

The Israel-Palestine Dispute and the United States of America's Peace Intervention

OSUCHUKWU, Nkechi Cynthia (Ph.D)

Department of Political Science, Chukwuemeka Odumegwu Ojukwu University, Igbariam, Anambra State Nigeria

Email address: cn.osuchukwu@coou.edu

Abstract: *This paper examined the intervention of the United States of America on the Israel-Palestine dispute over Jerusalem. It specifically explored the thrust of policy of the U.S. on the raging Israel-Palestine conflict especially appreciating their strengths and weaknesses. In doing, it assessed the level of impact or implications of the ongoing U.S. peace initiatives as well as those initiated by the major stakeholders at the various levels on the peaceful settlement of the Israel-Palestine conflict. Methodologically, the research was piloted using the secondary sources of recorded documents, hovering on the context of power school as its analytical framework. The research design was purely historical in nature. At this end, it was found that U.S intervention in the said dispute was very apt, as the intervention in question necessitate the declaration of Jerusalem of the sole capital of Israel.*

Keywords: Jerusalem, Intervention, Dispute, Israel, Palestine, USA

Introduction

The Israel-Palestine conflict started at the middle of the nineteenth century. The partition plan, also known as Resolution 181, was adopted by the UN in 1947 and aimed to create separate Arab and Jewish states inside the Palestinian Mandate by the British. Israel as a country was established on 14 May, 1948, which precipitated the initial Israeli-Arab War. Although Israel won the war in 1949, 750,000 Palestinians were evicted from their homes, and the region was divided into three parts: the State of Israel, the West Bank and the Gaza Strip.

The region had increased tensions during the coming years, mainly between Israel and Egypt, Jordan, and Syria. In response to 1956 of the Suez Crisis and Israel's invasion of the Sinai Peninsula, Egypt, Jordan, and Syria signed agreements for mutual defense in the hope that Israel may send soldiers to the region. In response to Egyptian President Abdel Gamal Nasser's moves, Israel conducted a preemptive strike against Egyptian and Syrian air forces in June 1967, kicking off the Six-Day War. Following the fight, Israel took control of Syria's Golan Heights, East Jerusalem and Jordan's West Bank and Gaza Strip and Egypt's Sinai Peninsula. Egypt and Syria suddenly attacked Israel from two fronts six years later in what is now known as the Yom Kippur War or the October War in an effort to retake territory lost. Although neither Egypt nor Syria gained much from the conflict—neither did Israel or Syria—Egyptian President Anwar al-Sadat hailed the conflict as a success for Egypt because it allowed Egypt and Syria to negotiate over previously ceded territory. In 1917, the British took control of Palestine from the Ottomans throughout World War I, and on November 2, 1917, they made a "national homeland" commitment to the Jews there in the Balfour Declaration. Palestinians publicly opposed the move for the first time at a gathering in Jerusalem in 1919. The League of Nations outlined the responsibilities of a British mandate in Palestine in 1922, including making sure that "the Jewish national home" was established (The Hindu, 2017). The British Mandate of Palestine was split into Arab and Jewish states by the partition plan, commonly known as Resolution 181, which the UN approved in 1947. The first Arab-Israeli War, which began on 14 May, 1948, and was ultimately won by Israel, and 1949 marked the end of it. Again, it was spurred by the establishment of the State of Israel. The State of Israel, Gaza Strip and the West Bank were the results of a third division. While the West Bank, which contains east Jerusalem, is ceded to Jordan, the Gaza Strip is granted to Egypt. (2021 CFR; 2017 The Hindu). The major outbreak of the violence in the ongoing Israel-Palestine conflicts commenced on 10 May 2021, though distributed tools place earlier and continued until a ceasefire came into effect on 21 May. The return of numerous core Palestinian Arab nationalists from Damascus to Palestine, led by Haj Amin al-Husseini, emphasized the rise of Palestinian Arab nationalist fight for the construction of a national home for Palestinian Arabs. As Sela (2002) informed, Amin al-Husseini, whose leadership promoted Immediately, the Palestinian Arab national movement marked Jewish national movement and Jewish immigration to Palestine as the sole enemy to his cause, initiating large-scale anti-Jewish riots occurred as early as 1920 in Jerusalem and 1921 in Jaffa. Among the consequences of the fighting was the formation of the Jewish paramilitary force Haganah. In 1929, the Arab leadership encouraged a series of deadly conflicts and riots against Jews. As a result of the disturbances in Hebron and Safed, Jews were evacuated from both cities (Sela, 2002).

Many militant Arab nationalists from various Middle Eastern countries, mainly Syria, were lured to the Arab national battle in Palestine in the 1930s. These militants created the Black Hand militant organization and started the Arab rebellion of 1936. The death of Qassam by the British in late 1935 heightened tensions, culminating in the Arab general strike and universal boycott in 1936. The Arab insurrection in Palestine against the British and the Jews, which was bloodily suppressed from 1936 to 1939, developed into significant bloodshed throughout that time. The British defeated several Arab organizations during the first phase of the fighting, which lasted until early 1937, and they forcibly drove out much of the Arab leadership. The insurrection resulted in the

creation of the Peel Commission to divide Palestine, although the Palestinian Arabs later rejected it. The two main Jewish leaders, Chaim Weizmann and David Ben-Gurion, welcomed the recommendations but some other Jewish leaders rejected it (Morris, 2001; Louis, 2006; Tomis, 1997).

