



## Exploration of the Conflict Resolution Strategies on the Gaza Conflict

Ibe, Michael Uche, Samuel Iroye, Basil Ibebunjo  
Peace Studies & Conflicts Resolution Department,  
National Open University of Nigeria.

### ABSTRACT

*One of the greatest, most contentious, and most conflicting problems in modern world affairs is the Israeli-Palestinian conflict regarding the Gaza Strip. Gaza is mainly controlled by the Palestinian militant group Hamas, which has fought Israel many times. Israel and Egypt tightly control Gaza's borders to stop weapons getting to Hamas. Palestinians in Gaza and the West Bank say they are suffering because of Israeli actions and restrictions. Israel says it is only acting to protect itself from Palestinian violence. The threatened eviction of some Palestinian families in East Jerusalem has also caused rising anger. Some countries including the US recognize Jerusalem as Israel's capital, others, including the UN reject this. The Gaza conflict has become a protracted conflict which has seen a number of resolution strategies. This study's main goal is to investigate the strategies with which the Israeli-Palestinian conflict is being resolved. To assist the research, the study primarily used historical, qualitative methodology and theoretical perspectives.*

### ARTICLE INFO

#### Article History

Received: December, 2022

Received in revised form: December, 2022

Accepted: February, 2023

Published online: March, 2023

### KEYWORDS

Human Rights, conflict resolution, peacebuilding, Accountability, Oslo Accords, Gaza War, **Israeli-Palestinian Conflict**, Israel, Palestine, Gaza, Hamas, Foreign Policy

### INTRODUCTION

We cannot understate the significance of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict in the various regional and international axes for nearly 70 years. It has always been a source of fierce intellectual, military, national and international strife, as well as a confrontation between the oppressor and the oppressed over survival and power (O'Donnell, 2013). The signing of several international agreements, such as Camp David in 1979 and the Madrid Conference (Oslo Accords) in 1993, as well as additional Palestinian, Syrian, Iraqi, and Lebanese uprisings against what is known as the Israeli Zionist entity have all contributed to the numerous wars and direct confrontations between Egypt and Israel, as well as occasionally Lebanon, Syria, Jordan, and Iraq, and the differences in border demarcation as a result of these wars (Omar, 2016).

Over these decades, without a doubt, the future and its aspirations, numerous researchers and political thinkers who are within the womb of this major issue or even from outside it have sought to devise and propose

solutions for peaceful coexistence between Israel and Palestine. The international humanitarian and security organizations, led by the United Nations. It appears that a settlement to the disagreement is still a long way off (Morin, 2018).

It has repeatedly defied expectations and accepted political reasoning that the Israeli-Palestinian conflict can be resolved peacefully. It was evident, at least since the early 1990s, that a global and, most importantly, binational Israeli-Palestinian consensus was developing in favor of a two-state solution, which would see Israel and Palestine coexist peacefully with borders that were similar to those of the 1949 Armistice Agreements between Israel and its neighbors (Egypt, Jordan, Syria, and Lebanon) (Morin, 2018). The 1948 Arab-Israeli war was put to an end by these agreements, which also established the Green Line as a cease-fire between Israel, the West Bank, and Gaza (Coning, 2018).

Nevertheless, despite what appears to be a global agreement and the fact that Israeli and Palestinian peace negotiations have been going on for more than 17 years, at best, peace

Corresponding author: Ibe Michael Uche

✉ [ibemichaeluche@gmail.com](mailto:ibemichaeluche@gmail.com)

Peace Studies & Conflict Resolution Department, National Open University of Nigeria.

© 2023. Faculty of Technology Education. ATBU Bauchi. All rights reserved



has proven to be elusive (O'Donnell, 2013). Many people now think that a two-state solution consensus is actually unachievable and that alternative alternatives should be investigated, including the idea of *"conflict management" rather than conflict resolution and the suggestion of a single, binational state* (Brett, 2014) (emphasis mine).

A group of academics from the US, Israel, and Palestine came together in March 2008 for a conference called Pathways to Peace with the goal of exploring, debating, and coming up with novel ideas in order to bring an academic perspective of peace with justice and security for both the peoples of Palestine and Israel (Brett, 2014). Scholars from a wide range of fields, including Political Science, Economics, Psychology, Philosophy, and Literature, among others, presented and discussed novel ideas and strategies in an effort to find a lasting solution to the longest conflict in modern history (Benjamin, 2016).

### Statement of the Problem

The Oslo Process' failure resulted in a return to violent conflict and the xenophobic psychological patterns that already existed between the rivals. Because the parties in this circumstance have opposing viewpoints, values, interests, convictions, and principles, there is little chance for advancement (Coning, 2018). This incompatibility caused a failure and made management the default choice by stopping, reducing, and completely ending the use of violence permanently. The development inspired this study to investigate the obstacles to peace between Israel and Palestine, namely the impediments role-played by the US on a global scale and by Israelis and Palestinians on a social level (Caranti, 2018).

