



Reshaping the Middle East: Ayoub Kara's Geopolitical Thought and the Strategic Imperative of Indigenous Peoples

A Geopolitical Analysis

By Marwan Flou

The political experience and strategic vision of former Israeli Minister and Knesset member from the Likud Party, Ayoub Kara, offer a compelling framework for rethinking the geopolitical landscape of the Middle East. Drawing on both his Druze heritage and decades of political experience, Kara challenges the regional order created by the Sykes-Picot Agreement.

In its place, he advances a vision centered on the rights of the Middle East's indigenous peoples to determine their own political future and to build partnerships that reflect the region's historic diversity rather than centralized Authoritarian structures imposed over the last century.



From right to left: Ayoub Kara, Martin Zichert, and Akram Naasan at the Bundestag in Berlin, July 2026.

Rather than viewing independence and self-determination for the Indigenous people as a source of instability, Kara presents it as a foundation for long-term peace, security, and regional cooperation.



I. Ayoub Kara's Geopolitical Philosophy and the Principle of Protecting Indigenous Peoples

At the heart of Ayoub Kara's geopolitical thinking is the belief that denying the political rights of the Middle East's historic communities has been one of the region's primary sources of instability.

He summarizes this view with a stark warning:

"Whoever does not demand Independence today will open the door of his home to ISIS tomorrow."

From this perspective, suppressing the political aspirations of indigenous communities while preserving highly centralized governments weakens moderate local leadership and creates political and security vacuums that extremist movements will exploit.

For Kara, supporting indigenous peoples is therefore not simply a moral responsibility, it is a geopolitical necessity for achieving lasting regional stability and preventing the spread of extremism.

He further expressed this vision by stating:

"I may stand alone, but I feel that all Israelis and Kurds are my brothers, and I take pride in all indigenous peoples who have the right to establish their own political entities."

This statement reflects his conviction that indigenous peoples including the Kurds, Druze, Alawites, and other historic communities should be free to determine the political framework that best reflects their aspirations, whether through independence or confederal autonomous governance.

According to this vision, recognizing the region's historical diversity and allowing its different communities to govern their own affairs would create a more balanced and stable political order, replacing the centralized state model that supporters of this approach regard as one of the principal causes of the Middle East's recurring crises.

II. The Importance of Direct Support and the Israeli Druze Model

Within this geopolitical framework, advocates argue that genuine independence cannot be achieved without sustained political, economic, and security support for the region's indigenous peoples.

The experience of the Druze community in Israel is often presented as an example of constructive cooperation between a state and one of its indigenous communities.

Supporters of this approach argue that the relationship has fostered mutual respect, institutional partnership, and meaningful integration in both national security and socioeconomic development.

Building on this model, several Israeli political figures, most notably Ayoub Kara have advocated extending similar principles to other indigenous communities across the Middle East through three central pillars:

- **Empowerment and Support:** Providing political, economic, and logistical assistance that enables historic communities to govern their own affairs independently of a centralized state control.
- **A Long-Term Strategic Vision:** Promoting political arrangements that provide independence of the indigenous communities as durable foundations for regional stability instead of relying solely on temporary security measures.
- **A Strategic Bridge:** Strengthening direct relations between Israel and the region's indigenous peoples based on the belief that enduring partnerships with local societies are more sustainable than alliances dependent on changing political regimes.

III. Restoring Syria to Its Historical Reality: A Reading of Dr. Akram Naasan's Vision

According to the author, Ayoub Kara's geopolitical vision intersects with the ideas presented by Dr. Akram Naasan in his article, "Deconstructing the Syrian Entity to Its Historical Reality: A Vision for Stability and Renaissance."

This perspective argues that Syria's current political structure emerged from historical arrangements imposed by the Sykes-Picot Agreement and that resolving the country's long-standing crises requires reconsidering this structure in light of Syria's historical, geographical, and demographic diversity.

Among the principal proposals discussed are:

- **Reviving the State of Jabal al-Druze and Unifying the Druze Community:** Supporters argue that establishing a political entity encompassing the Druze communities of Syria, Lebanon, Jordan, and Israel could strengthen their political, economic, and cultural institutions while transforming the community into a source of regional stability and development.
- **Re-establishing an Alawite State:** The proposal advocates restoring an Alawite entity similar to the one that existed during the French Mandate within the Federation of Syrian States. Its proponents believe such an arrangement would provide security, political protection, and institutional continuity for the Alawite community.
- **Autonomous Status for Aleppo and Damascus:** The vision proposes granting both cities independent political and economic status, enabling each to manage its own resources and development priorities with reduced central government control.
- **Recognition of an Independent Kurdistan and a Special Status for Deir ez-Zor:** The proposal also includes recognizing an independent Kurdistan while establishing a special administrative arrangement for Deir ez-Zor aimed at encouraging Kurdish-Arab coexistence and shared economic development.

IV. Critique of Military Dominance and Authoritarianism

The author argues that one of the principal causes of political and economic decline in the Arab East has been the dominance of military institutions over political life, leading to weakened civilian governance, diminished democratic institutions, and stalled economic development.

According to this interpretation, this trend began during the Nasser era in Egypt, when the military assumed an increasingly dominant political role.

The model subsequently spread to several Arab countries, including Syria and Iraq, through successive military coups that produced highly centralized authoritarian regimes.

The article further contends that these governments combined Arab nationalism with politically instrumentalized interpretations of religion, reinforcing exclusionary political cultures, weakening state institutions, limiting economic progress, and contributing to the structural crises that continue to affect the region.

V. Prospects for the Future and the Foundations of Regional Renewal

According to the vision presented in this article, any successful future political order in the Middle East should rest upon several fundamental principles:

- Comprehensive Disarmament: Limiting weapons to legally constituted security institutions responsible for maintaining public order and security.
- Neutralizing Totalitarian Ideologies: Preventing the exploitation of religion, nationalism, or any exclusionary ideology as instruments of political domination while safeguarding political pluralism, cultural diversity, and equal citizenship.
- Building an Alliance for Peace and Development: Establishing regional partnerships based on mutual interests, respect for the rights of individuals and communities, economic cooperation, and sustainable development as the foundations of lasting peace.

Conclusion

According to the vision presented in this article, reshaping the Middle East should not be understood simply as a project of territorial partition.

Rather, it is described as an effort to build a political order that more accurately reflects the region's historical, cultural, and social diversity while recognizing the right of its indigenous peoples to determine their own future.

From this perspective, the growing dialogue among several of the region's historic communities, together with proposals for new forms of cooperation, reflects an aspiration to establish a different regional model, one based on mutual recognition, respect for distinct identities, self-determination, and shared strategic interests.

The article concludes that the future of the Middle East should be built upon dialogue, cooperation, peaceful coexistence, sustainable development, and the freedom of indigenous peoples to shape their own political destinies, rather than the cycles of conflict that have defined previous decades.

According to this vision, lasting peace and regional stability require innovative political frameworks capable of embracing the region's diversity while promoting prosperity, mutual security, and genuine independence.

