



Zionist Settler Colonialism, Bullying and Rebellion against International Law and Human Rights in Occupied Palestine, A Legal and Political Perspective

Dr. Mohammad Salim Al-Rawashdeh¹

¹ International Relations, Al-Balqa Applied University, Princess Alia'a University College, Department of Basic Human Sciences, Amman. Po.box (942303), The Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, Amman Jordanian Academic Database: (12584) Email: jordanresearch@bau.edu.jo

Abstract

This study examines some central questions. Like, it asks whether Zionist Israeli Bullying and Rebellion against International Law and Human Rights in Occupied Palestine. The study examines the question raised by the implications arising from a finding of illegal occupation and Zionist violations of international law in Palestine and other occupied territories. What is the concept of bullying in international relations? And what is the UN Resolution on the Creation of Zionism in Arab Palestine?

In international relations, the concept of "bullying" refers to the potential threats or rights violations carried out by a state, usually against weaker states. The purpose of this paper is to provide a framework for analyzing bullying behavior in international relations that can potentially contribute to the identification of bullying when it takes place, and that can be utilized for both descriptive and prescriptive purposes. Although this paper introduces an analytical framework, it is not entirely an academic exercise because it has important policy implications.

The roots of the Israel-Palestine conflict are grounded in the desire of the Zionist movement to establish a Jewish national home in Palestine through Jewish colonization against the will of the indigenous Arab population.

The following segments of this paper highlight the aims of the Zionist movement and obstacles in their way, actions taken to establish a Jewish state, and human rights violations by the Israelis during various armed encounters with the assistance of international law.

Keywords

Middle East, Palestine, United Nations, Bullying and Rebellion, International Law, Human Rights, Israel-Palestine Conflict, Zionism.

Introduction

The title of this research paper suggests an academic slant on my adopted neutral approach to this subject. Academic neutrality on this subject would be impossible, not just because I believe that the Israeli government is regularly contravening international humanitarian laws and human rights in Israel's treatment of the Palestinian civilian population, but because, by misuse of language, the Middle East conflict between the State of Israel and the Palestinian civilian population is now referred to as the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, and some words are deemed to be politically incorrect in this arena. All non-Zionists become "pro-Palestinian", although I am against any action or behavior of either side that contravenes humanitarian laws and international norms of behavior.

Palestine is an Arab state a part of the Middle East that needs serious consideration and that can create a solid foundation for understanding what is happening in the Middle East and reveal a gross abuse of power. Palestinian lands have been part of the post-World War II legacy. Pre-World War I, Palestinian lands were part of the Ottoman Empire, which would shrink to modern-day Turkey. After the war, Britain and the League of Nations handed the territory to Britain as a Mandate, before

the creation of the United Nations. Over 97% of the population of these Palestinian Mandate territories were Arab-speaking Muslims and Christians who had possessed the land for over 1,000 years. Only 3% of the population were Jewish, and most of these had arrived within the preceding 80 years. These Jews in Palestine also included many who wished to be considered Palestinians. The land of Palestine has always been multicultural and multilingual, made up of an Arab majority, but also including Christian, Jewish, and some Armenian citizens.

The lands were to be taken away from the Arabs and given to incoming Jewish immigrants from Europe and Russia. Europeans would, in essence, relieve Europe of its "Jewish problem" by taking the problem out of Europe and transferring it to the Palestinians – with the support and assistance of collective Western powers. The twist was that these groups of nations had no legal authority to take this land from one group of indigenous Palestinians for the benefit of others who were not native to the land. There are many historical examples of displaced groups within long-settled lands, but rarely did an external group grab the land from one set of existing native residents and hand it over to the refugees.

The main theme which will be discussed in this research is the Arab character of Palestine. The expression "Arab character" can be confusing to those accustomed to the term "Arab state," so the word "Arab" should be differentiated before any such discussion. From existing literature, we find four related meanings of the word "Arab" that need to be clarified in Palestine's case. The first meaning of "Arab" is a common language shared by several peoples, also referred to as the Arabic-speaking language. The second meaning, the nostalgic or romantic view, is the concept of the Arab homeland, understood as Arabia in its wider sense, including Palestine within what is known in Arabic as (Bilad Al-Sham) or Greater Syria. It is important to clarify this nostalgic concept because it still represents the primary emotional motivation for most modern Arabs, irrespective of whether they live within what is understood to be the Arab World today.

The question of Palestine is addressed by the United Nations in the broader framework of the establishment of a comprehensive and just peace in the Middle East. The General Assembly and the Security Council, acting under various resolutions, established a comprehensive framework in consideration of the unique situation of the Palestinian people, who are the rightful constituents of a peace process. This framework was based on the recognition of the political rights of Palestinian Arabs and the establishment of the principle of self-determination within a centrist arrangement. This is evidenced in the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, as well as by several legal and diplomatic instruments emanating from the United Nations, regional organizations, and many ad hoc entities assigned to work in partnership for the gradual establishment of the two Palestinian and Israeli states. Among the legal foundations of diverse character that regularly refer to international law and the organization's act are:

- The Charter of the United Nations; -
- A resolution on the partition of the mandated territory of Palestine;
- The Convention on the Fight and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide.
- The Universal Declaration of Human Rights; - The Statute of the High Commissioner for Refugees;
- The four Geneva Conventions and their two attached Protocols; the Resolution on the Establishment of a Round Table on the Question of Palestine;
- The resolution designating 1980 as the International Year of the Palestinian Population;
- The resolution granting observer status to the Palestinian Liberation Organization in the United Nations.

The concept of the Arab state emerged, and the word "Arab" became so closely associated with this final stage of Arab nationalistic development that the two were considered the same. Practically applied today, in many ways, the outcome means that the term "Arab" in the expression "Arab state" is analogous to "French" in the expression "French state." In contrast, the direct connection between these two expressions exists in terms of modern nationhood. The last meaning of "Arab" is a replay of the romantic concept with the important exception that it has been inferred in reverse and within a completely autonomous context. Unlike the other meanings, this political meaning is contemporary and broadens the term beyond racial distinctions. A characteristic of this is the inert desire to preserve human rights based on Arab needs. It is relevant since the ethnic makeup of the region is also Arab. So when we ask about the need to address the Arab question or the Arab

World, we not only ask about geography, such as how many million Muslims live in the Arab World but also about where and to whom the inalienable rights are applicable. In the final instance, we must know whether we are asking a geographical question, an internal or international human rights question, a question of terrorism, a question of national security, or an additional and highly important regional peace question. The modern Arab question gained importance in the nineteenth century at the same time as the European national question.

The term "country" has lost its earlier crystal-clear analytical purity. In legal terminology, as in the definition of a "country," Palestine seems to be a modern state. In contrast, the territories that were occupied and have been under military occupation for many years do not fit the same definition. The subject to be treated extensively here is the population of the occupied territories, the Palestinian refugee camps located in Jordan, Lebanon, and Syria, and that of the Palestinian Diaspora scattered around the world. Since the early years of the so-called Middle Eastern crisis, the use of the term "Palestine" to refer only to the historical Palestine area has misled many, obeying unrelated political, religious, or nationalistic purposes. During the long and troubled centuries of the history of that land, Palestine changed politically and linguistically. Turkish, Syrian, Mandate and Israeli decades have not touched, though, the geographical basis of historical Palestine.