A record of 5,000 People were murdered in the battle, largely on the Arab side, as it proceeded to escalate. However, under the leadership of the Nashashibi clan, the Mandatory Palestine situation was calmed by the start of World War II, which also facilitated the establishment of the Jewish-Arab Palestine Regiments, which later came under British control and fought the Germans in North Africa. However, The extremist al-Hussein faction, which at the time was exiled, tended to maintain its cooperation with Nazi Germany and helped spread a pro-Nazi propaganda machine throughout the Arab world. Despite his repeated requests that the Italians and the Germans blow up Tel Aviv, Al Hussein was unable to launch military operations in Palestine after the Arab nationalists were expelled from Iraq and deported to Nazi-occupied Europe. Due to a crisis over what would happen to the Holocaust survivors from Europe, tensions between the Yishuv as well as the Palestinian Arab leadership had risen at the end of World War II. As a response, the British implemented immigration quotas, which resulted in increased illegal immigration and Zionist violence against the British (Sela, 2002).

In order to avoid a situation like the 1956 Suez Crisis and Israel's invasion of the Sinai Peninsula, Egypt, Jordan, and Syria intended to coordinate their military actions. Egypt's and Syria's troops lost control of the Sinai Peninsula, the Gaza Strip, the West Bank, and East Jerusalem after Israel's victory over their forces in the Six-Day War in June 1967. On the Golan Heights, Syria lost. In the Yom Kippur War, also referred to as the October War, which took place six years later, Israel triumphed over both Egypt and Syria.

The 1979 Camp David Accord, which was achieved after a thirty-year battle between Egypt and Israel, did not lead to an improvement in relations between Israel and its neighbors because of the unsolved issue of Palestinian self-determination and self-governance (Hesham, 2020). Palestinians in the West Bank and Gaza Strip began to revolt against Israeli control in 1987, beginning the first intifada. In addition to addressing the conflict, the 1993 Oslo I Accords encouraged mutual recognition between Israel's government and the newly established Palestinian Authority. They also gave the Palestinians in the West Bank and Gaza a mechanism for self-governance. The Oslo II Accords, which were signed in 1995 and expanded upon the original accord, mandated Israel's complete departure from 6 cities and 450 communities in the West Bank (CFR, 2021; The Hindu, 2017).

The main points of contention between Israel and Palestine are: mutual recognition, borders, security, and human rights; possession of Jerusalem; Israeli settlements; and the right of return for the Palestinian people (Lozowick, 2013; World Bank, 2017). The construction of a separate Palestinian state to live with Israel, which has existed since 1948, has been the subject of numerous attempts to broker a two-state solution. Israelis and Palestinians are still at odds, despite a protracted peace attempt and Israel's wide-ranging rapprochement with Egypt and Jordan. Mutual mistrust, considerable disputes over fundamental issues, and reciprocal skepticism about the other side's commitment to upholding duties in a final agreement have all hampered the peace process (Dershowitz, 2005; Kurtzer, and Lasensky, 2008). Consequently, Israel and the Palestinians have been at odds over who has the right to the Holy Land, including Jerusalem, for many years, and the conflict has remained one of the most unresolvable in the world.

The United States Policy on the Israel-Palestine Dispute

The US has made significant efforts to mediate and negotiate an end to the Israel-Palestine dispute. The possibility of achieving a lasting peace accord is undermined by a number of factors, including as the entrenched differences between and among the main players and stakeholders and the decreasing commitment of American officials to honoring many of the agreements. Even though it is Israel's staunchest supporter, the United States has consistently pushed for a diplomatic and policy remedy that would settle the opposing claims of the two parties to Jerusalem.

Essentially, fair and equitable treatment of all parties to the dispute including Christian, Jewish and Arab identities formed a key component of the United States policy towards disputed Holy land of Jerusalem after the rise of the Zionist movement in the late 19th century and the formation of Israel's independence in 1948. This has played a consistent role that both Christian and Jewish concepts have played in the longer history of U.S. policy and its peace initiatives (Dov, 2017; Hesam 2022; Sara, 2004; Orevi, 2013; Smith, 2013; Hummel, 2019).

The U.S White House released U.S policy statement toward the Israel-Palestine disputed conflict. The US policy statement on the Israel-Palestine conflict which is clearly documented on eight key thematic areas is built on the following policy frameworks:

1. **Peace vision:** This strives to provide both Israel and the Palestinian people with peace, security, dignity, and opportunity
2. **Diplomatic accomplishments:** This involves the use of diplomacy to bring Israeli political foes together in favour of established peace initiatives so as to foster better cooperation between Israel and its neighbours.
3. **Mutual respect and independence:** This is based on the return of Palestinians and Israelis to their homelands

4. **Israel's Security:** This policy assesses Israel's security needs to ensure Israel does not accumulate enhanced security hazards, and that it is able to protect itself from any encroaching threats on its own
5. **Holy Land and Jerusalem:** Israel is to maintain the responsibility to safeguard the Holy Sites and allow freedom of worship for the Jewish people, Christians and Muslims
6. **Palestine's Future State:** While Jerusalem serves as Israel's capital, this strategy provides significant territorial space to Palestinians; on the contrary, Al-Quds, which includes sections of East Jerusalem, will serve as the capital of the State of Palestine.
7. **Normalization:** This policy is aiming at putting a stop to long period of refugee status quo in addition to transforming the region in order to ensure greater stability, security, and more opportunities for development and human prosperity.
8. **Regional prosperity:** This policy aims to open up the great potentials of progress in the region held hostage by long years of conflict. In the territory, there is a \$50 billion dedicated trust fund for the Peace to Prosperity economic strategy (White House Statement, 2020).

