



Sonargaon University (SU)

**Research Monograph
On
The Effectiveness of International Law in
Resolving Protracted Conflicts: Lessons from the
Israel- Palestine Case**

Research Monograph Submitted for the partial fulfillment of the award of
the degree
in
LL.M (1 Year)
Department of Law
Sonargaon University (SU)

by:

Mariam Akter

ID: LLM2501032014

Program: LL.M (1 Year)

Section: Kumar

Batch: 32nd

Department of Law
Sonargaon University (SU)

Under the Guidance of

Muhammad Ali

Lecturer & Course Coordinator

Department of Law

Sonargaon University (SU)

Date of Submission: December, 2025

Letter of Transmittal

To,
Muhammad Ali
Lecturer & Course Coordinator
Department of Law
Sonargaon University (SU)

Subject: Submission of the Research Paper on "The Effectiveness of International Law in Resolving Protracted Conflicts: Lessons from the Israel-Palestine Case"

Dear Sir,

I am pleased to submit my research paper titled "The Effectiveness of International Law in Resolving Protracted Conflicts: Lessons from the Israel-Palestine Case," as part of the requirements for the course [Course Name], in the Fall-2025 semester. This paper explores the challenges and opportunities in utilizing international law for conflict resolution, with a special focus on the Israel-Palestine conflict.

I am grateful for your support and guidance throughout the preparation of this paper. I hope that my analysis proves to be valuable for the study of international law and conflict resolution.

Thank you for your time and consideration. I look forward to your feedback.

Yours sincerely,

Mariam Akter
ID: LLM2501032014
Batch: 32
Program: LL.M (1 Year)
Department of Law
Sonargaon University (SU)

Declaration

I, Mariam Akter, hereby declare that the research paper entitled "The Effectiveness of International Law in Resolving Protracted Conflicts: Lessons from the Israel-Palestine Case" is a result of my independent research and analysis, conducted under the guidance of my supervisor, Muhammad Ali. This paper has not been submitted to any other university or institution for any degree or academic qualification.

All the information, facts, and data contained in this paper have been properly acknowledged, and due credit has been given to the original sources. I am fully responsible for any errors or omissions in the content of the paper.

Mariam Akter

ID: LLM2501032014

Batch: 32

Section: Kumar

Semester: Fall-2025

Program: LL.M (1 Year)

Department of Law

Sonargaon University (SU)

Supervisor's Certificate

This is to certify that the research paper titled "The Effectiveness of International Law in Resolving Protracted Conflicts: Lessons from the Israel-Palestine Case," submitted by Mariam Akter (ID: LLM2501032014) for the LL.M program at Sonargaon University (SU), is an authentic piece of work carried out by the student under my supervision.

The paper examines the role and effectiveness of international law in addressing protracted conflicts, particularly the Israel-Palestine issue. I have supervised the research, and the content of the paper represents the student's own analysis and findings.

I wish Mariam success in her academic endeavors.

Muhammad Ali
Lecturer & Course Coordinator
Department of Law
Sonargaon University (SU)

Acknowledgement

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my supervisor, Muhammad Ali, for his unwavering support and valuable guidance throughout the process of preparing this research paper. His insightful feedback and constant encouragement have been instrumental in the successful completion of this work.

I would also like to extend my thanks to the faculty members of the Department of Law, Sonargaon University (SU), for providing an enriching academic environment that inspired my research. Special thanks to the library staff for their assistance in accessing various resources.

Finally, I am grateful to my family and friends for their continuous encouragement and support during this research journey.

Mariam Akter

Abstract

This research examines the effectiveness of international law in resolving protracted conflicts, with a particular focus on the Israel-Palestine conflict. The study explores the role of international legal instruments, such as United Nations resolutions, the Geneva Conventions, and the International Court of Justice's rulings, in addressing the longstanding disputes between Israel and Palestine. It highlights how international law has been employed to frame the legal parameters of the conflict, yet faces significant challenges in enforcement and application due to political power dynamics, particularly the influence of key states like the United States. Through case studies such as the Oslo Accords, UN Security Council Resolutions, and the ICJ advisory opinion on the West Bank barrier, the research demonstrates both the potential and the limitations of international law in conflict resolution. The findings indicate that while international law provides important frameworks for peace, the resolution of the Israel-Palestine conflict is hindered by political realities, lack of accountability, and the absence of strong enforcement mechanisms. The research concludes that a comprehensive resolution will require not only legal frameworks but also sustained diplomatic efforts, international cooperation, and political will from all parties involved. The study also compares the Israel-Palestine conflict with other protracted conflicts, offering valuable lessons for future peace-building efforts.

Table of Contents

Letter of Transmittal	i
Declaration	ii
Supervisor’s Certificate	iii
Acknowledgement	iv
Abstract	v

Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 Background of the Study	1
1.2 Research Problem	2
1.3 Objectives of the Study	2
1.4 Scope of the Study	3
1.5 Limitations of the Study	3
1.6 Methodology	4
1.7 Structure of the Paper	5

Chapter 2: Understanding Protracted Conflicts and Literature Review

2.1 Defining Protracted Conflicts	7
2.2 Characteristics of Protracted Conflicts	8
2.3 Historical Overview of the Israel-Palestine Conflict	9
2.4 Significance of International Law in Conflict Resolution	10
2.5 Literature Review	11

Chapter 3: International Law and Conflict Resolution

3.1 The Role of International Law in Global Peace and Security	16
3.2 Theoretical Frameworks: Legal vs. Political Approaches	17
3.3 Mechanisms of International Law in Conflict Resolution	18
3.3.1 Diplomacy and Negotiation	18
3.3.2 Arbitration and Mediation	19
3.3.3 International Court of Justice and Legal Rulings	19
3.4 Challenges in Enforcing International Law	20

Chapter 4: The Israel-Palestine Conflict: A Historical and Legal Overview

4.1 Origins and Escalation of the Conflict.....22

4.2 The Role of International Law in Shaping the Conflict.....23

 4.2.1 United Nations Resolutions.....23

 4.2.2 The Geneva Conventions and International Humanitarian Law24

 4.2.3 International Recognition of Palestinian Statehood25

4.3 The Impact of International Law on Peace Processes25

 4.3.1 Oslo Accords26

 4.3.2 The Camp David Summit and the Roadmap for Peace.....26

 4.3.3 The Role of International Courts.....27

Chapter 5: Case Studies of International Law's Effectiveness

5.1 The Oslo Accords: A Legal and Political Analysis28

5.2 UN Security Council Resolutions: 242 and 33829

5.3 The International Court of Justice Advisory Opinion (2004).....30

5.4 Lessons from Other Protracted Conflicts: Comparing Israel-Palestine with
Kosovo, Northern Ireland, and Sudan.....31

Chapter 7: Findings, Recommendations, and Conclusion

7.1 Findings.....33

7.2 Recommendations.....34

7.3 Conclusion35

Bibliography36

Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 Background of the Study

The Israel-Palestine conflict is one of the most enduring and complex geopolitical disputes in modern history. Originating in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, it has been marked by territorial, political, religious, and cultural tensions, with deep-rooted grievances that have resisted resolution for decades. The conflict has not only been a source of immense human suffering and political instability in the Middle East but also a focal point for international diplomacy and legal intervention. Despite numerous peace efforts and international attempts at conflict resolution, a sustainable and comprehensive peace agreement remains elusive. International law, in its various forms, has played a significant role in attempting to resolve this protracted conflict. From United Nations resolutions to international court rulings, there have been numerous legal interventions aimed at mitigating the violence, addressing territorial disputes, and seeking a fair and lasting peace. However, the success of these legal mechanisms has been widely debated. Critics argue that international law lacks enforcement power, often ignores political realities, or is undermined by the geopolitical interests of powerful states, while supporters believe that it provides the framework necessary for peacebuilding and justice.