Zionist Israeli Anomaly in Relationship with International Law and Human Rights: In general, the majority of countries worldwide, of all sizes, levels of development, and religions, have a normal and predictable positive relationship with international law and international human rights. This includes domestic laws upholding international law, human rights, and international humanitarian law. However, with the establishment of a state and its inception and history linked to designing major discrimination and eliminating the existing local population, Israel constitutes one of the anomalies in the world. This study theoretically contributes to understanding the power relations that entities apply to relationships among the state, its citizens, and non-citizens, and of regional conflict as a field of research in general. This study applies current pertinent international law to Israeli intrastate relations, particularly with non-citizens on its territory and its outmoded territories in Palestine in general, with Jerusalem and the Gaza Strip in particular.

The Zionist movement developed in 19th-century Europe as an outgrowth of nationalist ideologies that idealized the nation as a community of belonging based on shared religion, culture, language, and ethnicity. Identifying the Jewish religious community as a national community, Zionism embraced the anti-Semitic concept of Jews as an alien people and strove from its origins to create an exclusively Jewish nation. Theodore Herzl, the founder of political Zionism, discerned that the nationalist Jewish aspiration would best overcome extant Jewish antisocial and revolutionary global perceptions by containing them. Zionists endeavoured to secure recognition of their colonial settler movement by formulating an assertion of the right to national self-determination specifically for Zionism. Yet, whereas Herzl had initially approached the Ottoman sultan and also sought colonial support from the grossly anti-Semitic Prime Minister of Britain, both to no avail, he ultimately bequeathed to the Zionism that envisioned Mary's city the acceptance of an offer generally supportive of the resolution.

International law, including human rights law, is conceptualized to be devoid and neutral from variable features such as level of development, religion, race, majority or minority, and whether the population is permanent, temporary, transitional, or non-touristic and/or non-commercial legal status. Therefore, international law applies equally to a mature developed secular state with a majority population that has been resident over the long term in the location where the majority of territory residents hold as a homeland. It equally applies to all entities and populations worldwide at all stages of development, and time and location of residence on territories, including applications during times of violent regional conflict. Any deviation from these general principles for Israel suggests one or more economic, security, or diplomatic motives for particular justifications.

The Concept of Bullying in International Relations

Is bullying just a normal rite of passage occurring within a necessary transitional period of childhood? Although commonly assumed to be an expected part of growth and development, bullying is, in fact, a pervasive and complex form of psychological, physical, and social abuse that has a profound adverse impact on targets, bullies, and bystanders. Although bullying itself is not a new phenomenon, the aftermath of tragic events has brought bullying and violence within schools into the public eye. Acute and personalized targets, as well as their families, lawmakers, educational reformers, and

communities, seek remedies and solutions. This paper provides an analytical overview of contemporary insights into the existing typologies of bullying, its causes, and impacts. The purpose of this overview is to summarize the current understanding of bullying to provide a conceptual lens through which the possible actions and remedies to the issue of bullying can be more effectively evaluated. Specifically, the summary will utilize an analysis of efforts to address the problem of bullying and propose a newer and more comprehensive framework through which we can more fully appreciate both the problem and the potential interventions designed to prevent it. To achieve this goal, an original author and expert on school law on issues of discipline will first summarize the existing literature on bullying, particularly those depicting its impact. Subsequently, there will be discussions related to the actions for bullying and suggested frameworks for future interventions. These discussions will be augmented with detailed protocols and field experience-based examples to transform suggested best practices into a form that enables these findings to be fully utilized by those involved in policing, counselling, and educating our children.

The concept of bullying has received more attention lately. However, its implicit approach and lack of research have made it impossible to properly address the problem. The concept of bullying has been coined in educational environments, as it was used to outline a kind of behavior considered a characteristic of prisoners when young students revealed it and teachers explained it as a prisoner profile behavior. Also, the word was developed in the context of boarding schools when older and bigger students satisfied their ambitions by abusing and humiliating younger boarders. The common characteristic in all these situations was the intentional and unprovoked violence or abuse of power, intending to undermine the victim. Different meanings and interpretations have been given in international documents, the media, literature, legislation, victims, and professionals from various work sectors, which makes for a broad and operational concept. This research is therefore mainly focused on the following questions: How should the concept of bullying be properly defined? What types of bullying may exist in working contexts?

Regarding the types of bullying, analysing specialized literature and various conceptual frameworks, a significant cognitive overlap was verified in the several types and verbs, which compromise a majority of the existing concepts in the literature and as such only superficially reflect the subject. Thus, it is important to reflect on existing topics in specialized literature to abstract the most meaningful ones. This investigation has led to the identification of several types of bullying, which otherwise would remain hidden or not be investigated. Also, principal aggressors, targets, contractors, and mechanisms underlying the bullying phenomenon, such as the relationship and individual factors, the triggers, forms of harassment, consequences, and intervention and prevention plans.

When studying an ill-defined concept such as bullying, the meaning of the term needs to be defined within a historical context. The discussion explores the historical roots of the nature and causes of the construct and details sources that have had sociocultural influences on society's beliefs, views, and definitions of bullying. It is noted that "the standard historic time cited for aggression among children focuses on the 1970s-1980s consideration of a violent and socially deteriorating society." Inexplicably, school violence rose from schoolyards in the 1990s through to 2009, which saw the peak of violence among 'kindergarten to year 12' (K-12) school environments and the emergence of subsequent anticrime and terrorism legislation. However, students have been aggressive throughout the early recorded curriculum, and corporal punishment creates emotional responses and occasionally violence in students. In 451 BC, it is stated that corporal punishment promotes retaliation, and it is agreed that children should be educated to be free of bodily pain. It is related that children will not respect those who impose corporal punishment, and the forced child will turn against their family and keep a grudge, possibly throughout life. Teachers who force children may find the situation deteriorates into bullying.

In the social sciences, it is fairly common to refer to the word "bullying" to describe violent attitudes in the workplace, at school, and even within the family. This term is widely known and is applied to different situations of conflict. The repeated increase in alleged situations of bullying has been observed on the world political stage and in international relations, which can be supported by research ethics and the principles of ethical international relations in the role of the United States in the world after the events of September 11th. Here it will be shown that eight days after the terrible terrorist attack, the attitude of diplomacy and international relations among states changed to an

environment where the use of military force is legitimate, unlike the state using the term "bullying" to try to impose its military tactics influenced by the War on Terror.

In effect, the three main definitions – markedly differing in both etymological and contextual segmentation – still give us an overview of the scope of the concept as such:

Bullying: an unwanted aggressive behavior among school-aged children that involves a real or perceived power imbalance. The behavior is repeated or has the potential to be repeated, over time. Both kids who are bullied and who bully others may have serious, lasting problems.

Bullying is the systematic abuse of power and is defined as aggressive behavior or intentional harm-doing by peers that is carried out repeatedly and involves an imbalance of power, thus ruling out actual or perceived defence of the weaker. Behaviour is aggressive when it is intended to harm the victim. Bullying generally is a series of behaviors that can be categorized, for example, as physical, verbal, or social/relational.