Israel-Palestine Peace Agreements

(i) The Oslo Peace Treaty of 1993

In 1993, Yitzhak Rabin worked with other Israeli authorities, including Yasser Arafat, who represented Palestinian leaders from the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), to organize a peace effort known as the Oslo peace process. A significant step forward in this peace process was begun by Yasser Arafat's letter of commendation. The letter was a letter of support for the Israeli state's right to exist. The parties solidified the 1993 Oslo Accords on this basis, and other stakeholders as a sustainable framework for future Israeli-Palestinian relations (Gelvin, 2014). The Oslo accord also guaranteed that, in order to secure long-term peace in the region, Israel would relinquish control of the Palestinian territories to the Palestinians. It also permitted the PLO to return from Tunisia and form the Palestinian National Authority in the West Bank and Gaza Strip (Chris, 1994).

Unfortunately, the Oslo approach was complex and created more confusion as the agreement was not clearly defined on which side will control the contested Jerusalem holy site, whether the Israelis or the Palestinians. Meanwhile, the process was frustrated with Yitzhak Rabin's assassination. The Oslo accord suffered more setbacks as Ehud Barak and Yasser Arafat were unable to strike conclusive agreement in July 2000 at Camp David (CFR, 2017). A key factor that undermined the Oslo peace initiative was the overwhelming resistance mounted by the radical Islamic groups of Palestinian history, like Hamas and Palestinian Islamic Jihad. These radical elements wasted no time in starting a string of attacks that were specifically directed towards Israelis. Thousands of people died as a result, and radical anti-government propaganda grew in strength, which ultimately resulted in the murder of Israeli Prime Minister Rabin, who was purportedly slain by a fanatic who opposed the peace movement. The newly elected Israeli government withdrew from the peace negotiations as a result, dealing a significant setback to the peace aspirations (Sela, 2002).

(ii) Camp David Peace Accord

Accordingly, nearly 14 months of diplomatic negotiations between Egypt, Israel, and the United States, led at the time by President Jimmy Carter, resulted in the Camp David Accords. Jimmy Carter, the president of the U.S, helped broker the Camp David peace accord between Israel, Egypt, and the United States in 1978. Carter's decision to organize the peace talks was based on a Brookings Institution report's recommendation that he replace the fragmented bilateral peace talks held during Henry Kissinger's shuttle diplomacy after the 1973 Yom Kippur War with a more robust, palatable, and long-lasting multilateral approach. Two accords were created by the Camp David Peace Accord to serve as the framework for upcoming Middle East diplomacy (Stein, 1999; Jimmy, 2003).

The initial pact was known as the "Framework for Peace in the Middle East." It demanded talks between Egypt, Israel, Jordan, and the Palestinians over their right to self-government in the West Bank and Gaza. Compliance by all parties with United Nations Security Council Resolution 242 was the cornerstone acknowledged for a peaceful resolution to the conflict between Israel and its neighbors. A "land for peace" idea that would serve as the cornerstone of future Arab-Israeli discussions was precisely what the UN Security Council Resolution 242 asked for (see UN Security Council Res. 242, 1967). In accordance with Chapter VI of the UN Charter, the UN Security Council unanimously approved Resolution 242 (S/RES/242) on November 22, 1967, in the wake of the Six-Day War.

The Resolution urges respect for (a) acknowledges the achievement of a just and permanent peace in the Middle East and demands the removal of Israeli armed forces from the territories they have been occupying since winning the Six-Day War; and; (b) It rejected any claims of occupying forces or belligerent nations and urged respect for each state's sovereignty, territorial integrity, and political independence as well as their right to exist in peace within secure and recognized borders without being

subjected to coercion or intimidation (UN Security Council, 1967). In accordance with the terms of the Camp David Peace Agreement, Israel, Egypt, Jordan, and the Palestinians were required to convene a meeting to discuss the "legitimate rights of the Palestinian people" and to carry out the process of realizing those rights in a way that would grant the population complete autonomy within five years. In accordance with UN Security Council Resolution 242, the parties to the peace agreement stipulated that Israeli troops would withdraw from the West Bank and Gaza following elections for a self-governing body to take the place of Israel's military government (IMFA, 2021; Jimmy, 2003). The Golan Heights, Syria, or Lebanon were not mentioned in the Accords. During the previous American presidential changeover, Kissinger, Ford, Carter, or Sadat had a more comprehensive peace in mind than this (IMFA, 2021). Unfortunately, this accord noticeably left out the Jerusalem problem (Lewis, 2018). The UN General Assembly, however, rejected this original accord (A Framework for Peace in the Middle East) in the Palestinian territories, stating that the Palestinian parties were not involved in the deal's development. The second agreement of the Camp David Accords called for a peace treaty between Egypt and Israel. Later, in 1979, at the American White House, Egypt and Israel formally approved the deal (CFR, 2017; Jimmy, 2003). In July 2000, the Camp David Summit was held. It was a peace endeavor started by US President Bill Clinton in July 2000 that included a meeting between Israeli Prime Minister Ehud Barak and Palestinian President Yasser Arafat (Stein, 1999).

The principal options given as the basis for the peace process by Israeli Prime Minister Ehud Barak were a non-militarized Palestinian state divided into three or four sections that would include the whole Gaza Strip as well as 87-92% of the West Bank (Pressman, 2003; Karsh, 2003). The proposal also stated that Israel should receive control of the Jordan Valley while maintaining control over some 69 Jewish settlements (representing 85% of the West Bank's Jewish settlers), the Temple Mount, and any central East Jerusalem neighborhoods. The right of the settlers to return to Israel would be denied (Pressman, 2003). However, Yasser Arafat who represented the PLO, refused to accept this proposal as the Palestinian parties claimed that the arrangement failed to take away most of the Israeli's control and occupation in the contested areas especially regarding land, Jerusalem, security, and settlements (Pressman, 2003). Despite the chance provided by President Clinton to Arafat to propose a new plan that will ensure lasting solution, Arafat failed to come up with any counter-proposal. Despite the fervent efforts made by the United States and other stakeholders to mediate peace and restore peace and security in the region, the impasse in the Camp David Peace Accord demonstrated how difficult it is to develop a generally acceptable and tenable peace solution that would satisfactorily address Israeli and Palestinian demands.

