

NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATION

7 app., 11 Shimshon str., Haifa, Israel, 31000, +972525167977 executive@dor-moriah.org.il, www.dor-moriah.org.il

The Advancement of Israeli Peace Agreements and its Domestic Political Stability

Results of a Mass Sociological Survey of Israeli Citizens

April 2025

The research was conducted as part of a special internet survey among 1,004 respondents, internet users aged 18 and older, representing a national representative sample of this population group in the State of Israel (Jewish and Arab sectors). The survey was conducted in early April 2025. The maximum statistical margin of error with this sampling method is $\pm 3.1\%$ at a 95% confidence level.

I. The Potential of Various Countries to Contribute to the Advancement of Peace Agreements Between Israel and Other Political Entities

The results of a representative nationwide Israeli sociological survey show that the group of states capable, to varying degrees, of contributing to the advancement of peace agreements between Israel and other political entities[^1] includes: the United States, Arab countries (UAE, Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Qatar), Russia, and France.

Based on responses to the question "Which states can, to some extent, contribute to the advancement of peace agreements between Israel and (various states and political entities are listed)," this type of potential is most associated with the influence of:

- The United States on relations between Israel and Lebanon;
- Arab countries on relations between Israel and Lebanon, Gaza, and Syria;
- Russia on relations between Israel and Syria and Iran;
- France on relations between Israel and Lebanon.



Summarizing the respondents' answers about the possibilities of influence allows us to assert that **the highest potential for external forces to contribute to the advancement of peace agreements** lies in relations between **Israel with Lebanon and Syria:** here, higher assessments of this potential coincide with the largest number of foreign policy actors capable of contributing, and **the lowest** lies **in relations between Israel and the West Bank, Yemen**. The largest and fundamentally different proportion of responses indicating that no country can help in peace processes concerns relations between Israel and the West Bank, Iran (32.3% each), and the Gaza Strip (33.1%).

Summary table of responses: No country can help advance a peace agreement between:

| Israel and Lebanon | 14.0% |
|--------------------------|-------|
| Israel and Gaza | 33.1% |
| Israel and Syria | 11.6% |
| Israel and Iran | 32.3% |
| Israel and the West Bank | 32.3% |
| Israel and Yemen | 32.5% |



II. Detailed Survey Results for Each Conflict Situation

Regarding contributions to the advancement of peace agreements **between Israel and Iran**, Israelis place **the United States** (42.6%) and **Arab countries** (21.4%) in first and second places. **Russia** (15.8%) ranks third in this rating.

| | Total |
|--|--------|
| Arab countries (UAE, Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Qatar) | 21.4% |
| European Union | 9.7% |
| Russia | 15.8% |
| China | 8.2% |
| USA | 42.6% |
| Turkey | 5.2% |
| Iran | 8.7% |
| France | 3.9% |
| Other country (specify): | 0.5% |
| No country can help | 32.3% |
| Don't know | 9.1% |
| Total | 157.3% |
| Ν | N=1004 |

Table 1. - Which states can, to some extent, contribute to the advancement of peace agreements between Israel and Iran? (multiple choice)

For peaceful resolution of **relations with Syria**, according to Israelis, the United States (52%) and Arab countries (31.7%) can primarily contribute. Russia (16.7%) takes third place in terms of the ability to influence the peace process.

Table 2. - Which states can, to some extent, contribute to the advancement of peace agreements between Israel and Syria? (multiple choice)

| | Total |
|--|--------|
| Arab countries (UAE, Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Qatar) | 31.7% |
| European Union | 11.2% |
| Russia | 16.7% |
| China | 3.6% |
| USA | 52% |
| Turkey | 12.2% |
| Iran | 6.3% |
| France | 8.1% |
| Other country (specify): | 0.9% |
| No country can help | 17.0% |
| Don't know | 11.6% |
| Total | 171.1% |
| N | N=1004 |



According to Israelis, among countries capable of contributing to the advancement of peace agreements between Israel and Lebanon, the United States leads predictably and with a significant margin from other countries (58.4%). More than a third of respondents (35.6%) also attribute this capability to Arab countries (UAE, Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Qatar), and a fifth (21.4%) to France.

