

Dirassat & Abhath
The Arabic Journal of Human
and Social Sciences



مجلة دراسات وأبحاث
المجلة العربية في العلوم الإنسانية
والاجتماعية

EISSN: 2253-0363
ISSN : 1112-9751

The global Reactions to the new Israeli War on Gaza:

a critical analytical perspective

**ردود الأفعال العالمية على الحرب الإسرائيلية الجديدة على غزة
منظور تحليلي نقدي**

BENYZA Youcef

Professor, Batna1 University,

youcef.benzya@univ-batna.dz

تاريخ القبول : 2025/06/24

تاريخ الاستلام: 2025 /04/27

Abstract:

This paper critically analyzes global reactions to the recent Israeli war on Gaza(2025-2024) , aiming to uncover the underlying motives and implications of these responses. Employing a mixed-method approach, the study examines official statements from the United Nations, European Union, and key nation-states, alongside an analysis of media framing in major international news outlets and public opinion data from social media trends. The purpose is to reveal the complexities and contradictions in global responses, highlighting the tension between humanitarian rhetoric and strategic interests. Findings suggest that while some nations prioritize human rights in their condemnations, others align their stances with broader geopolitical goals, often at the expense of consistent ethical positions. The paper also identifies a growing disconnect between public sentiment and official policies, particularly in Western democracies, where grassroots movements increasingly challenge traditional alignments. By examining these dynamics, the study contributes to a deeper understanding of how global power structures influence perceptions of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and underscores the need for a more nuanced approach to international diplomacy in the region.

Keywords: Gaza, Israel, war, Global reactions,

المخلص :

يقدم هذا البحث تحليلاً نقدياً لردود الأفعال العالمية تجاه الحرب الإسرائيلية الأخيرة على غزة (2025-2024)، بهدف الكشف عن التباينات المسجلة فيها والدوافع الأساسية والتداعيات المترتبة، باعتماد منهجية متكاملة، يفحص من خلالها الباحث البيانات الرسمية الصادرة عن الهيئات الدولية، ويحلل التغطية الإعلامية في وسائل الإعلام الرئيسية، إلى جانب اتجاهات الرأي العام المستخلصة من وسائل التواصل الاجتماعي. ويقصد من ذلك إبراز التعقيدات والتناقضات الكامنة في المواقف الدولية، مع التركيز على التوتر القائم بين الخطاب الإنساني والمصالح الاستراتيجية. وقد خلص البحث إلى أن بعض الدول تُعلي من شأن حقوق الإنسان في بياناتها، بينما تصوغ دول أخرى مواقفها بما ينسجم مع أهداف جيوسياسية أوسع، غالباً على حساب اتساق المواقف الأخلاقية. كما يكشف عن اتساع الفجوة بين الرأي العام والسياسات الرسمية، ولا سيما في الديمقراطيات الغربية، حيث تتحدى الحركات الشعبية التحالفات التقليدية على نحو متزايد. ومن خلال تحليل هذه الديناميات، يساهم البحث في تعميق فهم كيفية تأثير هياكل القوى العالمية في تصوّرات الصراع الإسرائيلي-الفلسطيني، ويؤكد الحاجة إلى اعتماد مقاربة أكثر دقة في الدبلوماسية الدولية حيال المنطقة. الكلمات المفتاحية: غزة، الحرب، إسرائيل، ردود الفعل.

1. INTRODUCTION

The new war in Gaza, ignited by the Palestinian jihadists attack on Israel on October 7th, 2023, followed by Israel's subsequent large-scale military response, has not only resulted in devastating loss of life and a profound humanitarian crisis within the Strip but has also reverberated intensely across the globe.

The international reaction to the conflict has been swift, multifaceted, and often deeply polarized, reflecting complex geopolitical interests, historical alliances, and varying interpretations of international law and human rights.

Understanding the global response to the Gaza war requires examining this complex tapestry of diplomatic maneuvers, humanitarian efforts, legal debates, and public sentiment, revealing not only immediate stances on the conflict but also deeper, often long-standing, divisions regarding the Israeli-Palestinian issue itself. This paper aims to analyze the international reactions to the conflict in Gaza, focusing on both the positive and negative aspects of these responses. The primary goals of the paper can be summarized as follows:

- Analyzing International Reactions by examining how different countries and regions reacted to the conflict, including their political stances, humanitarian responses, and diplomatic actions. It highlights the diverse perspectives and biases that influenced these reactions.
- detailing each reaction, by providing a clear view of the complex situation. This includes discussing the implications of supporting or condemning Israel's actions, the effectiveness

of humanitarian aid, and the challenges faced by international organizations like the UN.

