

EDITIONS DAR EL MOUTANABBI

دار المتنبي للطباعة والنشر

دار المتنبي للطباعة والنشر شهادة لنشر

تشهد وتتشرف دار المتنبي للطباعة والنشر ب:
نشر وطباعة كتاب مشترك
الموسوم ب:

American Foreign Policy Through The Lens of Rawls's Theory of Justice: Revisiting the Liberal Attitude Towards the Israeli- Palestinian Issue Post Oslo

تأليف

Pr. Slimane Melouki / Pr. Noureddine Zebda / Dr. Youcef Benna

المسجل إداريا برقم الإيداع القانوني

ردمك (ISBN): 978_9969_04_120_0

مدیر دار النشر



دار المتنبي للطباعة والنشر



بتاريخ: 09 جانفي 2025

مقر دار النشر: حي تعاونية الشيخ المقراني
طريق اشبيليا مقابل جامعة محمد بوضياف - المسيلة
التواصل مع دار النشر: elmotanaby.dz@gmail.com
الهاتف: 0773.30.52.82 / 0668.14.49.75
فاكس: 035.35.31.03



Scan Our QR Code



2025 January

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY THROUGH THE LENS OF RAWLS'S THEORY OF JUSTICE: REVISITING THE LIBERAL ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE ISRAELI-PALESTINIAN ISSUE POST OSLO

Pr. Slimane Melouki

Pr. Nouredine Zebda

Dr. Youcef Benna



The subject of social justice was and still a demand and obsession of human societies and the aspiration of many philosophers and political theorists, who presented a comprehensive vision on politics. Rawls 's principles of justice assume an original situation in which complete equality prevails within the group that will agree on those principles. Complete equality in an original situation is a situation in which class divisions, exploitation or class privileges towards The strength and persistence of civic activities, throughout the History of the United States, in pursuit of justice.

720.00 DA

ISBN
978 9969 04 120 0



9 789969 041200

جميع الحقوق محفوظة
سنة النشر: 1446 هـ / 2025 م

مقر دار النشر: حي تعاونية الشيخ المقراني
طريق اشيليا مقابل جامعة محمد بوضياف
المسيلة - الجزائر

التواصل مع دار النشر: elmotanaby.dz@gmail.com

الهاتف: 0773.30.52.82 / 0668.14.49.75

فاكس: 035.35.31.03



امسح الرمز



Scan Our QR Code



**American Foreign Policy Through
The Lens of Rawls's Theory of
Justice: Revisiting the Liberal
Attitude Towards the Israeli-
Palestinian Issue Post Oslo**

Pr. Slimane Melouki

Pr. Nouredine Zebda

Dr. Youcef Benna

- The title of the book: **American Foreign Policy Through The Lens of Rawls's Theory of Justice: Revisiting the Liberal Attitude Towards the Israeli-Palestinian Issue Post Oslo**
- **Authors:** Pr. Slimane Melouki
Pr. Nouredine Zebda
Dr. Youcef Bennaï
- **Internal format of the book:** Dar Al-Mutanabi pour l'impression et l'édition
- **Book size:** 17/25
- **First edition**
- **Editor:** Dar Al-Mutanabi pour l'impression et l'édition
- **The specified international number**
- **ISBN:** :978 _ 9969 _ 04 _ 120 _ 0
- **Dépôt légal:** January/2025
- **Rights:** Tous droits réservés ©
- **Seat:** Quartier coopératif Sheikh Al-Moqrani/Route Ichbilya
En face de l'université de Mohammed Boudiaf /M'sila-Alger
- **To contact the house:**
- **Email address:** elmotanaby.dz@gmail.com
- **WebSite:** <https://elmotanaby.com>
- **Phone:** 0773.30.52.82/ 0668.14.49.75
- **Fax:** 035.35.31.03



**Pr. Slimane Melouki
Pr. Noureddine Zebda
Dr. Youcef Benna**

**American Foreign Policy Through
The Lens of Rawls's Theory of
Justice: Revisiting the Liberal
Attitude Towards the Israeli-
Palestinian Issue Post Oslo**

2025

DEDICATION

**To Our Teachers .To Those who want to die as
a martyrs**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface	11
Part One: John Rawls Biography	13
Early life	13
Military Service	14
Academic Career	15
Part Two; John Rawls Bibliography	16
Theory of Justice. Book Analyses	16
Political Liberalism	17
The Law of Peoples	18
Value of John Rawls in the American Foreign Policy	20
Part Three: John Rawls. Justice Theory Analysis	21
Justice Theory Analysis	21
Social Justice according to Rawls	22
Justice and Democracy	24
Part Four: American Political Thought Recourses.....	31
Jeffersonian Democracy	31
Jacksonian Democracy	32
Jacksonian principles.....	34
Part Five: American Making Decision.	41

Stages of political decision-making43

Who Decides in America?.....44

Lobbies pressure.....45

Means of influence.....46

Mechanisms Used by the United States of America to Spread Democracy.....52

Part Six: American Foreign Policy Towards The Israeli-Palestinian Issue55

American Relationship With The Israeli -Palestinian Conflict56

American Israeli Support60

a/ Financial Support.....60

b/ Military and Technological Support62

c/ Political and Diplomatic Support.....64

Part Seven: The Relationship of The American Stance Towards the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict.....66

A/ American option and shifts towards Palestinians66

The forces Supporting The Israeli Cause in American Society On Behalf Democracy and The Just Cause of Israel To Exist .68

1/ Conservative Democrats68

2/ Pro-Israel Lobbyists.....69

3/ American Jewish Democrats69

4/Progressive pro-Israel groups69

First American Stance70

**1/American Democracy Circumvents Laws In Support of Israel
.....70**

A/ Republican US Congress71

Second American Stance72

**The forces supporting the Palestinian cause in American society
.....74**

**Perspective Vision of The Relationship of The American Stances
Towards The Israeli - Palestinian Conflict76**

General Conclusion83

References87

Preface

The subject of social justice was and still is a demand and obsession of human societies and the aspiration and dream of many philosophers and political theorists, who presented a comprehensive vision on this subject through his books on politics, in which he directed his harsh criticism of the utilitarian trend that only concerned By focusing on the public good without concern for the rights of minorities. Rawls's principles of justice as assume an original situation in which complete equality prevails within the group that will agree on those principles. Complete equality in an original situation means a situation in which class divisions, exploitation or class privileges do not exist. The strength and persistence of civic activities, throughout the history of the United States, in pursuit of justice.

Part One: John Rawls Biography

John Bordley Rawls is born on February 21, 1921 - died November 24, 2002) was a moral and political philosopher in the liberal tradition. Rawls received both the Schick Prize in Logic and Philosophy and the National Medal in the Humanities in 1999, presented to him by President Bill Clinton, in recognition of Rawls's literary influence in "helping an entire generation of educated Americans to revive their faith in democracy itself. " Rawls is considered a theorist and founder of social liberalism, concerned with social justice. The English philosopher Jonathan Wolfe says, "There may be a dispute about the second most important political philosopher of the 20th century, but no one will disagree that the first most important philosopher is: John Rawls. "1

Early life

Rawls was born in Baltimore, Maryland, the second of five children of William Lee Rawls, "one of the most prominent lawyers in Baltimore", and Anna Abel Stamp Rawls. Tragedy struck Rawls at an early age: two of his brothers died in childhood from a disease fatal to him. Rawls's biographer Thomas Pugh describes the loss of the brothers as "the most important event in John's childhood". Rawls attended Calvert School in Baltimore for six years, before transferring to Kent School, an Episcopal preparatory school in Connecticut. After graduating in 1939, Rawls attended Princeton University, where he graduated summa cum laude and was accepted into the American Society of Free Philosophers. "2

¹ -Jonathan Wolfe, *A Critical Inquiry*, Vol. 20, No. 1. New York. (Autumn, 1993), pp. 36–68.

² -Ibid.p70.

He became deeply interested in theology and its doctrines" during his final two years at Princeton. He considered enrolling in a theological seminary to study for the Episcopal priesthood and wrote "a large, extensive religious treatise. Rawls was influenced by Norman Malcolm, a student of Wittgenstein, at Princeton. He completed his Bachelor of Arts degree in 1943, and enlisted in the Army in February of that year. ¹

Military Service

Rawls served as an infantryman in the Pacific during World War II, where he toured New Guinea and was awarded a Bronze Star; he toured the Philippines, where he withstood intense trench warfare and witnessed horrific sights like that of a soldier He takes off his helmet and puts a bullet in his head, instead of continuing the war. Therefore, he lost his faith in Christianity. After the Japanese surrender, Rawls became part of General Mac Arthur's army of occupation, achieving the rank of sergeant. But he became disillusioned with the armed forces when he saw the effects of the atomic explosion in Hiroshima. Rawls subsequently disobeyed an order to discipline a fellow soldier, believing there was no justification for punishment, and was demoted to private. He left the army in January 1946, disillusioned. After his military service.

¹-Edmundson, W., 2017, John Rawls: Reticent Socialist, Cambridge University Press. Fleming, J, (ed.), 2004, Fordham Law Review 72 (special issue).p22

Academic Career

Rawls returned to Princeton to pursue a doctorate in moral philosophy, in early 1946. He married Margaret Warfield Fox, a graduate of Brown University, in 1949. They had four children, Anne Warfield, Robert E. Lee, Alexander Emory and Elizabeth Fox. After receiving his doctorate from Princeton in 1950, Rawls taught there until 1952 when he was awarded a Fulbright Fellowship from the University of Oxford (Christ Church), where he was influenced by the liberal historian and political scholar Isaiah Berlin and the legal scholar Herbert Hart. He worked first as an assistant and then as an associate professor at Cornell University, after returning to the United States

He moved to Harvard University, in the same year, where he taught for nearly forty years, training some of the leading contemporary figures in moral and political philosophy, including Thomas Nagel, Alan Gibbard, Honora O'Neill, Adrian Piper. He held the James Bryant Conant Professorship at Harvard.¹

Rawls rarely gave interviews due to a stutter (caused in part by the death of two of his brothers, due to Rawls' infection) and "like a bat afraid of being in the public eye", he never became a public intellectual despite his fame. Instead, he remained committed mainly to his academic and family life. He suffered multiple strokes for the first time, in 1995, which severely hampered his ability to continue working. A statement responding to criticisms of the theory of justice, shortly before his death in November 2002. Rawls died on November 24, 2002, and is buried in Mount Auburn Cemetery in Massachusetts.²

¹ -Herbert Spielberg, "A Defense of Human Equality." *Philosophical Review*, vol. 53" *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*, vol. 51, pp. 187.

² - I bid. Herbert Spiegelberg.p190.

Part Two; John Rawls Bibliography

Rawls published three main books. The first book, "The Theory of Justice," focused on distributive justice and attempted to reconcile the competing demands for the values of freedom and equality. The second book, "Political Liberalism," dealt with the issue of the impact of the division of citizens due to stubborn religious and philosophical differences on the establishment of a constitutional democratic system. The third book, "The Law of Peoples," focused on the issue of global justice.

Theory of Justice. Book Analyses

According to John Rawls, each individual consciously tends to opt for collective decisions that maximize the general interest. The singular and selfish homo "œconomicus" is not completely found in Rawls, in fact he considers man as a being who realizes himself personally while thinking about the collective interest. In this sense, Rawlsian theoretical argumentation departs from the concept of the "invisible hand" often attributed to Adam Smith, according to which this collective aim was natural. However, for Rawls, in utilitarian morality, an action can be considered "good" if, and only if, it increases "the greatest happiness for the greatest number" and this, even at the price of the sacrifice of the well-being of some.¹

¹ -John Rawls, A Theory of Justice, Harvard University Press. Revised Edition, 1999. p177.

Political Liberalism

Justice is the first virtue of social institutions just as truth is that of systems of thought”. By explicitly comparing the essential principle of speculative thought to that of politics, Rawls builds a political theory based on the search for rules of justice. It seeks to make the highest level of freedom compatible with the achievement of effective equality of opportunity. Alexis de Tocqueville had already underlined the tensions which could arise from this double coupling (liberty/equality). It thus makes justice the principle of politics, just as truth is the keystone of systems of thought. The search for justice therefore constitutes for him an absolutely essential axiom at the foundation of all political reflection, and precede any decision: “being the primary virtues of human behavior, justice and the truth suffers no compromise.”¹

In *Political Liberalism* (1993), Rawls turned towards the question of political legitimacy in the context of intractable philosophical, religious, and moral disagreement amongst citizens regarding the human good. Such disagreement, he insisted, was reasonable—the result of the free exercise of human rationality under the conditions of open enquiry and free conscience that the liberal state is designed to safeguard.²

¹ -John Rawls, *Justice As Fairness: a Restatement*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2006.p213.

