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"So what do you suggest?” For many years, this was the question that shattered the arguments of the nationalists and the messianics who opposed a permanent status agreement, trying to convince the public of the dangers of two states. Despite the passage of over two decades since the Oslo Agreement, the question remains valid. However, in recent years, the leaders of this camp have sown sand in the eyes of some of the public by spreading "ideas" and "plans" for an alternative solution, even if baseless and with no practical and political feasibility.

In contrast to those who deny and ignore the history of the conflict and the contradictory narratives of the parties, who seek a federation, a confederation or a state of all its citizens, this camp is careful to show its awareness of the impossibility of annexing the entire West Bank to Israel. Its ideas are brimming with "solutions" to the tension between the desire to annex the land and the threat that granting citizenship to Palestinians poses to Israel's Jewish identity.

To these thinkers - Benny Begin and his emphasis on the status quo, Mordechai Kedar and his "emirates", the National Union's "Decisive Action Plan", the Jewish Home's "Lull Plan", and the Likud Central Committee's resolution on annexation – we can now add President Trump, who adopted and promotes Prime Minister Netanyahu's vision. Even if it boils down to the slogan "two states for two peoples," it ridicules the Palestinian Authority, and like others, it is based on ignorance, detachment from reality, aggression, disregard for international law and the rest of the international community, and a slippery rewriting of history.

Benny Begin is not asking for revolutions. Last October, he wrote: "The establishment of foreign sovereignty should not be permitted west of the Jordan ... As much as possible and dependent on us, within the limits of the security risk, we should allow the Arab residents of Samaria and Judea to live in comfort, including the right to work in Israel, and in the future enable their social and economic development." He concluded that "in these matters there is of course nothing new, and innovation is indeed impossible." In other words, as long as the Palestinians struggle for their right to a state as recognized by the international community, Israel will prevent them from attaining social and economic welfare and development through continuing control and occupation.

Mordechai Kedar, who serves as the "shofar" of the camp in the Arab world, admitted in an interview in July 2016 that "I am not concerning myself with the technical details ... I'm just laying out the general model." That did not stop him from drawing up an illogical plan that includes Jericho, Hebron, Tulkarm, Qalqiliya and Gaza, "each of which is a kind of city-state." For example, "Nablus and its nearby towns would have their own passport and government, and a political and economic structure." Could it be that Kedar is not aware that this model was appropriate for antiquity and the Middle Ages? That apart from a few unique examples, this model simply does not exist in the 21st century? Even if we assume that Kedar deliberately ignores East Jerusalem and its 350,000 Palestinian residents, who will probably acquire Israeli citizenship, we can not refrain from asking: Has he not heard of the 200,000-strong Bethlehem-Beit JalaBeit Sahour conurbation, excluded from the proposal? Has Kedar forgotten Jenin, where there are a quarter of a million Palestinians living without Jewish settlements?

Kedar continues: "The rural area slated for Israeli annexation will include about 10 percent of the Arab residents, who will be given the possibility of obtaining full Israeli citizenship." Has Kedar failed to notice that in fact, the rural areas surrounding his "emirates" include about 70 percent of the Palestinian population? Kedar remembers to state that "the crossings between Israel and each of the countries will be a kind of border crossing, and movement in the area will be possible through visas." Does he realize that in order to enforce this, a security barrier must be built around each "emirate"? That Israel would be required to construct and maintain hundreds of gates in order to allow the cultivation of Palestinian-owned fields? That it would have to monitor hundreds of kilometers of inter-emirate routes, since he would generously allow the emirates to form a federation?

Bezalel Smotrich and Uri Ariel have moved farther into the past than Kedar, and as a model of the desired treatment for Palestinians today, they launched a program based on the days of Joshua bin Nun. According to the Midrash, he sent three letters to the inhabitants of the land on the verge of entering it: "Whoever want to acquiesce - will acquiesce" - that is, to the annexation of the West Bank to Israel and the establishment of six administrative districts for the Palestinians (suggestive of Kedar's "emirates"); "Whoever wants to go - will go" - that is, regardless of the Palestinian ideal of sumood, receive compensation in exchange for emigrating; "Whoever wants to fight – will fight" - "We will fight the Palestinians who choose to continue the armed struggle against the State of Israel, and follow the normal conduct of wars." In other words, a golden opportunity for a second nakba.

Naftali Bennett and his colleagues from the Jewish Home Party have exceeded all others with their sophisticated smoke-and-mirrors "Lull Plan". Bennett admits that "the full annexation of Judea and Samaria and their two million Arab residents" is not feasible and "jeopardizes" the future of the State of Israel for security, demographic and moral reasons. Therefore, he seeks to "present a sober solution that serves the interests of the State of Israel," in the form of Israel's annexation of Area C, which covers 60 percent of the West Bank, and maintains Palestinian autonomy over Areas A and B. Is that so?

