

Sabotaging the Ceasefire in Tel Aviv. The CIA's Solution

By [Dr. Paul Larudee](#)

Global Research, June 07, 2024

Region: [Middle East & North Africa, USA](#)

Theme: [Intelligence](#)

In-depth Report: [PALESTINE](#)

All Global Research articles can be read in 51 languages by activating the Translate Website button below the author's name (only available in desktop version).

To receive Global Research's Daily Newsletter (selected articles), [click here](#).

Click the share button above to email/forward this article to your friends and colleagues. Follow us on [Instagram](#) and [Twitter](#) and subscribe to our [Telegram Channel](#). Feel free to repost and share widely Global Research articles.

[Give Truth a Chance. Secure Your Access to Unchained News, Donate to Global Research.](#)

I know we don't expect good faith commitments from Israel, but believe it or not, we have other options. The Biden administration charged CIA Director Bill Burns with negotiating a ceasefire in Gaza between Israel and Hamas.

Wonder of wonders, he succeeded. In cooperation with the Qatari and Egyptian mediation teams, and in communication with the Israeli and Hamas negotiating teams he finally concluded a detailed settlement that was submitted to both sides.



Now before I go any further, do you think that Director Burns, representing Israel's staunchest ally, would create a ceasefire agreement that is unacceptable to the Israeli negotiating team? But it was Hamas that responded first, with complete approval. Take a look at what Burns and the other teams – including the Israeli team – created, and which Hamas approved. Does it look unreasonable to you?

Biden's proposal – to date not supported by the white supremacist regime headed by war criminal Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu – would be carried out in three phases: The first phase would be a six-week ceasefire and the return of women, children and other Israelis held in Gaza; the release of Palestinian prisoners held in Israel; withdrawal of Israeli troops from populated areas of Gaza; and for Israel to release 600 trucks of humanitarian aid to be carried into Gaza daily.

The second phase would be a permanent ceasefire leading to a full Israeli withdrawal from Gaza, along with the release of all remaining Israelis held in Gaza. The third phase would be a 3-5 year period of internationally funded reconstruction of Gaza and the establishment of a non-Hamas Palestinian government.

Response from Hamas

The effort exerted by our brother mediators in Egypt and Qatar aimed to achieve a ceasefire, end the "israeli" aggression on Gaza, and withdraw the forces. We had a clear position and responded positively to these efforts and mediation. We accepted the final proposal presented by the mediators, which had U.S. approval. The U.S. side failed to oblige the "israeli" side and convince them to agree to the [early May] paper, leading to the collapse of all these efforts that were built.

Today, Biden announced ideas that we viewed positively. We said these ideas are not enough; we need a complete agreement because the details from the "israeli" side have always been a source of constant crisis, whether in the ceasefire and the "israeli" desire for it not to be permanent, or in the withdrawal and the "israeli" attempt to remain in specific locations in Gaza, or even in the [prisoner] exchange process.

The statement and the call from the U.S. president to reach an agreement is positive, but agreements cannot be achieved through mere hopes. We need clear texts that achieve what we want and what we have said, and that the "israelis" accept openly and explicitly, not in an evasive manner, or in a way that allows them to evade any commitment.

Principles alone are not enough to reach an agreement. They are a roadmap, but not the picture we can agree upon. We want a complete ceasefire; this was proposed by President Biden, but how? What is the timing and mechanism? We want a complete withdrawal from Gaza. This must be specified within clearly defined steps. We also want comprehensive shelter and relief for Gaza, reconstruction, and an end to the siege. We want a fair exchange deal. All these details must be agreed upon.

I expected President Biden to adopt the paper that was presented to Hamas at the beginning of last May as a paper from the mediators, which was approved by his mediator in the negotiation, CIA Director William Burns. The statement reflects a serious attempt by the mediators to reach an agreement. We need to see precisely what is being proposed and what the "israeli" position truly is.

'There is no initiative'

We have not received anything specific yet, and we are not about to return to square one for negotiations. There is a proposal presented to the mediators.

I believe the statement can be a prelude to re-presenting the same proposal to the “israeli” side, and that the “israelis” will accept it. There is no initiative; President Biden spoke about ideas. General ideas do not mean reaching an understanding. It is a general framework, and many details have been discussed over the past four months. The talk about the mediators’ desire to reach an agreement is good and acceptable.

