

UNIVERZITA PALACKÉHO V OLOMOUCI
Faculty of Arts
Department of Political Science and European Studies



U.S. Foreign Policy Towards Israel: The Case of Relocation
American Embassy to Jerusalem

Bachelor's Thesis

Eliška Slámková

Thesis Supervisor

Prof. Gokhan Bacik

Olomouc 2018

I declare that this Thesis is entirely my own work and I have written it with help of cited sources and literature.

Olomouc, 3th May 2018

Eliška Slámková

I would like to thank my supervisor Prof. Gokhan Bacik for his friendly attitude, help and his valuable advices. I would like to also thank my friends for their patience and supporting during the writing of the thesis. Last, I would like to thank them for their sense of humour and that they never let me give up.

Table of Contest

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	5
INTRODUCTION.....	6
1. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK.....	10
1.1. GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE U.S. FOREIGN POLICY	12
1.2. STATUS OF JERUSALEM.....	15
1.3. THE ISRAELI- PALESTINIAN PEACE PROCESS.....	18
2. THE U.S. FOREIGN POLICY TOWARDS ISRAEL	24
2.1. FROM RICHARD NIXON TO GEORGE H.W. BUSH	25
2.2. FROM BILL CLINTON TO BARACK OBAMA	27
2.3. THE PRO-ISRAEL LOBBY	29
3. THE U.S. FOREIGN POLICY TOWARDS PALESTINE	32
4. THE SUBJECT: THE RELOCATION OF THE US EMBASSY IN ISRAEL.....	35
4.1. DONALD TRUMP’S STATEMENT ON JERUSALEM	36
4.2. DONALD TRUMP AND FOREIGN POLICY	38
4.3. THE INTERNATIONAL REACTION	39
4.4. THE ROOTS AND IMPLICATIONS OF THE POLICY CHANGE	42
CONCLUSION	47
LITERATURE.....	49

List of Abbreviations

ADL – Anti-Defamation League

AFSI – Americans for a Safe Israel

AIPAC – American Israel Public Affairs Committee

AJC – American Jewish Committee

EU – European Union

IPF – Israel Policy Forum

JINSA – Jewish Institute for National Security Affairs

MEF – Middle East Forum

NSS – National Security Strategy

PA – Palestinian Authority

PLO – Palestinian Liberal Organization

UN – United Nations

UNESCO – United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization

US – United State of America

ZOA – Zionist Organization of America

Introduction

The history of Jerusalem has a very complicated historical backroad and evokes a lot of emotions. Jerusalem is a holy city for three Abrahamic religions Christianity, Islam and Judaism. The most important part of Jerusalem is the Old City where are located most of the Holy sites. The status of Jerusalem remains one of the core issues in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Both nations, Jews and Palestinians, are claiming Jerusalem as their capital city. The city has a long history, in 1948, after the first Arab-Israeli War, Jerusalem was captured by Israel and Jordan and divided into two parts. West Jerusalem was annexed by Israel while East Jerusalem was annexed by Jordan. Following the Six-Day War in 1967, Israel captured and annexed East Jerusalem and surrounding territory. After the War, the Knesset declared Jerusalem as complete and united capital city of Israel. In following years, Israel had started to build settlements in occupied Palestinian territory, and this action triggered protests and violation against Israeli forces.

The Israeli-Palestinian dispute over the city Jerusalem has tried to resolve the United Nations by passing the Resolution 242 (1967), which called on Israel to withdraw its forces from occupied Palestinian territories and Resolution 476 (1980) reiterated that all measures which had altered the status of Jerusalem were “null and void”. In following years, the UN adopted many others resolution dealing with the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and Jerusalem status dispute. The peace process between Israel and Palestine is a long-term procedure. The United States plays an important role in the peace process as the mediator of the negotiations. The first serious peace talks between Israeli and Palestinian representatives have begun during the presidency of Bill Clinton. The negotiations have been closed by reaching the peace agreements known as the Oslo Accords. These agreements mutually recognized the existence of the State of Israel and the Palestinian Liberation Organization as the legitimate representative of the Palestinian people. The Jerusalem problem has not been solved. Following the Oslo Accords was proposed another plan to resolve the Israeli-Palestinian conflict known as The Roadmap for peace. This plan suggested the Two-State Solution for the establishment an independent State of Palestinian alongside the State of Israel and returning the occupied territory to Palestinian people. The last direct talks between Israeli and Palestinian representatives began in 2013 and ended in 2014, without reaching the final status agreement.

On December 6, 2017, President Donald Trump announced, that the United States officially recognized Jerusalem as a capital and undivided city of Israel, and the American Embassy will be transferred from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem. Donald Trump, by this decision, has broken seven decades of US foreign policy towards Jerusalem and the foreign policy toward Israeli-Palestinian conflict as a whole.

The aim of this work will be to analyse changes of the U.S. foreign policy towards Jerusalem and to observe development of the U.S.-Israeli relationship. The thesis will analyse a new American policy of President Donald Trump and his decision to transfer the U.S. Embassy to Jerusalem. Afterwards, the thesis will examine why is Jerusalem important for the Israeli-Palestinian peace process.

The research questions of this thesis will be “*Why we observe the change in the U.S. foreign policy?*” and “*What are the implications of relocation the American Embassy to Jerusalem?*”. The thesis will be examined as a case study by using the theoretical framework of the foreign policy change. The time frame of the thesis will be from 1948 to present. The motive of choosing this topic is to analyse what are the reasons for the change of a long-term U.S. foreign policy and what consequences will have the relocation of the US Embassy to Jerusalem on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and international affairs.

The thesis will be divided into four chapters. In the first chapter, I will define theoretical framework of the work. For the analyses of the thesis I will use the theory of the foreign policy change. This theory will be on the basis of domestic and international parameters of the foreign policy change. The first chapter will include three more subchapters and the first one will focus on the general characteristics of the U.S. foreign policy since Harry Truman to a present situation. The following subchapter will define the status of Jerusalem and the importance of the city for the Israeli-Palestinian peace process. The aim of the last subchapter will be described briefly the peace process between Israel and Palestine and the role of the United States in the negotiations. In the second chapter, I will focus on the US foreign policy towards Israel and development of the U.S.-Israeli relationship during the 70 years of history. Furthermore, the last part of this chapter will describe influence of the pro-Israel lobby in the United States in policy making process. In the third chapter of this thesis, I will characterize the relationship between the United States and Palestine. This chapter is not very extensive; however, it has an important contribution to the analyses of this work and the understanding the peace

process. The last chapter will be divided into four parts, and in this chapter, I will analyse the case study of relocation the American Embassy in Israel. The first subchapter will examine Donald Trump's statement on Jerusalem and the personal aspect of this decision. In following subchapter, will be characterized the foreign policy of Donald Trump's administration and this part will include the comparison of a current foreign policy with previous one. The third subchapter will analyse the international reaction on the decision to relocate the U.S. Embassy to Jerusalem. This subchapter will be based on the official statements of the United Nations member states and the Gallup International Association opinion poll from provided research in 2017. The last subchapter will analyse the origins and implications of the U.S. policy change. In this part of the work I will examine the domestic and international factors of Donald Trump's decision to recognize Jerusalem as a capital city of Israel and relocate the U.S. Embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem. Furthermore, I will analyse the consequences of this decision on the Israeli-Palestinian peace process; the US relations with worldwide community; and the U.S. relations with Arab and Muslim countries.

For the research, I will use several publications from prestigious journals; independent analyses; and official government documents. And furthermore, I will use primary sources such as resolutions and remarks of statements from the White House and the United Nations online archives. I consider as the most relevant publication *Jerusalem in U.S. Policy* written by Donal Jeff. Donald Neff was an American historian and journalist interested in Arab-Israeli conflict and the Middle East. His work *Jerusalem in U.S. Policy*, published in 1993, concerns the history of the relationship between Israel and the United States from 1947 to 1992. Another important author is Yaacov Bar-Siman-To. Professor Bar-Siman-Tov was a noted expert on international conflicts, negotiation process and the Arab-Israeli conflict. For this thesis, I will use his publication *The United States and Israel since 1948: A "Special Relationship"?* where he defines the U.S.-Israeli connection as a special patron-client relationship, characterized by common interests and values. The significant contribution for this work represents the publication of Avi Shlaim. Avi Shlaim is an Emeritus Professor at the University of Oxford and one of the Israeli scholar who put forward critical interpretations of Zionism and Israel. His paper *The Impact of U.S. Policy in the Middle East* was prepared for the conference on "The Superpowers, Central American, and the Middle East" and characterized the

US policy-making process toward the Middle East and the position of Israel in this region. The only publication from a Czech author Marek Čejka is *Izrael a Palestina* published in 2005. Marek Čejka is a political scientist and lawyer who is interested in Middle Eastern politics. His book *Izrael a Palestina* is focused on the Israeli-Palestinian peace process and negotiations during the 1990's. Since the theme of my thesis is very actual, there are not enough academic publications yet. Therefore, I will use for my analyses primarily on-line sources, official statements and resolutions from the White House and the United Nations.

1. Theoretical framework

In this part of thesis, I will analyse the domestic structural parameters of the foreign policy change in the case of United States (US) policy towards the status of Jerusalem and I will focus on policy making process in the same vein. Also, I will focus on the authoritative decision element of the foreign policy. As I have underlined, the case is to examine the roots of the change in the U.S. foreign policy in the policy towards Israel. For my analyses, I will use a theoretical framework on the foreign policy change which was described by Spyros Blavoukos and Dimitris Bourantonis in their work *Identifying Parameters of Foreign Policy Change: A Synthetic Approach*, published in 2009.

In this book, the parameters of the foreign policy change are divided into *domestic* or *international origins* and *structural* or *conjectural nature* (Blavoukos, Bourantonis 2009: 2). Domestic structural parameters include the domestic political and institutional setting and the existence of advocacy groups in support of alternative foreign policy option. These parameters focus on the policy making process and on a collective or individual source of alternative policy input. The collective functions are based on authoritative decision element of individual or a set of individuals and they are divided into three types: *the powerful leader* (e.g. monarch, dictator, etc.), *the single group* (e.g. Politburo, a group of Army, Cabinet, etc.) and *the multitude of autonomous actors* (e.g. coalition governments, actors with veto power, etc.). The domestic structural parameters also consist advocacy groups which are identified in three categories: political culture, socio-economic groups with different views and interests, and policy entrepreneurs who propose foreign policy change (ibid.: 5–6).

International structural parameters are based on participation of the state in the international system (e.g. UN, EU, OSCE, etc.) which can lead to a systemic change. The foreign policy change can be affected by at least three or four mechanisms. The state can unify with another state with the same position and it can change the foreign policy action (e.g. balance of power and alliances). Another mechanism of strengthening relation between states in the international system can be through “sticks and carrots” (e.g. economic and political incentives or sanctions) and the last one can change the foreign policy through socialization processes with active participation in international organizations (ibid.:7). The membership can

affect adherence norms and values and socialization processes may lead to foreign policy redirection.

Conjunctural parameters of domestic and international origins refer to unexpected events that may have impact on existing status of state and lead to change of foreign policy (e.g. leadership change due to death or succession, military coup, humanitarian disaster, etc.). In analyses of foreign policy, change is not possible to isolate the impact of one parameter against the other, the changes in foreign policy are not necessarily consolidated in long term period, they may also overturn when one of the parameters disappear. *“The casual mechanisms of transforming foreign policy change to a new foreign policy path may differ and equally so may differ the importance of the identified parameters”* (Blavoukos, Bourantonis 2009: 16–18).

According to author Vinsensio Dugis, foreign policy is understood as authoritative action taken by governments to keep desirable aspects of international setting or to change it. The action is taken with a clear political orientation and the goal is to solve a problem or promote some changes in the international system. *“Foreign policy consists of statements and actions taken by state subjects to its relations with other external actors, states or non-states.”* (Dugis 2008: 101). The foreign policy has three main aspects: sources; process; and actions taken to implement the foreign policy change. In other words, *“foreign policy is not something static, but it tends to change in order to achieve its objectives.”* (ibid.: 103). In general, foreign policy change is divided into *change which is resulted from regime or state transformation*; or into *change which happens when the existing government decides to push in different foreign directions* (ibid.:103).

According to Kalevi Holsti, the reorientation of foreign policy is categorized into the various levels of external involvements; the policies regarding types and sources of external penetration; direction or pattern of external involvements and military or diplomatic commitments (Holsti 1982: 4–5). Based on these categories, Holsti proposed four typology of foreign policy change: *isolation*, *self-reliance*, *dependence* and *non-alignment-diversification*. The *isolation* policy is characterized as extreme lack of interest and low level of involvement in the international environment (e.g. military and diplomatic commitments are avoided). The *self-reliance* is specified by diplomatic and trade interactions, moreover the level of communication is low and military contracts are still avoided. The

dependence is characterized by a high level of external actions and relations; and the communication with other countries is well provided. The *non-alignment-diversification* refers to wide external directed actions and transactions with other countries. The government tries to balance between numerous types of policies and foreign interest, but external penetration is possible (ibid.).

