



RESEARCH PAPER

Peace without Justice: Liberal Imperialism and the Gaza Peace Framework (2025)

Atta ur Rehman Khilji

Research Associate, Department of International Relations, National University of Modern Languages, Islamabad, Pakistan

Corresponding Author: attarkhilji@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The 2025 Trump Peace Plan for Gaza is examined to demonstrate how this plan continues the pattern of foreign control under the guise of peace and development. Though the plan aims to bring stability and rebuilding, it mainly serves the interests of powerful elites and restricts Palestinian independence. The researcher employed a qualitative and interpretivist research approach from primary and secondary sources, i.e. White House text on Gaza, Reuters, POLITICO, The New York Times, and The Atlantic Council. It draws on the theoretical framework of Postcolonial Theory and Liberalism to examine the Trump Gaza Peace Plan 2025. The findings indicate that the plan creates economic dependence, foreign control, and limited political freedom, rather than real peace and justice. It uses humanitarian rhetoric to hide inequity and control. The paper recommends that unless local communities are fully involved and injustices corrected, such economic plans will repeat cycles of dependency and control.

KEYWORDS Gaza Peace Framework, Trump Peace Plan (2025), Liberal Peace, Neocolonialism, Postcolonial Critique, Humanitarianism, Western Dominance, Palestinian Self-Determination

Introduction

Since Hamas's al-Aqsa Flood military operation on October 7, 2023, the Gaza Strip has been undergoing one of the worst and most extended bombardments in recent history. For over five hundred days, Israeli forces have continuously attacked Gaza with air and ground bombardments. The power of those attacks equals six nuclear bombs. Much of Gaza infrastructure has been destroyed including homes, hospitals, schools, and even agricultural areas. The extent of human suffering has reached catastrophic levels. It is estimated that around 90 per cent of Gaza's 2.3 million population has become displaced, while 48,000 people have died, 110,000 injured and thousands detained (Scientists for Global Responsibility, 2024).

The damage is aggravated due to the Israeli blockade imposed on Gaza since 2007. The blockade has rendered Gaza economically and humanitarially crippled. Some have compared the ongoing bombardment to that of Allied bombing of Dresden in World War II, where high-explosive and incendiary bombs produced firestorms that destroyed 80 percent of the city center, killing approximately 25,000 civilians (Air Force Historical Support Division, 2025). The damage and destruction done in Gaza is far greater than anything seen in 1948. Numerous observers assert that the situation constitutes a genocidal military campaign that has rendered Gaza Strip nearly unlivable.

New geopolitical and economic narratives have emerged amid devastation. Figures such as U.S. President Donald Trump and his aides have begun to portray Gaza not as a humanitarian crisis, but as a redevelopment opportunity. Trump characterizes Gaza as a 'tabula rasa' that he would turn into what he calls the 'Riviera of the Middle East' (American Jewish Committee, 2025). According to his plan (2025, Reuters), Gaza

will be rebuilt through foreign investment and privatized work while two million Palestinians will be moved to Egypt and Jordan for a “better living condition”. Opponents argue that such a plan follows an age-old colonial pattern of dispossession, where people are disposed of, and territories are engineered for external profit and strategic control (Lamb 2025; Farid & Sarwar, 2025).

The approach taken by Trump for Gaza and the middle east is not new. Trump during his first presidential term made the expansionist ideas pretty open. It reflects a desire to increase American and Israeli influence. In 2019, he acknowledged Israel’s annexation of the Golan Heights, ending decades of U.S. policy and international consensus. In the same way, his 2020 “Peace to Prosperity” or the “Deal of the Century” was based on the logic of the 1917 Balfour Declaration which gave political recognition to Israeli control of Palestinian land while ignoring Palestinian self-determination (New York Times, 2020).

Trump’s proposal to redevelop Gaza in 2025 has a similar settler-colonial agenda as his first term. The plan envisages that Israel will undertake a military clearance of Gaza, followed by its economic reconstruction under U.S. directive, without Palestinian involvement. According to the plan, Gaza should become one of the most secure and prosperous places on the planet under the oversight of an international body chaired by Trump. This vision effectively nullifies Palestinian political agency, converting Gaza into an offshore economic site where the displaced indigenous inhabitants are viewed as an impediment rather than entitled residents (Atlantic Council, 2025).