-The paper explores how these reactions reflect broader political alliances, historical conflicts, and humanitarian concerns. It discusses how these factors complicate efforts to resolve the conflict and provide aid to affected populations (Brenner, 2017; *Middle East Latest*, 2025)

1.1 Purpose:

The purpose of this study is to highlight the international responses to war violations committed in Palestine by Israel. As well as a call for a reevaluation of international law.

1.2 Methods:

The study uses Comparative case study, which is a research method that compares two or more cases to test a theory. The cases are chosen, and then the method is used to find why something has happened. It also uses Quantitative Content Analysis, which is a systematic and replicable research method for analyzing text to classify its components through a structured coding scheme, enabling conclusions about message content.

This study is compatible with the two methodologies, which provide insights into how international actors perceive and react to violations of international law in Gaza.

1.3 Problematic:

The "new" Israeli war on Gaza signifies a distinct, recent conflict, differentiated from previous engagements by contemporary geopolitical, technological, and socio-political factors. Adopting a critical analytical perspective necessitates a rigorous examination of underlying assumptions, power dynamics, and motivations, rather than a mere factual recounting of events. This

approach prompts a crucial inquiry: what drives the diverse global reactions to this recent conflict in Gaza, and how do these responses reflect the inherent tensions and contradictions within contemporary international relations?

2- An Overview for The Palestinian Issue

in 1917, Britain supported the Zionist movement, leading to tensions with Arabs after the first world war. The Arab uprising in 1936 ended British support, resulting in Arab countries independence (Liyih, 2024).

The conflict between the Arabs and Israel – although the modern Jewish state has only officially existed since 1948 – has been going on since the beginning of the 20th century in the form of clashes between the Jewish and Arab populations in British-controlled Mandatory Palestine with varying intensity on the military, political, and economic levels.

In the late of 1987 Hamas formed at the beginning of the first Palestinian intifada. Its roots are in the Palestinian branch of the Muslim Brotherhood, and it is supported by a robust sociopolitical structure inside the Palestinian territories.

Since August 1988, Hamas adopted a national charter and committed itself to a holy war, or jihad, against Israel for the sake of recovering custodianship of Palestine, which it described as “an Islamic Waqf” consecrated for future Muslim generations until Judgment Day. Hamas made no secret of its aversion for the Palestine Liberation Organization PLO (Palestine Liberation Organization), which it refused to join. In its charter, it acknowledged the national structure but criticized the PLO for its secular character.

The 2006 elections to the Palestinian Legislative Council saw the first democratic ascent to power by Islamists in the Arab

world. In a landslide victory, the Islamic resistance movement in Palestine, Hamas, was catapulted from its former position of extra-parliamentary activism into the vortex of political power, assuming the role of government in Gaza strip (Brenner, 2017).

The Israeli attacks on Gaza and Lebanon in the summer of 2006, coupled with the intense conflict with Iran in June 2025, signal that the storm of regional tensions continues to rage. Organizations such as Hezbollah and Hamas, which challenge Israel’s unilateral actions in Palestine, have faced the full force of Israel’s military might, as did Iran during the 12-day war marked by missile exchanges and airstrikes targeting nuclear facilities. Despite the ferocity of these assaults, these groups and Iran have, so far, managed to withstand the onslaught, with a fragile ceasefire taking hold on June 24, 2025. However, the conflict is far from resolved. The regional patrons of these resistance movements, particularly Iran and Syria, remain at risk of further targeting, as the ceasefire’s stability is uncertain amid ongoing nuclear ambitions and covert operations. The potential for even more devastating conflict and bloodshed remains alarmingly high.

The regional patron of these resistance movements, Iran, could be targeted in the near future; the risk of even more devastating conflict and bloodshed has never been so acute (Pappe, 2006).

3- Analyzing the Dynamics of the Latest - Israeli war on Gaza "

When the war in Gaza started, many countries that are friends with Israel said they were against the attacks by Hamas and that Israel had the right to protect itself. But many countries in the Muslim world quickly said Israel's actions in Gaza were wrong. International organizations like the United Nations have called for the immediate

cessation of the fighting to assist those in need.

In the same time Different parts of the world had different reactions. Countries in the Middle East and some in Africa mostly said Israel was wrong and supported Palestine, unlike Countries in Europe and North America had more mixed reactions, often supporting Israel but also worrying about the people living in Gaza. Because so many people in Gaza were in trouble, countries all over tried to send help, but it was hard because the fighting didn't stop and it was difficult to get into the area (Oxfam, 2025). Overall, the world's reaction shows just how complicated and hard this long-lasting conflict is.

