

The Role Of Peacekeeping Missions And International Powers' Presence In Palestine

Dr. Muhammad Bahar Khan^{1*}, Dr. Muhammad Rizwan², Dr. Muhammad Waseem Mukhtar³, Dr. Saad Jaffar^{4*}, Dr Amaria Atta⁵, Waqar Ahmed⁶, Gulam mustafa⁷

¹Assistant Professor, Department of Pakistan Studies, Abbottabad University of Science and Technology, KPK, Pakistan.
Saadjaffar@aust.edu.pk

²Associate professor, Department of Pakistan Studies, Abbottabad University of Science and Technology, KPK, Pakistan.

³Assistant Professor, Department of Islamic Studies & Arabic, Gomal University DI Khan.

⁴Lecturer Islamic Studies, Department of Pakistan Studies, Abbottabad University of Science and Technology, Abbottabad.

⁵Assistant Professor, Department of Arts & Humanities Superior University Faisalabad Pakistan.

⁶Lecturer institute of Islamic studies Must Mirpur Azad Kashmir.

⁷Lecturer Institute of Islamic Studies MUST Mirpur Azad Kashmir.

***Corresponding author:** Dr. Saad Jaffar

^{*}Lecturer Islamic Studies, Department of Pakistan Studies, Abbottabad University of Science and Technology, Abbottabad.

Abstract

The political role of global major powers in resolving the Muslim-Jewish geographical conflict in Palestine in the 21st century remains a complex and contentious issue. Key players, including the United States, Russia, and the European Union, have often sought to mediate peace through diplomacy, negotiations, and economic aid. However, geopolitical interests, historical alliances, and varying approaches to Middle Eastern stability have influenced their involvement. While some powers advocate for a two-state solution, others align with one side, exacerbating tensions. This abstract explores how global powers' strategies, interventions, and competing national interests continue to shape the trajectory of peace efforts in the region. Moreover this paper explores how these global players' competing interests, strategies, and diplomatic engagements shape the conflict's resolution prospects, highlighting the challenges in achieving a lasting peace between Muslims and Jews in Palestine.

Key words: Global Powers, Israeli-Palestinian Conflict, Middle East Diplomacy, Peace Negotiations, Geopolitical Influence

Introduction

The Israeli-Palestinian conflict, rooted in deep historical, religious, and territorial disputes, remains one of the most complex geopolitical challenges of the 21st century. The political involvement of global major powers, including the United States, European Union, Russia, and China, has been central to efforts aimed at resolving the Muslim-Jewish geographical conflict in Palestine. This abstract examines the multifaceted role these powers play in influencing peace processes, shaping diplomatic negotiations, and determining the conflict's trajectory. The United States, as a longstanding ally of Israel, has been pivotal in mediating peace efforts, though its policies often favor Israeli security concerns, which complicates its role in addressing Palestinian aspirations for statehood. The European Union has consistently advocated for a two-state solution, balancing its relations with both Israel and Arab nations, yet its influence has been limited by internal divisions and inconsistent foreign policy. Russia, seeking to expand its influence in the Middle East, has recently taken a more prominent role, balancing its relationships with Israel and Arab states while pushing for broader diplomatic dialogue. China, though less directly involved, has sought to increase its influence in the region through economic partnerships and soft power, advocating for peace and stability but not engaging in direct mediation. The United Nations, despite numerous resolutions and peacekeeping efforts, has struggled to effect substantive change due to political divisions among major powers.

The Israeli-Palestinian dispute has been one of the most long-lasting and intricate challenges in contemporary international politics. Despite various efforts by nations globally to mediate peace, the fundamental issues—such as territorial disagreements, the status of Jerusalem, the suffering of Palestinian refugees and Israel's concerns about its safety—continue to fuel conflicts. Throughout the 21st century, significant global powers such as the United States, the European Union, Russia, and, to a lesser degree, China, have sought to impact the dispute. They have employed a combination of negotiation, financial leverage, and military partnerships, often yielding inconsistent outcomes. This examination investigates how these global powers have been involved in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, analyzing their approaches, difficulties, and the larger context of their participation.

The following letter is showing something original between non-Islamic powers against the Islamic power(s)' related issues. On November 2nd, 1917, Arthur James Balfour, on behalf of His Majesty's Government, sent a letter to Lord Rothschild conveying a declaration of support for Jewish Zionist aspirations. The declaration, approved by the Cabinet, expressed that His Majesty's Government favored the establishment of a national home for the Jewish people in Palestine and would make every effort to facilitate this goal. However, it also emphasized that nothing should be done that might harm the civil and

religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine or the rights and political status of Jews in any other country. Balfour requested that Lord Rothschild share this declaration with the Zionist Federation (Balfour, A. J. 1917, November 2).

Research Problem

The primary challenge is comprehending the ways in which the major international powers—more especially, the US, Russia, China, and the EU—have impacted the political dynamics of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and the part they play in settling the political and geographic conflicts between the Jewish and Muslim populations in Palestine.

Research Questions

- In the 21st century, what are the main political approaches and policies of the US, Russia, China, and the EU with regard to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict?
- How did the political role played by these superpowers affect the likelihood that the geographical dispute between Muslims and Jews in Palestine was resolved?
- How much did these nations' diplomatic initiatives, military pacts, and geopolitical objectives contribute to the conflict's continuation or resolution?
- What effects did these powers' foreign operations have on the political landscapes of Israel and Palestine locally?
- What impact did outside forces (such as public opinion, international law, and UN resolutions) have on the foreign countries' approaches to the conflict?

Research Objectives

This study's main goal is to examine how key international powers have been politically involved in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict in the twenty-first century, particularly in relation to the settlement of territorial and geographic conflicts.

Specific Objectives

1. To assess the involvement of the United States, Russia, China, and the European Union in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and their respective political positions.
2. To determine whether international military and diplomatic initiatives have succeeded in bringing about peace or escalating hostilities.
3. To examine the internal political interests of the major powers—such as foreign policy goals and domestic politics—that affect their positions on the conflict.
4. To investigate how international institutions (such as the World Bank and the United Nations) influence the policies of superpowers toward Israel and Palestine.

Literature Review:

The following major themes have been included in the literature review:

Historical Context of the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict: Understanding the long-standing territorial disputes, the establishment of Israel, the displacement of Palestinians, and the implications for global politics.

