

**Research Article****THE SECURITY AND STRATEGIC DIMENSIONS OF THE GAZA WAR AND ITS IMPACT ON THE FUTURE OF THE MIDDLE EAST*****Fawaz Bil'as Khamees and Abd Alhade Mossa Hasan Rshdan**

Faculty of Law, Amman Arab University, Jordan

Received 14th June 2026; Accepted 18th July 2026; Published online 30th August 2026

Abstract

This study examines the Gaza war through the lens of security and strategic studies, with a focus on its implications for the future of the Middle East. The research aims to analyze how the conflict reshaped regional security dynamics, altered deterrence strategies, and influenced the trajectory of collective security arrangements. The objectives include identifying the war's impact on state and non-state actors, assessing its role in redefining regional alliances, and evaluating its contribution to the evolution of asymmetric warfare in the region. Methodologically, the study employs a qualitative analytical approach grounded in strategic theory and international security frameworks. It integrates case study analysis of the Gaza war with comparative insights from prior regional conflicts, while also applying conceptual tools from deterrence theory, collective security, and hybrid warfare. This methodological design allows for a comprehensive understanding of both immediate military outcomes and long-term strategic consequences. The findings indicate that the Gaza war intensified the fragility of regional security, exposed the limitations of traditional deterrence, and accelerated the shift toward irregular and hybrid forms of conflict. It also highlighted the erosion of collective security mechanisms, particularly the inability of international institutions to prevent escalation or mediate effectively. Furthermore, the war contributed to a reconfiguration of regional alliances, with some states reinforcing reliance on external powers while others sought alternative partnerships. Ultimately, the study concludes that the Gaza war represents a pivotal moment in the strategic landscape of the Middle East, underscoring the need for new frameworks of security cooperation and conflict management.

Keywords: Gaza war, Regional security, Middle East, and Collective security.

INTRODUCTION

The Gaza war represents one of the most consequential conflicts in the contemporary Middle East, not only because of its immediate humanitarian and military dimensions but also due to its far-reaching implications for regional security and strategic stability. The conflict has drawn attention to the fragility of collective security arrangements (Valbjørn, Bank, & Darwich, 2024), the persistence of asymmetric warfare (Ashour, 2015), and the evolving role of non-state actors in shaping the strategic environment (Harel & Inbar, 2015). As such, it provides a critical case study for understanding the intersection between localized armed confrontation and broader regional security dynamics (Krieg, 2025; Aldalala'a & Shukri, 2025). Previous studies have examined the Gaza wars of 2008–2009, 2012, and 2014, as well as subsequent escalations, with a focus on military tactics, humanitarian consequences, and the role of international mediation (Ashour, 2015; Springer, 2019). Much of this literature has emphasized the operational aspects of the conflict, such as the use of rocket warfare, tunnel strategies, and Israel's reliance on advanced defense systems (Harel & Inbar, 2015). Other works have highlighted the political dimensions, including the impact on Palestinian governance, the role of regional actors such as Egypt and Qatar, and the limited effectiveness of international institutions in conflict resolution (Valbjørn, Bank, & Darwich, 2024). These studies have provided valuable insights into the recurring cycles of violence and the challenges of achieving sustainable peace (Krieg, 2025; Aldalala'a & Shukri, 2025).

However, a notable gap remains in the academic literature regarding the broader strategic and security implications of the Gaza war for the future of the Middle East. While existing research has addressed immediate military and political outcomes, less attention has been devoted to how the conflict reshapes regional security doctrines, redefines deterrence strategies, and influences the trajectory of alliances and rivalries across the region (Ashour, 2015; Harel & Inbar, 2015). Furthermore, the intersection between localized asymmetric warfare and the erosion of collective security frameworks has not been sufficiently explored systematically (Valbjørn, Bank, & Darwich, 2024). This study seeks to address this gap by situating the Gaza war within the wider context of Middle Eastern security and strategic studies. It aims to move beyond descriptive accounts of military operations to provide a comprehensive analysis of how the conflict alters the strategic calculus of both state and non-state actors (Krieg, 2025; Aldalala'a & Shukri, 2025). By doing so, the research contributes to a deeper understanding of the war's long-term implications for regional stability, the future of deterrence, and the prospects of collective security in the Middle East.

