

Between Washington, Tel Aviv, and Tehran: Does the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) Reveal the Limits of the Dispute or Redefine the Depth of the US-Jewish Alliance?

(Translated)

Introduction

In political and analytical circles, the recent US-Iran Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) is viewed as an event that reshuffles the cards in the region. However, the pressing question concerns not so much the content of the agreement as its repercussions on the relationship between Washington and Tel Aviv. Are we facing an imminent rift between these long-standing allies, as portrayed by much of the media? Or is the growing discord between the Trump administration and the Netanyahu government merely a fleeting bubble in a strategic sea whose foundations remain unshaken by storms?

The Entity: America's Strategic Wager

In reality, this question is something of an intellectual trap. Anyone who examines the political history of the relationship between Washington and Tel Aviv realizes that the bond runs too deep to be dictated by a single president and outlasts the tenure of any transient government. It is neither a mere friendship nor a conventional military alliance. Instead, it is a strategic wager—one that America did not create alone but inherited from preceding Western colonialist visions. Specifically, it stems from the legacy of Britain, which sowed the seeds of the Jewish entity in Palestine through the Balfour Declaration. This followed the earlier Campbell Conference, which outlined the mechanisms for realizing the Zionist dream of establishing a "Jewish State"—a vision articulated by Theodor Herzl at the 1897 Basel Congress in Switzerland—and Britain subsequently facilitated the Jewish entity's birth over decades of the Mandate. However, when the United States took up this wager, it did not treat it merely as a colonialist legacy to be preserved or a mechanism to ensure the continuity of the gains envisioned by the Campbell-Bannerman Conference. Instead, the US fundamentally reshaped it into a purely American project governed by the logic of its own interests and hegemony. It transformed it into a cornerstone of its Middle East policy, lending it political and military legitimacy that elevated it beyond a mere entity designed to undermine the Ummah's strength. Furthermore, the US provided it with all the means of power and survival, turning it into a lethal American instrument capable of confronting any alternative regional project—particularly one rooted in Islam.

This understanding explains why disputes regarding settlements, the issue of Palestine, or even Iran's nuclear program remain confined to the realm of tactical maneuvering instead of escalating into conflicts over existential decisions. The United States may disagree with Netanyahu's policies or criticize settlement expansion, yet at the critical moment, it stands by its favored entity—not out of affection, but in defense of its own civilizational project in the region. This project represents a strategic constant for America as long as it leads the Western capitalist civilization that opposes the resurgence of Islam in public life. A more complex aspect of the American equation is that Iran—which for decades orbited the US and served its regional interests—has emerged as a counterbalancing force capable of reining in that Jewish entity. Consequently, whenever strategic interests dictate, the US allows Iran to deter the Jewish entity, provided such deterrence does not threaten its very existence.

The Jewish Entity: Not Merely an Ally, but an Existential Pillar

Democratic and Republican administrations have succeeded one another in the White House, and the Jewish entity has seen both right-wing and left-wing governments. Yet, the Jewish entity has remained firmly in place—not because it is beloved, but because it is a geopolitical necessity. Even at the height of the 2015 dispute between Obama and Netanyahu over the Iran nuclear deal—when rhetoric reached unprecedented levels of

intensity—the strategic core of the relationship remained untouched. That core is unshaken by superficial storms.

From Washington's deep strategic perspective, the Jewish entity is not merely a military partner. It is the backbone of the regional security infrastructure designed by the US following the Cold War. It is the steadfast guardian of the boundaries of Western influence, the vigilant watchman over vital oil straits, and an impenetrable bulwark against any alternative regional project. In short, it is a Western model—armed and ready—situated in the heart of the Middle East, serving as an advanced Western military outpost within the lands of Islam.

Iran: Managing the Crisis, Not Ending the Threat

In this context, the recent agreement with Iran can be viewed as the latest chapter in a long series of attempts to manage the threat rather than eliminate it. The US administration does not believe—nor will it ever believe—that Iran will voluntarily abandon its nuclear or regional ambitions. Instead, it wagers that the danger can be contained and regulated within a framework of international oversight—particularly after suffering a disastrous military failure in crisis containment that tarnished its image and eroded its prestige.

