Article

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

America, Gaza & ‘Israel’:
Understanding the Crisis and the US Plan to Fix It

Since the dawn of October 7th, the conflict in Gaza has become an international focal point, capturing the attention of people worldwide. The unfathomable atrocities inflicted upon the innocent children, women, and men are beyond articulation. No words within the vast expanse of the dictionary can adequately convey the sheer brutality unleashed by the Zionist state upon the population of Gaza.

In the face of this crisis, the unstinting support displayed by the Western media and their leaders to the Zionist state itself is nothing short of mind-boggling. The world watches as contradictions unfold, as narratives are spun to justify the unjustifiable. Amid this chaos, the resilience of the people of Gaza stands as a testament to the strength of the human spirit in the face of adversity. It is a narrative of survival, courage, and a plea for humanity to rise above political posturing.

Nevertheless, the crisis has not been comprehended solely from a political standpoint, leaving many in a state of confusion regarding what is truly unfolding and why. Some assert that Israel orchestrated the situation, only for it to backfire; others claim that Israel seeks to redraw the map, pushing Gazans into neighbouring regions like Sinai. There are even those who suggest that America is involved in this plan, while some argue that Hamas initiated the conflict independently, without any foreign backing. However, none of these narratives accurately captures the essence of the issue. The crux of the matter lies in miscalculations by America, leading to an unexpected turn of events.

Understanding this conflict requires a breakdown of the region and an exploration of how different American political factions respond to the Middle East, each exhibiting distinct styles in policy. Since the issue is a political issue, and it is not disconnected from wider political issues of the region.

Understanding America’s Domestic Political Atmosphere in Relation to the Zionist State and the wider Middle East

It is no secret that the Biden administration does not favour Netanyahu and his government. Their stance runs counter to the Democratic agenda for ‘Israel’ and the region. The Democrats desire a more liberal government, in contrast to the right-wing factions in ‘Israel’, which tend to align with the Republican party’s preferences. Notably, some of the most influential US Zionist lobbies are Republican, populated by staunch Christian evangelicals whose interests in Israel extend beyond the realm of politics and economics.

When it comes to Iran, Democrats have shown a more accommodating stance toward the regime, occasionally engaging openly with the Iranian regime. In contrast, Republicans lean heavily towards favouring Israel, Saudi Arabia, and other Arab states over their approach to Iran.

The Democrats have consistently adopted a policy of seeking reconciliation with Iran. This approach stems from the Democratic belief that stability in the region can be achieved through Iran, given its strategic geographical location, abundant resources, and significant position in the Middle East. The establishment of J Street during former President Bill Clinton's tenure, under the guidance of his advisor Jeremy Ben Ami, exemplifies the Democratic commitment to resolving the Arab ‘Israeli’ conflict, mitigating tensions with Iran, and addressing other issues through diplomatic channels, multilateralism, and a non-military stance.

This stands in stark contrast to the Republican standpoint and the influence of the radical Zionist lobby. Consequently, Democrats have exhibited a more lenient approach towards

Iran, aligning with their strategic interests. Instances of this reconciliation include the progressive relations between Khatami and Clinton [1], Obama's JCPOA deal, the $400 million cash airdrop to Iran, and Biden's ongoing efforts to restore the nuclear deal 2.0.

The distinction in policy approaches between Democrats and Republicans does not imply that one is better than the other. It is a matter of different styles working towards the common objective of upholding US dominance. Acknowledging that Republicans have collaborated with Iran behind closed curtains doesn't negate the fact that their interests differ from those of the Democratic party.

Instances of collaboration between successive Republican administrations and Iran include:

- President Reagan orchestrated a covert deal with the clerical regime in Tehran during his term. The deal involved delaying the release of American hostages in exchange for arms, with the intent to undermine President Carter's chances of re-election. Interestingly, despite this collaboration, President Reagan officially labelled Iran as one of the greatest sponsors of terrorism.

- Under George H.W. Bush's leadership, Iran, led by Akbar Hashemi Rafsanjani, permitted Americans to use its airspace during the first Gulf War against Saddam Hussein in 1991. Despite this cooperation, Bush maintained a stern posture against the clerical regime, as adopting a softer tone toward Iran was deemed a potential threat to his re-election.

- During George W. Bush's presidency, both the US and Iran collaborated in efforts to topple Saddam Hussein from Iraq and in the war on terror. However, the Neoconservatives within the administration continued to express a belligerent stance towards Iran.

- Under President Trump, although US-Iran relations were perceived to be at their lowest point by many, a similar pattern persisted. During Trump's tenure, a backchannel deal emerged, involving collaboration with the Iranian-influenced Shi’a faction of the Iraqi government to install Al-Kadhimi as Iraq’s new ruler.

