

# Israel-Palestine Conflict and the United Nations Security Council Resolutions: Barriers to the Two States' Accord

Gani Akanbi Yusuf, Department of History & International Studies  
Fountain University, Osogbo, Osun State, Nigeria.  
yusuf.gani@fuo.edu.ng

Mohammed Olalekan Moyosore  
Department of History &  
International Studies  
Fountain University, Osogbo, Osun  
State, Nigeria

Suliyat Olajumoke Mohammadtaofeek, Department of History & International Studies  
Fountain University, Osogbo, Osun State, Nigeria.  
msolajumoke.fountainuniversity@gmail.com

## Abstract

Since World War II, the Israel-Palestine conflict remains one of the most enduring geopolitical crises, with several interventions at resolution failing to yield lasting peace. The October 2023 escalation between Israel and Hamas resulted in severe humanitarian consequences, underlining the persistent stalemate in diplomatic efforts. Over the decades, the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) has issued numerous resolutions advocating for two-state solution, but without significant result. This study examines Israel's response to UNSC resolutions and its broader implications for achieving a viable two-state accord through multilateral diplomacy. The study adopted a qualitative research approach through the lens of key concept in realism (security) as an underpinning theory. It combines both primary and secondary documents to achieve its purpose. Secondary documents such as journals, thesis reports and books. Primary document involves open-ended interview questions for 10 targeted respondents

(academics). The documents were analysed using thematic

analysis propounded by Braun and Clarke (2006) to generate themes and insights. The study finds that Israel's continuous settlement and occupation of Palestinian territories underscores her negative response to the resolutions which contributed to the collapse of various peace accords. Israel relations with other regional players, however, continues to flourish. Among mediators, Israel also enjoys strategic alliance particularly with the United States, where as the UN inability to independently demonstrate power or sanction Israel has faltered her role as an agent of change for solution in the conflict. As long as international law remains unenforced, and geopolitical interests dictate mediation efforts, the plausibility of resolving the conflict remains uncertain. This underscores how regional alliances and external influences continue to shape the trajectory of the conflict, making long-term stability elusive.

**Keywords:** Israel-Palestine Conflict, Two-State Solution, United Nations, UNSC Resolution, Diplomacy

## Introduction

The protracted nature of Israel-Palestine conflict continues to shape the modern history of the Middle East. As a key regional issue, it holds strategic importance to the Abrahamic faiths since the last hundred years and particularly so, since its emergence in 1948. Scholars have in recent decade identified the conflict as beyond war, but rather Israel's genocide against the Palestinians (Nijim, 2023, Rashed et al., 2014). A major proponent of such idea is Ilan Pappé, an Israeli historian. It is henceforth clear that, as a key regional and strategic issue, the Middle East will likely continue to experience a bullish-peace and a bearish-war over a long period of time for the next decades especially as Israel continues to expand its frontiers for a (greater Israel). At the same time, crippling rival states and proxies with territorial bombardment, serial killing, land grab, extrajudicial killing, detention without trial among others.

Historically, Israel's relation with the Arab states has experienced several upheavals, and during these periods have swayed between "bitter, bloody wars" and covert cooperation. The peace agreement with Egypt in 1979 broadened the scope even further paving way for an official and economic cooperation (Ishamali & Ibiang, 2023). Similarly, progress in peace negotiation with Palestinians in the 1990s ended with a peace treaty with Jordan in 1994 (Lucas, 2021), and even led to a growing relation between Israel and other Arab states and the gulf monarchs (Barany, 2020). Furthermore, the Abrahamic accord signed during Trump's first

administration, although did not yield a lasting peace for both parties, it went further to broaden Israel's relation with the gulf Arabs (Yossef, 2021). While Israel's expands its relation with regional Arab players for economic benefits, its relation with Palestine deteriorate further. Despite of all these development: covert and overt diplomatic relations, peace talk and agreements, why does the conflict persist? The answer simply lies in the fact that there seems to be no feasible political or diplomatic scheme to bring an end to the conflict especially since International law is always relaxed for Israel under the pretence of national security at the expense of the Palestinians. While rendering international law and the role of United Nations ineffective (Amina, 2018).

This failure has further threatened peace and stability in the region as Israel and Hamas sway between peace and war (Pappé, 2006; Pierce, 2012). If international players failed to resolve the conflict, what does that mean? It can only mean two things. First, these players are downplaying the conflict for their national and strategic interests with Israel. Second, perhaps a divine intervention will bring an end to the years of suffering and injustice for Palestinians as it once did when the children of Israel were enslaved and oppressed under a Pharaohic rule in ancient Egypt. Interesting how history repeats itself or man repeats history. This view has especially been dominant among religious scholars and theologians.

Apart from this, the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) for decades has faced increasing

pressure to intervene. The UNSC has historically advocated for the establishment of a democratic, secured Israel alongside a viable Palestinian state. While previous resolutions have called for Israel's withdrawal from territories occupied during the Six-Day War and for secure and recognized borders for both Israel and a future Palestinian state, the path to peace has remained elusive as Hamas resistance resurfaced, leading to a new ceasefire brokered by Qatar and Egypt. Another era in the conflict that is unlikely to end the war – at least not in the nearest future.

### **Statement of the Problem**

For more than a year, Israel and Hamas have engaged in intensive confrontations. This conflict has exacerbated the humanitarian crisis in Gaza, leading to international calls for ceasefires and negotiations. The violence has intensified political divisions and has further destabilized the Palestinians region.