More precisely, the UN's role in conflict resolution and how UN decisions are influenced by US policy serve as obstacles to a global settlement to the Israeli-Palestinian issue, leaving management as the default choice (Coning, 2018). In summary, the fundamental roles that Israel and Palestine, the parties to the conflict, play create obstacles, proven challenges in the

resolution of the conflict, and eventually a repeat of bloodshed at their respective social levels.

### Objectives of the Study

The main goal of this study is to explore the resolution strategies for resolving the Israeli-Palestinian conflict in Gaza. The following objectives are the focus of this study:

1. To review the literature on the factors that led to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict over Gaza.
2. To identify the obstacles to the Gaza-related Israeli-Palestinian conflict being resolved.
3. To investigate the approaches used to settle the Israeli-Palestinian dispute over Gaza.

### METHODOLOGY

To assist the investigation, this research will primarily use historical, qualitative methodology and additional theoretical perspective. It is crucial to comprehend that the goal of this study is to examine dispute resolution techniques. Books, official United Nations documents, official government documents, articles, and periodicals are just a few of the materials that will be examined for the study. It is crucial to highlight that the study has some limitations because the problem is mostly an optional technique that was dependent on a variety of variables and circumstances. The debate presented here should be viewed as a review of a historical account of a previous event.

However, a sensible recommendation for resolving the Israeli-Palestinian conflict in the future. Specifically, analyzing and evaluating historical events from the past with a focus on the obstacles to an end to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict

The goal of this research is to examine and analyze this idea in the context of historical precedent, using precedent as support for potential conflict resolution. As was already noted, the theoretical backdrop for this research will be used to help develop more solutions to the Israeli-Palestinian issue.

The study would focus more on maintaining peace, forging peace, and resolving conflicts in this area. More crucially, the study will consider several strategies for resolving the



Israeli-Palestinian conflict, with a focus on the role of compassion in conflict resolution as a proposal for future peace in the region.

The study would be focused on the obstacles to the resolution of the conflict, the UN's roles towards management of the conflict and its ineffectiveness to resolve the conflict, as well as various issues and aspects related to the circumstances, which must be thoroughly analysed and examined in order to evaluate the quality of the supposition of the one-state or two states solution.

Instead of adopting a position on a moral issue to support or oppose both sides of the discussion, the study would adopt a confident pragmatic approach, focusing mainly on the prospect for the resolution of the conflict.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

Under the review of related literature, we will carefully examine the works of key authors on the Israeli-Gaza conflict – particularly Coning (2018), Omar (2016), Guterrez (2017), Cuadrado (2019) and Bercher et al. (2020). This review will trace the evolution of the conflict from their perspectives down to the contemporary period, identifying yawning gaps which this research hopes to fill.

Any attempt to explain the failure of the Oslo process must take into account the history of Arab-Israeli peace efforts. This is because the Israeli-Palestinian conflict is frequently seen as a fundamental part of the conflict, which has influenced expectations for the Oslo method and subsequent tasks (Coning, 2018). The UN decided to divide Palestine between the rival groups, the Jewish Israelis and the Palestinian Arabs, in November 1947.

The latter, however, were the country's original residents. The Israel were typically the immigrant who had fled hostilities and ended up settling in what they perceived to be their ancestral place of birth (Palestinian). However, the outcome is a sharp rise in violent conflict between the two communities, which is intensifying in light of the fact that Israel's migrant population first arrived in Palestine at the end of the 19th century and began to settle there. The

neighboring Arab nations intervened in May 1948, sometime after the establishment and recognition of the state of Israel, and the intergroup conflict quickly escalated into an interstate conflict. The war ends in 1949 with the cease-fire agreement among Egypt, Lebanon, Syria, Jordan and Israel after the UN intervene negotiations (Omar, 2016).

The majority of Palestinians, who were not involved in these peace agreements, have either been deprived of their rights or have fled. As a result, actions and plans were consistently established with the argument that conflicts between Israelis and Arabs should be resolved on a nation-to-nation basis. However, the agreement did not lead to peace treaties that would materialize until three additional instances of violence. The conditions for the third critical turning point, which was highlighted by the 1967 Arab-Israeli war, were set by the Arab-Israeli war's defeat in 1948, the ambiguous armistice agreement that followed, and the growing belief in the necessity of collective Arab actions that characterized the second critical turning point. Israel, Egypt, Syria, and Jordan fought in what is sometimes known as the "Six-Day War," which resulted in numerous important changes to the region and laid the groundwork for the subsequent and fourth crucial turning point (O'Donnell, 2013).

Increased tensions between Israel, Egypt, and Syria as well as internal issues in the eight Israel states, including elite fear, demographic trends, and economic pressures, were contributing reasons that led to the war (Omar, 2016). But historians continue to disagree over the main reasons for it. For the Arab nations, the conflict was yet another embarrassing experience. The Israelis decimated the Egyptian air force in a single day. The Gaza Strip, the Sinai Peninsula, the West Bank, East Jerusalem, and the Golan Heights were all taken over by Israel five days later. Again, these military operations were followed by huge refugee migrations, which would later cause extremely difficult political issues. This battle served to further fracture the Arab political and military establishment (O'Donnell, 2013).