A quick glance at the map of the interim agreement reveals that Areas A and B are not the two virtual areas appearing in the video explaining the plan, but in reality, are made up of about 169 isolated Palestinian blocs and settlements. So too, Area C is made up of of dozens of narrow corridors that criss-cross the entire West Bank. How does Bennett intend to keep his promise to create a "full transport continuum for the Palestinians," one that allows "Arab residents to reach any point in Judea and Samaria, without checkpoints or soldiers?" By building dozens of connecting roads, interchanges and tunnels worth billions? By using hundreds of roadblocks, UAVs and IDF patrols for supervision?

Does he really intend to grant citizenship to Palestinians in Area C? Even if the dry facts count 300,000 people living there and not 50,000, as the plan notes? How does he plan to supervise entry into Israel from the territories of autonomy? By dismantling the existing security fence, in which NIS 15 billion was invested, and the construction of a new 1,800- kilometer fence at a cost of NIS 27 billion, involving an annual maintenance cost of NIS 4 billion, with a couple of army divisions for security?

How does he intend to secure the property rights of the Palestinians who own more than half of the Area C annexed to Israel? Is it by opening hundreds of agricultural gates to 350 Palestinian communities in the Autonomy, some of whose land has been annexed to Israel? Is he aware of the thousands of soldiers who will be required for such a routine task? Perhaps he is not aware of the threat posed by any such gate, as the IDF wrote to the High Court of Justice: "Every crossing point increases the risk involved in the infiltration of terrorists into Israel and constitutes a point of friction that increases the risk to the security forces in charge of the crossing point."

The Likud Central Committee unanimously approved the proposal to apply Israeli sovereignty to settlement areas - the "blocs" of Jewish settlement. Do the members know that with the exception of Gush Etzion (and the evacuated Gush Katif), the settlements have never been built in this pattern? In the Jordan Valley "bloc", the average distance between the settlements is 21 kilometers, 60 percent of the settlements are isolated, one-third of the settlements live about 60 families, and half of them have a population of less than 1,000, and the vast majority of the 15 largest settlements are located on the Green Line or near Jerusalem.

The final participant in this parade of illusions is Benjamin Netanyahu, who enjoys the support and encouragement of the American administration. It was hard to miss the enthusiasm in the Prime Minister's voice when he announced during Vice President Mike Pence’s visit that he would support Trump's efforts for peace, and it is even more difficult to assume that the source of the enthusiasm is his lack of knowledge of the details of the proposal being formulated. The document submitted by Saeb Erekat to Mahmoud Abbas reveals content suitable for Netanyahu's school as a glove for the hand, relying on the tremendous effort invested by ambassadors Ron Dermer and David Friedman in formulating and marketing them. And for those who have forgotten, the latter believes that Israel occupies only two percent of the West Bank.

An "American plan" that rejects the 1967 lines as a starting point and enables Israel to annex 10 percent of the West Bank without territorial exchange, is quite removed from the international consensus and the Palestinian position. Foregoing the possibility of a Palestinian capital in East Jerusalem can only make the Arab and Islamic World stand by the Palestinian "refusenik" approach. The possibility of Israeli military intervention in the demilitarized state of Palestine presents a new definition of the term "sovereignty". Therefore, the chances of acceptance of this plan, which undermines international resolutions and is based on forcefulness and the existing balance of power between Israel and the Palestinians, are no higher than the chances of the "Emirates Plan" being adopted. On the other hand, the chances that a Palestinian refusal to a proposal would legitimize the adoption of one or similar other plans by Israel (annexation of Ma'aleh Adumim or Greater Jerusalem) are much higher.

This line of though reflects the approach espoused by the person who suggested making do with one railway track. To those who asked how could the train go both ways on one track, he replied: "I'm only making a proposal." It was Yehoshafat Harkabi who wrote about the fall of Masada and warned that "the greatness of the vision, upon which its realization is conditioned, is its realism: although the vision seeks to transcend reality, its legs are always planted in it. That is what separates a vision from a fantasy, floating on the wings of illusion."

Hopefully, these words are sufficient to demonstrate that these "plans" are not visions, but hallucinations, ignoring reality and its urgency. The hope that ideas without any feasibility will shape a desired reality is a proven recipe to a deterioration into a disaster. Let us hope that we will not need the fan of reality to spread messianic dust in all directions, and rediscover the conflict with all its sharpness, and the necessary insight that the chance to settle it lies in the idea of separation and the establishment of two states.