² -John Rawls. *Political Liberalism* New York: Columbia University Press. Paper back Edition, 1996; Second Edition, 2005.p133.

In liberal conception of the role of justice, namely, that government should be neutral between competing conceptions of the good. Rawls tries to show that his two principles of justice, properly understood, form a "theory of the right" (as opposed to a theory of the good) which would be supported by all reasonable individuals, even under conditions of reasonable pluralism.

The question of legitimacy in the face of reasonable disagreement was urgent for Rawls because his own justification of Justice as Fairness relied upon a Kantian conception of the human good that can be reasonably rejected. If the political conception offered in *A Theory of Justice* can only be shown to be good by invoking a controversial conception of human flourishing, it is unclear how a liberal state ordered according to it could possibly be legitimate.¹

The Law of Peoples

It was not until late in his career that Rawls formulated a comprehensive theory of international politics with the publication of *The Law of Peoples*. He claimed there that "well-ordered" peoples could be either "liberal" or "decent". Rawls's basic distinction in international politics is that his preferred emphasis on a society of peoples is separate from the more conventional and historical discussion of international politics as based on relationships between states.

¹ -Pierre Ansay, John Rawls ou comment s'orienter dans la pensée politique, revue de débats, Bruxelles, no 70, mai -juin 2011 p27.

Rawls then devoted himself to the question of the possible stability (or not) of societies shared between the two conceptions of justice. He thus develops the idea of a “general consensus”, or an implicit agreement between citizens on “fair” justice between different citizens who have different philosophical (or religious) views. He thus introduces the concept of “public reason”, that is, a reason that lends itself to criticism within the framework of a public space of discussion. The political conception of justice that Rawls develops in *Political Liberalism* shows that individuals with conflicting opinions, but reasonable and reconcilable through compromise, agree to regulate the basic structures of society.

The political conception of justice would be nothing other than an “overlapping consensus”. Rawls also modifies the principles of justice in the following way, the first having priority over the second: Each person can claim the possession of an adequate set of fundamental rights and freedoms, which are the same for everyone. And in this set, only political freedoms are generally guaranteed. Economic and social inequalities must meet two conditions to be acceptable; first, they must not prevent equal opportunity for social mobility. Then, they must be done for the greatest benefit of society as a whole.

Value of John Rawls in the American Foreign Policy

Justice is a moral virtue and a social value that people and nations aspire to, and some political and social systems. That is why it has been the focus of interest and research by thinkers, philosophers, and scholars, whether legal, sociological, or political scholars, in terms of the concept or principles upon which it must be based, and its role in building institutions. Social and political, it is the basis of the structure of society. Man has dreamed of a society in which justice prevails, which is based on equality in rights and duties, and in which injustice and disparity are eliminated, so man thought about building a society and a state based on justice, so he developed theories and ideas on how to build justice, which is what we find in the Greeks with Plato in particular, and in thought.

As for contemporary philosophy, the theories of the American philosopher John Rawls had a great impact on societies and policies with the new ideas and theorizing they brought, which prompted me to study his philosophy of universal justice - that is, John Rawls.¹

The United States' return to the discourse of promoting justice and Democracy raises a question about the values, interests, and standards by which it will balance its relations with Arab governments with which it has strategic interests on the one hand, and on the other hand, demonstrate its rejection of violations of human rights and public freedoms. The United States will face two problems related to the credibility of its proposal to promote democracy in the world, the first related to its policy towards the region's issues, and the second related to its bias towards the ruling elites.

¹ -Martin, R, Rawls's Law of Peoples: A Realistic Utopia? Oxford: Blackwell. 2006, p 23.

Part Three: John Rawls. Justice Theory Analysis

Justice Theory Analysis

John Rawls's theory of justice is best understood as an attempt to adapt Rousseau's theory of the general will to the modern liberal democratic state. Central to the theory is a belief in the rationality of human nature and dynamics. In a well-ordered society men's natural sentiment will prove to be both unified and stable, and they will not permit morally arbitrary advantages to influence their social arrangements. Rawls's theory offers a rational accommodation of freedom and equality. His philosophical perspective opens him to the charge that his theory slights the historical dimension of human justice.¹

Rawls views the principles of justice as “arising from original agreement in a situation of equality”. That is, the principles of justice assume an original situation in which complete equality prevails within the group that will agree on those principles. Complete equality in an original situation means a situation in which class divisions, exploitation or class privileges do not exist.

Rawls's principles of justice, then, assume a classless situation, and attempt to preserve these principles in the presence of an already class-divided society. His statement says: If you want to establish principles of justice, classes and wealth must be set aside, even at the theoretical level as an assumption. Rawls's principles of justice are therefore based on an imagined and assumed classless society, that is, a non-bourgeois and non-capitalist society.

¹ -John Rawls, *Justice As Fairness: A Restatement*, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Belknap Press, 2001.p 199.

The theoretical abandonment of already existing capitalism and the practice of Epochianism must be abandoned to establish justice. This is absolutely necessary, because the original state of freedom and equality is the absence of classes.

Social Justice according to Rawls

The principles that Rawls presents for justice are for social justice, and he says that they “provide us with a way to assign rights and duties in the basic institutions of society, and determine the most appropriate distribution of the benefits and burdens of social cooperation”; The key words here are “social justice” and “social cooperation”.

Rawls says: “Our subject is rather social justice” and not the justice of institutions, laws, actions, or persons, but rather justice in its broader and more comprehensive sense, which is social justice. This means that the theory of justice presented by Rawls is a theory of social justice. The basic subject of justice (in the sense of subject, not in the sense of topic) is the basic structure of society, and this basic structure can only be the structure of power and authority in society, or its class structure. The theory of social justice presented by Rawls deals with a class society dominated by inequality and great disparity in privileges and burdens, and attempts to solve this problem with a theory of justice as fairness, which is the title of the book in which he summarized his theory in his first book and made it clearer.¹

¹ -Alexis de Tocqueville, Democracy in America (Volumes 1 and 2, Unabridged) Translated by Henry Reeve. Paperback – September 19, 2016.p154.

Rawls acknowledges that class differences in society cannot actually be abolished, although they must be assumed to have disappeared in the original situation, and he argues that people in the original situation can choose two different principles. The first is their choice to be equal in basic rights and duties, and the second recognizes the social and economic inequalities that already exist, but only accepts principles that lead to compensation for the less fortunate members of society. He says in this regard: "There is no injustice in a situation in which the few receive more benefits than others, provided that the conditions of the less fortunate improve".¹

This is the essence of his theory of justice as fairness. With the impossibility of actually abolishing classes, they are abolished theoretically and intellectually to establish principles of justice. When they are applied to an actual class society, a condition is put in place, which is that "the conditions of the less fortunate should improve," and they cannot improve except with effective, political intervention and legislative function of the state.

The general Rawlsian position that the interpretation of justice is linked with public reasoning. It focuses on has to be, in John Rawls's words, on "a public framework of thought" that provides "an account of agreement in judgment among reasonable agents." Implicit beliefs in the sufficiency or the necessity of a transcendental approach for comparative assessment clearly have had a powerful role in the widespread belief that the transcendental approach is crucial for the entire theory of justice. The importance of public reasoning for dealing with global problems of justice is a subject of

¹ -Op cit. Justice As Fairness, p 200.

importance on its own. The demands of objectivity not only require avoiding "personal slant", but also national parochialism. The institutional preconditions would be particularly hard to meet in dealing with, problems of global justice. ¹

Justice and Democracy

Democracy originally means the rule of the people for themselves, but the word is often used to refer to liberal democracy because it is the prevailing system of democracy in Western countries, as well as in the world in the twenty-first century, and thus the use of the word "democracy" to describe liberal democracy is a common confusion in the use of the term. Whether in the West or the East, democracy is a form of political rule based generally on the peaceful transfer of power and majority rule, while liberalism emphasizes the protection of the rights of individuals and minorities.

This is a type of restriction of the majority in dealing with minorities and individuals, unlike democratic systems that do not include a constitution. Such protection, which is called illiberal democracies, is necessary. There is a convergence between them in some matters and a divergence in others, which appears in the relationship between democracy and liberalism.

¹- Op. cit. Alexis de Tocqueville, Democracy in America.p160.

The reality is that democracy has never been a goal in itself, nor should it be. Rather, it derives its value from being the best means to achieve lofty goals in society, most important of which are justice, equality, freedom, partnership in governance, and oversight of the executive authority. If democracy turns into mere rituals and procedures that do not achieve these goals, then it will be of no value or benefit to society. Also, if society succeeds in achieving these lofty goals, it does not matter whether its political system is called democracy, partnership, governance, or whether it has no name at all. ¹

Removing injustice and achieving justice, democracy, and liberalism lies in thinking about injustice and justice, and this thinking should focus on the work of the impartial mind, separated from private interests and prejudices, with the aim of eliminating injustice and upholding justice, instead of turning only to contemplating descriptions of ideal societies that are characterized by complete justice if justice is sought. In general, and social justice in particular, it did not come all at once, but rather in batches that took a long historical development. The new thing in working to achieve justice and achieve it socially is linking it to freedom, just as it is justice, which is no longer presented in isolation from democracy and citizenship, so it is no longer a discourse of justice.

¹ -Op. cit .Alexis de Tocqueville, Democracy in America .p 43.

This discourse and that thesis of the developed democracy in the light of modern and contemporary intellectual visions to also focus on political and social life, and from here comes the importance of the unlimited demand for justice on the part of individuals and political groups that pushed the disbelievers. Westerners should not hesitate to research and write about this thesis, especially the Western thinker John Rawls considers it an urgent necessity in the era of capitalist globalization, as the state of inequality is tearing apart the fabric of existing societies in our contemporary world, including democratic societies and countries that want to become democratic, because the civil society that does not take In considering the reduction of differences, it is not a democratic society, as it is considered the source of all the principles that a person seeks to reform himself and reach the lofty goals of existence.

The theories, philosophies, beliefs, doctrines, and verses were concerned with the duties of justice and democracy, leading to social justice, and they search for happiness, each in its own way, to improve the human condition. And embodying fair relations between people and reaching a social contract with those who assume the standards of governance in the country. Justice and democracy are also linked to the human being, who is still searching for it and yearning to achieve it, because he finds in it his dignity and humanity. In return, man abhors injustice, aggression, and tyranny and seeks to stay away from the conditions that create the supremacy, persecution, inferiority, and calling people out and dividing them into the arrogant, the arrogant, and the oppressed, the weak.¹

¹- Op. cit. Mike Berry, Justice and Democracy. p 45.

Social change to undermine injustice usually should be pursued through democratic processes. A suitably defined model of deliberative democracy articulates how democracy can produce just policies. As usually understood, however, the model of deliberative democracy focuses too much on argument, privileges unity, assumes face to face discussion, and assumes a norm of order.

Rawls says of the basic social structure that it “contains the many social situations” into which people are born and find themselves which determine their opportunities and all that they can achieve in their lives; This is Rawls's way of talking about class conditions and the class into which a person is born and finds his entire destiny and all his expectations and opportunities in life determined by it. Rawls says: “The major institutions of society are taken as a unified whole that determines the rights and duties of people, and influences their destinies... By major institutions I understand the political system and the basic economic and social arrangements”.¹

The class structure of society with the political system that supports it; Rawls uses a code in writing, abstract words to avoid using real terms; “The basic structure [of society] is the primary goal of justice because its effects are so profound and present from the beginning.” Because people are born into certain social situations in which they find themselves and determine their fate, and because these situations are characterized by deep inequalities, they must be the goal of justice and democracy.

¹- Op cit. Jeffrey Edward Green, p. 140.

The reason for his concept of "justice and democracy " is also due to his awareness that the existing society is a class society and this characteristic cannot be removed from it, but since achieving justice presupposes equality and equality presupposes the absence of classes, in light of a class society equality becomes impossible and thus justice becomes impossible, and the only solution is What Rawls saw was that justice would be possible in this society as fairness, meaning that the concentration of wealth among some would not conflict with the pursuit of fair rights and opportunities by others. ¹

Rawls was living an intellectual condition and a political condition. The intellectual condition is that the American political intellectual heritage is devoid of a strong, prominent, and influential leftist or socialist movement similar to European trends, and the political condition is revolutionary social-political events that are unprecedented in American history: the Negro civil rights movement and the opposition to the Vietnam War. All of this within an international context, which is the cold war with the socialist bloc. Rawls could not be frank in his political positions or in his writings, and the contexts in which he lived imposed on him a cautious style of writing that bordered on secrecy. The thesis that, in order to move towards a more just world, the weaknesses of liberal democracy must be overcome through reconstructing robust, resilient social democracies.

