United States to back down from the resolution until it returns as a mediator to resume negotiations under its umbrella, while offering alternatives that would prevent the Palestinian leadership from being behind this situation if the American administration insists on its decision by talking about international mediation as an alternative American brokerage. But this proposal is not feasible because the international framework for the Palestinian cause is the international quartet, composed of the United States, the European Union, Russia and the United Nations, under a comprehensive American hegemony, and therefore: the Palestinian Authority's strategy was to remove the United States from the door and return it from the opposite door. A political maneuver that might reduce the public losses resulting from the Trump decision.

Therefore, the popular Mobility that can be allowed by the PA is the Mobility to vent public anger and the limited extortion of its partners in the settlement process in the hope of returning to it in better conditions while continuing to fulfill its security obligations and continue to strangle the Gaza Strip so as not to misunderstand its Mobility. Limited framework. ([Abhays](#), 2018: 15)

C. Israeli reaction and its gains from the resolution

Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu made the response to Trump's decision. Most of his government is silent, but its symbolic value should not be underestimated among the national circles in Israel, as well as among many ordinary Israelis. The Israeli government is active in promoting Israeli demands since the annexation of the city in 1980. The construction of settlements around Jerusalem is aimed at connecting the city and its further integration into Israel. At the same time, there were restrictions on Palestinian construction in the eastern part of Jerusalem and a series of restrictions on Palestinian access to the Al-Aqsa Mosque. ([Sofos; Felci](#), 6/12/2017: Net)

However; Israel's Prime Minister Netanyahu called on the world to follow the example of the United States in the transfer of its embassies to the city of Jerusalem, as the Israeli government announced the projects to build thousands of new housing units in the settlements, Israel will also seek to legalize some 200,000 settlers living in settlements in the eastern part of Jerusalem, although their presence is illegal under international law. It thus aims to strengthen its actions in imposing new facts to establish its sovereignty over the city, making it difficult to overcome facts on the ground in any future Mobility to reach a settlement. Israeli President Reuven Rivlin also praised "Trump's recognition of Jerusalem as the capital of Israel as a beautiful gift.

Thus, Israel's policies will escalate to Judaize the city and expel its Arab population from its occupation in 1967. It isolated the city from its Palestinian environs and imposed on its Arab population racist policies aimed at forcing them to leave; they live in crowded neighborhoods, on building permits, suffer from continuing discrimination, and three-quarters of them live under the threat of poverty. In 2015, Palestinians constituted about 37% of the 850,000 people in Jerusalem, most of whom live in the neighborhoods of the eastern part of Jerusalem. Israel seeks to reduce this number to a minimum by removing overcrowded neighborhoods from the city limits and annexing them to communities other construction. In contrast, as Israel seeks to transform the city into a purely Jewish state, the city and its Arab residents suffer from the Palestinian Authority's extreme neglect. There are numerous Palestinian references to the city, and the importance of Jerusalem falls on the priorities of the Palestinian Authority. ([Trump's Recognition of Jerusalem as Israel's Capital](#), 25/12/2017: Net; [Smith-Spark; Carey](#), 7/12/2017: Net)

With a threat to the ruling coalition of Israeli Prime Minister Netanyahu, the Trump administration should have carefully studied whether to publish the parameters of Israeli-

Palestinian peace and when to issue it. Netanyahu is in no hurry. Those at his right believe that this is a waste of time, and that the vast majority of Israelis do not believe it will lead to peace. Therefore, Most Palestinians agree over time that American peace standards have moved away from international law and the peace agreement that Palestinians can accept. (Hassan, 11/12/2018: Net)

However, a small number of Israelis begin in the predominantly Arab parts of the eastern part of Jerusalem, and most realize that peace cannot be achieved without Palestinian sovereignty over at least parts of the city. The issue of disposition of the Old City and its holy sites will remain among the most difficult final status issues under negotiation. On the other final status issues, President Clinton's talks and the talks of former Israeli Prime Minister Ehud Olmert and Palestinian President Abbas effectively blocked the right of return of Palestinian refugees to Israel and proposed amendments to the 1967 borders to accommodate Israeli security concerns, The presence of Israeli settlers, and the regulation of security arrangements to calm Israeli fears, while preserving Palestinian dignity. Far from raising the prospect of a "final deal," the Trump administration has pushed the United States into the middle of one of the thorniest problems in the region and has done little to promote the cause of peace. It may still be possible to turn this problem into an opportunity before it turns into more violence, leaving a diplomatic mess to clean up the next US administration. (KUMAR, 17/5/2018: Net)

