

Potential Evolution of Civilian Protection in Modern Warfare

In this brief essay, I intend to highlight certain ethical concerns and possibilities with the hope of accelerating a humanitarian resolution to the Israel-Palestine war. Though I will not claim to be an expert regarding the nuances of the conflict throughout time, I believe that my insights into human psychology and tactical creativity could prove immensely valuable to those involved more directly in the war and the associated humanitarian efforts if they are taken seriously by the right people. I encourage those of you who I am able to reach who are involved in the conflict to take the time to consider my words, and if you find value in them, please consider sharing this document (or simply discussing and elaborating upon whatever key points you find potentially beneficial within your particular field of influence) with those you know who may be more directly involved in either humanitarian efforts or government activity related to the conflict.

I have left this in a simple text document in hopes of minimizing bias based upon presentation and emphasizing the veracity of the points which I wish to address.

There are two topics which I will speak on: the nature of propaganda and biased/immature reporting in modern warfare and how to address it intelligently (though this is a fairly common topic, I believe my insights may prove beneficial to those who wish to encourage more nuanced rather than oversimplified and polarizing communication), and the potentiality for a mature and humanitarian evolution of the civilian relocation effort discussed recently by President Trump and Prime Minister Netanyahu (as well as how ethical civilian relocation efforts could theoretically become more commonplace in modern warfare).

I will endeavor to be concise.

I will begin with an immediately relevant example of how the discussion of the relocation effort (as of 7/16/25) is being reported by casual search results.

When I first heard of the discussion of a relocation effort, my immediate personal thought was that, in theory, it makes sense to endeavor to separate the innocent civilian population from the combatants and give them a new chance to support themselves outside of the conflict, insofar as the civilians are essentially in a manner being held hostage by the combatants (some might argue that they are being held hostage by combatants on either side of the divide, depending on personal perception). I was a little excited to learn more about what this plan might entail since it seemed like it could potentially be a significantly productive stepping stone towards the resolution of the conflict, so I began to search for more information. One of the top search results I found, which will likely persist for some time, is from The Guardian: "Israeli plan for forced transfer of Gaza's population 'a blueprint for crimes against humanity'".

Now, it is an unfortunate fact of reality that a large percentage of the world will think very little of the nature of the situation beyond the suggestions of that headline. This is understandable in a sense, as they are generally so moved by their heart's desire to prevent or limit tragedy that they may find it difficult to allow their minds to address nuance if it seems to contradict the initial impulse of their well-intentioned but overly-susceptible-to-propaganda hearts. However, this unfortunately is both built upon and reinforces certain common hard-encoded biases along the lines of "everything Trump and/or Netanyahu does is inherently oppressive and must be opposed for the sake of solidarity with innocent victims," and many people who have built their self-image around biases along those lines is now likely to do little if any research into the topic or consider the possibility of a humanitarian relocation, having seen that headline, and now considering the possibility of relocation inherently negative.

It is well enough for people to have heartfelt concerns over the ethical implementation of such a possibility, but it can be quite damaging when people are overeager to make a prematurely binary ethical declaration of the nature of the circumstance (or similarly reported circumstances) without

being willing to consider more nuanced details. Furthermore, I'm sure that it deeply wounds the hearts of many of the Jews involved in the war to be accused of any manner of intentional crimes against humanity, even if it is a clear oversimplification of the situation...

In this context, I wish to direct the consideration of all given souls who wish to facilitate productive communication in the face of both this specific controversy and potential future general controversies towards the simple intuitive notion that it is wise to consider endeavoring to designate a significant portion of upper level communication efforts towards reacting directly in a mature way to the top search results of search engines in a timely fashion whenever a given topic arises, as opposed to necessarily being overly self-referential about presenting information which is not receiving the attention of search engines, and hence which may not seem as subconsciously relevant to those who have been routinely entrapping themselves in biased echo chambers by repeating public opinion for some time now, always believing their positions to be well-founded and ethical. Both approaches have value, of course, depending on the nuances of any given situation; I am simply proposing that consciously considering an emphasis on reacting at least somewhat directly to whatever the immediate search results are in any number of evolving situations is one of the most theoretically productive ways to redirect people away from echo chambers and towards more realistic and nuanced discussion.

In this particular situation, what that means is that I wish to encourage those who are involved in this potential relocation effort to endeavor to promote discussion and prove that this will be handled in humanitarian and ethical ways, and to consider designing future communication efforts to directly counteract whatever oversimplifications and presumptuousness may be levied against them by those who control the search results.

This simple notion of developing a premeditated procedure for reacting intelligently and directly to the oversimplifications of top search result headlines could be crucial for sublimating bias and directing intelligent conversation towards realistic nuance in many conflicts, military or otherwise, throughout time (should this essay spread to the right people).

That said, I will now speak about the potentiality of a humanitarian relocation effort, and hence wish to directly address the IDF, Mossad, organizations currently involved in providing aid to Palestine (UNICEF, UNRWA, PRCS, MSF, Anera, MECA, WCK, PCRF, UPA, etc.), as well as those involved in providing US foreign aid to the conflict. Perhaps it could benefit certain components of Palestinian leadership to consider this message as well. Though I have limited means to reach everyone, I pray, as I mentioned in the beginning, that those who I do reach will find the message valuable enough to pass forward to their own connections.