4- Divergent Global Stances: The Gaza War as a Catalyst for Geopolitical Realignment

After the war in Gaza began, some countries, especially in the West, quickly said the attacks by Hamas were unacceptable. These countries, like the United States and some in Europe, said they stood with Israel and that Israel had the right to defend itself. Leaders from countries like the US, France, Germany, and the UK even went to Israel to show they supported them.

Conversely, numerous nations within the Muslim world swiftly condemned Israel's actions in Gaza as unjust, articulating strong diplomatic objections and highlighting perceived violations of international humanitarian law, thinking they were too harsh and unfair to the Palestinian people. Many countries around the world asked to stop immediately to prevent more people from getting hurt or killed (United Nations, 2023).

In October 2023, the United Nations General Assembly voted for a resolution asking for an immediate break in the fighting to help people, showing that many countries wanted

the war to stop. Also, some countries like Belize, Bolivia, Colombia, and Nicaragua decided to cut off their official connections with Israel. Others, such as Bahrain, Chad, Chile, Honduras, Jordan, South Africa, and Turkey, took their ambassadors out of Israel because of what Israel was doing during the war (Wikipedia, 2024).

5- Reactions Around the World:

5.1 The Middle Eastern States: A Mosaic of Responses

Almost of Middle East Countries had different reactions to the war in Gaza. Countries like Algeria and Djibouti strongly said Israel's military actions were barbarian and showed they supported the Palestinian people, with Algeria calling it a fight against Israeli colonial settlement (Wikipedia, 2024). Egypt asked both Israel and Palestine to be careful and asked other countries to pressure Israel to stop its attacks, pointing out that Israel, as the occupying power, had responsibilities under international law to protect people. Same as Jordan that suggested a plan to move 3,000 Hamas members out of Gaza as a way to end the war (Middle East Eye, 2025). The Arab League asked its member countries to stop doing business with Israel because of its actions in Gaza (Arab News, 2025). Egypt also came up with a big plan to rebuild Gaza, which the Arab League agreed to. The goal was to fix the damage and put the Palestinian Authority back in charge. However, this plan faced opposition from some in the region, with the UAE trying to get the US to reject it (Middle East Eye, 2025).

The different reactions in the Middle East showed the different political interests and relationships that countries in the region had with both Israel and the United States. While most countries generally said Israel's actions were wrong, their specific responses varied,

from wanting regional stability and suggesting solutions, like Egypt and Jordan, to showing stronger support for the Palestinian cause. The disagreements within the Arab world, like the UAE opposing the Arab League's plan, showed how hard it was to get a united response to the complex issues of the conflict.

5.2 Europe's Shifting Sands: From Condemnation to Conditionality

Europe's reaction to the war in Gaza started with many countries saying the attacks by Palestinians were rejected and strongly supporting Israel. Many countries in the European Union, including Belgium, Bulgaria, and the Czech Republic, put up Israeli flags on government buildings and held events to remember the Israeli victims.

The European Union itself, through its leaders, clearly said the attacks of October 7th was (terrorism act) and that Israel had the right to defend itself, but also said it was important to protect all civilians according to international law. In this moment Leaders from Germany, the UK, Italy, and France all visited Israel in the weeks after the attacks to show their support. However, as the war in Gaza continued and more Palestinians were killed, and the situation for people living there got worse, European support for Israel started to decrease (Social Europe, 2025). The EU, even after its initial support, became a major provider of aid to Gaza (European Commission, 2025).

There were disagreements within the EU, with countries like Belgium, Spain, and Ireland becoming more critical of Israel's actions (Social Europe, 2025). The EU considered taking actions like stopping its special agreement with Israel if it didn't follow international law, and putting penalties on violent Israeli settlers.

Amnesty International criticized EU leaders for what it called a "shameful" attempt to justify Israel's actions against Palestinians. Whereas Europe's initial strong support for Israel changed to a more critical view as the conflict went on, showing a tension between historical ties and a commitment to international law. While many European countries first stood with Israel, the growing fighting in Gaza and the increasing number of civilian deaths led to more public pressure and a change in the way some governments talked about the issue. This suggested that the principles of international law and human rights were starting to become more important than initial political friendships. The lack of complete agreement within the EU on how to react to the conflict limited the group's ability to have a big political impact on the situation. The different levels of support for Israel among EU countries, from strong backing to strong disapproval, prevented the EU from forming a clear and effective policy regarding the war in Gaza. This internal division weakened the EU's potential role as a peacemaker or a significant influence in the conflict.