The guiding premise was to give the Palestinians autonomy over the Arab regions while giving the Israelis control over the Jewish regions. The separation of the holy sites would keep the Western Wall under Israeli sovereignty and the Temple Mount and Noble Sanctuary under Palestinian control. Israeli comprehensive acknowledgement of responsibility for the harm done to the Palestinians in 1948, monetary restitution, and the right to return to the fledgling Palestinian State were also agreed upon. The negotiations asked for an international army to secure the borders and a "non-militarized" Palestinian state. Israelis and Palestinians welcomed the suggestion as a starting point for upcoming peace negotiations (Pressman, 2003).

(iii) Taba Summit 2001

The Israeli delegation to the Taba Peace Summit in Egypt in January 2001 drew up a fresh map. Previously, Israel insisted on "temporarily Israeli controlled" zones, but this recent plan departs from that position. The Palestinian parties welcomed this new plan as an acceptable framework for conducting future peace talks (Gold, 2007). However, the pace was hindered by the upcoming election in Israel at the time and progress of this peace arrangement and could not allow it to materialize. Following the rounds of negotiations, a joint statement was issued by the two parties. According to their statement, the parties from the both sides maintained the fact that they are too near to brokering an acceptable agreement by all parties and they vehemently affirm that all other areas not yet addressed will be conclusively finalized once they resumed negotiations after the forthcoming elections in Israel. However, after Ariel Sharon, a candidate for the Likud party, defeated Ehud Barak in the Israeli elections and was chosen as prime minister of Israel on February 7, 2001, future peace efforts based on the Taba Summit became impossible. The ongoing Taba peace initiatives were dropped by Sharon's new administration. (Pressman, 2003)

(iv) Arab Peace Initiative

Saudi Arabia's Prince Abdullah proposed for an Arab peace initiative during the Beirut Summit in 2002. In order to end the general Arab-Israeli conflict as well as the Israel-Palestine conflict specifically, the Arab peace proposal is an essential step towards restoring and establishing peace (Jerome, 2020). Despite the 2002 introduction of the proposal, the Riyadh Summit in 2007 helped to expedite a later agreement over the peace initiative (BBC News, 2007). The peace accord stated that the UN boundaries drawn before the 1967 Six-Day War would serve as the basis for the so-called final solution borders. The peace agreement ensured that Israel and the other parties' relations would be revived and improved, with the understanding that Israel would withdraw its military forces from all the regions it is occupying, including the Golan Heights. The motion called for the establishment of an independent Palestinian state in the West Bank and Gaza Strip, with East Jerusalem serving as its capital. The plan included a demand for "a just solution for the Palestinian refugees" (Ynet News, 2009). However, some key parties from the Israeli side have expressed dissatisfaction with the Arab peace initiative and have made strong criticism of the plan, in some cases, rejecting it outright. The Israeli government disagreed with many of the key decisions made in the peace initiative, particularly those that dealt with the

"red line," the Palestinian refugee crisis, issues related to domestic security, and the character of Jerusalem. This notwithstanding, the Arab League has remained unwavering and focused in its bid to market the Arab peace initiative to Israel as a possible solution to resolving the protracted conflict. In this regard, important talks and meetings have continued between the League and Israeli parties (Ynet News, 2009).

Peace initiatives of the United States and Impingement on the Peaceful Settlement of the Israel-Palestine Dispute over Jerusalem

a. The Two-State Solution

Among others, the Oslo Peace Accord, Camp David Accord, UN Resolution 242, Taba Peace Talk, and Arab Peace Initiative have all resulted in contradictory agreements that, in most cases, are either abandoned by the parties or misunderstood, resulting in poor implementation on which the conflict is escalated. Many of the peace accords that the parties to the Israel-Palestine conflict have signed have favored the establishment of two states, with Israel and Palestine coexisting in Jerusalem as well as the disputed territories of the West Bank, Gaza Strip, and Golan Heights. Specifically, the UN Resolution 242 called for the PLO and all other Palestinians living in other nations to return to their undefined "homeland." Unfortunately, this led to an escalation of the conflict because the majority of the returnees were radicals who went on to break the provisions of the agreement by continuing to struggle for total control of areas whose ownership has not been expressly stated in previous accords.

More so, up until now, most of the peace initiatives toward conflict resolution have largely been based on a "two-state solution," which has caused serious questions about which side will control which part of the disputed territories. The partition of Jerusalem has also remained a controversial issue that has contributed to the aggravation of the conflict, and regrettably, the existing peace agreements appear to be unclear on how to handle these difficulties. The peace initiatives have rather produced conflicting positions which parties to the combat accept to sign at some points, but only to turn out to do the contrary in the future. This is because of the indistinctiveness and lack of clarity of the conditions of agreement and their framework of implementation.

b. Israeli Settlement Policy in the West Bank

One of the consequences of the 1978 Camp David Accord and subsequent Camp David Summit in 2001 facilitated by successive U.S. leaders was the right for Israel settlement on parts of the contested areas ceded to them by the agreement. The Gaza Strip would be included in the non-militarized Palestinian state, which would also include 87-92% of the West Bank, according to the main proposals made by Israeli Prime Minister Ehud Barak as the foundation for the peace process (Pressman, 2003; Morra, 2016). The proposal further stipulated that Israel should be granted sovereignty over the Jordan Valley while retaining authority over the Temple Mount, any key East Jerusalem areas, as well as 69 Jewish communities that account for 85% of all Jewish settlers in the West Bank. There would be no right of re-entry for the settlers into Israel (Pressman, 2003).

