

CONTROVERSIAL FOREIGN AFFAIRS IN THE MIDDLE EAST – U.S. STRATEGY REGARDING THE ISRAELI – PALESTINIAN CONFLICT

GHET ANIS I. S.

Abstract: *The Middle East was an area of interference of the two blocks, where the problem of the several hundred thousand Palestinian refugees published in 1949, exacerbated after the June 1967 conflict, were added permanent interference with the Soviet and the US. The two powers protected their strategic and economic interests, the oil being the mobile of their regional alliances. The US was the main supporter of the state of Israel, constantly conflict with the surrounding Arab countries. The problem of Palestine has divided the Jews and the Arabs for decades, along with the struggle for the supremacy of the Arab states. Conflicts have become permanent, attacks on borders, mutual boycotting within the UN, up to direct conflicts. With the collapse of the Soviet Union and communism, the Soviet oil market opened to the West, which became the main beneficiary of this opening, diminishing the dependence of the western powers on Arab Petroleum.*

US interests remain approximately unchanged, the American state still expresses its interest in the natural resources of the region, especially oil, but also for weapon control. The United States has taken a double policy, as it wanted to maintain a bilateral relationship with Israel, but also to establish a cooperation relationship with Arab states control and path to oil resources in the region. With the outbreak of the Oil Crisis in 1973, representing the first economic crisis and being sufficient to show dependence on Westerners on natural Arab resources, the Arabs tried to use oil to isolate Israel, the increase of the price deeply affecting both the western power economy. Finally, the present article is meant to illustrate the reasons for dispute between the two populations, the US interventions based on their own interests and their consequences on the region that have been reflected in the internal policies of the states involved.

Keywords: *Israeli - Palestinian conflict, US, Trump, URSS, solution towards peace*

Introduction

The present work proposes the analysis of the Arab - Israeli conflict, a subject that was placed as one of the great crises of the half of the last century. From this general theme, I chose to focus on two considerations, namely the geopolitical and economic interest of the actors involved in the conflict and the attempts to cooperate and resolve the conflict, both internally and through the intervention of international actors. I will conduct an analytical and descriptive study, in order to restore the true face of the conflict as clearly as possible, but also the interests and consequences of the actions of the Great Powers. The Middle East has become one of the most important areas for Russia's national foreign policy and security. During the period in which the Cold War was carried out, the purpose of the Soviet Union was to diminish the American influence on the Middle East, using various methods such as economic, military and political assistance granted to hostile regimes. Once the substantial oil resources have been discovered, the US economic interest has amplified, and this factor has

led to a change on the agenda of US foreign policy, so they intensified their military presence in the region. The Middle East was an area of interference between the two blocks, where the problem of the several hundred thousand Palestinian refugees published in 1949, exacerbated after the June 1967 conflict, were added permanent interference with the Soviet and the US. The two powers protected their strategic and economic interests, the oil being the mobile of their regional alliances. The US was the main supporter of the state of Israel, constantly conflict with the surrounding Arab countries. The problem of Palestine has divided the Jews and Arabs for decades, along with the struggle for the supremacy of the Arab states.

A summary review of events

Disputes related to geopolitical interests in international spectrum have always existed, but over time, they have taken different forms. If, in the 20th century, the major interest of the great powers was the territorial extension, currently, the struggle goes to the front of maintaining influence and control over the territorial divisions' rich in natural resources and, especially, energy, as the 20th century is considered to be the Oil century, in such a way in which the 19th century was that of coal. The oil resources are noted by its importance, since the modern industry depends on this resource and its products. The interest for these resources has been transformed into a struggle for their control and will be increasingly configured as the main instrument in international relations, as it has been shown that, in the vast majority of international conflicts, there is a connection with oil and gas exploits.

If in the nineteenth century, American interests referred only to the relationship of several groups with the Middle East, not involving political or military decisions, once substantial oil resources have been discovered, and this factor led to a change on the agenda of American foreign policy has thus intensified their military presence in the region. Thus, "one of the major objectives of the US government is to ensure that the economic interests of the United States will be able to be extended on a planetary scale,"¹ it is deduced that both trade and economy remain the national priorities of the United States.

In order to observe the causes from which the conflict situation has started today, a more detailed analysis of historical events is required. Therefore, the conflict state that marked the territory of the Middle East begins with the dynastic and tribal differences that continued to exist over the centuries. The hostilities of a historical and cultural nature, but also the conflicts for the supervision and possession of the natural resources, following the geographical delimitation that the colonial powers have imposed after the First World War, have intensified the existing tensions. Although the Arab countries have undertaken several resistance movements, they could not be able to remove the obstacles that were in the form of a large and unique Arab state. The political guidelines of some states of the Middle East such as Egypt, Syria and Iraq have been a perpetual threat to the other countries in the region. The central area of the Middle East, including Israel, Egypt, Syria, Jordan, Lebanon and Palestinian entity, remains a region of strategic and economic interest whose evolution has consequences for the Eurasian center.

The mixture of the United States of America and the Soviet Union in the region was an act that the leaders of the Middle Eastern states looked questionable, however, they were

¹ Irwin Stelzer, *Neoconservatorism*, Ed. „Atlantic Books”, London, 2004, p.20.

tried to take advantage of the conflict of the two powers in order to strengthen their position. In this context, the diplomats of the two great powers, were forced to strengthen and delimit the strategies they had on the area of interest.

