



George W Bush's presidency in the Israel- Palestine conflict and peace process

SUJITHA B S

RESEARCH SCHOLAR

DEPT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE

UNIVERSITY OF KERALA

ABSTRACT

The Israel-Palestine conflict is land argument over the holy land in the Middle East region with religious and historical implication to Christians, Jews, and Muslims. This conflict is the continuing and started from the mid-20th century among the greater Arab -Israeli conflict. Moreover, the conflict is fundamentally related to the emergence of Zionism and Jewish immigration to Palestine. The major issues of the Israel-Palestine conflict are mutual recognition, borders security, water rights, control of Jerusalem, Israeli settlements, right of return. But this conflict persists the serious issue, resisting the interference by mediators and negotiations at different levels, evading the scope for any final solutions or remedies till date. United States has been able to impose itself as a mediator in peace process of the Israel-Palestine conflict over the past two decades. This paper "George W Bush's presidency in the Israel-Palestine conflict and peace process" focus on Bush major peace initiative in Israel-Palestine conflict.

Keywords-Israel -Palestine conflict, peace process, bush presidency.

INTRODUCTION

Israel and Palestine is one of the political and diplomatic tension of United States for the last 75 years. Israel-Palestine conflict became an essential segment of the US foreign policy, based their own national and strategic interests, and stretching US influence in the west Asia and compensating the Arab in close from the Palestinian problem and securing the entity and superiority in the state of Israel. George Walker Bush was the 43rd Republican President of the United States from 2001 to 2009 and during his presidency the peace process was given much importance and the two states solution was put forward. Bush critically analyzed the term "peace processes" in the context of the "Israeli-Palestinian conflict and peace processes. "The Israeli -Palestine peace process mentions to the alternating negotiations held by many parties and proposals put forward in an effort to resolve the ongoing this conflict. The terrorist's attack 9/11, shifted the president George W. Bush policy and approach in the Middle Eastern affairs and he declared the (June 24, 2002). Speech on "Support the creation of "peaceful and democratic Palestine state alongside the Israel." The failure of the Clinton administration to make significant breakthroughs in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, despite a major presidential effort, was a factor which influenced the Bush administration initially to maintain a hand – off policy towards the conflict, along with the general "I am not Clinton" approach of the early Bush presidency. Having seen Clinton try, and fail to achieve Palestinian-Israeli agreements in July, October and December 2000, Bush had little desire to invest political capital in trying to solve the conflict (Freedman 2004). This study analyzed special relationship with US and Israel in Bush administration and how to affect the Israel-Palestine conflict, and peace processes, and it was success or failure. And why America cannot achieve permanent peace solution in this conflict, so it was very difficult. Bush was the first US President to officially endorse Palestinian state hood, but because of his alignment with Israeli prime minister Ariel Sharon following the 9/11 attacks and a wave of terrorist attacks by Palestinian Militants, he also gave Sharon a free hand to quash the intifada, triggering accusations of war crimes, while systematically destroying Palestinian governing and security institutions along the way. (Elgindy, 2019)

Peace Processes

“George W. Bush memorably declared; I am the decider as president he was remarkably indecisive when it came to U.S. policy toward the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. His administration’s policy making featured an ongoing clash between moderate realists and conservative hard – liners inspired by right-wing religious ideas and a vision of democracy as cure all.” (Zoughbie, 2014). ‘Peace Processes’ is one of the important words in the Israel-Palestine Conflict, US Presidents from both parties are failed to the find permanent solution of this conflict. The Israel-Palestine peace process started with the Oslo accords in 1993 broke down with the failure of the Camp David summit in the 2000 and the onset of the second intifada in the fall of that year. “in the more than 45 years since the middle east war of june 1967, there have been many peace plans and many negotiations, but a settlement has still not been stretched in the core conflict, the dispute between the Israelis and Palestinians. In current decades, the US has been an important organizer of exertions to resolve the Israeli-Palestine conflict The US has been an associate of the “middle East Quartet”, with the European union, the UN and Russia, which in 2002 launched a “road map for peace “intended at resolving the conflict. The last peace proposal days back to 2010, subsequent the section of US president Barack Obama, in November 2009, president Obama convinced prime minister Netanyahu to settle to a 10 -month partial freeze on settlement construction in the west bank but president Abbas said this plan did not protection east Jerusalem and required a guarantee of a Palestinian state based on 1967 lines. Earlier Bush presidency of his presidency, Bush put forward the peace processes plan for settling the conflict on the basis of two-state solution, and he wanted from the Palestinian Authority (PA) despoil all Palestinian militant groups and elect new members and leaders in Palestinian Authority. Bush administration had a strong realist belief that Al –Qaida, as a non-state actor, could have not been born or strengthened to that extent without some military and political support from state actors (Prifti 2017, p. 91). Bush’s two states plan and Road map marked such a new shift in US policy in the regions, both proposals failed to exercise US leverage on Israel to halt its settlement expansion in the Palestinian territories. (Mohammad, 2015, p. 180).