| agreements between Israel and Debanon | Total |
|--|--------|
| | 10141 |
| Arab countries (UAE, Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Qatar) | 35.6% |
| European Union | 12.9% |
| Russia | 8.1% |
| China | 2.8% |
| USA | 58.4% |
| Turkey | 5.4% |
| Iran | 5.6% |
| France | 21.4% |
| Other country (specify): | 0.4% |
| No country can help | 14.0% |
| Don't know | 9.7% |
| Total | 174.2% |
| N | N=1004 |
| | 1 |

| Table 3 Which states can, to some extent, contribute to the advancement of peace |
|--|
| agreements between Israel and Lebanon? (multiple choice) |



Regarding contributions to peaceful resolution of relations between Israel and Gaza, Israelis point, without question, primarily to the possibilities of the United States (46.5%), but, as in the previous question, there is quite a high proportion of those who also think this about Arab countries (34.1%).

| Table 4 Which states can, to some extent, contribute to the advancement of peace |
|--|
| agreements between Israel and Gaza? (multiple choice) |

| | Total |
|--|--------|
| Arab countries (UAE, Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Qatar) | 34.1% |
| European Union | 10.8% |
| Russia | 7.0% |
| China | 3.2% |
| USA | 46.5% |
| Turkey | 4.9% |
| Iran | 6.5% |
| France | 4.8% |
| Other country (specify): | 1.1% |
| No country can help | 33.1% |
| Don't know | 6.3% |
| Total | 158.1% |
| Ν | N=1004 |



According to Israelis, only the United States (43.1%) and Arab countries - UAE, Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Qatar (27.8%) can essentially contribute to the advancement of peace agreements between Israel and the West Bank (Judea and Samaria).

Table 5. - Which states can, to some extent, contribute to the advancement of peace agreements between Israel and the West Bank (Judea and Samaria)? (multiple choice)

| | Total |
|--|--------|
| Arab countries (UAE, Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Qatar) | 27.8% |
| European Union | 11.5% |
| Russia | 5.3% |
| China | 3.6% |
| USA | 43.1% |
| Turkey | 3.8% |
| Iran | 3.0% |
| France | 4.5% |
| Other country (specify): | 1.0% |
| No country can help | 32.3% |
| Don't know | 10.9% |
| Total | 146.6% |
| N | N=1004 |



As in all previous cases, Israelis believe that the United States (37.3%) and Arab countries (26.9%) can contribute most to the advancement of peace agreements between Israel and Yemen.

| Table 6 Which states can, to some extent, contribute to the advancement of peace |
|--|
| agreements between Israel and Yemen? (multiple choice) |

| | Total |
|--|--------|
| Arab countries (UAE, Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Qatar) | 26.9% |
| European Union | 7.4% |
| Russia | 8.7% |
| China | 4.5% |
| USA | 37.3% |
| Turkey | 5.1% |
| Iran | 9.2% |
| France | 3.0% |
| Other country (specify): | 0.5% |
| No country can help | 32.5% |
| Don't know | 12.5% |
| Total | 147.3% |
| N | N=1004 |



III. The Secular-Religious Aspect of Perceptions About the Peacemaking Potential of Various Countries

Secular respondents, to a greater extent than religious ones, attribute some kind of peacemaking potential to different countries.

For example, regarding the situation between Israel and Lebanon, the following proportions report the possibility of peacemaking influence:

- Arab countries - 40.6% of secular respondents versus 31-32% of traditional and religious respondents to varying degrees;

- USA - 67.4% of secular respondents versus 58--60% of traditional and religious respondents to varying degrees;

- France - 25.8% of secular respondents versus 15--18% of traditional and religious respondents to varying degrees.

Religious and traditional Israelis somewhat more often than secular ones believe that no country can help in this (approximately 17% of both compared to 11% of secular respondents).