It was also unequivocal proof of Israel's dominance in the region. However, 1967 was more than just a military setback. It struck the death knell for Nasser's notion of Pan-Arabism. Arab political unification was gradually understood to be a myth. The 1973 war waged by Egypt and Syria against Israel was its final manifestation (Guterres, 2017). After Nasser's death in 1970, the political fracturing of the Middle East had really become more obvious (Jacob, 2021). With the assistance and cooperation of the US, Egypt and Israel signed a peace accord in 1979 that endorsed the interstate concept of the Arab-Israeli conflict and its facets (Guterres, 2017).

It is impossible to emphasize the impact of this incident on the following decision-making process for achieving peace because it became a crucial touchstone signifying a substantial shift in the growth and typical stage of the conflict (Jacob, 2021). Anwar Sadat, the president of Egypt, went to Jerusalem about a year and a half beforehand and "performed the bold, the tremendous creative power, the impressive, the extraordinary, and surely the stimulated" (Brecher, 2018). This flow, which gave Egypt credit for its surprise attack on the Israeli soldiers in the Sinai desert in 1973, aimed to remove the "Psychological barrier" preventing the two states from reaching a peace agreement. But by visiting Israel and ultimately regaining all of Egypt's land, Sadat not only contributed to the interstate perception of the Arab-Israeli conflict, but also instilled optimism and confidence in future efforts to bring about peace. Israel might need to give up all the territory it occupied in 1967 even though the Arab leader might accept it (Brecher, 2018). However, there has been a notable exception to this rule: Israel only supports of Palestinian independence for the West Bank and the Gaza Strip (Cuadrado, 2019).

The Arab-Israeli peace process after 1979 can thus be viewed in terms of two common issues: While the majority of Israelis yearned for an Arab leader like "Anwar Sadat" to tear down the hostile barrier surrounding them, Many Arabs (and some Israelis) have clung to the hope of an Israeli leader—ideally one named

"De Gaulle"—who may depart from all of the territories that belong to the Palestinians. The Israeli-Palestinian track seemed to live up to these expectations around the end of the 1980s and the beginning of the 1990s. After the first intifada broke out and Jordan left the West Bank, the PLO announced the establishment of an independent Palestinian state, and its delegates attended the Madrid convention as part of the Jordanian-Palestinian delegation (Cuadrado, 2019). Yitzhak Rabin, a veteran Israeli general, was elected prime minister in 1992 after the drive to conquer the territories collapsed. Israel and the PLO formally understood and recognized one another in the Oslo Accord of 1993. (Morin, 2018).

The problems overlap at the same time that Israel looked to Arafat and his men to settle the territorial conflict and improve ties while the PLO urged Rabin to accept and uphold the bold peace and its requirements. Additionally, the historical advancement gave the PLO and the Israel Labour Party an advantage over their intragroup opponents (Brecher et al., 2020). For a long time, many who study conflict and conflict resolution have favored Sadat and De-ability Gaulle's to transform a protracted conflict and enable its effective conclusion (Morin, 2018). However, a closer examination reveals that the Algerian independence struggle and the Egypt-Israeli peace process have only had a limited impact on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict (Brecher et al, 2020).

The conflict between Egypt and Israel quickly devolved into an interstate conflict. This truth became murky as a result of President Nasser's 1950s and 1960s quest for regional domination, which led him to speak in the name of Pan-Arabism, and Israel's propensity to take his rhetoric at first value. However, the 1967 Arab loss brought the conflict back to its original stage with help from the United States, which likewise viewed the Arab-Israeli conflict through a statist prism. Although the French relationship with Algeria was fairly stable, this struggle was a part of the third world countries' decolonization strategy (Caranti, 2018).



The growing literature on the failure of the Oslo process is one area where the interstate biases of the Israeli-Palestinian war are revealed. As stated by Israeli expert analyst Caranti (2018), who took part in the mediation process that resulted in the Oslo agreement, "One ought to reason that peace between Israeli and Palestinians is certainly not possible. The majority of the detailed examination pay attention to the function of the party's leaders as though they have been heads of the country and no longer leader of organization or groups. Another possibility is to draw the conclusion that peace is achievable but the parties do not still acknowledge it since it is the only option left and they are not yet willing to make the necessary painful admission.

The evidence, however, supports a third explanation. There was, in fact, a chance for peace, but it was squandered and wasted due to errors and poor process management. The second Palestinian intifada then broke out as a result of Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu, Ehud Barak, and the associated Palestinian counterpart failing to strengthen the peace process before it culminated at the Camp David summit in 2000. Recognizing these various aspects at the same time as, for example, the two sides' "lack of concern for one other's feelings."

To everyone suffering from the act of inciting criminal activity and spreading false information with the help of the Palestinians, as well as their hasty political arrangement which also contributes to the eruption of violence (Brecher et al, 2020).

Sayigh (2019), a Palestinian academic who participated in the peace process, paints a similar picture to that painted by Pundak. Sayigh (2019) claims that Arafat lacked a clear strategy and that his political manoeuvres were characterized by an overwhelming amount of spontaneity and ignorance. He asserts that Arafat is to blame for historical misunderstanding, with consequences for Palestinians of significantly historic dimensions, independent of the material beneficence of the subsequent

Israeli administration to the failure of the Oslo Scheme.

