



Policy Brief # PB-81-2023

December 08, 2023

**Ben Gurion's Legacy: Strategies that
Shaped Israel's Destiny**

**Muhammad Waqas
Research Intern**



Ben Gurion's Legacy: Strategies That Shaped Israel's Destiny

By

Muhammad Waqas

As the sun ushered in October 7, 2023, a harrowing chapter unfolded in the Israel-Palestine saga. Hamas, the political and military force of Palestine, launched a relentless assault on southern Israeli towns. Employing paragliders that defied Israel's defense mechanisms, along with attacks by land, sea and unguided rockets from Gaza, Hamas struck with unprecedented ferocity.

This marked the fourth major clash since Hamas assumed power in 2005, each instigated by provocations from the Israel Defense Forces (IDF). However, this assault transcended all previous incidents in brutality, with a death toll surpassing 1400, making it the deadliest since 1973.

Israeli Prime Minister Netanyahu likened it to Israel's 9/11 and responded with indiscriminate bombings in northern Gaza. Over the past 43 days, the IDF's actions claimed the lives of 15,242 Palestinians, including a heartbreaking toll of 6,150 innocent children. The collateral damage extended beyond lives lost, painting a grim picture of shattered families and displaced communities.

The impact on humanitarian efforts has been catastrophic. UNRWA reported the unprecedented death of 108 of its employees, while the Committee to Protect Journalists (CPJ) mourns the loss of 58 journalists, the highest figure since 1992. The Patriotic Vision (PVA) reveals the grim aftermath, with over 20,000 widowed women, 844,000 displaced women and girls and 800,000 displaced children. The echoes of the 2nd Nakba are resounding, reminiscent of the mass uprooting of the Palestinian population in 1948.

International organizations providing crucial aid face not only disruption but outright peril. Deliberate targeting and killing of their staff paint a chilling picture. The toll on

infrastructure is staggering, with 279 schools, often used as refuges and 135 health facilities, including the 2nd largest hospital, Al Ahli Hospital, reduced to ruins.

The intentional and systematic destruction, with its profound human cost, raises questions about the conscience of the international community. The world watches as lives are extinguished, communities are erased and hope seems to fade away in the face of a relentless and brutal conflict.

In this piece we would delve into the discussion of this Zionist state policy of Israel against Palestinians and its genesis retrospectively.

Ben Gurionist Doctrine: Unveiling the Machinations of Expansion

In the annals of Israel's history, the name David Ben Gurion resonates as the primary founder and inaugural prime minister, a visionary with a doctrine etched in the pursuit of an expansionist agenda. The core tenets of the Ben Gurionist Doctrine reveal a strategic blueprint designed to shape the destiny of the nascent state.

First Strategy: The Fortress of Invincibility

At its core, the doctrine's first strategy is a meticulous orchestration of power. Ben Gurion recognized the indispensable need to fortify Israel's defenses, creating a military juggernaut that would render the 'core Arab states'—Lebanon, Syria, Jordan and Egypt—impotent in their ability to mount any substantial challenge. To achieve this, he sought alliances with former imperialist powers, forging partnerships with Great Britain and France. Additionally, he courted the budding superpower, the United States of America, leveraging their support to bolster the Israel Defense Forces (IDF) to unparalleled levels of invincibility.

Simultaneously, a diplomatic dance unfolded, with Ben Gurion skillfully applying pressure on neighboring Arab states to acknowledge the existence of Israel. This dual-pronged approach aimed not only to secure Israel's borders but to create an aura of invulnerability that would dissuade any hostile endeavors from its immediate neighbors.

Second Strategy: Manipulating Perceptions in the Face of Opposition

The Ben Gurionist Doctrine's second strategy reveals a nuanced and cunning maneuvering of international sentiments. In the event that Arab states extended aid to beleaguered Palestinians, a scenario painted as an attack on Israel, the playbook dictated a tactical response. Here, the narrative of victimhood became a potent weapon.

By intentionally portraying Israel as the victim of external aggression, Ben Gurion sought to garner international sympathy. The calculated use of sheer and disproportionate responses to any perceived threat would not only divert attention but also lay the groundwork for the grander design – the realization of Greater Israel. This vision included

the eradication of Palestinian presence and the establishment of Jewish settlements in contested territories.

A stark proclamation encapsulates the ruthless resolve behind this strategy, echoing from the past: "Unless we show the Arabs that there is a high price to pay for murdering Jews, we won't survive." These words, uttered by the then-prime minister of Israel in 1953, encapsulate the unyielding determination to secure Israeli interests at any cost, casting a shadow over the geopolitical landscape that endures to this day. The Ben Gurionist Doctrine, with its dual strategies, continues to shape the destiny of the region, leaving an indelible mark on the complex tapestry of the Middle East.