Israel is frequently depicted as fragile and surrounded, a Jewish David encircled by a hostile Arab Goliath. This portrayal has been carefully cultivated by Israeli leaders and sympathetic authors, yet the opposite image is closer to reality. Contrary to common perception, the Zionists possessed larger, better-equipped, and better-commanded forces during the 1947-49 War of Independence, and the Israeli Defense Forces (IDF) achieved swift and decisive victories over Egypt in 1956 and over Egypt, Jordan, and Syria in 1967—before significant U.S. assistance began reaching Israel. These triumphs serve as clear proof of Israeli patriotism, organizational capacity, and military skill, but they also demonstrate that Israel was far from defenseless even in its early years. Today, Israel stands as the most formidable military force in the Middle East. Its conventional forces are significantly more advanced than those of its neighbors, and it is the sole nation in the region with nuclear capabilities. Egypt and Jordan have signed peace agreements with Israel, and Saudi Arabia has also extended an offer to do the same. Syria has lost its Soviet sponsor, Iraq has been devastated by three catastrophic wars, and Iran is hundreds of miles distant. The Palestinians possess little more than an ineffective police force, let alone a military capable of posing a threat to Israel (Dupuy, T. N. 1978).

Niebuhr and Edmund Wilson date from the forties and fifties, respectively. In the decade following the June 1967 war, Israel's borders expanded enormously; a large population of approximately one million Arabs was accumulated as a result. No one, least of all Israelis, could dodge the problem of this new Palestinian actuality. The word "Arab" no longer served to describe everyone who was not Jewish. There were the "old" Arabs in Israel, the new West Bank-Gaza set, the militant liberation fighters (later the PLO), and the various communities scattered in Lebanon, Jordan, Syria, and the Arabian Gulf. For over ten years now, Israel has been in military occupation of actual territories and people. It is true that the West Bank is designated as "Judea and Samaria," but the people there will not be so easily dissolved, at least not yet. Therefore the new obstacle for Zionism-liberalism is the problem of the occupation. Israel will have it that military occupation really means "living together," a concept congenial enough to The New York Times on occasion as to warrant wholesale approval.

On May 2, 1976, the paper's lead editorial denounced "Arab propagandists" for all sorts of abominations (chief among them, attacking the occupation of Arab territory), then—echoing the official Israeli line—proclaimed the military occupation of the West Bank and Gaza as "a model for future cooperation" between Arabs and Jews in former Palestine. In no other context could such a statement be made. A military occupation was taken as representative of good relations between people, a scheme on which to build a common future, just as "autonomy" was supposed to be what "the Arabs of Eretz Israel" reality wanted.... Much the same is true about the Palestinians as refugees. There is some dispute about how

many Palestinians were forced out of their country and off their land during [1948] (the figures range between 500,000 and 800,000; even Israeli sources dispute the numbers but not the exodus itself), yet there is total agreement now that refugees exist. Almost thirty years of existence away from their territory, as well as the absence for them of the right of self-determination, "prove" (the word is unfortunate when its human meaning in this context is seen for what it is) some measure of injustice done them. But when one asks by whom or what they were made refugees, when the question of agency is posed, Israel is not only seen as exempt from blame or responsibility.

According to President Carter for one, who similarly absolved the United States of responsibility for the devastation of Indochina), Israel (like the United States) is praised for its humanity. We are told that the Palestinians were an "exchange" for the Jews who left the Arab countries to come to Israel; that they left in spite of Haganah urgings that they not leave; that those who stayed are better off than their brethren in surrounding Arab countries; that there is only one haven for Jews and there are twenty-odd for Arabs, and why can't Arabs be like Jews and take in their own refugees; that the occupation of more Palestinian territory in 1967 produced in fact a "binational" existence between Arab and Jew; that the West Bank occupation is a fulfillment of biblical prophecies; that there is a Palestine, and that it is in Transjordan; that other refugees (from Muslim India, from Nazi Germany) have resettled elsewhere, and why don't the Palestinians understand this; that the Palestinians are simply a political pawn (or football) used by the Arab regimes, and therefore do not really pose a problem once those regimes are made to see that they cannot get away with such tactics indefinitely. All this of course simply moves around the issue, which seems to have been converted into powerful evidence for Zionism's morality and high standards of conduct (Said, E. W. 1980).

And finally, in the end, the Lobby which has made an impact was bad for Israel. Because of its ability to influence Washington to endorse an expansionist agenda, Israel has been dissuaded from taking opportunities—including a peace treaty with Syria and, most importantly, complete and quick implementation of the Oslo Accords—that would have saved lives and reduced the ranks of Palestinian extremists. Withholding legitimate political rights from Palestinians certainly did not do anything to enhance Israeli security; and the long campaign to kill or marginalize a generation of Palestinian leaders, over the years, has empowered extremist organizations like Hamas, and lessened the chances of finding a negotiable Palestinian leadership acceptable for a fair settlement. This course brings the grim possibility that one day Israel will become a pariah country, like those reserved for apartheid such as South Africa.

Ironically enough, Israel itself would have been better had the Lobby exercised less influence, and if its policy were a little less biased. But there is a glimmer of hope. The Lobby still retains great force, but its harmful effects have become increasingly inadequate to cover up. Great powers can carry out flawed policies for very long periods; but, in the end, reality cannot be ignored indefinitely. Therefore, what is needed is really a candid discussion concerning the Lobby's influence and a more open debate about U.S. interests in this key region. The well-being of Israel is one such interest, but not in terms of the continuing occupation of the West Bank or its greater regional agenda. Open debate would uncover the limits of the strategic and moral case for one-sided U.S. support and could put the U.S. in a position more consonant with its own national interest, with the interests of the other states in the region, and with Israel's long-term interests as well (Mearsheimer, J. J., & Walt, S. M. 2006).

The primary challenges of Russia's foreign policy towards Israel are linked to its support for the Palestinians and the Arabic-speaking nations that oppose Israel, particularly Syria, which is viewed as a pro-Russian state and was the most pro-Soviet Arab nation during Hafez Al-Assad's rule. Putin viewed Bashar Al-Assad as a potential ally for Russia in the post-Cold War era, particularly in the Levant region. Israel has made efforts to strengthen its relations with Russia under Putin's leadership, as Russia is regarded as a major global power, a member of the G7, and part of the Quartet Forum involved in Middle Eastern peace initiatives (D'Ambrosio, D. 2019).