Based on the above, the international dimension of the concept is then derived directly from the latter – bullying between countries is a phenomenon that can be equated with the concept of one country attempting to assert its power over the other, creating an intentional imbalance in this power relation – potentially repeated over time. In other words, the relations between countries as a form of dynamic communication imply a much more direct link between the two phenomena than is commonly admitted.

The first simple logic corollary of this view is that any abnormality, a focal point that disrupts the chain of communication – redefined as a severe breach of one of the six criteria identified in the definitions of power status – has the potential to evolve into a conflictual path that leads to some form of modality or another of adverse reactions. Since the whole process is completely exceptional and manifests an extremely deep level of pessimism (or optimism) pervading the overall socio-political and economic levels, the equilibrium among states is shattered and bullying oscillates with conflict.

Bullying is a phenomenon that has important negative impacts. Thus, the identification and understanding of bullying situations are essential for defining strategies to tackle this phenomenon effectively. This paper studies the variety of negative actions performed in bullying incidents, particularly in verbal and psychological types of bullying. Results based on a questionnaire carried out in a school indicate that students identify a set of different actions, where extreme actions such as stealing or destruction of personal belongings are present, alongside verbal and psychological bullying. These results suggest the importance of taking these different actions into account in the design of anti-bullying strategies.

Bullying is a phenomenon of increased interest, and it is gaining significant social impact. A variety of high-impact actions have been detected. Acts that are generally considered the main types of bullying include pushing or shoving, threatening, name-calling, taunting, maliciously excluding, breaking or stealing possessions, making obscene gestures, and making rude or threatening hand gestures. Such aggressive behaviour is often discussed with emphasis on the distinction between direct and relational actions. Relational actions refer to behaviours that hurt peers psychologically. The learning environment can be affected by aggressive interactions between teachers and young people.

Although general agreement is hard to come by in the analysis of school bullying, numerous definitions of bullying exist to classify specific behaviour that involves negative actions. Traditional conceptual descriptions of aggression in schools differentiate bullying from these other negative behaviours by three key components. Bullying must involve repeated actions against the victim, demonstrate an imbalance of power between the aggressor and the victim, and involve a pattern of aggressive behaviour. More elaborate definitions of bullying enable observers to better categorize specific instances as harassment, gender bullying, methods used by individuals, and distinguishing patterns that allow included negative behaviour to be classified as bullying. Such explicitness in defining school aggression provides simplified communication and monitoring in schools to address this behaviour. Research on bullying has traditionally distinguished between generalized or non-specific aggression and focused aggression in which an individual is targeted directly. Within these categories of bullying, many more distinctions also exist, providing depth for the proper classification of bullying behaviour. With this depth of classification, traditional distinctions between adults and students in bullying behaviour allow for more versatility in the definition of bullying, enabling differences between teenagers and young children while recognizing subtler influences of racism and

sexism on bullying behavior. High levels of specificity in the identification of teasing, hazing, girl-to-girl bullying, and cyberbullying help to avoid diluting the concept of bullying as a more intense form of meltdown. Misunderstandings of bullying are also positively influenced by the proper classification of bullying into criteria useful for the age level of the students involved.

The Concept of Zionism Historical Roots and Ideology of Zionism

Zionism is the modern movement for the protection and independence of the Jewish people. It was organized and founded by Theodor Herzl in 1897 upon the conviction that the Jews have the right to unrestricted sovereignty in representative portions of the world. As it is exceptional that the people without a home of their own should propose the autonomy of Palestine, which is the Holy Land to three great religions, the movement must be grasped at its exact value. To misrepresent Zionism is not only to undermine its cause but to do injury to the humanitarian idea. Zionism, in its law and justice, comes too late to be of great help in solving the politico-religious complex of which the Near East is the center. It offers peace on earth, but it is too late to influence at any instant the political diplomacy from which the old-world diplomat is about to learn, whatever the success of the amiable effort to regulate international relations and private wants by a rhetoric of kindly admonition.

Unfortunately, although it is the youngest of movements, and although there is no backwardness in the Jewish people as a whole in understanding its objects, it is harassed by a constant misrepresentation that threatens its development, if not its fulfilment. Called by other names than its own, it is the victim of misconceptions that stifle the intention and betray the ideal. When political Zionism met for the first congress in 1897, it did so to destroy the miserable tradition of Jewish identity and endow the Jews with the star of politics. However, it claims for its followers the very political and human rights that were ceded to other sections of mankind freakishly without a twinge of conscience or a murmur of jealousy from the satisfied claimants. By the very essence of its creators, it is energetic, straight in principle, moral in action and democratic in the hopes that characterize its leaders. Only the renegades of the movement restrict its scope, qualify its nature, and deny its reality by their adulation of misplaced privileges.

The rise of modern Zionism is largely an expression of European Jewry's response to the challenges posed by the Enlightenment and its aftermath. The emergence of Benjamin Disraeli, who had a Jewish background, as Prime Minister, achieved the passing of Jewish Emancipation in England in 1858 and was still seen by anti-Semitic traditionalist England as a saviour of the Dutch Calvinists from the Egyptians in the Sudan Crisis. This created the first positive perception that there is worth in being a visible Jew. This new political regard led to the resurgence of European Zionism, an ideology that was first mooted in Holland in 1450 but put into concrete expression only by Theodore Herzl in 1896, as an antidote to socialism, with which Jews of the late 19th century identified for ethnic security. Theodore Herzl captured the mood of his emotional, and psychological era with an ideology of Israel as a political destination for the Jews. Ideas behind this political movement include that Jews can only be like everybody else when in their state, and that genocide can only be avoided if Jews are self-ruled.

More specifically, nine underlying principles that fuelled European Zionism were: until 1884, European Jews everywhere had no concept of Jews as a nation separate from their co-nationals; in 1896, world Jewry knew no term for themselves, spoke of themselves as Hebrew not Jewish, and called themselves by their state of origin; until 1884, Jews everywhere had taken anti-Semitism to be a sign of the traditional masses' ignorance and lack of cosmopolitan education and had no structural differentiation between themselves in Gentile society nor within Gentile society; until 1884, no sizable Jews anywhere in the world considered themselves to be economic competitors with one another; until 1884, the culture was first Jewish, cosmopolitan was a result of economic circumstance, and assimilation was due to economic intermarriage; suffering is a Jewish tradition; until 1884, European Jews assumed themselves above having to fight, because they were not settled in one state; Jews everywhere in 1906 considered the formation of an army on behalf of a religious homeland as a throwback to the Dark Ages; and until 1900, Jews everywhere expected the ideology of Zionism, i.e., of a Jewish polity in Palestine, to consist only of people they perceived to be émigrés, temporarily inconvenienced, or as religious quarantined tribesmen taking time out from the modern world. Zionists were also the first to advocate a proletarian Jewish leadership and a socially integrated Jewish peasantry. Almost every 19th-century Jewish secular anti-Zionist believed in unoriginal Zionist settlements in less structured existing agricultural communes or managed capitalist farms, to be either

as hardworking foot soldiers or as defenceless strike-breakers for the major nationalist-socialist forces.