This research adopts postcolonial theory that reveals how contemporary policies reproduce colonial patterns of domination in the name of peace and development. Using this framework, the Trump Peace Plan for Gaza (2025) is analysed as a neocolonial project that will facilitate displacement, economic control and Palestinian identity erasure. To fortify this analysis, Liberalism is also included. Using ideas grounded in liberalism, the plan justifies the legitimacy of structural inequality and external control through humanitarian justification, economic liberalisation, and peace through markets. These theories together illustrate how the peace narratives can be used as weapons of power and unveil the contradiction between freedom and dispossession in global politics today.

Literature Review

Existing Research reveals that Western-led frameworks often reproduce the very structural inequalities that are inherited from the colonial past, rather than resolving them. Scholars like Edward Said and Frantz Fanon have argued that modern-day political and economic systems continue to marginalise people from post-colonial societies. According to Said’s concept of Orientalism, Western powers construct the East as inferior. This idea continues to shape international policies governing Palestine. Similarly, Fanon warned that colonialism becomes imperialism when countries speak in the language of development and peace. (Said, 1978; Fanon, 1963)

Over the past few decades, liberal peace theory literature has critically examined how Western liberal democracies use peacebuilding to project power. In the view of Richmond (2011) and Duffield (2001), the liberal peace initiatives focus on markets, elections and governance reforms. According to Richmond, these frameworks neglect the local agency and history and generate hegemony. Research on U.S.-backed interventions has illuminated how economic liberalisation and institution-building have deepened dependency, not created peace in Iraq and Afghanistan (Duffield, 2001; Escobar, 1995).

Postcolonial viewpoints add depth to this critique by linking current peace initiatives to earlier colonial strategies. Nkrumah (1965) coined the term neo-colonialism. It refers to economic control and administrative interference in former colonies by a powerful state. This study may fall into the category of liberal imperialism, as argued by Grovogui. In the Palestinian context, Barkawi and Laffey (2006) apply these ideas to explain the colonial present, where colonial empire continues to exist through global institutions, humanitarian programs and security arrangements (Barkawi & Laffey, 2006).

Empirical studies regarding the Israel-Palestine conflict show how Western peace efforts have successfully sidelined Palestinian perspectives. For instance, the Oslo Accords and the Abraham Accords have been condemned as bolstering Israeli political dominance while providing the Palestinians with a limited degree of autonomy (Pappé, 2017; Khalidi, 2020). These agreements show how peace is defined to promote the occupiers' interests and silence those of the occupied. Trump's previous Peace to Prosperity plan (2020) similarly emphasised economic incentives and demilitarization, ignoring occupation, displacement, and justice. (Peace to Prosperity Plan, 2020)

Recent studies have found that such peace plans treat the colonised population as a mere object of governance, which denies them a political voice (Mbembe, 2003; Spivak, 1988). Spivak's Epistemic Violence concept refers to the silencing of the subalterns or the powerless by the powerful. It means the inability of the less powerful to have a voice.

In this regard, the Trump Gaza plan treats the Palestinians as subjects who must be managed. This proves that the voice of the Palestinians in the peace process is irrelevant to the Trump Gaza plan. It is not a partnership but a one-sided agreement that the Palestinians must agree to. Similarly, Mbembe's theory of necropolitics enables us to understand how life and death are exercised through blockades, aid restrictions and military surveillance, all in the name of security (Yaseen, et. al., 2023; Mbembe, 2003).

The literature tends to indicate that peacebuilding in Palestine is characterised by colonial and liberal assumptions that privilege power over justice. The 2025 Trump Gaza Peace Framework is rooted in a tradition that mixes liberal peace discourse with postcolonial domination. While promising humanitarian aid and economic prosperity, it creates dependency and global management ordering in the periphery, replacing military occupation.

Theoretical Framework

Liberalism: Peace, Development, and Economic Cooperation

It is one of the major theories in the international system. The concept emphasizes democracy, economic interdependence and cooperation as tools of peace. According to liberal thinking, countries are less likely to go to war if they trade, cooperate through institutions, and honour each other's democratic values. According to Kant, a peaceful international order requires guaranteeing individual rights, the rule of law, and protection of human dignity (Kant, 1795/2003).

The Trump Gaza Peace Plan states (2025) this liberal rhetoric through a demand for the achievement of peace through economic development and development investment.. The plan is to make Gaza the "Riviera of the Middle East". This will allow progress and modernity to sweeten stability for the region. Initially, it aligns with liberal view that peace and cooperation come with the economic growth of society.