Throughout his five years in power, Putin has focused on strengthening Russia's ties with Israel. However, numerous disagreements persist. Jerusalem remains displeased with Moscow's ongoing support for Iran's nuclear initiative. Russian firms continue to be the primary contractors for the Iranian nuclear facility at Bushehr. In 1995, Tehran and Moscow reached an \$800 million agreement in which the Iranian government acquired a reactor and 2,000 tons of uranium. In March 2001, Iranian president Muhammad Khatami visited Moscow, where he concluded a \$7 billion agreement to buy Russian military hardware. His defense minister, the driving force behind the deal, returned to Moscow seven months later to finalize the arrangement (Grisé, M., & Evans, A. T. 2023, October).

In light of Israel's worsening ties with Russia, Israeli Prime Minister Ehud Olmert traveled to Moscow in October 2006, possibly seeking to negotiate a reversal of some of Russia's anti-Israeli regional strategies. Olmert had three main topics to address with Putin: (1) Iran, (2) Syria's delivery of arms to Hezbollah, and (3) Russia's diplomatic backing of Hamas. A secondary agenda centered around Russian-Israeli relations, including commerce — notably the potential acquisition of Russian natural gas — and mutual cooperation in arms exports to other nations. On the other hand, Putin had a narrower set of five objectives for Olmert's visit. Firstly, he aimed to have Russia acknowledged as a key participant in Middle Eastern diplomacy, and Olmert's trip helped affirm this. Secondly, he needed to revitalize the Russian economy, which was a crucial factor in Moscow's pursuit of regaining superpower stature. Trade with a technologically advanced country like Israel, particularly in nanotechnology, would contribute to achieving this aim. Based on the outcome of the discussions, it seems that Putin gained much more than Olmert. Regarding Iran, Russia made no compromises; Lavrov, after Olmert's visit, stated that Moscow remained opposed to sanctions. Moscow also downplayed the matter of weapon shipments. Concerning Hamas, Lavrov remarked, "It is unrealistic at this stage to demand that Hamas fully accept the Quartet's terms, such as recognizing Israel, renouncing violence against Israel, and agreeing to all current agreements." (Makhoul, E. 2021, March).

The purpose of this article is to examine the conflict, its causes and the different phases of its course. A historical perspective, taking into account the changing actors involved in military and peacekeeping activities, is helpful in wading through the intricacies of the conflict, which has for decades followed a set scenario—attack, response to attack, retaliation for

response, revenge for retaliation, and so on. Peace talks have punctuated this cycle, but have all ended in disruption for a variety of reasons. These talks too have fallen under the Israeli umbrella of peace in the twenty-first century. That is, Israel's primary concern is not going to be occupation termination, but doing away with its effects, that is, displacing Palestinians from more territory rather than accepting their rights. The actual research problem is the explaining what this conflict is all about and why, according to the author, a two-state solution and living next to two peoples is no longer possible. For the most part, the author relied on the historical method while writing this article for a display chronology of the conflict and its pivotal moments and an escalation of hatred leading to today, the Gaza war, fought since 7 October 2023. He has also used comparative analysis to show the conflict's historical origins, the motivations of the fighting parties, and to show the differences between Palestinians and Jews when it comes to that conflict. The author has divided the article into several sections which differ from the way this has been done in the publications he has used. They are broad categories where marked domestic and international events divide the period, such as the pre-World War I period, the interwar years, and the time of Israel's creation or even specific periods such as (Izak, K. 2024).

Pappé, I. (2017): In *Myths about Israel*, the Israeli historian Ilan Pappé has examined the most controversial ideas about the origins and identity of what is today known as the state of Israel. The "Ten Myths" are a collection of commonly held misconceptions about the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. First, there is the myth that Palestine was an empty country. Second, some believe that there were no lands available for the Jews to travel to. Third, it is often claimed that Zionism is synonymous with Judaism. Fourth, Zionism is not considered colonialism, despite many arguments to the contrary. Fifth, it is wrongly believed that Palestinians left their land voluntarily in 1948. Sixth, the June War of 1967 is seen by some as a "No-Choice War," where Israel had no other option but to fight. Seventh, Israel is often regarded as the only democracy in the Middle East, which overlooks the complexities of its governance. Eighth, the Oslo Agreements are frequently referred to with myths surrounding their success and outcomes. Ninth, the situation in Gaza is often misrepresented through various "Gaza Mythologies." Tenth, the belief that the only future solution to the conflict is the Two-State Solution has become a dominant yet contentious narrative.

History touches every conflict, and only an authentic, unbiased view of the past can open the way to peace. When history is twisted or manipulated, it can lead to disaster. In the case of the Israel-Palestine conflict, even a small amount of historical disinformation can cause significant harm. This deliberate distortion of history can fuel oppression and sustain regimes of colonization and occupation. This is why policies of disinformation continue to advance, playing a major role in perpetuating the conflict and leaving little hope for the future. Constructed myths about the past and present in Israel and Palestine cloud our understanding of how the conflict began. The constant manipulation of relevant facts only harms the interests of those embroiled in bloodshed and violence. So, what should be done? While the past is not entirely lost, the present, with its opposing narratives, continues to be shaped in opposition to the Zionist historical account of how the disputed land of Israel came to be.

Methodology

This research adopted a qualitative research methodology, utilizing secondary data sources. The study focused on the political, diplomatic, and international relations dimensions of the conflict.

Approach:

Comparative Analysis: The research compared the political roles of the U.S., Russia, China, and the European Union in the context of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

Case Study Method: Specific case studies of key events (e.g., the Oslo Accords, U.S. recognition of Jerusalem as Israel's capital, Russia's intervention in Syria) were analyzed to understand the global powers' involvement.

Research Design:

Qualitative Research: This study relied on qualitative data, analyzing political speeches, official documents, treaties, and press releases, as well as secondary sources such as books, journal articles, and reports from international organizations.

Historical Analysis: Given the historical context of the conflict, historical analysis was used to trace the development of global powers' policies over time.

1. The United States' Role in the 21st Century

Particularly since World War II, the United States had been playing a significant role in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. American steadfast military and political backing of Israel had been being a key component of American Middle East foreign policy, those had been influencing the course of the war and frequently had been placing the United States at conflicts with Arab nations and Palestinians. Because of its strong relations with Israel, the United States is growing to be a powerful presence in the area in future. Numerous variables, including the War on Terror, geopolitical interests in the Middle East, and the impact of domestic politics, particularly the pro-Israel lobby, are influencing American policies surrounding the conflict in the twenty-first century.