Hamas did not hesitate and made the decision when it agreed to the paper presented by the mediators. The role now is for the mediators to pressure the “israeli” side to accept the same proposal, which I believe achieved what President Biden proposed in principle. Hamas announced its acceptance of what the mediators presented, and ““israel” did not agree. They announced their rejection.

The side that has been intransigent over the past months is the “israeli” side, which met Hamas’s acceptance and the mediators’ efforts with an invasion of Rafah and the occupation of the Philadelphia Route and Rafah Crossing.

The “israeli” side needs to explicitly and clearly announce its commitment to reaching an agreement that achieves a comprehensive ceasefire, a complete withdrawal from Gaza, unrestricted entry of relief for sheltering and aiding the displaced, reconstruction of Gaza, lifting the siege, and achieving a fair prisoner exchange deal.

What Netanyahu wrote on X confirms that the intransigence is “israeli,” and that the efforts of the intermediaries were always thwarted by the “israeli” side. We are not insisting on conditions but on a proposal presented by the mediators, and we accepted it.

I believe the pressure should be directed towards the “israeli” side, which has thwarted all efforts so far. President Biden’s statements have so far been met with “israeli” rejection. The Palestinian resistance remains committed to its stance. It made the decision, while Netanyahu continues to obstruct all efforts, refuses to accept the ceasefire, and disrupts them.

—Taken from [Workers World](#), 4 June 2024

And what was Israel’s response? It invaded Rafah within hours of the Hamas acceptance, seized and closed the only remaining crossing for humanitarian relief supplies, and rejected the agreement that had been negotiated on their behalf. What is the definition of perfidy?

Israel has made its choice. No ceasefire. Level Gaza to the ground. Slaughter the civilian population and deny them food, water, medical care and everything needed to sustain life until they are gone, one way or another.

Image: The Givati Brigade in Eastern Rafah (Licensed under CC BY-SA 3.0)



That's Israel's criminal choice, as ruled by the International Court of Justice, with whose injunction to cease and desist Israel has not made the slightest attempt to comply. As long as Israel has the US on its side, enabling, aiding and abetting its genocide with massive arms and economic aid as well as direct participation through military and intelligence advice and expertise, Israel feels no need to comply. It's a choice that the post-WWII Nuremberg trials were supposed to prevent and deter forever.

But what about the US choice? If we want a ceasefire, do we not have the power to make it happen? Why can't we just shove it down Israel's throats by cutting off every penny of every type of aid that we are giving them? It worked for Eisenhower in 1956.

You know as well as I do why not. It's because Eisenhower was a strong, widely respected leader who made decisions that could be enforced. Biden is a ridiculous figure that is at best a thug, relying on other other thugs like the Israel Lobby, the military-industrial complex (about which Eisenhower warned) and the oil industry to prop him up. These thugs have our politicians (not to say our entire country) by the bowls. They rule for their own pleasure. Biden and the Democrats can't budge without their permission, and neither can Trump and the Republicans.

Absolute monarch Louis XIV of France is reported to have said, "l'état, c'est moi" (the state, that's me"). Apparently, today, the state is the Israel Lobby. No one dares to defy it. Ask those who lost their political careers trying to do so. Ask Cynthia McKinney. Ask Earl Hilliard. Ask Paul Findley. Ask Dennis Kucinich.

Is that our destiny? To be under the thumb of fanatics willing to commit genocide against millions of people who have only been trying to have their own sovereign country on their own land for the last hundred years? Are we destined to be governed by a foreign power rather than our own will? If so, perhaps it's time for the American people to pick up their torches and pitchforks and head for their own Bastille (which may be in Tel Aviv), and get themselves free.

*

Note to readers: Please click the share button above. Follow us on Instagram and Twitter and subscribe to our Telegram Channel. Feel free to repost and share widely Global Research articles.

This article was originally published on the author's Substack, [Paul's Substack](#).

Paul Larudee is a retired academic and current administrator of a nonprofit human rights and humanitarian aid organization. He is a regular contributor to Global Research.

[**Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page**](#)

[**Become a Member of Global Research**](#)

Articles by: [Dr. Paul Larudee](#)

Disclaimer: The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: publications@globalresearch.ca

www.globalresearch.ca contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca