

افغانستان آزاد – آزاد افغانستان

AA-AA

چو کشور نېاشد تن من مېباد بدین بوم و پر زنده یک تن مېباد
همه سر به سر تن به کشتن دهیم از آن به که کشور به دشمن دهیم

www.afgazad.com

afgazad@gmail.com

European Languages

زبانهای اروپایی

Simon Chege Ndiritu

22.05.2025

Beyond the Perception of Trump-Netanyahu Divide:

Why Trump Skipped Israel in his Middle Eastern Tour?

The possibility that Trump has noble intentions of stabilizing the security situation in the Middle East while leaving out belligerent Israeli leadership is slim.



Superficial Trump-Netanyahu Divide

US President Donald Trump's skipping Israel in his trip to the Middle East starting on May 13, 2025 could be more dangerous than its superficial impression, as it amplifies a false US-Israel split, allowing the latter to take a reckless military action while shielding the US from military and political responsibility. This action follows others [suggesting](#) a divide between Trump and the Israeli Leadership. For instance, On May 6, US Ambassador to Israel Mike Huckabee stated that Washington [did not need permission](#) from Israel to reach a peace agreement with Houthis in Yemen. On May 9, the New York Times published an [opinion piece](#) by a US nationalist, Thomas L. Friedman titled "This Israeli Government is Not Our

Ally”, which was puzzling since the same author has praised the role of Israel as a [lynchpin](#) for the US policy in the region for decades. In his [article from March 1999](#), he gave an example of how a grandiose opening of the American McDonald’s chain in Israel, which was attended by the US Ambassador, was an example for the world. He also pushed for Washington’s war against Iran in 2024, likening forces resisting Israeli open-ended ambitions in the region to [caterpillars](#) and Iran to wasps that the US needed to bomb. His decades-old justification of [endless wars](#) to consolidate Washington’s economic control over the region through Israel suggests that his latest opinion reflects the change of tact to pursue the same old goals using Israel. The US establishment may be planning to use Israel for more reckless bombing adventures, including against Iran.

In the past negotiations, the West divided itself into numerous parties, each with wild demands to disorient its opponents

Israel’s Unilateral Action or “Leave it to Bibi”?

Efforts to amplify the made-up US-Israel ‘*division*’ are likely designed to absolve Washington of Netanyahu’s future escalation to ethnically cleanse Gaza for Israel’s unlimited ambitions or an attack on Iran. This ‘*split*’ makes no sense when the US has provided Israel with military resource equivalent to [Brazil’s annual military](#) budget. In the year ending October 2024, the US provided over [\\$20 billion in military aid](#) to Israel, resources that remain in Benjamin Netanyahu’s hand, even as the Trump administration purports to distance itself from him. Netanyahu continues to wield the West’s weapons while occasionally pretending to be independent. He has repeatedly stated that Israel [will not be bound](#) by a potential US-Iran nuclear deal, indicating positioning for military escalation, in the face of [impractical demands](#) that Trump is presenting as requirements for reaching an agreement with Iran.

2009 Brookings’ report “Which Path to Persia” lays out one scenario of the US waging war on Iran, which would entail instrumentalizing Israel to conduct such an attack to deflect military and political responsibility away from Washington. This context information is crucial, especially when Trump has decided to exaggerate the perceived threat from Iran, including in his latest trip to the Middle East. Trump’s exaggeration using nuclear threat makes no sense since Iran is a signatory to the Non-proliferation Treaty (NPT), and is not bombing all its neighbors like Israel does with complete support from the West.

Meanwhile, the same Trump and the West ignore Israel’s [undeclared nuclear arsenal](#), and have never pushed for the UN nuclear watchdog to investigate Israel for possession of such weapons. Noteworthy, Israel is not a signatory to the NPT, and has nuclear reactors, while the

US has even demanded that Iran [ditch civilian nuclear technology](#), in a fragrant display of racism. Trump's demands show opposition to Iran's development since nuclear technology is indispensable for efficient energy generation and advanced medicine. He would even state that Iran has enough petroleum as a justification why it does not need nuclear energy, while his country sanctions Iranians from technologies needed to extract oil. Therefore, Washington's demands are either designed to reverse Iran's development by making it energy-poor, or are a justification for political and military pressure.

While political pressure against Iran has proven futile for over 40 years, military action may increasingly appear attractive to the US empire in its desperation to cause chaos and hobble the emerging multipolar world. One way the US can achieve such chaos is by attacking Iran, but may be discouraged by Iran's ability to retaliate by attacking Washington's military and oil infrastructure spread throughout the region. However, Washington may use Israel for such attacks, as it has a small population that the West feels is expandable for use in ruining other nations while hiding behind its need for security. As noted earlier, Washington has supplied Israel with adequate arms to achieve its parochial goals around the Middle East, while pretending to stand for peace, even while Israel's capability can be augmented with its undeclared nuclear arsenal. The Western establishment and its media overstatement of perceived Trump-Netanyahu disagreements may be designed to distance the US from the potentially reckless military adventure that Washington has assigned Netanyahu.

Trump-Netanyahu as a 'Fragmented' Party in Negotiations

In the past negotiations, the West divided itself into numerous parties, each with wild demands to disorient its opponents, and the US and Israel can be understood as these fragments. One example where this disingenuous strategy is applied is in the negotiations surrounding the Russia-Ukraine war. While the West presents a uniform front while arming Ukraine, it conveniently fragments itself into separate entities such as the US, Europe, and Ukraine, each of which has diverse demands. These parties present Russia with incoherent and often contradictory demands which obstruct meaningful agreement, enabling them to continue arming Ukraine as a unified front. Washington as one of these 'factions' can reach an agreement with Russia to establish a ceasefire on energy infrastructure, while empowering Ukraine to continue bombing energy facilities in Russia.

Meanwhile, Russia is expected, by the West, to remain bound by its agreement with the US. Another example was in the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA) in which the West divided itself into the US and E3([three European countries](#) of France, Germany, and the United Kingdom), where the US easily exited the deal but continued to demand that Iran

remain bound by inconsequential agreement with the E3. Similarly, the current charade of the US–Israel divide should be understood in this context, in which both parties are factions of one side; one of them can agree with Iran or pose as pursuing negotiation while the other maintains military pressure.

Noteworthy, the US has bipartisan consensus of using Israel to control resources in the region, views that have been expressed by Republicans and Democrats alike. Earlier, Trump proposed taking Gaza to establish a Riviera-type real estate project after cleansing it of Palestinians, plans that are now adopted by Netanyahu, showing that both sides pursue similar goals. It won't be long before the current US-Israel split is exposed as a façade.

[Simon Chege Ndiritu](#), May 21, 2025

Simon Chege Ndiritu, is a political observer and research analyst from Africa