Context and Alignment with Israel

Since the start of the 21st century, U.S. support for Israel has remained strong. Over time, global pressure for a two-state solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict has increased. The main goal of this global effort is to envision a secure Israel as well as a Palestinian state. Following this success, the central focus of U.S. diplomatic initiatives has been evolving around it. However, this effort faces considerable obstacles, but it strengthens American foreign policy. Major issues related to borders, the status of Jerusalem, the settlement of refugees, and security concerns continue to complicate possible agreements. While

the American alliance claims to promote global peace, U.S. long-standing commitments to Israel's security are addressing Palestinian aspirations for self-determination (Smith, 2019).

Diplomatic Initiatives and Peace Efforts

As evidenced by the 1993 Oslo Accords and the 2000 Camp David Summit, the United States is holding a long history of supporting peace initiatives. But the outcomes of these efforts have been uneven. President George W. Bush's administration backed the "roadmap for peace," which sought to establish an independent Palestinian state by 2005, but the continuous violence prevented its implementation (Makovsky, 2009). Under the leadership of President Barack Obama, the United States persisted in promoting a two-state solution and emphasised on the necessity of stopping the growth of Israeli settlements. Nonetheless, the Israeli government and its congressional allies opposed this step strongly (Finkelstein, 2003). The major changes in U.S. policies regarding the Israeli-Palestinian conflict were brought about by President Donald Trump's approach. These policies received harsh criticism from Palestinians and a large portion of the world community for his 2017 decision to relocate the U.S. embassy to Jerusalem and his "Deal of the Century" peace plan, which heavily favoured Israel (Gerges, 2018). A renewed emphasis on promoting a two-state solution has emerged under President Joe Biden, although progress has been sluggish, mostly because of political impasse in both Israel and Palestine (Chomsky, 2003).

Challenges and Criticisms

The United States has been and even currently is getting heavy criticism for being perceived as being biased in favour of Israel, particularly with regard to its veto power in the UN Security Council. Critics are contending that the United States' support and favour for Israel's geopolitical policies in the West Bank and Ghazza, particularly the urbanisation of settlements, is undermining global peace. The United States has been and even today is also struggling to strike a political balance between its close relations with Israel, Iran, and the Middle East, which has been and currently is making its diplomatic efforts even more difficulties (Finkelstein, 2003). The United States has played a significant role in mediating international peace talks and continues to do so today. Egypt and Israel signed a peace treaty in 1978 as a result of the Camp David Accords, which were mediated by President Jimmy Carter. In 1993, President Bill Clinton signed the Oslo Accords, which marked yet another important step in the direction of a two-state solution. Critics counter that the United States' credibility as an impartial mediator has been harmed by its backing of Israel. Using its veto power in the UN Security Council to prevent sanctions on Israel for its activities in Palestinian areas has also drawn criticism from the United States (Gould, 2018). With each new administration in recent years, U.S. foreign policy has changed. During the Trump administration, one of the most contentious actions was the relocation of the U.S. embassy to Jerusalem and the recognition of Jerusalem as Israel's capital in 2017, which further complicated the peace process because Muslim World as well as regional powers considered it a geopolitical unfair involvement that is harmful for global peace. In spite of these obstacles, the United States remains an essential player in any upcoming peace talks in the area (Trump White House Archives, 2020).

2. The European Union's Role in the 21st Century

Doing diplomatic efforts and support of a two-state solution, the European Union (EU) has been a significant player in the Israeli-Palestinian geopolitical conflict. However, the EU's incapacity to exert meaningful pressure on Israel and internal conflicts have been frequently hampered its participation because NATO Alliances its own policies for its regional interests. Due to which this geopolitical conflict is not seeing any kind of solution near in future. Moreover, due to the major as well as regional powers' several kind of own interests in this region this conflict is causing for more regional geopolitical complications.

EU Support for a Two-State Solution

Politically The EU has long supported the establishment of an independent Palestinian state alongside the Israeli state. This stance was reaffirmed in the 2002 European Security Strategy, which is emphasizing the need for a two-state solution that is essential for regional as well as global political and defence stability (Cohen, 2016). With the passage of time, the EU has been and currently is also involved in diplomatic efforts, such as supporting the Quartet on the Middle East (comprising the U.S., EU, Russia, and the UN) in its efforts to mediate peace among two states (Borrell, J. 2024, September 27).

Economic and Humanitarian Aid

The EU has been giving both direct financial assistance and humanitarian help to the Palestinians under the Authority. but according to the European media, a number of initiatives in the Palestinian territories have been receiving funding from the European Commission with the goal of advancing infrastructure, governance, and the economy (Kausch, 2010). due to notwithstanding these initiatives, the EU found it difficult to stop the growth of Israeli settlements because some political pressure, which it had been considering to be unlawful under international law and that had been jeopardising the prospects of a two-state solution, had been a big hindrance against this geopolitical solution or compromising (Cohen, 2016).

Internal Divisions and Criticisms

Internal divides are one of the EU's main problems. Others, like Germany, have adopted a more circumspect stance, placing a higher priority on their relationship with Israel, while others like France and the UK have been outspoken in their criticism of Israeli settlement policies. According to Gillespie (2017), the EU's diplomatic influence has been weakened by its incapacity to project a unified position. The EU has also come under fire for not doing enough to hold Israel responsible for its actions in the West Bank and Gaza or to apply pressure on it.

3. Russia's Role in the 21st Century

Since the end of the Cold War (1990), Russia's involvement in the Israeli-Palestinian geopolitical conflict has dramatically changed its face several times. Russian foreign policy used to be a staunch advocate of Middle Eastern geopolitics and related to its several other matters and the Palestinian cause, but recently it is trying to strike a geopolitical balance between Israel and the Middle East that is inevitable for regional as well as global peace and prosperity. Russian power, leveraging its influence in the Middle East to further its strategic and diplomatic objectives, has several kinds of its own interests in this region (Freedman, R. O. 1998).

Engagement with Arab States and Palestine

In stark contrast to the United States-sponsored Israel, the Soviet Union backed Arab nationalist movements and the Palestinian cause throughout the Cold War (Lynch, 2020). In an effort to regain influence in the Middle East following the fall of the Soviet Union, Russia established connections with Israel while preserving its long-standing ties with Arab nations like Syria and Iran (Azizi, H. R., & Barnes-Dacey, J. 2024, June).

