



Mohamed Kheider University of Biskra

Faculty of Letters and Languages

Department of Foreign Languages

Letters and English Languages

English Language

Literature and Civilization

MASTER THESIS

**The Impact of Donald Trump's Foreign Policy towards the
Middle East (Case Study: The Palestinian Issue).**

Submitted by

Chouiteh Nor El Imane

Board of Examiners

Chairperson	Mrs. Hamed Halima	University of Biskra
Supervisor	Mrs. Zerigui Naima	University of Biskra
Examiner	Mrs. Amri Boutheina	University of Biskra
Examiner	Mrs. Loulou Nadjiba	University of Biskra

Academic year 2020/2021

Dedication

“To all the difficult moments that made me strong”

I dedicate this humble work to:

To the candle of my life, my mother for her unconditional love, support, care and belief in me.

To the light of my eyes my father, the words are not enough to express my love and gratitude.

To my pillar, my supporter and my hero my brother Ramzi, who was there for me every time I need him.

To my twin brother and sister Ahmad and Chaima and to my fiancé Yassine.

To my Friend Mehommel Dounia whom I shared with the hard and happy moments during our Master study.

To all who have even a small piece of love to me.

To Palestine

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I am grateful to the Almighty Allah for giving me such strength and capacity in my life and to accomplish this research.

Special gratitude and thanks for my supervisor, Mrs. Zerigui Naima for her help, advice and guidance.

Special thanks to the jury members; Mrs. Hamed Halima, Mrs. Amri Boutheina and Mrs. Loulou Nadjiba for accepting to evaluate this dissertation.

I would like to express my sincere gratitude and appreciation to my teachers in Mohamed kheider University in Biskra and in Mohammed El Bachir El Ibrahimi University in Bordj bou Arrerridj.

Finally, I thank every person who has given me any help and advice to claim this work.

Declaration

I, Chouiteh Nor El Imane declare that this thesis has been composed entirely by myself and it has been the result of my own investigation, except where explicitly stated otherwise in the text, and that the work has not been submitted for any previous application for any other degree.

Abstract

The foreign policy is commonly known as the rules that are applied by a country leader to achieve its interests, such as the United States. Since the emergence of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict, the policies that were adopted by the different leaders of US differ from one period to another and from one president to another. This study attempts to clarify the US foreign policy towards the Middle East in general and towards the Palestinian issue in particular under Trump's administration. It presents the theoretical background of US foreign policy, the evolution and the landmark events of the conflict. The approaches that were used to accomplish this study are the historical, the descriptive and the analytical with a qualitative method. The study intends to describe the historical events of the Palestinian-Israeli ongoing conflict and to analyze the impact of Trump's policies towards the conflict. The importance of this study lies in tackling an issue that is sensitive for the Arab and Muslim world as well as to differentiate between the strategies adopted and what the US policy principles declared. The outcomes of this research demonstrate that the US foreign policy is biased to Israel while ignoring the status of Palestine as a state and their rights to self-determination. Thus, the policies adopted by Trump's administration were from the standpoint of managing the problem rather than resolving it.

Key words: US foreign policy, the Middle East, the Palestinian-Israeli conflict, Trump's administration.

List of Acronyms

US	United States
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
CIA	Central Intelligence Agency
CENTO	Central Treaty Organization
UK	United Kingdom
FBI	Federal Bureau of Investigation
USSR	Union of Soviet Socialist Republican
UN	United Nations
PLO	Palestinian Liberation Organization
PA	Palestinian Authority
PIJ	Palestinian Islamic Jihad
EQB	Ezzeddeen Al-Qassam Brigades
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNRWA	United Nations Relief and Works Agency
PCPOA	Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action

AIPAK

American Israeli Public Affairs Committee

Table of Contents

Dedication	I
Acknowledgements	II
Declaration	III
Abstract	IV
List of Acronyms	V
Table of Contents	VI
General Introduction	0
Statement of the problem	2
Research questions	2
Methodology	3
Objectives of the study	3
Significance of the study	4
Structure of the study	4
 Chapter one: The American Foreign Policy 	
1.1 Introduction	6
1.2 Definition of the American foreign policy	6

1.3 The history of US foreign policy	7
1.3.1 Isolationism or non-Interventionism	7
1.3.2 Interventionism	8
1.3.3 Containment policy and the cold war	9
1.3.4 Détente and Human rights.....	9
1.3.5 The war on terror.....	10
1.4 The interests of US foreign policy	11
1.4.1 Security interests	11
1.4.2 Economic interests	12
1.4.3 Ideological interests	12
1.5 The tools and methods of US foreign policy	13
1.5.1 The military force.....	13
1.5.2 The trade and economical policies.....	14
1.5.3 Foreign Aids.....	14
1.5.4 Treaties and agreements.....	15
1.6 US foreign policy making process	16
1.6.1 The president.....	16
1.6.2 The congress	17

1.6. 3 The cabinet	17
1.6. 4 The Bureaucracy	18
1.6.5 The influential powers	19
1.6.5.1 Think Tanks and Idea factory	19
1.6.5.2 The pressure and interest groups (lobbies)	20
1.6.5. 3 The public opinion and Media	21
1.7 Conclusion	22

Chapter two: The Palestinian- Israeli Conflict

2.1 Introduction	24
2.2 The historical roots of the conflict	24
2.3 The evolution of the conflict and the landmark events	26
2.3.1 The war of 1948 Al- Nakba	27
2.3.2 The Palestinian refugees	28
2.3.3 The six-day war of 1967 Al-Naksa	28
2.3.4 The first Intifada.....	29
2.3.5 The Second Intifada	29
2.4 The peace process of 1990s	30
2.4.1 Madrid Conference 1991	31

2.4.2 Oslo Accords.....	32
2.4.3 Camp David Summit.....	33
2.5 The war on Gaza	34
2.5.1 Gaza war 2008-2009	34
2.5.2 Gaza war 2012	34
2.5.3 Gaza war 2014	35
2.5.4 Gaza blockade 2017	36
2.5.5 Gaza war 2021	37
2.6 Conclusion	37

Chapter three: The Impact of Donald Trump's Foreign Policy towards the Palestinian-Israeli conflict

3.1. Introduction.....	40
3.2 US foreign policy under Trump’s administration.....	40
3.3 The characteristics of Trump’s foreign policy.....	41
3.3.1 “America First” and “Make America great again”	42
3.3.2 Ambiguity and uncertainty.....	43
3.3.3 Pro-Israel policy	44
3.4 Trump’s attitude towards the Middle East.....	45

3.5 Trump’s foreign policy towards the Palestinian issue	46
3.5.1 The recognition of Jerusalem as Israeli’s capital and the relocation of US embassy	47
3.5.2 Cut off the aids for the Palestinian refugees	49
3.5.3 The Deal of the Century.....	51
3.6 Conclusion	53
General Conclusion.....	56
Works Cited	58
ملخص.....	66

General Introduction

Introduction

Recently, the United States has started to improve and develop to be the dominant world superpower. Its large area and strength, more particularly military and economic power helped the United States to transfer and spread its culture all around the world, thereby forcing its policies easily. The American government has justified its foreign policies as being set up to develop, determine and save the American needs and interests and to save the world from any threat. The achievement of foreign policy goals that seeks to achieve the greatest amount of national interests requires the use of certain means and tools, the most important of which are diplomacy, military force and economic power, and it may resort to other methods such as propaganda and espionage. Every president of the US carries a set of principles and goals that he tries to achieve during his presidency.

When observing the strategy of the American foreign policy adopted by the republican and democratic American presidents who have ruled the United States for the past fifty years towards the Palestinian issue, it is difficult to find meaningful similarities between them. However, the form of bias towards Israel is the common feature regarding the US foreign policy towards the Middle East. That is why the United States dealt with the Palestinian issue from the perspective of managing the problem not solving it. The president Donald Trump assumed the presidency in 2016 with a large arsenal of war remnants, occupation, and foreign military and non-military intervention in the world, from those intervention the Palestinian case comes at the forefront of the Middle East issues after the declaration of Trump Jerusalem the capital of the state of Israel and his decision to move the US embassy from Tell Aviv to Jerusalem.

The study of the American foreign policy has a great importance due to the extent of its influence and effectiveness on the international political scene, as well as, its status in the hierarchy of international forces. This importance was linked with a broad debate during the era of the president Donald Trump, especially those who were interested in the Palestinian issue, in response to the president's statements and shocking political speeches during his campaign.

Statement of the problem

The study attempts to demonstrate the real nature of US foreign policy towards the Middle East under Trump's administration. The paper seeks to reach a comprehensive perception of the American foreign policy towards Palestinian case, by focusing on its beginning and development, the declared and hidden motives. Furthermore, it analyzes the position of Donald Trump vis-à-vis the issue in the light of the special relationship between America and Israel and the main strategies and conventions he used to deal with the conflict. As well as, the promises he made regarding a historical solution to the issue. The dissertation's main problematic can be expressed in the following main question; what is the impact of Donald Trump's foreign policy towards the Middle East?

Research questions

In order to uncover the aspects the research, this study therefore will answer the following questions: what is the impact of Donald Trump's foreign policy towards the Palestinian issue? As the main question and the subsidiary questions as follow: What is the historical background of the American foreign policy? What is the origins and evolution of

the Palestinian- Jewish conflict? How did the president Donald Trump deal with the conflict? How does trump's decisions and attitude affect that particular conflict?

Methodology

The approaches that are used in this research to study US foreign policy are the historical, the descriptive and the analytical with a qualitative method that seems relevant to the core of the study. The historical approach focuses on the objective study of events and facts within the historical frame of the research theme, this method helps to get an accurate account for the US foreign policy towards the Middle East. The descriptive approach tends to describe the process and the way of making the United States foreign policy and its major principles. Moreover it gives a precise description to the historical origins and the evolution of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict. The analytical approach bases on analyzing the impact of the political strategies and practices adopted by Trump's administration towards the conflict. In an attempt to collect data and analyze them, I based on reading books, articles, reports and newspapers therefore analyzing the policies and approaches were adopted.

Objectives of the study

The aim of the present study is to shed light on the major principles of the United States' foreign policy and its international interests and goals. Furthermore, the research trends to explore the motives of trump's foreign policy and the principles of his policies. It tends to shed light on the attitude of Trump's policies towards the Palestinian-Israeli ongoing conflict and the solutions he gave to resolve the problem and to bring peace to the Middle East region.

Significance of the study

Since the study simulates reality and tackles an immediate issue with the acceleration of events on the Palestinian arena, its importance lies in understanding and examining the divergences between what is declared as principles of the United States foreign policy and the mechanism of its implications.

