



By: Tomorrow's Affairs Staff

The American proposal for a ceasefire in Gaza – an attempt to redefine priorities in the conflict



The US administration's announcement of a **proposed** 60-day ceasefire in Gaza came shortly after a serious incident was documented on 28 May—the forced entry of starving civilians into a United Nations warehouse.

This incident was not isolated but the culmination of a weeks-long collapse of basic living **conditions** in the Gaza Strip, during which food distribution and medical care came to a complete **standstill**.

The US proposal provides for a temporary suspension of Israeli operations in densely populated areas, a gradual exchange of hostages and prisoners and the guaranteed entry of humanitarian aid.

All elements are part of a broader objective – the establishment of basic conditions for the physical survival of the civilian population.

In this formulation, the security of convoys and the distribution of food become the primary criterion for success, not the number of points the parties sign or publicly declare.

Changing the dynamics of the conflict

The Netanyahu government has accepted the plan. Within the Israeli security apparatus, there is no unified position on its justification.

For some in the cabinet, the proposal is a means of reducing pressure from the US administration and European partners. For others, it is a tactical pause that allows for regrouping and internal stabilisation.

In both cases, the plan does not mean the end of Israeli objectives in Gaza but a temporary redefinition of those objectives.

On the Palestinian side, Hamas has not **rejected** the plan but still does not accept its key elements.

The American side is aware of the limitations of its own proposal

The wording presents a problem: the proposal for a ceasefire lacks a specific deadline for the end of the blockade. For Hamas, this means a temporary respite with no guarantees that anything will actually change.

Without the formal withdrawal of Israeli troops and the reopening of closed border crossings, the ceasefire remains a control mechanism and not a political solution.

Diplomatic circles estimate that the American side is aware of the limitations of its own proposal.

However, they aim not to end the conflict but to create a new basis for negotiation. This is an attempt to change the dynamics of the conflict, which has continued uninterrupted since October 2023 and without an institutional mediation channel.

A different approach

So far, attempts to end the fighting have always come from a position of strength – one side imposes conditions based on military advantage.

The US plan envisages a different approach: a temporary de-escalation without political acknowledgement.

In other words, it creates a space for reshaping relations, not by acknowledgement, but by implementing a pause and regulating the transport of aid.

Safety of humanitarian corridors is a key issue

The humanitarian sector has reacted cautiously but supports the initiative.

According to the World Food Programme and

OCHA, more than 85% of people in Gaza are dependent on humanitarian aid. Reports from the UN clearly show that while supplies are available, their distribution remains uncertain.

Key logistics channels are under constant threat, and local institutions that could take over some of the work have either been destroyed or blocked.

Therefore, the question of the safety of humanitarian corridors becomes a key issue not only for the implementation of aid but also for the political sustainability of any agreement.

Redefining Washington's role

In this context, the US proposal should not be interpreted as a final solution. It is a stabilisation mechanism.

Should it prove successful, it can be extended. If it fails, it paves the way for failure to be defined not by military defeats but by the inability to provide a minimum level of protection for civilians.

In this respect, the proposal also serves as a test of the political will of all actors involved.

The political price of the Trump administration's passivity is becoming too high

The background of the proposal reveals an attempt to redefine Washington's role.

After months of ambivalent positioning towards Israeli operations, this initiative aims to portray the US as an actor capable of intervening in the crisis in a balanced way.

This is particularly significant given the growing criticism from European capitals and critical voices in America itself. The political cost of the Trump administration's passivity is becoming too high.

There is also a regional dimension. Egypt and Qatar are taking part in consultations, and Turkey is involved as a mediator with Hamas.

Implementing the ceasefire, with their active participation, will signal the possibility of a regional coalition for humanitarian stabilisation. Otherwise, it will be further proof that no Arab country can influence the actors in Gaza without Israeli mediation, cementing the status quo.

Redefining objectives

For Israel, the temporary pause may also serve to prepare for a new phase of operations.

IDF security analyses in recent weeks have considered a scenario in which Israeli forces would abandon certain sectors and focus on limited targets with greater political support.

Experts believe that the US ceasefire proposal will allow Israel to temporarily cease fighting and, in the meantime, redefine its military objectives and the deployment of its forces in Gaza.



If a minimum flow of 200 trucks per day is opened in the first seven days, this will be a clear indicator that the mechanism is working

For Hamas, rejection of the proposal carries the risk of international isolation, but acceptance without guarantees carries the internal risk of the erosion of political control.

In both cases, there is little room for manoeuvre. This explains why the plan was

neither immediately rejected nor accepted.

If the proposal is implemented, the key parameters for success will not be political declarations but rather the continuity of aid convoys, the availability of medicines, and the restoration of local distribution mechanisms.

If a minimum flow of 200 trucks per day is opened in the first seven days, this will be a clear indicator that the mechanism is working. If not, then it is clear that the ceasefire is an illusion and not stabilisation.

Based on the reactions and the dynamics of the consultation, there is a real chance of implementation. But it will be short-lived if a minimum framework for an extension is not created in these 60 days.

Humanitarian stabilisation without a political channel will only prolong the standstill. And a standstill without a change in relations will lead to a resumption of the conflict. In this respect, the proposal from Washington is a first step, but not a sufficient one.

If all parties agree that the physical security of the civilian population becomes the fundamental threshold, then that is a paradigm shift.

If it remains just a tactical tool, then this initiative will be part of a long series of failed attempts to contain violence through temporary technical agreements without deeper political will.