Modern Diplomatic Engagement

As a neutral power in the Israeli-Palestinian geopolitical conflict, Russia is and has been attempting to maintain geopolitical balance between both parties, Israel and Palestine, in the twenty-first century. Russia, upholding close bilateral ties with Israel, especially in the fields of trade, technology, and security, has been remaining a supportive power of Palestinian statehood. Russia's overarching plan to establish itself as a major power broker in the Middle East has been reflected in this twin political strategy. With the passage of time, Russia is participating in regional as well as global peace negotiations as a mediator, frequently advocating for direct talks between Israel and Palestine. Moreover, it is stressing the significance of a just, negotiated resolution. Under its foreign policy, Moscow has been and even today is demonstrating its intention to advance its trade and securities interests and affect regional stability through its diplomatic positive initiatives (Israel's Central Bureau of Statistics, Monthly bulletin of statistics (http://www.cbs.gov.il/archive/200701/yarhon/e4_e.htm)).

Challenges and Limitations

Due to the geopolitical opposite Israeli policy, Russian relations with Iran and Syria have been complicated in the Middle Eastern region. Russian diplomatic efforts and its political inclination are strained by these relations. It, frequently, is casting the country at odds with Israeli interests. Moreover, Russian power has a great influence in the Palestinian geopolitics in comparison to the US and the EU. Its struggles to negotiate regional and global peace agreements are not fruitful to produce significant geopolitical advancements (Azizi and Barnes-Dacey, 2024, June).

4. China's Role in the 21st Century

Comparing to the US, EU, and Russia, China has had a smaller involvement in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict; yet, its increasing influence in the Middle East is significant. China is promoting geopolitical peaceful settlement based on international law and communication, concentrating mostly on diplomatic and economic involvement.

Diplomatic and Economic Engagement

Seeing a long-time geopolitical conflict, China has entered into the global arena for a two-state solution. She is emphasizing the importance of negotiations for that the United Nations should be rendered its duties with responsibility. China, before this positive step for global peace, has not been a central player in peace negotiations. Yet China had been using its growing economic interests and always used diplomatic clout and advocated for Palestinian rights because some powers, only for their personal interest, had been and are destroying human rights (Siddiqi, A. 2024, September 19).

Challenges and Limitations

The reason for China's limited direct involvement in the geopolitical conflict between Israel and Palestine is that, in comparison to other major powers, its level of engagement is relatively modest. But China is becoming a great and global superpower having global trade importance in the future. In the Middle East, particularly in terms of international diplomacy and commercial alliances, she is emerging as a great positive trade power. It's all global agreements holding productive projects that are creating immense chances for its alliance circle development against Russia, USA and several others (Siddiqi, A. 2024, September 19).

Challenges Faced by Global Powers

Global powers had been and even currently are facing several kinds of economic, trade, political, and geopolitical challenges against their efforts to resolve the Israeli-Palestinian geopolitical conflict. One of the primary obstacles is the entrenched religious and economic survival position of both Israel and Palestine. Both are holding deeply held beliefs about their territorial and religious rights. Moreover, the political role of non-state actors has made this conflict complicated. Non-political freedom movements like Hamas in Gaza and Hizbullah in Lebanon are trying to reach a comprehensive peace agreement (Azizi, H. R., & Barnes-Dacey, J. 2024, June). The impacts of regional powers with different strategic objectives in the region of the Middle East are presenting several difficulties. These regional powers frequently are supporting opposing viewpoints in this geopolitical dispute. With the passage of time, it is polarising the economic and defence situation, and it is making international geopolitical and several other dispute resolutions that are challenging global peace (Fawcett, 2019). These active major powers are participating significantly in peace initiatives. It is also impacting the altering dynamics of world politics. Emerging China power and the United States are both changing their national interests. These international powers are mediating a long-term resolution for determining the Israel-Palestinian geopolitical conflict that is enhancing the

world's power dynamics changes. The Israeli-Palestinian conflict has now completed over a century. And between the years 2018 to 2024, there was sustained intervention by world powers to try and mediate the enduring political, geographical, and humanitarian problems of Israel and Palestine. Certain challenges do exacerbate the situation even as major world actors like the US, the EU, Russia and others continue with diplomatic overtures. This section looks at some of the most critical global issues that the regional powers are encountering in their attempts to foster peace among nations.

1. U.S. Policy Shifts and Perceived Bias The Trump Administration (2018-2020)

American power changed its foreign policy in favor of Israel under the leadership of President Donald Trump. One of the most contentious decisions in modern U.S. foreign policy history was the recognition of Jerusalem as Israel's capital in 2017 and the subsequent relocation of the U.S. embassy there in 2018. Both Israel and Palestine are claiming Jerusalem as their capital; and several powers believed that this decision would jeopardize the chances for global as well as regional peace. The "Deal of the Century," which the Trump administration also revealed, was largely rejected by Palestinians, as it heavily favored Israeli interests, including acknowledging Israeli control over major portions of the West Bank and Jerusalem (Azizi, H. R., & Barnes-Dacey, J. 2024, June).

Loss of Neutrality and Trust

There are charges of bias against the Trump administration because of its close ties to Israeli interests including backing the growth of Israeli settlements in this region rapidly. Any faith in American-led peace efforts weakens as a result of the U.S.'s decreased role as an honest mediator and further estrangement from the Palestinian leadership. In addition to refusing to cooperate with the Trump administration, the leadership of the Palestinian Authority demands that U.S. assistance to Palestinian organizations and refugees be discontinued.

Biden Administration (2021-2024)

The administration of President Joe Biden has been pushing for the two-state solution in an effort to return the United States to a more conventional approach to the Israel-Palestinian geopolitical conflict. But result is zero. The geopolitical complexity of the region, internal political divisions within the United States, and Israeli government policies have all resisted Biden's attempts to resume talks. moreover, instead of being less overtly pro-Israel than Trump's, Biden's administration continuously to provide Israel with substantial military and economic support, which has drawn criticism from progressive American organizations and Palestinian advocates who contend that this calls into question the United States' legitimacy as an unbiased mediator (Gerges, 2022).