The donors of the republican party include oil giants, the defence complex and the Zionist lobby, which is mainly made up of Christian Zionists. Each of these donors has fundamental requirements and interests that demand protection. Republican politicians craft distinct policies aimed at securing these interests, aligning with Washington's overarching goal of preserving US global supremacy.

In summary, capitalist states like the US governments must navigate through the interests of their benefactors alongside their own political considerations for retaining power and safeguarding national security. This complexity defines how America operates. It is not a straightforward execution of policies through the administration; rather, it involves catering to various interests, resulting in differing policies. However, the end goal remains unchanged which, is maintaining American supremacy globally. Every institution, politician, and powerful capitalist corporation and banks in the US maintain a consensus on this fact, yet they employ diverse strategies to achieve it through their preferred political party.

When it comes to the controversial Zionist state, it serves as a tool for various interest groups. Influential groups within America support it for diverse reasons. Some are driven by hardcore Christian beliefs, such as the evangelicals; others aim to create complexity in the region to sow division among Muslims. Some back it due to a simple deep-seated hatred of Islam. There are also those who support it to strategically prevent the resurgence of a united Muslim state. In truth, Israel is weak needs a foreign patron.

The US maintains a strategic stance regarding the Jewish entity’s expansion and the preservation of Palestinian territories like Gaza. The reality is that, despite the Jewish entity’s presence over the past 70 years, it has not achieved full control over the entire territory of historic Palestine. Instead, its territorial gains have been incremental, and at times, it had to roll back these advancements. This situation is intricately tied to America's overarching goal

of keeping nations engaged in Eurasia, a fundamental policy unlikely to change regardless of individual sentiments toward ‘Israel’.

It's crucial to recognise that the US is driven by its own interests rather than any specific allegiance to the interests of the Zionists. America's support for ‘Israel’ is shaped by strategic considerations, and its ultimate aim is to safeguard its own geopolitical interests.

During Dwight Eisenhower's presidency, US foreign policy circles were initially against Israel, with preferences for supporting Arab states. However, a notable shift occurred after the 1967 and 1973 wars when the US officially began backing Israel. This change was influenced by Arab rulers aligning with the US to bring ‘Israel’ into the US camp. Prior to this, the Jewish entity was tagging with the US, UK and France simultaneously which angered the US.

Additionally, these alliances with Arab rulers helped the US legitimise the Jewish entity’s existence through staged war efforts, which were later cited by Egyptian and Syrian governments as a basis for acknowledging and accepting Israel's presence.

During both administrations of the Bush family, the Jewish entity faced criticism whenever it engaged in the construction of illegal settlements in the West Bank. Under President Obama, ‘Israel's’ concerns regarding the nuclear deal were disregarded. When Netanyahu visited Washington to oppose Obama's plans, the latter responded by ignoring Netanyahu and causing him embarrassment. This illustrates that Israel is viewed by the US as a tool in the broader geopolitical landscape. Even if the Jewish entity were to cease to exist tomorrow, the US could still navigate the region using various other options.

Biden Middle East Policy

Upon assuming office, Biden aimed for a change in leadership in ‘Israel’ which led to increased tensions. Hamas, with Iranian backing, conducted strikes, and their missiles managed to breach Israel's Iron Dome defence system.

The crisis originated in 2023, triggered by protests in East Jerusalem over the potential eviction of six Palestinian families in Sheikh Jarrah by the supreme court of ‘Israel’. This area, though under ‘Israeli’ control since 1980, is considered part of the Palestinian Territories under international law. The situation escalated on May 7th 2021 when clashes occurred at the Al-Aqsa Mosque compound, leading to global protests and official reactions from world leaders.

The violence coincided with Qadr Night and Jerusalem Day, the latter being a Zionist national holiday. Far-right Jewish nationalists planned a Jerusalem day parade, the Dance of Flags, which was later cancelled. The confrontations resulted in over 600 injuries, mostly among Palestinians, drawing international condemnation. As a result, ‘Israel's’ Supreme Court delayed the ruling on Sheikh Jarrah evictions for 30 days to ease tensions.

Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu was in the process of convincing several far-right politicians to create a coalition, including figures like Ben-Gvir and King, contributing to the escalation of the crisis. The New York Times suggested that Netanyahu might be intentionally fuelling the crisis to garner support for his leadership, allowing tensions to heighten in Jerusalem. However, some view this perspective as conspiratorial," that Bibi was not seeking power, but over the years Bibi’s actions have become obvious.

