



Bulletin of Islamic Research

ISSN (Online): 3031-4526

Received: 15-12-2024, Revised: 15-01-2025

Accepted: 15-02-2025, Published: 11-03-2025

DOI: 10.69526/bir.v3i2.331

The Gaza Ceasefire Deal and the Trump Administration: Politics, Prospects, and Implications

Mukhtar Imam¹

Abstract

The Gaza ceasefire deal brokered during the Trump administration represents a critical moment in the ongoing Israeli-Palestinian conflict. This study examines the political dynamics, key stakeholders, and broader implications of the ceasefire, with a particular focus on the role of the U.S. government in facilitating the agreement. Using a qualitative approach with a library research method, this study analyzes various sources, including official documents, diplomatic reports, academic literature, and media publications. The research employs discourse analysis and content analysis to assess the motivations behind the ceasefire, its impact on regional stability, and its significance in shaping U.S. foreign policy. Findings indicate that the agreement, while providing temporary relief, does not resolve the fundamental political and territorial disputes driving the conflict. The study highlights the strategic interests of Israel, Hamas, Egypt, and Qatar, as well as the geopolitical considerations of the Trump administration in brokering the deal. This research contributes to a deeper understanding of the ceasefire's long-term prospects and the broader challenges of achieving lasting peace in the Middle East. It underscores the complexities of U.S. involvement in the conflict and the ongoing struggle for Palestinian sovereignty. Future studies should explore the evolving role of international actors in mediating peace efforts and addressing the humanitarian crisis in Gaza.

Keywords: Gaza; Ceasefire; Deal; Trump Administration; Politics; Prospects; Implications.

¹ Almuhibbah Open University, Abuja, Nigeria, Email: mukhtarimam01@gmail.com

Introduction

The Israeli-Palestinian conflict is one of the most enduring and complex disputes in modern history. The Gaza Strip, a densely populated and impoverished territory, has been a focal point of this conflict, experiencing repeated cycles of violence and temporary ceasefires. The Trump administration's involvement in brokering a ceasefire deal in Gaza marked a significant moment in U.S. foreign policy, reflecting both the administration's unconventional approach to the Middle East and the broader geopolitical dynamics at play.

This article explores the politics, prospects, and implications of the Gaza ceasefire deal under the Trump administration. It begins with a historical overview of the conflict and the role of previous U.S. administrations in mediating peace efforts. The article then delves into the specifics of the ceasefire deal, analyzing the motivations and strategies of key stakeholders, including the U.S., Israel, Hamas, and regional actors such as Egypt and Qatar. Finally, the article assesses the broader implications of the ceasefire for regional stability, U.S. foreign policy, and the prospects for a lasting peace in the Middle East.

Method

This study employs a qualitative approach using the library research method to analyze the Gaza ceasefire agreement during the Trump administration. This approach is chosen as the research focuses on gaining an in-depth understanding of the political dynamics, key stakeholders' interests, and the implications of U.S. foreign policy in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. The data used in this study come from official documents, diplomatic reports, academic articles, and credible media publications to ensure the validity of the analysis.

Data collection is conducted through documentation techniques, examining various literature related to the Gaza conflict and U.S. foreign policy. The data obtained are analyzed using discourse analysis and content analysis methods to identify the political motives behind the ceasefire agreement and its impact on regional stability and U.S. diplomatic strategies. The analysis process involves data reduction, thematic presentation, and drawing conclusions relevant to the research objectives.

The findings of this study are expected to provide insights into how U.S. policies, particularly under the Trump administration, have influenced the dynamics of the Gaza conflict and the prospects for peace in the Middle East. Additionally, this research contributes to understanding the role of countries such as Egypt and Qatar as mediators in this conflict. By utilizing a systematic

approach, this study aims to offer a comprehensive analysis of the Gaza ceasefire agreement and its potential long-term consequences.