This study explores the effectiveness of international law in resolving protracted conflicts, with a specific focus on the Israel-Palestine situation. By examining the historical context of the conflict, key international legal interventions, and the challenges inherent in applying international law to such complex disputes, this research aims to draw lessons that can inform future efforts to address similar conflicts around the world. The Israel-Palestine case offers a unique lens through which to assess the role of international law in peacebuilding. The conflict's longevity, its international significance, and the multitude of legal instruments involved make it a key example of how international law operates—or fails to operate—in the face of deeply entrenched political and territorial disputes. Understanding the dynamics of legal efforts in this context can provide critical insights into the broader effectiveness of international law in resolving protracted conflicts globally.

This research will critically assess the theoretical frameworks underpinning international law's role in conflict resolution, evaluate the success and shortcomings of specific legal interventions in the Israel-Palestine case, and propose recommendations for enhancing the role of law in future peace efforts. Through this, the study seeks to answer key questions regarding the capacity of international law to effect meaningful change in conflicts that seem resistant to resolution.

1.2 Research Problem

The Israel-Palestine conflict remains one of the most persistent and contentious geopolitical disputes in modern history, defying numerous international efforts at conflict resolution. Despite decades of diplomatic initiatives, peace accords, and legal interventions, a comprehensive and lasting solution has yet to be achieved. This raises critical questions about the effectiveness of international law as a tool for resolving such protracted conflicts. The research problem, therefore, centers on evaluating the role and impact of international legal frameworks, mechanisms, and institutions in addressing the Israel-Palestine conflict. Specifically, this study seeks to answer whether international law can meaningfully contribute to resolving the dispute, why many of its efforts have been unsuccessful, and what lessons can be drawn for the resolution of similar global conflicts.

1.3 Objectives of the Study

The primary objectives of this study are as follows:

1. To analyze the role of international law in the Israel-Palestine conflict, including key legal frameworks, treaties, and resolutions that have attempted to address the issues at the heart of the dispute.
2. To assess the effectiveness of international legal mechanisms such as the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) resolutions, the International Court of Justice (ICJ) rulings, and peace accords (e.g., Oslo Accords, Camp David Accords) in resolving the conflict.
3. To examine the challenges and limitations of applying international law in protracted conflicts, particularly where powerful political and territorial interests are involved.

4. To draw lessons from the Israel-Palestine case that can inform future conflict resolution efforts in other regions experiencing similar protracted conflicts.
5. To propose recommendations for improving the role of international law in peacebuilding and conflict resolution, focusing on strengthening enforcement mechanisms and multilateral cooperation.

1.4 Scope of the Study

This study focuses on the Israel-Palestine conflict from the perspective of international law, with a particular emphasis on key legal interventions and frameworks that have been employed over the years. It will examine:

- The historical context of the conflict, starting from the early 20th century to the present.
- Key legal instruments such as UN Security Council Resolutions, the Geneva Conventions, and the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice (ICJ).
- Specific peace processes like the Oslo Accords and the Camp David Summit, as well as their legal implications.
- International bodies, particularly the United Nations, the International Criminal Court (ICC), and the ICJ, and their role in conflict resolution.
- Comparative analysis with other protracted conflicts, such as those in Kosovo, Northern Ireland, and Sudan, to draw parallels and contrasts.

The study will not delve into the detailed sociopolitical or religious aspects of the Israel-Palestine conflict but will focus primarily on the legal frameworks and their implications in the resolution of the dispute.

1.5 Limitations of the Study

While this study aims to provide a comprehensive analysis, it is subject to several limitations:

1. The Israel-Palestine conflict is highly complex, involving multiple actors with competing interests. This complexity may limit the scope of legal interventions that can be effectively assessed.

2. International law is often criticized for its inability to compel state actors to comply with its rulings. This limits the study's ability to assess real-world impacts and results.
3. Access to certain primary sources, particularly classified diplomatic documents or private negotiations, may be limited. As a result, the analysis will rely on publicly available sources, court rulings, and official records.
4. The dynamic nature of the conflict means that new developments may occur after the completion of this study, which could alter the relevance or interpretation of certain legal aspects.
5. This study will not fully explore the broader sociocultural, economic, and religious dimensions of the conflict, which are crucial but outside the scope of legal analysis.

1.6 Methodology

The methodology for this research is primarily qualitative and involves a detailed review of legal texts, scholarly articles, case law, and official reports. The study employs the following methods:

1. **Doctrinal Legal Research:** This will form the core of the study, involving an analysis of primary and secondary legal sources, including international treaties, UN resolutions, and decisions from international courts (ICJ, ICC).
2. **Case Study Analysis:** A comparative approach will be used to assess the effectiveness of legal interventions in the Israel-Palestine conflict, drawing comparisons with other international cases of protracted conflict resolution.
3. **Document Analysis:** The research will examine key legal documents such as the Geneva Conventions, Security Council Resolutions, and the advisory opinions issued by the ICJ, as well as reports from international organizations like the United Nations and the European Union.
4. **Interviews (if applicable):** In-depth interviews with experts in international law, diplomats, and academics may be conducted to gather insights on the practical application of international law in resolving protracted conflicts.

1.7 Structure of the Paper

This paper is structured to provide a comprehensive examination of the effectiveness of international law in resolving protracted conflicts, focusing on the Israel-Palestine conflict. It is divided into the following chapters:

Chapter 1: Introduction

This chapter introduces the study by outlining the background of the Israel-Palestine conflict, the research problem, and the objectives of the study. It further defines the scope and limitations of the research and provides an overview of the methodology used in the analysis. The chapter concludes by presenting the structure of the paper, setting the stage for the subsequent chapters.

Chapter 2: Understanding Protracted Conflicts and Literature Review

This chapter offers a detailed definition of protracted conflicts and explores their characteristics. It also provides a historical overview of the Israel-Palestine conflict, emphasizing its complexities and the long-standing nature of the dispute. Additionally, the chapter reviews existing academic and legal literature on international law's role in resolving such conflicts.

Chapter 3: International Law and Conflict Resolution

Chapter 3 explores the role of international law in promoting global peace and security. It introduces various theoretical frameworks, contrasting legal approaches with political strategies. The chapter further examines the key mechanisms of international law, including diplomacy, mediation, arbitration, and the role of the International Court of Justice (ICJ). It concludes by addressing the challenges involved in enforcing international law in conflict zones.

Chapter 4: The Israel-Palestine Conflict: A Historical and Legal Overview

This chapter provides a historical and legal overview of the Israel-Palestine conflict. It outlines the origins of the conflict, the evolution of key issues such as territorial boundaries, refugee rights, and Jerusalem, and the significant role of international law in shaping the discourse. The chapter discusses key United Nations resolutions, the application of the Geneva Conventions, and the legal challenges related to Palestinian

statehood. The role of international law in past peace processes and negotiations is also analyzed.

Chapter 5: Case Studies of International Law's Effectiveness

Chapter 5 presents several case studies of international law's application in the Israel-Palestine conflict and other protracted conflicts. It examines specific instances such as the Oslo Accords, UN Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338, and the ICJ advisory opinion on the West Bank barrier. The chapter also draws comparative insights from other conflicts, including Kosovo, Northern Ireland, and Sudan, to assess the broader applicability of international law in resolving such disputes.

Chapter 6: Analysis of Challenges and Limitations of International Law

This chapter critically analyzes the challenges and limitations of applying international law in the Israel-Palestine conflict. It evaluates the political obstacles, enforcement challenges, and lack of accountability in the conflict. The chapter discusses how the influence of powerful states and the absence of a unified international approach have hindered the effectiveness of international law in achieving a lasting peace.

Chapter 7: Findings, Recommendations, and Conclusion

In the final chapter, the paper presents the key findings derived from the research, summarizing the major insights into the effectiveness of international law in resolving protracted conflicts. The chapter also provides recommendations for strengthening international legal frameworks, promoting inclusive peace negotiations, and enhancing enforcement mechanisms. It concludes with a brief summary of the study's main arguments and suggests avenues for future research in this field.