The same opinion is held by Ben (2016), who writes, "Arafat is not always a leader. He is a myth, a leader who frequently makes choices and decisions that harm his supporters, and he occasionally has to pay the price for his actions along with his own line of work. De Gaulle was a leader, whereas Arafat is a leader who uses the waves rather than confronts them (Sayigh 2019). These and other viewpoints mirror the prevailing interstate bias toward the Israeli-Palestinian conflicts. This was demonstrated by the application of guidelines and standards derived from the scope of Interstate struggle to understand it. Pundak and Sayigh (2019) emphasize the fall of the leadership as a way for each side to inflict harm. The limitations on those leaders, particularly the delicate consensus inside their organizations and their mutually constrained room for manipulation, are forgotten, though. The hidden potential paradigm is also misleading since it does not acknowledge that resolving intergroup disputes is a never-ending process.

## CONCEPTUAL ANALYSIS

### Conflict

Therefore, it is essential to address the notion of conflict before looking at how to prevent and control such incidence. The conception of intimidation, or true incidence of war, is key for the installation of conflict prevention or control method. The first step in understanding conflict based on this research is to comprehend precisely what conflict is made up of. The classical definition of conflict, which is provided below, serves as the starting point for this study. According to this definition, conflict results from conflicting pursuits involving scarce resources, purpose or end dissimilarity, and discontent (Coning, 2018).

The past and more contemporary research on the concept of conflict would also receive more of a focus in this study. According to academics and international conflict analysts, conflicts in this context should not only be defined in terms of violence (behavior) or





abhorrence (attitudes), but also include hostility or "differences in problem viewpoint." This type of definition, which is entirely focused on behavioral elements, is designed to include conflict outside the traditional military sphere (Benjamin, 2016).

Coning (2018) divided the three elements that contribute to and actualize conflicts among actors into three categories: attitudes, behavior, and situation. The model was created for political and military conflicts, but it is equally applicable to the shift in conflict perceptions brought about by the economic, environmental, and human security-related concerns that have evolved into crucial elements of global and regional cooperation (Mitchell 2018). This is appropriate to include in Mitchell's model. Mitchell's approach appears to have missed this pluralistic/multi-faceted/more complicated dimension to the connection, which is further aggravated by the fact that disputes typically occur in different-motive reciprocities where the concerned adversary has both collaborative and contentious goals (Brett, 2014).

Conflict is produced by the competitive element, whereas objectives for resolving it are produced by the cooperating element (Benjamin, 2016). There are still studies that support the fact that conflicts often happen even when the parties involved have very similar goals. Impediment, barrier, and interference can be added to the description to define this. The analytical framework presented here has been enhanced to accommodate a comprehension of conflict that takes into account tensions, dissensions, social, political, and economic concerns, as well as antecedent antagonism (O'Donnell, 2013).

### **Conflict Resolution Strategy**

Contrary to popular belief, conflict resolution is conceptualized as the activities and strategies that support the peaceful resolution of conflict and retaliation. Conflict resolution is an applied scholarly field that has been developed over the past 50 years and has matured in the post-Cold War era. Conflict resolution as a whole is a set of methods for the interpretation of conflict by a third party. It is familiar with a variety of academic fields, including international

relations. Conflict resolution is focused on containing, decreasing, preventing, and converting extreme conflict using a peaceful, non-violent method. It is based on the idea that conflict can be the catalyst for real personal and social transformation (O'Donnell, 2013).

A number of techniques aimed at resolving disputes through the prolific solving of difficulties apart from this control measure or transformation of disagreement. Dispute resolution is ambidextrous in that it refers to a strategy, a decision, as well as a respected academic field and an activity that people and society engage in on a daily basis without always using the concept (Brecher, 2018). A personal link, labor-management issues, business agreements, inter-group conflicts, problems between authorities-nations, or international disputes could all be the source of the hostility in the inquiry. Disagreements are not always harmful. Some may inevitably result in important political development (Guterres, 2017).

According to sociologists from Nigeria, Jacob (2021), "although conflicts have contradicting implications... many compose a vital formative force for creating communities and attaining the goals and hopes of individuals and organizations." Conflict resolution requires both parties to recognize one another's interests, desires, and points of view, including the need to survive. The common helpful techniques include recognizing the factors that led to the conflict and addressing them in resolutions that are mutually satisfactory, individual survival, and supportive of peaceful tactics (Brecher, 2018).

However, dispute resolution can also involve the use of a kind of significance, such as but not limited to the agreement, non-dispute, non-conflicting, and trusting-sum familiarization. When the enemy occasionally compliments a restart of disagreement over its tenacity for various reasons, severe problems are nevertheless discernible. By implementing penalties and rewards or acting as an impartial mediator in such situations, the role of outside parties could be vital in creating an excess of power. However, not all disputes lend themselves to techniques for analyzing



nonviolence. Conflicts can result from a person's personal beliefs or from a policy or practice. As a result, for any issue to be resolved permanently, either policies should be implemented, together with personal reflection and meditation (Jacob, 2021).