Result and Discussion

Historical Context

The Israeli-Palestinian Conflict: A Brief Overview

The roots of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict can be traced back to the late 19th and early 20th centuries, with the rise of nationalist movements among both Jews and Arabs in the region. The conflict intensified following the establishment of the State of Israel in 1948, which led to the displacement of hundreds of thousands of Palestinians and the creation of a refugee crisis that persists to this day [1]. The Gaza Strip, occupied by Egypt from 1948 to 1967, came under Israeli control following the Six-Day War in 1967. Since then, Gaza has been a flashpoint in the conflict, with repeated outbreaks of violence between Israeli forces and Palestinian militant groups, particularly Hamas [2].

U.S. Involvement in the Conflict

The United States has played a central role in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict since the mid-20th century, often acting as a mediator in peace negotiations. U.S. policy has generally been supportive of Israel, providing significant military and economic aid, while also advocating for a two-state solution to the conflict [3]. However, the U.S. approach has varied significantly across administrations. For example, the Clinton administration brokered the Oslo Accords in the 1990s, which aimed to establish a framework for peace but ultimately collapsed due to implementation failures and ongoing violence [4]. The Obama administration attempted to revive peace talks, but these efforts were unsuccessful, leading to increased tensions and violence in the region [5].

The Trump Administration's Approach to the Middle East

The Trump administration's approach to the Middle East was characterized by a strong alignment with Israel and a willingness to challenge traditional U.S. policies. Key decisions, such as recognizing Jerusalem as Israel's capital and relocating the U.S. embassy, were widely criticized by the international community and the Palestinians, who viewed them as undermining the prospects for a two-state solution [6]. At the same time, the administration sought to broker peace deals between Israel and its Arab neighbors, culminating in the Abraham Accords, which normalized relations between Israel and several Arab states [7]. These agreements were seen as a diplomatic achievement but raised questions about the future of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and the U.S. role in mediating peace efforts.

The Gaza Ceasefire Deal: Politics and Prospects The Path to the Ceasefire

The Gaza ceasefire deal brokered by the Trump administration came in the context of escalating violence between Israel and Hamas. In 2018, tensions in Gaza reached a boiling point with the "Great March of Return" protests, which called for an end to the Israeli blockade and the right of return for Palestinian refugees. These protests were met with a harsh Israeli response, resulting in hundreds of Palestinian casualties [8]. The violence escalated further in 2019, with repeated rounds of rocket fire from Gaza and Israeli airstrikes.

In this context, the Trump administration, working through intermediaries such as Egypt and Qatar, brokered a ceasefire agreement in late 2019. The deal included mutual commitments, such as a halt to rocket fire from Gaza and a reduction in Israeli airstrikes, as well as measures to ease the economic blockade of Gaza [9].

Realist Consideration of the Intricacies around the Cease Fire

First, Trump and the US administrations are trying to portray a bloodthirsty warmonger as a peacemaker. Second, it allowed him to claim the forced withdrawal a victory, which in addition relieved Israel of the burden of an occupation that was proving too costly. Third, it helped cover up Netanyahu's stepped-up annexation of the West Bank to make way for more Zionist settlements. And Netanyahu knows Israel can always go back to Gaza any time it wants. And return it will. An Israeli ceasefire in Gaza is merely an opportunity to seize—and fire following a cessation of hostilities. Now, with almost 50,000 Palestinians dead, and several thousand injured, Zionist troops have hinted at beating a retreat; but this retreat, like the others before it, is merely a tactic of war, [10].

When it left Beirut in 1978, for instance, it was only a matter of time before it returned, which it did in 1982; and as it blasted its way back on October 16, 1983, it attacked an Ashura procession in Nabatiya and directly helped in the creation of Hizbullah. And when the Israeli Defence Force was forced to flee South Lebanon in 2000, the plan to return was already in place; and the IDF came in 2006 and again in 2024 for the coup de grace—its own, [11].

Today, there is too much at stake for a permanent cessation of hostilities. There is the small issue of Jared Kushner's impossible redrawing of the map of a New Middle East to finish; there is Israel's relentless expansionism towards David Ben-Gurion's natural borders for Israel at the Jordan and Litani rivers; and there are the countless treasures below the Dead Sea to mine. And suddenly,

there is the Gaza gas which is so abundant that, if exploited, the Strip will become as rich and affluent as Kuwait.