Prior to the recent escalation, the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) have issued a number of resolutions such as: 194, 242, 338, and 2334 among others for a peaceful end to the prolonged conflict. These resolutions demonstrate that Israel's occupation of the Palestinian territory is illegal. However, Israel's non-compliance and the US continuous veto of the UNSC resolutions in support of Israel continues to influence and shape the condition of reaching the two states' accord which has further prolonged the conflict (Azoury, 2004; Okechukwu, 2019; Rane, 2009; Sarah, 2012).

### **Literature Review**

Israel-Palestine conflict has attracted the interest of scholars from diverse fields. Recent studies have investigated Israel's policy in Gaza and have identified it as a slow motion genocide (Nijim, 2022). This is further corroborated with the work of Rashed et al (2014) which discuss the argument on the Palestinian case as it relates to genocide, and its impact on the stability of the Gulf States (Mohammed & Ahmad, 2020). Other studies such as Amina (2019) have also examined the role of the United Nations in the conflict highlighting the challenges facing the UN to effect change in the conflict from a diplomatic standpoint. While Zureik (2020) have also explored the issue from a colonial and surveillance lens showing the human rights abuse suffered by Palestinians. Few studies have captured how the reaction of Israel as a major actor in the conflict has influenced the outcome. This study therefore examines the barriers to the enforcement of UNSC resolutions for the creation of the two states' as envisioned by the UNSC and its broader implications with a possible solution.

### **Methodology**

The study adopted a qualitative research approach through the lens of key concept in realism (security) as an underpinning theory. It combines both primary and secondary documents to achieve its purpose. Secondary documents such as journals, thesis reports and books were consulted. Primary document involved open-ended interview questions for 10 targeted respondents (academics) using purposive random sampling. The participants were

limited to 10 because of data saturation and their relevance and expertise to the study's theoretical framework. The documents were analysed using thematic analysis propounded by Braun and Clarke (2006) with the aid of Atlasti software for mapping to generate themes and insights for analysis.

## **Result and Analysis**

### **Israel's Attitude to the UNSC Resolutions for the Two States' Accord**

This study examines the Israel-Palestine conflict and the barriers to the enforcement of the UNSC resolution for the creation of two-states' accord, the role of the mediators and its broader implications for regional stability.

### **Barriers to the Implementation of UNSC Resolutions for the Two States' Accord**

At the end of a prudent thematic analysis, a number of themes emerged dealing with the obstacles impeding the formation of the two states' plan. The first theme is Israel occupation, settlement and failure to implement the UNSC resolutions. The second theme is the collapse of the peace process which is directly linked with the former. The respondents observed that the continuous Israeli occupation and settlement project on the Palestinian land is a major constraint to the formation of the two states' plan.

### **Israel Occupation and Settlement on the Palestinian Land**

Participants 1, 2, 3, 6 and 7 deals with settlement and occupation project of Israel.

There is no disagreement, there is no conflict, it is just Israel's occupation of Palestinian Land (Participant 1: line 4-7). This refusal and its continuous occupation of the Palestinian territory hinders all effort to achieve the two states' project by the UN (Participant 2). The illegal settlement of Israel with thousands of settlement in the west bank constitute a major barrier (Participant 3). The Israeli government is also embarking on more occupation and settlement project in the Palestinian territory (Participant 6). The occupation and settlement project is a common factor (Participant 7).

These views suggest that over 3.5 million Palestinians and settlement remains a core issue that hinders the realization of the two states' accord (Pappe, 2014; Yiftachel, 2005). Additionally, Israel's failure to implement the UNSC resolution 242 in particular is also another key issue. More so, the US support for Israel in the UNSC likewise threatens the possibility of achieving any success. However, it would have been different if the UNSC had used its power to sanction either of the actors that violates its ruling (Ghanim, 2016).

Other participants 4, 8, 9, and 10 shared similar views. Although, slightly different from the above observation.

From historical background Israelis will never obey any UN resolutions or any mutual agreement with Palestine.

Instead, they continue to build their settlement on the occupied land with an attack on the Palestinian homes and villages (Participant 4). The US-Israel alliance does not want the two states' plan to be executed. This is why we see the consistent settlement by the Israeli government (Participant 8). The state of Israel refuses to comply with this standard on the basis that it is a threat to its national security. Besides significant part of the territories is already occupied with settlements (Participant 9). I think the occupation and settlement by the Israeli government is a great calamity (Participant 10).

The settlement is standing as a roadblock to the successful implementation of the two states' solution (Inbar, 2009). According to Yiftachel (2005), Israel's ethnocentric mindset and its associated unilateralism stand were behind her steadfast refusal to accept any negotiations. In contrast, Palestinian anti-colonial movement, culminated to state violence and terror against organized Palestinians. Israel's strategy is understood to be targeted assassinations, occasional raids, and a range of controls over movement, housing construction, and economic development in opposition to the Palestinian interest.

### **Collapse of the Peace Process**

The resolution for peace has long been supported by the UN, EU and the Arab league. This led to the

initiation of several peace process from the Camp David Accord to the Abbas Peace Plan and the controversial 'deal of century'. All these efforts failed to establish a final solution to the conflict. Rather, it continues to escalate as Israel refused to comply with the UNSC resolutions. Not only did it refuse to comply with the UNSC resolutions (242 and 2334), Israel further launched another campaign to annex more of the Palestinian land which contradicts international law.