Israel therefore started building settlements and registering effective occupation in the areas as apportioned and ceded to them following the signed agreements. However, this move by the Israelis toward having settlements in the area has awakened international condemnation and disapproval which have further incited more conflict and encouraged more violent resistance from the Palestinians especially the PLO radical elements who have not only pulled out from the agreements, but have adopted violent means to challenge the move such heating up the area for more violence and conflict.

In July 2003, the Israeli government began constructing security fences above the West Bank in response to an uptick in suicide bombings and terrorist attacks. The Israeli coalition cabinet gave the go-ahead for the construction of the blockades and demarcations along the green line's northernmost portion, dividing Israel from the West Bank. The Israel Defense Forces claim that the placement of fences and obstacles has resulted in a 90% reduction or more in terrorist activity (Morra, 2016). Despite Israel's loss of sovereignty over the Gaza Strip, 1,726 such rocket launches were recorded by the Israeli government in 2006—more than four times the number of missiles fired by Hamas and Palestinian Islamic Jihadists in 2005. (IMFA, 2007) in Israel (Pressman, 2003). By January 2009, Israel had been hit by almost 8,600 missiles, interrupting daily life and causing a great deal of psychological pain (Patience, 2008). At least 2000 rockets and mortars were fired at Israel every year between 2000 and 2013 on average. In general, well-known Islamist organizations like Hamas and the Palestinian Islamic Jihad have long yearned for the eradication of Israel and the establishment of a Palestinian Arab state. These groups, to put it simply, consider the Israeli-Palestinian conflict as a religious Jihad (Sela, 2002). This posturing explains why Israel has taken preventative and extreme measures to erect boundaries and barriers within the West Bank to stop these extremist Islamic groups from causing more crisis and security breaches in the region. Such actions not only result in fatalities, but also jeopardize future peace solutions and a peaceful resolution of the protracted dispute.

c. Major Stakeholders Implicated on the Inciting of Violent Uprisings

Regional organizations on the UN Security Council all condemned Israeli settlement construction in December 2011 and claimed that this threatened impending peace negotiations (Sela and Eran, 2002). In April 2012, when Russia and the United Kingdom condemned Israeli plans to build Jewish settlements in the West Bank, including East Jerusalem, there was also clear evidence of global indignation. Both the intention to legalize colonial outposts and the posting of bids for new settler housing were among these initiatives. According to British officials, Israel's actions violated its commitments under the Road Map to stop all settlement expansion in the region it has seized since 1967. The two-state solution is seriously and currently threatened by systematic, illegal Israeli settlement activity, according to the British Foreign Minister (Sela, 2002).

In some aspects, the security situation has worsened due to the European Union's position on Israel's settlement activity. The EU's 27 foreign ministers, known as the Quartet, issued a report in May 2012 denouncing alleged Israeli settlement practices in the West Bank as the root of the conflict in the area. The European Union has therefore at different levels of engagement and fora complicated the security situation in the region through their position on the issue of Israel settlement policies, as reflected thus;

1. The UK deputy Prime Minister, Nick Clegg, condemned Israel's settlement construction and called it illegal settlement. The UK government saw the settlement as "an act of deliberate vandalism" that was doing "immense damage" to the prospects for peace. Mr. Clegg argued that "There may no longer be a two-state solution if illegal settlements continue to exist on the ground."
2. Israel's allocation of water resources among Israeli settlers and Palestinians in the West Bank amounted to "apartheid" methods, claimed a French parliamentary report.
3. An internal EU assessment harshly attacked Israeli actions in Area C, the 62% of the West Bank that is entirely under Israeli control, and claimed that doing so threatened the chances of a two-state solution.
4. Additionally, the EU study condemned Israel's plans to expand Gilo, a colony near Bethlehem on the outskirts of Jerusalem, which "attracted significant international concern and condemnation."
5. EU report accused Israel of a future plan to construct another new settlement for about 14,500 settlers on empty land east of Jerusalem otherwise called E1. Even though after U.S. disapproval in 2004, Israel stopped the construction work, but EU claims that there is a plan to forcefully remove 2,300 Bedouin Arabs from the area by Israel.
6. It also claimed that all Israeli governments implement a policy to transfer Jewish population into the OPT (occupied Palestinian territory) and such violates fourth Geneva Convention and international humanitarian law.
7. EU reported that East Jerusalem is occupied territory and Israel was illegally annexed systematically undermining the Palestinian presence in the area as they impose laws for building in Palestinian areas, demolish houses and evict people, from the 'historic basin' around the Old City, as well as revoke Palestinian residency rights, separate bypass roads for Israelis and Palestinians and construct demarcation boundaries.
8. The European Union demanded that Israel seize control of Palestinian lands and assets, including the recently designated privately owned territory for a new national park at Mount Scopus.
9. The Palestinians could not obtain permission to build, and Palestinian families are forced to either vacate Jerusalem or build illegally and risk their structures being demolished by orders from Israel that obstruct the expansionist tendencies of Palestinians (see Sherwood, 2012).