Analysis of the UN Resolution on the Creation of Zionism in Arab Palestine

In 1897, the Swiss journalist Theodor Herzl convened in Basel the first Zionist Congress, calling the Jewish population around the world to organize to create their state. From that first assembly until the proclamation of the State of Israel in 1948, a constant flow of Jewish colonists reached the territory that was then under British mandate. The Palestine Question had taken on a completely new face. Despite the British punitive measures, which alternated with others of clemency, Jewish immigration intensified and extended throughout the entire territory, not only in those areas destined to form part of the future Israel but also into the Jordanian and Egyptian zones. Gradually, the political consolidation of the emergent state was taking on a concrete form, prompting discussions and decisions in the international field, suggesting drastic reductions in the cantonal divisions of the basic territories proposed by the British colonial power.

Theodor Herzl's transformation of this powerful mythical ideal, based upon a recollection of the past and not necessarily an indicator of the present, into the practicable doctrine of political Zionism essentially created an organization that could realistically translate its ideology into a historically feasible movement. From its inception at the end of the 19th century, political Zionism as an ideology envisioned the establishment of a national home for the Jews, conceived of the reality of the Jewish people as one nation, a settling of the land by Jews, and the creation of the political mechanisms to promote and advance these purposes. The final definition of a Jewish state was equivalent in city-state terms. With the defeat of the ancient Jewish-inhabited city of Beersheba by the not-always-victorious armies of a united Israel at the end of the Iron Age, the Jewish state entered the historical reality of the ancient city-state. The failure of modern Zionism to heed the lofty admonition attributed to Hillel the Elder and debated among the theologians as an exhortation to madmen have littered the landscape with debates. For a younger generation of comparative religious historiographers, the relationship between Judaism and Zionism draws upon historical comparisons as an interpretive method.

Analysis of the UN Resolution on the Creation of Zionism in Arab Palestine. The Zionist movement was founded by European Jews during the rise of modern nationalism in the 19th century. In those years, the Jews of the Western countries gradually moved from the sacred world of the medieval ghetto to a secular society, a society that began to recognize Jewish identity and rely on educated and talented people. However, others believed that Europeans would never look like a people with a formal religion, and Jews with their specific religion, customs, and traditions would always be "line beasts" in "the Christian world, not respect". They raised the question of creating their state and saw this state as a possible settlement territory for all Jews.

The UN Resolution 181 divided Palestine into two separate states: one for Arabs and the other for the Zionists. The resolution passed by a narrow margin. Even though at the time of its passing, it was considered the fulfilment of a just demand presented by a genuine national liberation movement, it generated opposition among sectors of the Jewish population and official Jewish institutions. The representatives rejected the resolution, publicly announced their decision to refuse to recognize it, and withdrew from the UN Assembly, leaving the United Nations without their presence during the moment when final discussions about creating Israel were taking place.

This idea was pursued by a writer who is defined as a true founding father of Zionism. He came from a liberal Jewish family and saw what was happening with the Jews in France. The trial of Alfred Dreyfus, when the world demonstrated the complete powerlessness of French Jews and their political unanimity, influenced his decision. Using the expression "Antisemitism is Jewish socialism", he cultivated the idea that all ills bothering Jews would be finally overcome in a special state of Israel, a state that should include all values of liberal bourgeois society. The only solution he considered the most appropriate should result from the deal of political elites of central European countries with Jewish financiers. He believed that the Turks and the Germans would be able to share the fruits of Damak with the Slavs if the Jews were given Jerusalem.

Occupied Palestine: Legal Status and International Consensus

The question of Palestine has received particular attention over the years, given the international community's failings in one of the most long-standing conflicts that have increasingly brought suffering to the Palestinians. The roots of the difficulties experienced by the Palestinians under

occupation and their continued disputes with the occupying power, Israel, are significant. Since the establishment of the State of Israel in 1948, numerous international texts have attempted to resolve the situation in a manner acceptable to the peoples of the region. An unprejudiced approach permits no discernment of Israel's intentions. Its policies and conduct reveal no effort to enter into real and meaningful negotiations with the Palestinians in good faith.

Not only does Israel not pursue the path set out in the United Nations Security Council resolutions, but it also declares itself as the only party acting following these resolutions. The United Nations General Assembly, and above all the permanent members of the United Nations Security Council, must protect United Nations principles and law. If within the United Nations membership, the highest decision-making body is unable to do this, conflict situations will no longer be resolved under the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the Security Council resolutions, but rather power-politically on an unequal basis. Peace and sovereign equality of states would then be a legal fiction sown in the Charter of the United Nations and daily trampled upon with disrespect. This would be an intolerable consequence that strips the Charter of the United Nations of any content, devalues its signatories, and jeopardizes world order. The destruction of the legal order built by the United Nations to protect human rights and maintain world peace would likely have disastrous consequences.

The creation of the state of Israel on 15 May 1948 was the culmination of Zionist aspirations to create a "safe haven" for Jews. It was also the result of a violent campaign organized by the Jewish nationalist community in Palestine. Over six months, the Jewish community took over areas under the control of the British mandate before their planned withdrawal. The Zionist movement persuaded Western powers that the creation of an independent Jewish state was a valid aim. This was because the Zionists argued that Jews who were persecuted throughout the world needed to have a national home. This, they said, was a universal "right". The Jews in Palestine, living under the control of the British mandate, although little more than a quarter of the population, increasingly became the vehicle for the establishment of a Jewish state.

The Palestinian Arabs were to be reduced to third-class citizens, while Palestinians in the rest of the Arab world would be persecuted and expelled. On the Jewish side, the main Zionist terrorist group used bombs to attack Arab cafés and bus stops in the 1930s. Later, better-known groups made many atrocious attacks on villages in 1947/48 during Operation Dalet. The Jewish community's need for a Jewish majority was a fundamental issue, lest Western powers become embroiled in a civil war. However, the Jewish community had imported sufficient people from Europe, despite restrictions imposed by the British government to control these illegal immigrants, taught philosophy, and gained skills at the university. On 14 May 1948, Ben Gurion and his group declared a state, stating that "it exists and will continue". This led to the loss of people who had lived in the territory for generations.

Zionist Israeli Bullying and Rebellion:

In this paper, a new approach to international relations is proposed. This new approach should not be considered a prediction but an analytical formula based on an analytical approach. The proposed formula calculates what the present developments in international relations will lead to, rather than mapping out forthcoming events as in the case of predictions. In this respect, it shouldn't be considered fortune-telling, as fortune-telling is far removed from being a scientific concept. All the results and developments based on this concept are merely the products of, at the utmost, a subjective interpretation of the empirical evidence.

International relations represent a state of mutual intimacy among states, but this intimacy doesn't prevent political-military competition. Unlike national relations, international relations represent a comprehensive communication and interaction network. Each action, entity, relationship, and subsystem of the international system are subject to a system of international relations from which there is no option to opt-out. At this point, it is important to highlight a fact of special significance for the current stage of development. Under the current stage of development, Israel has declared its withdrawal from international state relations and the institutionalized international set of rules, which has, of course, led to a political-military restructuring in the region and the acknowledgment of Islamic reactions. The concept of the state is a member of political systems theory that represents a complex subsystem characterized by the unique practices of regulatory entities, taxing entities, and a centralized subsystem working in the current landscape. The state recognizes the range of operation of other states within its borders and does not accept a regulatory structure above itself.