Although the scheme uses the language of liberalism, it actually rejects liberalism in substance. The Gaza Peace Plan, though weirdly labelled a liberal document, contradicts the most basic liberal principles of liberalism – self-determination, equality and consent (Rawls, 1999; Beitz, 1979). For Liberalism to be realized, People must choose their destiny. Trump's scheme neglects the Palestinians, framing a political and economic scheme around them without their say.

The strategy undermines the Palestinians as a political entity and presents them as mere recipients of Western-led development through economic incentives and foreign-led reconstruction. Richmond (2011) speaks of "liberal peacebuilding", and this rationale justifies extensive interference by Western powers in peace missions, with order and control taking precedence over justice and inclusion. So, the Trump Plan aims to justify external domination and unequal power relations instead of realizing the liberal ideals.

The domination does not stop, even though colonialism is formally ended; this is the concern of postcolonial theory. According to Edward Said (1978), Frantz Fanon (1963) and Gayatri Spivak (1988) and other scholars, present-day mechanisms such as development assistance, humanitarian intervention, and economic restructuring sustain colonial hierarchies. These processes enable powerful states to exert influence on ex-colonised societies while pretending to promote development or peace.

Postcolonial Theory: Exposing Neocolonial Motives

Trump's Gaza Peace Plan, from a postcolonial perspective, is a neocolonial project disguising colonialism as development. Gaza is not envisaged as a national homeland for its people but a foreign investor enclave. The idea to move Palestinians to Egypt and Jordan and transform Gaza into an investment centre repeats patterns of colonial displacement and foreign control (Panikoff, 2025). The plan uses 'modernisation' to signify domination, just as was done by colonial powers in the past. The subjugation of the indigenous people continues when their agency is erased.



Figure 1: Theoretical Framework

Integrating Liberalism and Postcolonial Theory

Combining Liberalism and Postcolonial Theory complicates the contradictions inherent in the so-called 'Trump Peace Plan.' The liberal rhetoric of peace and prosperity is used to justify what postcolonial scholars see as new imperialism. The liberal hope for peace through economic development becomes, in practice, a technique through which a vulnerable population becomes controlled and restructured under an external authority (Sabaratnam, 2017).

As a result, the Trump Peace Plan manifests a blend of liberal-colonial governance that justifies a neocolonial form of control across the Palestinian territories. The terms "peace" and "development" in the plan mask a deeper agenda of dispossession, demographic engineering and economic exploitation. Through the synthesis of the two theories, the research reveals how liberalism, as such, can be deployed to sustain post-colonial domination if it is not tied to justice and equality.

Postcolonial theory helps us decipher how the stronger states are still able to subjugate the weaker states, albeit in political and economic spheres. On the contrary, Liberal Peace Theory shows how the ideas of democracy, development and humanitarian assistance are often used to legitimise external intervention in modern peace efforts. When combined, these two perspectives can also help explain the Gaza Peace Framework, which obscures deeper power asymmetries under economic and humanitarian language. The plan makes peacebuilding a means of management and control rather than an avenue to independence and justice.

Material and Methods

The researchers employed a qualitative and interpretivist research approach, which draws on the theoretical framework of Postcolonial Theory and Liberalism to examine the Trump Gaza Peace Plan 2025. The qualitative method is appropriate because the study aims to examine meanings, discourse, and power structures within the documents instead of numerical data. The approach seeks to identify how ideas of peace, development and governance are framed to reproduce dependency and inequality.

This analysis employs a thematic interpretive framework that identifies, organizes and interprets the meaning of recurring themes such as humanitarian justification, economic liberalization, conditional sovereignty and denial of agency. Theories by Edward Said, Frantz Fanon, Gayatri Spivak, Achille Mbembe and Oliver Richmond may help us to showcase a relationship between colonial power and the modern liberal government.

This research also investigates how power relations, control measures, and foreign intervention have become normalized in the peace plan and relevant policy documents, using critical discourse analysis (CDA) shows how apparently neutral liberal terms - 'reconstruction', 'stability' and 'modernization' - carry ideological meanings that favour postcolonial domination and global inequality.