Herein lies the fundamental point of divergence regarding the Jewish entity. While Washington views controlled enrichment—and turning a blind eye to certain ballistic missile activities for the time being—as an acceptable price to pay to avert a regional war, Jewish leaders regard this as a moral betrayal and an intolerable existential threat. In their view, the danger lies not merely in Iran possessing a nuclear weapon, but in its possession of the technical capability to make a rapid dash toward weaponization at a moment of its choosing. Consequently, Article 8 of the Memorandum of Understanding—which permits continued civilian enrichment—has become a thorn in the side of the security of the Jewish entity; it is perceived as an opportunity for Iran, an implicit threat to Jewish entity, and, by extension, a future point of contention with the United States.

However, this tactical disagreement does not negate the shared strategic objective: preventing Iran from becoming a nuclear-armed military power. Thus, the dispute concerns the pace of action—balancing economic factors and the costs of war—rather than the ultimate destination.

Netanyahu: Between the Hammer of Deterrence and the Anvil of Alliance

Faced with this reality, Netanyahu finds himself in a complex political predicament. He cannot accept an agreement he views as an existential threat, yet he is fully aware that entering into a confrontation with Washington would be political and strategic suicide. He is, therefore, once again attempting to navigate the US administration's anger—having grown accustomed to a barrage of criticism during crises of this nature. However, the most likely scenario is the continuation of what might be termed a policy of calculated opposition: raising the rhetoric, intensifying security strikes against Iranian influence—strikes that may well extend beyond Lebanon—stepping up Mossad operations to infiltrate Iran and its proxies, and asserting the right to self-defense for the Jewish entity, all while avoiding a genuine rift with Washington—and, consequently, leading to the severing of the critical military aid lifeline.

This is Netanyahu's signature style: shouting in public while operating in the shadows—a pattern he has perfected over two decades of dealing with successive US administrations. As for Trump—who had previously scolded Netanyahu and called him “crazy” after the strike on Beirut's southern suburbs on the eve of the Iran deal signing—he later affirmed to the public of the Jewish entity broadcaster that he maintains a good relationship with Netanyahu, though he believes the latter needs to be more rational. Trump expressed his readiness to meet him, adding, “I'll have to look at who's running, but I like Bibi very much. I would be most likely to endorse him.” (Anadolu, June 18, 2026)

Can the Jewish entity act alone?

Here, the most pressing question arises: What if the Jewish entity decides to expand its operations against Iran—or against its Hezb in Lebanon—in a way that reshuffles the deck and places the agreement under unbearable strain?

This question was put to Trump on the sidelines of the G7 summit in France. His answer was ready-made, proposing that the Jewish entity leave the task of dealing with Iran's Hezb in Lebanon to Syria—under the leadership of Al-Sharaa—on the grounds that Damascus would do a “better job.”

This proposal coincided with a report regarding the potential resumption of negotiations between Syria and the Jewish entity. According to the public broadcaster Kan 11, the anticipated talks would be conducted via a channel parallel to the direct negotiation track currently existing between the Jewish entity and Lebanon. The report indicates that Trump is pushing for a resumption of dialogue between Damascus and Tel Aviv, driven by his desire to involve Syrian President Ahmed Al-Sharaa in efforts aimed at weakening Iran's Hezb in Lebanon.

This brings us back to the same question: Can the Jewish entity act unilaterally in Syria or Lebanon?

The answer was clear in the statement made by its Defense Minister, Katz, on June 12, 2026—days before the agreement between the US and Iran was signed. He called for guaranteeing his entity's ability to act unilaterally against Iran and vowed to continue occupying areas in Syria, Lebanon, and Gaza, as well as maintaining military operations in refugee camps in the northern West Bank (Anadolu, June 12, 2026).

At first glance, this might appear to be the Jewish entity defying America's will. In reality, however, Netanyahu is not an independent actor. Instead, he is a player on a stage whose dimensions were defined by America. He operates within the permissible margin of maneuver, regardless of how loudly he speaks or how harsh his rhetoric becomes.

On one hand, the alignment of political messages regarding the Syrian and Lebanese files reflects a division of roles between America and the entity: the Jewish entity is assigned the role of the provocateur on the ground" whose military moves in Lebanon and Syria drive the situation toward the very negotiating table shared by the US and the Jewish entity. On the other hand, it is certain that at the moment of a major confrontation, the White House will not ask, “Do we want to help Netanyahu?” Instead, it will ask, “Can we bear the consequences of strategically weakening this entity?”