But even without the gas reserves, this murderous assault on Gaza will not have been untypical of Zionist terror in Palestine from the Mandate period to the current era of Netanyahu hubris: the overkill has in fact been ably presaged by Deir Yassin in 1948, Qibya in 1953, Beirut, and especially, Sabra and Shatilla, in 1982, Qana in 1996, Sheba Farms in 2000, Jenin in 2002 and Beirut again in 2006, among others. And the central figure in all these tragedies had been Ariel Sharon and today, Benjamin Netanyahu—in the earlier, his tutors, in the latter, his students.

It has always been driven by the fact of US desire for domination in the Middle East, Israel's hunger for territory and water or the mineral resources of Palestine. For these, they are ready to commit any crime.

Writing in *Counter Punch* on November 27, (2006), Kathleen and Bill Christison painted a graphic, sad and moving picture of the reality of life in Gaza: "Children shot to death sitting in school classrooms here, families murdered while tilling their land there; agricultural land stripped and burned here, farmers cut off from their land there; little girls riddled with bullets here, infants beheaded by shell fire there; a little massacre here, a little starvation there; expulsion here, denial of entry and families torn apart there; dispossession is the name of the game. With no functioning economy, dwindling food supplies, medical supply shortages, no way to move from one area to another, no access to a capital city, no easy access to education or medical care, no civil service salaries, the people will die, the nation will die without a single gas chamber. Or so the Israelis hope." These words resonate with today's reality on the ground in Gaza. It appears as though a *Déjà vu*.

The *Neturei Karta*, the Guardian of the City [of Jerusalem] a community of pious orthodox Jews, who do not recognise the Zionist state, described Israel as a secular anticipation of the religious Messiah, and is a state "conceived in atheism, based on materialism, nurtured by anti-Semitism, led by Marxism, ruled by chauvinism, and trusting in militarism".

As noted by Tascha Shahriari-Parsa, "Operation Protective Edge is the war of a colonial state dedicated to expanding its theft of Palestine's natural resources ... incarcerating and bombing its people in the world's biggest open air prison, while growing rich at their expense. What they seek in Gaza is merely access to Palestine's underground riches ... Behind the operation, behind the mass Israeli and US propaganda attempting to justify the massacre, and behind the death of every child in Gaza is a conflict rarely discussed—an imperialist

conflict and a contradiction that rests on Israel's ambitions to appropriate and profit from Gaza's natural gas resources [12]."

Quoting in detail a former Israeli chief of staff Moshe Ya'alon back in 2007 when, in answer to comments on Gaza's gas riches, he laid bare Israel's true motives. "Proceeds of a Palestinian gas sale to Israel would likely not trickle down to help an impoverished Palestinian public," he said. "Rather, based on Israel's past experience, the proceeds will likely serve to fund further terror attacks against Israel ... A gas transaction with the Palestinian Authority will, by definition, involve Hamas. Hamas will either benefit from the royalties or it will sabotage the project and launch attacks against Fatah, the gas installations, Israel - or all three ... It is clear that without an overall military operation to uproot Hamas control of Gaza, no drilling work can take place without the consent of the radical Islamic movement."

In other words, since Hamas is unlikely to agree to deal with Israel; or, if it does, it will become rich enough to procure arms, then it must go. And with Arab kings hailing Israel as better than Hamas and paying for their liquidation, and with the United States reiterating Israel's so-called right to self-defence, there is in fact nothing to stop Israel, except perhaps the cost it has begun taking. Israel is also not inapprehensive of the possibility of Yemen and Iran joining the war.

With the United States guaranteeing its existence and underwriting its war expenditure, it is in fact America that is fighting the Muslims of Hamas. According to Tom Marcellus of the Institute for Historical Review, 'In 1970 about 1% of the total U.S. foreign aid budget wound up in Israel's pocket. In 1971 Israel knocked on Congress's door for 7.4% and it was verily opened unto them. In 1974 "the only democracy in a sea of Arab tyranny" wanted 28% of our foreign aid budget and got it - a figure that jumped to nearly 35% in 1976. These figures do not even include America's indirect subsidies such as tax-free Israeli bond sales here, tax-exempt donations and bribe money to Egypt.