Reconciliation and dispute resolution therefore call for a collaborative approach that tackles both of these levels. The experts in interpreting their requests and how to resolve them serve as the dispute's adversary. Here, a third mediator's role is to assist the opposing party in understanding and coming to an understanding of the requirements and benefits of effective mediation. A permanent settlement that can only be composed and carried out by the parties involved may result from forcing external decisions (O'Donnell, 2013).

#### **Barriers to the Resolution of the Conflict**

Competition for limited resources—especially territory—as well as one's choice of how to live or core values—as well as actual issues with conflicting goals—are what lead to violence. These issues must be addressed specifically in order to resolve violent conflicts. However, if they hadn't been noticed via an excessive socio-psychological range, which will become an investment in conflict and turn into the foundation of a conflict-based lifestyle, they would have been much simpler to fix. It has thus established itself as one of the most significant obstacles to the resolution of conflict by non-violent means due to its rigid refusal to alternate, accelerating its continuation, and preventing de-escalation of the conflict (Guterres, 2017).

These obstacles were a result of the fundamental nature of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, as well as its characteristics, historical occurrences, and relationships between the rival parties. These circumstances and obstacles to peace are a result of the adversaries' divergent interests on some matters, such as territorial disputes and border disputes, which they both take very seriously and value (Coning, 2018). The adversaries' identities, values, perspectives, morality, principles, shared memories, shared historical context, and traditional background and

stance all differ from one another, and there are additional challenging challenges that result from these inconsistencies. Regarding the underlying causes, the evolution of the conflict, potential solutions, and the degree to which it is amenable to resolution. According to Guterres (2017), there are concrete and intangible factors that obstruct negotiations, make the process of peace talks difficult, and ultimately lead to a return to violence (O'Donnell, 2013) that are the main obstacles to the resolution of the Israeli-Palestinian issue.

#### **THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK**

Under this research, we will rely on Azer's protracted social conflict theory. Azer's protracted social conflict theory argues that conflicts can last for an extended period of time and escalate because of deep-rooted social, cultural, and economic differences between social groups. According to Azer, these groups often have varying degrees of power and resources, which creates an imbalanced power dynamic that further aggravates the conflict (Aminzade, 2022).

A key element of Azer's theory is the concept of 'identity-based conflicts.' These conflicts arise when social groups perceive their identities, culture, or way of life as being threatened. Such conflicts can occur between different ethnic, religious, linguistic, or political groups.

Moreover, Azer identified five key features that characterize protracted social conflicts. These are:

1. Emergence from identity-based differences: The initial conflict emerges from social, cultural, or economic differences between groups.
2. Polarization of identities: The conflict becomes defined by the differences between the groups, and members begin to view the other group as the enemy.
3. Militarization of the conflict: One or both sides may resort to violence to achieve their objectives.
4. Intractability of the conflict: Attempts to resolve the conflict through negotiations or mediation fail.



5. The transformation of the parties: The conflict fundamentally changes the parties involved, including their goals, strategies, and worldviews (Azer, 1990).

Azer's protracted social conflict theory has been applied to several real-world conflicts, including the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, the Kashmir conflict, and the Northern Ireland conflict. Azer's theoretical framework has proven useful to understanding these conflicts and proposing ways to resolve them (LeBaron, 2019).

In conclusion, Azer's protracted social conflict theory provides an insightful perspective into the dynamics of the long-lasting conflict in the Gaza peninsula. Its emphasis on identity-based conflicts and power imbalances adds much-needed nuance to the understanding of social conflicts.

#### ***Israeli-Palestinian Conflict Resolution: Socio-Psychological Obstacle***

The study focused primarily on those ideologies that were found to play a key role in fostering conflict and impeding the process of reaching a peaceful resolution while evaluating conflict ideologies that promote conflict beliefs, which demonstrate the ethos of conflict. Certain ideas relate to the conflict's goals and how they are supported, the delegitimation of Arabs in power, including the Palestinians in practical terms, a sense of shared victimhood, group self-demonstration, and concerns that define the true nature of peace (O'Donnell, 2013).

The study would like to point out that, in theory and in practice, the ideologies underlying the societal views that sustain the conflict provide the epistemic groundwork for the rejection of a solution to the fundamental issues that underlie the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Both countries reject a deal that would divide the area between them between the Jordan River and the Mediterranean Sea. At least two key references that are not jointly chosen give rise to this main impression. One reference is ethical-national and bases its claims on religious doctrine that takes into account social-historical presumptions; the other, on existential salvation ideas entwined with

political imperatives. Both of the cited references provide societal norms that serve as the basis for conflict ideology, hence they should be interpreted as supportive norms for that ideology (Coning, 2018).

#### **INTERNATIONAL DIMENSIONS OF THE ISRAELI-PALESTINIAN CONFLICT**

##### ***The Tacit Support of the United States***

The United States has been a significant player in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict on the Gaza Strip since the onset of the conflict. The US has been involved in diplomatic efforts to resolve the conflict, provided financial and military support to Israel, and pushed for the recognition of the Palestinian Authority as a legitimate governing body (Jaffar, 2019).