On May 10th 2021, Hamas issued an ultimatum for the Jewish entity to withdraw its security forces from the Temple Mount complex and Sheikh Jarrah. When the deadline passed without a response, both Hamas and PIJ launched rockets from Gaza into Israel. In June 2021, Bibi fell off from office as diverse parties across ‘Israel’ wanted to get rid of him since he caused nothing but failed promises and trouble for the entity’s citizens, this brought in Neftali Bennet as Prime Minister.

Indeed, Netanyahu's adversarial approach and lack of consideration towards Palestinians ultimately became a significant blow to his position in office. Many attributed

Netanyahu as the catalyst for Hamas attacks, which surprisingly managed to breach the Jewish entity's defence system.

However, Hamas didn't act independently. Iran has been supporting Hamas with both funds and military aid through tunnels, over the years, which is a well-known fact with ample information supporting this reality. More importantly, it was the Biden administration that allowed Hamas the green light via Iran to carry out such actions.

This is because Biden took three weeks to make his first phone call to Bibi after coming to the White House, but it took him only a day to call Naftali Bennett after he became the Prime Minister of 'Israel'. Furthermore, many media outlets have highlighted the uneasy relationship between Biden and Bibi ever since Biden became president. During the 11-day rocket attacks Biden advised Netanyahu to embrace a ceasefire and accept mediation offers through Egypt, which led to Bibi's eventual setback in June 2021, where many parties across the Jewish entity unifying in opposition to him.

Why this was a blow to Netanyahu is because his entire political stance revolves around security, emphasising his tough approach, especially concerning Iran. However, as many witnessed his shortcomings, notably in mishandling security matters where Hamas was able to cause substantial damage over the Jewish entity. This ultimately in 2021, led to Bibi's downfall.

Likewise, Hamas swiftly agreed to a ceasefire with 'Israel'. This raises questions about potential Iranian involvement in reshaping 'Israeli' politics, which aligns with America's interests, particularly within the Democratic Party. The reason is that the Biden administration aims to restore the nuclear deal and sees a need to eliminate right-wing elements that are in conjunction with Republicans in the US-might jeopardise this plan.

This stems from Biden's goal to unify the Middle East, a departure from the Republican approach under Trump, which maintained division and hostility in the region. The rationale behind this shift lies in the Biden administration's primary focus on countering Russia and China, particularly in Ukraine and Taiwan. America harbours significant global realignment plans under the current administration, necessitating a strategic de-escalation in the Middle East to channel political will, resources, and efforts toward pursuing greater geopolitical objectives.

However, Bibi has been a staunch opponent of the JCPOA deal since Obama's time, and since returning to power post-Bennet, he has become even more aggressive and insubordinate towards the US under the current administration. Thus, the Biden administration utilised a different approach to somehow legitimise Iran's position in the region; hence, came the Iran-Saudi deal, which was done by the US, but labelled China as the broker. In this scenario, America tried to hit two birds with one stone: first, to create rapprochement between Iran and Saudi Arabia, leading Gulf nations to also consider thawing relations with Iran so, it could continue controlling the region when focused on exiting the region to focus on Russia and China. Second, to further amplify the Chinese threat in the Middle East so, then America could justify its aggression towards China.

This development alarmed Israel as it posed a significant challenge. Netanyahu, who aimed to normalize relations with Arab nations like Saudi Arabia in the region, found himself in an official peace agreement and rapprochement with the Iranian government. While this raised concerns, the intentional move by the United States was strategic. By bringing Netanyahu into a peace agreement with Saudi Arabia, the US hoped to compel him to de-escalate with Iran due to Saudi Arabia being in a peaceful relationship with the Khomeini regime. Hence, it would become counterproductive if the Jewish entity continued its aggressive actions against Iran, such as strikes and assassinations, potentially putting Saudi Arabia in a difficult position.

This triangular dynamic created by the US was aimed to make the Jewish entity feel obligated to follow suit. Consequently, during the normalisation talks between the Jewish entity and Saudi Arabia under the US umbrella. This strategy stemmed from the Biden

administration's disapproval of Netanyahu and its desire for the Jewish entity to align with its regional plans, even though this contradicted Netanyahu's career as the military leader of the Jewish entity. And this eventually all of suddenly led to the war in Gaza because of two main reasons:

To begin with, Bibi finds it hard to acknowledge that Iran is in a comfortable position with a nation it intends to normalise relations with- Saudi Arabia. The circumstances were different under Trump, with a climate more favourable towards the Jewish entity, more anti-Iranian and increased divisions among nations in the region. Bibi's reluctance stems from his entrenched arrogance, especially given the changed geopolitical dynamics.