Pan-Arabism to Nationalism: The Shifting Sands of Middle Eastern Politics

The genesis of Pan-Arabism and its subsequent transformation into a wave of nationalism serves as a crucial chapter in the complex history of the Middle East. This ideological evolution unfolded against the backdrop of political upheavals, wars and the persistent struggle for Palestinian liberation.

The Rise of Pan-Arabism and the Suez Crisis:

The ascendancy of Gamal Abdel Nasser to the presidency of Egypt in 1956 marked a pivotal moment. Nasser championed the idea of Pan-Arabism, a vision that resonated beyond Egypt and exerted substantial pressure on ruling elites across core Arab states. The momentum gained further traction during the resolution of the 1956 Suez Crisis, where the withdrawal of invading forces – Israel, France and the United Kingdom – from the Sinai Peninsula became a symbol of Arab solidarity.

This fervor culminated in the establishment of the short-lived political union between Egypt and Syria, known as the United Arab Republic (UAR). Central to this union was the overarching goal of liberating Palestine from Israeli occupation, a sentiment fueled by the scars of the 1948 war.

The Six-Day War and the Erosion of Pan-Arabism:

The efficacy of Pan-Arabism faced a formidable test during the Six-Day War of 1967. The core states, galvanized by the Pan-Arab slogan, strategically blocked the Strait of Tiran, impeding Israel's access to the Arabian Sea. However, the conflict not only underscored the effectiveness of Israel's invincibility, as per the Ben Gurionist Doctrine but also dealt a severe blow to the Pan-Arab dream. Egypt lost the Gaza Strip and Sinai Peninsula, Jordan relinquished the West Bank and East Jerusalem and Syria ceded the Golan Heights to Israel.

The Yom Kippur War of 1973, a final attempt by the core states to reclaim lost territories, reiterated the invincibility of Israel while highlighting the geostrategic significance of the contested lands. The realization dawned among the Arab elites that war was not a viable

option. This ushered in an era of nationalism, transitioning from multilateralism to bilateralism in diplomatic negotiations for the recovery of lost territories.

A Dagger in the Back: Camp David and the Betrayal of Pan-Arabism:

With the death of Gamal Abdel Nasser in 1970, Anwar Sadat assumed the presidency of Egypt. Failing to recapture lost territories in the Yom Kippur War, Sadat sought diplomatic solutions, a move perceived as abandoning the Palestinian cause and quashing the remnants of Pan-Arabism.

The turning point came at the Camp David Accord in 1978, where Sadat, alongside Israel's Prime Minister Menachem Begin, signed a peace deal under the mediation of U.S. President Jimmy Carter. This historic accord saw Egypt becoming the first Arab nation to officially recognize Israel's right to exist, in exchange for the Sinai Peninsula.

However, this diplomatic triumph proved to be a betrayal in the eyes of other Arab states, particularly regarding the Palestinian cause. The repercussions were severe, culminating in the assassination of Anwar Sadat in 1981 by members of the Egyptian Islamic Jihad. Despite the turmoil, Camp David set the stage for other core states to acknowledge that bilateral engagement with Israel was the only pragmatic solution.

In essence, the journey from Pan-Arabism to nationalism epitomizes the intricate dance of ideologies and power dynamics that have defined the Middle East, leaving an indelible imprint on its geopolitical landscape.

Taking the Sting Out One by One: Dynamics of Shifting Alliances

In the wake of perceived betrayals and strategic recalibrations, Middle Eastern geopolitics witnessed a seismic shift as core states adjusted their approaches to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

Abandoning the Dream:

The bitter taste of betrayal from their own brethren led core Arab states to a stark realization: war at the state level was an impractical endeavor. Proxies emerged as an alternative, a means to score strategic points without direct confrontation. The trajectory set by Egypt's Camp David Accord with Israel became a blueprint, prompting other core states to recognize the settler state officially and, in the process, relinquish their commitment to the Palestinian cause.

The Domino Effect: Jordan and Lebanon:

Lebanon, following the Camp David legacy, echoed this sentiment with the Israel-Jordan Peace Treaty in 1994. Signed by Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin and Jordan's King Hussein, the accord reflected a pragmatic acceptance of the status quo under the watchful

eye of U.S. President Bill Clinton. The ball, it seemed, was now in the court of peripheral states.