When the Ottoman Empire entered the sphere of German influence, the United Kingdom changed its politics, starting its destruction. It is worth mentioning that during the period before the First World War, the UK has tried to keep the Ottoman Empire neutral. After the outbreak of the war, the British supported the independence of the Arabs, thus promoted actions to encourage riots. Only two years after the beginning of the First World War, the UK has conquered Palestine from the Ottoman Empire with the help of Arabs.

The collapse of the Ottoman Empire culminated with the revolts in Arabia and Syria. An important point in the history of Arab conflicts is the Sykes - Picot Agreement in 1916, through which France, the United Kingdom and Russia have planned a division of the Arab world at the end of the World War. It was a secret agreement between the three powers and the promises made by the Arabs were taken into account. The agreement was to divide the Ottoman Empire as follows: "France controlled the southeast area of Turkey, northern Iraq, Lebanon and Syria, the United Kingdom part of Palestine, the current Jordan and southern Iraq, the area around Haifa port with access to the Mediterranean"², and the Palestine area had to be administered internationally.

The Balfour declaration of 1917 throws all the promises made by Arabs, this agreement that occurred with the revolution in Russia, led to the establishment of the conflict situation between the Arabs and the Zionists. The United Kingdom offered help to the Zionist movement in order to establish a Jewish national home on the territory of Palestine, but in which the non-Jewish population will be able to maintain all its rights in this territory.

If before the First World War, the Arab states revolted against the Ottoman Empire, after the war they organized revolts against France and the United Kingdom. The British had changed their strategy immediately after the end of the war, if in 1914 they were pro-Arabi, in 1917 they became pro-Sionists, and in 1921, antisionists. Between 1914 and 1918 the great European powers believed that Jews and Arabs can be natural allies, at which point the enemies of the Zionist movement seemed to be the French, and not the Arabs. The European powers believed that they would be able to change the Middle East and the fundamental precepts of their political existence. Instead of religion, which was the foundation of the politics of Arab states, Russia proposed communism, and the UK dynastic loyalty.

In the face of this new strategy, the countries of the area tried to proclaim their independence, but did not resist the European powers that controlled the Middle East after the First World War. France and England have become the de facto "heirs" of the Ottoman Empire. In January 1919, Iraq's faisal emir and Zionist leader Chaim Weitzman signed an agreement by which they accepted the formation of an Arab state in Palestine with a Jewish enclave, was a short-term understanding between Arabs and Jews. From 1919, the revolts against the domination of the great powers began, thus, in May 1919, there were revolts in Egypt, the British refusing to recognize the independence of the Egyptian state. Also in 1919, at the end of the third war in Afghanistan, the British recognized its independence provided

² François Massoulie, *Secolul XX. Conflictele din Orientul Mijlociu*, Ed. „BIG ALL”, București, 2003, p.42.

they did not give any help or intervene in any way in India. On the territory of Palestine, the Bedouins began from 1920 attacks on the settlements of the Zionist Jews.

The European powers not only have drawn the artificial borders of the Middle East, but tried to change the mentalities and how to perceive society and religion. The year 1922 brought with it the return to the struggle of the oppressed nations of the Middle East, a area divided into several spheres of influence. The system of mandates of the League of Nations was applied by the British and French as an instrument of their ambitions. Both the mandates and the preferential alliances were considered provisional agreements, but caused the increase of Arab nationalism, giving the mandatory states political, administrative and economic legislative powers. In 1920, England received a provisional mandate on Palestine, which became formal in 1922. In 1929, the Jewish Agency for Palestine was created that promoted the emigration of the Jews. The reaction of the Arabs was virulent, so in 1920, 1921 and 1929 there were riots of the Arabs against the Jews in Jerusalem and other cities. The British divided Palestine into two, the demarcation line being the Jordan River: the eastern part, coping the emirate of Transjordan, on the throne being another son of Hussein, Abdullah, and the west was placed under a direct British administration, allowing Zionist Jews to Emigrate here from all over the world³.

In 1939, the United Kingdom tones its position on the Arab states. The white book for Palestine is a statement that presents its policy towards Palestine. On the threshold of World War II, the number of Jews emigrated from central Europe to Palestine has increased vertiginously, the threat of Nazism being closer. At the same time, the states of the Middle East want independence, increases Arab nationalism in Palestine encouraged by the successes of Egypt, Syria, Lebanon who had earned their independence. The Palestinians wanted concessions from the British and begin a guerrilla war due to the growth of the pro-Arab propaganda of Germany and Italy. The United Kingdom tries an agreement between the Arabs and the Jews under its mandate, but the Arabs in Palestine refuse any negotiations with the Zionist Jews. According to this white book, in the next ten years, an independent Palestinian state to conclude a treaty with England had to be created in Palestine. Also, the Jews had to remain a minority in the future state and not exceed one third of the total population.

In this context, within the European and American Jewish population, Zionism has increased. Zionism was a social current that revived the lives of European and American Jewish communities. Since the end of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century, Zionists formed a united movement that wanted a Jewish national home on the territory of Palestine, under the domination of the Ottoman Empire. Palestine was dominated by battles between Arab and Zionism nationalism, the situation had escaped the British under control. Hitler's Jewish extermination policy has accelerated the desire of Zionists to create a Jewish state in Palestine. In 1914, the total population of Palestine was around 700 000 people, of which about 600 000 were Arabs and 100 000 Jews. "⁴ The Arabs from Palestine wanted a Palestinian state and the removal of the British and French from the area.