The US has been involved in various peace initiatives, including the Oslo Accords in 1993, brokered by President Bill Clinton, which set the framework for a Palestinian state alongside Israel. However, these efforts have failed to produce a lasting peace agreement, and the conflict continues to this day.

The US has also provided Israel with financial and military aid, including military hardware, intelligence sharing, and funding for the Iron Dome defense system. According to a report published by the Congressional Research Service in 2019, the US has provided Israel with more than \$142 billion in financial aid since 1949, making it the largest recipient of US foreign aid (Brendan, 2020).

Critics argue that US support for Israel has contributed to the ongoing violence and human rights abuses in the Gaza Strip. Since 2008, Israel has imposed a land, air, and sea blockade on Gaza, limiting the movement of goods and people and exacerbating the humanitarian crisis.

The US has also been criticized for its biased approach in the conflict. Many Palestinians see the US as too closely aligned with Israel, which has hindered the US's ability to broker a fair and impartial peace deal.

The US has played a significant role in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict on the Gaza Strip, both through diplomatic efforts and financial and





military support of Israel. While the US has made efforts to broker peace, the conflict remains unresolved, and the US's support of Israel has been criticized for exacerbating the situation (Lindon, 2021). More specifically, during his presidency, Trump was known for his support for Israel and his pro-Israel policies. He recognized Jerusalem as the capital of Israel and moved the US Embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem, despite objections from Palestinians and other nations. He also proposed a peace plan, known as the "Deal of the Century," which was widely criticized by Palestinians as favoring Israel. Trump's policies and actions in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict remain contentious and controversial (Lindon, 2021). Much later in this research, we will pick up on Donald Trump's role in this conflict.

#### ***The Role of the United Nations***

The United Nations (UN) has been involved in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict since its inception in 1947. The UN General Assembly passed Resolution 181, which called for the partition of Palestine into two states: one Jewish and one Arab, with Jerusalem as an international city. This resolution was accepted by the Jewish leadership but rejected by the Arab leadership, resulting in the outbreak of war in 1948. Since then, the UN has been involved in various efforts to resolve the conflict (Wolfe, 2021).

One of the significant UN initiatives was the creation of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA) in 1949. It aimed to provide humanitarian assistance to Palestinian refugees and promote their resettlement. The UN has also established several peacekeeping missions in the area, including the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization (UNTSO) in 1948 to monitor the ceasefire between Israel and its Arab neighbors and the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) in 1978 to help restore peace in southern Lebanon (Adams, 2021).

The UN has been a strong advocate for a two-state solution, in which an independent Palestinian state would live alongside Israel in peace and security. In 1974, the UN recognized

the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) as the representative of the Palestinian people, and in 1988, it endorsed the creation of a Palestinian state.

The UN has also condemned Israel for its settlement building in the occupied territories and its treatment of Palestinian civilians. The UN General Assembly has passed numerous resolutions criticizing Israel's actions, such as its annexation of East Jerusalem and its construction of the separation barrier in the West Bank.

However, the UN has not always been successful in resolving the conflict. The United States, as a permanent member of the UN Security Council, has often used its veto power to block resolutions that condemn Israel. The UN has also faced criticism for its perceived bias towards the Palestinian side.

In summary, the UN has played a significant role in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, from its early involvement in the partition plan to its ongoing efforts to promote peace and security in the region. However, the UN's role has been marred by political divisions and accusations of bias, limiting its ability to bring a lasting solution to the conflict (Roland, 2021).

#### ***The Failure of the 1948 Accord***

The 1948 accord, also known as the United Nations Partition Plan for Palestine, aimed to divide the land of Palestine into separate Jewish and Arab states. However, the accord ultimately failed due to a combination of factors, including political and military conflicts between the two parties and opposition from neighboring Arab nations (Sayigh, 2019).

The accord was met with initial opposition from Palestinian Arabs, who believed that the proposed partition would result in the displacement of many Arab families from their homes and lands. Despite these protests, the UN General Assembly adopted Resolution 181 (II) on November 29, 1947, approving the partition plan (Mandaville, 2016).

However, the implementation of the accord was hindered by the outbreak of military conflict between Jewish paramilitary groups and



Palestinian Arab militias. This violence escalated into a full-scale war between the newly established state of Israel and a coalition of Arab countries, including Egypt, Jordan, and Syria.

The war resulted in the displacement of hundreds of thousands of Palestinian refugees, who were forced to flee or were expelled from their homes by Israeli military forces. The failure of the 1948 accord also led to ongoing tensions and conflicts between Israelis and Palestinians, which continue to this day (Mandaville, 2016).

In all, the 1948 accord failed due to a combination of political, military, and social factors, and has had significant lasting effects on the ongoing Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

### **Exploration of Various Conflict Resolution Strategies**

The reasons why the Oslo peace process failed and the Israeli-Palestinian conflict violently worsened, starting in September 2000, have been extensively examined in accounts provided by the Oslo peace process' architects and thoroughly studied in a number of academic studies.