1.1. General Characteristics of the U.S. Foreign Policy

The US foreign policy is a very complex subject, and it can naturally display realism, idealism, unilateralism and multilateralism simultaneously in different policy sectors. According to Daniel Papp, an American foreign policy scholar, the U.S. foreign policy stems from three American traditions: *isolationism*, *moralism* and *pragmatism*. These traditions are depending on external circumstances, domestic political situation and leadership inclination (Hoadley 2003: 1).

For American policy are the most characteristic four traditional theories. Actors of *traditional liberalism* focus on promoting democratic, social and market values. The main representatives of liberalism in American history is Thomas Jefferson, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Lyndon Johnson or Democratic Party. *Traditional conservatism* promotes the best interests of the physical security and economic stability for the US. Many leaders tend to generate isolationism and protectionism of the state. The conservatism ties with realism and the main protagonists are the Republican Party, Dwight D. Eisenhower, Henry Kissinger or George H.W. Bush. The theory of *neoliberalism* emphasises the spread of democratic and free market values throughout the world. The foreign policy of neoliberalists is called also as idealists with elements of evangelist or moralists but in practice the foreign policy tends to be multilateral. As exemplars from American politics are Woodrow Wilson, Harry S. Truman, Jimmy Carter or Bill Clinton. The theory of neo-conservatism seeks to act military, unilaterally and preventively against US security treats as well as against globe one. “*Their promotion of liberal values and regime change is a means to the end of greater security treat for the US.*” This theory represents for example Ronald Reagan or George W. Bush (Hoadley 2003: 2).

According to the theory of complex interdependence by Robert Keohane and Joseph Nye, the US is viewed as a “gentle giant” whose actions usually serves for the best interests of the internationally community as well as for the US. Such as creating a leading coalition against aggressor or pressuring protection for

governments which have lower trade barriers and subsidies. Nye suggests that the US hegemony does not provoke counterbalancing by the rival states because the US values of democracy, law, human rights and open market are shared by other countries and individuals. Those who benefit from this hegemony will applaud and support U.S. policy, and those who are offended by it will stay in opposition.

The U.S. foreign policy orientation has experienced a lot of significant changes from Harry Truman's Doctrine (1945-1953) to Barack Obama's foreign strategy (2008-2016). President Truman shifted the U.S. policy from a détente to the repression of the Soviet communism. President Dwight D. Eisenhower (1953-1961) increased U.S. involvement in world affairs, particularly in the Middle Eastern region by US intelligence services operations promoting the overthrow undemocratic regimes. Eisenhower's Doctrine promoted worldwide liberal and democratic values and containment of communist ideology. John F. Kennedy (1961-1963) continued in Eisenhower's policy to halt Soviet influence and tried to implement a non-proliferation policy (Charountaki 2014: 125–126). The U.S. foreign policy discourse and practice throughout this period converted rather than diverted and the interest of American policy was very similar. The main goals of foreign policy were the preservation of the *status quo*, balance of power and international stability under the US leadership. Furthermore, containment of Soviet influence, protection of US interest in Gulf region and recognition and support of the state Israel.

Richard Nixon's presidency (1969-1974) was the second turning point and the first change of the U.S. foreign policy in international politics. His foreign policy turned from political distance of world affairs into direct political involvement through Nixon's security strategy. The framework of the US policy discourse was balance of power in order to preserve the international and regional the *status quo*. The period of Jimmy Carter and Ronald Reagan's presidency (1977-1989) is identified by the same discourse of foreign policy which did not change until the collapse of Soviet Union. "*The US continued to pursue the same policies of containing both Soviet communism and radical religious ideologies, along supporting the sovereignty of Israel.*" (ibid.:128–129).

The third change of US foreign policy represents the post-Cold War era, characterized by explicit political interventionism and direct use of force. The collapse of the Soviet Union and the beginning of unipolar international system

caused an increase of an ethnic and radical politico-religious non-state actors and conflicts (Hudson 2005: 14). The fourth significant change in US foreign policy was the presidential election of Bill Clinton (1993-2001). Clinton stated that, “*when our vital interests are challenged, or the will and conscience of the international community is defied, we will act with peaceful diplomacy whenever possible, with force whenever necessary.*” (Clinton 1993, Inaugural Address).

The terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001, shaped the U.S. foreign policy of George W. Bush and also Barack Obama’s administrations. Both administrations were preoccupied by the increasing of radical Islamism and terrorist activity. The *New World Order* rhetoric of good American against “rogue states¹”, was constructed on use of force in the name of humanitarian interventionism. The *war on terror*, against terrorist organizations in the Middle Eastern region, is characterized for the US foreign policy of 21st century (Hudson 2005: 16). Barack Obama has tried to reorient foreign policy from the war on terror into anti-war policy. He wanted to focus mainly on domestic situation, nevertheless global events such as the war in Iraq; the Arab Uprising; and the war against Al-Qaeda caused that Obama had to deal with external issues more. His foreign policy has not shifted from his predecessors. Nevertheless, Barack Obama’s reorientation was based on “*transforming US Policy from maintaining the regional balance of power into the promotion of democratic development in the Middle East as a top US priority is a fundamental interest in place since the previous administration.*” (Charountaki 2014: 138).

President Donald J. Trump represents the last change of the U.S. foreign policy. In 2016, Donald Trump introduced “America First” policy and he stated, that he will pursue foreign policy change and distant from the precedes administration. Additionally, Trump noted that as part of his anti-terror policy against radical Islamic terrorism, the U.S. under his leadership would work even with authoritarian and autocratic regimes (Payne 2017: 1–4). According to the debate in this chapter, Trump’s foreign policy is based on domestic structural parameters and the policy making process lays on authoritative decision of

¹ The term rogue state is applied to states regarded as a threaten for peace in the world by sponsoring terrorism and seeking weapons of mass destruction. During George W. Bush presidency have been considered as rogue states Iran, Iraq, North Korea, Cuba, Libya and Syria. President Bush described these states by the phrase axis of evils.

powerful leader. The policy making decision is also affected by American advocacy groups, such as pro-Israel lobby, with a big influence in the US. The US policy under the Trump administration is based on principles of realism with conservative elements. Trump's policy promotes protectionism of the state, which tie with the best interest of the physical security and economic stability for the US. Furthermore, Donald Trump is reoriented US foreign policy from his predecessors when is no longer a top US priority to promoting democratic values and protect regional balance of power in the Middle East, but the object is to protect US interest in the region.

1.2. Status of Jerusalem

Jerusalem evokes a lot of emotions among Israel and Palestine, and it is hard to imagine consensus which could suit both sides. Jerusalem is important mainly because there are inferring three Abrahamic religions: Christianity, Islam and Judaism. The most important part of Jerusalem is an Old City which is divided into four quarters where are located the leading historian and religious architecture. Each quarter of the city is represented by the entity – Jewish, Muslim, Christian and Armenian. Inside the Christian Quarter is located the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. According to Bible, the place is essential for the death, crucifixion and resurrection of Jesus. The Muslim Quarter is the largest and contains the third holiest site in Islam the al-Aqsa Mosque. Muslims believe, that Prophet Muhammad has visited the place after his journey to Mecca, and he prayed there with the souls of other prophets. Inside the Jewish Quarter stands the Western Wall which was the part of the Holy Temple. The Holy Temple is the most sacred site for a Jewish people because they believe that at this place was found a stone from which the world was created. The Western Wall is for Jews the closest place where they can pray to the Holy of Holies (BBC 2014).

The history of Jerusalem, a holy city for Christians, Jews and Muslims refers to a very complicated historical background. During the World War I. on December 11, 1947, British troops captured Jerusalem on behalf of the Allies. Before that, Jerusalem was part of the Turkish Ottoman Empire, were used to live predominantly Arab Muslim with a minority of Palestinian Christians and Jews (Wenger 1993: 9). After the end of Ottoman Empire, Palestine was administered by the British government as granted by the League of Nations and Jerusalem was the

capital of Palestine. This mandate lasted from 1922 till 1948 when Israel declared its independence on May 14, 1948 (Cattan 1981: 3–4).

During the mandate, the numerous of a Jewish immigrant has increased, and a new Zionist community pushed for creating a Jewish state in Palestine. It led to litigations between Arabs and Jews about the territory and Jerusalem became a key objective. Due to growing disputes about the holy city, the U.N. General Assembly adopted on November 29, 1947, the resolution 181. The resolution 181, also known as Partition Plan, proclaimed the creation of independent Arab and Jewish States and the Special international regime for the City of Jerusalem (ibid.: 4). The resolution called upon to establish Jerusalem as a *corpus separatum* under a special international Trusteeship Council for ten years to guarantee free access to all populations and maintain religious peace. In the first part of the resolution is also mentioned that, *“during the transitional period no Jew shall be permitted to establish residence in the area of the proposed Arab State, and no Arab shall be permitted to establish residence in the area of the proposed Jewish State, except by special leave of the Commission.”* and the second chapter calls upon religious and minority rights, where is declared, that *“no discrimination of any kind shall be made between the inhabitants on the ground of race, religion, language or sex. And all persons within the jurisdiction of the State shall be entitled to equal protection of the laws.”* The Partition Plan was accepted by representatives from Israel but rejected by Palestinian and all Arab countries who declared plan as illegal (A/RES/181).

On May 14, 1948, the day when the British Mandate over Palestine expired, the Jewish People's Council officially approved a proclamation declaring the establishment and independence of the State of Israel. The first country which de-facto recognized Israel was the United States during Harry Truman's presidency in 1948. Among the first countries recognizing the State of Israel was also Czechoslovakia. A year after Israeli proclamation of independence, on May 11, 1949, was Israel admitted as 59th member of the United Nations (Jewish Virtual Library). On December 20, 1948, Israeli has decided to move all governmental institutions to Jerusalem. However, the recognition of the State Israel by the international community has not meant recognition sovereignty over occupied Jerusalem (Wenger 1981: 11). Following the Israeli declaration of independence,

the military coalition of Arab states² attacked Israel. The first Arab-Israeli war lasted until January 1949, when was reached the Armistice Agreement. After the war, Israel captured almost 60% of territories proposed by Partition Plan for the Arab state in 1948 (Cattan 1981: 7–8). After the war in 1948, Israel and Jordan signed the Armistice Agreement leaving a majority of Jerusalem *corpus separatum* area under Israeli control. The boundary between Jordanian and Israeli parts was called the Green Line. After the war and Israeli occupation of Palestinian territory, the U.N. General Assembly adopted resolutions 194 and 303 which called upon establishment of permanent international regime over the city Jerusalem. The Arab states did not recognize the resolution 194, and also Israel ignored it. “*Israel’s annexation was a flagrant violation of international law carried out by an occupying power against the will of the original habitants*” (Cattan 1981: 10–11). On November 1949, Israel presented to the U.N. General Assembly, the Memorandum on the Future of Jerusalem which had contained the application for guarantees to safeguard the Holy Places, and for religious rights by the UN. On December 13, 1949, Israel accepted the principles of international supervision over the Jerusalem and Jerusalem has acquired a special *status quo*. The Jerusalem question was extremely delicate because the city would be divided between two ethnocentric states and three monotheistic religions (Scaini 2001: 210).

The situation had rapidly changed after the Six-Day War in 1967. Israel has captured East Jerusalem along with the rest of the West Bank and immediately took control over the city. Israeli law has been applied to East Jerusalem, and eastern boundaries of the city were enlargement. Following the war, Israel had started building Jewish settlements in occupied Palestinian territory and took control over 87% of East Jerusalem (al-Jubeih 2017: 8). After the Israeli occupation of Jerusalem, the U.N. Security Council have introduced the Resolution 242 which declared Israeli action as illegal. The U.N. Security Council Resolution 252, accepted in 1968, called upon “*to rescind all such measures already taken and to desist forthwith from taking any further action which tends to change the status of Jerusalem*” and for “*withdrawal of Israel armed forces from territories occupied in the recent conflict.*” (S/RES/242).

² Egypt, Jordan, Iraq, Syria and Lebanon

On July 30, 1980, the Knesset adopted The Jerusalem Law also known as the Basic Law which declared that “*Jerusalem, complete and united, is the capital of Israel*”. This Basic Law is divided into five points: unified Jerusalem constitutes the capital of Israel; Jerusalem is the seat of Israeli political institutions – the presidency, government, the Knesset, and the Supreme Court; the holy places shall be protected from desecration and religious members shall be protected from any violation of free access to holy places or of their feelings to those places; Jerusalem shall enjoy special funds including an annual grant from the government for its development and welfare of inhabitants, and special priority from state authorities for economic and other benefits (al-Jubeih 2017: 8).

Declaration of the Jerusalem Law meant a violation of international law, according to the resolution 181, the UN Special Trusteeship Council should have administrated the city under international observation. The U.N. has considered East Jerusalem as a part of the occupied Palestinian territory. In 1980, the U.N. Security Council adopted the resolution 476 which urgently called on Israel to halt, by this and previous resolutions, from its activity affecting the character and status of Jerusalem. Whereas Israeli had not compliance with the resolution, the U.N. Security Council adopted the resolution 478 which *null and void* the Basic Law and called upon states to withdraw their diplomatic missions from the city. All member states followed this call, including the USA (Stettner 2010). In 2014, the Israeli Knesset ratified a multi-faced plan for East Jerusalem that aims to consolidate Israeli sovereignty over Jerusalem and intensify its detachment from the West Bank (al-Jubeih 2017: 8).