¹- Mahmoud Othman. Constitutional social justice in contemporary liberal political thought. John Rawls Model. Arab center research. p 88.

A thinker like Rawls, who holds a prestigious university position in America and is keen not to prejudice the prevailing political correctness, cannot express ideas that contradict the mainstream, especially since the students whom Rawls teaches at the university are the children of the ruling elites in all fields. The abstract writing style that appears in “A Theory of Justice” was imposed by Rawls’s intellectual, political, social, and then academic context. Rawls was educated at Princeton and Oxford, then worked at Cornell and Harvard. It is not expected that a radical thinker would emerge from this academic environment of elite universities.¹

If we look at the history of Western political thought and the history of Western political theories, we will find that the period in which theories of natural right and the social contract prevailed is limited to the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, with Hobbes, Spinoza, Locke, and Kant. In the nineteenth century, these theories began to gradually disappear, giving place to other theories inspired by political economy and its vision of Homo Economics, which contradicted the vision of natural right and the social contract.

The reason for this isolation is that these theories were among the most important intellectual elements behind the bourgeois revolutions and the democratic and republican principles of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, which were the era of bourgeois revolutions. The decline of these theories occurred during the period that witnessed stability of the bourgeoisie in governance and the economy, which made its thinkers abandon the theories of right and contract that had been intellectual support in the revolutions of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.²

¹ -Hampton, J. (1980). “Contracts and Choices: Does Rawls Have a Social Contract Theory?” *Journal of Philosophy*, p.315-338.

² -Hausman, D.M. and McPherson, M.S. *Economic Analysis, Moral Philosophy, and Public Policy*, 2nd Edition. Cambridge University Press. (1996), p 66.

The question of justice and citizenship in contemporary Western philosophical and political thought is clarified by the vision of the contemporary American philosopher John Rawls on these two issues. This is because the concept of justice, like the concept of citizenship, no longer carries those old concepts in all modernist discourses. Rather, contemporary global transformations have forced the international community to produce new concepts that are in line with urgent human requirements, not at the individual level, but at the global level. We chose the Rawls model as a philosopher who occupies an important place in Anglo-Saxon thought and contemporary Western political philosophy and in the hub of the decision makers of the American foreign policy. That's why we find the American position on the issues of the Arab region, especially in light of its continued support for Israel, and turning a blind eye to Israel's violations of the rights of the Palestinians.¹

¹ -Sandel, M. J. *Liberalism and Justice*, 2nd Edition. Cambridge University Press, 1998. p 22.

Part Four: American Political Thought Recourses

Jeffersonian Democracy

Named after its advocate Thomas Jefferson, was one of two dominant political outlooks and movements in the United States from the 1790s to the 1820s. The Jeffersonians were deeply committed to American republicanism, which meant opposition to what they considered to be artificial aristocracy, opposition to corruption, and insistence on virtue, with a priority for the "yeoman farmer", "planters", and the "plain folk". They were antagonistic to the aristocratic elitism of merchants, bankers, and manufacturers, distrusted factory workers, and strongly opposed and were on the watch for supporters of the Westminster system.

The roots of the Jeffersonian Republican Party are older than the United States itself. Anti-Federalists at the Constitutional Convention were deeply concerned with giving too much power to the federal government; having just escaped King George III's rule, they worried history would repeat itself. A movement for more democracy in American government in the first decade of the nineteenth century. The movement was led by President Thomas Jefferson.

Jeffersonian democracy was less radical than the later Jacksonian democracy. For example, where Jacksonian democracy held that the common citizen was the best judge of measures, Jeffersonian democracy stressed the need for leadership by those of greatest ability, who would be chosen by the people.¹

¹ -Noble E. Cunningham Jr. *The Jeffersonian Republicans in Power: Party Operations*, (1993), p.102.

Jacksonian Democracy

The spirit of Jacksonian democracy animated the party that formed around him, from the early 1830s to the 1850s, shaping the era, with the Whig Party the main opposition. Many Jacksonians held the view that rotating political appointees in and out of office was not only the right, but also the duty of winners in political contests. It was theorized to be good because it would encourage political participation by the common man and because it would make a politician more accountable for poor government service by his appointees. Jacksonians also held that long tenure in the civil service was corrupting, so civil servants should be rotated out of office at regular intervals. However, patronage often led to the hiring of incompetent and sometimes corrupt officials due to the emphasis on party loyalty above any other qualifications. ¹

Jacksonians believed the people's will had finally prevailed. Through a lavishly financed coalition of state parties, political leaders, and newspaper editors, a popular movement had elected the president. The Democrats became the nation's first well-organized national party. Jackson's expansion of democracy was exclusively limited to White men, as well as voting rights in the nation were extended to adult white males only. There was also little to no improvement, and in many cases a reduction of the rights of non-white U. S citizens, during the extensive period of Jacksonian democracy, spanning from 1829 to 1860. ²

¹ -Lawrence H. White, "William Leggett: Jacksonian as classical liberal political." *History of Political* (1986). p 83

² -William G. Shade, "The Second Party System". New York (1983) p p 77-111.

During his life, Andrew Jackson moved from poverty to wealth thanks to slavery, as slaves worked on his cotton farms and contributed to building his house and taking care of his property, thus giving him a prominent social status in southern society, which facilitated his victory in the presidential elections in 1828 and his move to the White House early the following year.

Jackson vetoed more legislation than all previous presidents combined. The long-term effect was to create the modern, strong presidency. Jackson and his supporters also opposed progressive reformation as a movement. Progressive reformers eager to turn their programs into legislation called for a more active government. However, Democrats tended to oppose programs like educational reform and the establishment of a public education system. For instance, they believed that public schools restricted individual liberty by interfering with parental responsibility and undermined freedom of religion by replacing church schools.

Jackson created a spoils system to clear out elected officials in government of an opposing party and replace them with his supporters as a reward for their electioneering. With Congress controlled by his enemies, Jackson relied heavily on the power of the veto to block their moves. Black slaves were not the only victims of Andrew Jackson. During his presidential term, the seventh president of the United States of America deliberately expanded at the expense of the indigenous people who had inhabited these lands for many years. He expelled them from their lands and forced them to leave, giving them instead to white colonists who settled and expanded there.

Many remember the period of Democratic President Andrew Jackson as bloody. Through the Indian Removal Act in 1830, a large percentage of the indigenous people were expelled from their lands. The same period also witnessed the beginning of the “Trail of Tears” process, which was a process of forced displacement of indigenous peoples from their lands in the southeastern United States to the western regions.

Andrew Jackson signed about 70 treaties with the indigenous tribes, whom he called savages, to transfer them from their lands to reserves. The tribes that rejected these agreements were classified as aggressors, and Andrew Jackson did not hesitate to call in the American army to expel them from their lands if they refused to leave.

Jacksonian principles

1/Patronage:

Also known as the spoils system, patronage was a policy that involved placing political allies and supporters in important positions. Many Jacksonians believed that switching political appointees back and forth was not only the right of the victors in political contests, but their duty. Deference was seen as a good thing because it encouraged public participation and because it made politicians more accountable if their appointed officials were incompetent. Jacksonians also believed that spending too much time in an official position was corrupting for anyone, and thus officials should be rotated in and out of official positions at regular intervals. However, due diligence often led to the appointment of incompetent or sometimes corrupt officials because of its focus on party loyalty to the exclusion of all other considerations and competencies.¹

¹ -Mary Beth Norton; et al. (2007). A People and a Nation: A History of the United States, Volume I: To 1877. Cengage Learning. p. 327.

2/ Strict Constructivism:

Like the Jeffersonian Democrats who believed strongly in the Kentucky and Virginia Statements, the Jacksonians favored the beginning of a limited federal government. Jackson said he would "defend against all encroachments upon the legitimate scope of state sovereignty. " But the constitutional nullification crisis certainly brought Jackson into conflict against what he saw as state encroachment on the scope of federal power. This position was one of the foundations of the Jacksonians' objection to the Second Bank of the United States. As the Jacksonians established their power, they continually attempted to expand federal power, especially presidential power.

3/Opposition to Banking:

Jacksonians particularly objected to government monopolies of banks, especially the National Bank, a central bank known as the Second Bank of the United States. Jackson said of the bank, "This bank is trying to kill me, but I will kill it," and he succeeded in doing so. The Whigs, who strongly supported this bank, were led by Henry Clay, Daniel Webster, and Nicholas Biddle, the bank's president. Jackson himself objected to all banks because he believed they were tools to deceive the public. Jackson and many of his supporters believed that gold and silver alone should back the currency rather than rely on the integrity of a bank.

4/ Preemptive War:

The concept of **Preemptive War** in the international politics is problematic on international level, this confusion is due to the absence of consensus defined by the various ongoing debates about the nature of the possibilities and consequences of the change in the process of international relations. The change in foreign policy as a “modification / sharp substitution patterns of international relations of the country”. It is that the dependent variable in this process is the changes in the patterns of foreign diplomatic relations, cultural, military, trade and economic, and the identification of new policies in view of the role of external agents within the state, and the intention of the policy maker in the reformulation of foreign policy, which is expressed restart foreign policy orientation. ¹

The United States relied on the theory of preemptive war in its strategy of world domination using the military tool either for deterrence or containment. It relied on preemptive war with the aim of shifting from deterrence to attack to prevent the emergence of any potential attack. The United States began using this war to fight countries that have terrorist organizations, as happened in Iraq and Afghanistan, believing that countries that contain terrorist organizations should be attacked, considering that terrorist organizations do not grow on their own but need a country to help them. ²

¹ -Alexander Keyssar, *The Contested History of Democracy in the United States* (2nd ed. 2009) New York. p 29.

² -Lake, Anthony, *American Power and American Diplomacy*, States Information Agency, 1994.p102.

A preemptive war is a war initiated by an army or coalition, which is convinced that future conflict is inevitable, although not imminent. For the attacker, preventive war aims to prevent a shift in the balance of power by taking the initiative. Preventive war is not preemptive war, which is attacking first when an attack is imminent. Due to the speculative nature of preventive war and the great subjectivity of threat assessment, this type of war is considered illegal by international law. Characterizing a war as preventive, preemptive or aggressive is a very complex debate and not free from bias. The arguments for preemptive war are not only the magnitude of the decline in power, but also other independent variables such as the likelihood of war in the future.¹

5/ National Interest:

National interest is summarized in the state's goals and ambitions, whether economic, military or cultural. It is one of the most important concepts in international relations, as each state seeks to achieve its own national interest, which is the basis of the realist school. The aspects of the national interest are many, but the basis is the state's survival and security. And in pursuit of wealth, economic growth and power.²

The concept of national interest is considered one of the main concepts in the field of international relations. The foreign policy of each country is based on its national interests, so that all countries seek to achieve goals that ensure securing these interests. Accordingly, countries try to justify their actions on the basis of the national interest, and their behaviors are usually conditional on national interests.

¹ -Nichols, David K., *The Myth of Modern American Presidency*, translation: Sadiq Ibrahim Odeh, Al-Ahlya Printing and Publishing House, Amman, 1997.p 88.

² -Noam Chomsky, *Perilous Power*, Penguin Books, traduction française, Fayard 2007.p 83.

Referring to the concept of national interest in US foreign policy towards Israel, we find that relations between the United States and Israel are an important factor in understanding US policy in the Middle East on the one hand and in deconstructing the nature of US interests towards Israel on the other hand. The financial and military aid provided by the United States to Israel, there is significant political support that began since the establishment of Israel in 1948 and doubled with the US-Israeli alliance against what was known as global terrorism after the events of September 11, 2001, which made researchers describe these relations within the framework of the concept of “special relationship”.

Its defined that the legal framework as a legal principle that makes a state responsible for the harm caused to individuals in another state by a third party, which is sufficient to trigger the positive duty to provide protection for these individuals, so that these relations describe the high level of cooperation and close political, diplomatic, cultural, economic, military and historical relations between the two parties.

Since the notion of the “national interest” plays a pivotal role in the discourse of state action, its clarification as a normative term is historically as well as systematically important. Differing from the conventional approach, which defines the national interest according to genus and taxa, I shall argue that due to its function as a normative term the national interest cannot be understood in taxonomic categories; it necessitates an investigation of the logic of its use according to specified criteria. In this context the notion of the “public interest” is, for historical as well as systematic reasons, illuminating. As historical investigation shows, the term national interest is neither self-justificatory nor arbitrary within the conventions of the European state system until the late nineteenth century.¹

¹ -Schild, George, Tension in American Foreign Policy between President and Congress, Aussen politic, Nr.2/98, 1998. P 102.

We find that relations between the United States and Israel are an important factor in understanding US policy in the Middle East on the one hand and in deconstructing the nature of US interests towards Israel on the other hand. In addition to the financial and military aid provided by the United States to Israel, there is significant political support that began since the establishment of Israel in 1948 and doubled with the US-Israeli alliance against what was known as global terrorism after the events of September 11, 2001, which made researchers describe these relations within the framework of the concept of “special relationship”, which is defined in the legal framework as a legal principle that makes a state responsible for the harm caused to individuals in another state by a third party, which is sufficient to trigger the positive duty to provide protection for these individuals.

These relations describe the high level of cooperation and close political, diplomatic, cultural, economic, military and historical relations between the two parties. Here, the content of this study revolves around researching the concept of national interest in US foreign policy towards Israel after the events of September 11, 2001, where we will try to analyze the dimensions of these relations based on the concept of national interest and try to apply it to many issues based on statistical data and in light of the stages Successive, starting with the events of September 11, passing through what was known as the Arab popular movement in 2011, and finally the arrival of Republican candidate Donald Trump to power in the United States of America.

Speaking of the relationship between national interest and national security, we find that there is a trend that uses both terms as synonyms for each other, and there is another trend that sees the relationship as a relationship of mutual influence, as the theory of national security of a state reflects its national interest, and also the definition of national interest stems from a clear concept of its national security, and what could pose a danger or threat to it.

As for national interest, it can be defined as "everything that would protect and develop the common components of a society", and the common components of society are religion and thought, land, culture, language, state, race, common history, natural resources, and others, and we will find that they have different dimensions, including political, social, economic, intellectual.

Part Five: American Making Decision

The concept of the decision-making process in foreign policy through several definitions that clarify this concept. We will also discuss the American foreign decision-making process, in addition to the goals of American foreign policy and the relationship between the American president and Congress in foreign policy decision-making to cover and understand this topic. ¹

Decision-making is an essential element in building models of political movement. Studies have been conducted on the concept of decision-making in its various dimensions. The decision-making process represents the pivotal stage in the political process. Political forces may be arranged and then move on to legislate official policies such as draft laws proposed and passed by the legislative institution or issuing decrees by leaders. After that, the process moves on to implementing foreign policy objectives and then reviewing the results. The decision-making process in American foreign policy is done by issuing decisions that would enhance the influence of the United States of America and control its global hegemony as well as dominating international organizations in a manner consistent with its being a global empire. ²

¹ -Suleiman, Munther, The State of National Security and American Decision-Making, The Arab Future, No. (325), Center for Arab Unity Studies, Beirut, March 2007.p145.

² -Quandet, William B., Decade of Decision: American Policy toward the Arab-Israeli conflict 1967-1973, University of California, Berkeley, California, 1997.p36.

From its inception to the present, US policy in the world has oscillated between those who advocate isolationism and those who demand imperialism. US policy in the world has evolved from isolationism to leadership of the global system according to US interests. Although the United States has played a role in shaping the global system in one way or another throughout its history, we are currently witnessing a different kind of global leadership that seeks to monopolize global decision-making and break away from the constraints imposed by international agreements and dictated by the ethics of human transactions.

The decision-making process refers to the forms of interaction between participants at all levels, formal and informal, in drawing and clarifying public policies. The decision-making process constitutes the main function entrusted to political institutions. Political institutions play a strong role in choosing the best alternative from among the available alternatives that achieves its goals in the first place.

It is the process of arriving at a formula or choosing an alternative from two or more alternatives, considering that the alternative is the most capable of solving the existing problem or problems in a way that achieves the states and institutions' specific goals. Or in other words, we find that decision making refers to the ability to adopt a specific behavior from among the alternatives presented.

Richard Snyder is considered the first political scientist to talk about decision-making analysis, as he pointed out that just as it was applied in foreign policy studies, it could be addressed in the field of studying political systems. He defined the decision-making process as "that social process through which a problem is chosen to be the subject of a decision, and that choice results in the emergence of a limited number of alternatives that are taken into account and one of them is put into effect and applied."

This foreign policy analysis translates the academic knowledge about the complex influences on American foreign policymaking into an intuitive, cohesive, and practical set of analytic tools. The focus here is not theory for the sake of theory, but rather to translate theory into practice. Classic paradigms are adapted to fit the changing realities of the contemporary national security environment. For example, the growing centrality of the White House.

Stages of political decision-making

The political decision-making process is a complex process that goes through several stages and is affected by a group of psychological, economic, political and other factors and influences. Therefore, ignoring such things leads to a mistake in making a political decision to solve a problem. Political decision-making usually goes through a stage that we summarize as follows:

- a/** Identifying the problem about which a decision must be taken.
- b/** And the process of searching for alternatives.
- c/** And choose the appropriate alternative.
- d/** Work to implement this alternative or option.

Who Decides in America?

The mechanisms for making foreign policy decisions in the United States depend to a large extent on a rational institutional system in which the presidency, Congress, the courts, the Departments of Defense and State, the National Security Council, and the Intelligence Agency play pivotal roles. These institutions also compete in placing the interests of the United States at the top of the government's priorities.

Government decisions and the way they are made are affected by many internal factors, such as the influence of political parties, pressure groups, the media, and public opinion. Therefore, adopting rational positions in dealing with American policies and its foreign policies in particular must depend on a deep scientific understanding of the nature of American political decision-making and its mechanisms, which ensures a reasonable degree of balance in positions and way of thinking away from ignorance or fruitless speculation.¹

Regarding the mechanism of American decision-making, there are merely a political façade that appears in the final stage of a complex process within which American policy is shaped. Important councils contribute to planning American policy, such as: the Council on Foreign Relations, the Brooking Institution, the Economic Development Committee, the RAND Research Corporation, the Hudson Research Institute, the Central Intelligence Services, and the FBI departments. These councils include figures at the top of power representing: the government, major corporations, multi-activity industrial institutions, banks, press institutions, jurists, and media figures who prepare public opinion inside and outside the United States to bring about the required change.

¹ -Djamel Zahran, theoretical frame work for American making decision, Cairo. Egypt, 2001. P 36.

Lobbies pressure

The nature of the work done by lobbies in United States foreign policy, the role of lobbyists in the decision-making process of United States foreign policy, the knowledge of the objectives and trends of the American foreign policy towards Arab countries, and the future of United States foreign policy towards Arab issues. Study society and sample: study society formed by journalists, political analysts who interesting in relation between Arab and American in Riyadh. The researcher followed Comprehensive inventory method.

The total persons for study society were (120) persons, (105) persons were given valid questionnaire for statistical analysis. Study methodology and tools: The researcher uses the descriptive approach, which is based on a quantitative and qualitative description of the reality of the phenomenon, and he uses the questionnaire as a tool for data collection.

The Israel lobby, also known as the pro-Israel lobby, the Zionist lobby, or even the Jewish lobby, is an expression that allows describing a group of individuals and institutions that actively work to direct American foreign policy in a way that achieves the interests of the State of Israel. The lobby, in this sense, is not a single movement with a central authority or leadership, and the individuals or organizations that make up it may sometimes disagree with each other on several political issues. The pro-Israel lobby includes not only American Jews, but also includes individuals or groups known as Christian Zionists within its activities. The American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC for short) is one of the most famous and important lobby organizations.

American Jews recognize the importance of supporting Israel because of the dire consequences the alternative could have. Despite the fact that Israel is now often referred to as the fourth most powerful country in the world, the perceived threat to Israel is not military defeat, but annihilation. At the same time, American Jews are afraid of what would happen in the United States if they did not have political power. ¹

Means of influence

a/Sanctions are one of the tools of American foreign policy:

Sanctions are among the most important tools that countries use in achieving their interests in international politics, in addition to diplomacy and the military. Economic sanctions are among the most prominent topics discussed in studying the field of international relations, as they are the means that enable countries to achieve their political goals. Foreign Affairs after exhausting voluntary diplomatic options and without resorting to military solutions. Applying this tool requires a strong economy that has significant influence on the international scene, as well as control over global economic organizations.

In the current context, the United States of America is the only country that has the ability to use economic sanctions as a tool in its foreign policy, thanks to the system of economic globalization that it has developed and proven globally based on its economic and technological resources, in addition to a strong network of international allies and partners, and reflects the strength of the American economy. Its pioneering role in

¹ -Stephen Spector, *Evangelicals and Israel: The Story of American Christian Zionism*, Oxford University Press, 2008.p 43.

the international arena is its ability to shape the rules of the global economic game and impose economic sanctions on countries and entities, which makes the use of economic sanctions.

The United States has used economic sanctions on many occasions and against various countries at different levels. For example, economic sanctions were used against Russia after its war with Ukraine and its annexation of Crimea in 2014.

These sanctions included freezing assets and imposing restrictions on trade with Russia, as well as imposing sanctions on Russian companies and Russian citizens suspected of supporting the military operation in Ukraine. These penalties have been intensified over the years; Due to the continuing tensions between the two countries, US economic sanctions were also used against Iraq against individuals, groups and financial institutions. Economic sanctions were imposed on it, either directly or by including names on terrorist lists, or as a result of (international human rights violations) as the US administrations put it.

b/ Economic sanctions:

The United States of America is considered one of the countries in the world that most uses the tool of economic sanctions at the global level in quantity and quality. The United States of America has taken economic sanctions as a well-established approach over a long period of time, depending on the periods of exchange of power between the Democratic and Republican parties. The United States of America has imposed many forms Economic sanctions, both primary and secondary, to achieve its foreign policy goals, through which it aspires to continue American leadership in the world.

Economic sanctions have been widely used as a tool of the United States' foreign policy, which is based in its application at various levels on the elements of its economic, financial, military, and propaganda power, and its international influence. These sanctions are legislated and implemented through several institutions, each of which has its own powers and roles. A group of institutions participate in this, such as the Presidency and its executive institutions, such as the Ministry of Treasury, Foreign Affairs, Defense, Trade, Justice, and others, as well as Congress, which issues the necessary legislation and laws to impose these sanctions.

Foreign policy tools are among the most important topics that the field of international relations is interested in studying and analyzing. These tools are what enable countries to achieve foreign policy goals. Economic sanctions are among the most prominent of these “punitive” tools that some countries adopt to achieve their foreign goals and subject opponents to adopting compatible policies. With the policies of the countries imposing these sanctions.

AIPAC did not make direct donations to candidates until the early 2020s. Those who donated to AIPAC often became significant political contributors in their own right. In addition, AIPAC helps connect donors to candidates, particularly to the network of pro-Israel political action committees. “AIPAC meets with every candidate running for Congress,” says AIPAC President Howard Friedman. “These candidates receive in-depth briefings to help them fully understand the complexities of Israel’s predicament and the Middle East’s predicament as a whole. We even ask each candidate to write a position paper on their views on the U. S. -Israel relationship-so it’s clear where they stand on the issue.”

The formal component of the Israel lobby consists of lobby groups, political action committees (PACs), think tanks, and the Media Watch Group, which tracks all lobby groups and PACs, describes the “background” of these “pro-Israel” donors as follows: “A national network of local PACs, generally named after the area from which the donors come, provides much of the information.” Pro-Israel money in U. S. politics. Additional money also comes from individuals who contribute to candidates favored by PACs. Its Arab.¹

c/ American propaganda:

The fact that the American decision-maker’s idea of controlling the world is an old and renewed idea. Sometimes it comes under the pretext of humanitarian intervention, sometimes it comes under the pretext of spreading democracy and human rights, and at other times it comes under the cover of combating terrorism. The United States has undertaken a series of military interventions, which have increased dramatically in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. Noting that US military interventions were initially limited to its regional sphere (the Americas) in accordance with the Monroe Doctrine, but the intervention soon extended during the Cold War and its aftermath to include the entire world.

The issues of democracy and human rights have gained attention at the level of American presidents and their electoral programs, and at the level of those directly responsible for American foreign policy. President Wilson (1913-1921) announced that the United States would enter World War I in order to make the world safer for democracy. But the Senate’s refusal to ratify the establishment of the League of Nations brought the United States into a period of international isolation.

¹ -Michelle Goldberg, *The Rise of Christian Nationalism*, Taylor & Francis, 2008, p. 60.