Both participant 1, and 5 posits that:

Without any doubt and further ambiguity, Israel's plan and outward behaviour does not want the two state plan (Participant 1). Non-compliance response coming from Israel and the support of the United States of America leads to non-implementation of United Nations resolutions, which also leads to the destruction of the peace process and Palestinian-Israeli disagreements toward the achievement of the two-state solution (Participant 5).

These participants view also indicates that the behaviour of Israel does not show concern for the establishment of the two state solution. Hence, jeopardizing the peace effort as it gradually depicts a set back towards a complete collapse (Selzer, 2020; Aswar, 2018).

Most participant holds that Israel's occupation and settlement project on the Palestinian land is a significant factor. The participants observed that the attitude of US who is regarded as a mediator in the conflict for several years does not position itself within international law. The US is Israel's foremost

defender. This has led to Israel's non-compliance to the UNSC resolution and the collapse of the peace plan (Yiftachel, 2005).

### **Mediators in the Conflict in Relation to Israel and Palestine**

The emerging themes from the participant's response to the question of Israel and Palestine relation to the mediators in the conflict as part of sub-question. The themes are: US-Israel strategic alliance and support, US influence and the weakness of the UN. Majority of the participants posit that US is far more influential in its role than the UN which shows the latter's weakness as an international institution for dispute resolution.

### **US Influence and the Weakness of the UN**

Participants gave their view regarding the role of the UN and US in resolving the dispute. Participant 1, 2, and 3 gave a remarkable insight expressing how the US have failed to mediate fairly in the dispute. The US position not only gives a strong support for Israel as constantly exercised by its use of veto power in the UNSC.

The U.S. presents itself as a mediator but is a biased arbitrator due to its alliance with Israel, driven by strategic interests in the region's resources (Participant 1). A true mediator should be neutral, but the U.S., sharing Israel's interests, fuels rather than resolves the conflict. The UN should ideally mediate, but its influence is limited as it relies on U.S. funding and cannot obstruct its agenda. This has hindered the two-state solution, as the U.S. vetoes resolutions against its interests (Participant 2). Ultimately, the U.S. aims to control dependent states

like Saudi Arabia and Qatar while ensuring Israel's dominance and security (Participant 3).

Insight from these participants allude that the US has an overwhelming influence in the conflict. Its role as a mediator is not fair but rather bias in favour of Israel. Although, it presents itself as a peace-maker between both actors, its actions are strongly in support of Israel, being one of the biggest players in the UN. This also makes it difficult for the latter to exercise its power considering the US-Israeli strategic interests. In addition, we can also see that the US is subjugating those states who depends on her such as Saudi-Arabia and other GCC members. Although, they are interested in resolving the conflict, which is of strategic importance to them; they lack the power to do so (Pratiwi, Qomara & Syarafi 2020).

Similarly, participants 6, 7, 8, and 10 also gave a supporting opinion which is close to the position of the previous observers. Specifically, the US with its veto power in the UNSC.

The situation could have improved if the U.S. and Western nations had upheld true democratic principles, but instead, they have undermined the peace process and efforts to establish two states (Participant 6). The U.S. and its allies are not genuinely committed to the two-state solution, and the UN has failed in its duty, as the U.S. continues to intimidate the Security Council with its veto power (Participant 7). Despite the UN's endorsement of a two-state plan, the U.S., as a key UNSC member, has used its veto to support Israel, exemplified by the recognition of Jerusalem as Israel's capital (Participant 8). The U.S. has

obstructed the plan by siding with Israel, possibly due to Zionist influence in Congress, and has vetoed crucial resolutions essential for the success of the two-state solution (Participant 10).

These participants also opine that the US and its western counterparts have not thoroughly implemented the true principles of democracy. For example, despite the UN's position on the status of Jerusalem, the US unilaterally changed the status in the favour of Israel, declaring it Israel capital. This position questions US democratic values as subjected to the Jewish communities' influence in the West (Hummel, 2019).

### **US-Israel Strategic Alliance and Support**

Other participants gave detail opinion of a deep relations between Israel and US, in which such relation is the reason why the UN resolution remains ineffective. The support Israel enjoys from the US due to their strategic partnership is significant and sufficient to agree with the participant's view. In short, Israel is recognised to be the largest receiver of US aid with enormous political support to protect its interest, at Palestinian expense. Participant 1, 4, and 5 gave a different view.

The UN's resolutions are ineffective regarding Israel and U.S.-related issues (Participant 1). The U.S., as a mediator, consistently supports Israel, vetoing resolutions that favour Palestinians and the two-state solution. At times, Israel dictates the terms of its relationship with Palestine, making the two-state solution unlikely. After years of financial and military support, the U.S. is unlikely to change its stance

(Participant 4). Mediators have little influence over Israel, as the U.S. continues its unconditional military and economic support while providing aid to Palestinians—an approach that avoids rather than implements the two-state solution (Participant 5).

Clearly, it is understood that the US strategic alliance with Israel for many years has often given Israel a full support particularly in the UNSC. Such a historical interplay will be difficult to change in the present context. The US has given military and economic support to Israel to pursue its cause at the expense of the Palestinians. Not only that, it has firmly challenge and veto a number of UNSC resolutions giving Israel the ride to neglect it too (Black, 2019). In so doing, Israel often dictates the terms of negotiations in the conflict. A core reason why so many peace plan has failed.