2. Israeli Politics and Governmental Instability

Right-Wing Government and Settlement Expansion

even in the 21st century when major powers as well as developing countries even backward states are changing their foreign policies, right-wing and religious factions are dominating Israel's geopolitical policy. These factions oppose the idea of a Palestinian state and favor the expansion of Israel's settlements in the West Bank. The Israeli government, under the leadership of Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu is consistently supporting the expansion of settlements in this area. Moreover, geopolitical complication between two-state solutions is the portrayal of peace resolutions presented to the UN Assembly. These actions have led to strong condemnation from the global community, including Europe and the United Nations. Yet, Israel continues to pursue various policies to extend its territorial control (Lynch, M. 2021). The hard-line approach of the Israeli government is facing significant challenge for global powers attempting to mediate peace because these powers, with the global peace and geopolitical compromising wants to extend their global trade trend positively and want to create peace or global progress. The continuously construction of Israeli settlements in the West Bank area, along with Israel's refusal to halt these practices, is making negotiations difficult, with Palestinians viewing it as a betrayal of the idea of a two-state solution.

Internal Political Fragmentation

Four elections 2019 to 2021 have created political instability in Israel because there are found many political doubts among political parties in the regard of pure election results. These political coalitions among governmental machineries have formed a fragile situation because ideological differences between parties are not matching with each other particularly in the regard of approaches Palestinian statehood because both have different political interests. So, this internal fragmentation has become a big hindrance against the Israel's ability. In the presence of this political internal fragmentation Israel's engagement for meaningful peace negotiations will be fruitless (Borrell, J. 2024, September 27).

3. Palestinian Political Fragmentation

Fatah vs. Hamas

Both Hamas, in Gaza, and Fatah, in the West Bank, are active against Israel's geopolitical policies and do not seek any kind of compromise with Israel. As a result, both are considered major barriers to regional peace. This has altered and fragmented the Palestinian political landscape, as both groups have ideological differences regarding Israel. Both Hamas and Fatah, opposed to a negotiated solution, aim to remove Jews from the area or, at the very least, establish recognized geopolitical control over a specific area for Palestinians. Meanwhile, international powers are trying to mediate the conflict, which remains a complex issue. Hamas's aggressive position, sovereignty over Gaza, and recurring clashes with Israel are making the peace process more difficult because both are not accepting a compromised ideology. Since several regional as well as global powers, including the Middle East, Asia, the US, and the EU, along with the whole international community, has

found it difficult to interact with the rival groups, despite the fact that it is continuing to play a significant role in Palestinian geopolitics. Actually, the whole international community has its own different interests with both sides (Khalidi, 2020).

Lack of Representation and Trust

Global powers find it difficult to find an impartial and cohesive ally for negotiations on peace because Palestinian leadership is disagree on important topics related to claimed geopolitical matters, which include the foreseeable future of Jerusalem and refugee rights. In this regard Palestinian power is right in her claim because Israel has destroyed human rights several times. That is why efforts to negotiate a sustainable agreement are hampered by the absence of confidence between Israel and the Palestinian leadership because both have different ideologies in the regional geopolitics for their interests (Gould, 2021).

4. Israeli-Palestinian Violence and Security Concerns

Escalating Violence

Major obstacles to peace continue to be the ongoing cycle of violence including protests, bombings, and military conflicts. Periods of severe combat between Israeli troops and Palestinian militants (such as the Gaza crisis in 2021) have occurred between 2018 and 2024, resulting in the deaths of numerous civilians and deepening hostilities. The violence is making it harder for diplomatic attempts to succeed since it deepens the mistrust and animosity between both sides. It has been difficult for world powers to persuade both parties to defuse the situation and engage in talks. Main contributing factors of the war, such as Israeli settlement growth, the siege of Ghazza, and Palestinian militant behaviour, are frequently had been ignored by U.S. and European efforts to mediate ceasefires. There is doubt about the chances of a sustainable peace as a result of the worldwide community's failure to stop bloodshed (Segev, 2021).

5. Geopolitical Shifts and Regional Dynamics

Iran's Influence and Proxy Conflicts

Iran's sponsorship of Palestinian militant organizations, particularly Hamas and Islamic Jihad, is making peace initiatives more difficult because, due to this action of Iran, other Western and European powers have to get involved in this conflict that is becoming a serious cause for the length of the conflict. Iran is continuously threatening the Middle East's security environment with its influence in the area and its involvement in proxy war like the Syrian Civil War. This war could prove to be a big tension. Because of its greater regional goals and backing for Palestinian militancy, Iran are posing a serious threat to international powers, especially the United States and Israel, which see it as a destabilizing force. There are additional connections between the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and the U.S. and EU's diplomatic engagement with Iran, particularly in relation to the nuclear agreement. Iran's opposition to Israeli policies complicates the peace process even more, especially as Iran still gives organizations in Gaza financial and military support (Chomsky, N. 2020).

Normalization of Arab-Israeli Relations

According to the Abraham Accords (2020), the Arab world, particularly the United Arab Emirates (UAE) and Bahrain, has shifted their foreign policy towards Israel while continuing to support Palestine. This political development, under the banner of Muslim unity, has brought a degree of stability to the region, fostering peace and progress. However, it has also led to a stronger alienation of the Palestinian cause in the pursuit of conflict resolution. As a result of this Muslim unity and effort, global powers are encountering significant obstacles in pursuing their interests in the name of regional peace. On the other hand, Arab countries have normalized their political relations with Israel (Gerges, 2022).

6. International Divisions and Diplomatic Challenges

Lack of Consensus within the EU and Global Powers

Since the attacks of 7 October 2023, the EU has been providing political umbrella and material support for Israel's geopolitical strength. This practice has continued through almost eight months of unrelenting bombardment with almost 40,000 people killed, and Israeli forces have forced 2.3 million people into displacement, the fastest descent into starvation of an entire population ever recorded, and the total destruction of Ghazza's civilian infrastructure, including settlements, medical centers, educational institutions, and commercial centers, as well as the places of worship. This brutal support continued as Israel was placed on trial for genocide at the International Court of Justice (ICJ) in The Hague and as the International Criminal Court (ICC) announced that it would seek arrest warrants for Israel's Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu and defence Minister Yoav Gallant (Akkerman, M., & Ni Bhriain, N. 2024.p.5). 'Today we celebrate 75 years of friendship between Israel and Europe. We have more in common than geography would suggest, our shared culture, our values, and hundreds of thousands of dual European Israeli citizens ... Europe and Israel are bound to be friends and allies. Your freedom is our freedom... 'Israel is closer to the European Union than any other country in the world outside Europe ... Israel is ... a member of the European Union without being a member of the institutions.'— European Commission President Ursula von der Leyen on 'Israel Independence Day' 14 May 2023 (Akkerman, M. 2024. p. 15).