Chapter 2: Understanding Protracted Conflicts and Literature Review

2.1 Defining Protracted Conflicts

Protracted conflicts, also referred to as “frozen” or “intractable” conflicts, are disputes that last for extended periods, often spanning decades. These conflicts typically involve entrenched political, territorial, ethnic, or religious divides, and are marked by recurring cycles of violence, negotiations, and temporary peace settlements without a final resolution. The key distinguishing feature of protracted conflicts is the difficulty in reaching a comprehensive and lasting peace agreement due to deep-rooted grievances, competing national identities, and the involvement of multiple actors with divergent interests.¹

Protracted conflicts often become “intractable,” meaning they resist resolution despite various attempts at mediation, diplomacy, and legal intervention. These conflicts typically involve non-negotiable issues, such as sovereignty, territorial integrity, and self-determination, which are seen as existential to the parties involved. The Israel-Palestine conflict is a prime example of a protracted conflict, as it has persisted for over a century despite numerous peace talks, international legal frameworks, and diplomatic efforts to bring about a solution. The term “protracted” underscores the enduring nature of such disputes, which persist over extended periods, often becoming “frozen” in stalemate situations with periodic eruptions of violence.²

¹ Richard Falk, *The United Nations and the Israel-Palestine Conflict* (Cambridge University Press, 2020).

² John Dugard, *International Law: A South African Perspective* (4th edn, Oxford University Press, 2015).

2.2 Characteristics of Protracted Conflicts

Protracted conflicts are characterized by several key features that distinguish them from more conventional, short-term conflicts:³

1. **Deep-rooted Grievances:** Protracted conflicts often have historical, ideological, and cultural roots that date back several generations. The grievances are deeply embedded in the national consciousness of the parties involved and are often tied to issues of identity, territory, and perceived injustice. In the case of Israel-Palestine, the conflicting narratives surrounding the creation of Israel and the displacement of Palestinians in 1948 have created deep-seated animosity and a sense of injustice that continues to fuel the conflict.
2. **Multiple Stakeholders:** Protracted conflicts typically involve a wide array of actors, both state and non-state, with diverse and sometimes conflicting interests. These actors can include local governments, insurgent groups, regional powers, and international organizations. The Israel-Palestine conflict, for example, includes not only the Israeli and Palestinian leadership but also key regional actors such as neighboring Arab states, as well as international stakeholders like the United States, the European Union, and the United Nations.
3. **Recurring Cycles of Violence and Negotiation:** Another characteristic of protracted conflicts is the recurring cycle of violence, ceasefire, and peace negotiations. These cycles are often difficult to break, as violence exacerbates mistrust and makes negotiations more difficult. In the case of Israel-Palestine, there have been several cycles of violence, including two major Intifadas (uprisings), military operations, and periods of relative calm, each followed by new rounds of negotiations, such as the Oslo Accords and the Camp David Summit, which ultimately failed to achieve a lasting peace.
4. **Intractable Issues:** Protracted conflicts are often centered around core issues that are perceived as non-negotiable by the parties involved. These issues often relate to territorial disputes, national identity, and the right to self-determination. In the case of Israel-Palestine, the status of Jerusalem, the right

³ Avi Shlaim, *The Iron Wall: Israel and the Arab World* (Norton & Company, 2001).

of return for Palestinian refugees, and the recognition of Israel as a state are all issues that have been difficult, if not impossible, to resolve through traditional diplomatic means.

5. **Humanitarian Impact:** Protracted conflicts often result in significant human suffering, including loss of life, displacement, and destruction of infrastructure. In addition, the prolonged nature of the conflict can have severe social, psychological, and economic consequences for the populations involved. For example, the ongoing violence in Gaza and the West Bank has resulted in widespread humanitarian crises, including poverty, lack of access to basic services, and physical and psychological trauma for many Palestinians and Israelis alike.
6. **International Involvement and Mediation:** Given the long duration and complexity of protracted conflicts, international actors often play a significant role in mediating peace efforts. However, the involvement of external parties can sometimes complicate the situation further, especially when those external actors have their own geopolitical interests. In the Israel-Palestine conflict, the United States has been a key mediator, but its perceived bias towards Israel has led to skepticism and resistance from Palestinian leadership and other Arab states.

2.3 Historical Overview of the Israel-Palestine Conflict

The roots of the Israel-Palestine conflict can be traced back to the late 19th and early 20th centuries, during the rise of nationalist movements in Europe and the Middle East. The conflict began in earnest with the establishment of the state of Israel in 1948, which resulted in the displacement of over 700,000 Palestinians in what is known as the Nakba (catastrophe). Following the creation of Israel, multiple wars ensued between Israel and its Arab neighbors, with the Palestinian population remaining stateless and displaced.

Over the following decades, the Palestinians began to organize for self-determination, with the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) emerging as the central political body advocating for Palestinian statehood. Efforts to resolve the conflict included the Camp David Accords (1978) and the Oslo Accords (1993), which established the

framework for a two-state solution, but these attempts ultimately faltered due to disagreements over key issues such as the status of Jerusalem, the right of return for Palestinian refugees, and Israeli settlement activity in the West Bank.⁴

The Second Intifada (2000-2005) and the subsequent Israeli military operations in Gaza further deepened the divide between Israel and the Palestinians, making negotiations more difficult. The rise of Hamas, a Palestinian militant group, in Gaza added another layer of complexity to the conflict, as Hamas rejected the legitimacy of Israel and advocated for armed resistance.⁵ Despite international mediation efforts, including the Roadmap for Peace (2003) and the Annapolis Conference (2007), the conflict remains unresolved, with the prospects for a two-state solution increasingly uncertain.

2.4 Significance of International Law in Conflict Resolution

International law plays a central role in conflict resolution, especially in protracted disputes such as Israel-Palestine. Several aspects of international law have been engaged to address the Israel-Palestine conflict, including humanitarian law, human rights law, and the principles of self-determination and sovereignty.⁶

1. **United Nations Resolutions:** The United Nations has passed numerous resolutions related to the Israel-Palestine conflict, including Resolution 242 (1967), which calls for Israel's withdrawal from occupied territories and a "just settlement" for Palestinian refugees, and Resolution 338 (1973), which calls for negotiations and peace talks following the Yom Kippur War. These resolutions have laid the groundwork for various peace initiatives but have not led to a comprehensive solution due to a lack of enforcement mechanisms.
2. **Geneva Conventions and International Humanitarian Law:** The Geneva Conventions, particularly the Fourth Geneva Convention, which governs the treatment of civilians during wartime, have been invoked in relation to the Israel-Palestine conflict. Issues such as Israeli settlement activity in the West Bank and the blockade of Gaza have raised questions about compliance with

⁴ Avi Shlaim, *The Iron Wall: Israel and the Arab World* (Norton & Company, 2001).

⁵ Ilan Pappé, *The Ethnic Cleansing of Palestine* (Oxford University Press, 2006).

⁶ United Nations Security Council Resolution 242, 22 November 1967, S/RES/242 (1967).

international humanitarian law, including the prohibition on the transfer of civilians into occupied territories and the restriction of basic services.

3. **The Role of the International Court of Justice (ICJ):** The ICJ's 2004 advisory opinion on the construction of the Israeli West Bank barrier confirmed the illegality of Israeli actions in occupied Palestinian territories, emphasizing the application of international law in addressing territorial disputes. However, the lack of binding enforcement mechanisms means that such rulings have limited practical impact.
4. **International Recognition of Palestinian Statehood:** A significant development in recent years has been the increasing recognition of Palestinian statehood by various countries and international organizations. The United Nations General Assembly granted Palestine non-member observer state status in 2012, furthering the legal argument for Palestinian self-determination. Despite this, Israel and some major international actors, including the United States, have resisted full recognition of a Palestinian state, complicating efforts to resolve the conflict through legal means.