D. International reaction

With the exception of the United States, 14 out of 15 (total members of the UN Security Council) affirmed their commitment to international resolutions and relevant UN Security Council resolutions. The overwhelming majority of influential countries rejected President Trump's decision as detrimental to the peace process and stability in the region. A few hours after the Trump speech, UN Secretary-General Antonio Guterres declared his opposition to any unilateral actions that would threaten the chances of peace between Israelis and Palestinians. The EU also strongly rejected the US decision by Federica Mughherini F. Mughherini, EU High Commissioner for Foreign Policy. The German and French positions, which are the two countries active in the European Union, were clearly prominent, declaring that the final status of Jerusalem must be settled through negotiations. Britain also opposed the Trump decision, while Russia rejected the resolution and expressed concern that it would complicate the internal situation in the Middle East. (Trump's Recognition of Jerusalem as Israel's Capital, 25/12/2017: Net)

Seventh: Implications of President Trump's decision on the future of the Palestinian cause

"The transfer of the US embassy to Jerusalem will not end the peace process because there is no peace process at all," said James Zogby, president of the Arab American Institute. "I will not say it also discredit the United States because the latter has lost its credibility with regard to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, "What I'm going to say is that it's a stupid and risky step, because it will inflame feelings and endanger people's lives". (Harb, 6/12/2017: Net)

According to an opinion poll conducted by AAI, 33% of Republicans prefer to transfer the embassy to Jerusalem, 19% want to keep it in Tel Aviv, while 48% are either unsure or not yet decided, and generally, only 20% of respondents prefer to transfer the embassy. (Harb, 6/12/2017: Net)

The Palestinian cause will be affected by the decision taken by President Trump to transfer the US embassy to Jerusalem and to recognize the city as the unified capital of the State of Israel. Among these are:

First: Cancel all international resolutions by preserving Islamic and Christian cultural heritage, under the pretext that Jerusalem has become the capital of Israel and has the right to control and expand its capital as it wishes.

Second: blow up of all the rights demanding the freedom of visits of Palestinians and Arabs to the holy places in the city, on the pretext of maintaining the security of the capital, which represents the security and stability of Israel.

Thirdly, the lifting of all Arab, Islamic and international mandates from the city of Jerusalem; as a recommendation of the Jordanian Ministry of Awqaf after it became the official capital of (Israel), which refuses to be the capital of the state under the tutelage of one, because it is a form of occupation.

Fourth: The threat of directly destroying the Aqsa Mosque, which is sanctified by Muslims, and building the alleged temple in its place.

Fifth: Expelling all those who do not have an Israeli identity from the city, and then stripping them of their original inhabitants (i.e. Palestinians).

Sixth: Cancellation of all documents and official documents of the property of the people of Jerusalem, and control Israel as state property. ([The United States of America's Position, 19/12/2017: Net](#))

Seventh: Recognition of Jerusalem as the capital of Israel will have serious consequences, as it will open its hand to continue building new settlements, expand existing settlements, and settle Jewish settlers on the pretext of American recognition of this new reality.

Eighth: This American recognition will necessarily undermine the political settlement with the Palestinians in particular and it proves conclusively the bias of the American administration to Israel, and that it is an unfair broker. ([Ayoub, Dec. 2017: 17](#))

Ninth: The American step threatens to blow up the option of two-state solution adopted by the international community to resolve the Palestinian cause, which is a ruling to execute this option. ([What does it mean to transfer the US Embassy to Jerusalem, 14/5/2018: Net](#))

Tenth: The position of Palestinian President Mahmoud Abbas and his legitimacy are at stake; accepting the negotiations under the current conditions will cost Fatah and the PLO a great deal of their legitimacy, which was based on the successive promises of more than 20 years ago to establish a Palestinian state with Jerusalem as its capital. It is difficult to convince the Palestinian people of any future solutions that do not include Jerusalem as the capital of the Palestinian state.