Structure of the study

This dissertation is divided into three chapters, all of them are mainly theoretical in nature, but the third chapter includes a small practical part. The first chapter untitled the American foreign policy, this chapter provides a theoretical overview to US foreign policy then it moves to the interests and tools of it and the last point is about the making process of US foreign policy. While the second chapter is about the origins and evolution of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict starting by a historical background of the conflict and its evolution, then it tackles the peace process that was held to resolve the problem since 1990s and the final included point is the war on Gaza Strip and its consequences. The third chapter untitled the impact of Donald Trump's foreign policy towards the Palestinian issue, it explains at first Trump's foreign policy ,principles and views as well as the characteristics of his policies, after that it discusses the attitude of Trump towards the Middle East and finally the political strategies he adopted to resolve the ongoing conflict.

Chapter One:

The American Foreign Policy

1.1 Introduction

The nature of United States' foreign policy is known for its complexity and changes over time. Therefore, many scholars and critics claimed that understanding the United States' foreign policy is a hard task to accomplish. Since the United States is considered as a powerful nation and the most preeminent leader of the new world system, its foreign policy has great influence on other countries, The study of American foreign policy carries in its folds exceptional, as it is the case with most aspects of political life in it, as the local environment for its industry is very complex, not because of the multiplicity of institutions and forces that contribute to its making, but rather because of the nature of the role it plays in the international arena. On the other hand, the American foreign policy began to attract different ideological and ideological references that directed the external political behavior. These references were taken from schools of thought that drew the road map for dealing with foreign affairs. The study of the local environment for the American foreign policy industry and its dynamics with its constitutional and institutional dimensions is of great importance because it discloses on the motives, interests and goals behind them.

This chapter is an attempt to explain the concept of United States 'foreign policy. By using a historical approach this chapter goes through significant events and major trends in US foreign policy. Further, it sheds light on the tools, interests and the mechanisms of the foreign policy making process starting from the president till the final influential powers.

1.2 Definition of the American foreign policy

The foreign policy can be explained as “the scope of involvement abroad and the collection of goals, strategies and instruments that are selected by governmental policy

makers”(Rosati and Scott,2007,4), in other words, the term refers to a policy persuaded by a nation in its dealing with other nations, designed to achieve a national objectives. The US foreign policy represents the different needs, interests and reasons for the United States involvements abroad, and the ways and means chosen to achieve those goals, it is based upon the interests of a particular country, whether those interests involve the export of products made in the US or the importation of oil, a worry about terrorism, global pollution or the drug trade. The US foreign policy is determined by the issues and concerns most important to the country as a whole (Miner, 2010).As for the parties targeted and the means used , they are defined as governmental measures that includes states, groups ,individuals and companies that are outside the borders of united states of America, and they include military operations, economic interactions human rights policy, interventions in civil wars and international conflicts, and the international efforts to limit weapons of mass destruction including nuclear weapons (Cavalli,328).

1.3 The history of US foreign policy

The United States foreign policy is considered to be a unique policy due to its changeable nature. Its history is marked by various changes and developments, because of the successive governments and presidents who brought new principles and ideologies each time they reach presidency.

1.3.1 Isolationism or non-Interventionism

For the first 200 years of the United States history, the national policy was Isolationism. George Washington’s farewell address is often cited as laying the formulation for a tradition of American non-interventionism;

The great rule of conduct for us, in regard to foreign nation, is in extending our commercial relations, to have with them a little political connection as possible. Europe has a set of primary interests, which to us have none, or a very remote relation. Hence she must be engaged in frequent controversies the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves by artificial ties in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics, or ordinary combinations and collisions of her friendship or enmities (Bianco, Canon, 471).

Non-interventionism continued throughout the nineteenth century, yet the only significant intervention by the US was in the Spanish-American war. In the wake of the first world war the non-interventionism tendencies of US foreign policy were in full force, the congress rejected joining the league of nations due to its fear of losing the ability to act on foreign policy as it pleased .After the crash of 1929, the United States began to focus on fixing its economy within its borders and ignored the outside world as it had returned to Isolationism during the inter war time (Krutz, 650).

1.3.2 Interventionism

In response to the growing threat of Nazi Germany, the congress had passed a series of neutrality acts 1935/1937 that were intended to keep the US out of a European conflict and it was only after the break world war two (September 1939) that the president Franklin Roosevelt was able to shift the American foreign policy to aid and allies, with the Japanese attack on Harbor 1941 the US formally joined the Grand Alliance of Britain, Free France, Soviet union and China. After the second world war the United States took the policy of Interventionism in order to

contain communism influence abroad, such form of Interventionism include giving aid to European nation to rebuild, having an active role in the NATO and place action around the world and involving the CIA in several coup take over Latin America and the middle East (Cavalli, 335).

1.3.3 Containment policy and the cold war

The American response to the expansion of communism and the influence of the union was the containment policy, the term was coined by the State Department staffer George Kennan and it was based on the premise that the US must apply a counter force to any aggressive moves. This policy was reflected in the creation of a network of political and military alliances such as North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), The Central Treaty Organization (CENTO) (Cavalli,335).Both of Trumann Doctrine 1947 which committed the US to protect free people in Europe from any attack and Korean war are examples of the containment policy in practice. In addition to this policy the US recognized the importance of economic assistance to prevent the communism from gaining any kind of support (Yergin, 1978).

1.3.4 Détente and Human rights

Détente was a period in US-Soviet relations in which the tension between the two superpowers was eased. The American foreign policy tool a new director during the 1970s under the administration of the president Richard Nixon in which there was an increase in the trade and the cultural exchange and the most important was the treaties and agreements such as the agreement to limit the nuclear weapons- the 1972 Strategic Arms Limitation treaty, in the same year Nixon began to process of normalizing relationships with China. Détente had ended after the US intervention in Afghanistan which led to America's boycott the Olympics in Moscow in

1980. After the election of Ronald Reagan in 1980 the tension of the Cold war had returned and the close of Détente was marked due to the Reagan's campaign that was based on anti-détente (Suri, 2003).

1.3.5 The war on terror

A decade of economic prosperity ended with the September 11, 2001 attacks on the World Trade Center in New York City. The surprise attack by terrorists belonging to a militant Al-Qaeda organization prompted a national mourning and paradigm shift in U.S. foreign policy. The focus on domestic prosperity during the 1990s gave way to a trend of unilateral action under President George W. Bush to combat what was seen to be the growing trend of fundamentalist terrorism in the Middle East. The United States declared a War on Terrorism. This policy dominated U.S. foreign policy over the last decade as the nation embarked on two military campaigns in the Middle East, in Afghanistan and Iraq. Across the world there was a transition from a bipolar world to a multipolar world. While the United States remains a strong power economically and militarily, rising nations such as China, India, and Brazil as well as Russia have challenged its dominance. Foreign policy analysts such as Nina Harchigian suggest that the six emerging big powers share common concerns: free trade, economic growth, prevention of terrorism, efforts to stymie nuclear proliferation. And if they can avoid war, the coming decades can be peaceful and productive provided there are no misunderstandings or dangerous rivalries (Cavalli, 336-337).

1.4 The interests of US foreign policy

The US foreign policy is built upon the principle of preserving the needs and the interests of the country by using different tools. The interests are categorized into many fields; security; security interests, economic interests and ideological interests:

1.4.1 Security interests

Security threats and risks at the international level take many forms, they might be in the form of military threats from other countries or from terrorist, or economic threats resulting from boycott and high tariffs on trade. The meeting of these interests requires confronting these potential security threats as well as the priority of safeguarding of the US and the lives of its citizens whether they were inside America or abroad. The US works to protect the allies and the supportive countries within the framework of these interests (Krutz, 629). The security interests have explored the necessity of preserving the balance of power in the world, meaning that no country could possess a region of more military power than the US. Due to the connection of the history of the American continent with the European continent, the United States sought to prevent the emergence of this dangers in Europe, thus the policy of preserving the balance of power in Europe become a fundamental security interest in US foreign policy and stability was achieved during the Cold war through the balance of nuclear horror between the two great powers; the US and the Soviet union. After the end of the war and the receding of fear about nuclear war; new challenges have emerged such as the vote of the UK to leave the European Union, the ongoing debate over the debt crisis in Greece, the Middle East issues and the terrorist activities in the United States (Krutz, 630).

1.4.2 Economic interests

Economic interests play an important role in the politics of the American foreign economic policy; these interests include achieving a major goal for US foreign policy which lies in ensuring the united states' access to major resources around the world, including natural resources such as oil, as well as investing foreign capitals for domestic infrastructure projects such as building bridges and weapons systems. The US works to preserve these interests through the access to global markets in which it seeks to sell the local products in the international market and to support the economic development in the world especially, in the developing countries (Krutz, 629).

1.4.3 Ideological interests

Under these interests, there is a combination of principles and values adopted by the United States of America. They are a mixture of historical legacy that appeared with the emergence of the American culture, as it includes in addition to those related to the American way of life, its ideals and worldviews principles such as the right for self-determination, freedom, protection of human rights and democracy as well as promoting the value of liberalism and capitalism. It is known that the US entered into conflicts during the Cold war due to Ideological concerns, thus it used this principles and ideals to strengthen its hegemony in the world and to expand its military geo-political interventions as in the case with the slogan of the war on terror (Krutz, 630).

1.5 The tools and methods of US foreign policy

As it is known, the US foreign policy is set up to achieve a set of goals and needs at the expense of other countries. Therefore, it depends on various tools and instruments such as diplomacy, military force and foreign aids in order to realize those interests.

1.5.1 The military force

Military power is the principle instrument of a sovereign state to protect and defend its national interests, especially its security interests vis a vis foreign powers, unless a country has a credible military deterrent about which the other side is aware, the latter could be tempted into launching an attack. US military force is an essential tool and the most prominent tool in its foreign policy since it has fought many wars and engaged in many interventions to promote its foreign objectives. US government officials have been exhibiting a surprising willingness to use military force as an instrument, the strategies called for and the capabilities sought by the president and high national security officials constitute more than a response to terrorist threats against the US homeland. Previous strategies that would restrict the use of military force to situations in which the country's vital interests or the lives of its citizens are threatened are giving way to force use doctrine premised on the need to counter a wide range of threats to the country's global interests. To demonstrate the importance of this tool, it is necessary to refer to the total military expenditure of the United States as it has always been first in the world in military spending in which in 2018 it reached 610 billion dollars equivalent to seven countries combined together (Edward, Stephen, 1997).

1.5.2 The trade and economical policies

From the earliest history of the US, the welfare and the prosperity of America has been based on economic growth and trade with other countries, a reality which shows that the United States has always engaged in internationalism (Mead, 2002). The underlying assumption is that through exchanging trade with other countries, the US will benefit and the productivity of the country and the wealth of the citizens will increase. From the early beginning American presidents have acted to ensure that US business would have access to markets to help promoting growth in the American economy. Following the Second World War, the government had focused on building strong economic linkages between countries to prevent a future economic collapse of the level of the great depression and a future conflict between the trading partners. While modern foreign policy continues to show the importance of protecting American interests, US foreign policy seeks to sustain economic growth by finding foreign markets for local products and goods ,the most important tool for trade policy is tariffs and trade agreements to bargain with countries in order to obtain concession in the other regions, as an example , the Clinton administration in the 1990s had used customs tariffs and had gave preferential treatment to China to urge it to reduce its human rights policy (Bianco, Canon ,469).