1.3. The Israeli- Palestinian Peace Process

The peace process between Israel and Palestine is a long going procedure mediated by the United States. The aim of the process is reach a final status agreement which would established an independent Palestinian state alongside Israel. Due to Israeli annexation of the West Bank and East Jerusalem in 1967 has increased protests and terrorist attacks against Israel. This situation tried to resolve the US and initiated the first peace negotiations between both parties.

In the 1990's started the first serious peace negotiations between Israel and Palestine. The first meeting of representatives of both states was held in Madrid on October 30, 1991, and it was the first effort to improving Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

The Madrid peace conference was shield by the US and the Soviet Union. The purpose of this conference was to give a decisive impulse for peace negotiation in the Middle East, especially between Arab countries and Israel. The conference did not resolve beyond some technical issues anything significant, but it had become an origin of the peace process in the Middle East, and for the first time both antagonist parties met and talked (Čejka 2005: 184). After the peace conference in Madrid started multilateral negotiations between Israel and Palestine with the US as a mediator of the process. Following the negotiations, on January 1992, in Moscow was holding another meeting where were mainly discussed questions about economic development, Palestinian refugees, gun control and environmental issue. The negotiations between Israel and Palestine have started in Washington and later were replaced by secret meetings in Norway. These meetings led to conclude peace agreements known as the *Oslo Accords* (CNN 2017).

Due to a new escalation of violence between Israel and Palestine, the peace process has been interrupted. A significant change for the middle eastern politics was the presidential election of Bill Clinton in 1992. The US along with the international community has begun to pressure on Israel to initiate new peace talks with Palestine. Following many secret negotiations in Norway has been achieved the *Declaration of Principles on Interim Self-Government Agreement* also known as the *Oslo I Accord*. A historic meeting of Israeli and Palestinian representatives took place in Washington on September 13, 1993. This meeting has significant importance because for the first time have met and shaken hands Israeli prime minister Yitzhak Rabin and PLO leader Yasser Arafat (BBC 2008).

By signing the Declaration of Principles have PLO recognized the right the State of Israel to exist in peace and security. Besides that, PLO accepted the U.N. Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338 and committed itself to the Middle East peace process, and to a peaceful resolution of the conflict between the two sides and declares that all outstanding issues relating to permanent status will be resolved through negotiations. The Declaration of Principles contain the *Letters of Mutual Recognition*. The Letters are the correspondence between Yitzhak Rabin and Yasser Arafat where they agreed to recognize each other. PLO recognized the State of Israel and its existence in peace and safety, and Israel recognized PLO as representative of the Palestinian people. The aim of the Declaration of Principles was to establish a *Palestinian Interim Self-Government Authority* and the elected

Council for the Palestinian people in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip. For a transitional period not exceeding five years, leading to a permanent settlement based on the U.N. Security Council resolutions 242 and 338. The interim agreements were an integral part of the peace process and would lead to a final peace agreement. Jerusalem question was not included in the Oslo Accords (Čejka 2005: 188–189).

According to the Declaration of principles, the end of the negotiations in all questions was expected by the end of 1999. The most significant problem of the negotiations was Jerusalem. Palestinian representatives have assumed that East Jerusalem would become a capital city of a future state of Palestine while Israel had considered Jerusalem as unified and indivisible capital city of Israel. Moreover, Israel had started to realise a project of a “Greater Jerusalem”, when Israeli started settlement activity around the Jerusalem and even on Palestinian territories. Both parties began to blame each other for noncompliance with international law (al-Jubeh 2017: 7–8).

On October 14, 1994, were awarded Yitzhak Rabin, Shimon Peres and Yasser Arafat for their effort on achieving peace in the Middle East the Nobel Peace Prize. The Nobel prize has been seen as stimulation for a peace process in the Middle East in times when violations in Gaza strip escalated. Peace talks between Israel and Palestine have continued, and after a few months, on May 4, 1994, Yitzhak Rabin and Yasser Arafat signed *The Agreement on the Gaza Strip and Jericho Area* in Cairo. The purpose of the agreement was that Israel agreed to schedule withdrawal from the Gaza Strip and the Jericho Area. Moreover, the agreement provided limited Palestinian self-rule in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip within five years. On July 1994, Yasser Arafat has become the first president of the Palestinian Authority. Following the Agreement on the Gaza Strip and the Jericho Area has been signed the *Protocol on Economic Relations* also called as the *Paris Protocol*. The major part of the Paris Protocol was the tax system of the Palestinian Authority and also regulation of the economic relations between Israel and Palestine (Barak 2005: 722).

The most significant treaty in the Israeli-Palestinian peace process was *The Interim Agreement on the West Bank and the Gaza Strip* signed on September 28, 1995, in Washington. The agreement is known more under the unofficial title as the *Oslo II Accord*. The preamble of the agreement expressed mutual coexistence and

recognition of legitimate and political rights for both parties. The agreement also divided West Bank into three zones: A, B and C. *“Area A, the major cities where Palestinians were to have full control; Area B, where Israel would be in charge of security while Palestinians handled civilian matters; and Area C, under full Israeli control.”* (Rudoren 2015).

In following phases, Israeli army should withdraw from zones B and C to other areas its exact boundaries have not been defined yet. After Israeli withdraw would be held a general election to Palestinian parliament under international observation. The agreement declared, that *“Israel and the Palestinian Authority shall seek to foster mutual understanding and tolerance and shall accordingly abstain from incitement, including hostile propaganda, against each other and, without derogating from the principle of freedom of expression, shall take legal measures to prevent such incitement by any organizations, groups or individuals within their jurisdiction.”* (Oslo II Accord). Afterwards, Palestinian parliament would remove parts of PLO charter from the legislation, which doubted Israeli right to exist in peace. A disputable problem was zone C which included the West Bank. The Oslo II Accord had an important meaning for the Israeli-Palestinian peace process. However, many questions have remained unresolved, and dispute about Jerusalem was left undecided. Above that, shortly after the Oslo II Accord had been signed, Yitzhak Rabin was assassinated in the centre of Tel Aviv at a peace demonstration for supporting peace agreements. Signing the Oslo Accords and disagreement with peace negotiation caused an increase of radical groups and terrorist activity on both sides. Following the Oslo Accords have been signed *Hebron Agreement* and *Wye River Memorandum* which guaranteed withdrawal of Israeli military forces from Hebron and returning part of the West Bank to the Palestinian Authority (Čejka 2005: 194).

In July 2000, U.S. President Bill Clinton announced his invitation Israeli Prime Minister Ehud Barak and Palestinian Authority Chairman Yasser Arafat. The purpose of the meeting was to continue in peace talks between Israel and the Palestinian Authority for reaching the final agreement to end the conflict and violence in the Middle East. Negotiations have contained questions about disputed territory, refugee problem and Israeli settlement activity. The key issue has remained Jerusalem. *“At Camp David Israeli Prime Minister Ehud Barak sought to test whether Yasir Arafat and the Palestinians were ready for a real peace by*

offering them a comprehensive settlement in which, in return for a definitive decision by the Palestinians to end their long conflict with Israel, they would acquire an independent state in 94–96 percent of the West Bank and Gaza and half of Jerusalem, including all the key areas.”. The Summit began on July 11 and ended on July 25, without an agreement being reached (Slater 2007:91).

Following the Summit has been declared the *Trilateral Statement on the Middle East Peace Summit at Camp David* which defined the agreed principles to guide future negotiations. Both Parties agreed that the aim of their negotiations to achieve is to put an end of the conflict and achieve a just and lasting peace. They also committed to continuing in efforts to conclude a final agreement on all permanent status issues as soon as possible. They also agreed that the US would remain as a vital partner in the search for peace. Furthermore, both parties agreed that negotiations would be based on UN Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338 (US Department of State).

In December 2000, were presented the *Clinton Parameters* as a basis for further negotiations and reaching a final status agreement. The Parameters proposing a future Palestinian state would include 94–96% of the West Bank and the entire Gaza Strip. The Parameters also included the Palestinian right of return to Israel and division of Jerusalem. The Old City should be separated according to the ethnic lines. Israel would gain sovereignty over the Western Wall and the space sacred to Judaism of which is a part of the Western Wall and Palestinian would gain sovereignty over the Temple Mount. Both sides accepted the principles with reservations however the main problem of the conflict has remained the question about East Jerusalem and Israeli settlements. The Palestinian rejected Israeli sovereignty over settlements outside the municipal borders of Jerusalem, and the Clinton Parameters have not been implemented (The Clinton Parameters). The Clinton Parameters were tied up with Taba and Beirut Summits held during 2001–2002, which also failed in reaching the peace agreement in Israeli-Palestinian conflict (The Guardian 2003).

In 2003 was introduced *The Roadmap for peace in the Middle East*, developed by the US in cooperation with Russia, the EU and the UN, so-called the Quartet. In 2002, President George W. Bush said about the Roadmap draft, that *„the Roadmap represents a starting point toward achieving the vision of two states, a secure State of Israel and a viable, peaceful, democratic Palestine. It is*

framework for progress towards lasting peace and security in the Middle East.” (U.S. Department of State). The Roadmap has been divided into three phases. The first phase would end Israeli-Palestinian violence and halt Israeli settlement activity in the West Bank and Gaza Strip. The second phase was proposing to establish an independent Palestinian State along side-by-side with the State of Israel in peace and security, also known under the term the Two-State Solution. And the last phase would reach a final agreement on permanent borders of a Palestinian state, the status of Jerusalem, and international recognition for both states (The Guardian 2003).

In 2007, the Bush Administration convened an international conference in Annapolis with a purpose to revive the Israeli-Palestinian peace process. In Annapolis conference has been reached the *Joint Understanding* in which Israel and Palestine agreed to launch continuous bilateral negotiations in an effort to conclude a peace treaty by the end of 2008. The final agreement would be based on the Roadmap proposal of the Two-State solution and both parties committed to implementing their respective obligations under the Roadmap (Migdalovitz 2007).

In following years, the representatives of both parties have met in many meetings, and in 2009, for the first time, Israeli prime minister Benjamin Netanyahu declared support for a future Palestinian state, within some conditions. From July 2013 to April 2014 were held the most intensive U.S.-mediated negotiation talks between Israel and Palestine since the Clinton administration. However, the negotiations failed on the same issues as the previous ones. The PLO Chairman was unwilling to recognize Israel as “the nation-state of the Jewish people” because of potential effect for Palestinian refugee’s claim to a right of return to Jerusalem (Zanotti 2014: 5–6). In 2013 began direct talks between Israel and Palestine and in 2014 was presented *Abbas’ peace plan*. The plan called for nine months of direct dialogues and three-year plan when Israel should withdraw from Palestinian territories and leave East Jerusalem as a capital city of Palestine. Neither this plan was implemented, and the peace process remained halt. “*One could argue that peace between Israelis and Palestinians is simply impossible. Or one could conclude that peace is possible, but the two sides do not yet recognize it as the only viable option, and therefore not ready to make the necessary painful concessions. But the evidence points to a third explanation. There was squandered through miscalculations and mismanagement of the entire process.*” (Barak 2005: 723).

2. The U.S. Foreign Policy Towards Israel

In this part of the thesis I will focus on American foreign policy towards Israel of time interval from 1948 to the present. This chapter is divided into three subchapters when one each of them will characterize the change of the U.S. foreign policy towards Israel among history. The first subchapter will describe the U.S.-Israeli relations from Richard Nixon to George H.W. Bush's presidency. During this period, Israel was the strategic asset against Soviet Union's influence in the Middle East. The relations between the US and Israel had changed after the collapse of the Soviet Union. The second subchapter characterizes period from Bill Clinton's presidency to Barack Obama. President Clinton represents a significant change in the U.S.-Israeli relationship and also for the Middle East peace process. The last subchapter is focus on the pro-Israeli lobby in the US and their influence on the U.S. foreign policy.

The relationship between Israel and the United States had begun when President Harry Truman gave his blessing by recognizing a new Jewish nation on May 15, 1948. The relationship between the US and Israel is also called as a "*special relationship*" and is defined as a unique relationship between two countries with high level of political and security cooperation (Little 2008: 77). "*The special relations between the USA as a powerful country and Israel as a small state have no match in the international sphere. This is indeed a rare case in international modern history. Both sides give enormous significance to the relations and work for their nurturing, empowerment and continuity. These relations include a high levelled friendship, sympathy, trust and a close, intensive political and security cooperation.*" (Bar-Siman-Tov 1998: 231). At the beginning of its existence, Israel was a strategic asset for the USA against Soviet influence in the Middle East, and Israel was perceived as a partner to keep regional stability. A newly created state of Israel looked for financial and security support in this unstable region, and the USA seemed to be an ideal partner. The military balance has been seen as the key for stability and peace (Shlaim 1988: 19).

