



TWO-STATE SOLUTION ACT FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

Why is this bill being introduced now?

The need to achieve a two-state solution is more urgent than ever. Earlier this year, we witnessed a conflict in Israel and Gaza that cost hundreds of lives and caused devastating damage to homes and livelihoods, worsening a humanitarian crisis in Gaza. We saw riots erupt in Israeli towns once applauded as models of peaceful coexistence between Jews and Palestinians. And all of this occurred against the backdrop of [a deepening occupation in the Palestinian territories](#), which tears at both the Israeli and American Jewish communities.

As we enter this new year in the Jewish calendar, we must also enter a new chapter—one in which Israel's future as a democratic state and homeland for the Jewish people is secure and Palestinians' aspirations for a state of their own can be fulfilled. We can no longer claim credibly to support a two-state solution without taking steps to bring one about. This bill reestablishes America's role in helping the parties move down the path of peace and coexistence.

Will this bill affect the amount of security assistance the U.S. gives to Israel?

No. This bill does not lessen the support the United States gives to Israel for its security by even one dollar. It simply makes clear that such support must be used for that purpose: legitimate security needs.

Why does this bill single out Israel? Why doesn't it focus on other countries?

This bill does not "single out" Israel. It actually does something the United States government does all the time: specify what U.S. taxpayer dollars may or may not support. Sometimes, those specifications focus on particular entities or activities; for example, [under a provision I authored in current law](#), no U.S. funding may be used for assistance to the Armed Forces of Haiti. This bill specifies activities for which U.S. security assistance may not be used.

Bibi Netanyahu is no longer prime minister and the Abraham Accords stopped annexation for now, so why is this bill necessary?

This bill is not a response to a particular person or event. It is an effort to bring about a two-state solution—an outcome that is critical no matter who serves as Israel's prime minister, and that further settlement expansion will render impossible by foreclosing the possibility of a viable Palestinian state.

Isn't this an internal matter for Israel? Why is Congress acting on this?

First, Congress has a duty to act as a thoughtful steward of taxpayer dollars. Indeed, setting policies around those dollars' use is one of Congress' core functions. Second, if the United States

wishes to be a friend to the people of Israel, it is critical that we make clear which policies we believe to be harmful. Ami Ayalon, a former commander in chief of the Israeli Navy and former director of Israel's Shin Bet security service, [said](#), "Continuing the occupation is the single greatest threat to Israel's safety, and to our existence as a democracy," and notes, "We need the United States to ensure that the relationship between our two countries is guiding us down a path toward peace, stability and the maintenance of democracy — not empowering or abetting a slide toward disaster."

Aren't the restrictions on aid to Israel in this bill totally unprecedented?

No, policies like the one in this bill have ample precedent. Dating back to the administration of President Dwight D. Eisenhower, the United States has delineated explicitly authorized uses of the aid it provides to Israel. For example, Congress passed, and President George W. Bush signed into law, the Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Emergency Wartime Supplemental Appropriations Act (P.L. 108-11), which authorized \$9 billion in loan guarantees for Israel over three years and \$1 billion in military grants. P.L. 108-11 stated, "guarantees may be issued under this section only to support activities in the geographic areas which were subject to the administration of the Government of Israel before June 5, 1967," and that the loan guarantees could be reduced by the amount Israel spent on settlements outside its pre-1967 borders. On November 26, 2003, the Bush administration reduced the FY2003 loan guarantees by \$289.5 million due to Israel's continued settlement expansion and security barrier construction. In FY2005, the administration reduced the amount Israel was eligible to borrow by another \$795.8 million.

Shouldn't there be restrictions on aid to the Palestinians as well?

Current law already includes numerous restrictions on aid to the Palestinians. For example, the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2021 imposes on assistance to the Palestinians restrictions and conditions, with limited exemption authorities, regarding any future Palestinian state and its governing entity, certifications and vetting prior to the obligation of funds, audit requirements, a general prohibition on assistance for the Palestinian Authority, and a prohibition on assistance for the Palestine Liberation Organization, Hamas, or "any entity effectively controlled by Hamas, any power-sharing government of which Hamas is a member, or that results from an agreement with Hamas and over which Hamas exercises undue influence."

Does the assistance to the Palestinian people in this bill violate the Taylor Force Act?

No. Currently, the Taylor Force Act (Div. S, Title X of [P.L. 115-141](#)) blocks most Economic Support Fund aid benefitting the Palestinian Authority directly. With respect to the grants in this bill, the bill says explicitly that no assistance may go to the Palestinian Authority.

Will this bill have any effect on the situation if it isn't signed into law?

This bill sends the message that there are members of Congress who want to see a real two-state solution—not words, but action to make it happen. I want to show ordinary Israelis, Palestinians and Americans who want to see a two-state solution achieved that they have allies in the U.S. Congress who are working to make that vision a reality.