

The Zionist State is DOOMED: One Country For ALL | Josef Avesar

The "Two-State Solution" is now dead in the water, mainly because it would imply maintaining the Zionist state as it is today, and that has proven itself to be not only genocidal but incapable of any form of local integration. The only way out is a One-State Solution with one (federal) political structure for all the peoples of the land between the river and the sea. That is the vision of my guest today, the Israeli-American lawyer Joseph Avesar, president of the Israeli Palestinian Confederation Committee. We speak about a one-state federal plan for Israel and Palestine, the limits of the two-state path, Zionism, democracy, public support, and a shared government model with equal rights, local self-rule, and elected bodies meant to build peace. Links: Israeli Palestinian Confederation: <https://ipconfederation.org> Neutrality Studies substack: <https://pascallottaz.substack.com> (Opt in for Academic Section from your profile settings: <https://pascallottaz.substack.com/s/academic>) Merch: <https://neutralitystudies-shop.fourthwall.com> Donation: <https://neutralitystudies.com/donate> Timestamps: 00:00:00 Introduction and federal plan 00:02:11 Israel without a constitution 00:08:39 Democracy religion and state power 00:11:29 From Zionism to confederation 00:15:16 Support and resistance in 2026 00:27:27 Federal design and parliament 00:38:08 Internal change or outside pressure 00:45:42 Two states versus confederation

#Pascal

Welcome back, everybody, to Neutrality Studies. This is Pascal Lottaz, and today I'm speaking to the Israeli-American lawyer Yosef Avesar, the president of the Israeli-Palestinian Confederation Committee. Yosef, welcome.

#Josef Avesar

Thank you. Thank you, Pascal. It's a pleasure to be with you.

#Pascal

Great having you, because you are one of the people who's actually championing one of the ideas that hasn't been very popular for a long time, but that is looking more and more like the only way to go, which is the one-state solution. And you're championing the idea of a federation or a confederation. And I really wanted to hear what you've been doing, how you're envisioning this to be, and how you're assessing the current situation of the horrible violence in Israel-Palestine.

#Josef Avesar

Yeah, so we are thinking that a federal government makes the most sense. We are not proposing the dismantlement of the Israeli government or the Palestinian government. We are proposing creating an independent federal government for the people of Israel and Palestine together — a government that will be based on a constitution, a secular constitution, equality for the people of Palestine and Israel, based on legitimacy. The legitimacy would be given to it through elections by the people of Israel and Palestine. That includes the geographic area of Israel, the West Bank, and Gaza. And this government will be elected by the people of Israel, the West Bank, and Gaza — 15.5 million people.

#Pascal

15.5, like all of them that are currently living inside these very fuzzy borders that we know as Israel. But in your vision, of course, that would mean basically abolishing the current Israeli constitution, right? And replacing it with a new one.

#Josef Avesar

Israel does not have a constitution. It never had a constitution. Ben-Gurion suggested in his Declaration of Independence that Israel would have a constitution by October of 1948. He declared the independence of Israel on May 15. Israel never had a constitution, so it does not require the abolishment of the Israeli constitution because it doesn't have one, and it does not require the abolishment of the Israeli government. It would be an independent government for the people of Palestine and Israel that would give the Israeli and the Palestinian governments a veto power over legislation that it passes which violates their sovereignty. So if the federal government passes legislation that violates the sovereignty of the Palestinian or the Israeli governments, those governments will have a veto power over that legislation.

#Pascal

That's a very good point. You know, there are a couple of states that use different setups. Like the Germans, they call their constitution Basic Law. The Austrians, they call the most fundamental aspects of their legal codes constitutional laws, but not constitutions themselves. What is the current Israeli situation? What fundamental premises are actually built upon for the legislative acts?

#Josef Avesar

Well, the Israeli system is based on a Knesset, a Knesset that is elected by the people with different parties, and also an executive branch. So the Knesset is the legislative branch, but they also have the executive branch, which is the government. But they don't have a constitution. The problem with the Israeli system is that it doesn't really have separation of power, because all the people that are in the executive branch, in the government, are also in the legislative branch. So it's not really—it's the same people. They move from one building to another, but that does not create separation of

power. It's the same people passing the legislation and the same people executing the legislation. And they also have what you mentioned, basic laws—basic laws that, again, were created by the Knesset. The problem with that is that a constitution has to be created in order to protect the people from the legislator.