5.3 North America's Response: between Veto and Public Pressure

When we talking about the North America's reaction to the war in Gaza, we indicate the strong and consistent support that the United States gave to Israel. From the beginning, the US government strongly condemned the October 7th attacks and clearly said Israel had the right to defend itself, providing a lot of military aid and political support throughout the conflict. However, as the war continued and the suffering for people in Gaza got worse, the US government also started to publicly criticize Israel's actions more, especially regarding the high number of civilian deaths and the limits on aid.

Despite this increased scrutiny, the US continued most of its support to Israel, only stopping one shipment of bombs as of July 2024. US President Donald Trump made controversial statements suggesting that the US should "take over" the Gaza Strip, a proposal that was strongly opposed by Palestinians and various Arab countries, who saw it as a call for the forced removal of Palestinians (Al Jazeera, 2024). At the United Nations, the US used its power to veto several resolutions in the Security Council that called for an immediate ceasefire, often saying that Hamas's initial attacks weren't condemned and that Israel's right to self-defense wasn't mentioned. Within North America, especially in the US, public protests became a big part of the reaction to the war. Protests were organized across the country, with people showing support for both Palestine and Israel, reflecting the deeply divided opinions on the conflict (Wikipedia, 2024).

Canada also condemned October's attacks and called for a decrease in violence, emphasizing the need for a peaceful solution. moreover, The United States maintained its strong alliance with Israel throughout the war but faced increasing pressure, both internationally and within the country, regarding the severe humanitarian consequences of the war in Gaza. While the US government's support for Israel remained largely firm, based on long-standing strategic and political reasons, the growing humanitarian crisis and the increasing global condemnation of Israeli actions led to more consideration and some public criticism from the US government supported by Public opinion showed a growing divide, with a noticeable increase in encouragement for a ceasefire and growing concerns about Israel's military actions, particularly among certain groups of people.

Beyond the loss of normative power, the Biden administration showed a lack of coercive power as well. Despite a change of American discourse on the war by early 2024, Netanyahu - the Israeli PM - continued to blatantly ignore Biden's half-hearted pleas to be more considerate. US calls for Israeli restraint did not have an impact on the conduct of the war. The fact that the United States had to engage in performative foreign and security policy by dropping aid into Gaza – a territory besieged by Israel whose war is largely funded by the US – shows the impotence of US power projection in the region (Krieg, 2024).

Polls indicated a gradual shift in public feeling, with less sympathy for Israel and more support for Palestinian rights and an immediate ceasefire, suggesting that the length of the conflict and the extensive news coverage of the dire situation in Gaza influenced how people felt.

5.4 Asia's Multi-Faceted Pragmatism Response: Geopolitics and Principles

Asia showed a wide range of reactions to the war in Gaza, reflecting the different political situations, religious beliefs, and economic interests of the countries in the region.

China presented itself as wanting peace, consistently asking for an immediate ceasefire in Gaza and the creation of an independent Palestinian state, while also criticizing the United States' strong support for Israel.

India, while initially saying the October attacks were wrong, also said it supported the creation of an independent State of Palestine. Other Countries in Central Asia took a more careful approach, balancing their economic relationships with Israel with a general leaning towards the Palestinian side in international discussions, often emphasizing

their desire for peace and not wanting to get directly involved in the Middle East conflict.

In Southeast Asia, some countries, especially Malaysia and Indonesia, showed significant support for the attacks.

The different reactions across Asia highlighted the continent's complex political relationships and the varying levels of involvement with the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. China's active role in calling for peace and criticizing US policy showed its growing global ambitions and its strategic goal to possibly take the US's place as the main peacemaker in the Middle East. By presenting itself as a fair go-between and supporting a two-state solution, China aimed to improve its standing among developing countries and show itself as a responsible global power, possibly at the expense of US influence in the region.

5.5 Africa's Responses: Echoes of Liberation and the Legacy of Anti-Colonialism

By strong support for Palestine in many countries, Africa's reaction to the war in Gaza was marked, based on shared histories of colonialism and struggles for freedom, although some countries also had or developed diplomatic ties with Israel. Algeria, for example, strongly condemned Israel's bombing of Gaza and urged international groups to step in, expressing sympathy for Palestinians fighting against Israeli colonial settlement.

Other countries like Angola and Botswana asked both sides in the conflict to show restraint and talk to each other (Wikipedia, 2024). Several African nations, including Benin, Burundi, and Chad, voted against condemning Hamas at the United Nations. South Africa took a particularly strong stance

against Israel, condemning its actions, recalling its ambassador, and even taking a case to the International Court of Justice accusing Israel of genocide against the Palestinian people.