³Ibidem, p.58.

⁴ Albert Hourani, *Istoria popoarelor arabe*, Ed. Polirom, București, 2010, p. 378.

At the end of the Second World War, the world had acquired peace, but also two super imitations: the US and the Soviet Union that will dissipate the world in two power poles. Both powers considered the colonial system as a form of anachronistic domination and both the US and the USSR opposed the maintenance of this system. The United States of America once were colonies until 1776 and promoted in the middle of the 20th century other values than those of colonialism: the freedom of peoples or the freedom of international trade. The US did not hide its disapproval of Britain's colonial policy and said London would not use American forces to perpetuate its colonial empire. The UK has understood that the end of the British Empire was waiting for her, but has made a strategy meant to maintain at least one more time the empire and the status of great power through a special alliance with the US⁵. British politicians did not want to accept or even patronize the liquidation of the British Empire, which is why the decolonization process throughout the world and in the Middle East was carried out under the pressure of the struggle of peoples in the countries with colonies status. The Soviet Union supported decolonization, communist ideology supported the right of peoples to self - determination, but also had pragmatic interests in decreasing the power of Western states.

In this international context, when the two great powers favored the struggle for independence, the battle continued in Palestine, taken between Arabs and Palestinians, without the involvement of Great Britain, culminating in 1947 with the United Nations Palestine Plan. The Middle East became after the end of the war an area of conflict perpetuation. Palestine, a territory for several decades under British mandate, has evolved to an area of permanent conflicts. The United Kingdom since 1917, by the Balfour statement, said the granting of substantial support to the Zionist movement aimed at creating the Jewish home in Palestine. During the British term, the arrival of Jews from all over the world was encouraged, thus gradually there appeared in this territory a non-Russian community, which, with the end of World War II, demanded the right to have Not just a homeland, but a state.⁶ The USSR intervened in the Middle East encouraging the end of British domination over Palestine, so the 1947 Andrei Declaration of the UN has encouraged both the Jews and the Arabs to end the British mandate and the division of Palestine into two states, one Jew and the other Palestinian. The UN General Assembly created UNSCOP, the Special Committee of the United Nations for Palestine.

UNSCOP adopted in 1947 a plan to divide Palestine, very complex, ratified by the UN in November 1947 and accepted with anxiety by Jews and rejected by the Arabs. The plan proposed that 56 % of Palestine form a Jewish state (the population was: 498,000 Jews and 497,000 Arabs) and 43 % of Palestine to appear the Palestinian state (725,000 Arabs and 10,000 Jews)⁷. Jerusalem had to become an international area under the UN administration. UNSCOP recommended this sharing, and the UN General Assembly adopted a plan on November 29, 1949, with the support of the US and the USSR. Through this plan it was practically the division of Palestine into two states: one Jew between the Special Commission of the United Nations for Palestine Jordan and the Mediterranean, the other Arab.

⁵ Henry Kissinger, *Diplomacy*, Ed. „Simon & Schuster”, New York, USA, 1994, p. 599.

⁶ Peter Mansfield, *O istorie a Orientului Mijlociu*, Ed. Humanitas, București, 2016, p. 256.

⁷ „Raportul Organizației Națiunilor Unite privind planul de împărțire a Palestinei, septembrie 1947 Rezoluția 242 a Organizațiilor Națiunilor Unite”, <http://www.un.org/Depts/dpi/palestine/ch3.pdf>.

The Arabs did not accept this plan. Resolution 181 divided the territory of Palestine into two equal parts, but in a complicated way, the purpose being to create an economic union with open borders⁸. The misunderstandings arising within the UN led to the renunciation of the sharing. On May 14, 1948, the British term of Palestine expired, so that Zionist leaders declared the independence of the state of Israel, David Ben Gurion proclaiming the state of Israel and thus becoming its first prime minister. Truman quickly recognized the new state, and Stalin did the same.

The declaration of independence was followed by the Arab-Israeli war in which the armies were involved: Egyptians, Syrians, Transjordanians, Lebanon, Iraq and Saudi Arabia being defeated by Israel. The war of independence between 1948 - 1949 led to the conquest of the territory and the organization of a national army. The defeat of the Arabs led to the birth of one of the most acute humanitarian problems of the second half of the 20th century, the problem of Palestinian refugees. Israel had conquered 78% of the western territory of the Jordan River, and Jerusalem was divided between Israel and Jordan. Egypt occupied the Gaza and Jordan strip. The official number of the Palestinians who fled from the territories conquered by the Jews varies between 500 000 and 800 000, becoming refugees in the countries in the area, giving rise to the "problem of Palestinian refugees." Two thirds of the approximately 758 000 – 866 000 Jews expelled from the Arab states became citizens of the State of Israel. During the two years of war the properties of the Palestinians were ruined, and the Palestinians were banished from their homes⁹.

The creation of the State of Israel was a unique political phenomenon, achieved by the will and struggle of the Jewish leaders as well as a population that had passed through Holocaust during World War II. Jews around the world have been encouraged to emigrate to Israel, and in a few decades the population of this state has grown vertiginously. One year after its creation, Israel was admitted as a member of the UN on May 11, 1949¹⁰. The gradual removal of European domination, the appearance and recognition by the great powers of Israel, increasing the importance of the oil industry and the market for oil products, all They led to the appearance of the contemporary Middle East. The balance had to be maintained by a great power, given the numerous conflicts in the area, and this power was the USA that became a guarantor of stability in the region, a difficult mission given the permanent conflicts, but also the beneficiary of oil and the greatest power in This industry.