The figure will probably top \$10 billion in fiscal 1984 - but no George F. Will or Geraldo Rivera will dare highlight these facts in juxtaposition to the growing financial crunch said to be besetting our own economy.' By the time Marcellus was writing this, Israel had received a total of \$251 billion, and, more importantly, it enjoyed American diplomatic and military cover as American mother-hen dilutes, disregards or vetoes countless UN resolutions on behalf of Israel, and as the Zionist state itself ignores, violates or defies what watered-down versions of hundreds of UN resolutions the world body is finally able to pass. And according to the Congressional Research Service, within the past few decades American hand-out to Israel has been of the order of \$3 billion annually 'under an agreement signed by the Bush administration to transfer \$30 billion to

Israel over ten years, starting in 2009'; and since the beginning of 2013, for example, Israel has received from the United States over \$8.5 million every single day and as the genocide continued under Biden, this figure increased exponentially. Things are not about to change under the Trump administration.

But the cost of Israel to the US and the world is much more than all that. We must add the \$1.6 billion bribe money that the US gives Egypt and Jordan annually to keep out of the war against Israel. Pamela Olson, a scholar and veteran researcher at the Institute for Defense Analysis, said many experts believe, the US would not have invaded Iraq without intense and sustained pressure from Washington insiders who advocate actively on behalf of Israel, and this adds yet another dimension of staggering cost to the equation: "hundreds of billions of dollars, 4,000-plus U.S. and allied fatalities, untold tens of thousands of Iraqi deaths, and many thousands of other US, allied, and Iraqi casualties," according to retired US foreign service officer Shirl McArthur. "Nobel Prize-winning economist Joseph Stiglitz and Harvard professor Linda Bilmes put the cost of the Iraq War at over \$3 trillion, and incalculably more if you take into account the opportunity costs of the resources spent on this unproductive war."

And if the Muslim World, against which all this is being perpetrated, holds the United States responsible for Israeli crimes, like the current one in Gaza, another American president may wonder 'why they hate us', which is a typical go-to place for President Trump.

Nonetheless, the US will not be bothered: it bases its concern and ground for involvement in the Middle East conflict on what it sees as its leadership of the world; and it bases its bias for Israel on their possession of a mutual Judeo-Christian root, which, even if true, shouldn't have been ground for US foreign policy to depart from justice to support an aggressor, but it is all utterly false; and it justifies its monopoly of the search for a solution on its so-called honest brokerage.

All of these are totally untrue: Gaza has exposed the falsity of all the three. The US leads no one in the world but its imagination; and as the African saying has it, if it leads and no one follows willingly, the US is merely taking a walk. As for Judeo-Christian heritage, it is a contradiction in terms in view of Israel's attitude to Christianity; and, as to the peace process in the Middle East, dishonest brokerage is too mild a term—indeed, an understatement—to describe US attitude to, and handling of, the Middle East crisis.

If there is anything that will forever deny the US that very coveted leadership role is precisely the way it has handled the Middle East conflict and Trump's threat to conquer, confiscate and colonise Gaza is more than anything else evident. Its kowtowing to Israel is unfortunate and cowardly, and a blatant

betrayal of their own Founding Fathers. It is difficult to believe that the authors of the great Declaration of Independence and the Federalist Papers would have countenanced a United States of America that would have sunk so low on the international moral scale.

Zionists advance claims of their inheritance of the land, and this is perhaps the most spurious of their claims. Claiming presence in Palestine 2,000 years ago, which was not untrue; but the Palestinians have themselves been there for more than 3,000 years. Zionist claim rests on the fact their ancestors had established an empire in Palestine. First of all this is not true because the ancestors of Zionists were not from the Holy Land. Arthur Koestler, himself a Zionist, pointed this fact out in *The Thirteenth Tribe*, his seminal work on the European stock that was grafted onto the 12 known tribes of Jews [13].

All these Ashkenazi Jews who migrated to Palestine from Germany, Poland, Ukraine, and Russia should go back where they came from, not least because they have never had any ancestral or any connection with Palestine – they being Mongoloid Caucasian and the Jews of Moses [AS] being Near-Eastern Semitic. True they are Jewish by religion today, but the adoption of religion has never conferred extra-territorial rights of citizenship on any believer. If today someone embraces Shintoism or Zen Buddhism, that won't qualify him for automatic citizenship of, or a right to return to, the land of Japan.

So, if a group of Italians today woke up intending to recover the Holy Roman Empire in the Middle of Europe because their ancestors once ruled an empire that covered this territory, would they be in the right? And if, in trying to realize their dream, they start annexing parts of Spain, chunks of France, all of Austria, Switzerland, the Benelux, Greece, the Balkans, and the Bosphorus, will US foreign policy come to their aid? Or if some Madinka tribesmen today decide to lay claim to Parts of Mauritania, Mali, Burkina Faso, parts of Senegambia, Guinea, Niger Republic, northern parts of Benin, and north-western Nigeria, because their ancestors once ruled an empire over this territory, will the US Department of State and the Defence Department come to their aid to recover, recreate and protect Songhai Empire?

But the reality was that it had nothing to do with Judeo-Christianity. When, three years before the creation of Israel, American diplomats were brought in from their posts in the Middle East to urge Truman not to heed Zionist urgings to create Israel, Truman bluntly explained why: "I'm sorry, gentlemen, but I have to answer to hundreds of thousands who are anxious for the success of Zionism: I do not have hundreds of thousands of Arabs among my constituents."

But if European Zionists have no claim over the land of Palestine, the Jews of the Middle East certainly have one – those of them, if any, who remained after

the Great Dispersion. They did have an empire in history – the empire of Judah; but they should have added that it lasted only 76 years out of the several millennia of the history of the Holy Land and it covered only a few barren hills. If they could rest their case for coming back on this untenable ground, what of Palestinians who had continuously occupied all of the rest of Palestine even before the Jews came and have continued to do so after they had dispersed?

When all else fails, Zionists fall back on God's Great Promise to Abraham [AS]. But what does it mean: a promise to Abraham [AS]? First of all, as David Ben-Gurion, Israel's first prime minister, said in a moment of Zionist candor, the God Who promised them Palestine, or to whose spiritual bounty they gave a materialist interpretation, is not the God of the Palestinians, so, why should they be bound by the legality or consequences of His generosity? And the rest of the world will not even begin to understand, countenance or accept the concept of a tribal God who could do something so unjust – and to a nation soaked in terror and blood.

Yet all this is to prove to the world that they have a right to return, but it is this right of return with which they justify their claim to Palestine that they wish to deny the Palestinians who have a greater claim to the land. And suppose God did indeed promise and give Palestine to the seed of Abraham [AS] in the sense of physical ownership of the land in perpetuity; for God can do as He pleases, and Abraham [AS] was of such spiritual stature that every of his prayer was answered. But he was himself neither of the one nor the other: he was father and patriarch to both branches of his Semitic progeny; so why do the Zionists exclude Arabs from the covenant?

And if the resort to the promise fails, they fall back on the Holocaust which is supposed to elicit such powerful, visceral outpouring of sympathy and guilt in a world that 'allowed' this to happen to the ancient people of God. Why is it that each and every idea in this world, including the fact of the existence of God, can be questioned but you dare not question the Holocaust? Why is Zionism so afraid of an inquiry being launched into it? Why is it the only idea that you cannot question in a West that pretends to be the successor to the Enlightenment and dedicated to, and guided by, the spirit of scientific inquiry and the freedom of speech?

And if we cannot question it, why should we believe it, especially in a situation where hundreds of academic tomes by scholars of international repute disproving it are given the silent treatment? So, where is just the proof of it? Just because Hollywood has made so many hundreds of films of the 'bad Germans'? Or because of those pictures of emaciated bodies? Or because there are so-called survivors? Or because they have built the Yad Vashem to it? Or, is it because the

world has to be reminded about it now and again? But suppose it took place, why should it have to fall the lot of Palestinians to bear the burden of a world payback?