The Gaza war represents a critical juncture in the evolution of Middle Eastern security dynamics

Beyond its immediate humanitarian and military consequences, the conflict has reshaped the architecture of regional security, redefined alliances, and exposed the fragility of collective security mechanisms. The war underscores the interplay between localized asymmetric confrontation and broader geopolitical transformations, making it a pivotal case for understanding the trajectory of regional order.

***Corresponding Author: Fawaz Bil'as Khamees**
Faculty of Law, Amman Arab University, Jordan.

Historical Context and Security Structures

Prior to the Gaza war, the Middle East's security architecture was largely influenced by the legacy of the Arab uprisings, the decline of U.S. regional leadership, and the rise of informal alliances. The region was characterized by fragmented security arrangements, where state and non-state actors competed to shape the balance of power. The Gaza war accelerated these dynamics, highlighting the erosion of traditional deterrence and the increasing reliance on hybrid strategies by non-state actors (Ashour, 2015; Harel & Inbar, 2015).

Regional Repercussions

Valbjørn, Bank, and Darwich (2024) argue that the Gaza war revitalized the centrality of the Palestinian issue, reenergized the so-called "Axis of Resistance," and altered the regional alliance structure. They note that the conflict has taken the region "forward to the past," reviving pre-2011 dynamics while simultaneously introducing new actors such as the Houthis into the resistance axis. This duality illustrates how the war both reconnected with historical fault lines and generated novel repercussions for regional politics. Similarly, Krieg (2025) situates the Gaza war within the decline of U.S. leadership, emphasizing that Washington's inability to shape outcomes has accelerated the emergence of a networked regional order. In this context, non-state actors and informal networks have become central to regional stability, challenging the traditional state-centric model of security. The war thus represents not only a humanitarian disaster but also a turning point in the geopolitical balance, where regional actors increasingly fill the vacuum left by declining American influence.

Toward a Nascent Security Community

Aldalala'a and Shukri (2025) highlight another dimension: the Gaza war catalyzed the development of a nascent Middle East Security Community (MESC). Drawing on Karl Deutsch's concept of security communities, they argue that the conflict propelled state-centric cooperation among actors such as Israel, Egypt, Jordan, and Gulf monarchies. This cooperation, often institutionalized through mechanisms like the Abraham Accords, reflects a pragmatic shift toward conflict management and collective preservation, even as ideological divisions persist.

Knowledge Gap and Contribution

While these studies provide valuable insights into the war's repercussions, they remain fragmented across tactical, geopolitical, and institutional dimensions. The knowledge gap lies in the absence of a comprehensive framework that integrates these perspectives to assess how the Gaza war reconfigures the security architecture of the Middle East. This chapter addresses that gap by situating the conflict within broader strategic studies, emphasizing its role as both a disruptor of existing structures and a catalyst for new forms of security cooperation.

The Impact of War on the Shared Security of the Middle East

The Gaza conflict exemplifies how non-state actors can employ unconventional tactics to challenge the dominance of

established military powers, thereby reshaping deterrence and undermining traditional security systems. Asymmetric warfare, defined as conflict in which weaker actors rely on irregular strategies to offset the technological and numerical superiority of stronger opponents, is central to the Gaza context. Armed groups imposed strategic costs on Israel through rocket salvos, tunnel networks, and decentralized command structures. Ashour (2015) highlights Hamas' hybrid defense strategy, which integrates guerrilla warfare, urban defense, and psychological operations to sustain resistance. This demonstrates the ability of non-state actors to exploit vulnerabilities in conventional military doctrines.

The Gaza war also underscores the weakening of classical deterrence theory in asymmetric contexts. While advanced defense systems such as the Iron Dome have mitigated immediate threats, Israel continues to face significant strategic challenges due to irregular tactics. As Harel and Inbar (2015) argue, deterrence in asymmetric conflicts is inherently unstable, since non-state actors often prioritize political legitimacy and symbolic victories over battlefield success. This dynamic complicates the ability of states to secure long-term stability through military superiority alone. Furthermore, the conflict reveals the fragility of collective security arrangements in the Middle East. International institutions, including the United Nations, have struggled to prevent escalation or enforce durable ceasefires. Valbjørn, Bank, and Darwich (2024) note that the Gaza war revitalized the "Axis of Resistance," undermining regional efforts at cooperative security and reinforcing polarization. The inadequacy of collective mechanisms to contain asymmetric conflict reflects broader structural weaknesses in the regional security order, where ideological divisions and competing alliances hinder effective cooperation.