Herein lies a paradox that some observers may overlook. Even when the United States disagrees with the Jewish government, it recognizes that any erosion of the Jewish entity's deterrent capability would throw the door wide open to Iranian influence, and completely reshuffle the regional balance of power. For weakening the Jewish entity implies not merely the loss of an ally, but the reshaping of the Middle East without the United States as a key player—a scenario Washington cannot afford.

At that juncture, the issue is no longer about supporting the entity itself, but about the United States' ability to maintain a regional balance of power in which the Jewish entity serves as a fundamental pillar.

Beyond Individuals: A Civilizational Conflict, Not a Mere Conjunction of Circumstances

Perhaps the greatest error in interpreting the current phase is reducing the conflict to the figures of Trump or Netanyahu. What we are witnessing today is not merely a dispute between two leaders, but a new chapter in a conflict—both old and new—between two civilizational projects: a Western capitalist project grounded in power, influence, and hegemony, and an Islamic revivalist project seeking to reclaim its civilizational role. Netanyahu's warnings regarding the establishment of an “Islamic Caliphate” take on special significance; they reflect a deep-seated conviction that the conflict with Iran is but one front in a confrontation with a comprehensive project threatening the Western foundations of the Middle East—and that the Jewish entity is not merely a regional actor, but the guardian of Western civilization's frontiers.

The West's stance—led by the United States—regarding this conflict is not a tactical choice, but an existential reaction to a civilizational project that threatens to redefine the region. The “Operation Al-Aqsa Flood” was merely the initial manifestation of this danger; a sincere band, possessing neither aircraft nor tanks, managed to shake the foundations of the Jewish entity and fracture its wall of immunity. If this is the capability of a group besieged within a narrow strip of land, what then of the establishment of an Islamic Khilafah that unifies the Ummah? In that event, the threat would not be a passing tremor, but a geopolitical transformation that reshapes the map from its very foundations. In a stark contradiction, Trump insists that he saved the Jewish entity—not literally, but by redefining it as an unruly Jewish entity, saying, “Without us, without the United States, there would be no Israel. Without me, there would be no Israel.” He did this by moving the embassy to Al-Quds, recognizing the Golan Heights, tearing up the nuclear deal, and paving the way for unconditional normalization, thereby transforming it from a constrained ally into an unbridled force. Yet, his ambassador to the Jewish entity, Huckabee, claims the opposite, “without Israel, the United States would not exist.” Amidst these conflicting claims, it becomes evident that Trump, driven by narcissism, seeks not to be a mere passing president but the guardian of Western civilization—a legend he intends to author himself. In this light, the US-Iran agreement emerges as merely a tool within a broader conflict. It does not alter the fundamental reality that the entity and the US are partners facing a shared existential struggle.

Conclusion: The Middle East on the Brink of Transformation

Ultimately, current developments cannot be viewed in isolation from a pivotal question: Are we witnessing a mere reshuffling of alliances, or a decisive moment in the clash of civilizations?

Signs point to the region entering a phase of unprecedented geopolitical turbulence. As this process unfolds, it becomes clear that the rift between Washington and Tel Aviv merely reflects the pressures of a deeper conflict—one that compels the entity's leaders to shoulder some of the consequences of this strain and the strategic exhaustion that has not only drained the world's leading state but also undermined its moral and political standing. Yet, the constant in this equation remains that the Jewish entity—with both its errors and its correct moves, and its right-wing or centrist governments—will continue to occupy a strategic position at the heart of American conceptions; not because it is in the right, but because it is essential to the American dream of hegemony.

If the agreement with Iran serves as a test of this constancy, the post-agreement phase will provide the definitive answer to a vexing question that has long troubled analysts: Is the conflict between Washington and Tel Aviv merely a matter of tactics, or does it herald a dangerous strategic shift?

Thus far, the answer leans toward the former. Nevertheless, we pray to Allah (swt) that the grip of those who toy with the Ummah's destiny be broken, that their schemes backfire upon them sooner rather than later, and that the Second Khilafah Rashidah on the Method of the Prophethood arises to scatter their plans and disrupt their calculations. Allah (swt) said, ﴿وَلَا يَحِيقُ الْمَكْرُ السَّيِّئُ إِلَّا بِأَهْلِهِ﴾ **“But the evil plot encompasses only its own people.”** [TMQ Surah Fatir: 43].

**Written for the Central Media Office of Hizb ut Tahrir by
Engineer Wissam Al-Atrash**