Second, for successful normalisation between Zionist state and KSA there are some things that Bibi must abide by. According to Chatham House Think Tank, "*Bibi's right-wing coalition government vehemently opposes engaging in negotiations with the Palestinian leadership, instead focusing on the controversial goal of annexing more of the West Bank. This particular aspect of the deal poses the greatest challenge for him to fulfil.*

Simultaneously, Palestinian President Mahmoud Abbas is actively participating in the negotiation process, aiming to rejuvenate his leadership by gaining increased control over West Bank territory currently under Israeli management. He also seeks to halt further Israeli settlement expansion, aligning this effort with a Saudi-funded economic support plan".

Further, added by Chatham House, "*To achieve this breakthrough deal, the prime minister must either garner support from his coalition of right-wing religious ideologues or consider dismantling the coalition and forming an agreement with a more centrist government, potentially led by former partner and prime minister Benny Gant".*

These demands are an American initiative, not Saudi's. This is because the United States aims to exert pressure on the Jewish entity to a certain extent while reconfiguring the roles of other actors in the region. The goal is to facilitate a successful shift of focus towards Asia which is the real game that the US is focused don playing. Furthermore, this aligns with democratic ideals of peace and diplomacy for achieving stability which would also boost Biden's votes in 2024 election race since it be a huge victory, however, things have not turned out the way the US hoped for.

How it Went all Wrong and what America intends from here on wards.

The Hamas attacks on October 7 occurred during a period of ongoing normalisation efforts. The United States aimed to exert pressure on 'Israel' to influence its behaviour. However, Netanyahu is accustomed to facing American pressure from both regional nations and militant groups seeking to change the Jewish entity's position. For this reason, the Jewish entity intentionally delayed its response by 6 hours, intending to escalate the situation further, potentially justifying its assertive stance on the Gaza population.

Presently, Bibi aims to prolong this issue for as long as he has support from Republicans in the US. Recently, Republican evangelicals have increased their assistance to the Jewish entity, demonstrating a bold and unapologetic stance, indifferent to global opinions on their relationship with the Zionist entity. Bibi hopes that this war will pose challenges for Biden, allowing him to tarnish Biden's reputation and political success score during the election race. If Bibi succeeds, Trump's entrance to the White House becomes smoother. This would lead to a drastic 180-degree shift in the Middle East restructuring, favouring the current the Jewish entity's government. Benjamin Netanyahu is exceedingly arrogant and stubborn, showing no inclination to halt the war. Moreover, he feels compelled to continue as his own power is at risk. Once the dust settles, the Jewish entity's population will defiantly question his failure to respond promptly to Hamas attacks and why many 'Israeli' lives were lost, leading to potential backlash and protests, as evident in videos circulating on social media of 'Israeli' parents expressing their concerns at army offices. Therefore, Netanyahu must emerge victorious in this war to validate his leadership. However, the reality is that the

Jewish entity may struggle to sustain this conflict, while Hamas, benefiting from the dynamics of urban warfare on the battleground, holds an advantage.

The Biden administration faces the urgent task of resolving this issue as global public opinion is rapidly turning against the Jewish entity. Pressure is mounting from everyday non-Muslims in America, further straining US association with Israel. For the United States, these are undoubtedly challenging times for its power and leadership, which already facing severe scrutiny due to domestic divides. Unfortunately, America initially believed it could employ customary tactics to achieve its objectives, but Netanyahu has proven to be a significant obstacle for the current administration. And the overall, issue has cast doubt on Western media, government officials, the system, and overall reputation.

Hence, for America, the prompt resolution of this problem is imperative, given the awareness that Egypt is on the brink of collapse. The escalating public pressure is likely to cause instability for American agents in the region. There's much more at stake for America than ‘Israel’, which underscores why America needs to address this issue promptly. However, the situation is not straightforward. The current administration must navigate a delicate balance, resolving the crisis without appearing overtly anti-‘Israel’, even if there might be underlying disdain for the Jewish entity behind closed doors. This is primarily due to the necessity of securing crucial votes during the election period, particularly from Zionist lobbies in pivotal states like Florida. It's a strategic game that Biden, like Obama before him, must play.

Obama initially expressed support for a two-state solution, but during his first term, he took a stance against Palestinian wishes while still wanting a two-state solution in secret. To achieve his objectives, Obama exerted pressure on the Jewish entity through regional nations like Egypt, Turkey, and Saudi Arabia, creating a sense of isolation for the Jewish entity during the 2011-2014 period. This strategic manoeuvring was driven by Obama's need to secure vital votes, necessitating the appearance of unwavering support for the Jewish entity even if the reality behind closed doors was different from the public perception.