 Table 7. - Which states can, to some extent, contribute to the advancement of peace agreements between Israel and Lebanon? (multiple choice)

| | Secular | Traditional | Ultra/Religious |
|--|---------|-------------|-----------------|
| Arab countries (UAE, Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Qatar) | 40.6% | 31.1% | 32.3% |
| European Union | 14.7% | 13.0% | 7.6% |
| Russia | 9.0% | 8.0% | 5.1% |
| China | 1.6% | 2.7% | 2.5% |
| USA | 67.4% | 60.2% | 58.2% |
| Turkey | 5.2% | 4.7% | 4.4% |
| Iran | 5.4% | 7.0% | 2.5% |
| France | 25.8% | 14.7% | 18.4% |
| Other country (specify): | 0.5% | 0.3% | 0.6% |
| No country can help | 10.9% | 16.7% | 16.5% |

| | Secular | Traditional | Ultra/Religious |
|------------|---------|-------------|-----------------|
| Don't know | 6.7% | 8.4% | 11.4% |
| Total | 187.9% | 166.9% | 159.5% |
| N | N=387 | N=299 | N=158 |



Reporting on the possibility of peacemaking influence on relations between **Israel and Iran** from:

- Arab countries - 25.1% of secular respondents versus 17-20% of traditional and religious respondents;

- USA - 48.3% of secular respondents versus 44--36% of traditional and religious respondents;

- Russia - 18.1% versus 11--12%, respectively.

In turn, religious Israelis to varying degrees more often than secular ones believe that no country can help in this (45.6% versus 31.8% of secular respondents).

Table 8. - Which states can, to some extent, contribute to the advancement of peace agreements between Israel and Iran? (multiple choice)

| | Secular | Traditional | Ultra/Religious |
|--|---------|-------------|-----------------|
| Arab countries (UAE, Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Qatar) | 25.1% | 20.1% | 17.1% |
| European Union | 10.1% | 8.0% | 7.6% |
| Russia | 18.1% | 12.0% | 11.4% |
| China | 7.5% | 6.7% | 5.1% |
| USA | 48.3% | 44.1% | 36.1% |
| Turkey | 3.6% | 4.7% | 5.1% |
| Iran | 12.4% | 6.4% | 5.7% |
| France | 2.8% | 3.3% | 5.7% |

| | Secular | Traditional | Ultra/Religious |
|--------------------------|---------|-------------|-----------------|
| Other country (specify): | 0.5% | 0.0% | 0.6% |
| No country can help | 31.8% | 34.8% | 45.6% |
| Don't know | 6.5% | 8.4% | 5.7% |
| Total | 166.7% | 148.5% | 145.6% |
| Ν | N=387 | N=299 | N=158 |



The trend according to which **religious Israelis to varying degrees more often than secular ones believe that no country can contribute to the indicated peace processes** is reflected in the values presented in the summary table and diagram below.

Summary table of values for the response ''No country can help'' (in peaceful resolution of the conflict between Israel and...) depending on the degree of secularity-religiosity of the respondents

| | Secular | Traditional | Ultra/Religious |
|-----------|---------|-------------|-----------------|
| Lebanon | 10.9% | 16.7% | 16.5% |
| Gaza | 30.7% | 37.8% | 48.1% |
| Syria | 15.0% | 18.7% | 23.4% |
| Iran | 31.8% | 34.8% | 45.6% |
| West Bank | 28.9% | 36.1% | 47.5% |
| Yemen | 33.1% | 34.1% | 37.3% |



IV. Israel -- USA -- Russia: Security Issues

Evaluating the statement by Presidents D. Trump and V. Putin regarding not allowing Iran to threaten Israel's existence,

- more than a quarter of Israelis (27.5%) view this as an objective assessment of Israel's right to exist,

- one in five (19.9%) see it as an expression of Israel's traditional relations with the United States and Russia as countries that initiated the creation of Israel in the UN in 1948.

Table 9. - During a telephone conversation between US President Trump and Russian President Putin, it was stated that Iran should not be allowed to threaten the existence of Israel. What do you think this statement means?

| This is an objective assessment of Israel's right to exist | 27.5% |
|---|--------|
| This is an expression of Israel's traditional relations with the USA and Russia countries that initiated the creation of Israel in the UN in 1948 | 19.9% |
| This is a sign of the formation of a new world order | 15.7% |
| The USA is transferring responsibility for the situation with Israel to Russia due to planned reductions in its presence in the Middle East | 12.6% |
| Other | 2.7% |
| Don't know | 21.5% |
| Total | 100% |
| Ν | N=1004 |

Russia was told by Putin that Iran cannot be allowed to threaten the existence of Israel. What do you think this statement means?