The research study uses documentary analysis and draws from several primary and secondary sources. The official White House text of the Gaza Peace Framework (2025), press releases and statements by U.S. and Israeli officials are primary materials. We took secondary data from reports by the United Nations, OCHA humanitarian updates, and international media such as Reuters, POLITICO, The New York Times and

The Atlantic Council. To provide a theoretical interpretation of a complex situation, a review of the academic literature on postcolonialism and liberal peacebuilding was conducted. The works of Said (1978), Fanon (1963), Spivak (1988), Mbembe (2003), and Richmond (2011) were particularly noted. The data was analyzed using thematic content analysis to detect patterns of power, governance and peace. The analysis of Gaza case will help establish an in-depth understanding of how liberal peace relates to postcolonial forms/structures of control.

Results and Discussion

Gaza as a 'Tabula Rasa': Destruction, Colonial Continuities, and the Politics of Reconstruction

Since the October 7, 2023, operation of Hamas named Al-Aqsa Flood, the Gaza Strip has been under constant bombardment by Israel for more than five hundred days. Analysts report that Israel's assault on Gaza is equivalent to the explosion of six nuclear bombs, with nearly 80 per cent of the territory's infrastructure and built environment obliterated (Scientists for Global Responsibility, 2024). The human cost is devastating, too: almost 90 per cent of Gaza's population is displaced, while over 48,000 are dead, more than 110,000 injured and thousands detained. Since 2007, a blockade by Israel has been worsening the situation. This has resulted in a humanitarian disaster that has affected 2.3 million people.

The scale and intensity of the assault are reminiscent of the World War II bombing campaigns against cities like Hiroshima, Nagasaki, London, Stalingrad and Dresden. The bombing of Dresden is similar to what is going on in Gaza in 1945. During a span of three days, Allied bombs created a firestorm that killed about 25000 civilians and destroyed 80 per cent of the centre of the city through high-explosive and incendiary attacks (Air Force Historical Support Division, 2025). While the Dresden bombing raised moral questions about attacking civilians during war, the constant bombing of Gaza seems bigger than that. At least bigger in scale and consequences. Israel's military operation has made conditions in the Strip almost uninhabitable. This may be enough to be a cause for genocide.



Figure 2: Israeli Atrocities in Palestine

In the wake of this unprecedented devastation, a deeply concerning narrative has emerged from U.S. policymakers. Gaza has been made 'tabula rasa' (a blank slate) by President Donald Trump, thus making it a 'development hub'. The above reflects a colonial attitude that wipes out Indigenous presence and suffering. As outlined in his recent proposals, Trump's vision is more about economic and geopolitical interests than peace. The so-called "peace plan" of this imperialist power is more or less similar to earlier projects of reconfiguration of empires, whereby devastated/occupied lands are seen as investment opportunities in the name of reconstruction, modernisation, etc (Bshara, 2025).

Trump's Expansionist Continuities

Trump's recent claims about expansionism do not mark a new turn in U.S. policy but rather a revival of his rhetoric from his first presidency term. Trump has stated expansionist ambitions by 2018 already. In fact, he even wanted Canada to be the fifty-first U.S. state (Opal, 2018; Mirror, 2025). Likewise, his March 2019 recognition of the occupied Syrian Golan Heights as part of Israel represented a major break with decades of international consensus and United Nations resolutions declaring the annexation illegal (Landler & Wong, 2019). The move was justified as being in the interest of Israeli 'security and regional stability', thus legitimizing the occupation of territories with US endorsement.

In January 2020, Trump issued his "Peace to Prosperity" plan, labelled the "Deal of the Century" which deepened these expansionist inclinations. The plan recognized Jerusalem as a united capital of Israel and granted Israel permission to annex large regions of the occupied West Bank, calling occupied territory "disputed" territory (NYT, 2020). Israel is using both legal language and linguistic strategies to legitimize settlements and undermine Palestinian statehood. As such, the logic of the plan was similar to that of colonial cartographic practices which created territories for an empire or settlers.

Gaza: From "Demolition Site" to "Riviera of the Middle East"

Trump's fresh proposal to convert Gaza from a wrecking ball to the Riviera of the Middle East brings to light the economic aspects of neocolonialism today. According to Hegazi (2023), their scheme envisions relocating the two million Palestinians in Gaza to Egypt and Jordan, claiming better living conditions. Such proposals are a blatant breach of International Law or the right of return, employing a method of inhabitants transfer and demographic engineering characteristic of colonial and settler projects. Israeli leaders have defended the plan as consistent with their broader geopolitical objectives despite the international criticism (Reuters, 2022; Goujard et al., 2022).

