

**YE.G. TOROSYAN**

**U.S. AS A CONFLICT RESOLUTION ACTOR IN RELATION TO THE  
ISRAELI-PALESTINIAN CONFLICT**

Israeli-Palestinian conflict emerged at the beginning of the twentieth century and it remains one of the tricky issues in the region. The nature of the conflict during its emergence has changed for many regional and geopolitical reasons. Despite all these changes, this conflict needs urgent solution, and it will remain relevant until it is resolved. After the proclamation of independence, the United States was one of the countries that recognized the State of Israel. During the last twenty-five years, the geopolitical structure has greatly changed and U.S. started to act as a global actor. Every president has his own approach to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, but every president tries to maintain a balance of power. Although there are many evidences that U.S. policy is more biased than balanced. It is known that there is a clear distinction between the foreign policies of Bush and Obama, whereas in the case of the new President, Trump, differences are so great that they can lead to geopolitical risks

**Keywords:** Israeli-Palestinian conflict, U.S. policy, foreign policy, geopolitical risks, September 11, Hamas, Palestinian National Authority, President Trump.

Israeli-Palestinian conflict emerged at the beginning of the twentieth century and it remains one of the tricky issues in the region. The reluctance of Arabs to act as united forces aggravated the conflict. The divided nature of the Arab world made Israel's victory possible, especially, the six-day war demonstrated that the lack of consolidation in the Arab states pledged Israel's victory and further triumphs made Israel one of the most powerful states in the world. When we study the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, we must emphasize that the nature of the conflict during its emergence has changed for many regional and geopolitical reasons. Despite all these changes, this conflict needs urgent solution, and it will remain relevant until it is resolved.

Over the past two decades, the Palestinian and the Jewish societies have gone through open and unprecedented changes, particularly, when the conflicting parties decided to withdraw from the battlefield and expressed readiness to negotiate. Today, mediators are trying to use negotiations as the only tool, but, unfortunately, these efforts remain ineffective. The study of the role of mediators and especially the role of the United States is important, since this can contribute to a comprehensive understanding of this conflict. The importance of the topic is also related to the fact that it affects the neighboring states.

After the proclamation of independence, the United States was one of the states that recognized the state of Israel. During the last twenty five years the

geopolitical structure has greatly changed and U.S. started to act as a global actor. The unipolarity made U.S. positions in the Middle East more assets. A study of US initiatives reveals the mistakes and miscalculations of the United States policy, as it tended to resolve numerous conflicts in the Middle East that extended from Morocco to Pakistan [1]. Furthermore, the United States has special preferences in the Middle East and differentiates between the Arab states.

Every president has his own approach to this conflict, but every president tries to maintain a balance of power, although there are many evidences that U.S. policy more is biased than balanced. Anti-Arab sentiments were particularly noticeable, especially after September 11 attacks. I believe that previous achievements around the Israeli-Palestinian conflict were seriously undermined.

Moreover, the Israeli-Palestinian conflict lost its significance as Washington found a new enemy and a new target-Iraq and Saddam Hussein. But I am sure, during the presidency of George W. Bush, the Israeli-Palestinian conflict had a higher level of violence. All the facts speak that the measures that have been taken by George Bush and his administration were not able to guarantee such norms as social solidarity, sustainable development, and good governance in Palestine [2].

The territorial dispute was the main reason of the emergence of Israeli-Palestinian conflict, and the religions, as the reason of the antagonism between these nations did not play a significant role. But the emergence of fundamental forces changed the nature of the conflict and complicated it. Both parties lost a chance to regulate the conflict peacefully as fundamentalism and extremism have expanded, and they don't allow rational approaches to find a solution. Particularly, the situation radically changed after the victory of Hamas in legislative elections in 2006[3]. Indeed, the religion became a splitting force which made the Israeli-Palestinian conflict more complicated and intricate topic. The expansion of Jewish settlements in the Palestinian territories, the disputes over the status of Jerusalem and the problem of Palestinian refugees complicates the further settlement of the conflict. The radical position of Hamas led the negotiations to a deadlock as no one wanted to sit at the negotiation table with Hamas. This fact indicates that the resolution of the conflict between the conflicting parties is complex and consensus between Palestinian National Authority and Israel is not enough. This is a more difficult task for the current PNA, since each of its actions can be misinterpreted.

Further internal political tensions in Palestine and the disagreement between Hamas and Palestinian National Authority caused the external interference in this matter. Therefore, it was difficult to speak about the peace process in the Middle East and such a proposal as the Great Middle East Initiative had a goal to establish the overwhelming power of the U.S. foreign policy. But the geopolitical situation

changed during the Obama presidency. It was expected that the antagonism between the conflicting parties would be reduced, although the further development shows that hatred remains unchanged.

It is known that there is a clear distinction between the foreign policies of Bush and Obama, whereas in the case of the new President, Trump, differences are so great that they can lead to geopolitical risks.