1.5.3 Foreign Aids

In its broadest sense, US foreign aid is defined under the Foreign Assistance Act 1961; the primary legislative foreign aid program as;

any tangible or intangible item provided by the United States Government [including "by means of gift, loan, sale, credit, or guaranty to a foreign country or international organization under this or

any other Act, including but not limited to any training, service, or technical advice, any item of real, personal, or mixed property, any agricultural commodity, United States dollars, and any currencies of any foreign country which are owned by the United States Government (Marian,Emily2019).

In other words foreign aids can be defined as money, technical assistance and commodities that the US provides to other countries in support of common interests of the United States and that country. Typically the support goes either to a government entity or to communities in the foreign country, such support falls into one of three categories; humanitarian assistance for life-saving relief from natural disasters, development assistance that promotes economic, social and political development of countries and communities, and security assistance which helps to strengthen the military and security forces in countries that are allied with the US.

The US government has been using this instrument in foreign policy and domestic policy as well to achieve a variety of national purposes including furthering diplomatic goals and to promote democracy and democracy abroad (Carolina, 2010).

1.5.4 Treaties and agreements

International agreements and treaties represents another of the broad-based foreign policy instrument, the United States finds it important and helpful to enter into international agreements with other countries for a variety of reasons and on a variety of subjects. These agreements run to gamut from bilateral agreements about tariffs to multilateral treaties among dozens of countries about the treatment of prisoners of wars such as Geneva agreement in 1949 ,human right, one

recent multinational pact was the seven country nuclear agreement in 2015 that intended to limit nuclear development in Iran. The format that an international agreement takes has been the point of considerable discussion. In the recent years, the US constitution outlines the treaty process in Article 02 in which the president negotiate a treaty then the Senates consents to the treaty by two-thirds vote and finally the president ratifies it, despite that constitutional clarity, today over 90 percent of international agreements into which the united states entered are not treaties but rather an executive agreements that are negotiated by the president (Krutz, 637,638).

1.6 US foreign policy making process

The mechanism of US foreign policy making process depends on varied factors governmental and non-governmental: the governmental factors including; the president, the branches, the congress, and other institutions. The non-governmental factors consist of; pressure groups, lobbies, Media and public opinion.

1.6.1 The president

Under the constitution the president serves as the head of state and the head of the government, the two functions are separate; as a head of state he is ,in effect, the personification of the US ,its visible image and its official and primary representative to the outside world , and as a head of government, he formulates foreign policy, supervises its implementation and attempts to obtain the resources to support it as he organizes the departments and agencies that play a part in the foreign policy making process. The president has more power and responsibility in foreign and defense policy than in domestic affairs, he is the commander in chief of armed forces and has broad authority over the army yet the congress has the authority to declare wars and decide the civilian and military budget (Rosati, Scott, 2011). As America's

chief diplomat, the president has the power to make treaties to be approved by the Senate , throughout the US history the president has made international agreements through congressional executive agreements CEAs that are ratified with only the majority from both houses and congress or by sole executive agreements made by the president alone . Another prerogative that the US constitution gave to the president over foreign affairs is in Article 02 known as the Appointment Clause, this clause empower the president to appoint certain public officials with the advice and consent of the Senate (Manne,2016).

1.6. 2 The congress

The foreign policy has been a fertile field for conflict between the president and Congress as long as the power was distributed between them and one of the most important purpose on which the US constitution is based is the distribution of power in order to preserve stability .The constitution had given the congress several powers to engage in foreign policy and to check the president's actions in foreign affairs as well , perhaps the most important powers are in the War Power Clause and in Foreign Commerce Clause. The congress is involved in appointment, treaties and war power, it has additional authority through its appropriation and over sight functions. It can cut or increase foreign aid or the budget for a defense project as it can set restrictions on the length of time that American troops are deployed during an intervention crisis by refusing to pay for them beyond a certain date (Bianco, Canon, 477).

1.6. 3 The cabinet

The presidential cabinet has several secretaries that aid the president in the Foreign Affairs; it includes the secretary of state and the secretary of defense. The secretary of state is the head of the United States department of state which is concerned with foreign affairs ,it has a

specific duties; organizes and supervises the entire US state department of state and US state foreign service; advises the president on matters relating to foreign policy including the appointment of diplomatic representatives to other and on the acceptance or dismissal of representatives from other nations .On the other hand the secretary of defense is the head of chief executive officer of the department of defense, it is appointed by the president with the advice and consent of the Senate. It is on the chain of command and exercises commander and control subjects only to the order of the president over all department of defense forces for both operational and administrative purposes (Cavalli, 330).

1.6. 4 The Bureaucracy

Decision making is a crucial part of the US foreign policy process, but implementation by the bureaucracy is what actually makes those decisions a reality by putting them into practice. Without the bureaucracy, foreign policies remain words on presidential letterhead. Each senior American leader heads a specific body of the US government, and whether it is the Department of Defense, State Department, Treasury, FBI or Homeland Security, each has a bureaucratic staff which is in charge of carrying out the specific US foreign policies. The implementation of leadership decisions sounds simple, but the reality is far from it (Allison and Zelikow, 1999) .The bureaucracy is immense, complex and comprised of different organizations with their own work cultures and individuals with their own career goals. Bureaucracy consists of many layers necessary to carry out US foreign policy decisions, but also provides the opportunity to modify or even change the original presidential decisions (Cavalli, 331).

1.6.5 The influential powers

The influential powers are a crucial element of the decision making process of the US foreign policy. They have an essential role in shaping the foreign policy not only in the foreign affairs, but also in the domestic level.

1.6.5.1 Think Tanks and Idea factory

One of the many influences on US foreign policy formulation the role of the Think Tanks is among the most important and least appreciated. A distinctively American phenomenon, the independent policy research institution has shaped the US global engagement for nearly 100years, but because Think Tanks conducted much of their works outside the media spotlight they garner less attention than other sources of US foreign policy. Like the jostling of interest groups, the maneuvering between political parties and the rivalry among branches of government, despite the low profile Think Tanks affect American foreign policy in five distinct ways; by generating original ideas and options for policy, by supplying a ready pool of experts for employment in government, offering venues for high-level discussion, educating US citizens about the world and by supplementing official efforts to mediate and resolve conflict(N. Haass, 2002).

Think Tanks are independent institutions organized to conduct research and produce independent policy-relevant knowledge, they fill a critical void between the academic world and the realm of the government, their primary contribution is to help bridge the gap between the world of ideas and actions. The rise of modern Think Tanks parallels the rise of the US to global leadership, the first wave has emerged during the progressive era then the second one aroused after the 1945 when the US assumed to mantle of superpower and defender of the free world.

Over the last decades, a third wave has crested it had focused as much as on advocacy as research (N. Haass, 2002).

1.6.5.2 The pressure and interest groups (lobbies)

Pressure groups and foreign political interests groups are major players in the US foreign policy and this appears through the presence of ethnic, ideological and economic groups whose interests dictate interests in foreign affairs. The ethnic groups that are interested in defending the interests of foreign countries in the United States of America have become an influential phenomenon especially after the end of the Cold war, despite the fact that historical reading indicates the existence of pressure and interest groups for decades before the Cold war. It depends in its movement on studying American institutions and providing information and studies to decision-makers so that their decisions would be compatible with the distribution of influence and power and the nature of work of the legal or legislative institutions existing within the American society (Joo kim, 1999).

This makes it easy for the foreign government for which the lobby works to clarify its policy in front of American public opinion and persuade the congress to adopt a policy in support of it. Ethnic groups whose members' origin are usually based on the nationality of the foreign country and the most prominent example is the Zionist lobby are known for their influence, in addition to this group there are many other lobbies such as Canadian, British, French, Japanese and others. Other lobbies show more effectiveness in controlling foreign policy decisions such as Oil lobby and Arms lobby represented by the military industrial complex which is a group of major arms producing companies from senior officials and military persons (Joo kim, 1999).

1.6.5. 3 The public opinion and Media

The relationship between public opinion and US foreign policy developed significantly after World War II and continued to develop in recent years, especially after the war on Iraq. During the years before World War I and II, domestic priorities dominated public opinion at the expense of foreign affairs. Therefore, the prevailing pattern of public opinion was lack of interest, and from here Gabriel Almond indicated in his book *The American People, Politics and Foreign Affairs*, that the public is not enlightened and interacts with various events with indifference, so policy makers cannot rely on public opinion reactions to form foreign policy, and there was no change in the years between the Second World War and the Vietnam War on this stereotype, and foreign policy remained the preserve of the elite, where the majority had little influence on the leaders, but after the repercussions of the defeat in the Vietnam War, the stereotype began to change and the theory became prevalent in academic circles. The American public opinion has a great influence on foreign policy (Mansour Nada, 07).

The media is also playing vital role in broadcasting / telecasting and publishing the foreign policy of the country. However, attitude of government literacy rate and political system influence the role of press in formulation of foreign policy of the country. Generally, printed or electronic media also contributes significant role in the foreign policy formulation process. The media contributes to this process by disseminating factual information on the basis of which people take decision by publishing specialized articles on current international developments, which enable the masses to comprehend the importance of development in their country as compared to the past developments and by analyzing the policy of the government related to foreign policy (Sobel, 288).

1.7 Conclusion

The American foreign policy has a great importance due to its complex nature and the ongoing change throughout the history as due to its influence and effectiveness on the national and international arena. The American government has justified its foreign policies as being set up to develop, determine and save the American needs and interests and to save the world from any threat. The achievement of foreign policy goals that seeks to achieve the greatest amount of national interests requires the use of certain means and tools, the most important of which are diplomacy, military force and economic power, and it may resort to other methods such as propaganda and espionage.

Chapter Two:

The Palestinian- Israeli Conflict

Chapter Two: The Palestinian-Israeli Conflict

2.1 Introduction

The Palestinian-Israeli conflict has been an ongoing war in the Middle East that began in the mid of the 20th century. It is essentially a modern conflict yet its roots go back thousands of years. It referred to the historical and political dispute from 1897 till the present day; the conflict is fundamentally related to the emergence of Zionism and Jewish immigration to Palestine. Over the last seventy years, the region has been characterized by widespread violence and war over territory and religious freedom that have heightened the tension between Palestine and Israel. Thus many countries and efforts especially the US, have attempted to resolve the conflict and bring peace to the region.

This chapter provides a brief history and the evolution of the conflict and the most prominent landmark events that shaped the conflict. Moreover it sheds light on the peace process and the major agreements and accords that were held to resolve the dispute in the Middle East generally and in Palestine in particular.