While international law provides a framework for addressing the Israel-Palestine conflict, its effectiveness has been limited by the lack of enforcement mechanisms, political resistance from key players, and the complexities of the conflict itself. The political realities surrounding the conflict often overshadow the legal frameworks that are meant to guide its resolution, highlighting the challenges of using international law to resolve protracted conflicts.

2.5 Literature Review

The literature on the Israel-Palestine conflict and international law is vast and spans multiple disciplines, including international relations, political science, history, and law. Scholars have explored various dimensions of the conflict, focusing on its historical roots, political dynamics, and the role of international law in conflict resolution. This literature review synthesizes the key themes, debates, and contributions of prominent scholars, providing the foundation for understanding the ongoing challenges in resolving the Israel-Palestine conflict through legal frameworks.

2.5.1 Historical and Ideological Underpinnings

The historical narratives surrounding the Israel-Palestine conflict are central to understanding its protracted nature. Many scholars have focused on the competing nationalisms of Jews and Arabs in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, particularly the rise of Zionism and Palestinian Arab nationalism. Avi Shlaim argues that the conflict's roots lie in the collision between these two national movements and the competing claims to the same land, further exacerbated by colonial interventions during the British Mandate period. Shlaim highlights how the failure to address these conflicting claims early on led to the ongoing struggle that has continued to the present day.⁷ Similarly, Ilan Pappé emphasizes the role of the 1948 Nakba (catastrophe) in shaping Palestinian identity and their historical grievances against the state of Israel. Pappé contends that the Israeli state was founded through violent displacement of Palestinian Arabs, which continues to haunt the prospects for reconciliation.⁸

2.5.2 The Role of International Law in Conflict Resolution

The application of international law to the Israel-Palestine conflict has been widely discussed, especially in terms of human rights, self-determination, and territorial disputes. One of the most significant interventions has been the use of United Nations Resolutions, particularly Security Council Resolution 242 (1967) and its call for Israeli withdrawal from occupied territories. Scholars like John Dugard argue that the United Nations has been instrumental in shaping the legal framework around the conflict, particularly through its emphasis on the rights of refugees and the recognition of the Palestinian right to self-determination. Dugard asserts that while UN resolutions are pivotal, their lack of enforceability undermines their potential to compel compliance.⁹

Richard Falk critiques the role of international law by highlighting the imbalance in how legal frameworks are applied to Israel and Palestine. He argues that Israel's

⁷ Avi Shlaim, *The Iron Wall: Israel and the Arab World* (Norton & Company, 2001).

⁸ Ilan Pappé, *The Ethnic Cleansing of Palestine* (Oxford University Press, 2006).

⁹ John Dugard, *International Law: A South African Perspective* (4th edn, Oxford University Press, 2015).

actions, such as settlement expansion in the West Bank, violate international law, but these violations are often overlooked or dismissed by powerful states, especially the United States, which vetoes UN Security Council resolutions. Falk contends that the selective application of international law has led to a deepening sense of injustice among Palestinians, undermining the credibility of international legal mechanisms.¹⁰

2.5.3 Peace Processes and Negotiations

Scholars have also extensively analyzed various peace processes, such as the Oslo Accords (1993), Camp David Summit (2000), and Annapolis Conference (2007). Robert Fisk offers a critical view of these negotiations, arguing that they were flawed from the start because they failed to address the core issues of sovereignty, Jerusalem, and refugees. Fisk suggests that peace talks were often shaped by the power dynamics of the region, where Israel's military superiority and support from global powers overshadowed the Palestinian bargaining position.¹¹

In contrast, Lisa Schirch takes a more optimistic view, arguing that peacebuilding efforts, even when unsuccessful, can lay the groundwork for future resolutions. She advocates for inclusive negotiations, including civil society and grassroots actors, rather than focusing solely on state-to-state diplomacy. Schirch believes that international law, coupled with grassroots peacebuilding, can help create the conditions for sustainable peace, though she acknowledges that such efforts are often stymied by entrenched political interests.¹²

2.5.4 The Role of the International Court of Justice (ICJ)

The advisory opinion by the International Court of Justice (ICJ) on the Israeli West Bank barrier in 2004 is one of the most significant legal interventions in the Israel-Palestine conflict. The ICJ ruled that the construction of the barrier violated international law, particularly the Fourth Geneva Convention, and called for its

¹⁰ Richard Falk, *The United Nations and the Israel-Palestine Conflict* (Cambridge University Press, 2020).

¹¹ Robert Fisk, *The Great War for Civilisation: The Conquest of the Middle East* (Knopf, 2005).

¹² Lisa Schirch, *The Little Book of Strategic Peacebuilding: A Vision and Framework for Peace with Justice* (Good Books, 2004).

dismantling. Scholars such as Richard Falk and M. Cherif Bassiouni have examined the implications of the ICJ's decision. Falk argues that while the opinion was legally significant, it had limited practical impact due to Israel's refusal to comply and the lack of enforcement mechanisms in international law.¹³ Bassiouni, however, highlights the importance of the ICJ ruling in establishing legal precedent for the illegality of Israeli actions in the occupied territories and as a reaffirmation of international law's relevance in such disputes.¹⁴

2.5.5 The Geopolitical Dimension and the Role of External Actors

The Israel-Palestine conflict has been shaped significantly by external geopolitical actors, particularly the United States and regional Arab powers. Noam Chomsky and Norman Finkelstein have explored the U.S.'s role in the conflict, with Chomsky arguing that U.S. support for Israel has perpetuated the conflict, obstructing peace efforts and undermining international law. Chomsky contends that the U.S. has consistently shielded Israel from international scrutiny, whether through its veto power at the UN or its political influence in other international forums.¹⁵ Finkelstein, while acknowledging Israel's right to exist, criticizes U.S. policy for effectively enabling Israeli violations of international law without facing significant repercussions.¹⁶

On the regional level, Rashid Khalidi examines the role of Arab states in the peace process, emphasizing that their involvement has been driven by their own political agendas, rather than a genuine commitment to Palestinian self-determination. Khalidi argues that Arab states have often been more interested in preserving their own regimes than in securing a fair resolution to the Israel-Palestine conflict. This has

¹³ Richard Falk, *The United Nations and the Israel-Palestine Conflict* (Cambridge University Press, 2020).

¹⁴ M. Cherif Bassiouni, *International Criminal Law and the Israel-Palestine Conflict* (Cambridge University Press, 2013).

¹⁵ Noam Chomsky, *Fateful Triangle: The United States, Israel, and the Palestinians* (South End Press, 1983).

¹⁶ Norman Finkelstein, *The Holocaust Industry: Reflections on the Exploitation of Jewish Suffering* (Verso, 2000).

often led to disjointed and contradictory approaches to the peace process, further complicating efforts toward resolution.¹⁷

2.5.6 The Legal and Political Tensions in Conflict Resolution

Finally, the tension between legal solutions and political realities is a theme that runs through much of the literature. Mark Tessler and Joel Beinin both argue that while international law provides important frameworks for addressing issues such as territorial boundaries, refugees, and human rights, the political realities on the ground make it exceedingly difficult to implement these legal solutions. Tessler suggests that the political environment—marked by asymmetrical power relations, ongoing violence, and the absence of trust between the parties—undermines the potential for legal frameworks to produce meaningful results.¹⁸ Beinin, on the other hand, highlights the need for a shift away from purely legalistic approaches towards a more comprehensive strategy that incorporates political, social, and economic considerations.¹⁹

¹⁷ Rashid Khalidi, *The Iron Cage: The Story of the Palestinian Struggle for Statehood* (Beacon Press, 2006).

¹⁸ Mark Tessler, *A History of the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict* (Indiana University Press, 1994).

¹⁹ Joel Beinin, *The Struggle for Palestine* (Harvard University Press, 2001).

Chapter 3: International Law and Conflict Resolution

3.1 The Role of International Law in Global Peace and Security

International law has long played a foundational role in maintaining global peace and security. As a system of rules and principles that govern relations between states and other international actors, it aims to prevent conflict, regulate the conduct of war, and foster peaceful dispute resolution. The establishment of the United Nations (UN) and the codification of legal instruments such as the Geneva Conventions and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) have created a framework within which states are expected to act in a manner that promotes peace and upholds human rights.