The African Union also criticized Israel's military invasion in Gaza and reiterated its support for a two-state solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict (African Union, 2024). However, the continent wasn't completely united in its response, with some African countries, such as Kenya, Ghana, and Cameroon, expressing their support for Israel and condemning October's attacks (Wikipedia, 2024). The African Union's clear condemnation of Israel's offensive, which was different from its more uncertain response to other global conflicts, suggested a growing assertiveness in its foreign policy and a focus on the Palestinian issue. This unified continental stance potentially reflected a shared understanding of the conflict as a matter of human rights and international law, and a desire for Africa to play a bigger role in the global search for peace and stability.

6. International Organizations stances

The war in Gaza has profoundly tested the mandates and cohesion of international organizations, revealing a complex landscape of diplomatic efforts, humanitarian imperatives, and deep-seated political divisions.

6.1 Assessing the UN's Impact on the Humanitarian Crisis in Gaza

The United Nations (UN) played a key role in addressing the war in Gaza, providing an important platform for expressing global concerns and trying to coordinate aid efforts. The UN General Assembly passed several resolutions calling for immediate and lasting breaks in the war on Gaza strip, showing a broad international agreement on the urgent

need to stop the violence and help civilians. The UN Security Council also discussed the situation and tried to pass resolutions, but its actions were often slowed down by disagreements among its powerful members, especially the United States and China, who used their veto power on resolutions that didn't fully align with their foreign policy goals. Various UN agencies, such as the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA), UNICEF, and the World Health Organization (WHO), were at the forefront of providing essential aid, including food, water, medicine, and shelter, to the Gaza people (UNRWA, 2025).

The UN also strongly condemned Israeli attacks on its facilities and staff in Gaza, emphasizing that UN property is protected under international law and demanding thorough investigations into these incidents. Furthermore, the UN Independent International Commission of Inquiry on the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, and Israel concluded that Israel had committed war crimes and crimes against humanity during its military operations in Gaza, including using starvation as a weapon. While the UN provided an important space for international discussion and the mobilization of aid, its overall effectiveness in resolving the conflict was often limited by the deep political divisions among its member countries, especially the constraints imposed by the veto power within the Security Council.

6.2 Analyzing the Shifting EU Policy Towards the war on Gaza

The European Union (EU) initially reacted to the war in Gaza by strongly condemning the October's 7th attacks and affirming Israel's right to defend itself. He engaged in diplomatic efforts, calling for the protection of

civilians on all sides and advocating for a long-term peace based on the two-state solution (European Commission, 2025). However, as the war continued and the situation in Gaza worsened, the EU's position became more nuanced, with increasing emphasis on the need for Israel to ensure the protection of civilians under international law (Social Europe, 2025).

The EU also considered potential measures to put pressure on Israel, including suspending the EU-Israel Association Agreement if Israel didn't follow international law, and imposing sanctions on violent Israeli settlers in the West Bank. The EU's response to the war showed a clear tension between its initial support for Israel and its growing concern about the severe humanitarian crisis in Gaza and the need to uphold international law. This internal dynamic, along with the need for agreement among its 27 member states, often resulted in a somewhat inconsistent and less impactful policy response to the conflict (Social Europe, 2025).

6.3 Regional Organizations stances:

Regional Organizations, such as the Arab League and the Organization of Islamic Cooperation, played a crucial role in shaping how their member countries collectively responded to the war in Gaza. The Arab League strongly condemned Israel's military actions in Gaza and asked its member countries to implement a complete economic boycott against Israel in protest.

Furthermore, the Arab League, led by Egypt, developed a plan for rebuilding Gaza after the war, aiming to reconstruct the damaged area and re-establish the Palestinian Authority's control (Al Jazeera, 2025).

This reconstruction plan was later officially supported by the Organization of Islamic

Cooperation, representing the wider Muslim world, which urged the international community and financial institutions to provide the necessary support for its implementation (Al Jazeera, 2025). The OIC consistently maintained a united stance on the issue of Palestine, condemning Israeli aggression and the blockade of Gaza, and rejecting any attempts to displace its residents (Organization of Islamic Cooperation, 2024). While these regional organizations provided a platform for unified statements and the development of joint plans, their overall influence on the conflict was often limited by disagreements among their member states, as well as the actions and policies of powerful countries outside the region.

The following table summarizes the overall pros and cons of the various parties regarding the Palestinian issue.