2.2 The historical roots of the conflict

The Palestinian-Israeli conflict began to appear in the early 20th century with the birth of large nationalist movements among the Arabs as well as among the Jews. Both of the two sides look up to realize sovereignty for their people. The disagreement between them and the up growth of the Palestinian nationalism in the 1920s led to the Palestinian-Israeli conflict in 1947(Alejandro, 2015).

Historically the ancient Jews from biblical times called their land Israel, Canaan, Galilee. While the modern Jews and few Christians believed that in the days of the Bible and Torah, God had bestowed the land to the ancient Jews led by men such as Abraham, Moses,

Chapter Two: The Palestinian-Israeli Conflict

David and others. According to the Jews, about 2000 years ago, the Roman Empire ruled that area and in suppressing several Jewish rebellions, the Romans destroyed the Jewish temple in the city of Jerusalem, killed large numbers of them and forced many others to leave their homeland in an exodus called the Diaspora. Some Jews remained in the area and huge numbers did not return until the 19th and the 20th century especially after the world war one and the Holocaust (Abdullahi Ahmed, Balogun, 2017).

During the first world war Sir Henry Mc Mahon, the British high commissioner, had gave a pledge to Husayn Ibn Ali, the governor of Mecca and Medina and the patriarch of the Hashemite family; that the British government would help to establish an independent Arab state including Palestine, if the Arabs supported the British in their war by an Arab revolt against the Ottoman empire which ruled for many years, and which was allied with Germany against Britain and France. After the Arab revolt succeeded Britain took control of a large part of the Ottomans' area. In 1917, lord Arthur Balfour declared that the British government would support for the establishment of "a Jewish national home in Palestine", a third promise in the form of Sykes-Picot Agreement, which was a secret deal between Britain and France to carve up the Arab provinces of the Ottoman empire and to divide control of the region (Beinin, Hajjar, 2014).

After the war, Britain and France requested the new League of Nations to give the semi-colonial authority over the Ottoman land, so France gained a mandate over Syria, while Britain over Palestine, the West bank, Gaza Strip and Jordan. The mandate was not accepted by the Arabs and the Palestinians because Britain could not keep up with its promise of an independent state for the Arabs, moreover many Palestinian Arabs including political figures, farmers and journalists refused the situation because of the rising of Jewish

Chapter Two: The Palestinian-Israeli Conflict

immigration and the fear of establishing a Jewish state in the Palestinian territory (Beinin, Hajjar, 2014).

In the early 1930s, the Palestinians prepared for a revolt with the help of many nationalist Arabs strugglers such as Sheikh Izaddin al Qassam from Syria. The Palestinian revolt witnessed a general Arab strike and boycott that lead to a rebellion against the British and the Jews. During the 1937 many Arab groups were defeated by the British and the revolution led to the Peel commission towards partitioning of Palestine ,where the Palestinian Arabs the recommendations while the Jewish leaders like Chaim Weizmann and David Ben-Gurion accepted them (Alejandro,2015).

After the end of the Second World War, the British mandate over Palestine came to its end due to many causes: Britain's exhaustion from the war, the increasing of the Jewish immigration to the region and the growing interests of the United States and USSR in the region. After the withdrawal of the British the UN took over the mandate through the establishment of United Nations Special Commission formed by 11neutral nations. In 29 November 1947, the General Assembly of the United Nations adopted a resolution 181 recommending the adoption implementation of a plan to partition Palestine into an Arab state, a Jewish state and the city of Jerusalem. The resolution was opposed by the Palestinians and Arab countries after that in 1947 the Israeli state was declared (Alejandro, 2015).

2.3 The evolution of the conflict and the landmark events

After the 1948 declaration of Israel as a state, the Palestinian-Jewish conflict goes through many stages:

2.3.1 The war of 1948 Al- Nakba

After the recognition of Israel a state in 1948, the Arabs and the Palestinian had launched a war on Israel. It was called Al- Nakba due to the catastrophic result of it such as the refugees problem ,despite the fact that the Arabs were outnumbered but the Jews had gained due to the fact they were more organized, they called that war the war of independence.

The war had two major stages; the first was from 1947 to 1948, a civil war in Mandatory Palestine that had started in the 30 November 1945 just after the UN resolution 181. This phase was described by historians as civil or ethnic war between the Jews and the Palestinian militias, supported by the Arab Liberation Army; it was ended by the defeating of the Jews. The second phase had begun after the declaration of Israel a state by David Ben-Gurion, the head of the provisional government with the US. The declaration was followed by the immediate invasion of Palestine by the surrounding Arabs armies and forces in order to prevent the establishment of Israel and to aid the Palestinians (Bassiouni, Ben Ami, 2009).

The Arab-Israeli conflict was ended in the 1949 with the signing of Israel to armistices agreements with Egypt, Lebanon and Syria. After the war Palestine was divided into three parts; Jordan took control over East Jerusalem and the West bank, Egypt obtained Gaza Strip and Israel occupied more than 77%of the Palestinian territories. Thus the UN partition was allocated (Beinin, Hajjar, 2014). The consequences of the war remains till nowadays, the most prominent was that the Palestinian refugees were forbidden from returning and most of them survived homelessly, the future of the dispute territories and the sharing of water resources (Bickerton, 2009).

2.3.2 The Palestinian refugees

As a consequence for Al-Nakba, more than 700,000 Palestinian became refugees. According to different views that problem was caused by different reasons; first the Palestinian view argued that the issue of refugees was due to the Zionist plan to clear the land, while the Israeli view stated that the Arabs' orders were the potential cause and thirdly, one of the Israeli military intelligence document claimed that the refugees were the result of Zionist actions (Beinin, Hajjar, 2014). Since the 1948, the Palestinian had refuge to the surrounding Arab countries Lebanon, Syria, Jordan and Egypt, some of them lived in registered camps while others lived in unregistered camps (Amiri, 2016).

Moreover, after the war Israel had issued several laws to prevent the Palestinians from returning to their homeland including the law of Return 1950, the Absentee Property law 1950 and the Land Acquisition 1953 (Bassiouni, Ben Ami, 2009). Although the UN resolution 194 stated that the refugees had the right to return, yet Israel rejected to accept justifying that they might threaten the existence of Israel (Zakaria, 2010).

2.3.3 The six-day war of 1967 Al-Naksa

The June 1967 war was an attempt by the Arab states to regain control of the land as the relation between the Arabs and Israel had not been fully normalized (Nasrallah, 56-58). On the 5th June 1967, Israel preemptively attacked Egypt and Syria destroying their air forces on the ground, Jordan had joined the fighting and consequently was attacked by Israel as well. The three Arab states' armies were defeated and Israel had captured the West bank from Jordan, the Gaza Strip and the Sinai Peninsula from Egypt and the Golan Heights from Syria. The 1967 war which lasted only six days established Israel as the dominant regional military power and it was ended with a great victory of Israel (Fraser, 2004). After 1967 Al-

Naksa, the Palestinian National movement emerged as the major actor in the form of Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO); a political and military group that worked to represent the Palestinian in the international forum (Baukhol, 2015).

2.3.4 The first Intifada

The first Palestinian Intifada in 9 December 1987 started when an Israeli truck hit four Palestinians causing their death in al-Jabalya refugee camp in Gaza Strip (Neff, 1997). This accident led thousands of Palestinians to protest against the occupation in refugee camps, cities and towns. The Intifada was launched by men, women and even children using rocks and stones hurting them on Israeli soldiers; it took the form of civil rebellion that aimed to end the occupation (Milton-Edward, Ferreil, 2010).

According to Arafat's advisor Mahmoud Noufal, the causes of the Intifada are fourfold: the poverty of the Palestinians had been living throughout 1948-1978, the feeling of humiliation rising from the conditions of living under the occupation, the loss of belief in the idea that they would be saved by Palestinian armed resistance from abroad and finally the feeling that their cause had been abandoned by the Arab states at the Arab Leader's Summit in Amman. The Intifada has brought an international concern to the Palestinian question, therefore the US and Europe have made efforts to find a solution leading to the establishment of Madrid conference in 1991 and the Oslo Accords in 1993 that ended the first Intifada (Nasrallah, 2013).

2.3.5 The Second Intifada

The second Intifada, also known as Al Aqsa Intifada, it began on 28 September 2000, when Ariel Sharon- the leader of the Likud party- visited Al Aqsa Mosque in a

Chapter Two: The Palestinian-Israeli Conflict

provocative way. Al Aqsa intifada had continued until 2005 resulted in the death of 4242 Palestinians. Actually the Palestinians returned to resistance after the collapse of camp David summit for many reasons; first due to the anger from the spread of the Israeli occupation, second because of the increasing of building settlements and the Israeli attempt to Judaize Jerusalem and thirdly because of the outcomes of the various negotiations (Saleh,2017).

Hamas the Islamic Resistance Movement was a militant organization that worked to liberate Palestine from the Israeli occupation and it was known for its active role during the Intifada (Nasrallah, 67). It carried out operations which terrified the Israeli security, including; 135 self-immolation that carried out by Hamas, the PIJ and the EQB leading to the killing of 1513 Israeli and injuring 3380. The number of Al Qassam Brigades dead was reached 604 during the Intifada including important leaders of Hamas (Saleh, 2017).

Mahmoud Abbas was declared the new president of Palestine in 2005 after the death of Yasser Arafat in November 2004. Abbas claimed that the armed Intifada was not healthy, for that reason he called for stopping the Intifada in order to open a new peace negotiations with Israel with the mediation of the US , he indicates that the Palestinians could not achieve an independent state without the peace negotiations. After that the end of the Intifada was declared in 2005 by Mahmoud Abbas (Milton-Edward, Ferreil, 2009).

2.4 The peace process of 1990s

The Palestinian-Israeli peace process refers to the intermittent discussions that were held by various parties put forward in attempt to resolve the ongoing conflict. The most

prominent agreement started by the 1990s when there have been parallel efforts made to find terms upon which peace can be agreed by the two conflict parties.

2.4.1 Madrid Conference 1991

By 1991 international developments such as the end of the Cold war and the starting of the Gulf war had affected the Middle East situation, while on the ground the first Intifada had continued in the occupied Palestinian territory. These developments increased the international concerns about the Arab-Israeli conflict and the need for a solution, thus an international conference was held on the 30th October 1991 in Madrid called the Madrid peace conference which aims to bring peace to the Middle East region. The conference was sponsored by the US and the Soviet Union, although the conference was not held by the UN yet the negotiations were based on the UN Security Council 242 and 338 resolutions “land for peace” principles to bring peace to the region. Madrid Conference sought to start negotiations involving Syria, Jordan, Lebanon, and Palestine; however the Israeli government refused to deal with PLO accusing them by a terrorist organization so the Palestinians joined as a member of Jordan-Palestinian team (Young, 2001)

On the 3rd November a bilateral agreements were held starting by three varied sets of negotiations between Israel on one hand and Syria, Lebanon and the Jordan-Palestinian delegation on the other hand. After that a multilateral track had took place in May 1992 aiming at improving regional cooperation through focusing on five common issues; the environment, water resources, refugees, economic development and arms control without the participation of Syria (Young, 2001).

