

Between the two perspectives, I found John Aziz's argument for the two-state solution more persuasive. While Kevin D. Williamson does make a strong case that Palestinian governance is dysfunctional and "intertwined with terrorism," his approach basically condemns the region to constant and perpetual conflict by treating the status quo as the only viable path. Aziz's solution is much better because it acknowledges the difficulties and shortcomings of past peace efforts, but insists that some of the other options, including displacement, occupation, or all-out war, would have been immoral and probably wouldn't have worked. His point repeatedly emphasized the importance of building institutions and promoting coexistence, which would be very difficult but ultimately achievable. His methods for pursuing reconciliation at least provide some sort of a pathway forward where both people can keep their dignity. In contrast, Williamson's stance feels like there would be no meaningful change and wouldn't change the current political climate in the area.