On November 29, 1947, the U.N. General Assembly Resolution 181 (Partition Plan) called upon creating separate Jewish and Arab states, while Jerusalem would be administrated as a corpus separatum under the U.N. Trusteeship Council with international control. The USA supported the Partition

Plan, and Jerusalem was under international regime until 1967 (Neff 1993:20). In 1967, after the Six-Day War, Israel captured the West Bank; annexed East Jerusalem and declared Jerusalem as unified and eternal city of Israel. The US had refused to recognize Israeli annexation of Jerusalem and considered East Jerusalem as an occupied territory of Palestinian people (Shlaim 1988: 20).

Israeli unification of Jerusalem has caused violation in the Middle East, and even the US, the most significant Israeli ally, called for return the borders to Palestinian people. The U.N. Security Council Resolution 242 called upon *land for peace* between Israel and Arab states and for the end of Israeli settlement activity. The Resolution 242 has become the basis for future negotiations in the Arab-Israeli conflict and called upon returning occupied Palestinian territories, including East Jerusalem. The special relationship between the US and Israel is also reflected in the U.N. platform when the US usually abstain in passing the resolutions concerning the Israeli-Palestinian question or in the most cases vote in favour of Israel (Sciarcon 2018). The U.S.-Israeli relationship is also characterized as a unique *patron-client relationship* build on common political, ideological, security and strategic interests which form a political and military alliance. This relation is reciprocal and exchanges goods and services for mutually beneficial. Another significant factor which represents a big part of this unique relationship is the large and active American Jewish community who promote most of the common values and ideals (Bar-Siman-Tov 1998: 232).

2.1. From Richard Nixon to George H.W. Bush

President Richard Nixon and Secretary of State Henry Kissinger considered Israel as a strategic asset for countering the Soviet Union's influence in the Middle East and Israel has an important role to play in the U.S.-Soviet power balance. After the Yom Kippur War³, the Arab-Israeli conflict escalated due to Israeli rejection of return occupied territory back to Palestine. The US role in the peace process has shifted into the mediator of the negotiations and the US started to be more active (Shlaim 2016: 19). Richard Nixon stated, "*Our interests, are pro-freedom and not just pro-Israel because of the Jewish vote. We are for Israel because Israel in our view is the only state in the Mideast which is pro-freedom and an effective opponent*

³ The Yom Kippur War lasted from October 6 to 25, 1973. In war was fighting a coalition of Arab states led by Egypt Syria against Israel.

to Soviet expansion.” (Bar-Siman-Tov 1998: 224). The purpose of U.S. strengthening relationship with Israel was to give Israel confidence to make later some concessions in Arab-Israeli negotiations. Richard Nixon, Henry Kissinger and Gerald Ford used military and economic aid to compensate Israel for the costs of the Yom Kippur War and induce it to make concessions.

On March 1, 1980, the US joined in passing U.N. Security Council Resolution 465 which affirmed Israeli settlement activity as illegal, including Jerusalem and demanding Israel to stop building a new one and dismantle existing ones. The resolution also determined that, “*all measures taken by Israel to change the physical character, demographic composition, institutional structure or status of the Palestinian and other Arab territories occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem, have no legal validity and that Israel's policy and practices of settling parts of its population and new immigrants in those territories constitute a flagrant violation of the Fourth Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War and also constitute a serious obstruction to achieving a comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the Middle East.*” (S/RES/465). This vote evoked resistance of Jewish community in the US and Israeli critics of the US government. Carter later said, that this vote was a mistake because his chances in approaching primaries in New York and Illinois were threatened (Neff 1993: 37).

During 1974–1976, the US provided financial aid of \$5.8 billion to Israel and \$3.4 billion of it in grants. Nixon said about the US-Israeli relationship, that “*Nothing was more important to the Israelis than their own military security. If we provided the hardware, we could convince the Israelis that they were secure. Then they might be willing to accept some risks in the search for peace.*” (Bar-Siman-Tov1998: 248). Ronald Reagan went even further when Israel has received \$22.9 billion all as a grand aid, and the military assistance has increased. The first official and public agreement between the US and Israel which expressed the special status of Israel was *The Memorandum of Understanding on Strategic Cooperation* of November 1981 (ibid.: 252–253).

The significant role in the U.S.-Israeli partnership has the Jewish community and the Jewish lobby which began to grow up since the 1960’s. One of the top goals of the influential *American Israel Public Affairs Committee* (AIPAC) was the relocation of the American embassy to Jerusalem. The campaign escalated in 1980’s when the bill for moving the embassy has been introduced in the House of

Representatives and the Senate. Mainly the Democratic national platform used this theme in the election because a big part of Jewish community lived in the key states for the election campaigns such as New York, Illinois and California. This position was officially endorsed in 1984: “*The Democratic Party recognizes and supports established status of Jerusalem as the capital of Israel. As a symbol of this stand, the U.S. Embassy should be moved from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem.*” (Neff 1993: 38). In 1988, Republican Senator Jesse Helms added an amendment which called for the construction of two separate diplomatic facilities in Israel, one in Tel Aviv and one in Jerusalem. Both facilities should serve as an embassy or consulate. On 24 April 1990, the House of Representatives voted 378 to 34 in favour to support a resolution which named Jerusalem as Israeli capital city. Despite this political pressure, George H.W. Bush’s administration stood by traditional policy of calling East Jerusalem as an occupied territory. Later Bush added, that the U.S. foreign policy should not support a new settlement activity in the West Bank or East Jerusalem. Bush statement did not represent any change in U.S. policy and the policy remained that “*the US supports a united Jerusalem whose final status should be determined by negotiations.*” (ibid.: 39).

2.2. From Bill Clinton to Barack Obama

During Bill Clinton presidency, the US and Israel reconstructed their special relationship, and Clinton announced that the US would take a more active role in the peace process. Clinton’s administration has initiated the Israeli-Palestinian peace talks which started in Madrid and was followed by negotiations in Washington DC. The peace talks under Clinton administration led to accomplish the Oslo Accords. The US cooperation in peace process provided Israel with the confidence to proceed with negotiations on all fronts, especially with the PLO (Bar-Siman-Tov 1998: 258).

During Clinton administration was introduced the *Jerusalem Embassy Act of 1995*, the U.S. public law, passed by the 104th Congress on October 23, 1995. This Act became law without a presidential signature on November 8, 1995, and recognized Jerusalem as a capital and undivided city of the State of Israel. The purpose of the Act was to developed funds for the relocation of the American Embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem. The Embassy would be established in Jerusalem no later than May 31, 1999. The president may suspend the Act for the

period of six months if he determines and reports to Congress in advance that such suspension is necessary to protect the national security interests of the United States (Library of Congress 1995).

Clinton in his statement said, that “*the Act could hinder the peace process. I will not let this happen and will use the legislation’s waiver authority to avoid damage to the peace process.*” Since Clinton, every president signed the waiver until December 6, 2017, while President Donald Trump officially ordered the State Department to plan relocation of the U.S. Embassy to Jerusalem (Bump 2017). In September 2011, was in Congress introduced a new bill the *Jerusalem Embassy and Recognition Act of 2011*, the Act called upon to eliminate the Presidential waiver authority and for opening the Embassy no later than 2013. The bill did not pass by the House Foreign Affairs Committee at the end of 2011 (the U.S. Bill 1622).

The change in the U.S. Middle Eastern policy represents George W. Bush, who on June 24, 2002, expressed support for the creation an independent Palestinian state alongside Israel. For final peace solution of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict Bush, with cooperation with the Quartet, proposed The Roadmap for Peace based on the two-state solution. The Roadmap was based on the Madrid Conference principles and on the UN SC resolutions 242 and 338. This plan was unique because for the first time called for creation of Palestinian state and considered Israel’s settlements as illegal.

The Bush’s administration failed to provide details concerning the final status, including the future status of Jerusalem; Jewish settlements; borders; and Palestinian refugee problem. The Plan also failed to halt Israeli settlement expansion in the Palestinian territories (Mohamad 2015: 79–80). Bush warned that the two-states solution provide “*an opportunity to lay the foundations for future peace across the region and a test to show who is serious about peace and who is not.*”. During Bush’s presidency, has Israel participated on the U.S. policy the war on terror. The U.S. military power endorsed moral principles in foreign policymaking and due to this policy, Israel was justified for using force against Palestinians as an instrument to achieve their own peace and security (ibid. 81).

When the Obama administration presented framework for the Israeli-Palestinian negotiations it became clear that the U.S. pro-Israeli orientation has not been changed. Although, in his campaign speech he said that the US will no longer

accept the legitimacy of expansion Israeli settlements. During this period the US increased an annual military aid for Israel from \$2.55 billion to \$3.1 billion (Ruebner 2016). In February 2011, the Obama administration used the U.N. veto to block Palestinian draft resolution which called Israeli settlement activity as illegal. The U.S. ambassador Susan Rice added that *“the U.S. veto should not be seen as an endorsement of Israeli’s settlement policies, which the Obama administration has repeatedly denounced, but the resolution risks hardening the positions of both sides.”* (Lynch 2011).

Even if Obama’s presidency did not represent any change in the U.S. foreign policy towards Israeli-Palestinian conflict, the relationship between the US and Israel had shifted from “special” to “normal”. Obama saw the Israeli-Palestinian conflict as a source of the problem in the Middle East and solution about Jerusalem question would resolve only compromise of both sides. Obama is seen as pro-Israeli president, however during his presidency, the US-Israeli relationship has been lacked confidence (Saltzman 2017: 53–54).

The special relationship between the US and Israel has never been formalized as a legally binding political and military alliance, but in general, the U.S. role was to protect the existence of Israel and Israel as a strategic asset was important in helping the US to advance its interest in the region (Bar-Siman-Tov 1998: 261). The American Jewish community and the Jewish lobby played a significant part of the special relationship, nevertheless a good relations and mutual respect between leaders were more important for the negotiations. However, if the Jewish lobby’s ability to work effectively in the American political system, the U.S.-Israeli relationship would be far less intimate (Mearsheimer, Walt 2006: 40).

2.3. The pro-Israel Lobby

The term *lobby* is used for the coalition of individuals and organizations that actively support and work to shape U.S. foreign policy in pro-Israel direction. The core of the lobby is made by American Jews, although it does not mean that every American Jew supports the policies endorsed by the lobby. Besides, *“the lobby is not a single, unified movement with a central leadership, however, and the individuals and groups that make up this broad coalition sometimes disagree on specific policy issues.”* (Marsheimer, Walt 2006: 112).

The most powerful and well-known pro-Israel lobby organization is the *American Israel Public Affairs Committee* (AIPAC), founded in 1963, this lobby played a major part in shaping U.S. policy towards the Middle East. The aim of the lobby is to prevent harmful public discourse and debate about Israel because controlling the discussion might lead Americans in favour to pro-Israel policy. The AIPAC has a big influence on Congress and Executive Branch and above that, has also a significant impact on a presidential campaign. The AIPAC help presidential candidates to get financial sponsorship from their members. The pro-Israel lobbies have strong ties also with the evangelist voters (Al-Jazeera 2012). In 2016, was held the AIPAC conference in Washington D.C. where participated political leaders and also presidential candidates, including Joe Biden, Donald Trump, Ted Cruz or Hillary Clinton. Hillary Clinton address to AIPAC in her speech, that “*You will keep the U.S.-Israel relationship going strong. You know, as a senator from New York and secretary of State...I’ve had the privilege of working closely with AIPAC members to strengthen and deepen America’s ties with Israel. Now, we may not have always agreed on every detail, but we’ve always shared an unwavering, unshakable commitment to our alliance and to Israel’s future as a secure and democratic homeland for the Jewish people.*” (Beckwith 2016).

Another key organizations whose agendas include working for benefit Israel and has an influence on U.S. foreign policy are: the *Zionist Organization of America* (ZOA), the *Israel Policy Forum* (IPF), the *American Jewish Committee* (AJC), the *Anti-Defamation League* (ADL) and the *Americans for a Safe Israel* (AFSI). The lobby includes also thinks-tanks such as the *Jewish Institute for National Security Affairs* (JINSA), the *Middle East Forum* (MEF). On pro-Israel interests participate also individuals who work in universities or another research centre. Another significant group, whose interest is Israel, are *Christian Zionist*. They claim a specific political agenda that defines the lobby, but not the religious or ethnic identity. They believe that the return of the Jewish people to Palestine would lead to the Second Coming of Christ’s return and that this process is preordained (Marsheimer, Walt 2006: 115–117).

The American Jewish community is united and feel a special connection with the State of Israel, however support for Israel is no longer related with support for Israeli government policy. The American Jewish community is increasingly divided, and it lays in pro-Israel lobbying groups policy. Besides a traditional pro-

Israel groups such as AIPAC with a significant influence in Congress, there is growing number of alternative pro-Israel groups for example *J Street* or *Americans For Peace Now* which have diversity opinion and growing impact on the debate. According to opinion poll in the US “*a growing number of American Jews, even a majority, are dissatisfied with Israel’s treatment of the Palestinians and deeply worried about Israel’s ability to remain a Jewish and democratic state if it continues to effectively rule over Palestinians in the West Bank and East Jerusalem.*” (Blackwill, Gordon 2016:19).