The Strategic Dimensions of the Gaza Conflict and Their Impact on Future Stability in the Middle East

The conflict in Gaza has not only altered the current security situation but also has significant strategic consequences for the stability of the Middle East in the future. The chapters discuss how the conflict restructures regional alliance, shapes foreign powers' functions and undermines prospects for collective security and lasting peace. Rapid changes in regional alignment have occurred due to the war, with certain nations strengthening ties with foreign powers and others exploring new partnerships. The Gaza conflict is cited by Valbjørn, Bank, and Darwich (2024) as evidence of the revitalization of "Axis of Resistance" by strengthening cooperation between Iran, Hezbollah, or other non-state actors, while also advocating for pragmatic security cooperation with Arab states in accordance with the Abraham Accords. This article discusses how Hamas responded to Israeli attempts to invade Gaza without authorization from Palestinian backers. The regional order is fragmented by this dual nature, with alliances becoming more shaped by ideological differences and strategic imperatives. But the Gaza conflict shows how much of an influence outside the United States is becoming a factor in shaping outcomes for the Middle East. In Krieg (2025), the diminished influence of Washington has created a vacuum that regional actors and non-state networks are filling, leading to an increased multipolarity and contested security environment. Meanwhile, the involvement of world powers like Russia and China in regional diplomacy reflects the diversification of external influence, making it more difficult to achieve coherent strategies for

managing conflicts. Thus, the Middle East can learn a lot about security from the Gaza conflict. It first demonstrates that even the most technologically advanced nations can change their strategic calculus through asymmetric tactics. Secondly, it emphasizes the importance of adaptable deterrence measures that consider irregular threats. In the third point, it exposes the shortcomings of collective security framework in managing conflicts triggered by non-state actors and ideological resistance. The conflict has prompted practical cooperation among some nations and caused more division in other areas, as demonstrated by the dual impact of asymmetric warfare on regional stability, according to Aldalala'a and Shukri (2025).

Collective Security Challenges and the Future of Regional Stability

The conflict underscores the limitations of regional collective security mechanisms. It has been difficult for international institutions, such as the United Nations, to enforce durable ceasefires or avert escalation. The war, as noted by Aldalala'a and Shukri (2025), not only initiated practical collaboration among certain nations but also highlighted the inadequacy of group structures characterized by ideological differences and national interests. Due to institutional fragility, there is uncertainty regarding the capacity of regional security communities to effectively manage future crises. The Gaza conflict is a turning point in history, at least from. It indicates that localized asymmetric conflicts have the potential to influence systemic consequences, such as changing deterrence principles or alliances and shifting power dynamics. The Middle East will continue to experience instability due to the ongoing uncontrolled conflict and deteriorating collective security without the introduction of new cooperation arrangements. Ashour (2015) and other scholars have observed that the pragmatism of non-state actors means that, in time, conventional military power is at its peak, leading to potential conflicts that undermine peace-building efforts.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The comprehensive analysis of the Gaza conflict across its security, strategic, and regional dimensions reveals the intricate nature of asymmetric warfare and its far-reaching consequences for Middle Eastern stability. The war underscored the adaptability of non-state actors, the erosion of traditional deterrence, the fragility of collective security arrangements, and the reconfiguration of regional alliances. Collectively, these dynamics demonstrate that the conflict not only disrupted existing structures but also created openings for new forms of cooperation. From the standpoint of asymmetric warfare, the Gaza conflict illustrated how irregular strategies such as rocket salvos and tunnel networks can impose significant costs on technologically superior militaries. Hamas' hybrid defense strategy, as Ashour (2015) observes, exemplifies the resilience of non-state actors and their ability to challenge conventional doctrines. This flexibility complicates deterrence, as symbolic victories and political legitimacy often outweigh battlefield outcomes. In terms of collective security, the war exposed the limitations of regional and international institutions. Valbjørn (2024) notes that the conflict revitalized the "Axis of Resistance," undermining cooperative frameworks and reinforcing polarization. Meanwhile, Aldalala'a and Shukri (1925) argue that although some states have achieved pragmatic consensus, structural weaknesses persist, raising doubts about the viability of a

