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Making conflict creates risks. As risk-taking becomes the norm in the Middle East. The U.S. decision to hand over Jerusalem to Israel has led to world-wide condemnation. An ideological decision, but nevertheless a hasty decision, that erupted into arm violence in Jerusalem as the United Nations Security Council convened a high-level meeting, early in the month, to discuss the takeover. Nevertheless, the U.N. remains helpless as the United States has been a staunch ally of Israel since its founding after world war II.

An alliance that has been met with a great deal of animosity and resentment. In which the major Western industrial powers allowed Israel to seek expansionism into the Palestinian territories. Leading to the displacement of Palestinians and the mass exodus of Palestinians from Israel. Creating, at the time, a violent conflict that has lasted for almost 70 years. Waging and encouraging an Israeli war machine that has developed a nuclear deterrent and amass heavy military funding to fuel Israel’s economy.
The resolution to the Palestinian/Israeli conflict remains, in conventional terms, the two state solution. Which is understood as the international consensus. But Israel maintains its authority to contain a Palestinian threat by imposing its right to self-defense. And so Israel remains oppose to the international consensus on the grounds that it must contain Palestine -- by upholding its dominion over the Gaza Strip, West Bank, occupied territories and the disputed neo-colonial settlements claim by hardline Israelis.

The two state solution has been a conundrum. As Israeli opposition to the two state solution has been a prime setback to achieving peaceful coexistence between Palestine and Israel. The only plausible alternative, to restore coexistence, is to pursue a new consensus that preserves Israel’s right to self-defense and allows Palestine to achieve existentiality.

This consensus is known as the internationalist model that allows Israel and/or Palestine to hold self-governorship of its own territories but
also to share strong economic ties -- through modernization and industrialization. By establishing the internationalist model in Israel/Palestine the two state solution is instead an economic solution. Paving the way for Israel-Palestinian coexistence that eventually leads to the disintegration of the borderlines between Israel and Palestine.

Strong economic ties that can be sought by creating trade agreements that will allow Israel to share Jerusalem, with Palestine, by making Jerusalem into a self-governing district that is neutral to Israeli/Palestinian interest. But in which Palestine will be able to pursue economic modernization that will minimize and finally end arm violence against Israel.
Only in the Scientific Age is the Israeli/Palestinian conflict more pronounce. With its pronouncement action to achieve coexistence is elusive as the two-state solution has disintegrated into bloodshed. Where Palestinians face surmounting economic plight that has led to the intensification of state and/or organized terrorist acts. Rendering the two-state solution a dead consensus. Where the only plausible alternative is to achieve an economic consensus that maintains Israel’s right to exist. And also Palestine’s right to self-govern and modernize. That consensus remains the promising avenue to the internationalist model.