In the Bush initiative US began to work with EU, Russia and the UN as part of a “Quartet” to fashion a “Road Map” leading to a Palestinian-Israeli peace processes. Finally,

Bush published Road Map with three phases for formation of Palestinian state. Many peace talks are made with the help of US for the two-state solution, started in the 1991. Madrid peace conference, and Oslo Accords (1993) Camp David Summit (2000). Taba negotiations (2001) Arab Peace Initiative (2002) 2013-2014 latest peace talks, these are the major peace initiatives in the Israel-Palestine Conflict. These all- peace processes and peace talks United States played mediator role, but cannot achieve two state solution, and permanent peaceful settlement. The US remains dedicated to the vision of two states living side by side in peace and security, and its execution as labelled in the roadmap. The US will do its greatest to avoid any effort by anybody to execute any other plan because US has one of the third-party mediators and behind national interest.

Security:

Here will be no security for Israelis or Palestinians till they and all states, in the region and outside, join together to fight terrorism and dismantle terrorist organizations. The U S restates its persistent promise to Israel's security, including protected, defendable borders, and to reserve and reinforce Israel's ability to prevent and protect itself, through itself, against any danger or conceivable combination of threats. The U S will connection with others in the international community to support the capacity and resolve of Palestinian security forces to fight terrorism and dismantle terrorist capabilities and organization.

Terrorism:

Israel will hold its right to secure itself against terrorism, with to take actions against terrorist organizations. The US will main efforts, working together with Jordan, Egypt, and others in the international community, to build the capacity and will of Palestinian institutions to fight terrorism, dismantle terrorist organizations, and stop the areas from which Israel has withdrawn from affectation a threat that would have to be talked by any other resources. The US recognizes that after Israel withdraws from Gaza and parts of the West Bank, and incomplete agreements on other provisions, current provisions concerning control of airspace, regional waters, and land ways of the West Bank and Gaza will endure.

Two-State vision

The US remains dedicated to the two-state solution for peace in the Middle East as set out in June 2002, and to the roadmap as the finest track to comprehend that vision. The area of two sovereign states has frequently been known in international resolutions and agreements, and it remains an important to agreeing this conflict. The US is powerfully dedicated to Israel's security and well-being as a Jewish state. It appears strong that an agreed, just, fair and realistic outline for a solution to the Palestinian refugee problem as fragment of any ultimate status agreement will essential to be create through the formation of a Palestinian state, and the become peaceful of Palestinian refugees there, rather than in Israel. By means of part of a final peace settlement, Israel must have secure and standard borders, which should develop from negotiations between the parties in accord with UNSC Resolutions 242 and 338. In light of new realities on the ground, with now current major Israeli peoples centers, it is impractical to suppose that the consequence of final status negotiations will be a full and complete reappearance to the armistice lines of 1949, and all earlier efforts to negotiate a two-state solution have touched the equal conclusion. It is faithful to think that any final status agreement will only be realized on the basis of jointly agreed changes that reproduce these realities.

Palestinian Statehood:

The US supports the formation of a Palestinian state that is practical, connecting, sovereign, and self-governing, thus the Palestinian people can shape their own future in unity, through the pathway set out in the roadmap. The US will connection by others in the international community to stand-in the development of democratic political institutions and new leadership dedicated to those institutions, the rebuilding of community institutions, the development of a free and wealthy economy, and the construction of talented security institutions dedicated to preserving law and order and dismantling terrorist organizations.

Palestinian Accountabilities:

Roadmap, Palestinians must assume a direct end of armed movement and all performances of violence against Israelis wherever, and all authorized Palestinian institutions necessity end encouragement against Israel. The Palestinian leadership must act decisively against terror,

including sustained, targeted, and effective operations to stop terrorism and dismantle terrorist capabilities and organization. Palestinians must assume a complete and important political improvement that contains a solid parliamentary democracy and an authorized prime minister.