Gaza can be a profit-making offshore territory, claims Trump. It can be made free of people, available for business. Similar to the 1917 Balfour Declaration, this policy allocates land belonging to one population group to outsiders in exchange for financial gain. Trump's plan basically gives Gaza, cleansed of its Palestinian population, to investors and new settlers, just like Britain assigned Palestine to the Zionist movement without asking the local population for their approval (Panikoff, 2025). By looking only at the region in economical terms, we strip it of its humanity and reduce it to space. Trump intends to work out a plan that seeks to serve the local elite, not secure the rights of the Palestinian peoples. Trump's 2025 Peace Plan for Gaza reflects a colonialism of a different kind (Wagner, 2024).



Figure 3: Trump Gaza Peace Deal 2025

Integrating Liberalism and Postcolonial Critique: The Illusion of Liberal Peace in the Gaza Framework

Proposed Gaza Peace Framework was launched under a Former US President Donald J. Trump is a demand from the liberal community for peace, stability, and reconstruction. It sounds modern, progressive and humane when it talks about humanitarian aid, economic growth, and institutional reform. But when examined traditionally through a postcolonial lens, there are contradictions. It introduces a certain kind of liberalism that includes freedom, democracy and progress, while reproducing different colonial control and dependency relationships (Barkawi and Laffey 2006). This segment will see how the Gaza plan reflects what the scholars have called liberal imperialism, which means using liberal values to justify dominance, and manage inequality.



Figure 4: States Accepting Israel's Occupation of Palestine

Liberal Peace as a New Form of Colonial Control

At the first glance it promotes peace through liberal means such as a ceasefire, reconstruction and governance reform. The ideas draw from liberal institutionalism, which argues that international cooperation and trade can mitigate conflict (Doyle, 1997; Keohane, 1984). In Global Northern discourses or the Global South, their impact is often limited (Richmond, 2011).

The Gaza plan transfers control of governance, aid and reconstruction to foreign actors represented by the "Board of Peace," which is headed by Trump himself. Much like the trusteeships of the colonies, where powerful states ruled on behalf of the local population until the local population was ready for self-rule. The plan disguises the management of occupation as peacebuilding and domination as stability – which is a false agenda.

Conflict and instability cause insecurity as well as impede development. According to a Duffield interpretation, this relates to the security-development nexus where development is not about empowering people but controlling and stabilizing them. According to this logic, the Gaza framework exhibits demilitarisation, deradicalisation and external scrutiny. The rhetoric of liberal peace turns Gaza into a zone of containment. The rationale is not as much about justice as it is about order (Duffield, 2001).

The Paradox of Liberal Institutions.

Under a liberal lens, the institutional framework serves as instruments of cooperation and accountability according to Keohane in 1984. Institutions imposed externally operate as apparatuses of domination. The proposed Gaza scheme creates a transitional administration under international supervision without political agency for the Palestinians. Decision-making now lies with foreign experts rather than elected representatives, making governance a form of management.

The British Mandate System (1920–1948) ruled Palestine with the idea of 'preparing' it for its independence. This model is akin. As put by Nkrumah (1965), they are neo-colonial in nature in which a state despite appearing independent is being controlled. Grovogui (1996) states that such systems enable the West to portray hierarchy as progress and surveillance as reform.

In Gaza, the same dynamic reappears. So-called transitional governance acts as a modern-day trusteeship where Palestinians are subject to conditional control. Once more, the residents of Gaza are regarded not as citizens with rights but merely as subjects of international supervision.

Economic Modernization and the New Colonial Economy

Economic development forms a central part of the plan. The plan assures it will create jobs, attract foreign investment and transform the Gaza Strip into the "Riviera of the Middle East." Such an idea shows liberal thinking that markets and trade generate peace by making one dependent on the other (Oneal & Russett, 1999)

Nonetheless, postcolonial and dependency theorists, such as Amin (1976) and Rodney (1972), argue that liberal economic models exacerbate inequality. Projects which involve foreign capital as well as special economic zones are designed to keep the

Palestinians dependent on donors and investors. Local workers and resources will be deployed to serve global big business, not national development. It is an example of the "continuation of colonial exploitation by new means" (Fanon 1963).

In addition, the plan's emphasis on private-sector growth, deregulation, and donor conditionality point to the influence of neoliberal institutions like the IMF and World Bank. According to Chang (2002) and Escobar (1995), such initiatives hinder development by locking developing regions into dependency. Further, they impose market reforms that favour foreign investors and not local priorities. Gaza does not require self-sufficiency; it needs reconstruction in order to be integrated into other's capitalist networks.