The absence of democracy and the violation of human rights are among the most important reasons for the increase in terrorism in the world, and this is what prompted the United States to try to impose its vision of democracy on the world, so that it excludes any threat to its security and national interests, and thus the American administration was convinced of the necessity of changing these conditions, especially in its political aspect.¹

The foreign policy of all American administrations witnessed an emphasis on the values of democracy and human rights and the necessity of promoting them. The United States of America also introduced some new elements to its policy in the Arab region, when it allocated a portion of the aid it provides to some countries in the region to civil society organizations, and to promote the principles of democracy and human rights. However, this change during this period did not rise to the level of a clearly defined policy.

Consequently, spreading democracy and respect for human rights in the Middle East, especially the Arab world, has become one of the declared goals of American policy in the region. This policy was made clear by trying to make Iraq a model of democracy to be emulated in the Middle East region, and this policy was also made clear by presenting the Greater Middle East Initiative.

¹ -George C. Herring, *From Colony to Superpower: U.S. Foreign Relations* (2008) New York. p 55.

Adopting the democratic process will contribute as an effective force in establishing international stability and security, given that openness and political pluralism will find non-violent ways to resolve conflicts, and that democracies do a better job of protecting ethnic and religious minorities, and that cooperation between regimes with similar human values will enable the development of the phenomenon Partnership between those who have common interests in international environmental protection and commitment.

Some researchers believe that while reading the American political discourse to spread democracy, the most important features of this discourse can be identified through mechanical factors:

American interests are the primary determinant of the American vision of spreading democracy in the Middle East region, especially the Arab world.

The extremism and terrorism that the Arab countries and some Islamic countries are witnessing is due to the climate of tyranny and backwardness that the region is witnessing.

The democratic world is considered more peaceful, as democratic countries do not fight each other and tend to resolve their conflicts peacefully.

The process of changing the Middle East is pivotal to confronting terrorism and establishing democratic systems.¹

¹ -Bukovansky, "American identity. Chicago, Edition, (1997).P64.

In fact, this American vision to bring about democratic change in the Middle East region was not an expression of a general consensus within the United States of America, but rather an expression of one direction, which is the direction that believes that the absence of democracy in this region essentially contributes to creating An environment conducive to the growth of extremism, violence and terrorism, and thus eliminating these phenomena depends in large part on spreading and strengthening democracy in the countries of this region, a trend that has found its supporters on the conservative right in the American administration.

Mechanisms Used by the United States of America to Spread Democracy

There is no consensus among the various political forces in the United States about the justifications and feasibility of spreading democracy as one of the goals of American foreign policy, and there is also no agreement about the mechanisms that can be used to spread democracy. On the one hand, there is the pro-isolation movement that rejects American intervention abroad, unless this intervention is to protect American interests in a narrow sense. As some supporters of the conservative movement from the far right see; International relations are not based on morals and values, but rather on power and interests, and therefore adopting the American policy of spreading democracy worldwide may impose restrictions on its foreign policy and national interests.¹

¹ -Brooks, Stephen G.; Wohl forth, William, America Abroad: The United States' Global Role in the 21st Century, New York. 2010. p45.

It can be said that there is great agreement between supporters of the traditional conservative movement and the liberal movement on the importance of American foreign policy being based on some values, the most important of which is democracy. As for the neoconservative movement, it links the internal situations in foreign societies on the one hand, and maintaining American security on the other hand, especially after September 11. Therefore, this movement calls for interference in the internal affairs of countries if their conditions threaten American security.¹

Among the means used by the United States to implement democracy in the world are:

a/ Political Means:

Such as the statements provided by the State Department on the state of democracy in other countries, providing American diplomatic missions with new elements who are knowledgeable in the field of propaganda for democratic transformation, and using international conferences to put pressure on non-democratic countries. Or from international organizations such as the United Nations.

b/ Economic means:

This is due to the link between democratic transformation and aid, or the threat to trade and investments, or the administrative freeze on aid, or voting in the World Bank or the International Monetary Fund against countries that are not consistent with the call for democratic transformation. There is the direct form of economic relations associated with the nature of grants rather than prevention, which is represented in providing aid to civil society organizations.

¹- Op cit. Bukovansky, "American identity". p50.

c/ Military means:

Through direct invasion, providing military aid to “democratic transition” countries, or financial support for opponents of governments that the United States deems undemocratic.

Part Six: American Foreign Policy Towards The Israeli- Palestinian Issue

The United States and Israel often claim to be liberal democracies with market economies. Yet the measures proposed by Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu to curtail judicial independence are seen by critics as clear evidence that Israel no longer adheres to the principles of liberal democracy as they were. It is also important to recognize that Israel has occupied Palestinian territory and continues to expand its illegal settlements in flagrant violation of international law, which is in direct contradiction to the core tenet of democratic systems: respect for the law.¹

Here, the content of this study revolves around researching the concept of national interest in US foreign policy towards Israel after the events of September 11, 2001, where we will try to analyze the dimensions of these relations based on the concept of national interest and try to apply it to many issues based on statistical data and in light of the stages Successive, starting with the events of September 11, passing through what was known as the Arab popular movement in 2011, and finally the arrival of Republican candidate Donald Trump to power in the United States of America.

The continued support of the United States for Israel is due not only to the fact that Israel is an American ally with whom we share “shared values” or that it finds in it what serves its national security, but also to a large extent to Israel’s success in steering the domestic American political system. The fact that the Israeli prime minister did not receive an invitation to

¹ -Coplin, Hian D. Introduction to International Politics, A Theoretical Overview, Markham Publishing Co, Chicago, 1991.p 213.

visit Washington after the formation of the new Israeli government is a strong and clear message of tension between the two countries after the formation of the new Israeli government, and this was reflected in President Biden's recent explicit statements. ¹

American Relationship With The Israeli - Palestinian Conflict

American-Israeli relations constitute a mystery to the Arab peoples and elites, as it is believed that America is the driver of Israel, and as long as it gives it money, weapons, and international support, it can order it to cease fire and withdraw from the occupied territories. There is another belief that Israel is the one that controls the United States because it is a bridgehead for colonialism, and it has a Jewish minority that is active in pressure groups and controls the media, the arts, and the economy, and is influential in political decisions, and has controlling votes in important states. ²

American foreign policy is subject to a group of influences whose importance and influence range from one group to another. What distinguishes these groups is that they do not seek to gain power, but rather to influence official decision-making institutions. Regarding American foreign policy towards the Arab world, several pressure groups interact to influence American decision-makers in a manner consistent with the interests and goals of those groups. Among the most important lobbies, the Zionist lobby is considered one of the most prominent influences on American foreign policy towards the Arab world.

¹ -Scott, Andrew M., the Functioning of International Political System, The Macmillan Co., New York, 1997.p46.

² -Zachary K. Goldman, "Ties that bind: NewYork2012. p 25.

Since the Jews occupied Palestine in 1948, several Jewish figures and groups have put pressure on Washington to gain its support in confronting the Arab countries. These efforts culminated in the organized emergence of the Zionist lobby, which became the primary influence on American foreign policy, especially when it came to the Arab-Israeli conflict.

National interests are considered the main determinant of American foreign policy. However, when it comes to America's policy towards the Arab nation, especially the Palestinian issue, other factors contribute to determining the American decision-making process, as America takes into account the interest of its strategic ally in the region, namely Israel, and here The United States is subject to pressure from the Zionist lobby that has penetrated the various American decision-making institutions, especially Congress and the White House.

The combination of strong support for Israel and a parallel effort to spread "democracy" in the region has inflamed Muslim public opinion and endangered American and global security. This situation has no parallel in American political history. This reflects Israeli-American relations, or more correctly, the Israeli lobby and its influence on the United States of America.

For Israeli-American relations, which are the bilateral relations between the United States and Israel, and this relationship dates back to the year 1948 when the State of Israel was founded, when the United States was one of the first countries to recognize Israel.

The United States supported Israel with money and weapons during its wars against the Arab countries. The United States supports most of Israel's steps because of the strength of the Jewish lobby in the American government, as it shares Israel's unwillingness to recognize the State of Palestine. ¹

American-Israeli relations have many alliances and a fair amount of differences, and the alliance often occurs at a moment of major existential threat, as happened after the Hamas attack. But the difference increases when Israel exceeds its capabilities and harms American interests. All American leaders worked to maintain balance in these relations, and in the ongoing war, the rift between the two parties is increasing, but it is an exaggeration to believe that it will reach an end. Managing relations with both requires high degrees of prudence and initiative. ²

To ensure the loyalty of American politicians to the idea of Zionism, they established a strong lobby with broad economic, political and media influence. They were able to control the joints of the state. They established strong relations with the two major parties. They dominated the decision-makers in both. They turned loyalty to the idea of a national homeland for the Jews into an elevator on which everyone with political ambitions could depend. This is what later made the relationship between the two countries based on a paradox. The United States, the most powerful country, has become subservient to Israel, dependent on its national interests in its national decision. As for Israel, it constantly assumes the role of the United States in its relationship with the indigenous people. It continued to oppress them with international cover imposed by the United States and its allies. ³

¹ -Steele, Jonathan. "Israel asked US for green light to bomb nuclear sites in Iran". The Guardian. Retrieved June 21, 2017.p 12.

² -Cooper, Helene" Turning Point For 2 Leaders Lacking Trust". The New York, 2012. p. 41.

³ -Friedman, Robert. Israel and the United States Israeli Relations (2012), New York. P43.

Opinions are divided on this issue at home and abroad over the importance of the role that Israel plays as a strategic ally of America in the Middle East region. But on the other hand, there are those who reinforce this trend that Israel represents a strategic ally of America, while on the other hand there are those who view Israel as a strategic burden on America.

In a study prepared by John Mearsheimer, Assistant Director of the International Security Policy Program at the University of Chicago, and Stephen Walt, Professor of International Relations at John Kennedy College at Harvard University An a study objected to the idea that Israel represents “a vital ally of America in the war on terrorism,” and the authors even attribute the problems that America suffers from to Israel, saying: “The United States’ problem with terrorism is due in large part to its being strongly allied with Israel, not “The opposite”.¹

The study showed the extent of American support for Israel through the use of its veto power several times against 32 Security Council resolutions criticizing Israel after 1992. The researchers’ study also pointed to the sources of power and influence of the Israel lobby inside America, attributing this to the presence of their representatives in the US Congress, most notably AIPAC is the Zionist lobby, which is most important when electing the President of the United States of America.

¹ -Mearsheimer, John; The Israel Lobby and U.S. Foreign Policy. (Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2007.p102.

American Israeli Support

a/ Financial Support

Israel is the largest recipient of US foreign aid since World War II, and according to official US indicators, the total aid provided by the United States to Israel between 1946 and 2023 amounted to about \$158. 6 billion. According to data from the US Agency for International Development, the volume of aid is much larger than what was stated in official estimates, as the total US aid committed to Israel in the same period reached about 260 billion dollars.

American support for Israel began since its establishment in 1948, as America was the first country to recognize the establishment of the Israeli occupation state, and since that time a long and continuous history of political, military and economic support has extended, and included joint cooperation in the fields of education, health, energy and scientific research.¹

The volume of American political support and foreign aid to Israel reflects the amount of attention given by successive American administrations to establishing the presence of the occupying state in the Middle East, which the United States considers a vital partner in the region, with which it has common strategic goals.

¹ -Schoenbaum, David. The United States and Israel, Oxford UP, 1993. p 93.

Successive American administrations saw Israel as a reliable strategic ally in confronting the Soviets and their Arab nationalist and revolutionary allies, and Israel's importance increased after its victory over the Arabs in 1967, as America's vision of Israel was consolidated as an ally and partner that it could rely on to protect its interests and weaken Soviet influence in the region. ¹

After the end of the Cold War, America's priorities in the region did not change. Rather, the importance of Israel's functional role increased in playing a major role in weakening the countries of the region and fueling the Sunni-Shiite dispute.

We see in our days, The US Senate approved a \$95 billion foreign aid package, including military support for Israel, Ukraine and Taiwan. President Joe Biden is expected to sign the aid legislation into enforceable law on Wednesday. The foreign aid package included \$26. 4 billion in military support for Israel approved by the Senate came on, after the House of Representatives passed foreign aid legislation on Saturday. The Democratic Majority Leader Chuck Schumer said: "After more than six months of hard work and many twists and turns on the road, America is sending a message to the whole world: We will not turn our back on you. "²

Biden praised the aid approval, calling it in a statement late Tuesday "important legislation that will make our nation and the world safer, at a time when we support our friends who are defending themselves against terrorists like Hamas and against tyrants like (Russian President Vladimir)". Putin.

