

Zionist Occupation: A Historical Analysis of the Israeli-Palestinian Question

Siyonist İşgal: İsrail-Filistin Sorununun Tarihsel Analizi

İbrahim Keskin¹, Moh'd Abdalla², Emine Vuslat Özke³

1) Prof. Dr., Bursa Uludağ University, Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Dept. of Sociology

ORCID: 0000-0002-9423-9236, ikeskin@uludag.edu.tr

2) Independent Researcher, **ORCID:** 0009-0003-8003-6432, mohd01001@gmail.com

3) Bursa Uludağ University, Institute of Social Sciences, PhD Student

ORCID: 0009-0009-3798-238X, eminevuslatozke@gmail.com

Arrival Date: 02/08/2024 - **Acceptance Date:** 06/11/2024

DOI: 10.55205/jocsosa.3120241527145

Citation: Keskin, İ., Abdalla, M. ve Özke, E. V. (2024) Zionist Occupation: A Historical Analysis of the Israeli-Palestinian Question. *Cihannüma Social Science Academy Journal*, 3(1), 30-45.

Abstract

Since biblical times, the Jews wanted to go back to the Eretz-Israel continuously, because the traditional Jewish belief holds that God promised Jewish people this land. However, the ambition of Jews to make Palestine their homeland planted the seeds of conflict between the Palestinians and the Israelites. The exposure of this desire had no perceivable effect until Zionists won armed assistance of the imperial powers. This is also based on a false idea that a land without a people for a people without a land formula should work. However, sacrificial clauses have always been expected from the Palestinian party. Therefore, in this article, scholarly works that consider the history of relations between the Palestinian and the Israeli authorities are evaluated in a descriptive manner from the beginning to this day. In this way, one can reach an understanding of possible solutions regarding the creation of one-state or two states in order to be able to reevaluate the critical issues taking place in the area these days.

Keywords: Zionism, Palestine, Israel, Jewish immigrants, Jewish settlement.

Siyonist İşgal: İsrail-Filistin Sorununun Tarihsel Analizi

Öz

Kitab-ı Mukaddes'te anılması dolayısıyla Yahudiler sürekli Eretz-İsrail'e dönmeyi istediler. Bunun sebebi, geleneksel Yahudi inancında Tanrı'nın bu bahsi geçen toprakları onlara söz vermesidir. Ancak Yahudilerin Filistin'i anavatan yapma isteği konusundaki hırslı tutumu, Filistin ve İsrail arasında geçimsizlik çıkmasına sebep olmuştur. Siyonistler emperyalist güçlerin desteğini kazanana kadar söz konusu isteğin dışavurumunun gözle görülür bir etkisi olmamıştır. Bu aynı zamanda topraksız bir halk için halksız bir toprak formülünün işe yaraması gerektiğine dair yanlış bir inanca dayanmaktadır. Zaten fedakârlığa katlanması her zaman Filistin tarafından beklenmiştir. Bu yüzden bu makalede, Filistinli ve İsraili otoriteler arasındaki ilişkilerin tarihini geçmişten günümüze kadar göz önünde bulunduran akademik çalışmalar, betimsel bir şekilde değerlendirilmiştir. Bu şekilde, bugünlerde bölgede meydana gelen gelişmelerin yeniden farklı bir gözle değerlendirilebilmesi amacıyla önceden ortaya konan tek devletli yahut iki devletli çözüm önerilerine dair bir anlayışa ulaşılabilmesi umut edilmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Siyonizm, Filistin, İsrail, Yahudi göçmenler, Yahudi yerleşkesi.

Introduction

Zionism was one of the nationalist ideologies that emerged in the nineteenth century under the influence of political developments in Europe. According to the ideology, Jews share a common history and culture. These historical and cultural elements are fundamental and morally significant to their community. This is the reason that Zionism inspired many Jews to realize their "right" to self-determination in the land of Palestine rather than in any other place where Jews were already populated. Moreover, this reason is based on biblical verses that mention the name of Zion. Zion is the name of a city, captured by the King David about 1000 BC. Later, David's son, King Solomon, built the Temple in this area. However, the area covers a small portion of Jerusalem. After that, Babylonians invaded Jerusalem and Jews were removed to Babylon in 586 BC. In the following years, the Romans expelled the Jews from Palestine due to the revolts led by Bar Kokhba. These revolts took place in 135 CE, which is why the same events are considered to mark the beginning of the Jewish diaspora.