### **Israel and Palestine Relation to the Conflict Mediators**

Understanding the reaction of the major actors in the conflict is essential to gives us a clear perception of who among the actors' act in defiance to the UNSC resolutions for the two state plan. In examining the behaviour of the actors in the conflict (Israel and Palestine), three themes emerged. The first is US and Israel's cooperation. Second, Negative intent, division and expansion strategy. Last being Intolerance and aggressive approach to the conflict.

### **US and Israel Cooperation**

Participant 3 gave a completely different view looking at the information extracted from the data.

It states that Israel's behaviour is due to the protection and support she enjoys from the US as a result of the cooperation and alliance between them. This is one major factor that influences Israel's behaviour in her dealing with the Palestinian.

The strategic alliance between US and Israel is a serious concern. The UNSC has the power to initiate a resolution but the US often veto it in favour of Israel. Such a condition will not allow us to see the reality of a two state agenda (Participant 3: Line 15-18).

The US-Israel strategic relations are deeply rooted in the formation and implementation of US foreign policy in the Middle East, even in the UNSC (Hamdi, 2018). This is best described as a bandwagon as Israel continues to receive the support of the United States. It is obvious that the US is overwhelmingly protecting the Israeli's interest at whatever cost. As such, contributing to a roadblock in the success of the two-state plan as the Palestinian rival feels neglected and cheated.

### **Negative Intent, Division and Expansion**

#### **Strategy**

Participants 4, 5, 7, 9, and 10 illustrate that the intention of actors is negative which renders all efforts for peaceful resolution ineffective. With most outcome having to do with the behaviour of Israel which determines the response given by the Palestinians. It is this intent and strategy that continues to fuel the conflict as the position of actors have not change over the years. Participant 5 highlights the division in the Palestinian camp which complicate the issue even more. Also participant 10 mentioned that Hamas behaviour

does not tolerate Israel as much as the latter do not either. In addition, participants 4 and 5 stressed that Israel's failure to respond positively to the UN resolutions especially (242) with the position of expanding its territory. This intention completely negates peace and rejection of the existence of a Palestinian state. All Israel wants is only a Jewish state as mentioned by participant 7.

Israel's actions undermine the two-state solution by continuing settlement expansion, even in occupied territories, in defiance of UN resolutions. Palestinians are often pressured to evacuate through intimidation or violence, showing Israel's intent to occupy more land (Participant 4). Israel has not implemented UN resolutions, continues settlement construction, and imposes restrictions such as roadblocks and checkpoints, all of which contradict the two-state plan (Participant 5). While both sides contribute to the conflict, Israel's land annexation remains a major obstacle. Additionally, Palestinian divisions, with Hamas rejecting Israel and the Palestinian Authority recognizing it, further complicate the situation (Participant 7). The Zionist goal is a Jewish-majority state, but Palestinian divisions hinder progress (Participant 9). While Hamas refuses to recognize Israel, and Israel sees Hamas as a threat, Israel's settlement expansion remains the biggest obstacle to the two-state solution (Participant 10).

In making sense of the participant's view, we understand that Israel has a negative reaction towards the Palestinians as it continues to build and annex more land. It does this using constant pressure, forceful displacement or terrorizing the Palestinians, so that they can evacuate and abandon their homes. According to the UNHRC, such action

downplays the Palestinian rights and the status of the UNGA resolutions (194 and 3236) to reach a consensus towards peace, grant the right of return of over 750,000 Palestinian refugees, their self-determination and national independence (Brockhill, 2020; Psilakis & Plachta, 2019). If Israel truly wants peace, it should put an end to the occupation and settlement while picking up effort to enter into a peace deal for relative peace.

On the other hand, the Israeli security forces are known to have committed gross misconduct and abuse of human rights by bullying defenceless protesters and young Palestinians by shooting their legs which results to amputation. Palestinian homicide cases constitutes more than 64% in Israel (Boulos, 2020). It also enacts strict movement and control policy which inhibits the rights of the Palestinians to seek for proper livelihood within the occupied territories or seek elsewhere easily.

Related to that, is the division between the leadership in the Palestinian camp towards Israel is also another contentious issue as Hamas does not tolerate Israel, Fatah PLO does. Such conflict of interest is also another hindrance to reach a comprehensive peace plan. However, in spite of the overlapping interest, majority of the participants posit that the Israeli occupation and settlement is not a good response to build confidence which could lead to a peaceful deal for both actors.

### **Intolerance and Aggressive Approach**

Most participants posit that Israel's aggressive approach against its Palestinian rival is not a good

sign for peace. The more Israel encroaches on the Palestinian rights, the more they are likely to respond with force. Already, there is an Israeli domination over the Palestinian, but groups such as Hamas does not tolerate that. It declines to accept such position. According to participants 1 and 5, it is this form of domination that the Palestinian perceived to be a threat to their interest and right to self-determination.

It is a friction between two nations, so a form of domination is likely to be present. Which is why it has been difficult for Israel to allow the existence of a Palestinian state as it continues with the settlement and occupation (Participant 1). Definitely. Palestinians would continue to resist such idea and action. It is against their interest. And it is a major impediment to their self-determination and state sovereignty (Participant 5).