¹ -Mitelpunkt, Shaul. Israel in the American Mind Rutledge. Chicago 2012.p66.

² -Okhovat, Sahar. "The United Nations Security Council: Its Veto Power and Its Reform" (PDF). Sydney.edu.au. Retrieved November 8, 2015.p31.

The foreign aid package passed on Tuesday included \$17 billion for Israel, in addition to \$9 billion for civilians suffering in conflict zones around the world. That is why the Israeli Foreign Minister Israel Katz responded to the approval of the aid package by thanking congressional leaders for their “steadfast commitment to Israel’s security”.¹

b/ Military and Technological Support

The humanitarian catastrophe in Gaza has sparked demands that the United States place conditions on the billions of dollars in military funding and other aid it provides to Israel. Since its announcement, Israel has received more American aid than any other country. Below are details of US support for Israel as it continues its war against Hamas in Gaza.

In 2016, the US and Israeli governments signed a third 10-year memorandum of understanding covering the period from October 1, 2018 to September 30, 2028. The memorandum of understanding provides military aid totaling \$38 billion over ten years, including \$33 billion in grants to purchase military equipment and \$5 billion for missile defense systems.²

Israel is continuing to purchase 75 aircraft of this type, receiving 36 of them last year and paying for them with American assistance. The United States helped Israel develop and arm the Iron Dome short-range missile defense system, which was developed after the 2006 war between Israel and the Lebanese Hezbollah group. The United States has repeatedly sent hundreds of millions of dollars to Israel to help resupply interceptor missiles.

¹ -Lawrence Solomon: Israel can live without U.S. aid".

Opinion.financialpost.com. Archived from [the original](#) on September 14, 2014. Retrieved November 8, 2015.p56.

² -Shlaim, Avi. "The Impact of U.S. Policy in the Middle East".2012, pp 15-28.

As the war entered its third Nineth month and the number of martyrs reached more than 35 thousand, most of whom were children and women, Israel bombed hospitals and residential buildings on the heads of their residents, causing a “humanitarian catastrophe,” according to the United Nations. US President Joe Biden called on Congress for an aid package amounting to \$14 billion. Exceptional, for Israel. ¹

Indeed, the United States began meeting some of these requests immediately, and American officials stated that they believe they have sufficient powers through the current memorandum of understanding with Israel to meet some of these requests in the near term without obtaining additional powers from Congress.

On October 7, after Hamas launched an attack on Israeli positions in the Gaza Strip, US President Joe Biden pledged absolute and steadfast support for Israel, and the latter requested in the first days of the war to obtain interceptor missiles for the “Iron Dome” air defense system, and guided munitions.

Accuracy, ammunition rounds, and intelligence sharing on other regional threats.

¹ -Roy, Sara. Hamas and Civil Society in Gaza. Princeton University Press. 2013. p 71.

c/ Political and Diplomatic Support

The United States has long used its veto power in the UN Security Council to block resolutions seen as critical of Israel. Earlier in the six-month war in Gaza, Washington vetoed measures that included calls for an immediate ceasefire. To pass the resolution in the Security Council, the resolution needs at least 9 supportive votes and no veto power by the United States, France, Britain, Russia, or China. Washington abandoned its traditional role to protect Israel, by abstaining from voting on a resolution calling for a ceasefire, instead using a veto, although it described the brief text as “non-binding.”

Former Republican President Donald Trump decided to withdraw from the United Nations Human Rights Council, the world's most important human rights body, in protest over its criticism of Israel's treatment of the Palestinians. Also during the Trump era, the United States withdrew from the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), for reasons including what his administration described as the organization's bias against Israel.¹

Trump abandoned a policy the United States had held for decades when in 2017 he recognized Jerusalem as the capital of Israel. The status of Jerusalem represents one of the biggest obstacles to reaching a peace agreement between Israel and the Palestinians.

¹ -Michelle Goldberg. *The Rise of Christian Nationalism*, Chicago, 2008, p. 60.

The Security Council includes 15 countries, including five permanent members: the United States, France, Britain, China and Russia, and 10 countries elected by the General Assembly according to geographical distribution, and annually half of the seats of the elected members are renewed.

The “veto” is a power given to the five permanent members of the Security Council, through which it nullifies the implementation of any resolution that conflicts with its interests. The United States has used it 89 times, according to American reports, 46 times of which were for Israel’s sake. It was not satisfied with that, but sought to provide a safe political climate for Israel, and was the primary sponsor in concluding many normalization agreements between it and Arab countries, starting with the Camp David Accords with Egypt in 1979. ¹

¹ -Rotenberg, Cheryl, Israel and the American National Interest: A Critical Examination. University of Illinois Press.2017.p 108.

Part Seven: The Relationship of The American Stance Towards the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict

A/ American option and shifts towards Palestinians

One of the most important transformations that American public opinion has witnessed towards Israel and Palestine in recent years is the decline in the orientation supporting Israel within the Democratic Party, especially among young people, ethnic minorities and progressive movements, as indicated by opinion polls that In recent years, the gap within the Democratic Party between the older generations and the younger generations regarding the position on Israel and the Palestinian issue has widened. An opinion poll - conducted in March 2021 - indicated that for the first time the percentages of support for Palestine exceeded those supporting Israel among supporters of the Democratic Party, at 49% in favor of Palestine compared to 38% in favor of Israel. ¹

This development has led to a state of division and polarization, within the Democratic Party, between the conservative democratic forces controlling the party's leadership represented by President Biden and his administration on the one hand, and rising sectors within the party, foremost of which are youth, ethnic minorities, and progressive forces, in light of the Israeli aggression on Gaza following October 7th. Many polls indicate that Biden's chances of winning the presidential elections in November 2024 are threatened due to the decline in his popularity, and among important sectors of Democratic voters due to his position in support of the war of extermination

¹ -Dennis Ross, The Mind-set Matters Foreign Policy, Chicago. 2006. p 23.

launched by Tel Aviv against Gaza In recent years, American public opinion has witnessed important shifts towards the Palestinian issue, as support rates for Israel within the Democratic Party declined significantly, especially among young people, ethnic minorities, and progressive forces that represent important segments within the party, while support rates for Israel within. ¹

The Republican Party increased with The influence of the Christian Zionist movement within the party increased. This movement represents a broad sector of supporters of the Republican Party, and represents about a third of the electorate in the United States of America. In recent decades, this movement has become the most important supporter of Israel and its extreme right-wing policies in Washington.

The trends of American public opinion towards Israel and Palestine at the current moment can be divided into three main trends: the trend supporting Israel in an absolute or conditional manner, the trend supporting the Palestinian cause in an absolute or limited manner, and finally the isolationist trend calling for adopting a neutral position towards the conflict in Palestine. ²

¹ -Donald Neff, *Fallen Pillars U.S. Policy towards Palestine and Israel since 1945*. p 54.

² -Nasser Aruri. *The Role of the United States in Palestine and Israel*. South End Press, 2003.p74.

The forces Supporting The Israeli Cause in American Society On Behalf Democracy and The Just Cause of Israel To Exist

There are several influential groups within the Democratic Party that support Israel, but they adopt a vision different from that adopted by the Republican Party, as most of these groups believe that Israel's security depends on finding a peaceful solution to the Palestinian issue through reviving the negotiating track and adopting the two-state solution.

In recent years, with the rise of the influence of the extreme right in Israel and the United States, the attention of these groups has focused on the path established by Donald Trump, which is based on ignoring the Israeli occupation of the Palestinian territories and seeking to normalize relations between Israel and the Gulf states, especially Saudi Arabia, with the aim of consolidating economic and security cooperation. Between Israel and the Gulf states in confronting the Iranian threat and the axis of resistance. The groups that support Israel within the Democratic Party can be classified as follows: ¹

1/ Conservative Democrats

This category includes many senior and veteran members of the party, and tends to support Israel based on shared democratic values and strategic interests. Also, they call for strong US-Israel relations and continued military and economic support, and their influence is significant, as they often hold key leadership positions and sit on committees.

¹ -Ronald T. Libby, "The Death of Democracy in America. Twelve Tables Publishers, 2024.p 46.

2/ Pro-Israel Lobbyists

Organizations such as the Democratic Majority for Israel (DMFI) work within the party to promote pro-Israel policies, focus on maintaining bilateral support for Israel, counter efforts to restrict or reduce US aid, and combat movements such as BDS (Boycott and Divestment). and penalties. These groups have great influence, because they donate to election campaigns, endorsements, and political advocacy. These groups are well-funded and highly organized, have significant influence through political lobbying and financial contributions, and their goal is to ensure continued unconditional American support for Israel. ¹

3/ American Jewish Democrats

Many American Jewish voters and activists within the party are strong supporters of Israel, calling for policies that ensure Israel's security, promote peace negotiations, and support Israel as a Jewish and democratic state, and their influence is noticeable, especially in areas with a high Jewish population density.

4/Progressive pro-Israel groups

Represented by organizations such as J Street, call for a two-state solution and a balanced approach to Israeli-Palestinian relations. They support Israel's right to exist and defend itself, while advancing diplomatic efforts and criticizing some Israeli policies, and their influence is increasing among younger, more progressive Democrats. ²

¹ -Alexander, Gerard, the sources of democratic consolidation, cornel university press. 2010. p 117.

² -Noam Chomsky, [The Israel Lobby?](#) [Archived](#) July 1, 2009, at the Portuguese Web Archive ZNET, March 28, 2006.p12.

First American Stance

1/American Democracy Circumvents Laws In Support of Israel

The United States of America is pursuing a policy of duplicity and double standards regarding the Palestinian issue. It supports and supports Israel, despite the massacres committed by Tel Aviv since October 7, against the Palestinian people and the siege of the Gaza Strip. US President Joe Biden made statements confirming that the United States of America is adopting this policy, as Biden affirmed his country's full readiness to provide the Israeli occupation authorities with all military and material capabilities, ammunition and missiles in their war on the Gaza Strip, which has been besieged by the latter since the 7th of this month of October.

American double standards. "Resistance in Ukraine and terrorism in Palestine". Washington supports Israel militarily and materially and ignores the Palestinians' right to everything. comprehensive intelligence support for Tel Aviv. and silence regarding the displacement of Gaza's residents and the siege of the Strip.

Its clear that, The United States has been using it to deceive the world and hide its nature through false democracy, but it is a country of real hegemony. To contain rivals and reap the rewards, Washington in recent years has assembled a so-called "values coalition," strengthened its military alliances and provoked confrontation with the bloc, endangering the world order and global peace and security. When America talks about democracy, in reality, this means American-style democracy, or American democracy, built on domination, tyranny and tyranny.¹

¹ -Hermann T, The Israeli Peace Movement. Cambridge University Press. 2009. p 41.

American democracy is not about justice but about bullying. American politicians follow selfish doctrines of “America first” and “winner takes all”. The United States puts its own interests above everything else, and arbitrarily uses sanctions against those who disobey it. Unilateral US sanctions ignore international rules and unhesitatingly abandon what they stand for - the principles of a market economy and free trade. Moreover, the United States has popularized the concept of "national security", arbitrarily placing other countries' companies on the so-called "Entity List" to enforce trade embargoes and long-term powers.

These global human rights “arbiter” has turned a blind eye to its own human rights violations within the country. From incitement to racial discrimination and hatred to the forced return of undocumented migrants despite the outbreak of the epidemic, Washington has also seriously violated a series of international agreements and regulations, including the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and their Families, and the American Convention.¹

A/ Republican US Congress

In his statement, Republican US Congress President Mike Johnson, who made great efforts to approve the law, claimed that “demonstrations in support of Palestine in universities serve the wave of anti-Semitism and increase prejudice against Jews,” noting that the law requires the US Department of Education to define “anti-Semitism,” which it adopted. “International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance,” and defining events at universities on this basis

¹ -Alterman Eric "AIPAC's Complaint". *New York*. 2016. p 52.

The US House of Representatives approved the draft “Anti-Semitism Law,” in a move aimed at circumventing the student protest movement denouncing the Zionist aggression against the Gaza Strip, and thus the “anti-Semitism” card will be raised against every movement that stands in the way of this aggression, under the pretext of violating the laws, and this is what It shows the extent of the sham in American democracy and its implementation, and that it is a case of deception that brings about “absence of demand” in a way that serves the interests of the American administrations and implicitly the Israeli entity.