The recent rise of protectionism and isolation threatens to weaken the U.S. foreign policy. With the arrival of the new administration in Washington, the roadblock to globalization has become more apparent. However, the U.S. is a democratic state, and the policies adopted by the new administration of the White House and the Capitol Hill do not always reflect all the wishes and expectations of the majority in the United States. Nevertheless, the trend towards isolationism is not a short-term phenomenon. An overview of relations with NATO, the EU and the imposition of tariffs indicates that the isolation policy has long-term goals.

Despite the newly adopted policy of isolationism, the Evangelical electorate exerts pressure on the White House to support the state of Israel. Thus, while investigating the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, it is premature to discuss the U.S. withdrawal from this conflict and this region in general. Indeed, Trump's bold moves towards Jerusalem issue indicate that the declared policies of protectionism and isolationism are not so comprehensive and there is certain dualism in the U.S. foreign policy. This dualism reflects itself in Trump's administration rejection of the inherited US long-term foreign policy. Despite a series of setbacks, only the U.S. was able to bring Palestinians and Israelis to the negotiation table. The U.S. provided humanitarian and development aid for Palestinians with political and diplomatic leverage over Israel. But today Trump does not allow to predict the further situation in the region, since there are many contradictions in his remarks about the Israeli-Palestinian conflict (Sorene 2017).

The turning point was December 2017, when Donald Trump made a decision to recognize Jerusalem as a capital of Israel and called to transfer the embassy of the U.S. to Jerusalem [4]. He interpreted his actions as a new approach to the conflict resolution. But this decision raised the wrath of the Palestinians and the negative reaction of the world. In addition, the head of the Palestinian National Authority (PNA), Mahmoud Abbas, called for an end to the U.S. participation in the Middle East peace process [5]. Besides, Hamas threatened with the new intifada [6].

Thus, the irresponsible decision of the US president only caused the condemnation of the world community. For the first time, the US foreign policy appeared in isolation. Moreover, this decision is very dangerous, especially today because of the influx of refugees to Europe, where anti-Semitic sentiments are growing, and such an irrational decision only complicates the situation.

The U.S. needs to adopt a more sustainable, coherent and balanced policy towards the Israeli-Palestinian conflict whereas the current policy should be reviewed. An attempt to maintain a balance between the parties of the conflict should be more visible and effective. This is a tricky issue since on the one hand there is a pro-American lobby, while on the other there are American interests in the Middle East and these should be reconciled. The U.S. foreign policy aims to resolve the conflict and make great efforts to solve it. By the auspice of the White House, initiatives, plans, agreements are carried out, yet none of them brought results. Today, when the world is mainly focused on other crises, the Israeli-Palestinian conflict should not lose its relevance and must remain under control. The analysis and studies on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict will facilitate the quest for a lasting solution.

#### REFERENCES

1. **Cofman Wittes T.** The new U.S. proposal for a Greater Middle East Initiative: An valuation. - May 10, 2004, <https://www.brookings.edu/research/the-new-u-s-proposal-for-a-greater-middle-east-initiative-an-evaluation>
2. **Oz Hassan,** Constructing America's Freedom Agenda for the Middle East.- UK, 2012, <https://www2.warwick.ac.uk/fac/soc/pais/research/researchcentres/irs/publications/hassanpreview.pdf>
3. **Haddad T. and Honig-Parnass T.** Between the Lines Israel, the Palestinians and U.S. War on terror, 2007.
4. **Borger J. and Beaumont P.** Defiant Donald Trump confirms US will recognize Jerusalem as capital of Israel.-7 December 2017, <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2017/dec/06/donald-trump-us-jerusalem-israel-capital>
5. **Lieber D.** Abbas says Trump's Jerusalem decision ends historic US role as peace broker. - 6 December 2017, <https://www.timesofisrael.com/abbas-says-trumps-jerusalem-decision-ends-historic-us-role-as-peace-broker/>
6. **Khoury J. , Kubovich Y. and Reuters** Hamas Chief Calls to 'Ignite New Intifada' After U.S. Recognizes Jerusalem as Israel's Capital. - 7 December 2017, <https://www.haaretz.com/middle-east-news/palestinians/hamas-chief-calls-for-new-intifada-after-u-s-recognizes-jerusalem-as-israel-s-capital-1.5628027>