3. The U.S. Foreign Policy Towards Palestine

The third chapter will characterize the evolution of the U.S.-Palestinian relationship since the PLO declared its independence to the present situation. Despite, that this part is very short, it has a relevant contribution for the research and it is important for understanding the peace negotiations.

The US and the State of Palestine had a difficult relationship since the US officially does not recognize Palestine as a state but as Palestinian Liberal Organization (PLO) which represents Palestinian people. Moreover, there are no official diplomatic exchanges between them. The PLO is represented in Washington DC by a General Delegation and the U.S. government has no official representatives in the Palestinian Authority areas, only a General Consulate in Jerusalem. Palestinian declaration of independence was proclaimed on November 15, 1988, in Algeria at Palestinian National Council's session. PLO was founded in 1964 and its purpose was to liberate Palestinian people from Israeli occupation. The international recognition of the State of Palestine has been the objective for the PLO. In 1974, has PLO gained an observer status at the UN, however the US and Israel considered PLO as a terrorist organization until 1991. During the Oslo Accords negotiations has PLO recognized Israel's right to exist in peace; and accepted the UN SC resolutions 242 and 338. In response, Israel recognized PLO as the representative by Palestinian people. In 1995 was by the Agreement on the Gaza Strip and Jericho Area established the Palestinian National Authority (PA or PNA) as a self-government interim body. East Jerusalem was excluded from the Accords but Palestinian have considered East Jerusalem as their future capital city (Kabha 2013: 6–8).

The first American president who advocated Palestinian right for their own state, was Jimmy Carter. He demanded creating a homeland for Palestinian refugees who lived in occupied territory. During the Carter's presidency has been established the Palestinian Information Office in Washington DC, however a real progress in the US-Palestinian relationship has not been made. President Reagan continuously opposed of the negotiations with the PLO and the Republicans rejected every proposal to establish the Palestinian state. Under Reagan's presidency has been accepted the Anti-Terrorism Act which proclaimed PLO as a terrorist organization and prohibited all of its activity. After the declaration of Palestinian independence

in 1988, following by recognition of mutual existence has begun a dialog between the PLO and Israel where the US held a role of mediator.

Tensions between the US and PLO continued until the Madrid Peace Conference in 1991 where was for the first time accepted an official Palestinian delegation. President Clinton has significantly changed the U.S. foreign policy towards Palestine. During his presidency has been signed the Oslo agreement between Israel and the PLO, and the US-PLO dialogue was resumption. Clinton administration also supported creation the State of Palestine materially by hosting the first donor conference in Washington on October 1993. Following the Oslo agreement was established the Palestinian National Authority and the PLO office was renamed as the PLO Mission to the United States. In 1998, president Bill Clinton visited the PA as the first American president. Under George W. Bush's administration has been established the Palestine Economic Development Group which is the committee for managing and supervise economic ties between the US and Palestine. The US-Palestinian relationship has been improved by the Obama's inauguration. Barack Obama, from the beginning of his term, supported the establishment of a Palestinian state. Tensions between the US and Palestine started again in 2012, when the U.N. General Assembly adopted Resolution 67/19 which recognized the State of Palestine as a non-member UN observer state by a vote of 138-member states in favor. The US and Israel voted against the resolution. The U.N. observer status of the PLO recognized PLO as "Palestine" within the U.N. system. The US and Israel were concerned that change of Palestinian status recourse to international forums could avoid and undermine U.S. mediator role in Israeli-Palestinian peace negotiations. After passing the resolution some U.S. senators called for a closure of the PLO delegation in Washington DC. The head of the Delegation stated that the closure would have worsen the U.S. position in the Middle East (Zanotti 2014: 13–14).

In September 2011, PLO Chairman Mahmoud Abbas applied for Palestinian membership in the UN. The application has not been approved by the Security Council's members whose did not achieve consensus until 2011. In 2011, the Palestine sis obtain membership in the U.N. Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). Since Israeli occupation the PA facing a regular annual budget deficit of over \$1 billion and Palestine has sought a financial aid mainly from the EU and the US. Since the establishment of Palestinian self-rule

government in the West Bank and Gaza strip, the U.S. government sent more than \$5 billion in bilateral economic and security assistance. The Palestine is among the largest recipients of the U.S. foreign aid worldwide. The U.S. financial aid for Palestine is intended to promote the prevention or mitigation of terrorism against Israel from the Sunni Islamist group Hamas and other militant organizations; fostering stability, prosperity and self-governance that may incline Palestinians toward peaceful coexistence with Israel and a two-state solution; and for humanitarian needs (Zanotti 2016: 1). Critics of the U.S. financial support for Palestine claim that the financial aid would promote terrorist activity and strengthen Fatah and Hamas. According to U.S. legislation the aid is specifically prohibited from going to Hamas or Hamas-controlled entities. The funds are not committed for provide to support a future Palestinian state unless the government of the state of Palestine demonstrate a firm to peaceful coexistence with the State of Israel; taking measures to counter terrorism in the West Bank and Gaza in cooperation with Israel and others; and is working to establish a just, lasting peace in the Middle East enable Israel and an independent Palestinian state to exist within the context of full relationship (Zanotti 2014: 13–14).

In January 2018, Donald Trump has threatened to halt the aid of economic and security assistance for Palestinians at the World Economic Forum in Davos. This was for the first time when the US has used aid as a bargaining tool to try forcing the Palestinians to negotiate peace. In 2016, the US bilateral aid for Palestinian amounted \$260 million. In contrast, Israel has received more than \$3 billion in military aid from the US. During the World Economic Forum in Davos, Trump in his speech said, that *“we give them (Palestine) tremendous amounts – hundreds of millions of dollars a year. That money is on the table. Because why should we do that, as a country, if they’re doing nothing for us?”* (World Economic Forum 2018). Tensions between the US and Palestine aroused after the Palestinian Authority President Mahmoud Abbas travelled to Brussels to urge the EU for recognizing the State of Palestine rather than met with U.S. vice-president Mike Pence. Mohamoud Abbas reacted on Trump’s decision to cut financial aid for Palestine when he said that under these conditions he would not accept any peace plan proposal from the US. He also added that, *“financial pressure for coercive political agendas does not work, especially when our position is supported by the international community.”* (BBC 2018).

4. The Subject: The Relocation of the US Embassy in Israel

The last chapter of the thesis will be divided into four sections. In the first subchapter, I will focus on Donald Trump's announcement on Jerusalem and his position on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Following, I will analyse the foreign policy change of the United States under Donald Trump presidency. Afterwards, I will focus on the origins and implications of President Trump's decision to relocate the American Embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem. Besides that, I will analyse the US policy under Donald Trump's Administration and compare it with the previous one. In addition, I will describe the international reaction to this controversial move. The aim of this chapter is to analyse, what consequences will the relocation of the Embassy have on the Israeli-Palestinian peace process and how the change of the US policy will affect the world affairs.

President Donald Trump announced on December 6, 2017, that the United States officially recognized Jerusalem as the capital and undivided city of Israel, and the American embassy will be relocated from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem. Donald Trump's statement had broken seven decades of US foreign policy towards Jerusalem when he did not sign a presidential six-month waiver adopted with the Jerusalem Embassy Act from 1995. Every administration since Bill Clinton the waiver has signed until 2017. President Donald Trump has also broken more than 20 years old tradition policy pursued by his predecessors who refused to relocate the Embassy until a settlement and the final Israeli-Palestinian peace agreement will be reached (Policy Analysis Unit, 2017).

The official date of opening the American embassy in Jerusalem was established on May 15, 2018. The opening will coincide with Israel's 70th anniversary of declaring their independence. Besides, on this date, 70 years ago, President Harry Truman recognized the State of Israel. The Embassy will be located in the Arnona neighbourhood, in a building that now houses consular operations of the U.S. Consulate General Jerusalem. The Consulate will continue to operate as an independent mission with the unchanged mandate. Meanwhile, the U.S. Department of State has started searching for a location where would be build a permanent Embassy in Israel. The planning and construction of the new Embassy will be a longer-term mission (U.S. Department of State, 2018).

4.1. Donald Trump's Statement on Jerusalem

On December 6, 2017, in the White House, Donald Trump delivered the statement on Jerusalem. Trump criticized his predecessor whose were not able achieved their promises. He proclaimed, that *"We cannot solve our problems by making the same failed assumptions and repeating the same failed strategies of the past. Old challenges demand new approaches. My announcement today marks the beginning of a new approach to conflict between Israel and the Palestinians."* (The White House, Statement 2017).

Trump's decision has also a personal dimension, Trump said, that *„while previous presidents have made this a major campaign promise, they failed to deliver. Today, I am delivering."* In the statement, Trump mentioned Israeli right, as a sovereign nation, to determine its own capital city. According to Trump, this fact is important condition for achieving the peace solution. The statement on Jerusalem expressed, that decision of recognizing Jerusalem as a capital city of Israel is not intended, in any way, to reflect a departure from strong commitment to facilitating a lasting peace agreement. Trump stated, that *"we want an agreement that is a great deal for the Israelis and a great deal for the Palestinians. We are not taking a position of any final status issues, including the specific boundaries of the Israeli sovereignty in Jerusalem, or the resolution of contested borders. Those questions are up to the parties involved."* Trump also admitted that Jerusalem is one of the most sensitive questions for reaching the peace agreement, but the US remains to support a two-state solution if both sides agreed to the status of Jerusalem's holy sites should maintain as the *status quo* (ibid.).

Decision about moving an Embassy to Jerusalem did not represent a compromise between president's chief advisors. In opposition to this move was a former Secretary of State Rex Tillerson, Defence Secretary James Forrester and CIA director Mike Pompeo. Arguments against the decision are based on the potential threat of American interests in the Arab and Islamic countries. Furthermore, the relocation of the Embassy to Jerusalem will break the commitment of UN SC Resolutions 181 and 242 based on Two-State Solution. Moreover, the relocation would break the position of the US as moderator of the negotiations and the Palestinian-Israeli negotiations will be destroyed. In addition, the peace proposals that they were working on to keep peace, can be abandoned and in the

occupied Palestinian territories would start a new round of violence (Policy Analysis Unit 2017).

Opponents of Trump's decision are also worried of tensions between the US and its Arab and Muslim allies, and even with its European allies and the international community. On the other hand, Trump's decision supported Vice president Mike Pence, US envoy to the UN Nikki Haley and US ambassador to Israel David M. Friedman. The move was also encouraged by President's son-in-law and senior advisor Jared Kushner and US Special Envoy for Peace in the Middle East Jason Greenblatt. Their argument for moving the Embassy to Jerusalem is that by this step would the US gain ability to manoeuvre with the Israeli right-wing government and the US administration would have a better position for offering a framework for a final Israeli-Palestinian peace agreement (ibid.).

Donald Trump justifies his decision in compliance with *Jerusalem Embassy Act* which was accepted by Clinton administration in 1995. The Act declares Jerusalem as capital and undivided city of the State of Israel and calls upon establishment of American Embassy there. During his presidential campaign, Trump had made a promise to the Jewish community that after his inauguration will fulfil his promise and move the Embassy to Jerusalem.

In 2016, the UN SC adopted resolution 2334 reaffirming that Israel's established settlements in Palestinian territory occupied since 1967, including East Jerusalem, had no legal validity and are a flagrant violation against international law. The Resolution 2334 passed by 14 votes, with the US abstention. Donald Trump was strongly against this decision and criticized Obama's administration. During the campaign on March 21, 2016, Trump addressed a speech at the AIPAC conference where he criticized a previous administration and the UN, and he said that "*When I'm president, believe me, I will veto any attempt by the U.N. to impose its will on the Jewish state. It will be vetoed 100 percent. I will meet with Prime Minister Netanyahu immediately. I have known him for many years and we'll be able to work closely together to help bring stability and peace to Israel and to the entire region.*", at the end of his speech to AIPAC Trump said, "*I love the people in this room. I love Israel. I love Israel. I've been with Israel so long in terms of I've received some of my greatest honors from Israel, my father before me, incredible. My daughter, Ivanka, is about to have a beautiful Jewish baby.*" (Begley 2016).

4.2. Donald Trump and Foreign Policy

On December 28, 2017, Trump's administration delivered a new National Security Strategy of the United States of America based on significant shift in emphasis from the past. The strategy document is divided into four pillars and the last part of it, is strategy in a regional context. The NSS is concerning all aspects of national power such as diplomatic, economic and military, all built on principles of realism. In opening preamble of the document is Trump mentioning his America First foreign policy in action and prioritizing the interest of American citizens. He also added, *"America is leading again on the world stage. We are not hiding from the challenges we face. The whole world is lifted by America's renewal and the re-emergence of American leadership."* (The White House, NSS 2017:1).

The first pillar promotes protection of American people and way of life. And also include security of U.S. borders and territory, pursue threats to their source and promote America resilience. Second pillar promotes American prosperity and this pillar emphasises the need of fair and reciprocal economic relationships. The third pillar deals with promotion peace through military strength in its conventional nuclear, cyber and space forces. Last pillar advancing American influence and encourage aspiring partners. The final section of the document is the strategy in a regional context where Trump stated that *"We will work with partners to deny Iranian regime all paths to a nuclear weapon and neutralize Iranian malign influence. We remain committed to helping facilitate a comprehensive peace agreement that is acceptable both Israelis and Palestinians."* Trump's administration also proclaimed, that *"for generations the conflict between Israel and the Palestinians has been understood as the prime irritant preventing peace and prosperity in the region. States have increasingly found common interests with Israel in confronting common threats. By revitalizing partnerships with reform-minded nations and encouraging cooperation among partners in the region, the United States can promote stability and a balance of power that favors U.S. interests."* (The White House, NSS 2017: 49).