Second American Stance

The American Attempts to Liquidate The Palestinian Issue:

The United States of America does not recognize the State of Palestine, and it has no diplomatic relations with it. After the closure of the Palestinian mission in October 2018, Palestine no longer had any diplomatic representation in the United States of America, thus ending the relations between the US government and the Palestine Liberation Organization as the recognized representative of the Palestinian people since the 1970 s.

The US government does not have any official representative office within the areas of the Palestinian National Authority. The United States of America established a section for Palestinian affairs within the US Embassy in Jerusalem to deal with the Palestinian National Authority, but Palestine refused to cooperate with this section in particular, and with the United States in general. ¹

¹ -Zartman I. W. Peace making and International Conflict. Institution of Peace. New York. 2007. P 78.

Exerting pressure on the Palestinian Authority to make fundamental amendments that contribute to its rehabilitation in line with Israeli-American standards, to take over management of affairs in Gaza after the war. Exerting pressure on Arab and Islamic countries, the League of Arab States, and the Organization of Islamic Cooperation to refrain from issuing political decisions with high ceilings in opposition to the war, and making unrelenting efforts to persuade many Arab parties to participate in future security arrangements in the Gaza Strip.

There are also American attempts to liquidate the Palestinian issue (the framework plan), known as the Kerry plan, which is based on geographical separation between the West Bank and the Gaza Strip. It is a plan based on the exchange of lands, while considering the apartheid wall as the borders of the State of Palestine. The restrictions imposed by Israel on movement to and from the Gaza Strip lead to the separation of family members, and impose on spouses, one of whom lives in the Gaza Strip and the other (the other) lives in the West Bank or Israel, a life subject to a series of restrictions.

American duplicity became clear when the war broke out between Russia and Ukraine, as Washington supported Kiev with all material and military aid, including drones, fighter jets, missiles, weapons, and military equipment, in order to regain control of the lands that Moscow was able to control, but the matter is different when Palestine demands its right to Its lands and confrontation of the Israeli occupation. Here in Ukraine it is considered resistance against Russia, and in Palestine it is considered terrorism against Israel.

The forces supporting the Palestinian cause in American society

It has been established, in recent years, especially since the beginning of the Israeli aggression on Gaza following the attacks of October 7, 2023, a broad coalition supporting the Palestinian cause inside and outside the Democratic Party, which includes organizations representing the Arab and Islamic-American community, and representative organizations.

For the progressive Jewish movement that rejects Zionism, and the progressive forces and social movements representing racial justice issues within the Democratic Party. These groups have been active in recent months and have organized a large number of campaigns and protest events with the aim of pressuring the American administration to demand an end to the aggression against Gaza, an end to American military support for Israel, and a boycott of companies cooperating with Israel.¹

With the escalation of the Israeli aggression on Gaza and its reaching the stage of ethnic genocide, the activity of these groups expanded significantly and extended to a large number of American universities, where students in these universities organized protest activities and set up camps inside these universities in solidarity with the people of Gaza.

¹ -Qumsiyeh M. Popular Resistance in Palestine, A History of Hope. Pluto Press, Chicago, p 49.

With organized campaigns to demand that American universities boycott companies cooperating with Israel, this new coalition, which supports the Palestinian cause and rejects the continuation of American military support for Israel, has become a new actor in American society.

The position of this coalition on Biden has also become an important element in determining his fate in the upcoming presidential elections. The efforts of this coalition may lead to important shifts in American foreign policy towards Israel and the Palestinian issue in the long term.

Progressive forces within the Democratic Party In addition to the Arab and American Jewish movements that have a direct identity connection to the conflict in Palestine, there are other currents within the Democratic Party that support the Palestinian cause on moral and political grounds. These currents include an important sector of the progressive wing within the Democratic Party, which includes members such as Bernie Sanders, Rashida Tlaib, and Ilhan Omar, who defend Palestinian rights and demand a more balanced American policy in The Israeli-Palestinian conflict, and they call for restricting American aid to Israel.

Although not officially part of the Democratic Party, many of their members and the candidates they support advocate for Palestinian rights and support the Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions (BDS) movement against Israel. These groups influence the Democratic Party's position on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict because they advocate policies that support Palestinian rights, promote the two-state solution, and call for a more balanced and just American approach to the region.

In recent months, these groups have been heavily involved in activating the Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions (BDS) movement, which aims to pressure Israel to comply with international law and respect the rights of Palestinians by boycotting Israeli products, divesting from companies involved in the occupation, and imposing sanctions on Israel. BDS activities include organizing global campaigns, raising awareness about the Palestinian struggle, and encouraging institutions and individuals to participate in boycott and divestment efforts. The movement influences American politics because it works to mobilize popular support, influence public discourse, and stimulate debates about American foreign policy and its implications for human rights in Israel and Palestine.¹

Perspective Vision of The Relationship of The American Stances Towards The Israeli - Palestinian Conflict

A /American option and shifts towards Palestinians:

One of the most important transformations that American public opinion has witnessed towards Israel and Palestine in recent years is the decline in the orientation supporting Israel within the Democratic Party, especially among young people, ethnic minorities and progressive movements, as indicated by opinion polls that In recent years, the gap within the Democratic Party between the older generations and the younger generations regarding the position on Israel and the Palestinian issue has widened. An opinion poll - conducted in March 2021 - indicated that for the first time the percentages of support for Palestine exceeded those supporting Israel among supporters of the Democratic Party, at 49% in favor of Palestine compared to 38% in favor of Israel.²

¹ -Op. cit, Katz, S. H. Connecting with the enemy. 2016. p 65.

² -Mokadi, T., & Yousef, A. The Palestinian American "Transnational Identity." An-Najah University Journal for Research - B (Humanities). 2022. pp 216–246.

This development has led to a state of division and polarization, within the Democratic Party, between the conservative democratic forces controlling the party's leadership represented by President Biden and his administration on the one hand, and rising sectors within the party, foremost of which are youth, ethnic minorities, and progressive forces, in light of the Israeli aggression on Gaza following October 7th. Many polls indicate that Biden's chances of winning the presidential elections in November 2024 are threatened due to the decline in his popularity, and among important sectors of Democratic voters due to his position in support of the war of extermination launched by Tel Aviv against Gaza. In recent years, American public opinion has witnessed important shifts towards the Palestinian issue.¹

The Republican Party increased with The influence of the Christian Zionist movement within the party increased. This movement represents a broad sector of supporters of the Republican Party, and represents about a third of the electorate in the United States of America. In recent decades, this movement has become the most important supporter of Israel and its extreme right-wing policies in Washington.

The trends of American public opinion towards Israel and Palestine at the current moment can be divided into three main trends: the trend supporting Israel in an absolute or conditional manner, the trend supporting the Palestinian cause in an absolute or limited manner, and finally the isolationist trend calling for adopting a neutral position towards the conflict in Palestine. The Israel's supporters within the Democratic Party support the negotiating path and the two-state solution. As for the orientation in support of the Palestinian cause, it is almost absent within Republican and extreme right-wing.²

¹ -Donald Neff, *Fallen Pillars U.S. Policy towards Palestine and Israel*, New York. P39.

² -Nasser Aruri. *Dishonest Broker: The Role of the United States in Palestine and Israel*. South End Press, p 45.

B/ Stopping the fighting and starting political negotiations:

This is the scenario favored by the United States and many international and regional powers and parties, but it in turn faces great difficulties, the most important of which is that stopping the fighting and opening the door to negotiation must take place with the agreement of both parties. As we explained previously, Netanyahu's remaining in power and his attempt to maintain his coalition contradicts the rejection of his allies on the right front, and some members of Likud itself, of the idea of a two-state solution in general, which the United States seeks to implement on the ground.

It will also be impossible to imagine Hamas accepting integration into the Palestinian Authority, marginalizing its political role, and stripping it of its military power, at the same time, as the movement will insist on maintaining its military capabilities, even if it agrees to integrate into the Palestinian Authority temporarily and under multiple pressures.¹

The American veto refusing to pass a draft resolution in the UN Security Council, which recommends that the General Assembly accept the State of Palestine as a member of the United Nations, brought the issue of Washington's seriousness in supporting the two-state solution to the fore. The draft resolution, which was thwarted by the Biden administration, was approved by the overwhelming majority of the 15 member states of the Security Council, including countries allied to the United States such as France, South Korea and Japan, as 12 countries voted in approval, while the United Kingdom and Switzerland abstained from voting.

¹ -David Tal, War in Palestine, Israeli and Arab Strategy, Published by Routledge, 2014. P 61.

The United States has justifications for refusing to pass the resolution, as US Deputy Ambassador Robert Wood said that the American veto “does not reflect opposition to the Palestinian state, but it is an acknowledgment that it cannot A Palestinian state shall be established only through direct negotiations between the two sides (the Palestinians and Israel).

Politicians have confirmed that the International Court of Justice’s decision to issue an advisory opinion on the illegality of Israeli policies and practices in the occupied Palestinian territories is an affirmation of the necessity of recognizing the Palestinian state and the legitimate rights of its people, and puts pressure on the international community. It also puts Israel in a critical position on the international scene, considering The decision is consistent with the Egyptian position. ¹

The Dialogue Bloc affirmed that the International Court of Justice’s decision on the necessity of stopping the war carried out by the occupying state against the Palestinian people in Gaza, as well as stopping settlement activity, is a major step towards affirming the necessity of recognizing the Palestinian state, and it is undoubted legal evidence of the legitimacy of Palestinian rights and a silence of allegations. Israeli. The dialogue bloc explained that the decision, even if it was an advisory opinion, has legal weight and represents a moral commitment to affirm the legitimacy of the Palestinian right and clarify the extent of the war of extermination that the occupying state is waging against the Palestinian people, including its description of racist Israeli policies and addressing the consequences of the occupation.

¹ -Yehuda Lukacs, *The Israeli-Palestinian Conflict*, (Cambridge: 2005), pp. 477–79.

The dialogue bloc saluted the resistance of the Palestinian people and their steadfastness in the face of the moral collapse of the major countries that provide financial and military support and political cover for the Israeli killing and genocide machine. Had it not been for the steadfastness of the Palestinian people for more than 75 years, their adherence to the soil of their land and their rejection of displacement plans, we would not have reached these moments in which we see a glimmer of hope. Remaining in the international conscience.¹

C/ Continue conflict Scenario:

1/ Palestinian Extermination:

There are many indications that the war between Israel and Hamas in Gaza since October 7th may be heading toward its end within a few weeks. Because the conditions under which the fighting will stop do not seem clear or specific to a single scenario, any attempt to explore the future of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict in general, or in the foreseeable future beginning in 2024; It will depend primarily on the results of the war.

In terms of theoretical and logical calculations of the results of any war, the war ends according to one of three possibilities: The first is for one party to clearly triumph over the other party, which admits its defeat and officially announces its surrender. The second possibility is for both parties to accept stopping the war, without ending the conflict, which means preparing for another round of wars between them in the future. As for the third possibility, the two parties express their willingness to stop the fighting and enter into negotiations in order to resolve the conflict radically, by addressing all its causes, to ensure that wars between them do not renew again.²

¹ -Algazi, Joseph. "Israeli Settlement Policy in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip". Arab Studies. p p 62–73.

² -Baxendale, Sidney J. "Taxation of Income in Israel and the West Bank: A Comparative Study". Journal of Palestine Studies. 18 (3): 134–141.

Numerous reports indicate that Israel has begun implementing its plans to flood the tunnels in which Hamas forces are hiding in Gaza, to accelerate the process of eliminating the movement. If Tel Aviv is able to accomplish the task in the coming days, the potential negotiating situation that the United States will impose on Israel and the Palestinian Authority (in which Hamas will be politically integrated) will be better for Tel Aviv. Perhaps even if this pressure leads to a formal surrender on the part of Hamas fighters, which is unlikely to happen, this will give Israel the opportunity to resist American pressure to implement the two-state solution.

The difficult humanitarian situation of the residents of the Gaza Strip, which may worsen further during this period, will place a double burden on the Hamas movement, in light of its inability to protect the residents of the Gaza Strip from Israeli attacks, and prevent their displacement to the south of the Gaza Strip.¹

Demographic concern:

The Zionist idea is based on the fact that “Palestine is a land without a people. It will be inhabited by a people without a land. ” In order for this idea to become valid for implementation, the land must actually become without a Palestinian people. It is known that the Israeli settlement pattern is “replacement,” meaning that it is based on expelling the owners of the land and settling in their place. This is what appears in the geography of the cities and settlements of the occupying state, which are based on the ruins of Palestinian villages destroyed in 1948. In light of this aggressive Zionist, the occupying state committed itself to policies that push towards emptying the land of Palestine of its people.²

¹ -Zureik, Elia; *Surveillance and Control in Israel/Palestine: Population, Territory and Power*. Routledge. pp. 3-45.