Table 1 : pros and cons of various parties regarding the Palestinian issue

Reaction	Pros	Cons
Western Support for Israel	Demonstrated a strong stance against Palestinian resistance and support for an ally solidarity with Israel.	Overlooked the long history of the conflict and the Palestinian perspective. Seen as biased and legitimizing Israel's military actions.
Muslim World's Condemnation of Israel	Highlighted concerns about civilian casualties and human rights. Reflected historical solidarity with Palestine.	Criticized for not adequately condemning October's attacks. Perceived as inflammatory.

UN Calls for Ceasefire	Emphasized the urgent need for peace and humanitarian aid. Demonstrated a broad international consensus on the need for a humanitarian truce.	Resolutions often faced challenges in implementation due to political divisions faced by Israeli stubbornness
Global Aid Response	Showed a willingness to help those in need. Crucial for the affected population.	Effectiveness was severely limited by ongoing conflict and access restrictions.
Diplomatic Actions	Strong signals of disapproval of Israel's conduct.	Could hinder diplomatic efforts to resolve the conflict.
Middle East Reactions	Supported the Palestinian cause and condemned occupation. Highlighted humanitarian risks of military escalation.	Perceived by certain western countries as inflammatory. Strained relations with Israel.
European Shift in Support	Reflected growing concern for humanitarian issues. Highlighted diversity of opinion within the EU.	Seen as inconsistent. Lack of unity weakened the EU's response.
US Support for Israel	Reflected the known close strategic alliance between US and the occupation. Seen as essential for Israel's security.	Criticized for enabling Israel's military actions without accountability. Not strong enough to influence Israeli policy.
US Criticism of Israel	Showed growing concern for humanitarian situation.	Criticized as not strong enough to significantly influence Israeli policy.

Arab League's	Economic boycott is a Strong form of protest.	Effectiveness was debatable. Could harm member states' economies.
Reconstruction Plans	Offered a vision for Gaza's future.	Faced significant obstacles, including funding and regional disagreements.

Table 1: created by the author

7. Trends in Global Public Opinion Regarding the War in Gaza

How people around the world felt about the war in Gaza showed significant changes and divisions. Surveys in Western countries indicated that more and more people disapproved of Israel's actions and wanted an immediate ceasefire (Social Europe, 2025). In the United States, public opinion was sharply divided based on political affiliation, with Republicans generally favoring continued military support for Israel, while Democrats and Independents were more sympathetic to Palestinians and more likely to support limiting military aid to pressure Israel to negotiate an end to the war (Pew Research Center, 2024).

According to a survey of international relations experts in the US, the majority disapproved of Israel's military action in Gaza, highlighting a big difference between academic opinion and the general public view (Good Authority, 2024). Unlike, Polls in Israel and Palestine showed deep divisions within society and widespread pessimism about the chances for lasting peace (Palestinian Center for Policy and Survey

Research, 2024). Nevertheless, Public opinion in Arab countries, as shown by surveys across 16 Arab nations, showed overwhelmingly negative views of the US response to the war, along with increasing opposition to recognizing Israel and a desire for Arab governments to take stronger actions, possibly including using oil as a political tool (Arab Center Washington DC, 2024). Thus, the changing global public sentiment, especially in Western countries, suggested a growing gap between what the public wanted—peace and an end to the humanitarian crisis—and the often more supportive stances their governments took towards Israel. The following table summarizes the trend in public opinion in the two parts:

Table2: Trends of global public opinion

Country/Region	Trend in Public Opinion
United Kingdom	More support for stopping arms sales to Israel; most think Israel abuses human rights.
United States	Less support for sending weapons to Israel; more support for a ceasefire.
Arab Countries	Mostly negative view of US response; more opposition to recognizing Israel.

Table 1: created by the author

8. Censorship, Bias: another war in Gaza

The war in Gaza was widely covered by news outlets around the world, presenting many different viewpoints and stories. Israel had strict rules for international journalists in Gaza, requiring them to have military escorts and get approval before showing their

footage, which raised concerns about how free and unbiased the reporting was.

Social media also played a big role in sharing information about the conflict, with platforms like TikTok getting billions of views on related content. Research showed that there were far more posts supporting Palestine than supporting Israel (Middle East Eye, 2024). Many people accused Western mainstream media outlets, like CNN and the BBC, of being biased towards Israel, with journalists from these organizations even saying there was pressure to downplay Israeli actions and emphasize the Israeli side of the story (Al Jazeera, 2025).

In contrast, Al Jazeera's coverage was often seen as giving more attention to the Palestinian perspective, which increased its global credibility. The stories used by different media outlets varied a lot. Western media often portrayed Hamas as a terrorist group engaged in violence, while showing Israel as a country defending itself. Media that supported the Palestinian cause tended to show Israel as an occupying force committing human rights violations, while portraying Hamas as resistance fighters. How media outlets framed the conflict and the global reactions to it significantly influenced how the public saw it and potentially shaped the international response to the war.