#Pascal

Yep.

#Josef Avesar

And so when the legislator creates legislation and calls it whatever fancy names you want to call it, they can even call it a constitution. But they don't call it a constitution; they call it basic laws. But it defies the basic meaning of a constitution, which is a set of principles to protect the people from the legislators. So in Israel, it's the opposite. It's the legislator protecting itself from the people.

#Pascal

Yeah, and we are seeing what kind of levels of violence this can produce, because a lot of the people that are under the direct control, of course, of that legislator, have not even a say in the vote. I mean, I talked to Ofer Kasif a year and a half ago, and he made the point there are at least three categories of Palestinians that are suffering in different types of categories: the ones with Israeli passports, the ones without, and then the ones in Gaza that are now under the horrible violence. And that would be something the constitution, in your view, would have to address and protect.

#Josef Avesar

Oh, yeah. The Constitution, it's already written. You can read it at ipconfederation.org. It's a secular constitution. It treats everyone, regardless of their religion, ethnicity, or any difference. It treats everyone the same regardless of their location. So we are speaking about a constitution that applies to the people in Gaza, the West Bank, and Israel, that creates a separate, independent legislative branch with 300 parliament members, an executive branch with a President and Vice President—one Palestinian, one Israeli—rotating every two years, and a judicial branch that receives its power from the Constitution, not from the parliament. In Israel, the Supreme Court gets its power from the Knesset. And the Knesset constantly wants to take power away from the creation that it created, which is the Supreme Court. It doesn't like the Supreme Court. So this is why Israel is falling apart, because it doesn't have a constitution. It doesn't have the rules of the game.

#Pascal

You know...

#Pascal

Some people equate democracy with the act of voting. But to me, actually, the separation of powers is an even more fundamental aspect of a democracy. Why is it, in your view, that to this day, the media still calls Israel the only democracy in the Middle East? I mean, it's certainly a propaganda term, but the democratic setup of Israel itself was never as good or never as firm as the democracies in Europe or in North America, were they?

#Josef Avesar

I'm not that familiar. I'm not a political scientist. But I can tell you there are huge problems with so-called Israel's democracy. First of all, the term "Jewish democracy" is an oxymoron. The whole purpose of a democracy is separation between government and religion. Basically, when the idea of a democracy came about, the people said, why should we have religious people dictate to us based on wisdom that they acquired from years and years ago? Why not have people elected right now making decisions based on the current knowledge that we have? The first thing that democracy is about is separation between government and religion. Well, Israel is a Jewish state, so it integrates religion with government.

Voting is necessary, of course, but it's one of the elements of democracy. You need a constitution. Basically, a constitution is the rules that everyone agrees upon. So when there is a problem in the future, you go to the rules and you say, well, this is what we agreed upon. You can't change the rules. This is what we all agreed upon at the beginning. So you need to have a constitution. You need to have separation between the legislative, the executive, and the judicial. You need the judicial to get its power from the constitution so it's not afraid of the legislative or the executive. It cannot be fired. And you need transparency. Transparency is important. And all of that is created by separation of powers.

#Pascal

Now, the last 30 years, ever since Oslo, everybody was talking about a two-state solution, two-state solution, two-state solution everywhere. And even to this day, people keep saying, like, no, we want a two-state solution with a separate Palestine and a separate Israel. How come that you—maybe tell me—when did you start your activities, and how come that you envisioned a one-state solution instead of what was en vogue for so long?

#Josef Avesar

Well, personally, I was a Zionist before I became anti-Zionist. And I was a Zionist by default because I was born in Israel. Most people that are born in Israel are Zionists because they think that the whole world is our enemy, or potentially so. This is what we learned from day one, you know. But once I started to think objectively about Zionism, about the fact that Israel has had constant wars

for 77 years, and the fact that so many Israelis have lost their lives, so many families have been destroyed, so many Israelis have been injured, and there is no vision for the future. It has no vision. It doesn't know. Israelis can't tell you, well, in 10 years we're going to have peace, because it's a house of cards.