These posturing not only incited more tensions, but potentially marred future peace processes in the area. The foregoing clearly shows that the major stakeholders believed strongly that Israel is essentially sabotaging the regional peace effort by constructing settlements and putting up infrastructures in the region. However, most of the peace agreements clearly sanctioned or approved the said 'two-state method' as well as the settlement of either of the parties in the areas partitioned to them. The fact remains that Israelis are more prepared and resolute to develop their own territories in the contested areas than the Palestinians who mainly have radical elements settling in the area and always fighting with Israeli troops. For instance, disparities in public support for education and transportation between Jerusalem's Jewish and Palestinian neighborhoods have been noted. Due to a shortage of appropriate classrooms, less than half of the Palestinian children in East Jerusalem attend municipal schools. Palestinians make up about 37 percent population in the town, but the authorities merely spent 10 percent of the municipal transportation expenses in Palestinian areas. Poverty level in Palestinian neighborhoods is far higher than in other areas of the city controlled by Israel (Quandt, 2005). There is great fear that Israel could make further expansionist moves and annex areas they are not ceded to in the peace talks. However, beyond apportioning blames and criticisms to Israel, the major stakeholders should be held accountable for the failure of series of their peace initiatives.

The point being made is that many of the peace initiatives developed by the U.S. and the key stakeholders in the Israel-Palestine dispute have rather encouraged more conflicts from the parties to the conflict. First is the indistinctness of many of the peace initiatives on the two-state solution as to which parties should occupy which areas of territories and claim sovereignty over such areas ceded to them. Second, the current arrangements regarding the ownership claims of Jerusalem's holy site are vague and lack a clear-cut framework. Insisting that talks over Jerusalem's status could only take place within the framework of a two-state solution (i.e., Jerusalem serving as the "shared capital" of Israel and the Palestinian state), the Arab world, the UN, and the EU severely hampered a quick and peaceful resolution to the Israel-Palestine conflict. In other words, the absence of a clear agreement about the occupation or ownership of Jerusalem encouraged Palestinian armed groups to engage in terrorist attacks against Israel as well as fueled violent conflict in the West Bank and Gaza Strip. nc.

Third, the settlement agreements produced by the peace agreements resulted in various settlement agreements for the two sides, which the Israelis have quickly explored more than the Palestinians due to the availability of funds and resources they have to build homes and erect infrastructure in the territory they have been given. The United Nations, EU, Arab countries, and other important stakeholders are outraged by Israel's rapid development in the occupied territories because they claim that Palestinians aren't permitted to have their own occupation. Despite the fact that the settlement policies were endorsed by the international mediation groups during their various peace negotiations, Fourth, and perhaps most significantly, the main players are complicit in the extension and escalation of settler disputes in the disputed territory by their unrelenting condemnations of Israel's actions, outbursts, and actions, as well as their biased backing for the Palestinians.

The following table lists the various peace initiatives that the key players have taken in an effort to resolve the long-standing Israel-Palestine conflict. Unfortunately, these peace initiatives have only made the security problems worse and sparked more conflicts, turning the region into a flashpoint for violence and one of the most notoriously conflict-prone regions in the world.

Table 1.1: Major Developments in the Israel-Palestine Conflicts

Year	Developments and Conflicting Peace Initiatives	Outcome
1947	In addition to calling for the division of Palestine into Jewish and Arab governments, UN General Assembly Resolution 181 also recognizes Jerusalem as a separate entity..	This led to the creation of the State of Israel
1948	Israel accepts UNGA Resolution 181 and declares its independence. It repels armies from nearby Arab countries that oppose its existence. UNGA Resolution 194 establishes Palestinians' right of return.	The UNGA resolution 194 about "the right to return" was adopted without a comprehensive peace plan for Israel and the Palestinians to coexist in peace. The confrontation was exacerbated and stoked by this.
1967	Future negotiations between Arabs and Israelis will be built upon the "land for peace" philosophy, which is enshrined in UN Security Council Resolution 242..	Resolution 242 of the UN Security Council declares the "land for peace," but it does not support peace efforts regarding how the Gaza Strip, the West Bank, or Jerusalem should be divided. As a result of preemptive strikes, Israel seizes the Golan Heights, East Jerusalem and the West Bank, the Gaza Strip, and the Sinai Peninsula in response to an Arab state's mobilization.
1973	The United States orchestrates a cease-fire during the Third Arab-Israeli War, starts the U.S.-led peace process, and supports Israel against a coalition of Arab nations seeking to reclaim lost territory.	Peace process initiated
1978-1979	American President Jimmy Carter visits Israeli Prime Minister Menachem Begin and Egyptian President Anwar Sadat at Camp David where they present a plan for Middle Eastern peace that includes	Peace process initiated

	Palestinian sovereignty. Egypt and Israel eventually reach a peace agreement and sign it.	
1987-1993	Palestinians pull out of the Camp David agreement and launched the 'first intifada'	Several hundred Israelis and over two thousand Palestinians were killed in the first intifada's widespread bloodshed..
1988	Palestinian Liberation Organization leader Yasser Arafat accepts UNSC Resolution 242 as the basis for Israeli-Palestinian negotiation.	peace process
1991	The Madrid Conference, co-hosted by the United States and the Soviet Union, opens negotiations between Israelis and Palestinians for the first time.	Peace process
1993	Secret The Oslo Accords, which were the product of Israel-Palestine discussions in Norway, stipulate Palestinian self-government and the phased departure of Israeli troops from the West Bank and Gaza. The PLO acknowledges Israel's legitimacy, and Israel acknowledges the PLO as the legitimate voice of the Palestinian people.	Peace process
1994	A peace agreement mediated by the United States is signed by Israel and Jordan.	Peace process initiated by the U.S
1995	The Oslo II Accords establish Palestinian self-government in Gaza and 40 percent of the West Bank.	Peace process
2000	During a summit held at Camp David to talk about boundaries, settlements, refugees, and Jerusalem, Israeli Prime Minister Ehud Barak and Arafat are present. Clinton reveals the conditions for an independent Palestinian state coexisting peacefully with Israel.	This peace talks ended without a clear-cut and interpretable agreement.
2000-2005	After the 2000 peace process collapsed, mistrust on both sides sparks the "Second Intifada"	One thousand Israelis and more than three thousand Palestinians were killed.
2002	Following a conclusion of the Israel-Palestine conflict, the Arab Peace Initiative provides peace to Israel and normalized ties with the Arab world.	This peacemaking effort was halted. Terrorist assaults took place within Israel as a result. Regaining control of Palestinian-ruled areas in the West Bank, the Israeli army then starts erecting a security fence around settlement outposts in East Jerusalem. This led to more disputes..
2003	George W. Bush the U.S. President announces a road map to end violence and restart Israel-Palestine negotiations leading to a Palestinian state.	-
2005	Israel withdraws from Gaza, including from all settlements there. President Bush sends a letter to Israeli Prime Minister Ariel Sharon recognizing the reality of settlement blocs in the West Bank.	-