United Nations

"We advocate for critical measures that simultaneously enable secure, unencumbered, and unrestricted access for humanitarian assistance while establishing the appropriate conditions for a feasible halt to combat. We also support Resolution 2728 (2024), which calls for a swift truce in Gaza. This aligns with the globally recognized two-state solution based on the pre-1967 geographic boundaries. The Palestinian Authority was granted observer state status in the United Nations after being guided by the UN Charter and its objectives, relevant resolutions, and rules—especially the principle that

it is inadmissible to seize another's land by force, the right of peoples to determine their own destiny, and the commitment to human rights and equality without discrimination." (Laghdaif, S. M. 2024, May 10).

Conclusion

With varying levels of achievement, powers around the world are continuing to attempt to resolve the Israeli-Palestinian dispute in the twenty-first century. As Israel's closest friend, the US is having a difficult time striking a balance between its backing for Israel and its attempts to arbitrate a peace agreement. Despite its minimal influence and internal conflicts, the European Union is being a steadfast supporter of the two-state solution. Despite having ties to both Israel and Palestinian groups, Russia is not being very successful in mediating disputes because of regional alliances. Although China is having a more indirect role, future peace initiatives may be being influenced by its growing prominence in the Middle East.

Geopolitical complication caused the attacks on October 7, 2023, those are considered spearheaded by Hamas, denounced numerous states denounced them. However, a much number were also denounced the serious atrocities committed by Israeli officials. While other nations have given military assistance to Israel armed factions, who run the possibility of being implicated in war crimes gave the persistent serious atrocities. Moreover the United States and other Western nations have given Israel weapons or assistance with military operations that is not a good thing for regional peace.

While the United States has not, as of the time of writing, tied its military assistance to Israel to granting civilian security, President Joe Biden and other US officials visited Israel multiple times to press Israeli leaders to permit aid into Gaza and to demand civilian protection. The Biden administration asked for an additional \$14.3 billion for armaments to Israel beyond October 7, 2023, on top of the \$3.8 billion in US military aid Israel receives every year. The United States also stated plans to provide or has already transferred a number of weapons, including 155mm artillery shells, 1 million rounds of ammunition, Joint Direct Attack Munition (JDAM) guidance kits, and small diameter bombs. But the United States stopped sending small guns because they were worried that they would end up in the hands of settlers.

Although Israel has not completely eradicated prejudice against United States citizens of Palestinian, Arab, or Muslim heritage during their travel to Israel and the Optional Practical Training, the US acknowledged Israel in September as part of its visa-waiver initiative, in which granting Israeli residents admission without a visa. The United States and the United Kingdom banned travel to the West Bank in December in response to aggressive colonists because of the aggressive groups' continuous conflicts that have made it dangerous to the environment.

A resolution advocating for humanitarian pauses in Gaza was vetoed by the United States in mid-October, while a similar resolution was abstained on in November. Similar to the resolution that the United States rejected, the UN Security Council's adopted resolution demanded that Israel and Palestinian armed organizations uphold international humanitarian law and protect civilians. Since 2016, this was the council's first resolution on Israel and Palestine to be adopted. However, the US once more vetoed a Security Council resolution in December that called for an end to hostilities between Israeli forces and Palestinian armed organizations. Two resolutions urging a ceasefire were approved by the General Assembly in October and December, respectively.

The member countries of the European Union were divided, which hindered the bloc's ability to come together and embrace firm stances and tangible actions in the wake of Israeli atrocities. This was especially evident following October 7, as evidenced by the differing votes cast by EU member countries at the UN. EU nations were unable to reach a united decision to denounce Israel's war crimes while denouncing Hamas. Due to the need for unanimity, there was little chance that the EU high representative Josep Borrell's portfolio of specific penalties for the mistreatment of residents in the West Bank would be adopted.

The directory of companies that conduct business in colonies has been revised by the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights in June. To guarantee funding for the database's ongoing updates, the UN Human Rights Council issued a resolution in July. The Palestine probe was still being conducted by the prosecutor for the International Criminal Court (ICC). Speaking from the Rafah, passing through, the prosecutor travelled to Israel and Palestine throughout the conflict. He made it plain to the parties that any major wrongdoing perpetrated during the continuing conflicts is within the purview of the ICC's mandate and indicated the court's continued existence.

Fifty-four states and three intergovernmental organizations submitted their arguments to the International Court of Justice (ICJ) in July regarding the advisory opinion that the UN General Assembly had asked for in December 2022 regarding the legal standing of Israel's protracted profession and the ramifications of its violations of Palestinian rights. On February 19, 2024, public discussion on the petition for an opinion of advisory nature will begin at the ICJ.

South Africa accused Israel of breaking the 1948 Genocide Convention during her armed operations in Ghazza in a complaint it filed at the International Court of Justice (ICJ) in December 2024. Protecting the Palestinians and guarantee Israel complies with the Convention; South Africa asked the court to issue temporary restrictions immediately. The main focus of the case is the accusation of acts that might be considered genocidal. The International Court of Justice (ICJ) held public hearings on the issue on January 11 and 12, 2024. The proceedings and their possible implications for the current Israel-Palestine conflict attracted a lot of attention from throughout the world.

References

1. Akkerman, M. (2024). Forever friends: The European Union and Israel. In *Partners in crime EU: Complicity in Israel's genocide in Gaza* (D. Eade, Ed.; p. 15). Transnational Institute.[Ní Bhriain, N. (2024). *Partners in crime EU: Complicity in Israel's genocide in Gaza* (D. Eade, Ed.). Transnational Institute.
2. Akkerman, M., & Ní Bhriain, N. (2024). *Partners in crime EU: Complicity in Israel's genocide in Gaza* (D. Eade, Ed.; p. 5). Transnational Institute.