² -Holmes, Oliver (27 April 2021). "Israel is committing the crime of apartheid, rights group says". The Guardian. Archived from the original on 2 February 2022. Retrieved 10 January 2024.

In times of peace, it adopted many means, including security, economic and livelihood restrictions, by restricting health and educational services, restricting the movement of Palestinians through hundreds of barriers it established between cities and villages of the West Bank, controlling natural resources and preventing them from exploiting them .In addition to the imposition of collective punishments, high fines, non-recognition of the Bedouins' citizenship and their displacement from them, and the adoption of the Absentee Property Law, which enabled the occupation authorities to seize the property enhances its opportunity to seize the gas fields in the waters of Gaza, and neutralize the threat to its projects to extract gas from Mediterranean.

General Conclusion

In conclusion, John Rawls's theory provides an important theoretical framework for understanding justice and equality in society. However, the application of this theory to U. S. foreign policy towards the Palestinian issue reveals significant contradictions and challenges. While the fundamental principles of the theory advocate for achieving justice and equality, the political and practical realities reflect policies that may be far removed from these principles, necessitating a reconsideration of how the concept of justice is applied on the international stage.

The Applications of Rawls's Theory in U. S. Foreign Policy Towards the Palestinian Issue in the context of U. S. foreign policy, the Palestinian issue is one of the most complex and sensitive matters. The U. S. approach to this issue can be analyzed through the lens of John Rawls's theory, even though foreign policy is influenced by a wide range of factors, including national interests and strategic alliances.

The Principle of Liberty of The U. S. support for a two-state solution can be viewed through the principle of liberty, as it emphasizes the right of Palestinians to self-determination and the establishment of their own independent state. However, in practice, this support faces significant challenges, as U. S. policies often lean towards Israel, undermining the equal application of the principle of liberty between the two parties.

The Difference Principle of U. S. policy adheres to the difference principle as proposed by Rawls. The U. S. tends to strongly support Israel, which leads to continued disparities and inequalities between Israelis and Palestinians. These policies may perpetuate the suffering of the Palestinian people without bringing tangible benefits to them, which contradicts Rawls's vision of justice.

In application of the U. S foreign policy towards the Palestinian issue faces significant challenges. Among these challenges are:

The Strategic Interests of U. S. foreign policy is heavily influenced by strategic interests in the Middle East, including the alliance with Israel, making it difficult to adhere to the theoretical principles of justice.

The Internal Influence of U. S. policymakers are subject to internal pressures from lobbying groups, such as the pro-Israel lobby, which leads to the adoption of policies that may not align with the concept of justice as outlined by Rawls.

The Promotion of Democracy and Human Right in American foreign policy has long emphasized the promotion of democracy and human rights globally. This aligns with Rawls's principles of respecting peoples' freedom and independence and honoring human rights justice.

We conclude that analyzing American foreign policy through the lens of Rawls's Theory of Justice reveals both alignments and divergences. While aspects of U. S. policy, such as the promotion of human rights and participation in international institutions, reflect Rawlsian principles, other elements, particularly in economic policy and selective interventions, deviate from his ideals of fairness and global justice.

The application of Rawls's theory to foreign policy provides a valuable ethical framework for evaluation and aspiration. However, the complexities of international relations and the competing demands of national interest and global justice present ongoing challenges. As the global landscape continues to evolve, the principles outlined by Rawls remain relevant in discussions of how to create a more just international order, even as policymakers grapple with the practical limitations of implementing these ideals in a complex world.

Domestic Constraints, U. S. foreign policy is shaped by domestic political considerations, which may not always align with Rawlsian principles of global.

We conclude that Current American foreign policy towards the Israeli-Palestinian conflict remains committed to the long-standing goal of a two-state solution while adapting to evolving regional dynamics. The U. S. continues to balance its strong support for Israel.

References

1. Alexander Keyser, *The Contested History of Democracy in the United States*, New York. 2007.
2. Alexander, Gerard, *the sources of democratic consolidation*, cornel university press. 2010.
3. Alexis de Tocqueville, *Democracy in America* (Volumes 1 and 2, Unabridged) Translated by Henry Reeve, 2016.
4. Algazy, Joseph. "Israeli Settlement Policy in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip". *Arab Studies Quarterly*. 2011.
5. Baxendale, Sidney J. "Taxation of Income in Israel and the West Bank: A Comparative Study". *Journal of Palestine Studies*. 2010.
6. *Brooks, Stephen G. Wohlforth, William, America Abroad: The United States' Global Role in the 21st Century, New York. 2010.*
7. Bukovansky, "American identity and neutral rights, Chicago, Edition, 1997.
8. Cooper, Helene" *Turning Point For 2 Leaders Lacking Trust*". The New York 2012.
9. Coplin, Hian D. *Introduction to International Politics, A Theoretical Overview*, Markham Publishing Co., Chicago, 1991.
10. D. Raphael, "Justice and Liberty," *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*, vol. 51, Chicago. 2022.
11. David Tal, *War in Palestine, Israeli and Arab Strategy and Diplomacy*, Published by Routledge, 2014.
12. Dennis Ross, *The Mind-set Matters Foreign Policy*, Chicago 2006.
13. Djamel Zahran, *theorical frame work for American making decision*, Egypt, 2001.
14. Donald Neff, *Fallen Pillars U. S. Policy towards Palestine and Israel*, New York. 2014.

- 15.** Edmundson, W, John Rawls: Reticent Socialist, Cambridge University Press. Fleming, J, (ed.) Fordham Law Review 72 (special issue). 2007.
- 16.** Farand, Max, The Story of the Constitution of the United States of America, translation: Ibrahim, Wahba, Library of Cairo, 1993.
- 17.** Frankel, Joseph, Analysis of Decision-Making, Oxford University, London, 1993.
- 18.** Friedman, Robert .Israel and the United States, New York. 2012.
- 19.** George C. Herring, From Colony to Superpower: U. S. Foreign Relations, New York. 2008.
- 20.** Hade, William G. "Politics and Parties in Jacksonian America," Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography Vol. 110, No. 4 (October 2000).
- 21.** Hamid, Shadi How Israel and the United States suppress democracy in the Middle East". Washington Post. ISSN 0190-8286. Retrieved August 4, 2024.
- 22.** Hampton, J. "Contracts and Choices: Does Rawls Have a Social Contract Theory?" Journal of Philosophy. 1980.
- 23.** Hausman, D. M. and McPherson. Economic Analysis, Moral Philosophy, and Public Policy, 2nd Edition. Cambridge University Press 1996.
- 24.** Herbert Spielberg, "A Defense of Human Equality". Philosophical Review, vol. 53, 2013.
- 25.** Hermann, T, The Israeli Peace Movement. Cambridge University Press. 2009.
- 26.** Holmes, Oliver (27 April 2021). "Israel is committing the crime of apartheid, rights group says". The Guardian. Archived from the original on 2 February 2022. Retrieved 10 January 2024.

- 27.** Jeffrey Edward Green, « Rawls and the Forgotten Figure of the Most Advantaged, *American Political Science Review*, vol. 107, 2013.
- 28.** John Rawls, *A Theory of Justice*, Harvard University Press. Revised Edition, 1999.
- 29.** John Rawls, *Justice As Fairness*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2006.
- 30.** John Rawls. *Political Liberalism* New York, Columbia University Press. Second Edition, 2005.
- 31.** Jonathan Wolfe, *A Critical Inquiry*, Vol. 20, No. 1. New York. (Autumn, 1993).
- 32.** Katz, S. H. (2016). *Connecting with the enemy: A century of Palestinian-Israeli joint nonviolence* (First edition). Austin: University of Texas Press. 2016.
- 33.** Lake, Anthony, *American Power and American Diplomacy*, States Information Agency, 1994.
- 34.** Lawrence H. White, "William Leggett: Jacksonian as classical liberal political. " *History of Political*, 1986.
- 35.** Lawrence Solomon: Israel can live without U. S. aid". *Opinion. financial post. com*. Archived from the original on September 14, 2014. Retrieved November 8, 2015.
- 36.** Mahmoud Othman. *Constitutional social justice in contemporary liberal political thought. John Rawls Model*. Arab center research .2019.
- 37.** Martin, R. and Reidy, D. (eds) *Rawls's Law of Peoples: A Realistic Utopia?* Oxford: Blackwell. 2007.
- 38.** Mary Beth Norton. *A People and a Nation: A History of the United States, Volume I: To 1877*. Cengage Learning. 2007.
- 39.** Mearsheimer, John; *The Israel Lobby and U. S. Foreign Policy*. Farrar Editions, 2007.
- 40.** Michelle Goldberg. *The Rise of Christian Nationalism*, Chicago, 2008.

- 41.** Mike Berry, Justice and Democracy, Centre for Urban Research, RMIT University, Australia. 2021.
- 42.** Mitelpunkt, Shaul. Israel in the American Mind, Rutledge. Chicago 2012.
- 43.** Mokadi, T., & Yousef, A. The Palestinian American "Transnational Identity". An-Najah University Journal for Research - B (Humanities) 2022.
- 44.** Morganton, Sir Hans, The American Year in Foreign Policy, translation: Hassan Saab, Arab Book House, Beirut, 1999.
- 45.** Nasser Aruri. The Role of the United States in Palestine and Israel. South Express, 2003.
- 46.** Nichols, David K., The Myth of Modern American Presidency, translation: Sadiq Ibrahim Odeh, Al-Ahlya Printing and Publishing House, Amman, 1997.
- 47.** Noam Chomsky, Perilous Power, Penguin Books, traduction française, Fayard 2007.
- 48.** Noam Chomsky, The Israel Lobby? Archived July 1, 2009, at the Portuguese Web Archive ZNET, March 28, 2006.
- 49.** Noble E. Cunningham Jr. The Jeffersonian Republicans in Power, New York. 2013.
- 50.** Okhovat, Sahar. "The United Nations Security Council: Its Veto Power and Its Reform" (PDF). Sydney. edu. au. Retriever Novembre 8, 2015.
- 51.** Pierre Ansay, John Rawls ou comment s'orienter dans la pensée politique, revue de débats, Bruxelles, no 70, mai -juin 2011.
- 52.** Quandet, William B., Decade of Decision: American Policy toward the Arab-Israeli conflict 1967-1973, University of California, Berkeley, California, 1997.
- 53.** Qumsiyeh, M. Popular Resistance in Palestine: A History of Hope and Empowerment. Pluto Press, Chicago .2012.

- 54.** Ronald T. Libby, "The Death of Democracy in America: Inventing Political Crimes. Twelve Tables Publishers, 2024.
- 55.** Rosenberg, Cheryl Israel and the American National Interest: A Critical Examination. University of Illinois Press. 2017.
- 56.** Roy Sara. Hamas and Civil Society in Gaza. Princeton University Press. 2013.
- 57.** Sandel, M. J. (1982). Liberalism and the Limits of Justice, 2nd Edition. Cambridge, University Press, 1998.
- 58.** Schild, George, Tension in American Foreign Policy between President and Congress, Assen politic, Nr. 2/98, 1998.
- 59.** Schoenbaum David. The United States and the State of Israel (Oxford UP, 1993.
- 60.** Scott, Andrew M., the Functioning of International Political System, The Macmillan Co., New York, 1997.
- 61.** Shlaim, Avi. "The Impact of U. S. Policy in the Middle East". 2012.
- 62.** Snyder, Richard, United State Security Interests, Ed, The Academy of Political Science, New York, 1986.
- 63.** Steele, Jonathan. "Israel. The Guardian. Retrieved June 21, 2017.
- 64.** Stephen Spector, Evangelicals and Israel: The Story of American Christian Zionism, Oxford University Press, 2008.
- 65.** Suleiman Munther, The State of National Security and American Decision-Making, The Arab Future, No. (325), Center for Arab Unity Studies, Beirut, March 2007.
- 66.** William G. Shade, "The Second Party System". Evolution of American Electoral Systems. New York .1983.
- 67.** Yehuda Lukacs, The Israeli-Palestinian Conflict, Cambridge: 2005.
- 68.** Zachary K. Goldman, "Ties that bind: New York 2012.
- 69.** Zartman I. W. Peace making And International Conflict. United States Institution, New York .2007.
- 70.** Zureik, Elia; Surveillance and Control in Israel/Palestine, Routledge. 2011.