Israeli Accountabilities:

The Administration of Israel is dedicated to take supplementary steps on the West Bank, with progress toward a freeze on settlement activity, removing illegal outposts, and enlightening the humanitarian situation by easing boundaries on the movement of Palestinians not involved in terrorist activities. As the Administration of Israel has specified, the barrier being created by Israel should be a security rather than political wall, should be provisional rather than perpetual, and therefore not preception any final status issues with final borders, and its way should take into account, reliable with security needs, its influence on Palestinians not involved in terrorist actions.

Regional Relationship:

Peace settlement converted between Israelis and Palestinians would be an excessive benefit not only to those individuals but to the individuals of the complete region. Therefore, all states in the area have special responsibilities: to sustenance the creation of the foundations of a Palestinian state; to contest terrorism, and cut off all methods of help to people and groups involved in terrorism; and to begin now to move toward more regular relations with the State of Israel. These actions would be factual contributions to construction peace in the region.

George W. Bush Peace Proposals in the Conflict

After the failure of Anthony Zinny Diplomacy Bush Presidency was faced high pressure into the conflict. Condoleezza Rice (National Security Advisor) in early 2002 “When she declared, alluding to US priorities such as the war on terror and ousting Iraq’s Saddam Hussein that there was not time for “marginal issues” like the Palestinian-Israeli Conflict (Benn 2002).

Bush declared

“My vision two states Israel and Palestine living side by side in peace and security. There is simply no way to achieve that peace until all parties fight terror. Yet, at this critical moment, if all parties will break with the past and set out on a new path, we can overcome the darkness with the light of hope, peace requires a new different Palestinian leadership. So that a Palestinian state can be born” (Bush 2002).

Bush first exposed his plans for a two -state solution to the conflict backbone in June 2002, provisional upon a modification of Palestinians institutions, the formation of western - style democracy and the election of the leader not included by terror. This was extensively understood to indication the bush administration’s rejection to deal with Mr. Arafat, leading to a high profile split between the US and EU. In this statement Bush strongly suggest the two-state solution for Palestinian state and his presidency was associated with the quartet’s members, and gave more importance to peaceful settlement of Israeli-Palestine conflict.

Bush and Road Map to Peace 2003

“The Roadmap represents a starting point toward achieving the vision of two states, a secure state of Israel and, peaceful, democratic Palestine.it is a framework for progress towards lasting peace and security in the Middle East....” (Bush 2003 Bureau of public Affairs Washington, DC) Various U. S administrations have anticipated road maps for peace process that would affect in two states, one Israeli and one Palestinians. But opponents say forecasts for a two-state solution reduced under President Donald trump, who implemented a deal of controversial policies concerning essential mechanisms of the conflict. Policy change proclaimed by Joe Biden could disengage some of those decisions, although others are likely to continue unchanged, including that on Jerusalem status. On April 30, 2003, the “Quartet”- the US, the European Union, the UN and Russia-issued the ‘Road Map’. (Harms and Ferry, p. 177). The plan is a performance-based area motivated plan with clear phases, timelines, and levels. It includes mutual steps by the two parties in the political, security, economic, and humanitarian arenas. The destination is a concluding and inclusive settlement of the Israel-Palestinian conflict. Continuing good -faith efforts by both Israelis and Palestinians are mandatory to implement the roadmap. The step of development will produce merely out of

their presentation. The US, other members of the quartet, and regional Arab leaders will effort to sustenance and enable the process. They also will see frequently to appraise the party's presentation in applying the plan.

The main aim of the peace processes plan was, this was Bush vision for peace in 2002, was organized clearly-defined bench marks and aim for progress in the Israel-Palestinian peace processes, with the goal of extending a wide settlement by 2005. The plan was also three phases, the first phase is end violence, freeze on Israeli settlement activity, territorial status quo and rebuilding of Palestinians institutions. The second phase was contained settlement of Palestinian state with conditional borders and third phase was included to attach to permanent status negotiations. The Israel and Palestine were demanded to catch proximate steps to end violence and settled the long-lasting peace. The Road Map was better than the Oslo peace processes because both sides will agree at the start the aim of Palestinian state. Oslo accords to couldn't include the international advisers, but the road map called the Quartet for monitoring progress and Oslo cannot approve a final settlement, leaving it open negotiations. Road map peace processes cannot success to two state solution, and establishment of Palestinian state and end the both sides violence.

“This fundamental endorsement of the two-state solution to the regional conflict by world powers signaled the beginning of a political push to solve the long running crises. Both players did not agree to abide by the agreement, Israel nor did Palestine truly meet the guidelines, making the effort to keep the Roadmap on track both frustrating and pointless” (Rodrigo, 2017).