But in all this, at least one thing has become clear: that the Arab regimes have taken on a responsibility beyond their capacity. At the end of the Six-Day War, they called an Arab summit in the Sudanese capital and issued the Khartoum Declaration on September 1, 1967 spelling out their conditions – no peace with Israel, no negotiations with Israel, no recognition of Israel, and the ‘maintenance of the rights of the Palestinian people in their nation.’

At the end of it all, all these unequivocal No’s of the Khartoum Declaration had become unequivocal Yes’s. Arab regimes have negotiated and made peace with Israel – and left Palestinians in the lurch. Only Islam will liberate Palestine; but it is an Islam grounded in knowledge and based on justice that can – and will – defeat Zionism and its Western allies and establish a unified Palestinian state in which Jews, Christians, and Muslims will live peacefully as equal citizens, just as they have been doing for more than a thousand years before the arrival of the Zionists.

And if any of the European Ashkenazi and the Sephardim elect to stay on in Palestine – and after more than a quarter century, they are qualified and entitled to do so – they must do so at the pleasure of the Palestinians, the owners of the land, just as the religious, truly Mosaic Orthodox Jews of the Neturei Karta have been saying for the past 66 years. Trump’s threat to take over the land will certainly jeopardize the already fragile situation in Gaza and indeed the entire region.

Key Stakeholders and Their Motivations

The ceasefire involved a complex set of stakeholders, each with distinct motivations:

- The Trump Administration: The deal was part of a broader strategy to reshape U.S. policy in the Middle East, reflecting the administration’s strong support for Israel and its desire for a foreign policy victory [14].
- Israel: For Israel, the ceasefire was a pragmatic response to ongoing violence, offering a reprieve while addressing some underlying issues [15].
- Hamas: Hamas sought relief from the economic blockade and aimed to consolidate its political position in Gaza, though the deal posed risks to its legitimacy [16].

- Egypt and Qatar: These nations acted as intermediaries, with Egypt seeking to reduce tensions on its border and Qatar aiming to strengthen its regional influence [17].

Prospects for the Ceasefire

The ceasefire's prospects are tied to the broader dynamics of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. While the deal offered a reprieve, the underlying issues – such as the status of Jerusalem, the right of return for refugees, and the humanitarian crisis in Gaza – remain unresolved [18]. Additionally, the lack of trust between the parties and the potential for external shocks, such as shifts in U.S. policy, pose significant challenges to the ceasefire's sustainability [19].

Implications of the Ceasefire

Regional Stability

The ceasefire has important implications for regional stability. While it offers a temporary reduction in tensions, the unresolved political issues driving the conflict mean that the region is likely to remain unstable in the long term [20].

U.S. Foreign Policy

The Trump administration's approach to the ceasefire reflected its broader Middle East strategy, which prioritized alignment with Israel and challenged traditional U.S. policies. This approach undermined the U.S.'s credibility as a neutral mediator and complicated efforts to achieve a lasting peace (Ross, 2004). The Biden administration faces the challenge of reengaging with the conflict while addressing the humanitarian crisis in Gaza and rebuilding trust with Palestinian leaders [21].

The Prospects for Peace

The ceasefire highlights the challenges of achieving a lasting peace in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Without significant progress on the underlying political issues, the prospects for peace remain uncertain, and the region is likely to continue experiencing cycles of violence and temporary ceasefires [22].

Conclusion

The Gaza ceasefire deal brokered by the Trump administration represents a significant but fragile moment in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. While the deal offers a reprieve from violence, it does not address the underlying political issues driving the conflict. The prospects for the ceasefire are closely tied to the broader dynamics of the region, and without significant progress on the political front, the region is likely to remain unstable. The ceasefire also has important implications for U.S. foreign policy and the prospects for peace in the Middle

East, highlighting the challenges of achieving a lasting resolution to one of the world's most intractable conflicts.

Author Contributions

Mukhtar Imam: Conceptualization, Methodology, Writing – review & editing, Supervision, Project administration.