Participant 1 and 5 posits that with the nature of the conflict, there is a presence of domination and the use of force by Israel which is against the Palestinian right. Meaning that Israel is currently dominating the Palestinian for its own security which makes it difficult to accept the existence of a Palestinian state as it feels threatened with such neighbour. Thus, the need for a continuous occupation and settlement on their land. As a response to such abuse, Palestinian would continuously resist the Israeli position as it denies them their basic and fundamental human rights.

Hamas does not recognize Israel, and vice versa. However, Israel's continued occupation is a major obstacle to the two-state solution. A resolution can only be judged once Israel complies with UN mandates. If Hamas acts

against agreed customs, it will bear responsibility (Participant 6). Israel does not want a Palestinian state, just as some Palestinian groups reject Israel. Ultimately, the side with political power is prevailing (Participant 8).

Both participants 6 and 8 emphasized that the Palestinian Hamas does not tolerate the existence of Israel as much as the latter refuses to acknowledge her. Particularly, on the issue of occupation and settlement which hinders their right to exist from the state of Israel's oppression. Majority of scholars argued that Israel's vision is to establish a Jewish majority state. This underpins her intolerance towards the Palestinian neighbour and negligence to the UNSC resolutions.

Also, the Palestinians continuous radical movement gives right to the argument of Israel that its agenda is to protect itself from invasion and security threat (Participant 2). Israel does not implement all UN resolutions, the continuous expansion and settlement construction, and the constant pressure on the Palestinians Authority. Israel mistreatment of Palestinian within the Israeli territory, road block and several check points around the green line area is not a sign of accepting the two States' plan (Participant 5).

In similar opinions, participants 2 and 5 observed that Israel's logic for intolerance is to achieve a Jewish majority state which is why it continues to neglect the UNSC resolutions. It is the sole reason why the Palestinians continue to firmly resist such position. Unfortunately, it tends to somewhat establish the Israeli argument as a reason for its aggressive security response. However, giving this

contrasting views, it does not give it the right to occupy and settle on the land as it is against the statute of international law. This is also followed by its maltreatment of Palestinians within the occupied territories, and those within Israel.

In all indications, based on the participant's views, the attitude of the actors toward one another is premised on the US relationship with them, being the prominent and most influential actor. Given the participant perception, Israel's behaviour in response to the UNSC resolutions as well as its relation to the Palestinian is determined by how the US plays its role among them. The support that Israel enjoys from the US is part of what gives her the privilege to embark on policies that seems belligerent and completely against the interest of the Palestinians. More so, although the relationship between the US and the Palestinian leadership is not perfect, it has continued to give so much reliance on the US to mediate, but often the outcome remains unchanging. An extreme support for Israel. Even though, some still posits that the Palestinian Hamas response is also a proven threat to the success and survival of the peace process. By and large, majority of the participant alludes that US-Israel alliance is predetermined by gaining ultimate control of the region to establish a Jewish majority state. Hence, fulfilling a biblical apocalyptic prophecy.

### **Potential Success and Prospects for the Two States' Accord**

The prospects for the achievement and success of the two states' plan is examined. From the

participant's responses, two themes emerged. An insight from the participants' views indicate that the success of the two state plan will remain dependent on the response of the international communities, specifically the Western states who direct and command global power. Without which, such attitude and failure to respond appropriately will remain a challenge for the success of the two states' accord as actors still largely depend on their position and support.

### **Conditional on the Status of the International System**

Some participants recognized that the success of the two states plan with regards to the actor's behaviour is premised on the status of the international system. A view from our theory suggests that the international system is exclusively anarchic in nature. The absence of any central authority to control and curb states actions is somewhat difficult, which gives room for power struggle among states. It also gives opportunity to stronger states to overpower the weaker ones in a zero-sum game. Behind this is Israel's rationality to continue to accrue power at the expense of its rivals and neighbours' weakness.

The current situation does not suggest change, but no political condition is permanent. A shift could occur if all UNSC states recognize and advocate for the rights of both nations to exist (Participant 2). Although the present reality does not support it, international law upholds the two-state solution—one for Jews and one for Arabs—though achieving it will require time and systemic changes (Participant 3). Given today's international order, this

remains difficult due to strong Western support for Zionist Israel, which aligns with a long-standing agenda. However, the future belongs to those who endure (Participant 8).

Participants 2, 3, 6 and 8 took this position that the key area where change can emanate is the condition of the international order and the sharing of power among states. This negatively affects the success of the two states plan. As a result, it becomes one of the major challenges. According to participant 6:

Except the Western nation are willing to demonstrate the true picture of democratic values and principles (Participant 6).

Additionally, participant 6 holds a slightly different view that until the western nations strive to enforce the true principles of democracy, the condition will practically be the same. What appears more constant in their observations is the position of the western states and international system. The lack of fairness and justice in the pursuit of international law and norms.

### **Prospects and Challenge for the Two States Accord**

We see that majority of the participants discussed more on the challenges and the prospects that obstruct the success of the two states plan. Participants 1, 5, 7, 9, and 10 held the view that the prospects and potential success of the two states plan is currently under challenge. Such conditions require some amendment and reconstruction as it relates to the initial theme which highlights the status of the international community and system.

Predicting the outcome is ambiguous since the struggle continues. Israel systematically ensures its dominance through annexation and occupation. The declaration of Jerusalem as its undivided capital signals further expansion into the West Bank, making the two-state solution difficult for now, though the future remains uncertain (Participant 1). Achieving it would be extremely challenging as Israel continues expanding its settlements and enjoys strong Western support. A major shift in the international system would be necessary for any change (Participant 5).