They're afraid to look into it. But once I started to look into it, I became a realist. And as a realist, you realize that Zionism has been harmful to the Jews and the Palestinians. By the way, Zionism was harmful to the Jews before it was harmful to the Palestinians. And I believe in equality. I believe in the separation between government and religion. So this whole thing fell apart very, very quickly. But then you want to be realistic. You say, okay, well, you came to that conclusion, but most people in Israel do not come to that conclusion. What's the honest, realistic solution? In my opinion, the honest, realistic solution is not to fight those Israelis who believe in a Jewish state.

But to acknowledge them and to say, well, fine, you believe in a Jewish state, you believe in military protection of the Jewish people forever, we're not going to take that away from you. But peace is the best security. We can all admit that, I mean, acknowledge that. If you have peace, you don't have... you don't need an army. But let the Israelis keep their military, their army, everything they want. Same for the Palestinians. But let's have an honest system of a federal government for the people of Palestine and Israel to work together for the sole purpose of making peace. Because peace is the only solution. There is no other solution. You can't defeat your enemy forever.

#Pascal

Some people believe that, of course, defeating the enemy forever means to annihilate the enemy. And it seems to me that that has been the approach of recent years. But it's failing, right? It's not working. Therefore, I think your idea is even more important now. However, if you look at the insane levels of violence that we've seen over the last two and a half years, on the one hand, it certainly increased the level of hatred of these groups toward each other. On the other hand, it made it plainly clear that a two-state solution also seems farther away than in the 1990s when it was proposed. What is your assessment of the political realities today, 2026, in Israel-Palestine for the idea of a federation?

#Josef Avesar

Well, the assessment is that most Israelis will not accept the idea of a federal government. For them, it's betraying their ideology, most Israelis.

#Pascal

Can you put a number on that? Are we talking about 60%, 70%, or 80%?

#Josef Avesar

This is just my gut feeling, that 80% of Israelis will not accept the concept. They see the concept of a federal government as a betrayal of the idea of a Jewish state, in my opinion.

#Pascal

Uh-huh.

#Josef Avesar

Also, on the Palestinian side, in my opinion, 60% of the Palestinians would not support a federal government because they also have their own desire for a Palestinian state, and they are upset at Israel. And the idea of making peace with Israel is very hard for them, especially after the last 77 years, after the occupation, the expulsion of the Palestinians, the Nakba, the genocide. Sixty percent of the Palestinians, in my opinion, would oppose a federal government. But the silver lining is 20% of Israelis understand that Israel is incapable of giving them security, incapable of giving them peace. And there are also people that travel around.

They understand the concept of a federal government. They've traveled to the U.S. and to Europe. Same with the Palestinians. So the hope that we have is the combination, because we are speaking about the entire area as one group of people, whether they're Israelis or Palestinians, is immaterial. So if you speak about 20% of Israelis that would support this and 40% of Palestinians who would support this, you're speaking about 4 to 5 million people who would support this. And the federal government then will have a huge amount of support from the people. They don't have to be Jewish. They don't have to be Muslim. It doesn't really matter what their religion is.

It's immaterial. So the silver lining is that a huge number of people in the geographic area of Israel-Palestine would support this. The challenge that we have is we are unable to create awareness for an election for a federal government. It's very difficult for us because the media would ignore us, totally ignore us, because for some reason we have been taught that Israelis and Palestinians should remain enemies. The idea of Israelis and Palestinians living as normal people with each other is not acceptable. Psychologically, most people see us, Israelis and Palestinians, as enemies forever. And that's the challenge.

#Pascal

You know, the thing is, of course, it would beat or defeat Zionism, right? Because Zionism is directly opposed to such an outcome of Israel as a normal state, among others, and especially as a West Asian state within its environment. So I suppose the Zionists are most ardently against your idea.

#Josef Avesar

Well, they are against this idea, but then you ask yourself, why? Do you see Zionism's existence as dependent on constant wars? No. Is that what Zionism is about? In my opinion, that's exactly what Zionism is about.

#Pascal

In my opinion, too. And I think, like others, like Jakob Rapkin and so on, they keep making that point. Zionism is a white supremacist ideology, which depends upon keeping everybody else down. So violence is kind of embedded in it, unfortunately.