I would like to ask you to imagine with me what an ideal, nuanced relocation effort could entail. I believe it is well within the means of the modern world, particularly in consideration of how much the Palestinian plight has moved the hearts of so many in the USA who would likely be eager to provide aid (I'm unaware how things have been reported and received in Europe or elsewhere), to uphold high humanitarian standards while relocating civilians outside of the warzone.

There are three primary aspects which I would like to discuss: the consensuality of the relocation, the stability of the protection of the sanctuary zone and its separation from the warzone, and the potential for greater foreign aid within the sanctuary zone (in consideration of the fact that Israel has been limiting foreign aid due to concerns that it has often been stolen by Hamas).

Now, whether or not the relocation is fundamentally consensual is a topic of primary concern, and I believe it would behoove Israel to emphasize a consensual process rather than endeavoring any form of forced relocation. Surely many will be quite eager to leave the warzone if they are promised safety (and perhaps the opportunity to work and build new lives), provided they can stay with their families and communities, so for one it seems largely unnecessary to attempt a forced relocation (if the first waves report that the conditions are humanitarian, more civilians might be eager to sign up

afterwards), and for two, forced relocation would be regarded extremely negatively if Israel were to attempt it.

The key points I wish for the IDF to consider in the context of consent are simply these:

1. Ensure that full communities (such as church communities) are able and encouraged to migrate with one another. If different camps/apartments/facilities have fairly stable communities preemptively within them, it may make it easier for others to integrate with them, and will encourage a foundation for hope. If terrorist communities attempt to exploit this to move in together on the other side, they will be deweaponizing themselves, and if they are discovering making any efforts to gain weapons on the other side, those they formally signed up to move with may be similarly implicated and subjected to higher surveillance.
2. Prioritize families, women, and children (obviously).
3. Let people move with smaller friend groups or individual friends as well (consider keeping a digital register of who wishes to move with who for the aforementioned reason). Isolation is not healthy for the human soul.
4. Provide incentives to the first waves of refugees, that they will ideally be able to receive not just additional foreign aid support on the other side, but stable labor positions helping to build the new city if possible. This would likely need to be a fairly malleable and multifaceted process prepared to react to needs and demands as they arise, though certain basic things, such as the immediate need for hospitals, irrigation, electricity, and shelter, would be mandatory and hence easier to prepare some sort of growing financial architecture around.

These may be rather straightforward concepts, but I believe that if Israel prioritizes these notions in their relocation effort in whatever ways are realistic considering the circumstances, and is adequately transparent about them (I reiterate, reacting respectably to accusations levied against them as circumstances evolve), they may be able to receive much more international support than they could otherwise.

Now, let's talk about the potential stability of the sanctuary zone and its separation from the warzone. If I am particularly ignorant regarding some nuance or other in any of these topics, please forgive me. I do not wish to overstep or be overconfident in my thoughts, but do wish to offer creative and productive ideas if there is any chance that they may contribute to a humanitarian resolution to the conflict.

I see this particular topic as two-fold: the assurance of adequate policing within the sanctuary zone, as though everyone will be disarmed, there may yet be efforts at violent theft and the like, and the stability of the blockade/checkpoint where caravans of civilians enter into the sanctuary zone (How nefarious would any country have to appear to attack a blockade designed to offer safety to the civilians in its warzone, either in this individual context and future potentialities? Yet it would still be mandatory to prioritize defensive measures.).

In the context of policing, I wish to attempt to address the potential issue of racial tensions between refugees and the IDF. I propose that it may be ideal to endeavor to pass on, in due time, many of the policing duties to foreign countries (perhaps the USA could provide troops to protect the distribution of aid sent by the USA, and things of that nature), so that the refugees do not have to endure as much potential frustration in what is being designed to be a safe space for them to find hope and begin to rebuild their lives, and so that Jewish soldiers wouldn't need to worry as much about inadvertently escalating situations due to tensions against them, or other potential concerns.

This notion of an effective blockade and policing for expandable refugee camps (or perhaps small border cities which have volunteered to expand to accommodate refugees) is something that could in theory evolve significantly alongside modern warfare (provided we don't see world peace sometime soon). If it were a premeditated notion in certain conflicts to establish this sort of option for safety for innocent civilians in various military conflicts between governments and regimes, it could be emblematic of the integrity of the countries offering refuge, provided the opportunity for refuge and

reform is genuine and effective.

My final point, regarding the potential to allow greater foreign aid to reach designated refugee camps and sanctuary zones, is self-explanatory and extremely obvious. However, I feel it is important to emphasize that this extra aid does not detract from the necessary provisions for those who remain in the warzone, but is largely redirected from the provisions which would have otherwise been denied entry to the warzone or forced to wait.

If I were to elaborate further on this topic, I would want to discuss the details of rebuilding Gaza in contrast with trying to offer the refugees new countries to live in (and to emphasize the consent of and cooperation with refugees in both circumstances), but I acknowledge that I would need to do a large amount of research in able to provide an effective commentary on such things. As such, I am going to simply draw this essay to an abrupt close, and pray that the commentary thus far provided is of some benefit to the peaceful and humanitarian resolution of this situation as a whole, and the reconnection of the victims in this tragedy with the hearts of their global human family who has long heard their cries of sorrow, but has been unsure what we can do to help.