The rise of citizen journalism and the widespread use of social media provided alternative stories and firsthand accounts from people inside Gaza, offering a direct challenge to the main media narratives and potentially influencing public opinion by providing unfiltered views on the human cost of the conflict (Middle East Eye, 2024).

9. The Unfolding Catastrophe: Humanitarian Crisis and Aid Challenges

A severe humanitarian crisis caused by the war in Gaza, with the healthcare system almost collapsing, most people not having enough food, and the majority of Gaza's residents being displaced from their homes (UNRWA, 2025).

International organizations, including the UN, the Red Cross, and many non-governmental organizations, made big efforts to provide aid to the affected population.

However, these efforts were constantly hindered by significant challenges and restrictions on getting aid into and around Gaza, including long sieges and the blocking of essential supplies (Oxfam, 2025). As well as various countries and international groups promised and gave a lot of money to address the humanitarian needs (European Commission, 2025). Additionally, people and organizations around the world worked to support the affected populations through donations and campaigns, calling for a ceasefire and more humanitarian access. Despite the considerable global response, the sheer scale of the crisis and the ongoing obstacles to delivering aid meant that the needs of the civilian population in Gaza were largely unmet (World Food Programme, 2025). The effectiveness of the global aid response was seriously undermined by the continuing conflict and the restrictions on humanitarian access. Furthermore, there were accusations that humanitarian aid was being used for political purposes, with deliberate obstruction and the linking of aid to political goals, which further worsened the suffering of civilians in Gaza (Norwegian Refugee Council, 2025).

10. The Gaza War and Global Power Dynamics

The world's reaction to the war in Gaza showed some common themes, including

widespread condemnation of civilian deaths on both sides, constant calls for an immediate ceasefire, and a big debate about Israel's right to self-defense compared to the harm caused by its military actions in Gaza. Different opinions on the conflict were mostly based on existing political alliances, historical views on the Israeli-Palestinian issue, and religious or cultural connections to either side. The involvement of many international and regional players, each with their own interests, added to the complexity of the global response. International law and human rights principles were important in shaping many of the global reactions, with various groups using these ideas to either condemn or justify the actions of those involved.

The conflict and the different global reactions it caused have had a noticeable impact on international relations, possibly changing alliances and highlighting the challenges to the current world order (Council on Foreign Relations, 2025). The many different aspects of the global response show the complex interaction of political, moral, and historical factors that influence how the world reacts to long and deeply rooted conflicts. The war in Gaza has shown the limits of current international systems in effectively dealing with such conflicts and ensuring the protection of civilians when faced with strong national interests and significant global divisions.

11. Conclusion:

The global reaction to the war in Gaza reveals a deeply divided international community struggling with a complex and long-standing conflict. While initial reactions often followed traditional political friendships, the length of the war and the severity of the humanitarian crisis in Gaza have led to changing views and increasing calls for accountability and a

lasting solution. The lack of a unified global stance highlights the ongoing challenges in achieving international agreement on the Israeli-Palestinian issue.

The diverse reactions, from strong support to outright condemnation, emphasize the deeply rooted and multifaceted nature of the conflict, with international responses often reflecting existing political divides and showing the difficulties in achieving a unified global position on such complex issues. The war has also exposed the limitations of current international systems in effectively addressing long conflicts and ensuring the protection of civilians. Ultimately, the global reaction to the war in Gaza serves as a stark reminder of the urgent need for a comprehensive and fair resolution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, one that addresses the legitimate security concerns of all parties while upholding the fundamental rights and dignity of both Israelis and Palestinians.

12. References:

- Brenner, B. (2017). Gaza under Hamas: From Islamic democracy to Islamist governance. I.B. Tauris & Co. Ltd.
- Krieg, A. (2024). The war in Gaza, the decline of US leadership and the emergence of a networked regional order. *Mediterranean Politics*, 1–10.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13629395.2024.2358618>
- Liyih, A., Anagaw, S., Yibeyin, M., & Tehone, Y. (2024). Sentiment analysis of the Hamas-Israel war on YouTube comments using deep learning. *Scientific Reports*, 14(1), 13647.
<https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-024-63367-3>
- Middle East latest: Israeli strikes kill scores in Gaza as Egypt offers new ceasefire proposal. (2025, 24 مارس). AP News.
<https://apnews.com/article/mideast-gaza-israel-hamas-war-latest-03-24-2025-373f418f4658f943e34738fd4e9f490f>
- Pappe, I. (2007). The Ethnic Cleansing of Palestine. Oneworld.