I will explore the topic of Israeli international relations in the present context of domestic Israeli-dominated power relations and world politics. I pose the following: the concept of international relations is based on relations of states and other groups. This is true not only in academia but in general usage. Yet the concept of international relations originated at a time when an international system genuinely existed when relationships were clearly and neatly divided among the great powers, and when there was little of relevance in the interactions of relatively weak states. Now, even if the various jihad types overcome imperialism and the Zionists, and multilateral containment of imperialism is built, the international system will remain defunct because of actual relations and shall become even more complex in the concept, as ever more groupings jostle for a place in the sun of the international community, contending for power, status, influence, control, markets, and spheres of interest, both concerning like others and relatively weak others. Hence, an octuplet-meaning structure exists concurrently: the traditional concept of the international system still applies to the interactions of the dominant groups, and to some modern international systems, the international community, the cluster of phenomena grouped in many instances, and organizations, the assemblage of power relations, and special relations.

Zionist Violations of International Law in Palestine and other Occupied Territories

It is indeed a common belief among politicians and international lawyers that the solution to the Palestine issue must proceed within the framework of international law. The fact is that Palestine is the only country in the world where these norms have been consistently and systematically violated. The violations are of various kinds and affect every aspect of international law. In the first place, the basic principles upon which international law is based are violated: the equality of states, the illegality of territorial expansion, the prohibition of war, and the respect for human rights. Secondly, countless violations of specific provisions of international conventions have taken place. The plans formulated by Israel concerning the eventual annexation of the remaining part of Palestine, the annexation of Jerusalem and the Golan Heights, the attack on the Suez Canal, the Suez Canal, and the Beirut Airport certainly violate international law, especially the prohibition of territorial expansion, the non-interference in the internal affairs of other countries, the prohibition of the use of force, and the prohibition of reprisals.

Equality among states, sovereignty, independence, and territorial integrity, non-interference in the internal affairs of other countries, human rights, non-use of force in international affairs, the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by use of force, and the right of peoples to self-determination are basic principles on which, at least in words, the entire structure of international law is based. Although the unequal treaties which the national states have concluded with the colonial administrations infiltrate the international legal establishment, the fact is that contemporary law has codified and developed such important and revolutionary principles in this regard. In the eyes of some, the importance of the non-use of force, the prohibition of violations against independence, the non-interference in the internal affairs of other countries, and the respect and protection of human rights are basic elements of success for a society based on welfare and lasting peace.

International law is the covenant of the civilized world. It provides the foundation of all social relations and lays down the principles and values that should govern humanity's behaviour toward itself and the world at large. In the long and tortuous centuries of humanity's evolution, the foundation of international law and the organization of international society always reflected the balance of power between states, as conceived at each specific stage of social evolution. Jointly or separately, the ruling elites saw to it that domestic law and international law were shaped and adopted by the interests and prerequisites of the system they dominated, even while reflecting certain semi-universal values and principles of peaceful coexistence. Not only have the principles and sanctions it introduced not been effectively implemented, nor have they stopped it from fomenting situations of oppression, national and social discrimination, or colonization, but imperialism has even systematically violated international law and undermined the authority of international organizations whenever this has been necessary to further its dedication to domination and exploitation and to ensure its control over strategic resources and markets. However, the struggle to assert the principle of lawful relations and solve disputes between states through dialogue, mediation, arbitration, judicial settlement, and respect for equality and sovereignty - preconditions for states as international organizations - represents a valid instrument for protecting peace, cooperation, and development as well as democracy and human rights.

During periods of active violence, like the war on Gaza or the war on Lebanon, aggression receives its most concrete expression. The daily cruelties of the occupation of the West Bank and Gaza, as well as the discrimination faced by the Palestinians as second-class citizens within the borders, ensure an overall context for the grosser and more blatant expressions of colonialist repression. The techniques of repression are numerous and varied: from the destruction of Palestinian homes, the construction and maintenance of roads that may not be used by the indigenous population, the various forms of curfew and restriction of movement within the occupied areas, the hiding or theft of water resources around which the settlements are built, and the confiscation of precious arable land for future settlement expansion. The damage done to individual and family circumstances through the imprisonment or administrative detention of thousands of militants, the use of torture on detainees, or the maiming and killing of activists during their arrests all contribute to reminding the occupied of the costs of resistance.

Another tactic of repression, more insidious and prolonged, has been the international isolation of the Authority and its people since the election of the resistance movement as the government following the elections. Despite the organ of the nation to which this government owes the majority of its obligations and legitimacy, and the refusal of the people to abandon the hope of liberation, freedom of movement, financial contributions, and the legal possibility of representing their nation and choosing its government have all been denied to the Authority and its people. It is important to stress that this repression should be seen in its proper context: the continual effort by the oppressed to resist their colonizers by armed means, and to try and variously make this resistance costlier and more futile, as well as to permanently destroy any possibility of establishing a viable national commune within these territories.

The Apartheid Regime in Israel: Discrimination against Palestinians:

Israel continues to legislate ethnic and racial discrimination by codifying apartheid policies. For example, the Citizenship and Entry into Israel Law denies citizenship or residency to non-Jewish but not Jewish non-citizen spouses, maintaining Israel as a Jewish-majority state. There are also serious concerns that the Jewish Nation-State Law entrenches discrimination against the non-Jewish population in other respects as well. This paper develops a framework for analysing and determining Israeli legislation as constituting crimes against humanity of apartheid and persecution as forms of apartheid against the Palestinian people.

Israel is the only state in the world that possesses institutionalized practices of apartheid that exist today. Apartheid is described as an internationally criminal act that the state and its leaders, both in government and society, actively engage in and plan to ensure its continued existence. A brief description of apartheid periods and conditions reveals its historical beginnings. The rebirth of the plan and regime describes the evaluation that led to the onset of the apartheid rampage. Historical events of the 78-year Israeli aggression under conditions surrounding apartheid on the Palestinians comprise the assessment of apartheid effects.

At the onset of apartheid, each of the basic Israeli regimes produced planners' analyses of period conditions. Expected collective positive reactions by the Palestinians to highly oppressive policies continue to occur today. The effect on society is described through public indicators. International perspectives of apartheid describe the essence of the state's breaking of hundreds of international laws and regulations. Its effect today reveals the world condoning the criminal actions of apartheid while at the same time citizens of nations over decades participated in the anti-apartheid struggle to free the oppressed society. The contrast raises the question: Why does the world not act again to end the embankment of oppressed Palestinians?

Apartheid, an African term meaning the state of being apart, crystallizes the segregation and dichotomy that characterized the political and social landscapes of present-day South Africa until the early 1990s. The term is historically tightly linked to the policies of Cape Colony, inherited by South Africa in 1948 when the Nationalist Party was voted into power, and subsequently applied as the ideological framework of that government. This system caused widespread division and strife in the population and encompassed areas such as territorial segregation, forced labour, and disenfranchisement of the Indigenous population; oversimplified, apartheid enforced a dual caste system in which native Blacks were effectively deprived of their rights, including the basic freedom of movement and expression. They were allowed to live in certain areas only and travel through others when granted a special government-issued permit.

The apartheid regime specified four racial categories: White, Coloured, Black, and Asian, each with its own set of rights. Any one of these was racial identification cards that controlled almost all aspects of daily life, including where one was allowed to shop or dine, which school or hospital to attend, and so on. Because the discrimination faced by Blacks and other non-Whites was born from an entrenched belief in their genetic inferiority and incompatibility with modern Western values, the apartheid system reflected a true form of racial fascism. It effectively replaced race-based identity with race-based hierarchical status, deeming access to all public services and land tenure on this basis, thus reinforcing the social chasm that already existed.