V. Israel's Foreign Policy Independence

Based on respondents' answers, Israel's domestic political situation is little affected by any foreign policy actors, except for the United States, about whose potential influence almost half (47.1%) of respondents report. With a huge gap in the degree of such influence from the United States, Arab countries (18.9%), Russia, the EU, and Iran (12-14%) follow.

| Table 10 In your opinion, are there forces within other countries interested in and |
|---|
| capable of influencing the domestic political situation in Israel in any way? If yes, which |
| countries are we talking about? (Multiple choice) |

| | Secular | Traditional | Ultra/Religious | Total |
|---|---------|-------------|-----------------|--------|
| Arab countries (UAE, Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Qatar) | 23.0% | 15.1% | 16.5% | 18.9% |
| European Union | 15.5% | 11.4% | 10.8% | 13.2% |
| Russia | 17.6% | 12.7% | 14.6% | 14.6% |
| China | 6.7% | 6.4% | 3.8% | 6.2% |
| USA | 57.6% | 45.8% | 41.8% | 47.1% |
| Turkey | 5.2% | 3.0% | 5.7% | 5.0% |
| Iran | 14.2% | 13.0% | 12.7% | 12.1% |
| France | 3.9% | 1.7% | 3.2% | 3.4% |
| Other country (specify): | 0.8% | 0.0% | 2.5% | 0.7% |
| No country can influence the domestic political situation in Israel in any way | 15.2% | 25.1% | 25.3% | 20.1% |
| Don't know | 10.3% | 15.4% | 17.7% | 15.5% |
| Total | 170.0% | 149.5% | 154.4% | 156.9% |
| N | N=387 | N=299 | N=158 | N=1004 |



As in previous questions, religious Israelis less often speak about the possibilities of foreign policy influence than secular ones.



VI. Israel's Domestic Political Stability

The absolute majority of Israelis (54.6%) associate Israel's domestic political instability with the political crisis and ineffectiveness of its modern political structure (such understanding characterizes secular Israelis to a greater extent - 64.6% versus 48.1% of ultra/religious). Only 15% of respondents consider such a situation a sign of Israel's democracy, and 10% are convinced that this is due to the characteristics of Israeli society.

Table 11. - After Menachem Begin's government (1981-1983), no Israeli government has served a full term. How can this be explained?

| | Secular | Traditional | Ultra/Religious | Total |
|--|---------|-------------|-----------------|--------|
| This indicates the existence of a political crisis and the ineffectiveness of the modern political structure of Israel | 64.6% | 50.2% | 48.1% | 54.6% |
| This is a sign of the democratic nature of Israeli society and the state | 13.2% | 18.7% | 11.4% | 14.9% |
| This happens due to the objective characteristics of Israeli society | 8.8% | 9.0% | 13.9% | 9.7% |
| Other: | 3.4% | 4.0% | 8.9% | 4.1% |
| Don't know | 10.1% | 18.1% | 17.7% | 16.7% |
| Total | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| N | N=387 | N=299 | N=158 | N=1004 |

Since the government of Menachem Begin (1981-1983), no Israeli government has served a full term, how can this be explained?

This is due to the objective characteristics of Israeli society

This is a sign of the democratic nature of Israeli society and state

This indicates the existence of a political crisis and the ineffectiveness of the current political structure of Israel



VII. Ethnic Factor

Speaking about the ethnic factor, **the biggest difference in responses between the Jewish and Arab sectors concerns the role of the United States in advancing peace agreements. This role is fundamentally more highly evaluated by the Jewish sector**, and primarily regarding the possibilities of the United States in promoting peace initiatives between Israel and Lebanon (here the difference in the proportion of responses between Jews and Arabs is 2 times), as well as Syria (almost 2 times).

Summary table of response data in the Arab and Jewish sectors regarding the role of the USA in advancing peace agreements

| Peace agreement between Israel and: | Jews | Arabs |
|-------------------------------------|-------|-------|
| Lebanon | 63.2% | 33.1% |
| Gaza | 49.3% | 31.3% |
| Syria | 56.2% | 30.0% |
| Iran | 44.5% | 32.5% |
| West Bank (Judea and Samaria) | 45.1% | 32.5% |
| Yemen | 38.8% | 28.7% |



These conclusions are consistent with the fact that the Arab population almost 2 times less often believes that there are forces in the United States interested in and capable of influencing Israel's domestic political situation in any way (29.4% versus 50.4% in the Jewish sector).