3. Azizi, H. R., & Barnes-Dacey, J. (2024, June). *Beyond proxies: Iran's deeper strategy in Syria and Lebanon* (Policy Brief ECFR/538). The European Council on Foreign Relations. <https://ecfr.eu/wp-content/uploads/2024/06/Beyond-proxies-Irans-deeper-strategy-in-Syria-and-Lebanon-v2.pdf>
4. Balfour, A. J. (1917, November 2). *Letter to Lord Rothschild* [Foreign Office]. Wikisource. https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Balfour_Declaration
5. Bijan, A. (2020). The future of peace in the Middle East: Russia's approach to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. *Journal of Iran and Central Eurasia Studies*, 3(1), 51–73.
6. Khan, Muhammad Bahar, Saad Jaffar, Imran Naseem, Muhammad Waseem Mukhtar, and Waqar Ahmed. "Nature Of 21 st Century's Global Conflicts Under The Global Powers' Geoeconomic Strategies And Islamic Ideology For Peace." *Journal of Positive School Psychology* 7, no. 4 (2023).
7. Borrell, J. (2024, September 27). *Middle East: Opening address by High Representative/Vice-President Josep Borrell at the Ministerial side event on the Peace Process and the Two-State Solution*. European External Action Service. https://www.eeas.europa.eu/eeas/middle-east-opening-address-high-representativevice-president-josep-borrell-ministerial-side-event_en.
8. Chomsky, N. (2003). *The Fateful Triangle: The United States, Israel, and the Palestinians*. South End Press.
9. Chomsky, N. (2020). *The United States and the Middle East: A History of Interventions*. Haymarket Books.
10. Cohen, S. (2016). *The European Union and the Middle East peace process: A complicated relationship*. *International Politics*, 53(4), 516-534.
11. Khan, Muhammad Bahar, Saad Jaffar, Shazia Sajid, Waqar Ahmed Amaria Atta, and Muhammad Waseem Mukhtar. "Alone Atomic Islamic State Pakistan's Significant Geo-Political Location For Super Powers Monopole Strategies Cultivation." *Kurdish Studies* 12, no. 4 (2024): 1537-41.
12. D'Ambrosio, D. (2019). *The relations between Russia and Israel: Focus on the Syrian conflict* (Master's thesis, LUISS Guido Carli University). pp.7-9. https://tesi.luiss.it/28554/1/638642_D%27AMBROSIO_DAVIDE.pdf
13. Dupuy, T. N. (1978). *Elusive victory: The Arab-Israeli wars, 1947-1974* (pp. 3-19, 121-125, 146-147, 212-214, 231-244, 333-340, 388-390, 597-605, 623-633). Harper and Row.
14. Fawcett, L. (2019). *International relations of the Middle East*. Oxford University Press.
15. Finkelstein, N. (2003). *The Holocaust Industry: Reflections on the Exploitation of Jewish Suffering*. Verso.
16. Khan, Muhammad Bahar, Saad Jaffar, Sardar Muhammad, Muhammad Waseem Mukhtar, Waqar Ahmad, and Bushra Rasheed. "Partitioning the subcontinent in 1947: A move of west against the stability of Islam using applicable geopolitical laws." *Russian Law Journal* 11, no. 1 (2023): 157-165.
17. Finkelstein, N. (2020). *The Tragedy of the Palestinian Cause: U.S. Policies and the Peace Process*. Verso.
18. Freedman, R. O. (1998). *Russia and Israel under Yeltsin*. *Israel Studies*, 3(1), 148–151. Indiana University Press.
19. Gerges, F. A. (2018). **The U.S. and the Middle East: The Making of an Uncertain Alliance**. Oxford University Press.
20. Gerges, F. A. (2022). *The U.S. and the Middle East: The Making of an Uncertain Alliance*. Oxford University Press.
21. Gillespie, P. (2017). *The UK's role in the Middle East peace process*. Routledge.
22. Gould, E. (2018). *The United States and the Israeli-Palestinian conflict: Diplomatic challenges*. *Foreign Affairs*, 97(3), 28-36.
23. Gould, E. (2021). *Palestinian Politics: The Struggle for Sovereignty*. Oxford University Press.
24. Grisé, M., & Evans, A. T. (2023, October). *The drivers of and outlook for Russian-Iranian cooperation. Expert insights on a timely policy issue*. RAND Corporation. <https://www.rand.org/t/PEA2829-1>
25. Izak, K. (2024). The Jewish-Palestinian conflict: History and the present. *Terrorism – Studies, Analyses, Prevention*, 6, 289–404. <https://doi.org/10.4467/27204383TER.24.027.20247>
26. Kausch, K. (2010). *The European Union's role in the Middle East peace process*. Centre for European Reform.
27. Khalidi, R. (2020). *The Iron Cage: The Story of the Palestinian Struggle for Statehood*. Beacon Press.
28. Laghdaf, S. M. (2024, May 10). *Letter dated 10 May 2024 from the Permanent Representative of Mauritania to the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council (A/78/879-S/2024/382)*. United Nations. <https://undocs.org/A/78/879-S/2024/382>
29. Lynch, M. (2021). *Israel and Palestine: The Impact of the Political Landscape on Peace Talks*. Cambridge University Press.
30. Makhoul, E. (2021, March). *The Russian foreign policy towards Israel in the post-communist period* [Research proposal]. Jagiellonian University. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/383851141https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.10659.67363>
31. Mearsheimer, J. J., & Walt, S. M. (2006). *The Israel lobby and U.S. foreign policy* (pp. 41-42). Retrieved from file:///C:/Users/drba/Downloads/RWP06-011.pdf
32. Said, E. W. (1980). *The Question of Palestine*. Vintage Books, New York.p-p.38-45.
33. Segev, T. (2021). *One Palestine, Complete: Jews and Arabs Under the British Mandate*. Henry Holt & Co.
34. Siddiq, A. (2024, September 19). *China's expanding influence in the Middle East: The path to regional cooperation and stability*. Research Fellow, Centre for Afghanistan, Middle East & Africa (CAMEA), ISSI. Edited by A. Khan. https://issi.org.pk/wp-content/uploads/2024/09/IB_Arhama_Sept_19_2024.pdf
35. Smith, C. (2019). *Palestine and the Arab-Israeli Conflict: A History with documents*. St. Martin's Press.
36. Trump White House Archives. 2020. (January 2020). *Peace to Prosperity: A Vision to Improve the Lives of the Palestinian and Israeli People*. <https://trumpwhitehouse.archives.gov/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/Peace-to-Prosperity-0120.pdf>. Accessed August 23, 2023.