The Road Map peace processes plan was failed, many elements are the problem of failure that was, containing the clarity and perfection of aims and the world powers efforts and interventions. The deficiency of forth coming positive changes to reform Palestinian daily life, this was another problem outlined by the Road map peace processes. The peace processes plan was included step by step processes including for both Israel and Palestine and to take particular actions to reach its eventual, for the formation of sovereign, independent Palestinian state, peaceably existing side-by side with the nation of Israel. Bush effort was very good in this issue and solution of peace because he visited Israel and Palestine territories on eight-day Middle East trip. In Israel and Palestine demanded more arguments, because the

freeze the Israeli settlement, and dismantle an authorized outpost built by Israel. Since 2001, and Israel's demand to dismantle the terrorist group. The Palestinians viewed the roadmap as an improvement over Oslo, which consisted only of an agreement to negotiate, while the roadmap explicitly identified the end of occupation and an independent Palestinian state as an objective by 2003. The failure of such peace plans along with the absence of peace in general in the area largely rests on the inequality between Israel and the Palestinians, along with the lack of an impartial third-party mediator (Mohamad 2015, p. 85).

Bush's Road map and two states vision changed the US policy in this region, but these proposals are failed to exercise US leverage to Israel, establish peace between the two sides. Bush two state vision faced thoughtful problem connecting to implementation, since, it is only one among other, after conflicting, goals that the US also tried to achieve in the region. The US ability to resolve the Israeli-Palestinian conflict in a satisfactory way for both sides would have perhaps much of the US's long-term interests and credibility across the region. (Mohamad 2015, p. 8).

The Ministry of foreign affairs Israel, Ariel Sharon included 14 Israeli reservations in the Roadmap but it was changeable in President Bush vision with Israel's interests. Roadmap peace plan totally not agree Israel, but they are raised some problems related to Israel-Palestine peace processes, it was security and peace, right of return and Palestinian state. Without the PA disarming and uprooting the Palestinian militias, the Israeli government would not be prepared to engage with the process, including the demands for a settlement freeze" (Foreign Affairs 2003).

United States and Israel relationship called the special relationship. US has gave special attention Jews and Israel before and after formation of Israel state. The friendship between Israel and the United States runs deep-shared values, economic partnership, strategic cooperation, humanitarian assistance and cultural ties". (Oren, 2008, p. 123). Those special relationship always reflects the entire peace-processes of the Israel-Palestine Conflict and US always made a hegemony this entire region. The word 'peace processes' is very popular in the close of Israel-Palestine conflict. Bush during his election campaign for the presidency in 2000 he actually spoke of pursuing a "humble" foreign policy, and he expressed doubt about "nation building". (Quandt, 2006).

US and Roadmap

- . President Bush's vision of two states existing side-by-side in peace and security as expressed in his June 24 speech was the roadmap foundation
- . The U.S. work broadly with Russia the UN, and the European Union (the Quartet) to proposal the Roadmap and will work with them to advance it.
- . President Bush moved to the region in early June to recruit the Roadmap process.
- . Secretary Powell traveled to the area in May and late June to help return negotiation between the Israelis and Palestinians and advance the road map process
- . Bush sent letter to Sharon.

Failure of the road map

Third party mediation

There are three motives for external parties to become involved in an international conflict. Through fundamentals with traditional coalition obligations ethics or people ties or the existence of humanitarian crises are at the centre of these involvements. Third-party efforts are placed on discovery a method of negotiation that each side can appreciate. Third party interventions in the Middle East were considered a reasonable conflict resolve process by the outside powers that were worried about the region and its resources. The roadmap was a produce of the essential of the bigger nations to guarantee their line of oil supply and production, which in turn dictated that an association of the moderate states in the region come composed to complete this goal. The four nations closely elaborate with road map were the US, Russia, EU and UN, and they are performed their own priorities. President Bush involved the actual respect of his office in the effort to settle the nations and this original hesitating on the part of Israel directly reduced the forecasts for progress in the region. The American administration was enforced to opposite course and agree these changes before even the first step of the Roadmap could be understood. This formed a very clear insight of Israel holding the upper hand in the negotiations. The third-party resolve efforts known that the parts of settlements and refugees were subtle topics for both the Israeli's and the

Palestinians. Applying summits to effort to organize efforts between the powers, the very direct involvement of the United States President, actively working through Russian and the European Union to shape provision for the Roadmap, there was an original sense of achievement. This initial end of hostilities brokered by the external parties continued rapidly after President Bush left the region, creation much of the efforts of the earlier months insignificant, through facets including the announcement of political prisoners focused at directly building trust between the states, the third-party negotiators create a common goal in the realized decrease in violence. There was a real insight that the third parties involved in the Roadmap procedure had their own agendas, which in turn reduced their integrity, through each outside nation offering incentives for compliance, it was in the best interest for both Palestine and Israel to agree to the broad outline proposed.