Trump administration's national security strategy rejects key elements of the previous administration's approach. The national strategy plan emphasis upon economic strength as a basis for a strong foreign policy and reflects American strength abroad deeply rests upon prosperity at home. The NSS calls for American leadership not for isolationism, on the other hand leadership which is more

unilateral and sovereign. The first line of Trump's national strategy is "*An America that is safe, prosperous, and free at home is an America with the strength, confidence, and will to lead abroad.*" The NSS puts America first and foreign policy is changed from preceding one. Obama's foreign policy emphasised on multilateral action and cooperation with international actors, while Trump acts unilateral with authoritative executive elements. Furthermore, Trump rejected environmental policy and foreign security strategy of previous Obama administration and reoriented the US policy toward a new era of economic developing and putting American interest in the first place. The alliance system, which was established after World War II with the aim of building a post-war international order under the leadership of the US as a hegemonic power, may wither to under Trump's rule (Marcus 2017).

4.3. The International Reaction

According to Gallup International Association opinion poll from December 2017, provided research about *Attitudes Towards the Recognition of Jerusalem as Israeli Capital* and found that there is international disapproval with Trump's decision. The research included 24 countries⁴ across the globe. According to this study, were found, that more than 71% of respondents disagree with the decision by President Trump to recognize Jerusalem as the capital city of Israel and thereby to move the US embassy. Group of the Arab countries disagree more than 94% and Islamic countries more than 84%. Another examined question was the justification of Palestinian use of force to achieve their own state based on the Trump's decision on Jerusalem and total average of agree answers was 52% in contradiction of 26% of disagree answers. In the Arab world, this figure increases to 77%. As a result, more than 70% of polled countries around the world think, that the decision would result in increase of terrorism in the Islamic world. Agree answers in group of Islamic countries increase to 81% and the most worried countries of increasing of terrorism are Yemen (87%), Syria (82%) and Iraq (76%). A peace settlement between Israel and Palestine was always a fragile issue but now the poll showed

⁴ Among selected countries are: Algeria, Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Libya, Morocco, Syria, Tunisia, Yemen, Indonesia, Nigeria, Pakistan, Turkey, Austria, Bulgaria, Finland, Italy, Germany, Cote d'Ivoire, Kenya, Moldova, South Korea, UK. Group Arab countries includes Algeria, Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Libya, Morocco, Syria, Tunisia and Yemen. Group Islamic countries includes Indonesia, Nigeria, Pakistan and Turkey.

that the relocation of the Embassy made it a lot harder to achieve (Gallup International 2017).

United Nations position on Jerusalem remained unchanged and clear, when *“a final status issue to be determined through a comprehensive, just and lasting solution to be negotiated between the two sides concerned on the basis of relevant United Nations resolutions and other agreement”* (UN SC/13111). The UN expressed concern about the potential of escalation violence and clashes between Palestinian protestors and Israeli security forces in the West Bank and Gaza Strip. The UN is also worried about increasing protests in Arab countries and cities around Israel. The Permanent Observer for the State of Palestine, Riyad H. Mansour, underlined Jerusalem’s significant role for Palestinian people and there could be no just and lasting solution for the peace agreement without a solution of Jerusalem’s question. He also affirmed that the UN remained committed to working with the parties and with the international and regional partners to achieve through a comprehensive agreement. UN Secretary General Antonio Guterres has *“consistently warned against any unilateral action that would have potential to undermine the two-state solution. I will do everything in my power to support the Israeli and Palestinian leaders to return to meaningful negotiations”* (ibid.).

Even traditional and major U.S. allies condemned recognition of Jerusalem as the Israeli capital. The United Kingdom’s delegation disagreed with the Trump’s decision and affirmed that the final Jerusalem’s status should not be determined before the peace agreement will be reached. The UK delegation is also concern about Israeli settlement development, particularly in East Jerusalem, which constituted a barrier to finding a lasting solution and also create terrorism activity. UK Prime Minister Theresa May denouncement Trump’s decision and said that the British embassy to Israel is based in Tel Aviv and the government has no plans to remove it. She also added, that *“We believe it is unhelpful in terms of prospects for peace in the region.”* (Al Jazeera 2017). France rejected the “unilateral” decision, and the French president Emmanuel Macron said, that *“for now, I urge for calm and for everyone to be responsible. We must avoid at all costs avoid violence and foster dialogue.”* Germany stated that Jerusalem’s status could be resolved only on a base of the two-state solution and Germany’s foreign minister, Sigmar Gabriel, warned that any US move to recognise Jerusalem as Capital would not calm a conflict and such a move would be a very perilous development (Heinrich 2017).

The EU foreign policy chief, Federica Mogherini, reiterated that EU position on Jerusalem remains unchanged and it would continue to recognize the international consensus and commitment to a two-state solution. She said that any actions which would undermine peace effort between Israel and Palestine have to be avoided. On the EU side have joined most of the European countries, even the Czech Republic⁵, which is a long-time Israeli closest ally said that the Trump's decision would have an adverse impact on peace efforts. However, on March 25, 2018, The Ministry of Foreign Affairs released a statement on opening the Czech Honorary Consulate and Czech Centre in West Jerusalem by the end of May 2018. In statement is expressed that the Czech Republic fully respects the common policy of the European Union, which considers Jerusalem as the future capital of both the State of Israel and the future State of Palestine. The only European Union member state which follows the US step and will move its embassy to Jerusalem is Romania (Beaumont 2017).

The Russian Federation had received the decision with serious concerns because a reliable solution should be based on international law, including UN resolutions. The Russian Federation is also concerned about a further complicating situation in the region, and as a member of the Quartet for Middle East Peace, the Russian Federation would provide support in reaching the agreement. The Russian Federation also added that beyond two-state solution, there is no other alternative (UN SC/13111). Turkish President Tayyip Erdogan even threatened to cut diplomatic ties with Israel, and he said, "*We implore the US once again: You cannot take this step*". He also adds, that "*Jerusalem is a red line for Muslims*" (Al Jazeera 2017). Egypt's UN representatives called for the legal parameters following the international law which is the only way how to address the issue. Egypt invoked binding Security Council resolutions relating to Jerusalem's status, including resolution 242, 478 and 2334, and also request about differentiate Israel's territory from occupied territories, including Jerusalem. Statement of Jordanian delegation

⁵ The Czech Republic and the State of Israel share a long and friendly relations. Czechoslovakia was one the first countries to recognize the independent State of Israel. The first president of Czechoslovakia, T. G. Masaryk, was a long-standing supporter of the creation of a Jewish State (MFA Statement 2018).

in UN citing the illegality of settlements built by Israel and calling on the US to be a neutral mediator to reach a lasting peace. Jordan declared, that “*would take all measures to help achieve a settlement and realize the legitimate rights of its brotherly Palestinian people.*”. Jordan will also continue in diplomatic efforts in the region to help to end Israeli occupation and will support the creation of the Palestinian State (UN SC/13111). Iran condemned Trump’s move as a violation of international law and U.N. resolutions on the Israel-Palestinian conflict. Supreme leader Ayatollah Ali Khamenei said that the US was trying to destabilize the region and started a war to protect Israel’s security (Heinrich 2017).

4.4. The Roots and Implications of the Policy Change

Roots of the Trump’s decision to recognize Jerusalem as a capital city and moved American Embassy there, is a combination of domestic and international factors which shaped the US foreign policy. The relocation of the American embassy to Jerusalem will have several implications on foreign affairs. Donald Trump’s reorientation of foreign policy will affect US relations with the wider Muslim world and will create tensions between Islam countries and the West. Furthermore, this decision will make more difficult to resolve the Israeli-Palestinian problem and reach a final agreement. Since the EU and US have a problem to find out a common policy on the Middle Eastern issues, such as Iranian nuclear deal and the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, this situation might divide the transatlantic relations.

Trump’s announcement is not anomaly case among previous U.S. policy towards Israeli-Palestinian conflict, all former presidents recognized Jerusalem as Israel’s capital city and since Jerusalem is internationally recognized as a disputed territory, it is a violation against international law and treaties. However, relocation of the US Embassy to Jerusalem before reaching the peace agreement of Israeli-Palestinian conflict decrease the US political legitimacy with the international community (Aun 2017: 2). Critics of this decision also mentioned that the U.S. declaration of the Jerusalem’s status as Israeli capital would constitute an adoption the persecutions of non-Jews which reaffirms Jerusalem’s unity under Israeli laws. In declaring Jerusalem as the capital of one state and not the other, Trump stole the “self” in self-determination for Palestinian people.

Many international scholars considered Trump’s foreign policy as the end of the liberal world order, supported by the US since 1945. Trump administration shifted US policy from liberalism, carried out by Barack Obama, to “intense”

realism. Donald Trump's view of international affairs is the zero-sum game there can be only winners or losers. Since Trump put America first, America can only win if other states lose. Trump's predecessor, Barack Obama, supported multilateral cooperation with mutually benefits, while Trump promote unilateral policy. Trump has openly criticized the purpose of the EU as an organization and its policy toward Iran nuclear deal, multilateralism, climate and also on Jerusalem. The Transatlantic relationship, during Trump's presidency, has reached a crisis. The recognition of Jerusalem and relocation of the American embassy made the situation even worse. Regarding to the fact, that the EU disagree with the Trump's policy on Jerusalem the gap between them is getting bigger (Payne 2017: 2-4). EU president Jean Claude Juncker warned that Trump's election has placed America's relationship with Europe at risk. *"The election of Trump poses the risk of upsetting intercontinental relations in their foundation and in their structure,"* he said

Domestically factors, which played a role in Trump's decision, are the investigations into the alleged Russian intervention in the U.S. elections in 2016. Former national advisor Michael Flynn was accused of making a false statement to the FBI about Russia's intervention in the presidential campaign. Besides that, Trump's son-in-law, Jared Kushner, who has a close tie with Israel, was also involved in investigations. This problematic situation could be a reason to push suspicions away from Trump and divert the attention of the debate over the issue to more controversial Jerusalem (Al Jazeera Centre for Studies).

Another domestically root of this decision is influence of Israel lobby and Christian Zionist. These groups developed a big effort for transition of the American Embassy to Jerusalem. Israeli lobby groups such as the AIPAC, the ZOA or the AJC have a big influence in decision making process in Washington. Besides that, American Jewish community is making a big amount of Donald Trump's electorate. Moving the Embassy to Jerusalem is a boost for Trump's popularity among these circles. Under these circumstances, Trump wanted to fulfil the promise which he gave, during his presidential campaign, when he said, that after his inauguration will transfer the Embassy to Jerusalem. By this promise, Trump wanted to increase his support inside the Republican Party, especially conservatives and evangelists groups (Fisher 2017).

Evangelical Christians make up around 25% of American population, and the majority of them were voting for Trump in the presidential elections in 2016. For

Evangelical Christians has been the decision about the relocation of the American embassy and declaration Jerusalem as the capital of Israel very important. For this group, the embassy is not a political issue, but mostly religious matter. They believe that it is a fulfilment of prophecy and the Christ will return on the way to the end of the days, then the Jews will find redemption in accepting Christ as their saviour. Although, Trump does not have to believe it, he does not want to upset this large electoral bloc (Bass 2017). Alternative reason for moving the Embassy to Jerusalem is influence from the Jewish billionaire Sheldon Adelson. Adelson, as a supporter of Trump's presidential campaign, donated \$20 million to a political action committee for the campaign purposes, and furthered \$1.5 million to the committee that organized the Republican Party convention following the AIPAC address. After Trump's election to the office has persistently reminded him of his promise which he made during the campaign (Lander 2017).

International factors, which shaped the decision of moving the Embassy to Jerusalem, are tensions between Iran and Israel due to Iran's nuclear programme. Israel is afraid of Iranian production of nuclear weapons and dominance over the region. On July 14, 2015, Iran and the P+1⁶ signed the Joint Comprehensive Action (JCPOA) to ensure that Iran's nuclear program will be exclusively peaceful. This act is the signature foreign policy achievement of Barack Obama's presidency. Donald Trump, as a presidential candidate, was opposed of this step and he promised, that he will not recertify this nuclear deal. According to allegation against Iran's compliance with the nuclear deal, Trump has threatened to abandon the JCPOA. This move was supported by Saudi Arabia and UAE. During the Obama administration, tension between the US and Iran has been reduce by closing the Iranian Nuclear deal. Iran represents a threat for Israel's position in the Middle East and Israel has pushed on the US to reduce Iranian influence in the region. Furthermore, Iran is fighting alongside Bashar al-Assad's forces in the Syrian civil war, where the US is trying to depose Assad's regime and to end a long-lasting conflict. (Al Jazeera Centre for Studies).