The Erasure of History: Liberal Reconstruction and the Dispossession of Gaza.

Trump's proposal separates the people of Gaza from their own history as well. For over four thousand years, Gaza has been destroyed and rebuilt multiple times. Excavations in archaeology shows layers of settlements and resettlements. During Salah al-Din al-Ayyubi's period, the city was destroyed in 1191 Safed, to prevent it from falling into the hands of the Crusaders. Likewise, the three battles for Gaza in 1917 almost destroyed the city when the British and Ottomans fought for the control of the town. The 1956 Khan Younis campaign by the Israeli army and the post-2005 unilateral withdrawal military operations of the Israeli army, destroyed the Gaza Strip heavily and it has proved difficult for the Gaza Strip to recover from them. However, the most recent one, Swords of Iron, which is post-7 October 2023, is the deadliest of all (Reich, 2023).

The Civilizing Narrative and Orientalist Assumptions.

The Gaza narrative reiterates an old story about 'civilizing' missions that justified European colonialisms. Stress on "deradicalization," "modernization" and "change of mindsets" means Palestinians should first accept Western liberal values. This logic matches Said's (1978) Orientalism, whereby non-Western societies are depicted as backward, irrational and incapable of ruling themselves.

This story portrays the Palestinians as forces that block peace because of their cultural and ideological deficiencies. The part of Israel and the Western parts are portrayed as rational and progressive. The educational reform and inter-faith dialogue as mentioned in the plan needs to address more on re-education and culture reform..

Doty (1996) explains such discourse makes domination a duty and legitimizes the intervention. In the past, colonial powers used the excuse that they had to civilize the world. In the same way, the Trump Plan also shows us that peace will not come from justice and equality, it will come from Western supervision over the Other.

Conditional Sovereignty and the Denial of Agency

The plan's attitude presents a serious contradiction on Palestinian sovereignty. This one says self-determination but says can be independent if they approve. By the United States and its allies, Palestinians will only achieve recognition if they meet certain "reform benchmarks,".

The idea of conditional sovereignty revitalized the colonial idea of trusteeship. Colonised peoples were deemed "not ready" for independence. As Spivak (1988) famously asked, "Can the subaltern speak? The Gaza plan indicates that the Palestinians

will not be allowed to determine their political position; others will manage and speak for them.

Chowdhry and Nair say that non-Western voices being silenced is epistemic violence. Gaza Palestinians are robbed of their political agency and become mere aid recipients. Citizens became dependents: their resistance is seen as instability. In simpler words: the language of reform and modernization hides a logic of coloniality (Chowdhry & Nair, 2002).

Peace without Justice: Liberal Idealism and Colonial Realism

The Gaza framework expects a kind of peace which is without justice. It emphasizes on stability and control rather than equality and rights. As Galtung (1969) defines these definitions, it indicates that there is no violence (negative peace) as opposed to positive peace which clears the source of conflict.

The ceasefire monitoring and demilitarisation will allow Israel to control Gaza's borders, airspace, and economy. It means that such arrangements will sustain the continued occupation under the name of peace. From a postcolonial perspective, this is a type of imperial pacification where "peace" is maintained through surveillance, dependence, and coercion. (Fanon, 1963 & Mbembe, 2003)

Discussion

Together, the Gaza Peace Framework demonstrates how liberalism and Post Colonialism can combine in contemporary international politics. When you put the humanitarian Plan into the mechanism of domination, the plan is what Barkawi and Laffey (2006) call the colonial present. Liberal global governance still has a strong hard power.

Conditionality, external control, and neoliberal economics are the components of the liberalism management system. This has transformed liberalism from being a philosophy of freedom and emancipation into one of management. They assure order but not justice, production but not equality.

The Gaza initiative shows that liberal imperialism is not simply an idea or an artifact. It goes on the historical pattern of claiming control of Palestine through modernization and peace moral language. According to Richmond 2011, these frameworks of peace comprise "liberal peace as hegemony" where the Western model of governance is universalised and local voices and histories excluded.