Political and economic interest nased on the Middle East's natural resources

The entire political scene of the Middle East was interpreted in the international arena through a long range of seemingly endless conflicts. With the end of the Cold War, the repercussions on the conflict area also followed, as the great powers were forced to diminish their spheres of influence in the region promoted by the regional powers and the point of interest focused on the evolution of the peace process.

⁸ „Rezoluția ONU Nr. 181”, <https://unispal.un.org/DPA/DPR/unispal.nsf/0/7F0AF2BD897689B785256C330061D253>

⁹ Benny, Morris, *The birth of the palestinian refugee problem revisited*, „Cambridge University Press”, 2004, New York, USA, p. 168.

¹⁰ „Statul Israel - scurt istoric”, <http://www.mae.ro/node/1832>.

At the same time, the states that have maintained their interest are the U.S., Russia, Japan, North Korea, China, France, the United Kingdom, but also the European Union, this interest being divided into two directions: Arab-Israeli relations and the Palestinian issue. The state that is subjected to an analysis is the US, a state that, with the end of the Cold War and the Gulf War, redefines its status and position of influential power in the region. Although certain changes have occurred on the international scene, we can say that American interests remain approximately unchanged, the US state is still interested in the natural resources of the region, especially oil, but also for weapon control. The United States has taken a double policy, as it wanted to maintain a bilateral relationship with Israel, but also establish a cooperation relationship with the Arab states to maintain the Gulf Security. Specifically, he has taken a policy to promote security with both the Israeli and Arab states, to allow them to secure the control point and the path to the oil resources in the region. American propaganda promoted in the Middle East focuses on several criteria, such as "Precaution against Arab fundamentalism, promoting the reform and development of the economy"¹¹.

The interests of the Russian state in the region have been limited to the nuclear capability, considering that cooperation with the Arab countries is absolutely necessary.

In 1973 the first crisis of oil takes place, being sufficient to show dependence on Westerners on natural Arab resources. Arabs have tried to use oil to isolate Israel political, the price increase deeply affecting both the western and world power economy. The shock on the international scene came after the end of the Israeli-Arab war of 1973, when countries that were part of the OPEC (the organization of oil exporting countries) said in October 1973, that they no longer export oil to the countries supporting Israel. It should be mentioned that OPEC was formed in 1960, with "5 founding members: Iran, Iraq, Kuwait, Saudi Arabia and Venezuela, and 1971 were joined by 6 more states: Qatar, Indonesia, Libya, United Arab Emirates, Algeria and Nigeria"¹².

The role of OPEC was, since its founding, to "limit the oil extraction to maintain the price on the international oil market"¹³. The emergence of this organization is closely related to the change of power balance in terms of Oil and Economy of the Middle East and the transition from multinational oil companies to a new stage, namely the national oil production.

The Oil War represented an economic conflict, which was started by the OPEC states, in 1973, during the Arab-Israeli conflict of October. The oil shock occurred on October 17 1973, when the Arab countries of OPEC said they no longer export oil to the countries that support Israel, and the oil production of these states has decreased, creating uncontrolled increases in the world market. This substantial increase in the price was due to American intervention and western states in support of Israel, to the detriment of the Arab states involved. OPEC members imposed an embargo of oil stopping all deliveries to the states that helped Israel. There were serious consequences: the whole world economy has entered the recession, and to overcome the crisis, the Americans have imposed a price to their own oil production, depreciating the impact of the crisis. The oil embargo continued until March

¹¹ Noam Chomsky, Gilbert, Archcar, *Perilous Power: The Middle East & U.S. Foreign Policy*, „Penguin”, 2008, USA, p. 144.

¹² Al-Chalabi, *OPEC and the International Oil Industry*, Ed. „Oxford University Press”, 1980, p. 21.

¹³ *Ibidem*, p. 22.

1974, after the Washington Conference. Even after the conclusion of this international oil summit, the effects of price increase were felt until the early 1980s, the impact of embargo being not only one immediately, but a lasting one.

It is also worth mentioning the Israeli-Palestinian conflict in terms of a struggle on water viewed as a declining resource in the arid region of the Middle East. Water rights in Palestine, which influences the economic, social, and political role represent a crucial factor in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict for a nation. The conflict on water, not because of religious differences, becomes one of the contested problems between Israeli and Palestinians.

The undetermined lines in the Palestine of the Jordan River and the Aquifer complicate the problem of water rights and represent the main water resources of Palestine. Water sources are not limited to a single authority or state, which further complicates negotiations for water distribution.

The Jordan River creates serious problems because of its geopolitical status. Prior to the six -day war of 1967, the corresponding borders were delimited by water sources and used by all surrounding nations, such as Lebanon, Syria, Israel and Jordan. Each has rights to the courses and tributaries leading to the Jordan River, which crosses the four limits of the state¹⁴. The river flows from 2 200 meters above sea level and 400 meters below sea level, creating a natural flow of water.

The Aquifer system is made up of natural and drilled springs, fountains that extend to both sides of the central territory of the Jews and Samarian Mountain in Israel, from the Jezreel Valley to the Beersheba Valley and from the foot of the Judean Mountains to the Jordan River. The aquifer is divided into three general areas, the Western Aquifer (Yarkon-Tannin), the North-East Aquifer (Scheme / Nablus-Gilboa) and the East Aquifer basin.