Al Jazeera. (2024). Failing Gaza: Pro-Israel bias uncovered behind the lens of Western media. Retrieved from <https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2025/3/18/failing-gaza-pro-israel-bias-uncovered-behind-the-lens-of-western-media>

Al Jazeera. (2025). World reaction to Trump's 'take over' and ethnic cleansing plan for Gaza. Retrieved from <https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2025/2/5/world-reaction-to-trumps-comments-on-ethnic-cleansing-in-gaza>

Arab Center Washington DC. (2024). Arab Public Opinion About Israel's War on Gaza. Retrieved from <https://arabcenterdc.org/resource/arab-public-opinion-about-israels-war-on-gaza/>

Associated Press. (2025). Middle East latest: Israeli strikes kill scores in Gaza as Egypt offers new ceasefire proposal. Retrieved from <https://apnews.com/article/mideast-gaza-israel-hamas-war-latest-03-24-2025-373f418f4658f943e34738fd4e9f490f>

Council on Foreign Relations. (2025). Israeli-Palestinian Conflict. Retrieved from <https://www.cfr.org/global-conflict-tracker/conflict/israeli-palestinian-conflict>

European Commission. (2025). The Middle East crisis. Retrieved from https://commission.europa.eu/strategy-and-policy/priorities-2019-2024/stronger-europe-world/middle-east-crisis_en

Good Authority. (2024). What do international relations scholars think about the war in Gaza? Retrieved from <https://goodauthority.org/news/international-relations-scholars-survey-israel-war-gaza/>

Middle East Eye. (2025). Jordan proposes exiling 3,000 Hamas members from Gaza to end Israel's war. Retrieved from <https://www.middleeasteye.net/news/jordan-proposes-exiling-3000-hamas-members-gaza-end-israels-war>

Middle East Eye. (2025). UAE lobbying Trump administration to reject Arab League Gaza plan, officials say. Retrieved from <https://www.middleeasteye.net/news/uae-lobbying-trump-administration-reject-arab-league-gaza-plan-officials-say>

Norwegian Refugee Council. (2025). Suspension of humanitarian aid to Gaza will lead

to more suffering. Retrieved from <https://www.nrc.no/news/2025/march/suspension-of-humanitarian-aid-to-gaza-will-lead-to-more-suffering>

Organization of Islamic Cooperation. (2024). OIC Has Unified Stance on Palestine. Retrieved from <https://spa.gov.sa/en/N2204372>

Oxfam. (2025). How to help Gaza - Donate now. Retrieved from <https://www.oxfamamerica.org/explore/emergencies/gaza-and-israel-emergency-appeal/how-to-help-gaza/>

Palestinian Center for Policy and Survey Research. (2024). Palestinian-Israeli Pulse: A Joint Poll. Retrieved from <https://pcpsr.org/en/node/989>

Pew Research Center. (2024). Views of the U.S. Role in the Israel-Hamas War. Retrieved from <https://www.pewresearch.org/2024/03/21/views-of-the-u-s-role-in-the-israel-hamas-war/>

Security Council Report. (2025). The Middle East, including the Palestinian question. Retrieved from <https://www.securitycouncilreport.org/whatsinblue/2025/03/the-middle-east-including-the-palestinian-question-briefing-and-consultations-15.php>

Social Europe. (2025). Europe's Silence Fuels Gaza Crisis—Can EU Act? Retrieved from <https://www.socialeurope.eu/europes-silence-fuels-gaza-crisis-can-eu-act>

The Link. (2024). The media is distorting global perspectives on Gaza. Retrieved from <https://thelinknewspaper.ca/article/the-media-is-distorting-global-perspectives-on-gaza>

UNICEF. (2025). Children in Gaza need lifesaving support. Retrieved from <https://www.unicef.org/emergencies/children-gaza-need-lifesaving-support>

UNRWA. (2025). UNRWA Situation Report #164 on the Humanitarian Crisis in the Gaza Strip and the West Bank, including East Jerusalem. Retrieved from <https://www.unrwa.org/resources/reports/unrwa-situation-report-164-situation-gaza-strip-and-west-bank-including-east-jerusalem>

US Department of State. (2025). Briefing with Department Spokesperson Matthew Miller. Retrieved from

<https://www.state.gov/briefings/department-press-briefing-march-21-2025/>

Wikipedia. (2024). International reactions to the Gaza war. Retrieved from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/International_reactions_to_the_Gaza_war

World Food Programme. (2025). Palestine emergency. Retrieved from <https://www.wfp.org/emergencies/palestine-emergency>