A critical understanding of the response from participant 7, 9, and 10 show an indirect position on the challenge for the two states' plan. Given the present condition, it is difficult to achieve. However, they further posit that we can be optimistic for a better change in the future as no political condition is permanent. Peace and success can only be achieved as a long term goal relative to the reaction of the parties.

In view of past events, the future is not certain so it is a two sides coin. But we should be optimistic that such agenda becomes a reality so that we can have peace in the region (Participant 7). This is a serious debate among several commentators and scholars. In my own opinion, I believe it is difficult to see that happening in this time. But the future is open for any possibility (Participant 9). In my humble opinion, this would literally take time. It can be possible and might not be possible. No one can really decide what tomorrow would look like even though we know the date (Participant 10).

Generally, it will suffice to say that the success of the two states plan rest on the changes in the reaction of the actors and the position of the

international system which has more to do with the interest of western states. Although, Israel seems to be enjoying the support of the US government, autonomy and influence in the international system, a strong position as posited by our theory in view of participants' response. The underlining issue remains that its annexation and settlement in the Occupied Palestinian Territories (OPT) clearly contradict international law as it violates the Fourth Geneva Convention related to the protection of victims of war and, specifically, its prohibition on settlements (Article 49(6)). Such condition of the international system allowing Israel to violate this ruling without sanction also negatively affects the success of the two states' plan as the law does not seem to be effective. Making Israel appears more like a state of exception in the international scene. A position that is delicate for cooperation, peace and harmonious relation among these states.

Most participants' response in relation to the research question, which seeks to examine how Israel non-compliance attitude to the UNSC resolution has affected the two states' plan is that, Israel did not comply to majority of these resolutions passed by the UNSC to recognize the effort of the two states plan. In addition, a great number of the participants opined that Israel approach to the issue was aggressive which led to the difficulty in realizing the two states goal. This approach contradicts the norms and standard on the effectiveness of the UNSC resolutions, which has negatively affected the whole process of seeking to resolve the conflict and the effort to establish peace between both nations. The thematic map showed the

existing relationship between all 9 themes that emerged for research question. These themes are then restructured to two defining themes which are: Israel's failure to respond to the UNSC resolution and the poor approach used to safeguard itself in fulfilling the demands of the UNSC. Be that as it may, it is easy to deduced that Israel approach in responding to the UNSC resolutions was poor and inappropriate with an arrogant disregard for international law which led to the failure of the two states plan.

### **Discussion**

The struggle for power and security to survive continue to persist between Israel-Palestine despite UNSC resolutions for a lasting peace. Between 1949-2006, the UNSC issued two hundred and seventy-six (276) resolutions. Among these resolutions, sixty (60) directly relates to the Israel-Palestine conflict addressing key issues such as final status known to be most contentious in the dispute. These includes: the status of Jerusalem, Israeli settlements, acquisition of territory, right of Palestinian refugees return as well as water and natural resources (Rane, 2009). However, Israel remains an occupying power in much of Palestinian territories in the West Bank spanning across several decades and still present as located in the 2008 and 2014 war in Gaza which established the logic of realism (Bayeh, 2015; Cordesman, 2009).

Even after resolution 2334 of 2016, border and security dispute remain. The establishment of Israeli civilian settlements in the occupied West Bank and other conquered territories is an impediment which

violates the Fourth Geneva Convention related to the protection of victims of war and, specifically, its prohibition on settlements (Article 49(6)). In contrast, Israel has consistently demonstrated that such law is not applicable to the OPT, a deliberate misinterpretation of law. Hence, this has continued to negatively shape the condition of the conflict.

Looking at the rational and interest of Israel, the study showed that in line with the status of UNSC resolutions, there is an existing state of Israel alone in the historical Palestine; while there is yet the presence of a Palestinian state. Except, a fragmented society and people living under Israeli surveillance. Israel also maintains autonomy over Palestinian livelihoods enhanced by legal restrictions on infrastructural development, the expropriation of Palestinian land and the expansion of the permit system that restricts the movement of Palestinians particularly in the West Bank as they live under austere Israeli confinement (Zureik, 2020). The Israeli government consequently built a separation wall decimating more land out of the West Bank, and expanded bypass roads, checkpoints and other physical means of establishing Jewish settlements in the West Bank.

The study also identifies that not just did Israel control these Palestinian territories in the West Bank, it has forcefully displaced thousands of its inhabitant with settlement on their land with the continuous war (Pappe, 2014). Such move has led Palestinians to lose more than two-third of its land to Israel's occupation. Israel announced it will build more than a thousand housing units east of

Jerusalem, permanently dividing the West Bank into two parts so as to prevent the establishment of a continuous Palestinian state (Yiftachel, 2013). Alas, Israel prime minister Benjamin Netanyahu has threatened to occupy and annex more land in the West Bank to give her full control of resources along the Jordan river area. Such rhetoric indicates a negative impulse from Israel towards the UNSC resolutions. Considering all these, it will only further deny the Palestinian the right to sovereignty (Roithmaier, Woodcock & Dima, 2021).

In the Gaza Strip, an Israeli-Egyptian blockade hinders the people of a decent livelihood. Israel retained control over Gaza's land and sea borders and the inflow and outflow of goods, people and capital in the territory (Benoliel, 2011). In case of decision-making on issues such as infrastructural development in much of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, it is authorized by Israel's Coordinator of Government Activities in the Territories (COGAT), which brings both civil administration in the West Bank and the coordination and liaison administration for Gaza together. Evidently, denying the Palestinian the right to self-determination.

