

Not a Bystander: The U.S. Role in the 'Israeli' Strike on Doha

News:

In September 2025, "Israel" bombed Doha, killing Hamas leaders and a Qatari security guard. The Independent reported that Trump was furious because Netanyahu informed him only at the last moment – "He's f***ing me" – while "Israeli" sources instead spoke of Trump's "green light." (*Independent*)

Comment:

In contrast to Trump's claim that he was not aware of the "Israeli" attack on Doha on 9 September 2025, the longstanding relationship and cooperation between the two shows quite the opposite.

It is utterly implausible to assume that Washington—with its vast military presence in Qatar and its intimate cooperation with "Israel"—was entirely unaware of an operation of this magnitude. For decades, the U.S. and "Israel" have maintained a deeply entrenched military and political partnership. Under the Memorandum of Understanding that runs until 2028, "Israel" receives \$3.8 billion annually in U.S. military aid. The two countries jointly develop missile defense systems such as Arrow and Iron Dome, share intelligence extensively, conduct joint exercises, and maintain close technological cooperation.

In addition, Qatar hosts the Al Udeid Air Base, the largest American airbase in the Middle East, where thousands of U.S. troops are stationed and where CENTCOM's forward headquarters is located. This base is equipped with the region's most advanced radar and air defense systems. That an attack of this scale—rockets launched from warplanes over the Red Sea, penetrating Qatari airspace—would go undetected is simply not credible. If the systems saw nothing, then tactical ingenuity of this kind would have been impossible without detailed knowledge of allied radar capacities. If they did see something but failed to respond, it points to tacit approval.

Questions also arise as to how "Israeli" aircraft could carry out their mission without detection by Saudi Arabia, which has spent billions on American radar and Patriot defense systems. These systems are specifically designed to detect and intercept ballistic threats. That neither Qatar nor Saudi Arabia showed any reaction only strengthens the impression of coordination, or at least passive approval from Washington.

An operation of this scale typically requires aerial refueling. "Israel" does possess its own tanker aircraft, but given the distance and complexity, it is highly unlikely this mission was executed entirely without U.S. logistical support.

Netanyahu attempted to frame the attack as an immediate retaliation for the death of "Israeli" soldiers. But multiple reliable sources confirm that the operation, codenamed Summit of Fire, had been prepared for months. "Israeli" media speak of

two to three months of planning, with intensified preparations in the weeks leading up to the strike. Egypt even reportedly warned Hamas leaders in advance that they could be targeted. This clearly shows it was not a spontaneous reaction, but a long-term planned operation.

The picture is further complicated by contradictory accounts of Washington's role. According to The Wall Street Journal and The Independent, Trump was enraged that Netanyahu informed him only shortly before the attack—"He's f***ing me," he reportedly said. Yet "Israeli" sources insist the operation was carried out with Trump's "green light." Whichever version is true, both underscore the deep entanglement of the U.S. and "Israel" at the highest level of military and political decision-making.

This attack also fits a well-known pattern of "Israeli" operations: whenever diplomatic openings or ceasefire negotiations appear, "Israel" escalates through targeted killings. Consider the assassination of Hamas leader Ismail Haniyeh in Tehran in July 2024, or the killing of Nasrallah in Beirut in September 2024. In both cases, crucial political moments were deliberately undermined. The Doha attack sabotaged Qatari mediation. Likewise, in June 2025, as a new round of U.S.–Iran nuclear talks was about to take place, "Israel" launched Operation Rising Lion with deliberate strikes on Iranian nuclear and military sites.

Conclusion: The U.S. is Not a Bystander, but a Partner

Everything indicates that the U.S. was not merely a passive bystander but a complicit actor in this scenario, whether through active coordination or deliberate passivity. Official denials fit a familiar pattern of deception and hypocrisy by tyrannical, bloodthirsty regimes and systems.

Written for the Central Media Office of Hizb ut Tahrir by

Okay Pala

Media Representative of Hizb ut Tahrir in The Netherlands