2.4.2 Oslo Accords

After a several secret negotiations between PLO officials and the Israeli deputy foreign minister, an agreement reached on the Declaration of Principles in the late of 1993 as a peace accord. The Declaration of Principles was based on two sections; first, the mutual recognition of both sides and second, setting a timetable for negotiations. The Oslo Accords were signed in a white house ceremony attended by the PLO representative Mahmoud Abbas and the Israeli foreign minister Peres. In a historic gesture Arafat and Rabin shook hands in the presence of the president Clinton Bill who commented “A peace of the brave within our reach” (Bickerton, 2009). The Oslo Accords comprised a series of agreements starting by 1993 Declaration of Principles then the Oslo 2 in 1995 which had tackled the issues of the West bank and Gaza Strip and the last negotiation was the Wye River Memorandum in 1998 (Golan,2013).

The most important points that the Oslo Accords had tackled were: the ending of the Israeli rule over the West bank and Gaza Strip, signing the parties an agreement about the withdrawal of Israel military forces from Gaza and Jericho, Palestinian authority would take over health, tourism, social welfare and direct taxation sector and the last point was about the negotiations on the final status including settlements, refugees and Jerusalem would start within five years (Bickerton, 2009).

The outcomes of the Oslo Accords were not satisfied because they didn't recognized neither Palestine a state nor the right of the Palestinians for self determination as it did not discussed the fundamental issues including Jerusalem and refugees problem (Bickerton,2009). Further, the Accords' result led the Palestinian to lose confidence in their negotiators and political leaders, consequently the popularity of Islamic groups such as

Hamas, Palestinian Islamic Jihad and Al-Qassam Brigades increased and gained support from the Palestinian society (Baukhol, 2015).

2.4.3 Camp David Summit

The Camp David Summit was a summit meeting at Camp David from 11 to 25 July 2000. The summit was held according to US president Bill Clinton's invitation to the Israeli prime minister Ehud Barak and Yasser Arafat in order to continue their negotiations on the Middle East peace process (Ka.Cowicz .A,2005). The David Summit had addressed the major aspects on the Palestinian-Israeli conflict including; borders, the status of Jerusalem and the right to return of the Palestinian refugees (Naufal, 2005). Barak put some limitations in the summit involving: East Jerusalem should remain under Israel control, Israel would annex settlements in the West bank and it would maintain its borders as after 1967. On the other side, according to the UN resolution and the Oslo Accords, the Palestinians called for a total withdrawal of Israel from West Bank, Gaza Strip and East Jerusalem as well as the recognition of an independent state in those areas (Beinin, Hajjar,2014)

The US president had announced in 25 July that the summit had reached no agreement. Although Barak had withdrawal from the West Bank, the peace negotiation had failed due to the lack of agreement between the parties on the refugee problem and East Jerusalem issue as well as the Israeli's and the America's abusive conditionality. Two months after the summit failure, the second Palestinian uprising had broken out (Beinin, Hajjar, 2014).

2.5 The war on Gaza

Over the last years, the Palestinians witnessed several wars on Gaza Strip by Israel due to the fact that Gaza Strip is a sensitive part to both parties, mainly because of Al-Aqsa which is, religiously, important to the Muslims and the Jews.

2.5.1 Gaza war 2008-2009

The Gaza war of 2008-2009 known as the Operation Cast Lead and in the Muslim world as the Gaza Massacre and referred to as the battle of Al-Furqan by Hamas, was a three-week armed conflict between Gaza Strip Palestinian paramilitary groups and the Israeli Defense Forces that began in December 2008 and ended in January 2009 with a unilateral ceasefire (Gaita ,Raimond ,2010). Israel had launched a military operation against militant Hamas in Gaza Strip as a reaction to the rocket fire by the Palestinians, through attacking Hamas weapons caches and military installations. The armed conflict had continued until 17 January despite the passage of the UN resolution 1860 on the 8th January to ceasefire. On the same day Israel declared its withdrawal and a ceasefire followed by Hamas the next day. The war had resulted the death of 1440 Palestinians and about 5380 injuries and unknown number of refugees. On the Israeli side; 4 civilians were killed and approximately 183 were injured (Zanoti et al, 2009).

2.5.2 Gaza war 2012

In November 2012, the Israeli Defense Forces launched operation Pillar of Cloud which was an eight-day campaign in Hamas governed Gaza Strip after Hamas fired rockets on IDF as a response for the killing of Ahmad al-Jabari, the commander of Hamas' Gaza military wing by an Israeli airstrike. According to the Israeli government, the operation started because of the Palestinian launching of over 100 rockets at Israel during 24h period

Chapter Two: The Palestinian-Israeli Conflict

as well as due to the attack of Gaza militant on an Israeli military patrol jeep with Israeli borders, while the Palestinian had blamed the Israeli government for the upsurge in violence and their attack on Gaza civilian days before the operation, they cited the blockade of Gaza Strip and the occupation of West Bank including East Jerusalem as the reasons for the rocket attacks. During the operation Israel fired 1500 sites in Gaza Strip, on the other, in an operation called Hijarat Sijil, al-Qassam Brigades, Hamas and Islamic Jihad launched 1465 rockets attack on Israel. After a day of negotiations between Egypt and US a ceasefire was announced on 21 November (Casey, Maslen, 2014).

2.5.3 Gaza war 2014

The 2014 Gaza war, also known as Operation Protective Edge, was a military operation launched by Israel on Hamas- ruled Gaza Strip on the 08 July 2014. The operations were designed to stop the rocket fire from Gaza, yet those operations were increased after the kidnapping and murdering of three Israeli teenagers in 12 June, from that date till the 5th August there was a several attacks from both sides. On the 5th July, Ossama Hamadan, a Hamas official claimed that Hamas would not stop its attack without eliminating the blockade on Gaza. On 16 July Israel rejected the ten-year armistices by Hamas and Islamic Jihad condition on the release of the prisoners and lifting the blockade on Gaza, so it launched a ground attack on the tunnels crossing the Gaza Israel borders however Hamas had responded with many air-raids. Despite the fact that a ceasefire was declared on 05 August, yet it was infringement then in the 26th from the same month the two sides had agreed on ceasefire because of the catastrophic consequences of the war (Bellal, 2015).

2.5.4 Gaza blockade 2017

2017 was the tenth year of the blockade on Gaza Strip by “Israel”. The blockade was imposed by “Israel” on Gaza Strip following the success of Hamas in the Palestinian elections in 2006 and the conflict between Fatah – the largest PLO’s group – and Hamas which led to their division in 2007. Then, after refusing Hamas to recognize “Israel” and respect all previous agreements between “Israel” and the Palestine Authority (PA) as well as its takeover of Gaza, “Israel” tightened the blockade on Gaza in the mid- 2007 through its control of all border crossings by land, air, and sea. Israel’s control of Gaza characterized by preventing the export of Gaza goods to the outside world and restricting the exit and the entry of people except for emergency illnesses and prominent businessmen. On the other side, Egypt participated in an indirect way in the blockade through its prevention of all regular movement of goods at Rafah crossing and the limitation of people movement. In mid-2017 the PA in the West Bank imposed sanctions to force Hamas to reach a reconciliation agreement (Ferrer, 2018).

The consequences of the blockade and the sanctions imposed by Fatah and “Israel” on Gaza were catastrophic. As reported in November 2017, public services and the infrastructure were in a critical situation: more than 95 percent of the water in Gaza was polluted ; electricity deficit reached 63% ; the unemployment in Gaza reached 44% ; make a number of schools, hospitals and businesses work part-time ; the PA reduced the salaries of about 50,000 servants in Gaza; more than 6,000 employees are forced to retire early; and President Abbas imposed additional restrictions on the medical border crossings for Gazans (Ferrer, 2018).

2.5.5 Gaza war 2021

An outbreak of violence in the ongoing Palestinian-Israeli conflict began on 10 May 2021. Although the violence took place earlier, yet it continued until a ceasefire came into effect on the 21st May. The violence coincided with al-Qadr night observed by Muslims and it was marked by protests and rioting, police riot control, rocket attacks on Israel by Hamas and Islamic Jihad, and airstrikes by Israel targeting Gaza Strip. The violence resulted in the death of 256 Palestinian including 66 children and 13 people from Israel. The Gaza ministry of health claimed that more than 1900 Palestinian were injured and about 200 Israeli. Calls for a ceasefire were first proposed by Hamas on 13 May they were refused by the other side, and on 18 May France along with Egypt and Jordan announced the filing of UN Security Council resolution for a ceasefire. On 21 May the war was ended by a ceasefire that is accepted by both sides (Kingsley, 2021).

2.6 Conclusion

The Palestinian-Israeli conflict can trace its roots to the late of the 19th and the early 20th centuries, with the emergence of major nationalist movements for both Arabs and Jews. Following the declaration of Israel a state the Arabs engaged in ongoing conflict with the Jewish starting by the Arab war in 1948 to establish an independent Palestine state, then another war was launched in 1967 by the Arabs but unfortunately those two wars resulted in the occupation of Israel for more 77% of the Palestinian territories and the creation of the refugees problem. The miserable situations that the Palestinian were living in at that time led to the first Intifada which aims to end the occupation. The ongoing conflict in the Middle East pushed many countries to try to find solutions that are accepted by the two sides. Though there was a peace process in 1990s starting by Madrid Conference, the Oslo

Accords and Camp David Summit, yet another uprising was sparked called al-Aqsa Intifada after the collapse of latter in 2000. During the last eleven years Israel had launched many wars on Gaza Strip as it imposed a blockade since Hamas won the election in 2006.

Chapter Three:

The Impact of Trump's Foreign Policy towards

The Palestinian-Israeli Conflict

3.1. Introduction

The strategy of US foreign policy that is carried by American leaders towards the Palestinian-Israeli conflict differs from one president to another and from one period to another, since it is based on a set of interests and needs. The election of Donald Trump came with a drastic change in the US foreign policy towards the Middle East in general and the Palestinian issue in particular. He represented a new dimension of the United States 'foreign policy after eight years of the Obama administration that sought equal partner around the world. The previous American leaders worked to solve the conflict many times, yet each one had used certain approaches to bring peace to the region. The president Trump had shown less interest and enmity with the Muslim communities and the close relationship with Israel from the early beginning of his campaign, thus he as well followed a specific way to resolve the problem and to manage the ongoing conflict.

This chapter focuses on the nature of US foreign policy during the administration of the president Donald Trump as well as his policies principles. Moreover it explores Trump's attitude towards the Palestinian-Israeli conflict and the major policies he adopted to manage the conflict. Finally, the chapter discusses the future of the Palestinian issue and the way those policies affected the process of the Palestinian case.