US involvement in the regional conflict

The Middle East dispute was held long in the form of a substantially extended conflict between the Israelis and the Arab peoples. There were various events that, we can say, that they marked on the wars map a progress in the evolution of the peace process between the two parties. One of the stages that led to the arbitration and mediation of the conflict was the Madrid Conference, in 1991, under the Soviet-American aegis, during which the issue of the Middle East was debated and which is concluded with a bilateral dialogue between Palestinians and Israeli¹⁵. An important mediator was Norway, who hosted the Oslo agreements, signed on September 13, 1993 and which stipulated the need to withdraw the Israeli force from certain parts of the Gaza strip and from the western part of the Jordan River, as well as to assert the Palestinian people's rights to self -government. A point of great interest, which appeared with the signing of the agreements, was the recognition by Israel of the Organization for the Liberation of Palestine and, in contrast, the EPO recognized the existence and legitimacy of the state of Israel.

The 1993 Oslo agreements gave rise to the peace process, representing a continuous US -mediated effort to intermediate a peace treaty between Israeli and Palestinians. The purpose is a final state agreement, which will establish a Palestinian state in Gaza and the

¹⁴ Nurit Kliot, *Water Resources and Conflict in the Middle East*, Ed. „Routledge”, 1993, p. 185.

¹⁵ „The 1991 Madrid Peace Conference”, <https://adst.org/2015/10/the-1991-madrid-peace-conference/>.

West Bank, in exchange for an acceptance of Palestinians to permanently end attacks on Israeli targets, a formula often called peace land.¹⁶

It would have been believed that the peace process was concluded in January 2001, but the Palestinian leader, Yasser Arafat, rejected the peace proposal of his Israeli counterpart, Ehud Barak. In addition, the renewed discussions failed to generate an agreement, and the aggravation of violence during the second violence has made a new round of discussions seem impossible.

Despite the 2001 failure, the Oslo's General Bone for Peace remains the dominant American and international approach for conflict resolution. The Bush administration pushed its own update on Oslo, called the roadmap, and the Obama administration has made the peace process an important priority in foreign policy. The Trump administration has not officially abandoned this formula, but has not yet taken any significant measure to advance it.

Any successful peace initiative should solve the four fundamental problems that have affected the peace process: settlements in the West Jordan area, Israeli Security, Palestinian refugees and Jerusalem. So far there have been few successes and there are three major obstacles to any agreement.

The Palestinian-Israeli crisis has gained new dimensions in 2002. First of all, against the backdrop of hard orientation in Israel, Intifada is doubled by extremely dangerous suicide attacks. The Ariel Sharon regime replied with vigor: in April 2002, the Israeli army attacked the Palestinian territories, reproaching Yasser Arafat the inability to comply with the Oslo agreements, 1993 and control the extremist Hamas and Islamic Jihad movements.

In this context, the actions of Israel violated UN resolution no. 1397, promoted by the US, which reiterated the principles of the edification of the Palestinian state and the peaceful regulation of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.¹⁷ The Palestinian problem was also complicated by the dissensions within the Palestinian authority, as well as by the disagreements between it and the Palestinian diaspora or between moderate Arabs and Islamic fundamentalists. The old age of Yasser Arafat and the mystery of success in power, maintained a space of uncertainty at the upper level of the Palestinian authority.

At the Arab meeting in Beirut, from March 27-28, 2002, the peace plan of the heir Abdallah Abdelaziz of Saudi Arabia, which included the recognition of Israel, the withdrawal of the Israeli army on the borders on June 4, 1967, was adopted on the other hand and the creation of the Palestinian state.¹⁸ The exit from the crisis is a difficult objective to see under the conditions in which both the Palestinians and the Israelis are pushed by the escalation of the armed violence towards irreconcilable positions. The EU joined the Saudi Plan, which also includes the problem of returning to the refugees, but the US and Israel remained in expectation until June 24, when President George. W. Bush ruled again in favor of the existence of a Palestinian state, established by direct Israeli-Palestinian negotiations, without prior Palestinian conditions.

A month later, on July 22, the Israeli army intervened in Gaza, killing a well -known Hamas leader, despite the fact that the organization had announced that she was willing to

¹⁶ „Oslo Accords 1993”, http://cis.uchicago.edu/oldsite/sites/cis.uchicago.edu/files/resources/CIS-090213-israelpalestine_38-1993DeclarationofPrinciples_OsloAccords.pdf.

¹⁷ „Rezoluția ONU Nr. 1397/2002”, <http://unscr.com/en/resolutions/1397>.

¹⁸ „The Arab Peace Initiative”, <https://www.aljazeera.com/focus/2009/01/200912764650608370.html>.

cease suicidal attacks. On August 10, 12 Palestinian organizations reached an agreement on a common project of building an independent state, different from the Hamas Plan. A few days later, on August 18, high Israeli and Palestinian dignitaries signed a security protocol in Gaza, and on September 17, Quartet 20, made up of the US, EU, UN and the Russian Federation, proposes a peace - focused plan on recognition in stages, of the Palestinian independent state. Known as the name "Road Map", the plan could not be finalized until the following year, 2003, when Mahmoud Abbas was appointed prime minister of the Palestinian authority, given that both Israel and the USA, considered that Yasser Arafat did not. It can also be considered a dialogue partner.¹⁹

Although sustained efforts have been made from the international community, the Israeli-Palestinian conflict is currently remaining a challenge for the future. The events of the last years, such as the Arab Spring, in 2011 or the transformation, following the vote in the UN General Assembly, of the Palestinian National Authority in the UN Member Observatory, similar to the Vatican, suggests that the attention of the actors involved will be directed to the conflict resolution by choosing The solution of two states for two peoples, which involves the establishment of a Palestinian state along with the Israeli on the territory of the former British mandate of Palestine.