Although, the Israeli claims that the extreme policy on movement of people, goods and capital is premised on its need for state security. The study views such rational as a form suppression to subjugate the common rival from a realist standpoint. Historically, the Israeli's fear and action can be understood after several years of humiliation and extradition in exile without a permanent home.

Yet, completely inadequate as it contradicts the status of international norms as emphasized. Furthermore, Israel calls for the demilitarization of Hamas who controls and protect the Gaza strip, whereas, militarily Israel is more armed than both Gaza and West Bank (Inbar, 2015). Doing that will only empower Israel more to embark on its colonial state building. It is therefore imperative to curb Israel's behaviour to ensure that international law is implemented without hindering any of the actors right.

The study shows that Israel's hostile policy toward Palestinian has continued to jeopardize the establishment of the two states plan. Israel belligerent approach is supported by the US dominance in the UNSC and its aggressive diplomacy in the Middle East as demonstrated by the Trump administration who unilaterally transformed the status of Jerusalem in favour of Israel with the support of the occupation project in 2017. In essence, this is related to why almost all peace process have collapse. The last peace effort being the Abbas Peace initiative, did not survive after its rejection by Washington including the bizarre Abrahamic accord. Thus, this is strongly associated with Israel hard approach to come to terms with the Palestinians even though the latter also at some point disagrees to recognize the former; particularly with Hamas threat. Indeed, a complete demonstration of power politics in an anarchic system. the findings also resonate with the studies of (Amina, 2019; Okechukwu, 2019; Pappé, 2014; Rane, 2009) who all alludes that Israel offensive and its military aggressiveness and state

preparedness for the expropriation of land is a major roadblock to the proposed two states plan. Israel's hard line approach in coming to terms with the UNSC resolution and its aggressive behavior proved to have shattered the peace effort.

In other words, Israel's unwillingness to comply with the UNSC resolutions 242, 2334, among others is a major impediment to the two-state plan. It has rendered all the peace initiative to no avail as Israel continues to engage in more settlement plan in the occupied Palestinian territory (OPT). Israel has also destroyed most of the Palestinian durable land for agriculture to maintain its settlement. Thereby, resulting to hunger and homelessness for the Palestinians. The Israeli government also controls most of other resources such as water and airspace on international route that is meant to serve the Palestinian purpose and needs.

It is also noteworthy to mention that Palestinians residing in the West Bank have been relegated to guinea pigs. They are placed under systemic experiment for Israel's surveillance technology. Technologies which are being traded to some of the gulf states for surveillance security. Giving this circumstance, the study resonates with the arguments of (Zureik, 2020; Sarah, 2012, Azoura, 2004) who alludes that Israel's colonial state demonstrate Israel's unwillingness to implement the UNSC resolutions thereby violating international law as well as Palestinian the right to self-determination in every facet that Israel has portrayed itself. The approach which Israel defend its border on the Palestinian soil is offensive, a

position that undermines the survival of the two-states' solution. A major reason why many scholars argued that the two-state enterprise is no longer feasible.

In lens our theory, we see that this is a deliberate action to overpower the Palestinian, render them weak until she becomes powerless to defend itself. The outcome leaves Palestinian with no state or a strong political body except a weak Palestinian Authority (PA) who only performs designated administrative task. A unit that is alleged for gross misconduct and spilling corruption. Such a huge pitfall denies Palestine an independent state under the UNGA vision which is a win for Israel's domination and control under the zero sum-game of state security and survival. Logically, this depicts Israel's rational and fear and theoretically shows her interest and struggle to survive either by crook or hook as a pragmatic realist state.

## Conclusion

The Israel-Palestine conflict remains a major war in the modern history of the Middle East. This signifies its landmark importance to the stability and security of the region. Despite the UNSC efforts for peace between both parties, its policy and resolutions have remained so far ineffective. This is majorly so because the United States have continued to shield Israel from sanction and systematically provided her with financial and military support for strategic reasons. This support has encouraged Israel to remain arrogant and disrespectful of international law. An attitude that has rendered all peace process invalid between

Israel and Palestine, further escalating tension between her and Hamas. Even though Israel enjoys significant influence and benefits from its relations with other Arab states particularly the gulf, the Arab public opinion does not recognize and accept Israel's imperial, colonial, and genocidal agenda in the region.

The trajectory of the conflict shows that in the future, Israel may no longer need the United States to continue its genocide in the Middle East as it grows further to become more powerful. Geopolitical interests, it is clear dictates mediation efforts, leaving the plausibility of resolving the conflict uncertain. This highlights how regional alliances and external influences continue to shape the course of the conflict. The implication for key regional players like Iran is a possible confrontation, for Saudi Arabia and other Gulf Arab nations, diplomatic subjugation to achieve its age-long aspiration of restoring ancient Israel. This poses a serious security concern for the region which is likely to remain unstable for many years to come. At the same time, an endless dialogue that will for long continue to shape international and regional security.