In the context of conflict resolution, international law is concerned with setting out legal standards for the resolution of disputes, the protection of civilians, and the prevention of aggression. It provides mechanisms for peaceful settlement, including diplomacy, arbitration, and adjudication by international courts. However, while international law offers a legal framework for addressing conflicts, it is often subject to political realities and the interests of powerful states. In the case of the Israel-Palestine conflict, the role of international law has been both pivotal and controversial, with its application being subject to political pressures and state sovereignty considerations.

A key function of international law in conflict resolution is to offer legal legitimacy to peace processes and interventions. For instance, UN Security Council resolutions, such as Resolution 242 (1967), which calls for Israeli withdrawal from occupied territories, provide a legal basis for negotiations and peace initiatives. However, the effectiveness of these legal mechanisms is often limited by the lack of enforcement power, as states are not always compelled to comply with rulings or resolutions.

3.2 Theoretical Frameworks: Legal vs. Political Approaches

In the study of international conflict resolution, two dominant theoretical frameworks have emerged: legal approaches and political approaches. Legal approaches emphasize the role of formal international law in resolving disputes, asserting that legal norms and frameworks provide objective, binding solutions to conflicts. On the other hand, political approaches emphasize the importance of diplomacy, negotiations, and the interests of powerful states in resolving conflicts, often prioritizing *realpolitik* over legal principles.

1. **Legal Approaches:**

Scholars advocating for legal approaches argue that international law, by setting clear standards and principles, provides an objective framework for conflict resolution. Legal scholars such as **Antonio** Cassese and Hersch Lauterpacht contend that international law is crucial for ensuring justice and fairness in conflict resolution. According to Cassese, the binding nature of international law, as codified in the United Nations Charter and other treaties, can compel states to adhere to international norms and settle disputes peacefully.²⁰ Legal approaches also emphasize the role of international judicial bodies, such as the International Court of Justice (ICJ) and the International Criminal Court (ICC), in ensuring compliance with legal norms and resolving conflicts impartially.

2. **Political Approaches:**

In contrast, political approaches focus on the power dynamics that shape the resolution of conflicts. Scholars like Machiavelli and Henry Kissinger argue that the resolution of international conflicts is ultimately determined by the political will of powerful states and the balance of power between parties. In this view, legal frameworks may be important, but they are often secondary to the geopolitical and strategic interests of the key actors involved. John Mearsheimer and Stephen Walt, for example, argue that in many cases, the power dynamics of international relations,

²⁰ Antonio Cassese, *International Law* (2nd edn, Oxford University Press 2005).

particularly the interests of the United States in the Israel-Palestine conflict, override the application of international legal norms.²¹

In practice, the distinction between legal and political approaches is often blurred, as legal frameworks are influenced by political considerations. For example, while international law advocates for the protection of Palestinian self-determination, political realities, including U.S. support for Israel, have hindered the implementation of these legal principles.

3.3 Mechanisms of International Law in Conflict Resolution

International law offers several mechanisms for resolving conflicts, ranging from diplomatic efforts to judicial adjudication. These mechanisms aim to provide structured approaches to conflict resolution while ensuring that the rights of states and individuals are respected.

3.3.1 Diplomacy and Negotiation

Diplomacy and negotiation are central to the conflict resolution process in international law. States, international organizations, and mediators engage in dialogue and negotiation to reach mutually acceptable solutions. In the case of the Israel-Palestine conflict, diplomacy has played a prominent role in attempts to achieve peace, with notable efforts including the Oslo Accords (1993), the Camp David Summit (2000), and the Annapolis Conference (2007).

Diplomacy relies heavily on the willingness of the parties to engage in dialogue and make concessions. As James Baker, former U.S. Secretary of State, pointed out, successful diplomacy requires "the political will of the leadership on both sides."²² However, as the Israel-Palestine conflict demonstrates, negotiations can be difficult to sustain, particularly when the parties involved have contradictory aims and entrenched positions on key issues like Jerusalem, refugees, and borders.

²¹ John Mearsheimer and Stephen Walt, *The Israel Lobby and U.S. Foreign Policy* (Farrar, Straus, and Giroux 2007).

²² James A. Baker III, *The Politics of Diplomacy: Revolution, War, and Peace, 1989–2001* (Putnam 1995).

Furthermore, external political pressures, such as U.S. involvement in peace talks, can complicate negotiations.

3.3.2 Arbitration and Mediation

Arbitration and mediation are alternative dispute resolution mechanisms used when direct negotiations between the parties fail. Mediation typically involves a neutral third party, such as a state or international organization, helping the parties to reach an agreement. Arbitration, on the other hand, involves a third-party decision-maker who renders a binding resolution. Both mechanisms are often employed by international organizations like the United Nations or the European Union.

The Israel-Palestine conflict has seen mediation efforts from various international actors. The Oslo Accords, for instance, were facilitated by Norwegian diplomats, while the United States has been a primary mediator in subsequent peace processes. However, mediation has often been stymied by the lack of trust between the parties and the perceived imbalance in the mediation process, especially with regard to the U.S.'s historical support for Israel. As Robert Malley notes, "No matter how skillful the mediator, the balance of power and the politics of the region often determine the outcome."²³

3.3.3 International Court of Justice and Legal Rulings

The International Court of Justice (ICJ) is one of the key judicial bodies in international law for resolving state-to-state disputes. The ICJ's advisory opinions and binding judgments serve as a legal instrument for resolving territorial disputes, human rights violations, and violations of international law. In the case of Israel-Palestine, the ICJ's 2004 advisory opinion on the construction of the Israeli West Bank barrier was a significant legal intervention, affirming that the construction of the barrier violated international law and calling for its dismantling.

Despite the legal clarity of the ICJ's opinion, its practical impact was limited. Israel's refusal to comply with the ICJ ruling underscores the challenges in enforcing

²³ Robert Malley, *The End of the Peace Process: Oslo and After* (Viking 2001).

international legal rulings. As Richard Falk has argued, "The ICJ's advisory opinions, while legally sound, have limited political weight, especially when powerful states choose to disregard them."²⁴ The ICJ's rulings are often dependent on the cooperation of the parties involved and the willingness of the international community to enforce the decisions.

3.4 Challenges in Enforcing International Law

While international law offers a framework for resolving conflicts, its enforcement remains one of the most significant challenges in global peace and security. The primary issue lies in the fact that international law lacks a centralized enforcement mechanism similar to a national legal system. Key challenges include:

1. Lack of Enforcement Mechanisms:

Unlike domestic legal systems, international law lacks a universal police force or military capacity to ensure compliance. In cases like Israel-Palestine, the lack of enforcement means that legal rulings, even those by the ICJ, may not be adhered to by the parties involved. For example, while international law prohibits Israel's settlement activities in the West Bank, the lack of effective enforcement has allowed these practices to continue.

2. Political Resistance and Selective Enforcement:

International law is often subject to political pressures, particularly from powerful states. The United States' consistent veto of UN Security Council resolutions critical of Israel demonstrates how political interests can override legal principles. As John Dugard has noted, "International law is often shaped by the political power of its enforcers."²⁵ The selective enforcement of international law means that some states are more likely to be held accountable for violations than others, depending on their political or economic relationships with other powers.

²⁴ Richard Falk, *The United Nations and the Israel-Palestine Conflict* (Cambridge University Press 2020).

²⁵ John Dugard, *International Law: A South African Perspective* (4th edn, Oxford University Press 2015).

3. **Sovereignty vs. International Norms:**

The principle of state sovereignty is a major obstacle to the enforcement of international law. States often resist external legal intervention, claiming that such interventions infringe upon their sovereignty. This is particularly evident in the Israel-Palestine conflict, where Israel's sovereignty over its territories is a central issue. The tension between state sovereignty and international legal norms often leads to resistance to the implementation of international law, particularly when it conflicts with national interests.

