

RELEASE IN PART
B6

From: Sullivan, Jacob J <SullivanJJ@state.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, February 1, 2011 8:06 PM
To: H
Subject: FW: UNSC

FYI.

From: Samuel Berger [mailto:]
Sent: Tuesday, February 01, 2011 6:40 PM
To: Sullivan, Jacob J
Subject: UNSC

B6

If we can get the language changed (e.g. illegal vs illegitimate) and a commitment from the Pals not to pursue similar resolution, we have a rationale for abstention, including with the Israelis – although they won't like it. In that connection, it could be decisive with the Pals if the Europeans were to say that they would abstain if this were brought to the UNSC under current circumstances. We would have to work it hard with relevant folks here and in Israel.

If we are unable to change the language, on balance I would veto. If we abstain on a resolution that is contrary to our position, after we have suggested we would veto, it will appear that we are acting in reaction to the situation on the ground. I think that would make us appear weak rather than strong. It is hard to articulate a rationale for abstention that does not suggest that this is a retreat in response to events. In Israel, that would be seen as the first manifestation of the "post- Mubarak" order, and reinforce the narrative of abandonment, perhaps contributing to an atmosphere in Israel that produces unhelpful steps of their own in reaction to the current crisis.

S