cohesive Middle East Security Community. Strategically, the war restructured alliances and highlighted the diminishing influence of external powers. Krieg (2025) situates the conflict within the broader retreat of U.S. leadership, noting that regional actors and non-state networks increasingly fill the vacuum, creating a contested multipolar environment marked by divisions and tensions, particularly in Iraq. This shift suggests that future stability will depend more on the capacity of regional actors to build adaptive networks of cooperation than on external intervention. Taken together, the Gaza war represents a pivotal moment in Middle Eastern strategy. It affirms the enduring relevance of asymmetric warfare, the fragility of collective security, and the reconfiguration of alliances in a multipolar setting. Evidence from the conflict points to the necessity of deterrence models that integrate political, psychological, and military dimensions, alongside innovative frameworks of regional cooperation capable of addressing irregular threats. Ultimately, the war demonstrates that localized conflicts can generate systemic repercussions, reshaping the architecture of regional security and influencing prospects for long-term peace. Managing such crises requires a proactive and integrated approach balancing deterrence, cooperation, and resilience rather than reactive crisis management. Only through this comprehensive strategy, can the Middle East move toward a more sustainable and secure future.

FINDINGS

The outcomes of this study highlight several interconnected occurrences that aid in deepening our comprehension of the Gaza conflict and its impact on Middle Eastern security. Additionally, Presented in a systematic, and elucidated way possible, summarizes the following:

1. Asymmetric warfare has become a dominant mode of conflict, as evidenced by the study that highlights its significance in regional conflicts. Additionally, The strategic costs imposed on Israel by armed groups in Gaza were due to their use of hybrid tactics, including rocket salvos and tunnel networks, despite the country's technological superiority. The conclusion of this study supports Ashour's (2015) argument on hybrid defense theory, highlighting that non-state actors can adapt to the military situation and blur the boundaries between conventional and irregular warfare.
2. The deterrence's instability in asymmetric environments is highlighted by the elimination of classical deterrence frameworks. While the use of advanced defense systems like the Iron Dome mitigated some of the immediate threats, Israel's strategic weaknesses were not countered by its irregular tactics. Harel and Inbar (2015) argue that this finding supports the idea that deterrence is compromised when adversaries prioritize symbolic successes over political legitimacy. The Gaza conflict demonstrates the importance of employing military, political, and psychological tactics in deterrence.
3. The Middle East's collective security arrangements are still fragile and subject to a partial reorganization of collective strength, as demonstrated by the study. Regional polarization intensified as international institutions worked to ensure that ceasefires were durable. In 2024, Valbjørn argues that the war revived the "Axis of Resistance," dismantling cooperative arrangements and strengthening ideological differences. Aldalala'a and Shukri (2025) propose

that the formation of a Middle East Security Community is based on the practical partnership of specific nations. The findings align with Deutsch's theory of security communities, which suggests that conflict can lead to limited forms of cooperation. This is supported by the study.

4. The decline in the role of external powers, particularly the United States, in determining outcomes in and around the Middle East is highlighted by the findings. The Gaza conflict is considered a part of the wider U.S. leadership decline by Krieg (2025), which highlights that regional actors and non-state networks are filling the gap. A more multipolar and contested security environment is emerging as a result of this, with regional states taking on greater responsibility for their own security.

REFERENCES

1. Ashour, O. (2015). Hamas' hybrid military strategy: The transformation of asymmetric warfare in Gaza. *Journal of Strategic Studies*, 38(5), 1–25. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01402390.2015.1014479> (doi.org in Bing)
2. Harel, A., & Inbar, E. (2015). Deterrence in asymmetric conflicts: Lessons from Israel's experience. *Middle East Quarterly*, 22(3), 45–56.
3. Valbjørn, M., Bank, A., & Darwich, M. (2024). The Gaza war and the return of the Axis of Resistance. *Middle East Policy*, 31(1), 12–30. <https://doi.org/10.1111/mepo.12567>
4. Krieg, A. (2025). The decline of U.S. leadership and the emergence of a networked Middle East order. *International Affairs*, 101(2), 233–250. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ia/iiv233> (doi.org in Bing)
5. Aldalala'a, N., & Shukri, M. (2025). Toward a Middle East security community: Lessons from the Gaza war. *Journal of Peace and Conflict Studies*, 42(4), 77–95.
6. Deutsch, K. W. (1957). *Political community and the North Atlantic area*. Princeton University Press.
7. Springer, N. (2019). Cycles of destruction and reconstruction in Gaza: Humanitarian and strategic dimensions. *Conflict Studies Quarterly*, 28, 55–72.