Keeping the same model of action as before, will not make a major change, especially in the case of the Arab-Israeli conflict, the application of previous strategies will not bring changes and will strengthen the EU, acting with the UN, and especially the USA, which It is, more part of the problem than the solution in the conflict region. The effort to empower the new generations of local activists and leaders, along with a concerted effort to ensure that the Israeli and Palestinian authorities comply with EU laws and standards, should be a minimum of EU approach. This would not only serve the main cause of peace, but it will also help the EU protect its credibility and weak power in Palestine, in the region and international system generally.

The status of Jerusalem has a vital importance for all three monotheistic religions, and its exclusive claim by one party cannot remain without repercussions: "20In Israel, Jerusalem is officially qualified as an eternal and indivisible capital, while Palestinians hopes that Jerusalem is I am to become the capital of the Palestinian state." The end of 2017 agitated the spirits of the Palestinians, when the US President Donald Trump has publicly announced that he would move the American embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem, recognizing by this action the city of Israel.

By this decision, Trump violated the international consensus that argued that the status of Jerusalem should only be established in some Israeli-Palestinian peace negotiations and took a step that no other country or president of the USA has assumed. Due to the unique character of Jerusalem, the international community has decided that neither Palestinians nor Jews should exercise an exclusive political power over it.

The same principle has guided the international policy of the United States for more than 70 years, the origins of this decision being found in the 1947 partition plan, which established the division of Palestine into two distinct states: one Jew and one Arab, Jerusalem

¹⁹ „A PERFORMANCE-BASED ROADMAP TO A PERMANENT TWO-STATE SOLUTION TO THE ISRAELI-PALESTINIAN CONFLICT”, <http://www.un.org/News/dh/mideast/roadmap122002.pdf>.

²⁰ „The Significance of Jerusalem”, <http://www.pij.org/details.php?id=646>.

remained neutral, being placed under international control. The US declared, for several decades, the main mediator of the conflict between Israeli and Palestinians, and neutrality allowed him to remain a credible arbitrator to keep both parties at the negotiation table. The announcement of President Trump to move the US Embassy has been received as a threat to the peace process since public opinion concerns neutrality as indispensable to solve stresses in the area.

In the Middle East, the US was perceived rather as an ally of Israel than an arbitrator. A biased actor who promotes the interests of Israel, perpetuating the state of conflict. This perception is due, in part, to the pro-Israel internal politics promoted by American leaders, but also the imbalance of forces between Israeli and Palestinians, the US being blamed, with or without credible arguments, for the military and logistics superiority of Israel. The last three administrations: Clinton, Bush and Obama have considered it to provide Israel to determine Israeli leaders to take more steps to obtain peace.

A similar initiative came from Bill Clinton, in 1995, when he decided to move the US Embassy to Jerusalem. The proposal to move the embassy came to a positive climate for Palestinian-Israeli bilateral relations, dominated by the effect of historical peace agreements between Israel and Palestinians from Oslo. They were seen by the head of the American Executive as a form of concretization of a peace process. The non-realization of the decision was due precisely to the deterioration of the situation in the area and to freeze the peace process, started in Oslo. The current political context is different from the Clinton moment of 1995, not meeting, at the end of last year, no perspective of materializing the peace process between Israeli and Palestinians. At first glance, President Trump's decision is not in line with the geostrategic component of national interests and can endanger the safety of the United States.

By moving the embassy to Jerusalem, Donald Trump has reached a very sensitive string for the evangelical community, given the strong symbolism that the holy city has. The US president has understood that the Evangelical Electorate will always support the candidate who helps him to fulfill his religious desires, regardless of his private life. On the other hand, even if there are Republicans who do not support the aspirations of the evangelists, however, they want a pro-Israel camp due to the influence exerted by the lobby of Jewish organizations. In other words, there is no opposition to his decision²¹. And, although it is a geopolitical risky movement, it has achieved its purpose internally.

Apparently, Trump's actions are motivated by the desire to be re-elected for a new term as president. And through this movement, Trump has ensured the support of the Evangelical Lecture and donors who support Israel, we mention Sheldon Adelson, a well-known Pro-Israel policy, who offered \$ 35 million financial support for Trump's campaign²².

If we look at the decision in terms of the US East strategy, it falls into normal patterns. Trump aims to bring the Arab countries and Israel to the negotiation table, the ultimate goal being to form an alliance against Iran and religious fundamentalism so present in the region. Each of the previous administrations pursued this result and tried to achieve a

²¹ „Jerusalem embassy: Why Trump's move was not about peace”, <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-44120428>.

²² „Sheldon Adelson driving Trump's Middle East policy”, <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2018/jun/08/sheldon-adelson-trump-middle-east-policy>.

proximity between the Arab and Israel, but they concluded that this is impossible without reconciliation between Palestinians and Israeli. Peace being indispensable to support the integration of the regional map.