3.2 US foreign policy under Trump's administration

The United States foreign policy under the administration of Donald Trump started by 2017 until 2021. After his winning in the presidential election of 2016 over the democratic nominee Hillary Clinton, the Trump presidency displays continuity and

discontinuity in terms of the broader patterns of the United States foreign policy, and many of its positions are included in the mainstream of the Republican Party. Like the previous presidents Donald Trump came to office with a set of views and principles, yet he had achieved mixed results in term of securing those political principles (Abrams, 2019).

The US foreign policy during Trump's presidency was noted for its unpredictability and renegeing on prior international commitments, upending diplomatic conventions, straining relations with traditional allies and embracing political and economic brinkmanship with most adversaries (Katrin, 2020). Trump's America First policy pursued nationalist policy objectives and prioritized bilateral agreements rather than multilateral agreements, where Trump gave more superiority to the US interests over the other countries. Despite the fact that Donald Trump described himself as a nationalist, however he espoused an isolationist, non-interventionist and protectionist views (William, 2018). Many of US foreign policies were reevaluated by Trump's administration as a part of America First policy, including prior multilateral commitments such as the withdrawal of US from the Trans-Pacific partnership, the INF treaty and UNESCO, Paris agreement and urging the NATO allies to increase burden sharing. The Trump's administration often used economic pressure to advance its foreign policy (Baker, 2017)

3.3 The characteristics of Trump's foreign policy

During his presidential campaign, Trump always describes himself as different in the sense that his policies are better than the previous ones. His foreign policy carried out many characteristics that were vague to the commentators and critics.

3.3.1 “America First” and “Make America great again”

Throughout Trump's campaign, he frequently stated to put America First as a major policy to his term. The policy of America First refers to US policy that emphasized nationalism and non-interventionism. The roots of this policy can be traced back to Thomas Jefferson period who promoted the Embargo act of 1807 and later the non-intercourse act under James Madison. The president Donald Trump adopted the America First doctrine after his election to the presidency; it was a theme of Trump's inaugural address. During his campaign, Trump described himself as less hawkish foreign policy in comparison to the previous American leaders as he focused on the anti-globalist and anti-establishment doctrine (payne, 2017). Although, he tended to put America First, yet he claimed that the administration of the post-cold war era was a success in which during that period, US foreign policy was to pursue an irresponsible vision of global hegemony especially in the Middle East. In that sense, Trump worked to make America great again through reconstructing its economy and projecting its military capabilities (Curran, 2018).

Trump did not show support for the institutions of global governance that emerged after the 1945. Scholars, journalists, diplomats and former policy makers did not agree on the priorities of Trump's foreign policy and many critics claimed that his policy would destroy a well-established international order-grounded in free trade, multilateralism and alliances. The president Donald Trump wanted the US winning of any negotiation while the other party do not win anything, thus Payne claimed that he do contradict with his vows that his administration will not be aggressive (Payne, 2017).

During his campaign, Trump had spoken about finding a solution to the ongoing conflict in the Middle East and about keeping the promotion of his peace policy of the century deal. However when he get into office he started doing contrast with his speeches and promises. He cut off the United States funding of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees (UNRWA) as well as he threatened to cut off financial aids to all who will vote for UN resolution for the US to withdraw its decision to recognize Jerusalem as a capital of Israel (Asseburg,2019).

3.3.2 Ambiguity and uncertainty

Though specialists had worked to understand on what basis and under which circumstances did Trump build his views, the pattern of thinking that he used to stand on was labeled as Trumpism. The latter alluded to ambiguity and uncertainty and does not have a common or standard definition. In fact, unlike the previous presidents Trump had no prior political experience and his affiliation with the world of money and media had affected his understanding of the world (Wassim,2020).Since Donald Trump get into power many analysts and critics claimed that Trump's foreign policy was vague and unclear. During AIPAK talk Hillary Clinton stated "we need steady hands, not a president who says he's neutral on Monday, pro-Israel on Tuesday and who knows what on Wednesday because everything is negotiable (Beckwith, 2018). Trump's statements always received widespread media coverage and often exhibited significant changes from long-standing American foreign policy and priorities. Trump and other members of his administration had made crucial foreign policy choices clearly, however the main policy he adopted still ambiguous. He often offered incoherent views that served to promote uncertainty. Thus, Payne claimed

that Trump had a possibility not behaving according to the plan and the fact that his rhetoric often been inconsistent and even incoherent (Payne, 2017).

3.3.3 Pro-Israel policy

The relationship between Trump and Israel had been a priority in his policies, he gave much importance to them so that he worked to improve the close relationship with Israel because during Obama's administration the Israeli government was suffering (Thompson, 2018). The fact that Trump had close relations with Israel many of his actions were affected by the Jewish government. In this sense, Trump had withdrew from the 2015 deal that aimed to curb Iran's nuclear weapons program known as the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action or JCPOA as he imposed sanctions on Iran because it threatened the existence of Israel and it was its most dangerous enemy (Zanotti, 2019).

Moreover, Trump's family and Israel had important ties before his presidential campaign in 2015. In addition to that, in January 2013 during Israel elections, Trump had demonstrated his support to Netanyahu through presenting his video recording stating:

And you truly have a great prime minister in Benjamin Netanyahu. There's nobody like him. He's a winner. He's highly respected. He's highly thought of by all. And people really do have great, great respect for what's happened in Israel. So, vote for Benjamin. Terrific guy. Terrific leader. Great for Israel" (Wermenbol, 2019).

Furthermore, the Prime Minister of Israel Benjamin Netanyahu had a personal relation with Trump's son in law Kushner Jared who were deeply involved in Israel, and he

was appointed by Trump as a leader to the peace plan for the Palestinian-Israeli conflict. As another stand, he assigned the ambassador David Friedman and others who were preternatural pro-Israel stance within Trump's peace plan. Hence, the outcomes of the Middle East peace policy also far reaching Israel decisions (Wermenbol, 2019).

3.4 Trump's attitude towards the Middle East

The Middle East was a key testing ground for the US foreign policy, since it had been a longstanding major source for American leaders due to its eternal religious and cultural relevance, a strategically pivotal location, huge oil reserves, interlocked and intractable conflicts and the persistence of major threats such as terrorism and the risk of nuclear proliferation. Although events such as the Arab Spring, the NATO-led multinational military intervention in Libya and Syrian civil war and tough process that led to the Iran nuclear deal, yet the dealing with those many crisis was likely defined as a challenge for the Trump administration (Naser,2016). The President Donald Trump's Middle East policy represented significant changes from that of Barack Obama. He sought to bolster Israel and Saudi Arabia in particular and to isolate Iran. This agenda had emerged in piece mental fashion rather than as a part of a coherent strategy and there were a few indications that Trump's administration officials had considered as the long-term implications of their approach (Thompson, 2018).

Donald Trump had taken different approaches certainly there were aspects of continuity, where the president had encouraged allies to accept more regional security burden, resisted the temptations to send large numbers of troops to Syria and other hotspots.

The military power had a great concern in Trump's policy where it is used in the term of counter terrorism than in term of stabilization and nation building as he stated during his presidential campaign, in addition, allowed the intervention of Saudi Arabia in Yemen just like the president Obama (Diego, 2017).

However, in key respects he had departed from the policies of his predecessors. Trump had improved relationship with Riyadh that were in odd during Obama's term and similarly, he worked to tightened ties with Israel considering it as a great friend and gave it a priority in his policy, because the Israeli government suffered a lot in Obama's tenure. Moreover, Trump had withdrawn from the 2015 deal designed to curtail nuclear weapons program, formally known as a Joint Comprehensive Plan and reinstated sanctions on Tehran. Finally, Trump had shown no interest in promoting political reform or blistering dramatic norms as he demonstrate soon after taking office his so-called Muslim travel ban. It was clear that Trump attempted to organize a bloc led by Saudi Arabia, Israel and United Arab Emirates in order to contain Iran and to maintain democratic reform, and as a final stand for the president his plan of the normalization agreements between Israel and the Arab states with the mediation of US as a part of his peace process in the Middle East (Thompson, 2018).

3.5 Trump's foreign policy towards the Palestinian issue

After the election of Donald Trump as the 45 president of the United States in January 2017, Israel had took the language of Trump towards the Arab communities and the

Muslims as a green light to their decisions for constructing at least 6000 settlements in the Palestinian territories (Balogun, Salleh ,2017).

During his 50 first days in office, Trump claimed that it was important to have a peace deal between the conflict parties to get the peace they deserve. Moreover, he stated that the solution would not be obligatory unless Palestine and Israel agreed upon it and neither Palestine nor Israel could impose an agreement on the other. In the mid-February 2017, Trump said "I'm looking at two-state and one-state and I like the one that both parties like" and he kept expressing his impression "I am very happy with the one that both parties like. I can live with either one". In that sense, Trump during a meeting in the white house with the Israeli prime minister Netanyahu he expressed his support to the one- or the two-states solution as the most prominent one to resolve the conflict (Balogun , Salleh,2017).

3.5.1 The recognition of Jerusalem as Israeli's capital and the relocation of US embassy

The US president Donald Trump announced by a Twitter text on December 6, 2017.

I have determined that it is time to officially recognize Jerusalem as the capital of Israel. I am also directing the State Department to begin preparation to move the American Embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem[...] At my direction, the United States finally and officially recognized Jerusalem as the true capital of Israel. Today we follow through on this recognition and open our embassy in the historic and sacred land of Jerusalem (Balfour, 2019, p.329) .

Chapter Three: The Impact of Trump's Foreign Policy towards The Palestinian-Israeli Conflict

The recognition of Jerusalem as the capital of Israel by Trump changed nearly 70 years of US foreign policy and made the US in an opposite standpoint for the Palestinians. He worked to make a drastic change though he signed his declaration with warning and exclusion that made his policies too much vague for the commentators (Tilovska, Kechedji, 2018).

Many Arab and Islamic reactions both governmental and popular were revealed against Trump's decision of making Jerusalem the capital of Israel. His decision angered several Arab countries such as; Palestine, Algeria, Egypt, Morocco, Syria and others as well as Turkey and Pakistan (Hamadi, 2018). Elgindy (2017) stated that Trump's recognition of Jerusalem as the capital of Israel could mean the end of the US efforts to bring peace to the region. In addition, this decision upturned the previous policies of the previous administrations as well as the international bases on which the peace was based. Furthermore, many governments condemned Trump's announcement even people from America as well as some members from the UN security council proposed for condemning this policy yet, later it was vetoed by the US and warning of those who will support the UN council, the US administration would cut off any aids and assistance to them (Elgindy, 2017).

After the recognition of Jerusalem the capital of Israel, one of the most controversial Trump's policies towards the Palestinian-Jewish conflict was the relocation of US embassy from Tell Aviv to Jerusalem. In fact the idea of moving US embassy in Israel to its original place was not the first attempt by Trump however previous presidents like Clinton, H.W.