Failed Resistance and the Triumph of Bilateral Engagement:

Unable to counter the formidable Ben Gurionist Doctrine, core states shifted gears. The Palestinian cause took a back seat as negotiations with Israel took center stage. Instances like the Oslo Accord, while proposing the resettlement of refugees and a semblance of autonomy for the Palestinian Liberation Organization in Gaza and the West Bank, faced the harsh reality of being overlooked or ignored by Israeli ruling elites.

This transition was not without its casualties. Those who dared challenge the status quo, like Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin, paid the ultimate price. Assassinated during the Oslo Accord era, Rabin's death was attributed by his widow to the influence of right-wing Gurionists, with fingers pointing at none other than Benjamin Netanyahu.

Peripheral States and the Abraham Accord:

For peripheral states like Iran, Iraq and Gulf countries, leverage against the settler state dwindled. Options boiled down to sponsoring proxies or supporting militant Palestinians in their resistance against Israel. However, a paradigm shift occurred in 2020 with the Abraham Accord, brokered by the Trump Administration.

Gulf countries, the power players among the peripherals, normalized relations with Israel, citing economic and security reasons. United Arab Emirates, Bahrain, Sudan and Morocco were among the early adopters, breaking away from the traditional stance. Even the once-reluctant Saudi Arabia seemed on the path to acceptance.

However, the normalization was notably bilateral, ignoring the standing disputes, particularly the enduring thorn – the Palestine Issue. This pragmatic approach highlighted a new era in Middle Eastern alliances, where shared interests and economic benefits eclipsed historical grievances.

In this ever-evolving geopolitical landscape, the winds of change continue to reshape alliances, leaving the question of a lasting resolution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict hanging in the balance.

Evolution of Hamas: From Non-Violence to Conflict

Hamas's evolution from non-violence to conflict is marked by a series of historical events that underscore the complex dynamics between the organization and Israel. In the early years, Hamas, founded in 1987 by Ahmed Yassin, initially focused on providing social services, education and engaging in non-violent resistance against Israeli rule. The First Intifada in 1987, triggered by the killing of Palestinians, became a turning point. Israel's response, marked by disproportionate violence, had a radicalizing effect on Hamas.

Israel's strategy of supporting Islamic charities in the 1980s, as part of a "divide and rule" policy to weaken the PLO, unintentionally contributed to the growth of Hamas. While initially pursuing non-violent resistance during the First Intifada, Hamas gradually shifted towards military actions. By the late 1980s and early 1990s, the organization began targeting Israeli soldiers and after the Ibrahimi Mosque massacre in 1994, it fully embraced attacks on civilians.

Throughout the years, instances of reported peace initiatives by Hamas illustrate a willingness to negotiate. However, challenges and disruptions, often attributed to Israel's actions, hindered progress. For example, the assassination of a key Hamas military commander in 2012, just hours after receiving a draft peace deal, highlights Israel's role in impeding potential negotiations. The overarching narrative suggests a nuanced relationship shaped by historical events, regional dynamics and the consequences of Israel's actions, ultimately influencing Hamas's shift from non-violence to conflict.

The Erosion of UNO Authority: A Grim Parallel to History

In a disconcerting pattern, the United Nations General Assembly has witnessed the passage of 62 resolutions urging a ceasefire of Israeli Defense Forces' operations in Gaza. However, these resolutions, born out of majority consensus, face a stark rejection from Israel and the Western powers. The echoes of this duplicitous behavior reverberate eerily with historical instances, notably Iraq's rejection of resolutions leading to a U.S.-led invasion under the pretext of alleged weapons of mass destruction.

The Israeli ambassador to the UN, in an alarming turn of events, not only rejected international resolutions but also resorted to threats and pressure, aiming to force the resignation of the UN Secretary-General. This coercive tactic sought to suppress the Secretary-General's efforts in shedding light on the brutality of the Israeli Defense Forces in Gaza and the West Bank.

Drawing a somber parallel with the decline of the League of Nations, the UNO finds itself at a crossroads where its mandate to safeguard states from the belligerent actions of imperialist powers is visibly undermined. This erosion of authority and the apparent disregard for international resolutions sets a foreboding stage, reminiscent of the events preceding the catastrophic prospect of World War III.

The haunting similarities between historical precedents and the current state of international affairs paint a disconcerting picture. The decline in the prestige of the UNO raises critical questions about its efficacy in fulfilling its mission and underscores the urgent need for a recalibration of global diplomatic mechanisms to avert the specter of another global conflict.