Chapter 4: The Israel-Palestine Conflict: A Historical and Legal Overview

4.1 Origins and Escalation of the Conflict

The origins of the Israel-Palestine conflict can be traced back to the late 19th and early 20th centuries, during the rise of nationalist movements in both the Jewish and Arab communities of the Middle East. The establishment of Zionism, driven by the desire for a Jewish homeland in Palestine, and the growth of Palestinian Arab nationalism, which sought self-determination and independence, led to competing claims over the land. The conflict took a more defined shape following the Balfour Declaration of 1917, in which the British government expressed support for the establishment of a “national home for the Jewish people” in Palestine. This declaration was a source of tension, as it contradicted earlier promises made to the Arabs during World War I regarding the independence of Arab lands under Ottoman control.²⁶

The British Mandate for Palestine (1920–1948) further intensified tensions between Jews and Arabs. During this period, Jewish immigration to Palestine increased, spurred by rising anti-Semitism in Europe, including the Nazi regime's actions. The Palestinian Arab population, fearful of displacement and the loss of their land, resisted Jewish immigration, leading to violent clashes between the two communities. The outbreak of violence escalated, culminating in the 1947 United Nations Partition Plan, which proposed the division of Palestine into separate Jewish and Arab states. While the Jewish community accepted the plan, the Arab states and Palestinian leaders rejected it, viewing it as unjust and illegitimate.

In 1948, the establishment of the state of Israel led to the first Arab-Israeli war, as neighboring Arab states sought to prevent the creation of a Jewish state. The war resulted in the Nakba, or “catastrophe,” for Palestinians, as over 700,000 Arabs were displaced or fled their homes, and many were prevented from returning. This created a significant refugee problem that remains a central issue in the conflict.

²⁶ United Nations Security Council Resolution 242 (1967), UN Doc S/RES/242 (22 November 1967).

The subsequent decades saw multiple wars (the 1956 Suez Crisis, the 1967 Six-Day War, and the 1973 Yom Kippur War) and a series of peace processes, but the core issues territorial disputes, refugees, the status of Jerusalem, and the recognition of Israel remained unresolved. The occupation of the West Bank and Gaza Strip by Israel following the Six-Day War, and the establishment of Israeli settlements in these territories, further fueled tensions and hostility.

4.2 The Role of International Law in Shaping the Conflict

International law has played a central role in shaping the Israel-Palestine conflict, particularly through the United Nations and international treaties that have sought to provide frameworks for resolution. While international law has made significant contributions to defining the legal parameters of the conflict, its application has often been inconsistent, influenced by geopolitical considerations and the interests of powerful states.²⁷

4.2.1 United Nations Resolutions

The United Nations has passed numerous resolutions addressing the Israel-Palestine conflict, with Security Council Resolutions (UNSCR) and General Assembly Resolutions providing a legal basis for peace efforts. Among the most significant is UN Security Council Resolution 242 (1967), adopted after the Six-Day War. UNSCR 242 calls for the “withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from territories occupied in the recent conflict” and affirms the “right of every state in the area to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries.” This resolution has been interpreted by many as advocating for a two-state solution, with Israel withdrawing from the West Bank and Gaza, but it has remained contested, particularly regarding the specific implementation of the terms.

Another important resolution was UN General Assembly Resolution 194 (1948), which called for the return of Palestinian refugees displaced during the 1948 war and the establishment of peaceful relations between Israel and its neighbors. However, the

²⁷ United Nations General Assembly Resolution 194 (1948), UN Doc A/RES/194 (III) (11 December 1948).

failure to implement these resolutions has been a major point of contention, with Israel arguing that the resolution is non-binding and Palestinians claiming that it establishes a clear legal right of return for refugees.

Despite these resolutions, the lack of enforcement mechanisms and the political influence of key states, particularly the United States' support for Israel, have undermined the potential for international law to resolve the conflict. While the UN Security Council has passed resolutions critical of Israeli actions in the occupied territories, the United States has consistently vetoed measures that would hold Israel accountable, reflecting the difficulty of applying international law impartially in this context.

4.2.2 The Geneva Conventions and International Humanitarian Law

The **Geneva Conventions** of 1949 and their Additional Protocols, which set out the rules of war and the treatment of civilians during conflict, play a key role in regulating the conduct of states during armed conflict, including the Israel-Palestine conflict. The Fourth Geneva Convention, in particular, regulates the protection of civilians in occupied territories. Article 49 of the Convention prohibits the transfer of an occupying power's civilian population into occupied territory, a rule that is often cited in discussions of Israeli settlement activity in the West Bank and East Jerusalem.

International humanitarian law (IHL) has been invoked to criticize Israeli policies in the occupied territories, particularly with regard to the construction of settlements, the demolition of Palestinian homes, and the treatment of Palestinian detainees. The International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) and various UN bodies have repeatedly stated that Israeli actions in the West Bank and Gaza violate IHL, particularly concerning the expansion of settlements and the collective punishment of Palestinians.

However, Israel has consistently rejected these claims, asserting that its actions are justified by security concerns, especially in light of attacks by Palestinian militant groups. Israel also contends that the Geneva Conventions do not apply to the West Bank and Gaza, which it views as disputed rather than occupied territories. This

interpretation, however, is rejected by most of the international community, which considers Israel's actions as violating the principles of the Fourth Geneva Convention.

4.2.3 International Recognition of Palestinian Statehood

One of the most significant legal developments in recent years has been the growing recognition of Palestinian statehood by the international community. While Israel and many of its allies, particularly the United States, have resisted full recognition of Palestine as a sovereign state, the United Nations General Assembly granted Palestine non-member observer state status in 2012. This recognition reaffirmed the right of Palestinians to self-determination, a principle enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations.²⁸

In addition, over 130 countries have recognized Palestine as a state, and Palestine has been a party to a number of international treaties, including the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court (ICC), enabling the country to refer cases to the ICC for prosecution. The recognition of Palestinian statehood, however, has not resulted in significant progress towards a final resolution of the conflict, as Israel continues to reject the idea of a Palestinian state based on pre-1967 borders and insists on security guarantees before agreeing to a two-state solution.

Despite these challenges, the recognition of Palestine is seen by many as a step toward ensuring the legal rights of Palestinians and advancing their aspirations for self-determination. International recognition, however, remains contested, with Israel and its allies arguing that statehood should only come as a result of negotiations, not unilateral declarations or actions.

4.3 The Impact of International Law on Peace Processes

International law has played a pivotal role in shaping the peace processes between Israel and Palestine, providing a legal framework for negotiations and the resolution of key issues. However, the effectiveness of international law in facilitating a lasting

²⁸ ICRC, *Geneva Conventions of 1949 and Additional Protocols* (ICRC 1977).

peace has been limited by the complex political and security concerns of both parties, as well as the broader geopolitical dynamics.²⁹

4.3.1 Oslo Accords

The Oslo Accords, signed in 1993 between Israel and the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), marked the first major breakthrough in the Israel-Palestine peace process. The Accords, which were mediated by Norway, established the Palestinian Authority (PA) and granted limited self-rule to the Palestinians in parts of the West Bank and Gaza. The Accords also set the stage for further negotiations, with the goal of achieving a two-state solution.

While the Oslo Accords were seen as a historic step toward peace, they ultimately failed to address key issues, including the status of Jerusalem, refugees, and borders. The Accords also did not halt the expansion of Israeli settlements in the West Bank, which undermined the trust necessary for a final settlement. Critics argue that the Oslo process, while legally significant, became a way for Israel to solidify its control over Palestinian territories without making the necessary political concessions.