The Gaza Peace Framework (2025) draws heavy criticism reflecting its controversial and humanitarian character through international reactions. According to UNFPA (2024), since October 2023, nearly 1.9 million people have had to leave their homes – 90% of Gaza's population. This is one of the largest relocations to take place in recent memory. In the first week alone of September 2025, the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) reported 57,638 individual displacement movements, largely fib displacement, from northern to southern Gaza. Almost all of these movements were from Gaza City (Dawn, 2025; Anadolu Agency, 2025). The United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) reports that as of mid-2025, approximately 190,115 buildings had suffered damage and 102,067 had been destroyed, while over 330,000 housing units had become uninhabitable (UNA-OIC, 2025).

The world and the region condemned these appalling figures. Egypt and Jordan state that any actions to move people and conditional reconstruction will not help create stability or build peace. According to analysts, the plan's focus on private-sector-led reconstruction and investment zones is merely a neoliberal intervention. The implementation of such a plan in Iraq and also the Afghanistan has impacted neither the development nor political stability (Richmond, 2011; Duffield, 2001).

Stakeholder messages indicate that the Gaza Peace Framework involves a diplomatic sleight of hand by promoting humanitarian and economic rhetoric. This rhetoric disguises systemic inequalities. Moreover, the messages claim the reconstruction enables dependency rather than sovereignty.

Conclusion

In other words, in Gaza Peace Framework (2025) there is a significant gap between the promises of liberal peace and postcolonial control. The plan for peace, development and reconstruction merely reinforces systems of unequal dependence – and exploitation. The arrangement does not give Palestinians real freedom; rather, it puts them under indirect domination involving an international entity with conditions. The ideas behind peace and humanitarianism are recast as systems that constrain and regulate Palestinian sovereignty. The plan does not represent a break with colonial history. Or, one can say that it is a continuation, but in the new postcolonial plan. The takeover is direct, while the occupation has faded into a form of economic and administrative containment. These form of activities involves the treatment of Palestinians as subjects of reform rather than partners in peace. The initiative is actually a development plan for Gaza as it emphasizes investment and reconstruction under foreign management, and not a political community with rights. Modern peace-making activities often assume a neocolonial character where peace is ensured by control and development but not by equality or justice. The Gaza Peace Framework shares a similar essence with its proposed peace. Establishing a Palestinian state under the law, freely chosen by the people, is the key solution to restoring peace. Only then can peace become meaningful, fair, and lasting.

Recommendations

The Gaza Peace Framework raises key questions about peacebuilding and reconstruction in war-torn areas. Unless local communities are fully involved and injustices corrected, the history of economic projects is that they repeat cycles of dependency and control. For future peace policies to make peace sustainable and not something temporary, there should be support for local ownership, local transparency, local inclusion instead of external agents or investment-related solutions. To avoid reproducing structural inequalities in new forms, one needs to know how colonisation patterns are acting in contemporary peace interventions.

References

- Air Force Historical Support Division. (2025). *1945-Bombings of Dresden*. <https://www.afhistory.af.mil/FAQs/Fact-Sheets/Article/458943/1945-bombings-of-dresden/>
- American Jewish Committee. (2025, March 5). *What is Trump's proposal for Gaza?* <https://www.ajc.org/news/what-is-trumps-proposal-for-gaza>
- Amin, S. (1976). *Unequal development: An essay on the social formations of peripheral capitalism*. Monthly Review Press.
- Anadolu Agency. (2025, October 2). *Over 417,000 displaced from northern Gaza since August: UN*. Anadolu Agency.
- Barkawi, T., & Laffey, M. (2006). The postcolonial moment in security studies. *Review of International Studies*, 32(2), 329–352. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0260210506007054>
- Bshara, K. (2025). Settler colonialism rebranded: Trump's Gaza plan and the capitalist logic of war. *Journal of Palestine Studies*, 54(1), 62–70. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0377919X.2025.2489264>
- Chang, H.-J. (2002). *Kicking away the ladder: Development strategy in historical perspective*. Anthem Press.
- Chowdhry, G., & Nair, S. (Eds.). (2002). *Power, postcolonialism and international relations: Reading race, gender and class*. Routledge.
- Dawn. (2025, June 27). *UN report highlights mass 'forced displacement' by Israel in Gaza*. Dawn.
- Doty, R. L. (1996). *Imperial encounters: The politics of representation in North–South relations*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Duffield, M. (2001). *Global governance and the new wars: The merging of development and security*. Zed Books.
- Doyle, M. W. (1997). *Ways of war and peace*. W.W. Norton.
- Escobar, A. (1995). *Encountering development: The making and unmaking of the Third World*. Princeton University Press.
- Fanon, F. (1963). *The wretched of the earth*. Grove Press.
- Farid, A., & Sarwar, G. (2025). The Kashmir-Israel-Palestine Analogy: Propaganda Narratives And Pakistan's Diplomatic Response. *Journal of Media Horizons*, 6(2), 739–748.
- Galtung, J. (1969). Violence, peace, and peace research. *Journal of Peace Research*, 6(3), 167–191. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002234336900600301>