This is the reason Blinken was dispatched to Arab states and Turkey to address this matter. However, the prevailing sentiment among many US agents in the region is that Blinken's efforts were met with scepticism. There were comments suggesting that a ceasefire should be reciprocal, and that humanitarian pause is a joke. Turkey, in particular, gave Blinken a chilly reception, where Erdogan did not even meet him, and sent his foreign minister instead, who insisted that a ceasefire should be mutual, and that humanitarian aid should not be impeded.

The question arises whether this negative reception is staged or genuinely reflects the sentiments of the regional rulers. In reality, these rulers have historically followed US directives, a pattern observed over several decades. Many have undertaken questionable actions against their own people who pursue Islamic ideals, maintaining relationships with the Zionist entity over the decades. They have consistently bowed down to the US in every policy matter. Even now, countries like Turkey continue to uphold economic ties and gas supplies.

Therefore, what really is happening here is that the US sought to orchestrate this negative reception, providing the Biden administration with a justification in Washington for reconsidering its stance on Israel. This strategic move is driven by the significance of votes for the Biden administration. They preferred that these rulers give Blinken a negative reception to shield agents from increased pressure from the masses, potentially pushing for military action against the Jewish entity. Therefore, creating this atmosphere serves US interests by alleviating pressure on its agents and justifying a shift in its approach to the Jewish entity. This is crucial as the world and its people are closely watching, and the Biden administration needs to secure its position in 2024, safeguard its agents, prevent upheaval, maintain the Jewish entity as a strategic tool, and uphold its political credibility as a global superpower.

Therefore, after Blinken's tour, America has started to alter its rhetoric regarding the Jewish entity's actions in Gaza, including occupation and hospital bombings. Even figures with a history of disdain for Islam, such as Macron, have recently chosen to criticize 'Israel' for the killing of children, despite embracing them just three weeks ago. As Blinken's tour proved ineffective in its outward objectives, this furnishes America with a legitimate excuse to shift its stance against the Jewish entity.

The anticipated resolution is as follows:

America plans to involve Turkey as a security guarantor to maintain a ceasefire. This is something the foreign minister of Turkey conveyed to Blinken, expressing the desire for a ceasefire and some form of coalition to uphold peace, as reported by Al-Jazeera. Additionally, it has been reported that the Turks are not willing to persuade Hamas to release captives unless the Jewish entity also agrees to release captives. For the US, this issue is not a primary concern; instead, it aligns with what the US wants and prefers. This dialogue and atmosphere will provide the US with legitimate reasons to increase pressure on the Jewish entity, influencing the management of the situation in the upcoming elections and permit such measures of security coalition in monitoring peace in near future once war ends.

This will enable the US to completely undermine the right-wing coalition and Bibi, removing them from power, as many 'Israelis' feel unsafe. Having foreign forces near the Jewish entity monitoring peace will absolutely destroy Bibi's legitimacy. This is what the Biden administration desires however, it cannot do this directly as it will cause issues back home of domestic political purposes instead, it wants others to commit to do heavy lifting while manages from Washington.

This will additionally enable Turkey to boost its popularity and pacify the Ummah's anger, as they might be swayed by its efforts, thinking that Turkey is a nation to follow. Exploiting Turkey's presence in this coalition, the US will neutralize the Ummah and its aspirations for jihad and Khilafah (Caliphate), given Turkey's historical leadership over the Ummah.

The US will also possess a valid excuse to present to the Republican Congress, elucidating why they had to take the actions they did as there was no alternative. Simultaneously, this serves to deceive the Zionist lobbies into casting their votes for Biden, ensuring his retention of power post the 2024 election.

This will also enable America to continue its realignment of the Middle East and shift focus on Russia and China, as resolving the current issue is absolutely critical for the US. Presently, America has had to adjust its stance towards China. A US general stated two days ago that China's threat towards Taiwan represents a significant shift in rhetoric from America towards China. Moreover, the US advising Ukraine to pursue peace with Russia illustrates that America is facing challenges and needs to resolve this issue caused by the Jewish entity.

Regarding the UK and France deploying their troops to the Middle East for training, though it's not entirely clear, it could be part of America's initiative to establish a coalition of security forces. This may involve adding British and French troops alongside Turkey to monitor the ceasefire, a direction that the US is currently advocating.

And Allah Knows Best!

Written for the Central Media Office of Hizb ut Tahrir by

Mohammed Mustafa

References:

Kenneth M. Pollack, The Persian Puzzle (New York: Random House, 2004), p. 317.