2008-2009	The PLO's return and Hamas's additional relocations in Gaza and the West Bank led to the end of the cease-fire. From Gaza, Hamas fires rockets at civilians in Israel.	Israel goes to war with the Palestinian militant group there. The weeks long conflict killed an estimated one thousand Palestinians and thirteen Israelis.
2013-2014	Israel-Palestine final status negotiations have been restarted by the Barack Obama administration.	This peace talks collapsed over disagreements on settlements, the release of Palestinian prisoners, and other issues.
2017	Donald J. Trump U.S. President announces his decision to relocate the U.S. embassy to Jerusalem, recognizing the city as Israel's capital.	Other nations recognized Jerusalem as capital of Israel
2018	The United States slashes bilateral aid to the Palestinians and the UN Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees (UNRWA), closes the PLO office in Washington, DC, and opens its embassy in Jerusalem.	A diplomatic move to make Palestinians conform to peace initiatives
2019	The Trump administration expresses its disagreement with a long-standing State Department position that claims Israel's West Bank settlements are against international law while recognizing Israeli sovereignty over the Golan Heights.	Israel gains more recognition
2020	According to President Trump's plan for Israeli-Palestinian peace, a tiny Palestinian state would exist alongside Israel annexing 30% of the West Bank. Later, his administration negotiates agreements on behalf of other Arab nations to normalize relations with Israel.	U.S. brokers deal to normalize situation

Source: Robinson, Kali (2020) "What Is United States Policy on the Israel-Palestine Conflict?" *CFR*, 15 December. Available at: <https://www.cfr.org/backgrounder/what-us-policy-israel-palestine-conflict>

The table above shows that most of the peace initiatives not only collapsed, but further incited more violent conflicts which further prolonged the resolution of the age-long Israel-Palestine conflict. Importantly, it highlighted the actions of the major stakeholders who themselves were implicated in the Israel-Palestine dispute following the indistinctiveness and issues caused by their series of peace initiatives. This underlies the motivation and incitement to the Palestinian authorities, the PLO and other fighting Palestinian groups for more conflicts in the disputed areas. In most cases, the peace initiatives have been faultily or wrongly pursued and misinterpreted even by those who mediated them such as the parties that signed the agreements.

Conclusion

It is therefore the position of this research that beyond the façade of conflicting developments, accusations and counter-accusation, the fault lines of the peace initiatives by the major stakeholders is implicated in the continued and intractable Israel-Palestine conflicts. That is why despite many years of mooting peace initiatives of different kinds, the conflict has rather increased than abated. Invariably, peace processes initiated by the stakeholders have rather fuelled more conflicts in the disputed area.

Indeed, if existing patterns persist, the, the prospect of Jerusalem as the future capital of two states will be definitely unlikely to happen and unworkable, and this potentially undermines the 'two-state solution.' In other words, this shatters essentially ensuing peace talks and peace processes engaged by the major stakeholders over the years. Hence, Palestinian elements commenced the second intifada (Palestinian uprising), in 2000 (to last for about a five-year period), due to their grievances over Israel's control over the West Bank. This clearly showed that existing peace negotiations have totally collapsed. In response, the Israeli government authorized the erection of a barricade/wall in the West Bank in 2002, to stave off the tumultuous challenge from angry Palestinians (CFR, 2021).

References

Center for Preventive Action (2022) Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Council on Foreign Relations. Retrieved from: www.cfr.org/global-conflict-tracker.com