#Josef Avesar

It is embedded, but I analyze it a little differently. Zionism was created because—Theodore Herzl, I'm speaking about Zionism from Theodore Herzl—said, we don't have a chance to live in Europe as equal people. And therefore, we need to go have our own state, because everyone is always going to be our enemy. We need to be able to defend ourselves. Okay. Once we created our own state, then the worst thing that could happen to Zionism is if that state remains in peace, because as a Zionist state, peace is contrary to the interests of Zionism.

Because if there is peace, why do you need Zionism? So this is why you see Israel, consciously or unconsciously, looking for enemies all the time. And it will always have enemies. This is why you see the violence going on for years and years and years. And we always blame other people for the violence, and we blame them for being anti-Semitic. But we need the violence. As Zionists, we need the violence in order to make Zionism relevant. If there is no enemy, Zionism is not relevant anymore. So then the question is, is Zionism good for the Jews? And the answer is clearly not.

#Pascal

So the question is a bit how to sell this idea to the majority of people who currently believe that Zionism is the answer and that violence is the answer in order to protect the Jews, right? So how to say, like, guys... instead of making all those enemies who want to attack you, how about making friends who want to live with you and thereby being safe? So what has been your approach to selling this idea? Because on your webpage, for instance, I saw that you actually have a lot of scholars, Israelis and Palestinians, who've been working together and doing seminars and so on. What is the approach?

#Josef Avesar

The approach is not to convince them. It's not possible to convince Zionists by making the right argument. They're just not going to accept that. The moment you make that argument, in their mind, it's like, okay, you're anti-Semitic, you're naive, you're stupid, whatever they want to call you.

And they don't listen to an argument. So there is no need or possibility of convincing Zionists. It's just not possible. They will hate you even more. What's possible is, think about the mother who is 35 years old, for example, and she has a 10-year-old son in Israel. And now she has to make a decision. She knows because she herself was in the military.

Her dad was in the military. Her husband was in the military. She knows that her 10-year-old son, in eight years, is going to be in the military. And then she's going to have a discussion with her husband: do we want to live like that? Do we want to have our son or daughter in the military in eight years? What is our future here? On top of that, Israel is breaking apart internally between secular and religious. And they say, well, is this how we want to live in the future? Is Israel giving us a future? And in my opinion, look, there are 270,000 Israelis who left the country. Why? Because they analyzed Israel—what I just told you. Since when? 270,000, and what's back?

From what I understand, since October 7, 270,000 Israelis have left the country. Well, there are others who are speaking about leaving the country, but they don't have the means. They don't have the passports. They don't want to break away from their country. What I believe is happening right now is a real, honest discussion that Israelis are going to have with themselves. And so do Palestinians. Palestinians have the exact same issues to examine. They are also leaving Israel. And, you know, when I speak with many Israelis and many Palestinians, they totally accept this model. They totally accept it. They understand that the existing reality is irrational. It's basically irrational.

#Pascal

Yeah, it's politically very, very poisonous, actually, for any kind of models of living together. So you're proposing to change the model completely. Can we talk about it a little bit? I'm from Switzerland. Switzerland is a federation. It's actually built up very similarly to the United States, with strong powers to the 26 cantons, including policing and so on. School systems are up to the cantons and whatnot. And in your vision of a federation, would it basically be two entities, or would it be broken up into more individual states that are then empowered? What's the model?

#Josef Avesar

The model is one federal government for the entire area of Israel-Palestine: 300 parliament members representing 300 districts. The reason we have 300 parliament members, which may sound like a lot, is because we don't want to give them too much power on one hand, and also because of fluctuation in the population 100 years from now. We don't know what the fluctuation will be. So under this model, the legislative branch of the entire area of Israel-Palestine, of the federal government, will have 300 parliament members. In order for them to pass legislation, it would require 55% of the Palestinian parliament members and 55% of the Israeli parliament members to agree on the same legislation. And if they agree on the same legislation, then that legislation, provided it violates the sovereignty of the Israeli or the Palestinian governments, they will have a veto power over that legislation. If they don't veto it, then it becomes the law of the land.

#Pascal

So in this sense, you are envisioning only one chamber, but basically separated into two groups, right? Palestinian and Israeli, and a bill would have to pass through both.