This research paper builds on the analysis object and purpose of the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid and practice before international human rights bodies regarding apartheid. Crimes against humanity are offenses that impinge on human security, such as torture, enslavement, deportation, or denial of the right to life, and the object and purpose of the relevant convention is the protection of individual freedom and a more inclusive and equal society. In contrast, apartheid specifically concerns the maintenance of an institutionalized self-perpetuating system of domination, especially by one race over any other race, based on race, color, descent, or national or ethnic origin, with the object of establishing and maintaining domination by one racial group of persons over any other racial group of persons.

In March 2021, the Office of the Prosecutor of the International Criminal Court announced the initiation of a probe concerning the situation in Palestine. Shortly, the Israeli prime minister issued a statement calling the proceedings “the epitome of antisemitism and hypocrisy,” and the Israeli Foreign Ministry labeled them “morally and legally bankrupt.” These reactions were not out of character, as Israel consistently rebuffs any comparison between the apartheid regime in South Africa and their treatment of the Palestinian people. By doing so, the semantic warfare tends to veer away from discussion of whether a system of differential rights in the occupied Palestinian territories is discriminatory, as well as other established international norms.

Given the strong opposition to the use of the term apartheid, it is of great significance that ongoing legal proceedings are referencing it. Furthermore, on several occasions, legal analyses have been made, and despite the fear of placing this issue firmly under the international legal microscope, this inquiry has much to contribute. Since in some instances, the evidence supporting this premise was excluded, and a mostly historical account was made, the creation of a comprehensive and forward-looking legal analysis is warranted. A full legal appraisal of the apartheid regime in Israel necessarily involves first the historical context and the proper identification of the crimes typical of this practice.

The existing literature is filled with debates on the appropriateness of the term "Apartheid" concerning Israel. While some argue that Israel is a democracy that distinguishes between its religious and non-religious citizens, reports from international NGOs state otherwise and criticize Israeli policies towards Palestinians. This article is part of a larger research project about Palestinians in Jaffa, Israel. The photos used in the chapter stem from interviews and ethnographic studies conducted in the 7th of October neighborhood, including Arab and Jewish residential structures that emerged on lands confiscated from Jaffa in the 1950s and throughout the 21st century. The most recent laws and construction projects aim to strengthen the Jewish character of the neighborhood and decrease the Arab presence in it.

To Answer the main research question of this study: How are the Palestinians of the 7th of October marginalized, discriminated against, and disempowered? The research was conducted in the 7th of October neighborhood, home to Jewish and Arab residents, along with additional structures, some authorized and some not. The neighborhood is situated among affluent Jewish communities, and construction works in recent years have transformed the area to favour a Jewish majority, strengthening Jewish life at the expense of Arab existence. I argue that the state practices a segregationist policy against its Palestinian minority as a Jewish state. This policy increases the Jewish majority in the area at the expense of the rights of the original Arab population, which until recently had building permits.

In 2007, an International Fact-Finding Mission was conducted by independent experts regarding the incident. The Mission's conclusion attests that the State of Israel has discriminated against and is stealing land and expropriating Palestinian citizens' property rights in the area.

In 1966, Israel unilaterally enacted the Apartheid Regime known as the October 7th Amendment, for "maximizing the amount of expropriated land from Palestinian citizens of Israel and

reducing the possibility that they would be reunited with their properties." The Apartheid Law is valid to this day. The June 2021 war on Gaza exhibited the most severe acts of ethnic discrimination and abuse that Palestinians suffer in Israel, and consequently, the Apartheid Law was exposed to the international media through many reports. In addition to the filing of the United Nations Commission of Inquiry Resolution, the Discriminatory Law has entered the legal and political dialogue as a core issue that seeks exposure of Israeli practices. This research aims to answer the following questions: What is the Apartheid Regime in Israel (the 7th of October Apartheid Law)? And, in what ways does it differ from the two types of Apartheid?

The theoretical framework of the research lies in the discriminating old 7th of October 2007 Law that the State of Israel enforces in the confiscated area to segregate its actual Palestinian Christian and Muslim residents. The research focuses on the group of persons defined and referred to in Article 3, Subject and field of application, of the Statute of the International Criminal Court, as constituting the Crime of Apartheid as opposed to the legal properties in the field of state laws, as was expected by Article 1.2 and the Amendment adopted by the Knesset on June 21, 2009, called "Plan for regulation of certain illegal residents in Israel." The legislature attempts to transfer enforcement of the old law by using a different format, not for Israeli citizens. To that end, if as a group, the said group, State intentionally discriminates against the group, preventing the enjoyment of their rights, concerning political, economic, social, and other fields, based either directly or indirectly on the grounds of race or ethnic origin of the said group or its members.

Conclusion and Recommendations

The future of the Arab-Israeli conflict and its implications for international law and human rights in Palestine are inextricably linked to its historical antecedents. It is no coincidence, then, that the torrent of articles, reports, and books that have appeared in the past few years in the ongoing polemic between what are generally referred to as the Zionist narrative and the Palestinian narrative have frequently been preoccupied with the events of 1948. That year saw the consummation of the Jewish political and territorial aspirations that had culminated in the partition of the troubled English mandate in Palestine into separate entities: A Jewish state and an Arab state. It was accompanied by the exodus of the population of over three-quarters of a million non-Jewish Arab men, women, and children who were forced or persuaded to flee from what is now Israel. It was also the year in which Israel was admitted to membership.

The popular imagery of the passage of the Palestine resolution is that it encapsulates the international consensus that addressed the ancient problem of how to give the Jewish people a territorial and political expression without at the same time destroying the legitimate rights and interests of the indigenous Arab population of Palestine. The resolution was, of course, preceded by three decades of struggle by the Jewish national movement to establish a political framework in Palestine that would manifest the rights and privileges generally sought by national groups whose objectives and inspirations were centred on their possession of a particular territory. This subjective right, however, was asserted against the backdrop of the objective right of all peoples to self-determination, a right which, by the end of the Second World War, had been promoted from the status of relative obscurity to an international norm of considerable significance. Ending the Arab-Israeli conflict must be the single most important objective facing the international community in the next three decades. The staggering costs of the hostilities and the concomitant unnecessary human suffering, subversion of international order, potential proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, and affront to shared national policies of nearly every important political unit combine to call for effective measures to change present conditions. This raises the need to analyse what can or should be done based on a realistic assessment of domestic and international variables. The need for an end to the conflict is largely self-evident. Israel's total spending on the defence and civilian components of its national security exceeds by far the combined spending of the other eighteen members of the Arab League. The situation of the Arab countries is no less compelling, whether measured in security costs or economic and social standards. An oil-dependent economy compounds the situation. Despite international development assistance that reached \$2.3 billion in 1977 from the Arab world, \$16 billion has flowed into the country's treasuries, as Israel's national income has exceeded its expenses, largely funded by receipts from that world and indirectly from another source. Political development is also seriously affected. Open systems call for conciliation and compromise between competing

ideologies, but Israeli policies in the occupied territories increasingly serve as an unwelcome polarizing influence, with implications for regional intrastate as well as interstate conflict.