Trump, however, considers the process of inefficient peace and chooses another approach. It is possible, therefore, that the US decision will focus on an Arab-Israeli alliance against Iran, then on the impulse of the peace process. The strategy could even bear fruit if we take into account the tacit cooperation between Israel and the Gulf countries in order to minimize the influence of Iran in the region and the fact that Saudi Arabia regards Iran as the most urgent of its problems²³. Whatever the opinions of the parties directly targeted by the decision of the US president, it is clear that his statement from December last year has aroused strong reactions.

Because of these ambiguities, the politics of the United States still remains uncertain. It is obvious that the Trump administration wants the final borders of Jerusalem to be negotiated as a result of a peace agreement, but it is not as clear what part of Jerusalem is considered the Sovereign Israeli territory. Until last year, the US believes that Israel has sovereign rights inside the armistice lines established in 1949, except for Western Jerusalem, considered neutral territory. With the statement of the president of recognition of Jerusalem as the capital of Israel, it can be assumed that, in the future, the US will consider Western Jerusalem as part of Israel's law.

Despite these things they led to the interpretation by the political leaders in the Middle East as a possible recognition of the sovereignty of Israel over the whole of Jerusalem. This ad has led to strong reactions among the Arabs. The Palestinian national authority and states in the Arab region such as Egypt, Jordan and Saudi Arabia have condemned the decision of the US president, claiming that such recognition can affect regional stability. The reaction of the Palestinian part was not delayed, as Ahmad Majdalani, a member of the Executive Committee of the Organization for Palestine Liberation, announced that Palestinians will oppose the decision by peaceful protests.

Conclusions

The Arab-Israeli conflicts, which have begun for half the 20th century, did not find their settlement until the beginning of the 21st century. Diplomacy was trying to lay the foundations for a peace between Israel and the Arab world, but this has been only partial. The Palestinian problem, which had been at the origin of the conflict, gained international support, increasing the global recognition of the organization for the liberation of Palestine. On December 7, 1978, the UN General Assembly claimed that there could be no right and lasting without solving the Palestinian problem and pronouncing the participation of the EP in the efforts and deliberations under the aegis of the United Nations. In addition, since 1979, in favor of the law of self-determination of the Palestinian people, the Assembly of the Western Europe was also pronounced, and the EPE has been recognized as the representative of the Palestinian people by a high number of countries, including the Netherlands, Japan and Austria. Thus, it is observed the sketch of an international current in favor of the Palestinian

²³ „Face to Face: Saudi Arabia-Iran”, <https://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/interactive/2018/04/face-face-saudi-arabia-iran-180425140132414.html>.

cause. However, the twentieth century ended without a concrete settlement of the Palestinian problem, continuing in the next century that the instability appears, having political and diplomatic implications globally.

The Arab - Israeli crisis is classified in the cycle of persistent disputes, since the problem of resolving the conflict continues today. The guilt of the outbreak of this type of conflict consists neither in the Palestinians, nor in that of the Jews, but in the inability of the diplomatic decisions that the United Kingdom made during his term in Palestine, decisions that have proven to be contradictory and incompatible compared to both communities on the Palestinian territory. Can it be a fair peace? No, as long as the heavy wars carried by the Arabs and Jews culminated largely with the victory of Israel, specifically it annexed more territories than was consecrated in the UN Resolution of the Palestine State of 1947, which determined the Arabs from Palestine is in an impossible position to be able to have any type of negotiation with the state of Israel.

A sustainable peace and to thank both parties prove to be unattainable, given that at the beginning of the conflict, the Jewish population was about half compared to the population of Arabs in Palestine, and which, at present, have come to have many more the territories were initially proposed by the Anglo -American coalition for the division of Palestine. Moreover, the water rights in Palestine occupy a substantial position in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Religious and cultural differences are not the only reasons for conflict, as they are often perceived. The creation of the state of Israel in 1948 amplified the power structure in Palestine, offering more power, influence and control over the region's resources.

As a result, a continuous struggle exists between Israeli and Palestinians for equal rights to a nation that can only be achieved through adequate natural sources to support the economic and social development of a nation. Moreover, the persistence of US to maintain its influent position and role in the region, but also in search of a hidden agenda, for example the help offered to Israel to control the Palestinians, control the Iraqi oil fields or generally expand American hegemony.

From the economic point of the external powers' interests, we refer to the importance of the natural resources of the region, if, in the 20th century, the major interest of the great powers was the territorial extension, currently, the struggle goes on the front of maintaining influence and control over the rich territorial divisions In natural and especially energy resources, as the 20th century is considered to be the Oil century, in such a way that the 19th century was that of coal. The oil resources are noted by its importance, since the modern industry depends on this resource and its products. The interest for these resources has been transformed into a struggle for their control and will be increasingly configured as the main tool in international relations, as it has been shown that in the vast majority of international conflicts there is a connection with oil and gas exploits.

The Suez channel was listed as the most important navigable artery for world trade between East and West. It is considered the most important waterway due to the possibility of moving oil between production sources and consumption markets. Thus, it has a great impact on the economies of the states. In addition, it is considered as a path and a gateway for military convoys from the Mediterranean to the Red Sea. The Suez channel has a strategic significance and has led to the increase of conflict between the great powers on the influence in the Middle East. The advantages and characteristics of the location, in particular, make it

suitable to be a world center for industrial economic areas, the distribution of trading transit and logistical services for ships and trade, everything can go through the Suez channel. The current Suez Canal is considered one of the most important navigation bands in the world, being host to a tenth of world trade.