Chapter Three: The Impact of Trump's Foreign Policy towards The Palestinian-Israeli Conflict

Bush and Obama had promised to do so in their campaign speeches. Those pledges perhaps were used to secure the Jewish votes from the Americans or those presidents had no courage to do so due to the international pressure and disapproval of moving the US embassy (Rinehart, 2018).

Although Trump's foreign policy was vague and unclear during his campaign, yet some of the high profile individuals such as Sheldon Adelson the pro Likud billionaire gave much support and funding to Trump expecting him to move the embassy to Jerusalem as a commitment to his support (Wermelbal, 2019). Furthermore, the period that Trump was in office, his administration adopted a more lax attitude towards the Israeli settlements than its predecessors. Instead of urging Israel to hold the agreement, the white house also said "we don't believe existence of the settlements is an impediment to peace (Elgindy, 2019).

3.5.2 Cut off the aids for the Palestinian refugees

US aids to the Palestinians had changed more dramatically in 2018 than any time since 2007, when it was restricted to respond to the takeover of Gaza Strip by the Islamic group Hamas. The Trump administration had significantly cut funding for the Palestinian during a time of tension in US-Palestinian relations. The statements of the president suggested that via this cuts the administration may seek to persuade the Palestinian Liberation Organization to participate in US- led diplomacy on the Palestinian-Israeli peace process. Despite the funding cuts ,the PLO chairman and the Palestinian Authority Mahmoud Abbas and other officials had not change their decisions to break off diplomatic contacts with the United States, that came after the president Trump's announcement on

Chapter Three: The Impact of Trump's Foreign Policy towards The Palestinian-Israeli Conflict

December 2017 of recognizing Jerusalem as the capital of Israel and the relocation of US embassy (Beaumont,Holmes,2018).

During the year of 2018, Trump's administration had made drastic changes in the funding; first, reprogramming 231,532 million of 2017 bilateral economic assistance that was originally intended for the West Bank and Gaza Strip for other purposes, second, ending US humanitarian assistance contributions to UNRWA and deciding to prevent Palestinians from participating in conflict management and Mitigation program funded by the US embassy in Israel and Non-lethal US security assistance for the PA security forces had continued (Beaumont,Holmes,2018).

The US had long been the largest individual donor pledging about one third of the United Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees total budget in previous years (Asseburg, 2019). According to Elgindy (2018), initially the US announced cutting of 200 million in economic aid projects for West Bank and Gaza Strip while leaving 60 million for Palestinian security management in Israel. Despite the fact, that the State Department's spoken person Heather Nauert announced that the amount of US funding for Palestine approximately one tenth of the value given to Israel. Few days later, another announcement by the US declaring that, the US administration eliminates all the remaining assistance for the UNRWA as well as for the humanitarian programs (Elgindy, 2018).

Those decisions were taken because of the shared view between Israel and the US governments about the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees that it will make refugees problem ongoing and keep continuity by encouraging the refugees to

claim on their status and right to return rather than incorporating within their current host state, especially when the UNRWA do not serve only the Palestinians in the occupied land, however also in Jordan, Syria and Lebanon. Many of the European countries as well Arabs had pledged to protect the agency and Germany promised to keep a significant increase in financial backing after US cutting of aids (Asseburg, 2019).

Wermenbol (2019) stated that the decision of cutting all funds and defunding the UNRWA was the suggestion of Trump's son in law Kushner Jared through an email informing the officials that it was crucial to interrupt the UNRWA because it was ineffective and did not help for the peace process, the email was supported by the Israeli prime minister Netanyahu who did not accept any large-scale return of the Palestinian refugees and had accused the agency for pressing the crisis of refugees which is the core of the Palestinian-Israeli ongoing conflict (Wermenbol,2019).

3.5.3 The Deal of the Century

On the evening of January 28, 2020 thousands of Palestinians and people around the world following the Palestinian-Israeli ongoing conflict sat in front of their TV to watch the release of the "prosperity plan" by the US president Donald Trump. The plan had been in the works since the three past years, yet after the recognition of Jerusalem as the capital of Israel, it moved into a high gear, upturning all United Nations Assembly and Security Council resolutions on the conflict (Iriqat, 104).

The Trump peace plan was called by its proponent the Deal of the Century; phrasing used the Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu in a joint press conference with Donald

Chapter Three: The Impact of Trump's Foreign Policy towards The Palestinian-Israeli Conflict

Trump announcing the plan. However the Palestinian president Mahmoud Abbas in his reaction to the announced plan named it as the Slap of the century, while the secretary general of the Palestine Liberation Organization Saeb Erekat tweeted that the plan would be known as the Fraud of the century. Names were given to the deal differs from one to another according to their impression and view of the deal (Sawafta, al-Mughrabi, 2020).

During his presidential campaign of 2016, Trump had already proclaimed an ultimate deal to end the Palestinian-Israeli conflict. Since he took office a trio composed of his son in law Kushner Jared, Jason Greenblatt, long time confidant and chief legal officer to Trump's Business Empire, and US ambassador to Israel David Friedman had been working on such plan. The US State Department however had not been involved. Alongside the so-called final status to be agreed between the two conflict parties; Jerusalem, refugees, settlements status and borders of Palestine entity and security, yet Trump's team appeared to be focusing above all on economic cooperation and development in the Palestinian territories (Asseburg, 2019).

Trump's proposal is a déjà vu of the Marshall plan. The Deal of the century called itself a vision to improve the lives of the Palestinians and Israeli people. The plan is a document consists of 181pages divided into two parts; political and economic frameworks. For the political portion, it is included in fifty-off pages that cover the important political issues that were already identified as the final status by the Oslo Accords. The Trump vision did not cite the UN resolutions, claiming that they have not and they will not solve the conflict (Eriqat, 105). While economic portion takes up the remaining 130 pages. Trump

administration had announced a co-host to a conference in Manama, Bahrain to encourage the investment in the Middle East in general and in the Palestinian territories in particular, however the Palestinian authority didn't agree on that conference claiming that it is meaningless and it's a part of a meaningless plan (Wermenbol, 2019).

According to Trump "the peace to prosperity" represented the most prominent comprehensive and ambitious international effort for resolving the ongoing conflict. Despite the fact that the plan contain two parts, the main focus was on economic investments in the Middle East as the it gave much focus to the normalization of relations between the Arabs and Israel as the long-term implications and as the core of the peace process in the region (Eriqat,2020).

3.6 Conclusion

Donald Trump's administration as the previous administrations had dealt with the Palestinian-Israeli ongoing conflict from the viewpoint of managing the problem rather than giving an applicable solution. The suggested solutions were not satisfying for both and specially for the Palestinian, in which they did not give them their rights to self-determination as they did not recognize Palestine as a state. However those proposed solution were in favor to Israel due to the close relationship between the US president and Israel even before his election, in addition the less knowledgeable experience of Trump of the situation in the Middle East had affected the status of the Palestinian issue. The attempts were taken by Trump and the previous presidents to solve the conflict were based on achieving the American interests and major goals in the region. The approaches that Trump

Chapter Three: The Impact of Trump's Foreign Policy towards The Palestinian-Israeli Conflict

had used were different and unexpected as he claimed, starting by the recognition of Jerusalem as the capital of Israel and the relocation of US embassy from Tell Aviv to Jerusalem. Those policies were provocative to the Arabs and the Muslim communities where they expressed their anger towards those decisions, moreover, the cutting off of the funding for the Palestinians had added much pain and pressure as long as the main interest of the US was the pro-Israel tone.

General Conclusion

General Conclusion

The United States foreign policy towards the Palestinian-Israeli conflict differs through its successive administrations to achieve its national and international interests and needs. However when observing the strategies adopted by the American presidents, it is difficult to outline a meaningful difference where the common feature in them is the form of bias towards Israel. The president Donald Trump like the previous presidents, during his presidential campaign promised to provide a unique solution to the conflict and to the uncomfortable situation in the Middle East in terms of building the nation, yet the implemented policies towards the conflict were more than shocking to the world and specially to those who are interested in the Palestinian issue, in which the decisions of recognizing Jerusalem as the capital of Israel and relocating US embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem confirmed the pro-Israel tone in his policy. Thus this study aims to understand the way the Palestinian issue gets affected by Trump's foreign policy.

The study of US foreign policy has a great importance due to its complex nature and its effectiveness on the national and international political scene as well as its status in the hierarchy of international forces. The US foreign policy is set up according to the United States government to determine and to achieve the American interests all over the world. The achievement of such interests depends on certain methods and tools that were identified as military force, economic power and diplomacy. The making process of US foreign policy is complicated more than its nature where there are different parts and groups share the responsibility of making the policy depending on the constitution and the president's views and principles, each part has a task to accomplish the making process.

The Palestinian-Israeli ongoing conflict traced back to the late of the 19th and the early of 20th centuries accompanied with the emergence of both Arab and Zionist nationalist movements. The history of the conflict is full of decisive events and spots in which after the declaration of Israel a state in 1948, several wars were launched by the Arabs in order to establish the Independent state of Palestine and to end the occupation of Israel. The major wars were the 1948 Arab war then the 1967 war that were ended in favor of Israel and resulted in huge problems such as refugees as a catastrophic consequence. The ongoing violence in the Middle East pushed the international concerns to find solutions through the peace process of 1990s including Madrid Conference, Oslo Accords and David Summit. Those processed led to outbreaks of uprisings such as the first and the second Intifada. In addition the conflict witnessed multiple wars on Gaza Strip with the imposition of blockades for long time.

On the light of the discussion of Trump's administration and, the impact of his political strategies towards the Palestinian-Israeli ongoing conflict, we may come to conclude that the US administration dealt with the conflict from the standpoint of managing the problem rather than finding a solution in which it did not give the Palestinian their right of self-determination and the establishment of an independent state. Therefore, the US policies and approaches were completely biased to Israel at the expense of Palestine as well as they were designed to achieve US interests at first.

Works Cited

- Abrams, Elliot. *Trump versus the government: can America get its story straight, foreign affairs*, pp129-137, January/ February, 2019.
- Ahmad, A., Balogun, A., Mohamed, A. & Salleh, M. "Effect of Donald Trump foreign policy toward the Muslim world: The Israeli-Palestinian issues", *World applied sciences journal*, 35(9), 1709-1717, 2017.
- Alejandro, M. *The Palestinian-Israeli conflict: an analysis of Palestine's bid for statehood* (Master's dissertation). Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/2445/65843>, 2015.
- Ali, Sawafta, Nidal al-Mughrabi. *Slap of the century: Palestinian reject of Trump Mideast plan*, January, 2020.
- Amiri, Z. *Boundaries and political agency of Palestinian refugee camps in Lebanon* (Master's dissertation, Iowa State University). Retrieved from <https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=6662&context=etd>, 2016.
- Anderson, S. R.. *Trump's Jerusalem Policy is More Ambiguous than it seems*. Retrieved from *Foreign Policy* : <https://foreignpolicy.com> ,2017/12/11/.
- Asseburg, M. *The "Deal of the Century" for Israel-Palestine. US Proposals Are Likely to Speed Demise of Two-State Settlement*. Retrieved from *German Institute for International*

andSecurityAffairs:https://www.swpberlin.org/fileadmin/contents/products/comments/2019C20_ass.pdf,2019, April,20.