Acknowledgment

I would like to thank for Almuhibbah Open University and an anonymous reviewer for providing valuable input on these papers.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Funding

This research did not receive any financial support.

Bibliography

- [1] Adamu A. (2014); Daily trust Newspaper. Gaza Ceasefire I & II.
- [2] Bregman, A. (2014). *Cursed Victory: A History of Israel and the Occupied Territories*. Penguin Books.
- [3] Gelvin, J. L. (2014). *The Israel-Palestine Conflict: One Hundred Years of War*. Cambridge University Press.
- [4] Khalidi, R. (2020). *The Hundred Years' War on Palestine: A History of Settler Colonialism and Resistance, 1917–2017*. Metropolitan Books.
- [5] Morris, B. (2001). *Righteous Victims: A History of the Zionist-Arab Conflict, 1881–2001*. Vintage Books.
- [6] Pappé, I. (2006). *The Ethnic Cleansing of Palestine*. Oneworld Publications.
- [7] Quandt, W. B. (2005). *Peace Process: American Diplomacy and the Arab-Israeli Conflict since 1967*. Brookings Institution Press.
- [8] Ross, D. (2004). *The Missing Peace: The Inside Story of the Fight for Middle East Peace*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- [9] Shlaim, A. (2001). *The Iron Wall: Israel and the Arab World*. W.W. Norton & Company.
- [10] Smith, C. D. (2016). *Palestine and the Arab-Israeli Conflict: A History with Documents*. Bedford/St. Martin's.

- [11] Tessler, M. (2009). *A History of the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict*. Indiana University Press.
- [12] T. Brück, M. d'Errico, and R. Pietrelli, "The effects of violent conflict on household resilience and food security: Evidence from the 2014 Gaza conflict," *World Dev.*, vol. 119, 2019.
- [13] T. Farhat, S. Ibrahim, Z. Abdul-Sater, and G. Abu-Sittah, "Responding to the Humanitarian Crisis in Gaza: Damned if You do... Damned if You don't!," *Ann. Glob. Heal.*, vol. 89, no. 1, 2023.
- [14] S. Milton, G. Elkahlout, and S. Barakat, "Protecting higher education from attack in the Gaza Strip," *Compare*, vol. 53, no. 6, 2023.
- [15] S. Jalala, G. Latifoğlu, and H. Uzunboylyu, "Strength-based approach for building resilience in school children: The case of Gaza," *An. Psicol.*, vol. 36, no. 1, 2020.
- [16] R. R. El Kishawi, K. L. Soo, Y. A. Abed, and W. A. M. W. Muda, "Prevalence and associated factors influencing stunting in children aged 2-5years in the Gaza Strip-Palestine: A cross-sectional study," *BMC Pediatr.*, vol. 17, no. 1, 2017.
- [17] M. Nijim, "Genocide in Palestine: Gaza as a case study," *Int. J. Hum. Rights*, vol. 27, no. 1, 2023.
- [18] E. Radwan, A. Radwan, and W. Radwan, "The role of social media in spreading panic among primary and secondary school students during the COVID-19 pandemic: An online questionnaire study from the Gaza Strip, Palestine," *Heliyon*, vol. 6, no. 12, 2020.
- [19] F. Abreek-Zubiedat and A. Nitzan-Shiftan, "The right to an urban history: The Gaza Master Plan, 1975-1982," *Environ. Plan. D Soc. Sp.*, vol. 39, no. 2, 2021.
- [20] S. AlWaheidi, "Breast cancer in Gaza-a public health priority in search of reliable data," *Ecancermedicalsecience*, vol. 13, 2019.
- [21] S. Barakat, S. Milton, and G. Elkahlout, "Reconstruction under siege: the Gaza Strip since 2007," *Disasters*, vol. 44, no. 3, 2020.
- [22] G. M. Andreou, M. Fradley, L. Blue, and C. Breen, "Establishing a baseline for the study of maritime cultural heritage in the Gaza Strip," *Palest. Explor. Q.*, vol. 156, no. 1, 2024.

Copyright

© 2025 The Author(s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC-BY 4.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited. See <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>.