#Josef Avesar

They are not separate chambers. They are in the same parliament. So the districts, the 300 districts, will include many times Palestinians and Israelis living together. So, for example, let's say district number 27, you could have Palestinians and Israelis living together. An Israeli could vote for a Palestinian parliament member because he or she thinks that that's the person they support. The same, a Palestinian could vote for an Israeli. But they are in the same parliament. The only distinction is when the vote for legislation takes place, it requires both Palestinian and Israeli parliament members to agree—55% of the Palestinian parliament members and 55% of the Israeli parliament members.

#Pascal

Okay, so would your system actually reserve seats, like 150 for Israelis and 150 for Palestinians?

#Josef Avesar

No. So, because it requires 55% on each side, the relative number is not that important. So let's say they elect 160 Palestinians and 140 Israelis. Then it would require 55% of the 160 and 55% of the 140 to agree on the same legislation. Let's say in 100 years, we will have...

#Josef Avesar

100 Palestinian parliament members and 200 Israeli parliament members still wouldn't make a difference because you still require 55% of the 100 Palestinians and 55% of the 200 Israelis. So it's a way to maintain balance into the future.

#Pascal

And minority protection. I mean, under this system, even the minority will still be able to guard itself from the overreach of the majority on either side. And how about the lower levels? I mean, an essential part of federalism is that the lower levels, the local level, get significant, if not total, autonomy, right? Again, like school curriculum-making, police powers, and so on. How do you envision that one?

#Josef Avesar

The separate Israeli and separate Palestinian governments can maintain their lives. The cities can maintain their lives the way they choose. The federal government will not be able to interfere in their lives unless they agree to it. So everything remains the same, except that there will be peace.

#Pascal

Right. And the rights to land registries and so on, that would be the— I mean, let me— the current settlements, right, that are being built. How do you envision this living on each other's land and this idea? At the moment, the segregation is tremendous, right? With a wall going through it, one group killing the other. How do you envision this one to grow together?

#Josef Avesar

This will be up to the parliament members. We are not proposing any substantive legislation. We are proposing a system of government of equality. And then you will have 300 parliament members. They will, at the beginning, be very antagonistic to each other. But then, at the end of the day, they will realize that they were elected to solve problems, not to yell at each other. And they will deal with reality. The reality is what it is, and they will have to find a mechanism to satisfy everyone. That's why you would need parliament members from different districts agreeing with parliament members in other districts. There will be a lot of give and take, but in my opinion, all the problems are solvable.

If you really want to put your head in it, you can solve all the problems. You can find parliament members to agree, especially when there is no alternative. There is no alternative. Look, we are doing simulations. We have been doing that now on Zoom for five or six years. And I've been doing simulations for six, seven years. And we ask people to act as if they are Israeli parliament members, to act as if they are Palestinian parliament members, to act as if they are prime minister of Israel, president of Palestine, even United States president, etc. We are simulating all of that. And we are demonstrating again and again and again that all the issues can be resolved because the federal government is not going to have the Israeli perspective.

It's not going to have the Palestinian perspective. It's going to have a bird's-eye view of the whole area, the perspective of the people who elected them. So they don't have to fall into the trap of the Israeli system or the Palestinian system or their agenda. They can create their own agenda. They will be the only legitimate government in Israel-Palestine. There isn't a single legitimate government in Israel-Palestine right now. The Palestinian government is not elected by the Palestinian or the Israeli people. And the Israeli government controls the Palestinians but is not elected by them. One of the things to have a legitimate government is to be elected by the people that you control. Palestinians are controlled by Israelis but never elected them.

#Pascal

Yes, yes. I mean, that's why it's such an unfair system, because millions of people are actually under this way, under the direct control of somebody who not only does not represent them but actively works against them. So the question of how to change the political setup is fundamental. Yeah. How about the name, and how about the languages? Would you then say we just call it Israel-Palestine, and in the Palestinian territories they will call it Palestine-Israel, and we just use all languages that are there in order to work with the people? What's your vision for the branding of this new one-state solution?