Because the Suez channel has a privileged geographical location, it is a very important element for maritime transport being one of the cheapest means of transport and considering that over 80% of world trade is operated on waterways. Ships that transit the channel can save time, distances and operating costs. An important feature is that this channel can be extended and deep when necessary and thus adapts to the evolution of the dimensions and weights of the ships.

At the same time, the states that have maintained their interest are the U.S., Russia, Japan, North Korea, China, France, the United Kingdom, but also the European Union, this interest being divided into two directions: Arab-Israeli relations and the Palestinian issue. The state that is subjected to an analysis is the US, a state that, with the end of the Cold War and the Gulf War, redefines its status and position of influential power in the region. Although certain changes have occurred on the international scene, we can say that American interests remain approximately unchanged, the US state is still interested in the natural resources of the region, especially oil, but also for weapon control. The United States has taken a double policy, as it wanted to maintain a bilateral relationship with Israel, but also establish a cooperation relationship with the Arab states to maintain the Gulf Security. Specifically, he has taken a policy to promote security with both the Israeli and Arab states, to allow them to secure the control point and the path to the oil resources in the region.

If, in the initial phase, the Middle East was an area where the great powers practiced their powers of territorial expansion, mainly refer to the United Kingdom, wanting to impose its colonialist policy in the Middle East region, after the mid-20th century, it will become A territory in which a fierce struggle will lead to the region's natural resources, especially between the US and the USSR. In the struggle for supremacy, actors like Romania will join, who will participate as a mediator of the Arab-Israeli conflict, having of course, economic interests: Nicolae Ceausescu wanted to open the economic market to the states of the Middle East and Africa.

In a last matter, the focus is on Donald Trump's decision to move the embassy to Jerusalem, wishing that the Arab countries and Israel will start the round of negotiations, the ultimate goal being to form an alliance against Iran and religious fundamentalism. In addition to the fact that this action represents an affront against the Arab states, the most acidic consequences would manifest on the Palestinian population remove the possibility that a Palestinian state be formed, and Israel will be placed in front of two possibilities, one refers to The preservation of the religious identity of Israel, the second - to adopt democracy as a form of governance throughout the territory, in which it can border the rights of the Palestinian population, while exercising its absolute control over the Palestinian settlements, or it gives them full rights. To observe a resemblance to this event with the British colonization system, as the president imposes his own understanding of the region, without taking into account the geopolitical realities of the Middle East, and the price will be paid by Israeli and Palestinians.

References

- Al-CHALABI, *OPEC and the International Oil Industry*, Ed. „Oxford University Press”, 1980.
- CHOMSKY Noam, ARCHCAR Gilbert, *Perilous Power: The Middle East & U.S. Foreign Policy*, „Penguin”, USA, 2008.
- HOURANI Albert, *Istoria popoarelor arabe*, Ed. „Polihrom”, București, 2010.
- KISSINGER Henry, *Diplomacy*, Ed. „Simon & Schuster”, New York, USA, 1994.
- KLIOT Nurit, *Water Resources and Conflict in the Middle East*, Ed. „Routledge”, 1993.
- MANSFIELD Peter, *O istorie a Orientului Mijlociu*, Ed. „Humanitas”, București, 2016;
- MASSOULIE François, *Secolul XX. Conflictele din Orientul Mijlociu*, „Ed. BIG ALL”, București, 2003.
- MORRIS Benny, *The birth of the palestinian refugee problem revisited*, „Cambridge University Press”, New York, USA, 2004.
- STELZER Irwin, *Neoconservatorism*, Ed. „Atlantic Books”, London, 2004.

References online

- „Oslo Accords 1993”,
http://cis.uchicago.edu/oldsite/sites/cis.uchicago.edu/files/resources/CIS-090213-israelpalestine_38-1993DeclarationofPrinciples_OsloAccords.pdf.
- „Face to Face: Saudi Arabia-Iran”,
<https://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/interactive/2018/04/face-face-saudi-arabia-iran-180425140132414.html>.
- „Jerusalem embassy: Why Trump's move was not about peace”,
<https://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-44120428>.
- „Raportul Organizației Națiunilor Unite privind planul de împărțire a Palestinei, septembrie 1947 Rezoluția 242 a Organizațiilor Națiunilor Unite”,
<http://www.un.org/Depts/dpi/palestine/ch3.pdf>.
- „Rezoluția ONU Nr. 1397/2002”, <http://unscr.com/en/resolutions/1397>.
- „Rezoluția ONU Nr. 181”,
<https://unispal.un.org/DPA/DPR/unispal.nsf/0/7F0AF2BD897689B785256C330061D253>.
- „Sheldon Adelson driving Trump's Middle East policy”, <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2018/jun/08/sheldon-adelson-trump-middle-east-policy>.
- „Statul Israel - scurt istoric”, <http://www.mae.ro/node/1832>.
- „The 1991 Madrid Peace Conference”, <https://adst.org/2015/10/the-1991-madrid-peace-conference/>.
- „The Arab Peace Initiative”,
<https://www.aljazeera.com/focus/2009/01/200912764650608370.html>.
- „The Significance of Jerusalem”, <http://www.pij.org/details.php?id=646>.

„A PERFORMANCE-BASED ROADMAP TO A PERMANENT TWO-STATE SOLUTION TO THE ISRAELI-PALESTINIAN CONFLICT”,
<http://www.un.org/News/dh/mideast/roadmap122002.pdf>.