- Grovogui, S. N. (1996). *Sovereigns, quasi-sovereigns, and Africans: Race and self-determination in international law*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Keohane, R. O. (1984). *After hegemony: Cooperation and discord in the world political economy*. Princeton University Press.
- Landler, M., & Wong, E. (2019, March 21). In Golan Heights, Trump bolsters Israel's Netanyahu but risks roiling Middle East. *The New York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/2019/03/21/us/politics/golan-heights-trump.html>
- Mbembe, A. (2001). *On the postcolony*. University of California Press.
- Mbembe, A. (2003). Necropolitics. *Public Culture*, 15(1), 11–40. <https://doi.org/10.1215/08992363-15-1-11>
- New York Times. (2020, January 30). *Trump's Middle East plan: Starting point or dead end?* *The New York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/01/30/opinion/peace-plan-trump.html>
- Nkrumah, K. (1965). *Neo-colonialism: The last stage of imperialism*. Thomas Nelson & Sons.
- Oneal, J. R., & Russett, B. (1999). The Kantian peace: The pacific benefits of democracy, interdependence, and international organizations. *World Politics*, 52(1), 1–37.
- POLITICO. (2025, February 5). *Global fury builds over Trump's plan to turn Gaza into the Middle East "Riviera."* <https://www.politico.eu/article/global-fury-builds-over-donald-trump-plan-turn-gaza-middle-east-riviera/>
- Reich, M. (2024, July). The great fire of Rome. *Origins: Current Events in Historical Perspective*. <https://origins.osu.edu/read/great-fire-rome>
- Reuters. (2025, February 12). "Hell worse than what we have already?" Gazans reject Trump plans. *Reuters*. <https://www.reuters.com/world/middle-east/hell-worse-than-what-we-have-already-gazans-reject-trump-plans-2025-02-11/>
- Richmond, O. P. (2011). *A post-liberal peace*. Routledge.
- Rodney, W. (1972). *How Europe underdeveloped Africa*. Bogle-L'Ouverture Publications.
- Said, E. W. (1978). *Orientalism*. Pantheon Books.
- Said, E. W. (1993). *Culture and imperialism*. Vintage Books.
- Scientists for Global Responsibility. (2024, March 13). *Gaza: One of the most intense bombardments in history?* <https://www.sgr.org.uk/resources/gaza-one-most-intense-bombardments-history>
- Mbembé, A., & Meintjes, L. (2003). Necropolitics. *Public Culture*, 15(1), 11–40. <https://muse.jhu.edu/article/39984>

- Spivak, G. C. (1988). Can the subaltern speak? In C. Nelson & L. Grossberg (Eds.), *Marxism and the interpretation of culture* (pp. 271–313). University of Illinois Press.
- The Atlantic Council. (2025, February 5). *Trump is serious about shaking up the Middle East, even if his Gaza plan isn't*. <https://www.atlanticcouncil.org/blogs/new-atlanticist/trump-is-serious-about-shaking-up-the-middle-east-even-if-his-gaza-plan-isnt/>
- The Trump Declaration for Enduring Peace and Prosperity. (2025, October 13). *The White House*. <https://www.whitehouse.gov/presidential-actions/2025/10/the-trump-declaration-for-enduring-peace-and-prosperity/>
- United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs. (2025). *Humanitarian situation update: Gaza Strip* (Report No. 326). <https://www.unocha.org/publications/report/occupied-palestinian-territory/humanitarian-situation-update-326-gaza-strip>
- United Nations Population Fund. (2025, May). *Palestine situation report – April 2025*. <https://www.unfpa.org/resources/palestine-situation-report-april-2025>
- Wagner, K. (2024, July 9). The awful plan to turn Gaza into the next Dubai. *The Nation*.
- Yaseen, Z., Muzaffar, M., & Tariq, K. (2023). Impacts of Saudi-Israel Relations on the Middle East: An Analysis, *Political Studies*, 30(1), 17–27