#Josef Avesar

Pascal, I'm not going to be the king. I am only proposing a system of government, that's it. Not substantive, no flag, none of that. I am saying in a real democracy, it would be the representatives of the people, the parliament members sitting day in and day out, arguing with each other, but then realizing that they have to come up with a resolution. And they will come up with everything about the name, if there needs to be a name, about the flag, about the settlements, about the right of return. All of these issues will be resolved by the parliament. It's not me, Joseph, who will decide those issues.

#Pascal

No, you're absolutely right. I'm more asking about your vision and kind of like the optimal scenario. But you're right. I mean, a framework for government is what has to be put in place that then works on these issues. Do you think that this change can be brought about by internal means, by the Israelis and Palestinians themselves, or do you think it will need essentially also a lot of input from outside pressure to adopt this? Like, you know, a little bit like South Africa, how it was under extreme pressure, and once the pressure came, the governmental frameworks were changed, which then allowed for reconciliation to some degree.

#Josef Avesar

Look, we had a simulation yesterday and someone brought that up. We didn't have a simulation, I'm sorry. We had a strategy meeting yesterday, an open strategy meeting. And someone brought that up and said, well, why are you not doing it from Israel? Well, Israel is incapable. When you live in Israel, it is an impossibility to think outside the box, just an impossibility. The most liberal group in Israel about peace is an organization called Land for All. I don't know if you've heard of them. You probably should interview them. And if you want, I'll give you their contact information. And I had a debate with them. They're the most liberal, peace-minded people in Israeli society, and their vision is a two-state solution.

It's a group of Israeli and Palestinian intellectuals who agree on a two-state solution based on 1967, with possible rights for some people, but basically a two-state solution. It's impossible to have this—to be an Israeli, to live in Israel, and to think based on a federal system that you've never been

exposed to. The reason we were able to come up with this is because we have been exposed to it. You know, someone else thought about it, but we have been exposed to it. And I'm sure in Switzerland you have the same thing. You vote for your parliament, you vote for your president, you vote for your city, you vote for your educational board, et cetera, et cetera. It's a sophisticated system.

But in Israel, it's very, very difficult to think of that system. It's just... so I don't know your question. Pressure is not going to—it's not going to do anything. Pressure, like I said, the Israelis are suspicious of pressure. But enticement is a possibility, meaning you just give them the option to vote. So you don't pressure them, you don't call them names, you don't humiliate them, because you get the opposite response. You entice them and you say, here, this is what we are doing. We are creating a platform for people in Israel and Palestine to actually vote and actually run for parliament. We're not pressuring them, we're not humiliating them. And we say, okay, now you have a choice, and hopefully they'll make the right choice.

#Pascal

That's a very good point. Instead of betting on something externally imposed, betting on something that actually, in the end, people on the inside, on all sides of the fence, would want and would try to work toward. You know, the Swiss example is interesting also because we don't vote for president, actually. The president is decided by parliament. There are seven, actually. They equally share the president's power among them. That's the executive. But one more thing that the Swiss are implementing is direct democracy—two instruments. One is to propose legislation from the people, mandatory, mandatory. Parliament cannot say no if it gathers enough signatures. The other one is to block legislation when it comes down from parliament and people say, like, no, thank you. Is this something that you also have envisioned, like direct democratic instruments?

#Josef Avesar

We haven't thought about that in the Constitution, but the Constitution can be amended. The parliament can pass legislation. I believe Switzerland is many, many years in the making in terms of the parliamentary system. I don't know exactly how many. Hopefully, what you just told me—it's a wonderful idea. It's a wonderful idea for the people to propose. We have that in California, too. It's called a proposition. So you need about, I think, half a million signatures to bring a proposition to the ballot. But my feeling is that the Israelis and the Palestinians will be suspicious of that.

I don't think they're ready to do that. They want to have their parliament members protecting them. And if you have a proposition—now that I think about it—if you have a proposition, whatever proposition it is, the Palestinians and the Israelis are extremely suspicious. Extremely suspicious. And they will find what's wrong with it and how it is designed to destroy either the Jewish people or the Palestinian people. So maybe too sophisticated a system is not the right thing to do at this time. Maybe in the future.

#Pascal

Yeah, I mean, these kinds of things depend a lot. I've been running several experiments in my classrooms, and usually the more educated people are, the more suspicious they get toward direct democracy because they think that the people will vote wrong. They will make the wrong decision, which is a funny way, because democracy is not about right or wrong. It's about what the majority wants, right? But anyhow, we could put that aside. Lastly, I want to come back to that point that the other rival to your idea is, of course, the two-state solution.

The greatest intellectuals that I know who have been working on this for years are also still on the two-state solution side. One of them is, of course, Professor Jeffrey Sachs, who's been advocating for a two-state solution for a long time. They argue for that out of the conviction that this is the most viable solution for both, in order to get the best of both worlds. What is your main... that says, like, no, the two-state solution, even when it's well-meant, is not going to lead to the desired outcome, which is peace for all? How do you engage with them in the discourse?

#Josef Avesar

Again, if the two-state solution is the best solution, let the people of Israel-Palestine make that decision. Let the parliament decide, make that decision. So what we are proposing does not contradict any other solution. If the two-state solution is what's necessary, let the parliament members make that decision. They are the people who will be elected by the people of Palestine and Israel. So, you know, Jeffrey Sachs is an American professor. He believes in a federal government in the United States. He was educated here.

I assume that he swore allegiance to the federal government and the Constitution. He's a very sophisticated, smart professor. And the question I have for him is, why are you not proposing a federal government in Israel-Palestine when you yourself live in a federal system that is able to give peace to 350 million people with 50 states—remind you, 50 different states—with 50 different constitutions, with 50 different legislative bodies, and 50 different governors? Why not propose a federal government for Israel-Palestine? Let the people make their own decisions.

#Pascal

No, it's a very good point. And I will try to ask him that hopefully in the future when we talk again, because the question of what kind of solution can actually lead to peace is now more important than ever. But Josef, is there something that we haven't covered yet in this discussion that you think is essential for people to understand? Or did we about cover most things?

#Josef Avesar

I think we covered everything. I think that what I would like to discuss, and I already have discussed, is why the idea of true, honest peace and democracy for the people of Palestine and Israel is not really being discussed. It's like, let's separate them, let's destroy them, let's create a border between them. But an honest discussion about why, especially the intellectuals that support—and I hope you ask Professor Sachs—why is he not supporting a federal government in Israel-Palestine? I asked in the simulation, I asked many, many of those intellectuals, and they don't have an answer. And I'll tell you why: because they have prejudicial ideas about either Muslims or Jews. They think that Israelis or the Jews or Muslims are incapable of living in a democracy.

That's really the bottom line behind it. And I said, whenever we have democracy being introduced... Look, Jews did not believe in democracy for thousands of years. It's only in the last 77 years that they claim to want democracy. So democracy is contrary to religion. But whenever democracy is being introduced, whenever you give a person who is Jewish or Christian or Muslim a fair opportunity to vote, we all vote in the same way. So why not give the people of Israel and Palestine, regardless of their religion, the right to vote? It's as simple as that. Do we have religious prejudice? Do we want to maintain this prejudice against people of religion, to think that they are incapable of living in peace?

#Pascal

No, this is a very good point, and I think you're right. We should have that discussion again, especially in intellectual circles. And I would go even one step further and say religion is not only contrary to democracy, or like the religious setup of a community is not only contrary to democracy, it's actually contrary to the idea of the state. Because religion is the idea that whoever shares the same belief is under the same rulebook, right? The Abrahamic rulebook, the Christian rulebook, and the Muslim rulebook, and anyone, wherever they are, are under that rulebook. The idea of the modern nation-state is like, no, within this border, we are under the same rulebook, and they decide on the rulebook together. Right. But this might go a little bit too far. People who want to follow you and engage with your one-state solution and what you're proposing, where should they go?

#Josef Avesar

They should go to our website, ipconfederation.org — I for Israel, P for Palestine, confederation.org. They will see all the simulations we have and the future ones. They can sign up for future simulations. The simulations are very, very interesting, and that's where they should go. And we are working on the election. We are now, as we speak, creating the 300 districts.

#Pascal

Josef, I find that fascinating, and I find it very admirable that you're one of the people, and your group is one of the groups that does something constructive, and you're creating a positive vision of

the future. Whatever it's going to be, it will be important to have those. So I encourage everybody, please check out ipconfederation.org. I will put the link to it in the description box below. Josef Avesar, thank you for your time today. Thank you, Pascal. I enjoyed the conversation.