Eleventh: The divided Arab situation and the Arab / Arab conflicts and wars have reduced popular and official reactions. As divisions in the Arab region increase and the Arab peoples concentrate on their immediate tragedies, the Palestinian cause and Jerusalem become secondary. Therefore, it is not possible that the Arab states will constitute any effective pressure on the United States to withdraw the resolution. ([Trump's Recognition of Jerusalem as Israel's Capital, 25/12/2017: Net](#))

Twelfth: American recognition represents a flagrant violation of international law and relevant international treaties and resolutions, which prohibit the occupying state from repealing or changing the legislation in force in the occupied territory and imposing its laws on these territories, taking into account that Israeli laws discriminate against Palestinian Arabs

Indigenous peoples) throughout the Arab territories it has controlled since 1948. (Ayoub, Dec. 2017: 17)

Thirteenth: The American decision will serve as a lever for several foreign countries and will encourage them in the near future to follow the US policy of transferring its embassies from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem such as Guatemala, Honduras, the Philippines, South Sudan and Romania.

Fourteen: It will involve the American decision, and the Palestinian and Arab lack of determination to confront it with the separation of the files of the Palestinian cause as a whole, the most important of which is the issue of Palestinian refugees. This resolution will certainly be followed by another decision to settle these refugees in the countries where they currently reside.

Conclusion

At the conclusion of this study can be stopped at some stations:

- The United States, after the establishment of the State of Israel in 1948, voted in favor of General Assembly Resolution 194, which calls for the unification of Jerusalem and its internationalization in East and West Jerusalem.
- The American position has declined from the idea of internationalization of Jerusalem after Israel transferred its institutions to the western part of the city, which implies implicit approval by the American administration for that Israeli behavior.
- The United States has not yet taken the occupation of the eastern part of the city of Jerusalem in 1967 to support the annexation of that part of the western part of the city of Jerusalem and to consider united Jerusalem as the capital of the State of Israel, but considered it part of the occupied territories.
- In 1995, the US Congress passed a resolution to transfer the US Embassy in Israel from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem. The decision was suspended due to the postponement of the transfer of the US Embassy to Jerusalem every six months.
- That President Trump one year before he took office took an official decision on 6 December 2017 to recognize that Jerusalem is the capital of the State of Israel, and that Jerusalem is the unified capital of the State of Israel.
- The official Palestinian and Arab positions towards President Trump's decision to transfer the US Embassy to Jerusalem were dim and did not enjoy the minimum national responsibility, as they merely denounce and refuse without taking actual steps to confront it on the ground.
- The files of the Palestinian cause, not just the issue of Jerusalem, will be negatively affected by President Trump's decision to transfer the US Embassy to Jerusalem and recognize the city as the unified capital of the State of Israel.
- The official American recognition of the city of Jerusalem as the capital of Israel, threatens to blow up the option of two-state solution adopted by the international community to resolve the Palestinian cause.

Recommendations

At the end of this study, we recommend that:

- The Palestinian leadership and the Palestinian organizations must work hard to bring down the decision of President Trump.
- The official Arab system must eliminate America's dependency by exploiting Russia and China in the Arab region to find a balance in its relationship with all these forces.

- The international community must work to limit the influence of the United States in all organs of the United Nations.

Study References

First: Arabic references

- Abhays (Zeyad) (2018), Prospects for Confronting the American Decision to Recognize Jerusalem as the Capital of the Zionist Entity, edit. ¹, Beirut: Jerusalem International Foundation, 2018.
- Ayoub (Nizar) (Dec. 2017), Jerusalem: Between Israeli Colonialism and American Acceptance, Doha: Arab Center for Research and Policy Studies.
- Dweik (Musa al-Qudsi) (2002), Jerusalem and International Law "A study of the legal status of the city and the Israeli violations of Palestinian human rights in it, Alexandria: Al-Ma'arif house.
- Saad (Fouad) (1995), The American Position and the Jerusalem Issue, in a book: Defending the Arabism of Jerusalem, Cairo: At-Tadamon Publications, African-Asian Peoples Solidarity Organization.

Second: Seminars, periodicals and newspapers

- Abdullah (Salah) (August 1990), "The Limits of Contradiction in Israeli-American Relations," Palestinian Affairs, No. 209.
- Abu Nahel (Osama) (Feb. 2017), "The American Position on the Issue of Jerusalem and its Impact on Relevant UN Resolutions", Working Paper for the Conference (United Nations and the Palestinian Question: Challenges and Opportunities), Gaza: Al-Isra University, Gaza.
- Al-Asadi (Abdu) (July 1995), "American Projects on the Palestinian Question," Samed Economic Review, Year 17, No. 101.
- Al-Shanti (Intisar) (April-June 1997), "The United States of America and the Cause of Jerusalem", Samed, No. 107, Year 19.
- Tahboub (Faeq Hamdi) (1994), "American Zionism and its Role in the Partition of Palestine", Baghdad: Journal of the Arab Historian, Issue 48, Year 19.