Aymen Mansour Nada A. The influence of public opinion on the American foreign policy towards Iraq 1999,2011, School of Humanities and social sciences,2012.

Baker, Peter. “Trump Abandons Trans-Pacific Partnership, Obama’s Signature Trade Deal”. The New York Times. Retrieved March 23, 2017, January 23,2017.

Balfour, A. The walls of Jerusalem: preserving the past, controlling the future 1st ed, Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell,2019.

Bassiouni, M. C., & Ami, S. B. A Guide to documents on the Arab Palestinian-Israeli conflict:1897-2008, 2009.

Baukhol, I. Security and fear in Israeli and Palestinian conflict narratives: a social-psychological study (Master’s dissertation, University of Gothenburg). Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/2077/39985https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315100241>, 2015

Beinin, J., & Hajjar, L. Palestine, Israel and the Arab-Israeli conflict :a primer. The Middle East Research & Information Project, 2014.

Bellal, A.The War Report: Armed Conflict in 2014 ,1st ed .Retrieved from <https://books.google.dz/books?id=IfX8CgAAQBAJ&pg=PA204&dq=The+war>,2015.

Best, R. A.National security council: an organizational assessment, Congressional Research Service, 2009.

Bennhold, Katrin. Has 'America First' Become 'Trump First'? Germans Wonder, *The New York Times*, June 6, 2020.

Bickerton, I.J., & Klausner, C.L. *A History of the Arab–Israeli Conflict*, 8th ed, Routledge, 2017.

Bickerton, I. J. *The Arab-Israeli conflict: A history*, London: Reaktion Books, 2009

Cavalli, C. D. *The basics of american government*, Dah kilonega, GA: University of North Georgia, 2013.

Bortolletto, Ana Carolina. American foreign Aids: Recent trends in Goals and Allocation, *Social Science journal*, vol.6: iss.1, Article 07. 2010.

Casey-Maslen, S.(Ed) *The war report: armed conflict in 2013*, Retrieved from <https://books.google.dz/books?id=pj3KBQAAQBAJ&printsec=frontcover&dq=The war,2014>.

Cummings, William. "I am a nationalist": Trump's embrace of controversial label sparks uproar", *USA Today*, October 24, 2018.

Curran, J. "Americanism, not globalism": President Trump and the American mission, Sydney : Lowy Institute , 2018.

Dalal. Iriqat. *The Deal of the century from a Palestinian perspective*, *Palestinian-Israeli Journal*, vol.25, no.1-2, 2018.

- Diego, Pagliarulo . Donald Trump, The Middle East, and American foreign policy, E-international Relations, January 3, 2017.
- Elgindy, K. *Blind Spot: America and the Palestinians, from Balfour to Trump*, Washington D.C: Brookings Institutions Press, 2019.
- Ferrer, M. *The Palestinian-Israeli armed conflict: fifty years on*. In a bellal (ed), *the war report armed conflicts in 2017* (pp. 33-48). Geneva: The Geneva Academy of International Humanitarian Law and Human Rights, 2018.
- Fraser, T.G. *Arab-Israeli conflict* (2nd ed.). New York : Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.
- Glen Krutz, *American Government*, U. S. A, Rice University, 2017
- Golan, G. *Peace Plans, 1993-2010*. In J. Peters , & D .Newman (Eds), *The Routledge handbook on the Israeli Palestinian conflict* (pp. 92-106). London: Routledge, 2013.
- Greathouse, C. B. & Miner, J. S. *American strategic culture and its role in the 2002 and 2006 version of the national security strategy*. Retrieved from http://a-s.calayton-edu/trachnberg/2008/20%_PDF, 2008.
- Hamdi, O.A. *American foreign policy toward the Arab-Israeli conflict: strategic transformations*. *Insight Turkey*, Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/26390316>, 2018, 251-272.

Hay, J. The Arab-Israeli six-day war. Retrieved from

<https://books.google.dz/books?id=MoVmDwAAQBAJ&printsec=frontcover&dq=,2013>.

Kingsley, Patrick; Kershner, Isabel (10 May 2021). "After Raid on Aqsa Mosque, Rockets from Gaza and Israeli Airstrikes". The New York Times. Archived from the original on 10 May 2021. Retrieved 1 June 2021.

Kim, Byoung. Joo. Explaining the country patterns of foreign lobbying in the United States: issues, capabilities and norms, PhD thesis in Massachusetts Institute of technology, Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/17211/36095pdf>, 1999

Mead, W.R. *Special Providence: American Foreign Policy and How it Changed the World*. New York, NY: Routledge, 2002.

Mickey Edward, Stephen J. Solarz. Foreign policy tools: Aid, Defense and Force, Brookings, March 1st, 1997.

Milton-Edwards, B. *The Israeli-Palestinian conflict*, London: Routledge, 2009.

Milton-Edwards, B., & Farrell, S. *Hamas: the Islamic resistance movement*. Retrieved from <https://books.google.dz/books?id=ozLNNbwqlAEC&printsec=frontcover&dq= Hamas, 2010>.

Nasrallah, R. *The first and second Palestinian intifadas*, In J. Peters, & D. Newman (Eds), *The Routledge handbook on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict* (pp. 56-68). London: Routledge, 2013.

- Nasr. V. Trump's Big test in the Middle East, the Atlantic, November 25,2016.
- Payne, R. A. Trump and American Foreign Policy; A Threat to Peace and Prosperity? Annual Meeting of the International Studies Association, Louisville: University of Louisville,2017,pp.1-16.
- Peter Beaumont, Oliver Holmes. US confirms end to funding for UN Palestinian refugees, The Gardian, August 31,2018.
- Richard N. Haass, Think Tank and U. S foreign policy: A policy – makers perspective The Role of Think Tanks in U. S foreign policy, An Electronic journal of the U. S department of State, Vol (7), No (3), November 2002.
- Rinehart, C. S. (2018). President Trump and Jerusalem: The Effects of the Relocation of the American Embassy on the Israeli-Palestinian Peace Process,2018.
- Rosati, J. A., & Scott, J. M . *politics of United States foreign* (5th ed.), Boston ,MA: Wadsworth, Cengage Learning, 2011.
- Rucker, Philip; Costa, Robert. "Trump questions need for NATO, outlines noninterventionist foreign policy". The Washington Post, March 21,2016.
- Saleh ,M.M. *The Islamic resistance movement (hamas):an overview of its experience & history 1987-2015*.In M.M. Saleh (Ed), *Islamic resistance movement (hamas): studies of thought & experience* (pp.24-61).Beirut, Lebanon: AlZaytouna Center for Studies & Consultations ,2017.

- Sarles, Ruth. Kauffman, Bill (ed.). *A Story of America First: The Men and Women Who Opposed U.S. Intervention in World War II*, 2003.
- Sobel, Richard. *The Impact of Public Opinion on U.S. Foreign Policy since Vietnam: Constraining the Colossus*. New York, New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Suri, Jeremi . *Power and Protest: Global Revolution and the Rise of Détente*. Harvard University Press, 2003.
- Tilovska-Kechedji, E. *Israeli-Palestinian Relations: Waging for Peace or Lost Desperately . International E-Journal of Advances in Social Sciences, Vol. IV, Issue 10, 2018,pp.120-130.*
- Thompson, J. *Trump's Middle East Policy*. Retrieved from CSS ETH Zurich: <https://css.ethz.ch/content/dam/ethz/special-interest/gess/cis/center-for-securities-studies/pdfs/CSSAnalyse233-EN.pdf>, Octobre,2018.
- Wermenbol, G. *Israel-Palestine And The Deal Of The Century. U.S. Foreign Policy Under President Donald J. Trump 2017–2019*. Washington D.C: Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung, 2019.
- William T. Bianco and David T. Canon, *American Politics Today*, U. S. A, W. W. Norton & Company, Inc, 2013.
- Yergin, D. *Shattered peace: The origins of the cold war and the national security state*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin, 1978.

Youngs, T. Developments in the Middle East peace process 1991-2000. London: House of Commons Library,2001.

Zakaria, M. The Palestinian refugee problem: is there any hope for a sustainable solution? (Master's dissertation, School of International Migration and Ethnic Relations).Retrievedfrom <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/282251572>,2010.

Zanotti, J., Migdalovitz, C., Sharp, J. M., Addis, C. L., Blanchard, C. M., & Margesson, R. (2009). Israel and Hamas: conflict in Gaza Congressional Research Service ,2008-2009.

Zanotti, J. (2018). U.S. Foreign Aid to the Palestinians. Washington, D.C.: Congressional Research Service,2018.

Zanotti, J.Israel: Background and U.S. Relations in Brief,Retrieved from Congressional Research Service: <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/mideast/R44245.pdf>, December 6,2019.

ملخص

تُعرف السياسة الخارجية عمومًا بالقواعد التي يطبقها زعيم الدولة لتحقيق مصالحها ، مثل الولايات المتحدة. منذ ظهور الصراع الفلسطيني الإسرائيلي ، اختلفت السياسات التي اعتمدها مختلف قادة الولايات المتحدة من فترة إلى أخرى ومن رئيس إلى آخر. تحاول هذه الدراسة توضيح السياسة الخارجية الأمريكية تجاه الشرق الأوسط بشكل عام وتجاه القضية الفلسطينية بشكل خاص في ظل إدارة ترامب ، حيث تهدف إلى إلقاء الضوء على الخلفية النظرية للسياسة الخارجية الأمريكية وعلى تطورات الصراع وأحداثه البارزة. المناهج التي تم استخدامها لإنجاز هذه الدراسة هي المقاربات التاريخية والوصفية والتحليلية بالمنهج النوعي ، حيث تهدف الدراسة إلى وصف الأحداث التاريخية للصراع الفلسطيني الإسرائيلي المستمر وتحليل تأثير سياسات ترامب تجاه الصراع. تكمن أهمية هذه الدراسة في معالجة قضية حساسة بالنسبة للعالم العربي والإسلامي وكذلك في التفريق بين الاستراتيجيات المعتمدة وما يتم الإعلان عنه كمبادئ للسياسة الأمريكية. تظهر نتائج هذا البحث أن السياسة الخارجية الأمريكية منحازة لإسرائيل في حلولها بينما تتجاهل مكانة فلسطين كدولة وحقوقها في تقرير المصير. وهكذا كانت السياسات التي تبنتها إدارة ترامب من وجهة نظر إدارة المشكلة بدلاً من حلها.

الكلمات المفتاحية: السياسة الخارجية للولايات المتحدة ، الشرق الأوسط ، الصراع الفلسطيني الإسرائيلي ، إدارة ترامب.