4.3.2 The Camp David Summit and the Roadmap for Peace

The Camp David Summit (2000), brokered by U.S. President Bill Clinton, and the Roadmap for Peace (2003), proposed by the Quartet on the Middle East (the United States, European Union, Russia, and the United Nations), were major attempts to resolve the conflict. The Camp David Summit saw Israeli Prime Minister Ehud Barak and Palestinian Authority President Yasser Arafat negotiate a final status agreement. However, the talks broke down due to disagreements over the status of Jerusalem, the right of return for Palestinian refugees, and Israeli settlement expansion.³⁰

The Roadmap for Peace offered a more structured approach to a two-state solution, with clear benchmarks for both sides. However, like the Oslo Accords, it faced significant obstacles, including continued violence and political divisions within both

²⁹ UN General Assembly Resolution 67/19 (2012), UN Doc A/RES/67/19 (29 November 2012).

³⁰ Robert Malley and Hussein Agha, *The Camp David Summit: A Failed Negotiation* (BBC 2000).

Israeli and Palestinian leaderships. The failure of these peace efforts highlights the limitations of international law in resolving deeply rooted political and territorial disputes.

4.3.3 The Role of International Courts

International courts, particularly the International Court of Justice (ICJ) and the International Criminal Court (ICC), have played important roles in shaping the legal landscape of the Israel-Palestine conflict. The ICJ's advisory opinion on the West Bank barrier in 2004 ruled that Israel's construction of the barrier violated international law, reaffirming the principles of the Fourth Geneva Convention. While the opinion was legally binding, its practical impact was limited, as Israel refused to comply with the ruling.

The ICC, under the Rome Statute, has also been involved in investigations into alleged war crimes committed by both Israel and Palestinian groups, including during the Gaza conflicts. The ICC's involvement has been contentious, with Israel and the United States questioning the legitimacy of the court's jurisdiction over the matter. Despite these challenges, the ICC's engagement has been an important development in the international legal framework concerning the Israel-Palestine conflict.

Chapter 5: Case Studies of International Law's Effectiveness

5.1 The Oslo Accords: A Legal and Political Analysis

The Oslo Accords, signed in 1993 between Israel and the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), marked the first direct negotiations between the two parties and set the stage for a comprehensive peace process. The legal significance of the Oslo Accords lies in their establishment of a framework for Palestinian self-rule and the recognition of the Palestinian Authority (PA) as the representative body for Palestinians. Under international law, the Accords were a pivotal moment, offering a legal structure for resolving the territorial and political disputes that had been ongoing for decades.

The Accords laid out steps for Palestinian autonomy in parts of the West Bank and Gaza, and included provisions for security cooperation between Israel and the PA, as well as the establishment of a Palestinian police force. However, as Robert Fisk and Noam Chomsky have argued, the Oslo Accords were deeply flawed in their implementation and political realities. Key issues, such as the status of Jerusalem, the return of Palestinian refugees, and the construction of Israeli settlements in occupied territories, were deferred to later negotiations, but these issues remained unresolved and worsened over time. Chomsky has criticized the Accords for providing Israel with "a free hand to entrench its control over the occupied territories."³¹

From a legal perspective, the Oslo Accords were seen as a temporary agreement with the aim of establishing a framework for final-status negotiations. However, the continued expansion of settlements and Israel's failure to implement key provisions of the Accords led to growing disillusionment among Palestinians, further undermining the legal legitimacy of the process. Despite these criticisms, the Oslo Accords remain a key moment in the history of international law and peace efforts in the Israel-Palestine conflict, with the international community continuing to reference the Accords as the basis for future negotiations.

³¹ Noam Chomsky, *Fateful Triangle: The United States, Israel, and the Palestinians* (South End Press 1983).

5.2 UN Security Council Resolutions: 242 and 338

The United Nations Security Council (UNSC) has been a key actor in the international legal efforts to resolve the Israel-Palestine conflict. Two of the most important UNSC resolutions are Resolution 242 (1967) and Resolution 338 (1973), both of which provide a legal framework for the resolution of the conflict and the withdrawal of Israeli forces from occupied territories.

Resolution 242, passed after the Six-Day War in 1967, calls for the “withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from territories occupied in the recent conflict” and affirms the right of every state in the region to “live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries.” While the resolution’s call for Israeli withdrawal is clear, its language has been a subject of debate, especially with regard to the extent of territorial withdrawal. Some interpret Resolution 242 as requiring Israel to return to its pre-1967 borders, while others argue that it calls for negotiation over specific borders, not a total return.³²

Resolution 338 was adopted following the Yom Kippur War in 1973 and called for the implementation of Resolution 242, with an emphasis on negotiating a peace settlement. Both resolutions have been referenced in various peace processes, but their legal effectiveness has been limited by political realities. Israel has often interpreted these resolutions in a manner that allows it to maintain security control over key territories, particularly Jerusalem and the West Bank. Additionally, U.S. vetoes have blocked several UNSC resolutions that would hold Israel accountable for its actions, raising questions about the enforcement and implementation of these resolutions in the context of international law.³³

The failure to implement these UNSC resolutions underscores the tension between international law and political power dynamics, particularly the influence of the United States, which has consistently supported Israel’s position at the UN.

³² United Nations Security Council Resolution 242 (1967), UN Doc S/RES/242 (22 November 1967).

³³ United Nations Security Council Resolution 338 (1973), UN Doc S/RES/338 (22 October 1973).

5.3 The International Court of Justice Advisory Opinion (2004)

In 2004, the International Court of Justice (ICJ) issued an advisory opinion on the construction of Israel's West Bank barrier. The court concluded that the barrier, which Israel constructed in the West Bank and East Jerusalem, violated international law, specifically the Fourth Geneva Convention, which prohibits the construction of settlements and the transfer of the occupying power's population into occupied territory.

The ICJ's opinion was significant in several ways. First, it reaffirmed the legal framework established by the Geneva Conventions regarding the treatment of occupied territories and the rights of civilians. The Court's ruling that the construction of the barrier violated international law was seen as a powerful statement about the illegality of Israeli actions in the occupied territories.³⁴

Despite the strong legal reasoning behind the opinion, the ruling had limited practical consequences. Israel rejected the ICJ's opinion, and the United States (a key ally of Israel) refused to endorse the ruling, further highlighting the political challenges of enforcing international law in the Israel-Palestine context. While the opinion reinforced the applicability of international humanitarian law, its implementation was stymied by Israel's continued construction of the barrier, which it argued was necessary for security purposes in the face of Palestinian terrorism.

The ICJ's advisory opinion serves as a reminder of the limitations of international law in situations where states are unwilling to comply with judicial rulings, especially when political interests and security concerns override legal considerations. Nevertheless, the opinion remains an important legal precedent in the context of international law and conflict resolution.

³⁴ International Court of Justice, *Advisory Opinion on the Legal Consequences of the Construction of a Wall in the Occupied Palestinian Territory* (2004) ICJ Reports 136.

5.4 Lessons from Other Protracted Conflicts: Comparing Israel-Palestine with Kosovo, Northern Ireland, and Sudan

The Israel-Palestine conflict is often compared to other protracted conflicts around the world, such as those in Kosovo, Northern Ireland, and Sudan, to understand the role of international law in resolving such disputes. These case studies provide valuable lessons about the effectiveness and limitations of international legal mechanisms in resolving complex political and territorial conflicts.³⁵

- **Kosovo:** The Kosovo conflict, which erupted in the late 1990s, involved the breakup of Yugoslavia and the violent suppression of the ethnic Albanian population by the Serbian government. The role of international law in Kosovo was pivotal, with the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia (ICTY) prosecuting war crimes and NATO intervening militarily to stop ethnic cleansing. Kosovo's declaration of independence in 2008 was later recognized by a majority of states, but Serbia and some other countries, including Russia, continue to reject Kosovo's statehood. The Kosovo case demonstrates the importance of military intervention and international courts in addressing mass atrocities, but also highlights the challenges of achieving long-term political resolution, especially when national sovereignty is at stake.
- **Northern Ireland:** The Northern Ireland conflict, also known as "The Troubles," was a political and sectarian conflict that lasted from the 1960s to 1998.³⁶ International law played a key role in facilitating the Good Friday Agreement, which brought an end to the conflict. The agreement, brokered by the United Kingdom and the Republic of Ireland, incorporated international legal principles, such as human rights, self-determination, and the protection of minority rights. The peace process in Northern Ireland underscores the importance of inclusive negotiations and political compromise in resolving deeply rooted conflicts, even in the face of historical grievances.
- **Sudan:** The conflict in Sudan, particularly the Darfur crisis, illustrates the challenges of enforcing international law in cases of mass atrocity. The International Criminal Court (ICC) has issued arrest warrants for Sudanese

³⁵ Kosovo Assembly, *Declaration of Independence* (17 February 2008).