Third: Foreign References

- Smith (Charles D.) (1992), Palestine and the Arab-Israeli Conflict, Second Edition, New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Marlow (John) (1959), The seat of Pilate, an account of the Palestine mandate, London: Gresset Press.
- Report on Israeli Settlement in the occupied territories, A Jerusalem Primer, A Special Report of the Foundation f o Middle East Peace, Feb. 1994.
- Polk (William R.) (1978), The United States and the Arab world, 3^{ed}, Mass Harvard University Press Cambridge.

Fourth: Websites

- Abul-Gheit: Trump's recognition of Jerusalem as the capital of Israel would be a blow to US-Arab relations, RT Arab, 6/12/2017;

https://arabic.rt.com/middle_east/913989--الغيط-اعتراف-ترامب-بالقدس-عاصمة-لإسرائيل-سيمثل--ضريبة-العلاقات-الأمريكية-العربية/

• Al-Masri (Hani) (31/1/2017), "How has the transfer of the embassy become the lesser evil?", Sawa News Agency; <https://palsawa.com/post/101695>

• "Defiant Donald Trump confirms US will recognise Jerusalem as capital of Israel", The Guardian, 7/12/2017;

<https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2017/dec/06/donald-trump-us-jerusalem-israel-capital>

• Harb (Ali) (6/12/2017), "Huge implications for moving US embassy to Jerusalem", Middle East Eye;

<https://www.middleeasteye.net/news/analysis-huge-implications-moving-us-embassy-jerusalem>

• Hassan (Zaha) (11/12/2018), "Trump's Plan for Israel and Palestine: One More Step Away From Peace", Carnegie Endowment for International Peace;

• <https://carnegieendowment.org/2018/12/11/trump-s-plan-for-israel-and-palestine-one-more-step-away-from-peace-pub-77905>

• Fisher (Max) (17/5/2018), "The Jerusalem Issue, Explained", The New York Times, 9/12/2017;

<https://www.nytimes.com/2017/12/09/world/middleeast/jerusalem-trump-capital.html>

• KUMAR (PREM G.) (17/5/2018), "Trump's Jerusalem Theatrics Have Dealt A Blow to Peace", Foreign Policy;

<https://foreignpolicy.com/2018/05/17/trumps-jerusalem-theatrics-have-dealt-a-blow-to-peace/>

• Miller (Elhanan) (12/12/2017), "Another Humiliation for Abbas", Carnegie Endowment for International Peace; <https://carnegieendowment.org/sada/74990>

• Smith-Spark (Laura); Carey (Andrew) (7/12/2017), "Trump's Jerusalem decision: How the world reacted", CNN;

<https://edition.cnn.com/2017/12/06/middleeast/jerusalem-israel-us-intl/index.html>

• Sofos (Spyros); Felci (Vittorio) (6/12/2017), "What Trump's recognition of Jerusalem as the capital of Israel means for the Middle East", The Conversation;

<http://theconversation.com/what-trumps-recognition-of-jerusalem-as-the-capital-of-israel-means-for-the-middle-east-88722>

• "Trump's Recognition of Jerusalem as Israel's Capital: Background and Ramifications", Aljazeera Centre for Studies, 25/12/2017;

<http://studies.aljazeera.net/en/positionpapers/2017/12/trumps-recognition-jerusalem-israels-capital-background-ramifications-171225072045602.html>

• "Trump's recognition of Jerusalem as the capital of Israel ... what next?", DW, 6/12/2017; <http://www.dw.com/ar/اعتراف-ترامب-بالقدس-عاصمة-لإسرائيل-ماذا-بعد/a-41674564>

• "Trump declares his recognition of Jerusalem as the capital of Israel", 6/12/2017;

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=T2QGOIMhKBg>

• "What's At Stake With the U.S. Recognition of Jerusalem", Council on Foreign Relations, 6/12/2017;

<https://www.cfr.org/backgrounder/whats-stake-us-recognition-jerusalem>

• "What does it mean to transfer the US Embassy to Jerusalem?", Al Jazeera Net, 14/5/2018;

<https://www.aljazeera.net/encyclopedia/events/2018/5/14/What-Means-Transfer-Embassy-American-Jerusalem>

• "The United States of America's Position on Jerusalem over History", Umm al-Donia Baladi, 19/12/2017;

<http://omeldoniabalady.com/موقف-الولايات-المتحدة-الأمريكية-تجاه/>