- Chris, H. (1994). Mideast accord: The overview: Rabin and Arafat sign accord ending Israel's 27 year hold on the Jericho and Gaza strip. New York Times.
- Dershowitz, A. (2005). Time to tell the truth about the Palestine issue. The Hill publication, USA. Retrieved from: https://thehill.com/?segment=1*1u62nf*s_amp_id*c3pVci1Rb3NvZW13REJLQjViVGVIZU5RNzZVWmREOW10Q2N2YmUxb01vZXNBSGRTb1JleThGQ0k0R0pQQ2pDbg.
- Dov, W. (2017). American Jews and the Israeli-Palestinian conflict: Part of the problem or part of the solution? *Political Science Quarterly*, 132 (2), 313 – 340. Retrieved from: <https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Dov-Waxman/publication/318166339.pdf>
- Gelvin, J. L. (2014). The Israel-Palestine conflict: One hundred years of war. Cambridge University Press, (3rd ed). ISSN: 12251401.
- Hesham Y. (2022). The Israeli-Palestinian conflict: The danger of 'no solution' messaging: The six 'No's' that are cementing a one-state outcome and perpetual conflict. United States Institute of Peace Publications. Retrieved from: <https://www.usip.org/publications/2022/02/israeli-palestinian-conflict-danger-no-solution-messaging#>
- Hesham, Y. (2020). The Israeli-Palestinian Conflict in 2020: What are the possible plans ahead? United State Institute of Peace. Retrieved from:
- Hummel, D. G. (2019). Covenant brothers: Evangelical, Jews, and U.S-Israeli relations. University of Pennsylvania Press, pp. 352. ISBN: 978-0812251401.
- Jerome, S. (2020). Mythologies without end: The US, Israel, and the Arab-Israeli conflict, 1917 – 2020. University of Oxford Press. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/>
- Jimmy, C. (2003). Camp David accords: Jimmy Carter reflects 25 years later. The Carter center publications, Atlanta, G. A. ISSN: 420-5100. Retrieved from: <http://www.cartercenter.org/news/documents/doc1482.html>
- Joseph, H. & Al-Arabiya, E. (2020). Palestinian-Israeli conflict: White house calls for calm as violence flares between Gaza, Israel. Retrieved from: <https://english.alarabiya.net/amp/News/middle-east/2022/08/05/White-House-calls-for-calm-as-violence-flares-between-Gaza-Israel>
- Kurtzer D. C. & Lasensky S. B. (2008). Negotiating Arab-Israel Peace: American Middle East Leadership. The US Institute of Peace Publishers (1st ed) p.191. ISBN: 978-1601270306
- Lewis, S. (2018). Deal of the century: US pushes Israeli-Palestinian plan. Deutsche Welle Press. Retrieved from: <https://m.dw.com/en/deal-of-the-century-us-pushes-israeli-palestinian-plan/a-45023242>
- Louis, T. (2006). Terrorism in the Arab-Israeli Conflict. Palgrave Macmillan. Pp. 175 – 191. Retrieved from: <https://brill.com/view/book/9789004394148/back-1.xml?language=en>
- Lozowick, Y. (2013). Right to Exist: A mora defense of Israel's wars. Kirkus Publication. Pp. 1-326. Retrieved from: https://books.google.com.ng/books/about/Right_to_Exist.html?id=LYxtAAAAMAAJ&redir_esc=y
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs (2021). Policy of the government of Israel. Foreign Ministers of the state of Israel Publication. Retrieved from: <https://history.state.gov/milestones/1977-1980/camp-david>
- Morra, M. (2016). The Palestine-Israeli peace process after the cold war. *Journal of International Relations and Foreign Policy*, 4 (1). Doi: <https://10.15640/jirfp.v4n2a4>
- Morris, B. (2004). Understanding Israel-Palestine: Race, Nation, Human in the conflict, volume 8, Brill books (2nd Ed). Retrieved from : https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1057/9780230204546_13
- Pressman, J. (2003). Vision in collision: What happened at camp David and taba? *Quarterly Journal: International Security*. Havard Kennedy School Press. Retrieved from: <https://www.belfercenter.org/publication/visions-collision-what-happened-camp-david-and-taba>
- Quandt, W. (2005). Peace process: American diplomacy and the Arab-Israeli conflict since 1967. Washington DD: Brookling Institution and University Press. ISBN: 0-520-22374-8.

- Sara R. (2004). The Palestinian-Israeli conflict and Palestinian socioeconomic decline: A place denied. *International Journal of Politics, Culture and Society*, 17 (3) 365 – 403. Retrieved from: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/20007687>
- Sela, A. & Eran, O. (2002). Arab-Israel peacemaking: The continuum political encyclopedia of the middle east. New York: continuum, pp. 121.
- Sherwood, H. (2012). “EU Report Calls for Action Over Israeli Settlement Growth.” *Guardian*, 18 January. Available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2012/jan/18/eu-report-israeli-settlement-growth> (accessed 5 January 2021)
- Smith, C. D. (2013). Palestine and the Arab-Israeli conflict: A history with documents. Bedford/St. Martin’s (9th ed). pp.624. ISBN: 978-1319028053
- Stein, K. (1999). Heroic diplomacy: Sadat, Kissinger, Carter, Begin, and the quest for Arab-Israeli peace. Taylor & Francis Press, pp. 228 – 229.
- The Hindu (2017). Israel-Palestine conflict. Retrieved from: <https://www.google.com/amp/s/www.thehindu.com/opinion/editorial/balancing-act-the-hindu-editorial-on-indias-stand-in-israel-palestine-conflict/article34608788.ece/amp>
- United Nations Security Council (1967). Camp David accord: UN security council resolution, 242. Office of the Historian, U.S. Department of State Publication. Retrieved from: <https://www.usip.org/>
- White House Statement (2020). “President Donald J. Trump’s Vision for Peace, Prosperity, and a Brighter Future for Israel and the Palestinian People.” 28 January 2020. Available at: <https://uk.usembassy.gov/president-donald-j-trumps-vision-for-peace-prosperity-and-a-brighter-future-for-israel-and-the-palestinian-people/> (accessed 6 January 2021)
- Wikipedia (2022). History of the Israeli-Palestine conflict. Retrieved from: https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_the_Israeli%E2%80%93Palestinian_conflict
- World Bank (2017). Prospects for Growth and Jobs in the Palestinian Economy: A general equilibrium analysis. World Bank Group Publication. Retrieved from: <http://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/en/952571511351839375/pdf/121598-WP-P159645-PUBLIC-PALESTINEPROSPECTSFORGROWTHANDJOBS.pdf>
- Robinson, Kali (2020) “What Is U.S. Policy on the Israel-Palestine Conflict?” *CFR*, 15 December. Available at: <https://www.cfr.org/backgrounder/what-us-policy-israel-palestine-conflict>
- Ynet (2020). Israeli-Palestinian peace must not be just a dream. Retrieved from: <https://www.ynetnews.com/article/byxynggyf>