RIPENESS

Several fundamentals are at the essential of the failure of the Roadmap policy, including clarity, ripeness of goals and the overall involvement efforts by the bigger world powers. Through increase rates of violence taking their toll on each side, it was considered time for involvement by the world powers prior to the formation of the Roadmap. Additional central element of the inspiration behind the peace plan was the desired alliance of the sensible states in region that the American president required. In an actual real way, each step of the peace process in the Middle East was considered as a result of the essential to guarantee acceptable oil supply from the region. This acknowledgment of ripeness acceptable the Israeli's to achieve much of the dismantling of the Palestinian infrastructure directly, making these elements critical to any long-lasting consensus. Absent any clear feature or way, the Roadmap was unable to address many of the issues at the regional level, creation any form of development hard. There was a real awareness of drifting direction with no real promise by the making controls

Conclusion

Israel Prime Minister Sharon stated Bush is “Man of Peace”, Bush and Sharon always keep good and healthy relationship. Bush was the first President to support the Palestinian

State, and the two-state solution, and peace and security of the region. In this conflict US was third party mediator role in the all-peace processes but the final result was failed. 9/11 case was changed the US policy towards the Israel-Palestine conflict and Bush enter into the new peace plans and two state vision but these plans are not successful, they cannot achieve real peace between Israel and Palestine. Bush was really wanting the peace in this region, and Israel and Palestinian put forward different type of policies and reservations. Two state solutions and peace processes are the major challenges in the Bush Administration in this region, and his presidency wanted to Palestinian Leadership fight against terrorism and reengagement in the peace processes. Bush policies and programmers cannot achieve final solution because Israel has no interest to Two-State solution, and freeze to the Israeli settlement in the Gaza and West Bank. Bush was supported the peace processes and two-state vision but he always played within the national interests. US was always impartial third-party mediator in this conflict always played a safe zone strategy and with the support of Israel. Another President was continued the peace processes but final result was failed why Israel-Palestine conflict peace processes is very difficult, because everyone played their own national interest and high degree of nationalism. They are not willing to peaceful negotiation and peaceful settlement in the region of Holy Land because their own interest with the nationalism.

Reference

1. Robert O. Freedman (2004), “The Bush Administration and the Arab-Israeli Conflict: The Record of the First Three Years”. Online- jcpa.org
2. Khaled Elgindy (2019), “Trump can’t kill the Peace Process, it was already dead”. Online: state.com/news-andpolitics/2019/04/Israel-palestine-peace-process-bush-clinton-obama-trump.html.

3. Husam Mohammad (2015), "President George W. Bush's Legacy on the Israeli-Palestinian 'Peace Process'", *Journal of International and Area Studies*, vol.22, no. 1, p. 80.
4. Aluf Benn (2002), "US Concerned about Palestinian Plight", *Haaretz English Edition* 18 February.
5. Special Document- George W. Bush (2002), Rose Garden Speech on the White House's Site, <http://www.whitehouse.gov>.
6. Gregory Harms with Todd M. Ferry (2005), *The Palestine Israel Conflict A Basic Introduction*, London: Pluto Press, p. 177.
7. Rodrigo (2017), "The Failure of the Roadmap to Peace", *the Write Pass Journal*. Online: writepass.com/journal/2017/02/thefailure-of-theroad-map-to-peace/.
8. Graham Usher (2003), "The Roadmap lives on", *Middle East International*, 27 June, 703, p. 10-11.
9. Special Document: Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Government of Israel, "Israel's Response to the Road Map", 25 May 2003. Online Web: URL: <http://www.knesset.gov.il/process/docs/roadmap-response-eng-htm>.
10. Michael B Oren (2008), "Israel and the United States: The Special Bond between Two Nations and Two Peoples". Online web: <https://mfa.gov.in/MFA.graphics/mfa/20gallery/Israel/60/ch10.pdf>.2008.
11. William B. Quandt (2006), "On the Peace Processes in the Middle East", University of Virginia, April. Online web: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/249559612-on-the-peace-process-in-themiddle-east>.
12. Prifti, Bledar (2017). *US Foreign Policy in the Middle East, the Case for Continuity*. Palgrave Macmillan, Switzerland, p. 91.
13. Daniel E. Zoughbie (2014). "Indecision points: George W. Bush and the Israel-Palestinian Conflict". <http://www.belfercenter.org>. Harvard Kennedy School Belfer Center.