The moving of Embassy to Jerusalem will also increase a tension between the US and the wider Muslim countries which refused to recognized Jerusalem as a capital city of Israel and do not agree with Trump's Middle East policy. Trump's

⁶ China, France, Germany, Russia, the United Kingdom, the United States and the European Union

decision would cause anger and prompted protests throughout the occupied Palestinian territories and in Muslim countries (Al Jazeera 2017).

Israel was pleased by the Trump's decision and called upon other states to follow the US in moving their embassies to Jerusalem. Furthermore, Israel gained strength its sovereignty over the city and make it more difficult for future attempt to reach a settlement. Israel plans to legalise more than 200 000 settlers living in East Jerusalem and also to plan to construct a new unit, although their presence there is against international law (White 2018). The Israeli settlement population in the West Bank has risen from a few thousands to at least 400 000 today. Israeli argue, that settlements are not illegal and against Fourth Geneva Convention, because the West Bank which was administrated by Jordan for 19 years before Israel, was never been recognized as the sovereign power there, and the area was captured by Israel in defensive war. Another argument is that Jews have a right for the territory because it is their religious territory according to Bible. This situation causing a great Palestinian refugee problem and litigation among the international community, refugee crisis tries to manage mainly the EU (Ferziger 2018). On December 2016, the UN Security Council reaffirmed that Israel's establishment of settlements in occupied Palestinian territory, including East Jerusalem, and had no legal validity and constituted a flagrant violation under international law. As a result, the UN accepted Resolution 2334 with 14 votes in favour and one abstention of the US. Donald Trump, as a presidential candidate, criticized the US decision and wrote on Twitter a message for Israel "*stay strong*" until his inauguration the next year (DeYoung 2016).

The final status of Jerusalem has been a sensitive and the most problematic issue in the Israeli-Palestinian negotiations. The Trump's decision would change the status quo of the city and the peace process will be disturbed. Trump's unilateral move prevents the US from its active and mediator role in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Above that, the international community has unified position about the final status of Jerusalem which should be reached by final agreement between Israelis and Palestinians, even if it seems now to reach a consensus on the both sides difficult. Another implication is the disruption of the internal Palestinian situation which is already fragile. The Trump's decision could cause demonstrations and increasing of violence on the streets. Moreover, for Palestinians authorities will not

be easy to accept or reach the final peace agreement which will not contain East Jerusalem as a capital city of the state of Palestine (Al Jazeera Centre for Studies).

Trump's decision is also linked with international dynamics. The polarized situation in the Middle East and ongoing conflicts and tensions could open the door for other international actors who want to expand their influence in the region. As a traditional rival who is taking a more sympathetic position toward Palestinian and Arab aspiration, may Russian Federation try to seek a strong position vis-a-vis Trump's new policy, similarly with Turkey and effort to achieve their interest in the region. Iran's position is due to Trump and his policy toward Middle East weakened and is also interpreted as a deliberative. Contradictions about Jerusalem question could be a great opportunity for Iran and its allies to criticize the US and improve Iranian image in the Muslim world (Ferziger 2018).

Conclusion

The relationship between the United States and the State of Israel has 70 years long history. Their relationship is considered as a “special relationship” with a patron-client character. The US foreign policy is important for Israeli-Palestinian conflict as for the world order. Since the US play a mediator role in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, the change of the US policy would have implications for the whole peace process. Although every US Administration has tried to establish lasting peace in the region, none of them has reached a lasting consensus. The important part of the conflict has the U.N. which affirms Israeli occupation and settlement activity as illegal and violation of international law.

The aim of my work is to examine the changes in the US foreign policy towards Jerusalem and observe the development of the U.S.-Israeli relationship. During the period of Harry Truman’s presidency to George H.W. Bush, we can consider Israel as a strategic asset for countering the Soviet Union influence and as a partner in the balance of power in the Middle East. A turning point in the U.S.-Israeli relationship represents Bill Clinton. Under his presidency, the relations between the US and Israel has become “special”, and the US started to play a more active role in the peace process in the Middle East. The U.S. foreign policy towards Israel has not been changed until the election of Donald Trump. Another important part of the U.S. policymaking process towards Israel is the pro-Israel groups. They have a big influence in the presidential campaign and even in the Congress. In the 1980’s escalated campaign of the AIPAC for moving the Embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem. AIPAC’s effort was accomplished in 1995 when the US recognized Jerusalem as a capital city of Israel by the Jerusalem Embassy Act. Since 1995 every Administration signed a presidential waiver for delayed the relocation of the American Embassy to Jerusalem until now. Donald Trump recognized Jerusalem as a capital city of Israel and announced to move the Embassy there. His foreign policy is a significant shift from previous administrations, and it is based on the authoritative executive decision. The US policy under the Trump’s administration promotes “America First” policy based on realism and conservative’s elements.

While the US is viewed as a superpower, the U.S. foreign policy should serve for the best interests of the international community, and it has to be observed. The precedent US administration’s policy was based on the theory of

interdependence. The election of Donald Trump has shifted liberal and multilateral U.S. policy into unilateral policy based on realism parameters. Since Donald Trump criticizes the United Nations and the European Union policies his “America First” policy would destroy established alliance system. The act of recognition Jerusalem as a capital city of Israel and announcement of the relocation the Embassy there have not been supported any of the US allies. Donald Trump’s foreign policy creates a gap between the worldwide community and this policy would disturb the balance of power in the world.

The relocation the American Embassy to Jerusalem will have several implications on foreign and domestic affairs. This move will cause a division of transatlantic relationship because the EU and US have not reached a common policy towards Israeli-Palestinian conflict, including Jerusalem question. The EU position on Jerusalem is based on the U.N. resolutions to achieve a consensus through negotiations of both parties. The opening of the Embassy in Jerusalem will produce an outbreak of violence among Arab and Muslim countries, and moreover, it will increase Palestinian terrorist activity and protests against Israeli forces in occupied territories. Furthermore, Trump’s move and the change of the policy will create tensions between Islam and the West. Donald Trump’s decision will change a status quo of Jerusalem, and the peace process between Israel and Palestine will be disturbed. Moreover, the U.S. mediator position in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict will be destroyed. Since there is no other common solution among the worldwide community for the conflict than the two-state solution, the US act will complicate further international approach in this process. The polarized situation and ongoing tension in the Middle East will open the door for other international actors to expand their influence and promote their interest. This situation would be an opportunity for Iran to take control and spread the influence in the Middle East.

Due to a low range of the thesis, I could not analyse every aspect of the topic. The status of Jerusalem is a long-going problem, and the solution should be reached by a consensus of both sides with the international support. Moreover, the theme of my work is current, and the American Embassy has not been relocated yet. For this reason, my thesis is based on hypothetical examination, and the consequences of the Trump Administration will be reflected after. I think that the observation of the American foreign policy is important for its impact on the world affairs and the US as a superpower shapes the world order.

Literature

Allin, Dana, Steven Simon. 2017. „Trump and the Holy Land” *Foreign Affairs* 96 (2): 37–45. Available from: <<https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/israel/2017-02-13/trump-and-holy-land>> (2. 3. 2018)

Al-Jubeh, Nazmi. 2017. „Jerusalem: Fifty Years of Occupation” *Jerusalem Quarterly* 72: 140–159. Available from: <<http://www.palestine-studies.org/sites/default/files/jq-articles/Pages%20from%20JQ%2072%20-%20al-Jubeh.pdf>> (7. 3. 2018)

Aun, Amal. 2017. “Trump’s Jerusalem Announcement and Its Impact on U.S. International Standing” *Cornell Policy Review*, (online). Available from: <<http://www.cornellpolicyreview.com/trumps-jerusalem-announcement-impact-u-s-international-standing/>> (24. 4. 2018)

Barak, Oren. 2005. „The Failure of the Israeli–Palestinian Peace Process, 1993–2000” *Journal of Peace Research* 42 (6): 719–736. Available from: <<http://www.jstor.org>> (28. 3. 2018)

Bar-Siman-Tov, Yaacov. 1998. „The United States and Israel since 1948: A „Special Relationship“?” *Diplomatic History* 22 (2): 232–262. Available from: <<https://academic.oup.com/dh/article-abstract/22/2/231/407328>> (10. 3. 2018)

Bass, Diana Butler. 2017. “For Manu evangelicals, Jerusalem is about prophecy, not politics” *CNN*, (online). Available from: <<https://edition.cnn.com/2017/12/08/opinions/jerusalem-israel-evangelicals-end-times-butler-bass-opinion/index.html>> (24. 4. 2018)

Beaumont, Peter. 2017. “Europe tells Netanyahu it rejects Trump’s Jerusalem move” *The Guardian*, (online). Available from: <<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2017/dec/11/eu-to-step-up-efforts-over-middle-east-peace-process>> (25. 4. 2018)

Begley, Sarah. 2016. "Read Donald Trump's Speech to AIPAC" *Time*, (online). Available from: <<http://time.com/4267058/donald-trump-aipac-speech-transcript/>> (24. 4. 2018)

Blavoukos, Spyros, Dimitris, Bourantonis. 2009. "Identifying Parameters of Foreign Policy Change: A Synthetic Approach" annual ISA Convention. *ISA Convention*, February 2009, (online, Pdf). Available from: <<http://www2.aueb.gr/users/bourantonis/isa2009.pdf>> (13. 4. 2018)

Black, Ian. 2017. "Why would moving the US embassy to Jerusalem be so contentious?" *The Guardian*, (online). Available from: <<https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2017/dec/05/jerusalem-embassy-move-can-the-saudis-stay-trumps-hand>> (20. 4. 2018)

Blackwill, Robert, Philip, Gordon. 2016. "Repairing the U.S.-Israel Relationship" *Council on Foreign Relations* 76: 1–59. Available from: <<https://www.cfr.org/report/repairing-us-israel-relationship>> (17. 4. 2018)

Bump, Philip. 2017. "In 1995, Congress reached a compromise on the issue of Jerusalem. Trump is poised to end it." *The Washington Post*, (online). Available from: <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/politics/wp/2017/12/06/in-1995-congress-reached-a-compromise-on-the-issue-of-jerusalem-trump-is-poised-to-end-it/?noredirect=on&utm_term=.8474f3ac278a> (14. 4. 2018)

Cattan, Henry. 1981. „The Status of Jerusalem under International Law and United Nations Resolutions" *Journal of Palestine Studies* 10 (3): 3–15. Available from: <<http://www.jstor.org>> (7. 3. 2018)

Clinton, J. William. 1993. *Inaugural Address*, January 20, 1993 (online). Available from: <<http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=46366>> (20. 4. 2018)

Čejka, Marek. 2005. *Izrael a Palestina: minulost, současnost a směřování blízkovýchodního konfliktu*. Brno: Centrum strategických studií.

DeYoung, Karen. 2016. "How the U.S. came to abstain on a U.N. resolution condemning Israeli settlements" *The New York Times*, (online). Available from: <https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/national-security/how-the-us-came-to-abstain-on-a-un-resolution-condemning-israeli-settlements/2016/12/28/fed102ee-cd38-11e6-b8a2-8c2a61b0436f_story.html?utm_term=.1823739373dd> (25. 4. 2018)

Dugis, Vinsensio. 2008. „Explaining Foreign Policy Change” *Jurnal Masyarakat Kebudayaan Dan Politik* 21 (2): 101–104. Available from: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/287269614_Explaining_Foreign_Policy_Change> (19. 4. 2018)

Stettner, Ilona-Margarita. 2010. "Fact sheet: Positions on the Legal Status of Jerusalem" *Konrad Adenauer Stiftung* (online; Pdf). Available from: <http://www.kas.de/wf/doc/kas_7186-1442-2-30.pdf?120718151647> (10. 3. 2018)

Ferziger, Jonathan. 2018. "Israeli Settlements" *Bloomberg*, (online). Available from: <<https://www.bloomberg.com/quicktake/israeli-settlements>> (25. 4. 2018)

Fisher, Max. 2017. "The Jerusalem Issue, Explained" *The New York Times*, (online). Available from: <<https://www.nytimes.com/2017/12/09/world/middleeast/jerusalem-trump-capital.html>> (25. 4. 2018)

Gallup International Association. 2017. "Attitudes Towards the Recognition of Jerusalem as Israeli Capital". Gallup, December 2017 (online, Pdf). Available from: <http://www.gallup-international.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/2017_USA-Decision-on-Jerusalem.pdf> (22. 4. 2018)

Heinrich, Mark. 2017. "Arabs, Europe, U.N. reject Trump's recognition of Jerusalem as Israeli capital" *Reuters*, (online). Available from: <<https://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-trump-israel-jerusalem-reaction/arabs->

europa-u-n-reject-trumps-recognition-of-jerusalem-as-israeli-capital-
idUSKBN1E0312> (24. 4. 2018)

Beckwith, Ryan Teague. 2016. "Hillary Clinton's Speech to AIPAC" *Time*, March 21, 2016 (online). Available from: <<http://time.com/4265947/hillary-clinton-aipac-speech-transcript/>> (8. 4. 2018)

Holsti, Kalevi. 1982. "Restructuring Foreign Policy: A Neglected Phenomenon in Foreign Policy Theory" Pp. 1–20 in Kalevi Holsti (ed.). *Why Nations Realign: Foreign Policy Restructuring in the Postwar World*. London: Allen & Unwin.