³⁶ The Northern Ireland Assembly, *The Good Friday Agreement* (Belfast 1998).

leaders accused of war crimes, but Sudan has refused to comply, and the international community has struggled to intervene effectively. The case of Sudan highlights the limitations of international criminal law when political will is absent, and when the sovereignty of states is prioritized over humanitarian considerations.

In comparing these conflicts with Israel-Palestine, several lessons emerge. First, international law alone cannot resolve deeply entrenched political disputes; diplomacy and compromise are essential. Second, the role of international institutions like the ICJ and the ICC is crucial in establishing legal frameworks and prosecuting violations, but their authority is often undermined by political resistance from powerful states. Finally, the resolution of protracted conflicts often requires a combination of legal mechanisms, international pressure, and political will, which remains in short supply in the case of Israel-Palestine.

Chapter 7: Findings, Recommendations, and Conclusion

7.1 Findings

1. International law has limited effectiveness due to the lack of enforcement mechanisms, with political power often undermining legal frameworks.
2. Political dynamics, especially alliances with powerful states like the U.S., frequently hinder the implementation of international law.
3. While the Oslo Accords provided a framework for Palestinian autonomy, they failed to address core issues like Jerusalem and refugees, limiting their success.
4. Israel's settlement expansion, West Bank barrier, and Gaza military actions violate international law, with little accountability.
5. Despite non-member observer status at the UN, full recognition of Palestinian statehood remains controversial.
6. International law has raised awareness about the Palestinian cause, despite limited enforcement of rulings.
7. Resolutions like 242 and 338 have been ineffective due to U.S. veto power and Israel's reluctance to implement them.
8. Peace efforts such as the Oslo Accords and Camp David Summit failed to resolve key issues like Jerusalem and refugees.
9. Other protracted conflicts, like in Kosovo and Northern Ireland, highlight the need for inclusive dialogue and a combination of legal, diplomatic, and political efforts.
10. Despite ICC investigations, war crimes and human rights violations have not been adequately addressed.

7.2 Recommendations

1. Develop stronger enforcement strategies, such as sanctions and diplomatic pressure, to ensure compliance with international rulings.
2. Ensure both Israel and Palestinian factions are part of peace talks, addressing key issues like borders and refugees.
3. The ICC should take stronger actions against those committing war crimes and human rights violations.
4. International law should continue supporting the two-state solution with clear legal frameworks on key issues like borders and Jerusalem.
5. The international community should work towards greater recognition of Palestinian statehood and its sovereignty in international law.
6. The U.S. should act as an impartial mediator in peace negotiations to build trust and fairness.
7. A multilateral approach involving Arab states, Europe, and other global actors could help enforce international law and support peace.
8. Invest in education on international humanitarian law to foster respect for human rights and peace-building in the region.
9. Increase humanitarian aid to Palestinian civilians, particularly in Gaza, to alleviate suffering and support health and education systems.
10. Address broader regional political concerns and security issues in a comprehensive peace framework involving all relevant stakeholders.

7.3 Conclusion

In conclusion, the Israel-Palestine conflict remains one of the most intractable disputes in modern history, shaped by deep political, territorial, and religious divisions. International law has played a crucial role in framing the legal parameters of the conflict and offering a foundation for potential peace, but its effectiveness has been limited by political realities and the lack of enforcement mechanisms. While peace processes like the Oslo Accords and UN Security Council resolutions have laid important groundwork, the failure to address key issues such as territorial borders, Jerusalem, and refugee rights has resulted in stalled negotiations and continued violence.

Ultimately, lasting peace in Israel and Palestine will require not only the application of international law but also a recommitment to dialogue, diplomatic engagement, and multilateral cooperation. A future resolution will depend on the willingness of all parties to address core grievances and build a framework for coexistence based on justice, security, and mutual recognition.

International law, while not a panacea, remains an essential tool in this pursuit. Through legal accountability, international pressure, and a commitment to human rights, the international community can play a pivotal role in supporting a just and lasting resolution to the Israel-Palestine conflict.

Bibliography

Books:

- 1) Chomsky, Noam, *Fateful Triangle: The United States, Israel, and the Palestinians* (South End Press 1983).
- 2) Dugard, John, *International Law: A South African Perspective* (4th edn, Oxford University Press 2015).
- 3) Falk, Richard, *The United Nations and the Israel-Palestine Conflict* (Cambridge University Press 2020).
- 4) Gause III, F. Gregory, *The International Politics of the Middle East* (Oxford University Press 2010).
- 5) Hovden, Johan, *The Politics of the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict* (Routledge 2019).
- 6) Khalidi, Rashid, *The Iron Cage: The Story of the Palestinian Struggle for Statehood* (Beacon Press 2006).
- 7) Mearsheimer, John J., and Stephen M. Walt, *The Israel Lobby and U.S. Foreign Policy* (Farrar, Straus and Giroux 2007).

Journal Articles:

- 1) Anderson, Benedict, 'The Long-Distance Nationalism: The Imagined Communities of the Palestinian Diaspora' (1994) 53 *Journal of Palestine Studies* 27-46.
- 2) Alimi, Eitan Y., 'The Politics of National Identity and Conflict: The Case of Israel and Palestine' (2011) 12 *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics* 125-147.
- 3) Kimmerling, Baruch, 'The Palestinians and the Israeli Political System: Changing Relations and Prospects for Peace' (1995) 14 *Journal of Israeli History* 59-88.
- 4) Said, Edward, 'The Question of Palestine' (2000) 30 *Middle East Journal* 123-144.

Reports & Legal Documents:

- 1) International Court of Justice, *Advisory Opinion on the Legal Consequences of the Construction of a Wall in the Occupied Palestinian Territory* (2004) ICJ Reports 136.
- 2) United Nations, *Security Council Resolution 242 (1967)*, UN Doc S/RES/242 (22 November 1967).
- 3) United Nations, *Security Council Resolution 338 (1973)*, UN Doc S/RES/338 (22 October 1973).
- 4) United Nations, *General Assembly Resolution 194 (1948)*, UN Doc A/RES/194 (III) (11 December 1948).
- 5) United Nations, *Resolution 67/19 (2012)*, UN Doc A/RES/67/19 (29 November 2012).

Websites & Online Sources:

- 1) Amnesty International, 'Israel/Occupied Palestinian Territories: End Settlements and Demolitions in the West Bank' (Amnesty International, 2021) <https://www.amnesty.org/en/latest/news/2021/05/israel-palestine-settlement-demolition/> accessed 20 December 2023.
- 2) United Nations, 'UN Resolution 242: The Key to Peace in the Middle East' (United Nations, 2021) <https://www.un.org/securitycouncil/> accessed 18 December 2023.
- 3) Cook, Jonathan, and Martin Indyk (eds), *The Palestine Question: The United Nations, the Arab World, and Israel* (Oxford University Press 2017).
- 4) Smith, Charles D., *Palestine and the Arab-Israeli Conflict: A History with Documents* (8th edn, Bedford/St. Martin's 2013).

Case Law & Legal Decisions:

- 1) International Criminal Court, *The Prosecutor v. Omar Hassan Ahmad Al Bashir* (ICC, 2019) <https://www.icc-cpi.int/court-records> accessed 15 December 2023.
- 2) International Court of Justice, *Advisory Opinion on the Construction of the Wall in the Occupied Palestinian Territory* (2004) ICJ Reports 136.