## References

- Amina, A. S. R. (2019). *The United Nations Un-Captured Peace Process: The Case of the United Nations in the Israel-Palestine Conflict (1948-2012)* (Doctoral dissertation, United States International University-Africa).
- Aswar, H. (2018). *The US Foreign Policy under Trump Administration to Recognize Jerusalem as the State Capital of Israel*. *Nation State Journal of International Studies*, 1(2), 132-141.
- Azoury, N. (2004). *The Last Colonialist: Israel in the Occupied*. 325–374.
- Barany, Z. (2020). *The Gulf Monarchies and Israel: From Aversion to Pragmatism*. *The Middle East Journal*, 74(4), 559-578.
- Bayeh, E. (2015). *The Current War on Gaza: A challenge to the principle of responsibility to protect “*. October 2014.
- Benoliel, D. (2011). *Israel, Turkey and the Gaza Blockade*. *U. Pa. J. Int'l L.*, 33, 615.
- Black, I. (2019). *Just below the surface: Israel, the Arab Gulf States and the limits of cooperation*.
- Boulos, S. (2020). *Policing the Palestinian National Minority in Israel: An International Human Rights Perspective*. *Journal of Holy Land and Palestine Studies*, 19(2), 151-174.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). *Using thematic analysis in psychology*. *Qualitative research in psychology*, 3(2), 77-101.
- Brockhill, A. (2020). *The wall of violence: Understanding the structural violence of the West Bank wall and the politics of terminology*. *Mediterranean Politics*, 1-25.
- Cordesman, A. H. (2009). *The “Gaza War”*. *Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS)*.
- Ghanim, H. (2016). *Between Two ‘One-State’ Solutions: The dialectics of liberation and defeat in the Palestinian national enterprise*. *Constellations*, 23(3), 340-350.
- Hamdi, O. A. (2018). *American foreign policy toward the Arab-Israeli conflict: strategic transformations*. *Insight Turkey*, 20(2), 251-272.

- Hummel, D. G. (2019). Foreign Policy and Religion: US Foreign Policy Toward Israel. In *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Politics*.
- Inbar, E. (2009). The rise and demise of the two-state paradigm. *Orbis*, 53(2), 265-283.
- Ishamali, I., & Ibiang, O. K. O. I. (2023). Peace agreements: Instruments of resolving conflict in israeli-palestinian conflict. *GNOSI: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Human Theory and Praxis*, 6(2), 99-116.
- Lucas, R. E. (2021). Public attitudes on peace with Israel in Jordanian politics. *Middle eastern studies*, 57(3), 469-484.
- Moyosore, M. O., & Ahmad, A. A. (2020). Israel Palestine Conflict: Implications of the Political Dynamics in the GCC. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, 4(12), 485-493.
- Nijim, M. (2023). Genocide in Palestine: Gaza as a case study. *The International Journal of Human Rights*, 27(1), 165-200.
- Okechukwu, A. T. (2019). Appraisal of the Politics of Israeli and Palestine Conflict using Intractable Conflict Theory. *June*. <https://doi.org/10.21275/ART20198314>
- Pappe, I. (2006). Calling a Spade a Spade: The 1948 Ethnic Cleansing of Palestine. *majdal*, 21.
- Pappe, I. (2014). The 1948 Ethnic Cleansing of Palestine. *Journal of Palestine Studies*, Vol. 36, No. 1 (Autumn 2006), Pp. 6-20.
- Pierce, J. J. (2012). Coalitions, external subsystem events, and the policy process: U.S. foreign policy and the question of Palestine, 1945-1947 by Jonathan Jeffrey Pierce B. A., Loyola Marymount University, 2004 M. A., University of London, School of Oriental an.
- Pratiwi, F. I., Qomara, G., & Syarafi, M. A. R. (2020). US Involvement in the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict: Solution or Problem?. *Tamkang Journal of International Affairs*, 24(1), 57-107.
- Psilakis, A., & Plachta, M. (2019). Int'l Criminal Court. *IELR*, 35, 101.
- Rane, H. (2009). Trading Rockets for Resolutions: Restructuring Palestinian Resistance in the Context of International Legal and Political Dynamics. 1-26.
- Rashed, H., Short, D., & Docker, J. (2014). Nakba memoricide: genocide studies and the Zionist/Israeli genocide of Palestine. *Holy Land Studies*, 13(1), 1-23.
- Roithmaier, K., Woodcock, T., & Dima, E. (2021). Year in Review 2019. In *Yearbook of International Humanitarian Law, Volume 22 (2019)* (pp. 187-280). TMC Asser Press, The Hague.
- Sarah, R. (2012). Picking Sides in the Arab-Israeli Conflict: The Influence of Religious Belief on Foreign Policy [Regent University]. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004>
- Selzer, A. (2020). Building the capital: thoughts, plans, and practice in the process of making West Jerusalem the capital city of the State of Israel, 1948-1967. *Middle Eastern Studies*, 57(1), 57-71.
- Yiftachel, O. (2005). Neither two states nor one: The disengagement and "creeping apartheid" in Israel/Palestine. *The Arab World Geographer/Le Géographe du monde arabe*, 8(3), 125-129.
- Yiftachel, O. (2013). Colonial deadlock or confederation for Israel/Palestine?. *Middle East Insights*, 87, 1-9.
- Yossef, A. (2021). The regional impact of the Abraham Accords. *Modern War*

*Institute*, 20(2), 1-17.

Zureik, E. (2020). Settler Colonialism, Neoliberalism and Cyber Surveillance: The Case of Israel. *Middle East Critique*, 0(0), 1–17.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/19436149.2020.1732043>