Unraveling the Quandaries: Unmasking U.S. Middle East Foreign Policy Pitfalls

In a bold departure from the Zionist expansionist policies of Netanyahu, President Joe Biden took a resolute stand against the North Gaza incursion, reminiscent of the Gurionist Doctrine's disproportionate use of force. However, the paradox emerges as the Biden administration, while rejecting Netanyahu's approach, simultaneously reinforces its stance by wielding the veto power against four Security Council Resolutions urging an immediate ceasefire and the cessation of hostilities.

Amidst this diplomatic dissonance, President Biden declared on November 28th, via Twitter, that "A two-state solution is the only way to guarantee the long-term security of both the Israeli and the Palestinian people." This proclamation, seemingly advocating restraint in the face of expansionist ground operations, was swiftly contradicted by Netanyahu's government launching a ruthless and extensive ground and aerial campaign in North Gaza. This disconcerting outcome lays bare the repercussions of unwavering support for the United States' Middle East foreign policies.

Beyond the geopolitical chessboard, the U.S. foreign policy stance undermines the deeply rooted aspirations of indigenous Palestinians for a peaceful resolution to their longstanding plight. This disregard is notably evident in recurrent accords between Israel and Arab states, where Palestinian interests are relegated to the periphery. Even when these aspirations manage to find a place in peace agreements, such as the Oslo Accord, the tangible realization of autonomy for Palestinian regions and the repatriation of refugees remains elusive.

Reports suggest that Netanyahu, in his bid for political survival within Likud, pledges to confront the Biden administration head-on. His promise to thwart the establishment of a Palestinian state echoes a defiance against U.S. preferences, emphasizing his unique ability to withstand pressure from a Biden-led America. Netanyahu asserts, "I'm the only one who will prevent a Palestinian state. The U.S. was against a ground operation. I'm the only one who can withstand U.S. pressure, as I know Biden for 40 years and I know how to manage American public opinion."

This complex interplay of geopolitical dynamics highlights the intricacies and pitfalls embedded in American Middle East foreign policy, showcasing the delicate dance between conflicting ideologies, power dynamics and the pursuit of enduring regional stability.

Policy Options:

The Israel-Palestine conflict persists, partly due to the unrealized potential of the United Nations (UN) and the failure to fully implement the two-state solution. To move forward,

policy options should focus on rectifying this historical lapse, embracing the spirit of the Oslo Accord and emphasizing the central role of Palestinians in any peace accord.

Cessation of Hostilities:

International Monitoring: Advocate for international monitoring mechanisms to ensure the sustainability of the current ceasefire between Hamas and the IDF.

Humanitarian Corridors: Facilitate the establishment of humanitarian corridors to enable the safe and efficient delivery of aid to those in need.

UN-Led Two-State Solution:

International Consensus: Mobilize global support to reinvigorate the UN's commitment to the two-state solution, emphasizing the need for a sovereign and independent Palestinian state alongside Israel.

Security Council Resolution: Advocate for a comprehensive Security Council resolution outlining the parameters of the two-state solution, providing a framework for negotiations.

Oslo Accord Implementation:

International Oversight: Establish an international oversight mechanism to ensure the faithful implementation of the Oslo Accord, promoting autonomy for Palestinians in their territories.

Dispute Resolution Mechanism: Create a dispute resolution mechanism, possibly under UN auspices, to address grievances and disputes arising from the implementation process.

Inclusive Diplomacy:

Regional Involvement: Encourage the active participation of neighboring and Gulf states in the peace process, stressing the importance of a holistic regional approach.

Palestinian Representation: Insist on the direct and meaningful involvement of Palestinian representatives in negotiations, ensuring that any accord, either Abraham or any future one, reflects the aspirations and concerns of the Palestinian people.

Humanitarian Support:

UN-Led Aid Efforts: Strengthen UN-led humanitarian aid efforts to address the immediate needs of Palestinians in conflict-affected areas, fostering goodwill and trust.

Reconstruction Funding: Mobilize international funds for the reconstruction of damaged infrastructure and homes, promoting stability and economic recovery.

Security Guarantees:

International Peacekeeping: Explore the possibility of deploying international peacekeeping forces to provide security guarantees for both Israelis and Palestinians during the transition period.

Counterterrorism Cooperation: Encourage regional cooperation on counterterrorism measures to address shared security concerns.

As the region navigates towards a lasting peace, it is crucial to recognize that any accord, be it the Abraham Accord or Camp David, must have the genuine involvement and endorsement of the Palestinian people. The UN, with its unfulfilled commitment to the two-state solution, needs to play a central role and neighboring states must understand that without Palestinian participation, sustained peace remains elusive. The path to resolution demands a collective and unwavering commitment to justice, autonomy and the fundamental rights of all involved parties.