In your opinion, are there forces within other countries interested in and capable of influencing the domestic political situation in Israel in any way? If yes, which countries are we talking about? (Multiple choice)

| Countries | Jews | Arabs |
|--|--------|--------|
| Arab countries (UAE, Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Qatar) | 18.9% | 18.8% |
| European Union | 13.2% | 13.8% |
| Russia | 15.3% | 11.2% |
| China | 6.0% | 6.9% |
| USA | 50.4% | 29.4% |
| Turkey | 4.5% | 7.5% |
| Iran | 13.5% | 4.4% |
| France | 3.0% | 5.6% |
| Other country (specify): | 0.8% | 0.0% |
| No country can influence the domestic political situation in Israel in any way | 20.6% | 17.5% |
| Don't know | 13.5% | 26.2% |
| Total | 159.8% | 141.3% |
| N | N=843 | N=160 |



Also, in the Jewish sector, three times more often than in the Arab sector, they believe that the statement by **the presidents of the United States and Russia that Iran should not be allowed to threaten the existence of Israel** is an **objective assessment of Israel's right to exist, while the Arab population twice as often found it difficult to answer the question** "What, in your opinion, is the meaning of this statement."

Table 12. - During a telephone conversation between US President Trump and Russian President Putin, it was stated that Iran should not be allowed to threaten the existence of Israel. What, in your opinion, is the meaning of this statement?

| Response options | Jews | Arabs |
|---|--------|--------|
| | | 10.0% |
| This is an expression of Israel's traditional relations with the USA and Russia - countries that initiated the creation of Israel in the UN in 1948 | 19.7% | 20.6% |
| This is a sign of the formation of a new world order | 15.4% | 17.5% |
| The USA is transferring responsibility for the situation with Israel to Russia due to planned reductions in its presence in the Middle East | 12.6% | 13.1% |
| Other | 2.8% | 1.9% |
| Don't know | 18.6% | 36.9% |
| Total | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| Ν | N=843 | N=160 |

During a phone call between US President Trump and Russian President Putin, it was said that Iran should not be allowed to threaten Israel's existence. What do you think the significance of this statement is?



Conclusions:

- 1. Israelis name four countries that are more capable than others of contributing to the advancement of Israel's peace agreements: the United States, Arab countries, Russia, and France.
- First and foremost, the United States, but also Arab countries, can contribute to this in Israel's relations with Iran, Lebanon, Gaza, Syria, the West Bank, and Yemen; Russia

 in Israel's relations with Syria and Iran; France - with Lebanon.
- 3. The highest potential for external political forces to contribute to the advancement of Israel's peace agreements lies in relations between Israel and Lebanon and Syria, the lowest **concerns** relations between Israel and the West Bank and Yemen.
- 4. Secular Israelis, to a greater extent than religious ones, attribute some kind of peacemaking potential to different countries. Religious Israelis more often than secular ones believe that no country can contribute to the advancement of these peace agreements.
- 5. The statement by Presidents D. Trump and V. Putin regarding not allowing Iran to threaten the existence of Israel:
 - 27.5% of Israelis view this as an objective assessment of Israel's right to exist,
 - 19.9% as an expression of Israel's traditional relations with the United States and Russia as countries that initiated the creation of Israel in the UN in 1948.
- 6. Based on respondents' answers, Israel's domestic political situation is little affected by any foreign policy actors, except for the United States, about whose potential influence almost half (47.1%) of respondents report.
 With a significant gap in the degree of such influence from the United States, the

following are next: Arab countries (18.9%), as well as: Russia, the EU, and Iran (12-14%).

- The absolute majority of Israelis (54.6%) associate Israel's domestic political instability with the political crisis and ineffectiveness of its modern political structure (such understanding characterizes secular Israelis to a greater extent - 64.6% versus 48.1% of ultra/religious).
- 8. The biggest difference in responses between the Jewish and Arab sectors concerns the role of the United States in advancing peace agreements. This role is fundamentally more highly evaluated by the Jewish sector, and primarily regarding the possibilities of the United States in promoting peace initiatives between Israel and Lebanon, as well as Syria.

[^1]: This list includes states that have at least once entered the top three capable of contributing to the advancement of peace agreements between Israel and other political entities.