The paper reaches a contentedness, the so-called "Zionist project" is based on the idea that Jews are one people who need representation by a state. According to Zionist ideology, Jews are unable to have equality with non-Jews other than in a state that represents them as Jews. Political Zionism is a nationalist ideology with a settler-colonial practice, created by Jews who believed in the desirability and feasibility of "Judaizing" Palestine to the point that it turned into a racially exclusivist state. With the escalation of the conflict in Palestine, the Zionist movement further developed a framework of exclusion and racial subordination based on racist doctrines. The ultimate goal of political Zionism has been and still is to colonize Palestine, driving away its Palestinian inhabitants and absorbing their place in the cultural and social life of the Jewish people. Political Zionists have constantly discriminated against Palestinians, subordinating them to this goal and, to achieve it, they have often ruled out every principle of international law inhibiting their freedom of action in eliminating the territories of the previous residents. These actions have turned Palestine into a land of apartheid; a land where the governmental machinery does not act equally toward its citizens, systematically discriminates against them, and is based on racial criteria to maintain power. Since 1948, the political project of removing Palestinians from Palestine, through direct means, was converted into a persistent process of colonization of that same territory by creating conditions of life in which the occupying settlers are privileged and the occupied natives are excluded. Today, the Hebrew State has adopted apartheid as an ideology of difference that is racist and unmissable, because its objective remains the domination of native Palestinians using violence and oppression to achieve a centuries-old goal of confiscating Palestinian lands. To maintain a regime based on the domination of one racial group over another, the policies and practices of this regime are similar to those associated with apartheid as a crime against humanity, as described in international law.

In the end, I could say that Zionist policies regarding Palestine, its people, and their properties descended through historical developments, its conceptions and objectives, and its transformation into a state by occupying about 95% of Palestine. These policies have violated the two basic elements of the human community: human rights and their respected deterring structure, namely international law. Since the eruption of World War II, when international crimes were committed, the link between these two structures started to appear in the accounts of the trials. Both branches of legal thought about the historic event were in a vacuum or were disregarded by the international community at the general level during the period of the liberation of colonies. After that turning point, particularly marked by the development of the Declaration of Human Rights and the codification of the laws of war, relations between the two branches of legal thought began to appear.

References

- "A2. European Union, Internal Report on "Area C and Palestinian State Building," Brussels, January 2012 (excerpts)". *Journal of Palestine Studies*. 41 (3): 220–223. Spring 2012. doi:10.1525/jps.2012.xli.3.220. JSTOR 10.1525/jps.2012.xli.3.220.
- CERD/C/ISR/CO/17-19, Concluding Observations on the Combined Seventeenth to Nineteenth Reports of Israel (27 January 2020) para. 23; UNHCR, "Israel's 55-year Occupation of Palestinian Territory is Apartheid – UN Human Rights Expert" (25 March 2022); Al-Haq et al., *Israeli Apartheid: Tool of Zionist Settler Colonialism* (29 November 2022); Al Mezan, *The Gaza Bantustan – Israeli Apartheid in the Gaza Strip* (29 November 2021); Addameer and Harvard Human Rights Clinic, *Joint Submission on Apartheid to the UN Independent Commission of Inquiry on the Occupied Palestinian Territory and Israel* (3 March 2022); B'Tselem, *A regime of Jewish Supremacy from the Jordan River to the Mediterranean Sea: This is Apartheid* (12 January 2021); Human Rights Watch, *A Threshold Crossed, Israeli Authorities and the Crimes of Apartheid and Persecution* (27 April 2021); Amnesty International, *Israel's Apartheid Against Palestinians A Look Into Decades of Oppression and Domination* (2022).
- Cullinan, Maeve (21 February 2024). "Sexual violence against Palestinian women 'may be higher than first thought', says UN expert". *The Daily Telegraph*. Archived from the original on 5 March 2024. Retrieved 7 March 2024.

- Dr. Mohammad Salim Al-Rawashdeh, *The International Efforts to Encounter the Phenomenon of International Terrorism*, Vol...64, Issue-2, *Journal of Law, Policy and Globalization*. ISSN 2224-3240.. 2017. www.iiste.org.
- Dr. Mohammad Salim Al-Rawashdeh, *Arab National Security (Dimensions, perceptions, challenges, risks and future strategy*. Volume-4, Issue-2, January, 2019), *Saudi Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*.(Scholars Middle East Publishers, Dubai, United Arab Emirates)
- Enzo Cannizzaro, "Contextualizing Proportionality: Jus ad Bellum and Jus in Bello in the Lebanese War" 88 *Int'l Rev. Red Cross* (2006) 779; Antonio Cassese, *Self-determination of Peoples: A Legal Reappraisal* (CUP 1995) 99; Christine Gray, *International Law and the Use of Force* (OUP 2008); Vaivos Koutroulis, "The Application of International Humanitarian Law and International Human Rights Law in Situation of Prolonged Occupation: Only a Matter of Time?" 885 *Int'l Rev. Red Cross* (March 2012); David Hughes, "Of Tactics, Illegal Occupation and the Boundaries of Legal Capability: A Reply to Ardi Imseis" 31(3) *European Journal of International Law* (August 2020) 1087; Ralph Wilde, "Using the Master's Tools to Dismantle the Master's House: International Law and Palestinian Liberation" *Palestine Yearbook of International Law* vol. 22 (2019–2020); Ralph Wilde, "Is the Israeli occupation of the Palestinian West Bank (including East Jerusalem) and
- Francis, Sahar (Summer 2014). "Status of Palestinian Prisoners in International Humanitarian Law". *Journal of Palestine Studies*. 43 (4): 39–48. doi:10.1525/jps.2014.43.4.39. ISBN 978-1-466-80054-0. JSTOR 10.1525/jps.2014.43.4.39.
- Gaza 'Legal' or 'Illegal' in International Law?" University College London (29 November 2022); Vito Todeschini, "Out of Time: On the (Il)legality of Israel's Prolonged Occupation of the West Bank" in *Prolonged Occupation and International Law Israel and Palestine*, Nada Kiswanson and Susan Power, eds. (Brill 2023); Valentina Azarova, "Israel's Unlawfully Prolonged Occupation: Consequences Under An Integrated Legal Framework" *European Council on Foreign Relations* (June 2017) p. 7; Valentina Azarova, "Business and Human Rights in Occupied Territory: The United Nations Database of Businesses Involved in Israel's Settlements in Occupied Palestinian Territory" *Business and Human Rights Journal* vol. 3(2) (2018) pp. 1–23; Valentina Azarova, "Illegal Territorial Regimes: On the Operation of International Law in Crimea", in *The Use of Force against Ukraine and International Law*, Sergey Sayapin and Evhen Tsybulenko, eds. (TMC Asser Press 2018).
- Gregory H. Fox, "Transformative Occupation and the Unilateralist Impulse", 885 *International Review of the Red Cross*, (March 2012) 237.
- Harel, Amos (5 June 2017). "Settlements Do Not Serve Israel's Security Needs, Say Former Generals". *Haaretz*. Archived from the original on 12 May 2019. Retrieved 10 January 2024.
- "HRW says inhumane treatment of Palestinian detainees amounts to 'war crime'". *Al Jazeera*. 11 December 2023. Archived from the original on 12 December 2023. Retrieved 12 December 2023.
- ICRC, "What Does the Law Say About the Responsibilities of the occupying Power in the Occupied Palestinian Territory?" (28 March 2023). "The ICRC considers Gaza to remain occupied territory on the basis that Israel still exercises key elements of authority over the Strip, including over its borders (airspace, sea and land – at the exception of the border with Egypt). Even though Israel no longer maintains a permanent presence inside the Gaza Strip, it continues to be bound by certain obligations under the law of occupation that are commensurate with the degree to which it exercises control over it."
- International Court of Justice, *Case Concerning Armed Activities on the Territory of the Congo (Democratic Republic of the Congo v. Uganda)* (Judgment) *International Court of Justice Reports* 168 (19 December 2005), para. 345, p. 287.
- International Court of Justice, *Legal Consequences of the Construction of a Wall in the Occupied Palestinian Territory* (Advisory Opinion) *International Court of Justice Reports* 136 (2004) p. 136-140.
- International Court of Justice, *Case Concerning Armed Activities on the Territory of the Congo (Democratic Republic of the Congo v. Uganda)* (Judgment) *International Court of Justice Reports* 2005 (19 December 2005) Separate Opinion of Judge Kooijmans, para. 62; Doris