Hoadley, Stephen. 2003. "Characterising U.S. Foreign Policy" *Centre for Strategic Studies* 5 (1): 1–4. Available from: <<https://www.victoria.ac.nz/hppi/centres/strategic-studies/publications/strategic-briefing-papers/USForeignPolicy.pdf>> (19. 4. 2018)

Hudson, Valerie. 2005. "Foreign Policy Analysis: Actor-Specific Theory and the Ground of International Relations" *Foreign Policy Analysis* 1 (1): 1–30. Available from: <<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1743-8594.2005.00001.x>> (15. 4. 2018)

Charountaki, Marianna. 2014. "US Foreign Policy in Theory and practice: from Soviet Era Containment to the era of the Arab Uprising(s)" *Journal of International Relations and Foreign Policy* 2 (2): 123–145. Available from: <http://jirfp.com/journals/jirfp/Vol_2_No_2_June_2014/7.pdf> (15. 4. 2018)

"Israel International Relations: International Recognition of Israel" *Jewish Virtual Library*, (online). Available from: <<http://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/international-recognition-of-israel>> (28. 4. 2018)

"Jerusalem: US embassy to move by end of 2019 – Pence" *BBC*, January 22, 2018 (online). Available from: <<http://www.bbc.com/news/world-middle-east-42773456>> (28. 4. 2018)

Library of Congress. 1995. "Jerusalem Embassy Act of 1995" Public Law 104-45. *The United States Congress*, November 8, 1995 (online, Pdf). Available from: <<https://www.congress.gov/104/plaws/publ45/PLAW-104publ45.pdf>> (10. 3. 2018)

Forreign Affairs Committee. 2011. "Jerusalem Embassy and Recognition Act of 2011" Bill H.R.1006. *The United States Congress*, March 29, 2011 (online). Available from: <<https://www.congress.gov/bill/112th-congress/house-bill/1006>> (10. 3. 2018)

Kabha, Mustafa. 2013. "The Palestinian People: Seeking Sovereignty and State", (online; Pdf). Available from: <<https://www.rienner.com/uploads/5253231615868.pdf>> (20. 4. 2018)

Lander, Mark. 2018. "U.S. Presses to Relocate Embassy to Jerusalem by 2019" *The New York Times*, (online). Available from: <<https://www.nytimes.com/2018/01/18/us/politics/trump-israel-embassy-jerusalem.html>> (24. 4. 2018)

Little, Douglas. 2008. *American Orientalism: The United States and the Middle East since 1945*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press.

Lynch, Colum. 2011. "Obama administration rejects Israel resolution, using U.N. veto for first time" *Foreign Policy*, (online). Available from: <<http://foreignpolicy.com/2011/02/18/obama-administration-rejects-israel-resolution-using-u-n-veto-for-first-time/>> (17. 4. 2018)

Marcus, Jonathan. 2017. "Trump's National Security Strategy: A pragmatic view of troubled world" *BBC*, (online). Available from: <<http://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-42406212>> (27. 4. 2018)

Mearsheimer, John, Stephen M. Walt. 2007. *The Israel Lobby and U.S. Foreign Policy*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Migdalovitz. Carol. 2007. "Israeli-palestinian Peace Process: The Annapolis Conference" *CRS Report for Congress*, December 7, 2007 (online; Pdf). Available: <<https://fas.org/sgp/crs/mideast/RS22768.pdf>> (27. 4. 2018)

Mohamad, Husam. 2015. "President George W. Bush's Legacy on the Israeli-Palestinian "Peace Process"" *Journal of International and Area Studies* 22 (1): 79–92. Available from: <<http://www.jstor.org>> (14. 4. 2018)

The White House. 2017. "National Security Strategy of the United States of America", December 18, 2017 (online, Pdf). Available from: <<https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/NSS-Final-12-18-2017-0905.pdf>> (24. 4. 2018)

Neff, Donald. 1993. „Jerusalem in U.S. Policy" *Journal of Palestine Studies* 23 (1): 20–45. Available from: <<http://www.jstor.org>> (10. 3. 2018)

"Opening of U.S. Embassy Jerusalem" *U.S. Department of State*, (online). Available from: <<https://www.state.gov/r/pa/prs/ps/2018/02/278825.htm>> (23. 4. 2018)

"Oslo Accords Fast Facts" *CNN*, September 5, 2017 (online). Available from: <<https://edition.cnn.com/2013/09/03/world/meast/oslo-accords-fast-facts/index.html>> (10. 3. 2018)

Payne, A. Rodger. 2017. "Trump and American Foreign Policy; A Threat to Peace and Prosperity?" Conference Paper in the *International Studies Association*, February 22–25, 2017 (online). Available from: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/313851504_Trump_and_American_Foreign_Policy_A_Threat_to_Peace_and_Prosperty> (25.4. 2018)

Rudoren, Jodi. 2015. "What the Oslo Accords Accomplished" *The New York Times*, (online). Available from: <<https://www.nytimes.com/2015/10/01/world/middleeast/palestinians-mahmoud-abbas-oslo-peace-accords.html>> (10. 3. 2018)

Ruebner, Josh. 2016. "Obama's Legacy on Israel/Palestine" *Institute for Palestine Studies* 46 (1). Available from: <<http://www.palestine-studies.org/jps/fulltext/207365>> (16. 4. 2018)

Saltzman, Ilai. 2017. "Not So Special Relationship? US-Israeli Relations During Barack Obama's Presidency" *Israel Studies* 22 (1): 50–75. Available from: <<http://www.jstor.org>> (10. 3. 2018)

Sciarcon, Jonathan. 2018. "Trump's Jerusalem Decision: A US Policy Perspective" *e-international relations*, (online). Available from: <<http://www.e-ir.info/2018/01/15/trumps-jerusalem-decision-a-us-policy-perspective/>> (15. 4. 2018)

Slater, Jerome. 2007. "Muting the Alarm over the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict: The New York Times versus Haaretz, 2000–06" *International Security* 32(2): 84–120. Available from: <<http://www.jstor.org>> (10. 3. 2018)

Scaini, Maurizio. 2001. "The Jerusalem issue in international politics" *Geographica Slovenica* 34 (1): 207–215. Available from: <https://giam.zrc-sazu.si/sites/default/files/gs_clanki/GS_3401_207-215.pdf> (10. 3. 2018)

Shlaim, Avi. 1988. "The Impact of U.S. Policy in the Middle East" *Journal of Palestine Studies* 17 (2): 15–28. Available from: <<http://www.jstor.org>> (10. 3. 2018)

Shlaim, Avi. 2016. "U.S. Foreign Aid to the Palestinians" *Congressional Research Service*, December 16, 2016 (online; Pdf). Available from: <<https://fas.org/sgp/crs/mideast/RS22967.pdf>> (25. 4. 2018)

Sciarcon, Jonathan. 2018. "Trump's Jerusalem Decision: A US Policy Perspective" *E-International Relations*, (online). Available from: <<http://www.e-ir.info/2018/01/15/trumps-jerusalem-decision-a-us-policy-perspective/>> (11. 4. 2018)

Policy Analysis Unit. 2017. „Trump's Decision to Announce Jerusalem as the Capital of Israel: Motives, Implications, and Prospects" *Arab Centre for Research and Policy Studies*, December 2017 (online; Pdf). Available from: <<https://www.dohainstitute.org/en/Lists/ACRPSPDFDocumentLibrary/12%20december%20situation%20assessment.pdf>> (3. 2. 2018)

"Trump's Recognition of Jerusalem as Israel's Capital: Background and Ramifications" *Al Jazeera Centre for Studies*, December 25, 2017 (online, Pdf). Available from: <http://studies.aljazeera.net/mritems/Documents/2017/12/25/4b95a54c599a4155987f7af1b3999244_100.pdf> (25. 4. 2018)

"Trump threatens to stop aid to Palestinians", *BBC*, (online). Available from: <<http://www.bbc.com/news/world-middle-east-42823429>> (28. 4. 2018)

"Transcript of Remarks by President Trump and Prime Minister Netanyahu of Israel Before Bilateral Meeting", World Economic Forum Congress Centre, Davos, January 25, 2018. Available from: <<https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefings-statements/remarks-president-trump-prime-minister-netanyahu-israel-bilateral-meeting-davos-switzerland/>> (28. 4. 2018)

Transcript of UN SC meeting. "United Nations Position on Jerusalem Unchanged, Special Coordinator Stresses, as Security Council Debates United States Recognition of City", December 8, 2017, (online). Available from: <<https://www.un.org/press/en/2017/sc13111.doc.htm>> (25. 4. 2018)

"The Clinton Parameters 2000", (online, Pdf). Available from: <<http://www.multaqa.org/pdfs/2000%20clinton%20parameter.pdf>> (20. 4. 2018)

“The Road Map to Peace” *The Guardian*, (online). Available from: <<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/jun/04/israel.qanda>> (10. 3. 2018)

The United Nations. 2017. “United Nations Position on Jerusalem Unchanged, Special Coordinator Stresses, as Security Council Debates United States Recognition of City” SC/13111. *Security Council*, December 8, 2017 (online). Available from: <<https://www.un.org/press/en/2017/sc13111.doc.htm>> (20. 4. 2018)

The United Nations .1947. “Resolution 181 (II). Future government of Palestine” A/RES/181. *General Assembly*, November 29, 1947 (online). Available from: <<https://unispal.un.org/DPA/DPR/unispal.nsf/0/7F0AF2BD897689B785256C330061D253>> (20. 4. 2018)

The United Nations. 1967. “Resolution 242” S/RES/242. *Security Council*, November 22, 1967 (online). Available from: <<https://unispal.un.org/DPA/DPR/unispal.nsf/0/7D35E1F729DF491C85256EE700686136>> (20. 4. 2018)

The United States Congress. 2011. “Jerusalem Embassy and Recognition Act of 2011” Bill S. 1622. Senate (online). Available: <<https://www.congress.gov/bill/112th-congress/senate-bill/1622>> (27. 4. 2018)

The White House. 2017. “Statement by President Trump on Jerusalem”, December 6, 2017 (online). Available from: <<https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefings-statements/statement-president-trump-jerusalem/>> (22. 4. 2018)

U.S. Department of State. 2003. “Trilateral Statement on the Middle East Peace Summit at Camp David” *Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs*, July 2003 (online). Available from: <<https://2001-2009.state.gov/p/nea/rls/22698.htm>> (24. 4. 2018)

Wenger, Martha. 1993. „Jerusalem” *Middle East Research and Information Project* (182): 9–12. Available from: <<http://www.jstor.org>> (2. 3. 2018)

“World reacts to US Israel embassy relocation plan” *Al Jazeera*, (online). Available from: <https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2017/12/world-reacts-israel-embassy-relocation-plan-171205175133734.html> (25. 4. 2018)

„What makes Jerusalem so holy?” *BBC*, October 30, 2014 (online). Available from: <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-middle-east-26934435> (24. 4. 2018)

„What role does AIPAC play in US election?” *Al Jazeera*, (online). Available from: <https://www.aljazeera.com/programmes/insidestoryus2012/2012/03/20123774029910326.html> (15. 3. 2018)

White, Ben. 2018. “Israel’s creeping annexation of West Bank continues” *Al Jazeera*, (online). Available from: <https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2018/03/israel-creeping-settlements-continue-expanding-180303201420050.html> (25. 4. 2018)

“1993 Oslo Agreement” *BBC*, May 6, 2008 (online). Available from: http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/middle_east/7385301.stm (10. 3. 2018)

Zanotti, Jim. 2016. “U.S. Foreign Aid to Palestinians” *Congressional Research Service*, (online; Pdf). Available from: <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/mideast/RS22967.pdf> (28. 4. 2018)

Zanotti, Jim. 2014. “The Palestinians: Background and U.S. Relations” *Congressional Research Service*, (online; Pdf). Available from: <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/mideast/RL34074.pdf> (28. 4. 2018)

ABSTRAKT

The aim of this Thesis is to analyse the U.S. foreign policy change towards the State of Israel and the status of Jerusalem. This Thesis is an analysis of the case study of relocation the American Embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem, ordered by President Donald Trump in 2017. Following, the Thesis analyses domestic and international origins and implications of this decision. The Thesis also examines the development of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and the U.S. mediator role in the peace process.

KEYWORDS

United States, Embassy, Jerusalem, Change, Israel, Palestine, Conflict

ANOTACE

Cílem bakalářské práce je analyzovat zahraniční politiku Spojených států amerických ke státu Izrael a statusu Jeruzaléma. Tato bakalářská práce je analýza případové studie přemístění americké ambasády z Tel Avivu do Jeruzaléma, nařízené prezidentem Donaldem Trumpem v roce 2017. Následně se bude práce zabývat vnitrostátními a mezinárodními příčinami a důsledky tohoto rozhodnutí. Bakalářská práce bude dále analyzovat vývoj Izraelsko-Palestinského konfliktu a roli USA jako mediátora mírového procesu.

KLÍČOVÁ SLOVA

USA, ambasáda, Jerusalem, změna, Izrael, Palestina, konflikt