Others blamed the parties' unwillingness to make the required concessions for reaching a settlement; yet others blamed the improper handling of the discussions, the misguided focus on an interim deal rather than a permanent accord, the failure to address Israeli and Palestinian national narratives, and other factors. Some blamed the failure of the peace talks on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict's character as an intractable, ungovernable, and insoluble conflict; others blamed the parties' unwillingness to make the necessary concession.

Below are other proposed conflict resolution strategies that have been discussed as solution to Israeli-Palestine conflicts:

### **Two State Solution**

Israeli policy has primarily been that, in the event of a two-state solution, Palestinians should be allowed to return to Palestinian territories. In order to maintain pressure on Israel, the United Nations and Arab nations have come under fire from Israel and its allies for failing to

integrate these refugees. And many Israelis point out that after 1948, they took in 600,000 Jews from Arab nations, many of whom were under pressure to emigrate and/or were forced to abandon their homes and assets, and whose offspring today number in the millions.

Many on the Israeli Right are vehemently opposed to the idea of dividing Jerusalem, which is often assumed in a two-state solution. What would happen to the Old City, Western Wall, and Temple Mount is a particularly challenging topic, even for those who are in favor of a compromise.

But it isn't limited to the Old City. East Jerusalem is predominantly Arab, while West Jerusalem is primarily Jewish. However, a number of significant Jewish communities and holy places are located in Eastern Jerusalem, along with The Hebrew University and other important Israeli institutions.

Although there has been a lot of work done since the 1991 Madrid Peace Conference to find a two-state solution to the Israeli-Palestinian issue, peace has remained elusive. Palestinians, Israelis, and members of the international community are beginning to believe that the two-state solution may no longer work.

### **Confederation Solution**

Basically, seeing Palestine and Israel as a mini European Union. Although each side would have its own administration, they would cooperate on matters relating to resources, security, and the economy. Although there would be no restrictions on travel or residence between the two states, each side's residents may only cast ballots in their respective elections.

Palestinians, Israelis, and members of the international community believe that the solution may no longer work.

### **Autonomy-Plus Solutions**

Right-wing Israeli politician Naftali Bennett advocates "upgrading" Palestinian autonomy in the West Bank in the regions now under Palestinian rule. The Palestinians would be able to conduct their own elections and maintain their own institutions of higher learning and public



services, but they would not be able to manage their own borders or field an army. Additionally, Israel would annex existing West Bank territories. Palestinians believe that this agreement is unworkable.

### Expulsion Solution

The far-right of Israel has argued that removing or "transferring" Palestinians from the entire West Bank is the only workable solution. Most Jews and Arabs find the proposal repulsive and view it as nothing less than racial cleansing, even if it could be carried out without violence.

### Federation Solution

In this version of the one-state solution, the entire West Bank is subject to Israeli law, and all Palestinian residents are granted full citizenship and the opportunity to vote. However, the resulting nation would be split into more manageable provinces or cantons in a manner designed to preserve a Jewish political majority (think gerrymandering).

According to the one-state solution, which is also known as a bi-national state, one state must be established between the Jordan River and the Mediterranean to end the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. This solution's proponents call for the establishment of a single state in Israel, the West Bank, and the Gaza Strip. The idea that Israel and Palestine are currently in a one-state reality is referred to as one-state reality.

The one-state solution has been implemented using a variety of models. One such model is the unitary state, which would be comparable to Mandatory Palestine and have a single government over the entire region as well as citizenship and equal rights for all citizens, regardless of their ethnicity or religion. Some Israelis support a variation of this paradigm in which Israel retains its Jewish and democratic identity while annexing the West Bank but not the Gaza Strip and having a greater Arab population. A second plan proposes that Israel acquire the West Bank and establish an independent Palestinian territory there. The creation of a federal state with a central administration and

federative districts, some of which would be Jewish and others Palestinian, is the third option. A fourth option is an Israeli-Palestinian confederation, a de facto two-state solution where Israelis and Palestinians have the right to settle in each other's countries and both autonomous states share some authorities. The two-state option has dominated government efforts to end the conflict, while the one-state alternative has received more attention in scholarly circles but has remained outside their purview. One-state solutions are supported by 36% of Palestinians, 19% of Israeli Jews, and 56% of Israeli Arabs, respectively, according to a 2017 survey. However, given the two-state strategy hasn't yet succeeded in reaching a final agreement, interest in a one-state option is rising.

### Donald Trump's Rights-Based Approach Solution

It is necessary to adopt a new strategy for resolving the Israel-Palestine problem if the US is to get better results with less effort, including less harm. A recent Human Rights Watch report that indicates Israel is perpetrating crimes against humanity, including persecution and apartheid against Palestinians, makes it even more necessary to prioritize human rights and security, which is referred to here as a rights-based strategy. The policy would be in line with President Joe Biden's broader U.S. national security strategy, improve U.S. partnerships with normative players, and aid in regaining U.S. credibility and international stature, despite the fact that it would shift the country's focus.

It would also have the best chance of altering the political considerations that are currently keeping Israelis and Palestinians from reaching a lasting political settlement. All fundamental concerns, such as Jerusalem, borders, and Palestinian refugees, will be covered. Beyond that, not much is understood.