- Appel Graber, *The Development of the Law of Belligerent Occupation* (Columbia University Press 1949) 40-49.
- “Israel’s Creeping Annexation: Knesset Votes to Extend Israeli Law to Academic Institutions in the West Bank”, *Haaretz*, 12 February 2018.
- Mohammad Salim Al-Rawashdeh , *Arab National Security* (Dimensions, perceptions, challenges, risks and future strategy, Volume-4, Issue-2, January, 2019), *Saudi Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*.(Scholars Middle East Publishers, Dubai, United Arab Emirates)
- Mohammad Salim Al-Rawashdeh, *The phenomenon of International Conflict in International Relations*, Vol-5-2017, Issue- 4, *The International Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities Invention* ISSN: 2349-2031 (Scientific Indexing Services SIS)
- Mohammad Salim Al-Rawashdeh, .*International and Regional Political Competitions in Syria "Geo-political dimension*, Vol. 25, Issue - 1, 2018, *Journal of Political Studies*, DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCES, University of Punjab-Lahore-Pakistan.
- Mohammad Salim Al-Rawashdeh, *Scenarios of Strategic balance and instability in the Middle East*. VOL,2 ISSUE 5. *International Journal of Humanities & Social Science Studies (IJHSSS)* lingual Research Journal ISSN: 2349-6959. ISSN: 2349-6711.
- Mohammad Salim Al-Rawashdeh, *Political Fluctuations in the US - Arab Relations*, Vol-7-2017, Issue-3, *International Journals of Multidisciplinary Research Academy (IJMRA)*
- Michael Lynk, “Prolonged Occupation or Illegal Occupant?” (EJILTALK, 16 May 2018).
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs, *Israeli Settlements and International Law* (30 November 2015).
- Norway Supreme Court, *A. v. Oslo Sparebank* (The Crown Intervening) (January 14, 1956) *International Law Reports* Year, 1956, p. 795.
- Ottoman Debt Arbitration*, *Borel Arbitration*, 3 *International Law Reports* 1925–1926, (28 April 1925) Case No. 360.
- Robert Jennings, Arthur Watts, *Oppenheim’s International Law*, Volume I, Peace (9th edition, Longman, London and New York) 204.
- Rosalyn Higgins, “The Place of International Law in the Settlement of Disputes by the Security Council”, 64 *AM. J. INT’L L.* 1, (1970) 8; Gabriella Blum, “The Fog of Victory” 24 *Eur. J. Int’l L.* (2012) 391; Omar Dajani, “Symposium on Revisiting Israel’s Settlements: Israel’s Creeping Annexation”, 111 *American Journal of International Law* (2017) 52; Salvatore Fabio Nicolosi, “The Law of Military Occupation and the Role of De Jure and De Facto Sovereignty” XXXI *Polish Yearbook of International Law* (2011).
- Roth, Richard; El Damanhy, Kareem; Greene, Richard Allen (20 February 2024). "UN experts demand investigation into claims Israeli forces killed, raped and sexually assaulted Palestinian women and girls". *CNN*. Archived from the original on 20 February 2024. Retrieved 7 March 2024.
- State of Palestine, “It Is Apartheid: The Reality of Israel’s Colonial Occupation of Palestine” (June 2021).
- Sayed, Hani (2014). "The Fictions of the Illegal Occupation in the West Bank and Gaza". *Oregon Review of International Law*. 16: 79. Archived from the original on 6 September 2023.
- Shlaim, Avi (2015). "Israeli Interference in Internal Arab Politics: The Case of Lebanon". In Luciani, Giacomo; Salamé, Ghassan (eds.). *The Politics of Arab Integration*. Routledge. pp. 232–254. ISBN 978-1-317-41119-2. Archived from the original on 7 March 2024.
- Shulman, David D. (2007). *Dark Hope: Working for Peace in Israel and Palestine*. University of Chicago Press. ISBN 978-1-459-62712-3. Archived from the original on 7 March 2024.
- Shulman, David D. (2018). *Freedom and Despair: Notes from the South Hebron Hills*. University of Chicago Press. ISBN 978-0-226-56665-8. Archived from the original on 7 March 2024.
- Shehadeh, Raja (17 September 2020). "Occupying Palestine is rotting Israel from inside. No Gulf peace deal can hide that". *The Guardian*. Archived from the original on 17 May 2023. Retrieved 10 January 2024.
- Sher, Gilead (2006). *The Israeli–Palestinian Peace Negotiations, 1999–2001: Within Reach*. Routledge. ISBN 978-0-714-68542-7. Archived from the original on 7 March 2024.
- Sherwood, Harriet (5 December 2013). "Israeli former security chief: failure to end conflict is bigger threat than Iran". *The Guardian*. Archived from the original on 18 September 2019. Retrieved 10 January 2024.

Shezaf, Hagar (23 June 2020). "When an Archaeological 'Find' Can Evict Palestinians From Their Home". Haaretz. Archived from the original on 29 October 2021. Retrieved 10 January 2024.

Shezaf, Hagar (8 July 2021). "Palestinians Claiming Land at Illegal Outpost Take Israel's Deal With Settlers to Court". Haaretz. Archived from the original on 21 May 2022. Retrieved 10 January 2024.

Shwenk Edmund H., "Legislative Power of the Military Occupant under Article 43 Hague Regulations", 54(2) Yale Law Journal (1944–1945) 393–418, 400.

The Constitution of the World Zionist Organization and the Regulations for its Implementation (Updated November 2019). Article 2 of the World Zionist Organization's Constitution states that "the aim of Zionism is to create for the Jewish people a home in Eretz Israel secured by public law".

United Nations Security Council resolution 674 (29 October 1990), para. 11.

United Nations Security Council resolution 435 (1978), para. 2; United Nations Security Council resolution 276 (1970).

United Nations General Assembly resolution 62/243 (25 April 2008) para. 5.

United Nations Habitat, "Spatial Planning in Area C of the Israeli Occupied West Bank of the Palestinian Territory Report of an International Advisory Board" (May 2015) 18.