## Ե.Գ. ԹՈՐՈՍՅԱՆ

### ԱՄՆ-Ը ԻՍՐԱՅԵԼԱ-ՊԱՂԵՍՏԻՆՅԱՆ ՀԱԿԱՄԱՐՏՈՒԹՅԱՆ ԿԱՐԳԱՎՈՐՄԱՆ ՄԻՋՆՈՐԴԻ ԴԵՐՈՒՄ

Իսրայելա-պաղեստինյան հակամարտությունը սկսվել է քսաներորդ դարի սկզբին և շարունակում է մնալ տարածաշրջանի բարդ խնդիրներից մեկը: Տարածաշրջանային և աշխարհաքաղաքական պատճառները նպաստել են հակամարտության բնույթի ձևափոխմանը: Չնայած բոլոր փոփոխություններին՝ այս հակամարտությունն առայսօր չի հանգուցալուծվել: Այսօր կրոնը հակամարտության առանցքային ուժ է դարձել, իսկ իսրայելա-պաղեստինյան հակամարտությունը՝ գրեթե անլուծելի:

Վերջին քսանհինգ տարիների ընթացքում աշխարհաքաղաքական կառուցվածքը զգալիորեն փոխվել է, երբ ԱՄՆ-ը սկսել է հանդես գալ որպես համաշխարհային դերակատար: ԱՄՆ-ի յուրաքանչյուր նախագահ իր մոտեցումն է դրսևորել իսրայելա-պաղեստինյան հակամարտության նկատմամբ: Փաստերը վկայում են, որ ԱՄՆ –ի քաղաքականությունը ավելի կողմնակալ է, քան՝ հավասարակշռված: Նախագահ Թրամփի դեպքում մոտեցումները հստակ ընդգծված են կողմնակալությամբ Իսրայելի նկատմամբ, որոնք կարող են ունենալ անկախատեսելի աշխարհաքաղաքական հետևանքներ:

2017 դեկտեմբերը եղավ վճռորոշ պահը, երբ Դոնալդ Թրամփը որոշեց ճանաչել Երուսաղեմը որպես Իսրայելի մայրաքաղաք՝ իր գործողությունները մեկնաբանելով որպես հակամարտության կարգավորման նոր մոտեցում: Սակայն այս որոշումը առաջացրեց պաղեստինցիների զայրույթը և աշխարհի բացասական արձագանքը: Առաջին անգամ նկատվեց ԱՄՆ արտաքին քաղաքականությունը մեկուսացումը: Ավելին, այդ որոշումը շատ վտանգավոր է, հատկապես այսօր՝ Եվրոպա փախստականների ներհոսքից հետո, որտեղ հակասեմիտական տրամադրությունները աճում են, և նման անհեռատես որոշումը միայն բարդացնում է իրավիճակը:

**Առանցքային բաներ.** Իսրայելա-պաղեստինյան հակամարտություն, ԱՄՆ քաղաքականություն, աշխարհաքաղաքական հետևանքներ, սեպտեմբերի 11, ՀԱՄԱՍ, Պաղեստինի ազգային վարչակազմ, նախագահ Թրամփ:

**Е.Г. ТОРОСЯН**

**США В РОЛИ ПОСРЕДНИКА ДЛЯ УРЕГУЛИРОВАНИЯ  
ПАЛЕСТИНО-ИЗРАИЛЬСКОГО КОНФЛИКТА**

Палестино-израильский конфликт начался в начале 20 века и продолжает оставаться одной из самых насущных проблем в регионе. Региональные и геополитические причины способствовали трансформации конфликта. Несмотря на все изменения, этот конфликт еще не разрешен. После провозглашения независимости Соединенные Штаты Америки были одним из государств, признавших Государство Израиль.

Геополитическая структура резко изменилась за последние двадцать пять лет, и Соединенные Штаты начали выступать в качестве глобального игрока. У каждого президента есть свой подход к палестино-израильскому конфликту. Факты свидетельствуют о том, что политика США более предвзятая, чем сбалансированная. Известно, что внешняя политика Буша и Обамы существенно различалась, тогда как политика нового президента Трампа настолько предвзята, что может привести к геополитическим рискам.

**Ключевые слова:** палестино-израильский конфликт, политика США, внешняя политика, геополитические риски, 11 сентября, Национальная администрация Палестины, Хамас, президент, Трамп.

UDC 316.62:321.01

**YE.G. TOROSYAN**

**THE IMPORTANCE OF HEROES FOR THE STATE'S SUSTAINABLE  
DEVELOPMENT**

The work is devoted to the importance of heroes for the state sustainable development of the state. Thanks to heroes, the society shapes its ideals and stimulates social development. The main goal of the hero is to achieve the result, since the ineffective hero is absurd.

Each nation has its own heroes. States need both heroes of the past and heroes of our time to strengthen national consciousness. In addition to the heroes of the war, civilian heroes also deserve attention. Time and heroes change, but people are inclined to ideals and heroes will always exist.

**Keywords:** heroes, state, sustainable development, war, society, ideals, national history, identity, national pride.

The role of heroes is significant for states, as it contributes to the improvement of the moral spirit of the nation and cultivation national pride. Thanks to heroes, society shapes its ideals and stimulates social development. The main goal of the hero is to achieve the result, since the ineffective hero is absurd. Each nation has its own heroes. The state supports and promotes national culture