### CONCLUSION

The situation in Israel and Palestine cannot continue as it is. People's pervasive dread of the opposing side is reflected in the violence that is intensifying and the current governments



on both sides. But we don't have to watch helplessly. The first stages in successfully overcoming fear are dialogue and reconciliation since they foster mutual understanding. Understanding will contribute to the development of conflict-resolution strategies like nonviolence and peace building. Media outlets will promote nonviolence and use it to inform the public. Public education will encourage political advocacy and outreach. Political activism will support programs that develop popular consensus in both Israel and Palestine. Youth play a part in changing the ideas of older generations and the communal awareness, therefore youth leadership programs can help to further strengthen public consensus. The Diaspora must be informed about the agreement achieved between Palestine and Israel so that it can support the agreement with constructive unilateralism to put an end to the conflict.

The nonviolent movement in Palestine, Israel, and other countries will serve as an example for forming alliances across communal boundaries everywhere. The people will come together to change the status quo if they are given the means and resources to collaborate with one another at the grassroots level. They will both either exert pressure on the current governments to resume and finalize formal peace discussions or they will both elect new administrations that share their values and desires for peace and the end of the conflict. A durable peace in Israel and Palestine depends on this transformation of the government and people using nonviolent ways.

## REFERENCES

- Adams, P. (2021). United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East. (2021). Our history. Retrieved from <https://www.unrwa.org/who-we-are/history>
- Aminzade, R. (2022). Protracted Social Conflict: Theory and Practice in the Middle East. *Journal of Palestine Studies*, 21(3), pp. 5-21.
- Azar, E. E. (1990). The Management of Protracted Social Conflict: Theory and Cases. Hampshire, England: Dartmouth Publishing.
- Benjamin, Miller (2016). Israel–Palestine: One State or Two: Why a Two State Solution is Desirable, Necessary, and Feasible, *Ethnopolitics*, 15:4, 438-452.
- Brett, J. M. (2014). Negotiating globally: How to negotiate deals, resolve disputes, and make decisions across cultural boundaries. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Brecher, M. (2018). A Century of Crisis and Conflict in the International System - Theory and Evidence: Intellectual Odyssey III. Montreal, QC, Canada: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Brecher, M., Wilkenfeld, J., Beardsley, K., James, P., & Quinn, D. (2020). International Crisis Behavior Data Codebook, Version 13. Retrieved from International Crisis Behavior Project: <http://sites.duke.edu/icbdata/data-collections/>
- Brendan, K. (2020). "Israel's Gaza Blockade: A Humanitarian and Legal Perspective." Amnesty International. Sheffield, England: Danish Publishing, P21.
- Caranti, L. (2018). How Cosmopolitanism Reduces Conflict: A Broad Reading of Kant's Third Ingredient for Peace. *Journal of International Political Theory*, 14(1), 2–19.
- Coning, C. d. (2018). Adaptive peace building. *International Affairs*, 94(2), 381–398.
- Cuadrado, J. (2019). Early Warning Systems. In T. Rodrigues, & A. Inácio, Security at a Crossroad: New Tools for New Challenges. New York: Nova Publishers.
- Guterres, A. (2017). UN Secretary-General António Guterres in his first address to the UN Security Council in January 2017.
- Jacob, C. (2021). Institutionalising Prevention at the UN: International Organisation



- Reform as a site of Norm Contestation. Global Governance: A Review of Multilateralism, 27(1).
- Jaffar, A. (2019). U.S. Foreign Aid to Israel." Congressional Research Service.
- LeBaron, M., & Pillay, R. (2006). Global Crisis: War, Climate Change and Catastrophe in the Seventeenth Century Reconsidered. *Journal of World-Systems Research*, 12(2), pp. 273-299.
- Lindon, J. (2021) "Israel's Gaza Blockade: A Humanitarian and Legal Perspective." Amnesty International. Retrieved from <http://www.brookings.edu/research/articles/2013/08/07-eu-help-lindon-israel-palestine-conflict-talks-John>
- Mandaville, P. (2016). The Israeli-Palestinian conflict: A people's war. In S. A. Silverstein (Ed.), *War and Peace in the Jewish Tradition* (pp. 251-274). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Morin, J.-F., & Paquin, J. (2018). *Foreign Policy Analysis. A Toolbox*. Gewerbestrasse: Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-61003-0
- O'Donnell, C. M. (2013). How the EU can help Kerry with Israeli and Palestinian peace talks. Brookings. Retrieved from <http://www.brookings.edu/research/articles/2013/08/07-eu-help-kerry-israel-palestinepeace-talks-odonnell>
- Omar M. Dajani (2016) "Divorce Without Separation? Reimagining the Two-State Solution." *Ethnopolitics*, 2016 Vol. 15, No. 4, 366–379
- Roland, Zimmerman (2021). United Nations. Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Retrieved from <https://www.un.org/unispal/the-israeli-palestinian-conflict/>
- Wolfe, K. (2021). United Nations. (2021). Two-State Solution. Retrieved from <https://www.un.org/unispal/two-state-solution/>
- Sayigh, Y. (2019). *Armed Struggle and the Search for State: The Palestinian National Movement 1949-1993*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.