For many years, even though the Jews adapted to their lives in different countries all over the world, they succeeded in preserving their identity. In addition to that preservation, they transferred their narration of a dream about returning to Zion, which is considered to be part of the so-called promised land, one day for almost two millennia, from generation to generation.

Initially, this narration was based on religious beliefs. From biblical times, the Jewish people have been waiting for their redemption, which would be provided on the Day of Judgement. This day refers to times when all nations would find peace after the coming of the Messiah. However, in time, this notion of redemption and the term Zion have become politically oriented during the age of nationalism in Europe, affecting Jewish communities in both positive and negative, but mostly negative ways.

This article will, therefore, try to provide links between religious discourses and political claims. These claims serve for the realization of the historical rights of Israel. Additionally, the article will also try to reach an understanding of probable solutions discussed by some academics. In order to do this, in the first sections of the article, the history of Zionist movement will be introduced in a descriptive manner from the beginning to this day under the different phases where religious and political discourses will be analyzed at the same time. Last, two different solutions for the peace in Palestine (namely, the creation of one state and the creation of two states) will be compared, for it will help providing a comprehensive reading about the region.

Zionist Movement

Starting from the 1700s, a group of Jews, about 1500 in Eastern European countries -Poland and Lithuania- began their journey to Palestine. In the middle of the eighteenth century, a small minority population of Jews already resided in Palestine (Harms and Ferry, 2008). The economic hardship that the Jewish immigrants encountered made it difficult to live in Palestine. Consequently, agricultural schools were founded, and with the emergence of the so-called “anti-Semitism” towards the end of the nineteenth century the wave of Jewish immigration increased toward Palestine.¹ The Jews from Rus-

1 Harms and Ferry (2008) states that when a German journalist named Wilhelm Marr used the word “anti-Semitic,” it became popular towards the end of the nineteenth century. At first, the term was referring to religious hatred. However, after a while, it meant racist hatred. Although the Jews adopted the culture of the society in which they live, they were always defined biologically as Jews.

sia were at high speed to head not only to Palestine but also to the different parts of the world.

The Jews who immigrated to Palestine formed two groups of movements: Bilu and Hovevei Zion (Lovers of Zion) -or later Hibbat Zion (The Love of Zion)- and slowly started their activities in Palestine. In 1882, under the financial support of Baron Edmond de Rothschild, they managed to build the Jewish town known as Zikron Yaakov (Memory of Jacob). Gilbert (1998) says that in the same year, a British citizen, Hayyim Amzalak, bought land, gave it to Bilu, and financed the building of Jewish villages known as Petah Tikvah and Rishon le-Zion (First to Zion). Villagers were dealing with agricultural activities and were supported by Moses Montefiore Testimonial Fund. Later, educational activities of the Jews also increased. There opened a Hebrew spoken kindergarten and a primary school for children. These developments in Jewish settlements caused an increase in the number of Jewish immigrants in the area. Between 1864 and 1889, only in Jerusalem, they reached to 25.000 while the Arabs were 14.000.

According to Hellinger *et al.* (2018) these were the first movements introduced under the heading of religious Zionism in order to redeem the land, since the religious Zionists aim at controlling the Greater Land of Israel. Settling down in Palestine was already planned in accordance with the messianic ideals of Holy Bible. However, the religious Zionists believe that this God-given state should be delivered to them without bloodshed. They believe that a Jew can choose to live in Palestine as an individual but cannot establish a state². Therefore, since then, they oppose to the actions of the government if those actions provide an obstacle for the realization of the divine plan.³

2 This idea is based on an interpretation of Talmud Meseches Kesuvos 111a (which also interprets The Song of Songs 2:7, 3:5, 8:4) by saying Heaven and Earth made three vows for Jews not to get Eretz Yisrael/Falastin with a massive force but one by one. <https://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/anti-zionism-among-jews>.

3 According to the Book of Genesis (15:18-21) on that day the Lord made a covenant with Abram and said, "To your descendants I give this land, from the Wadi of Egypt to the great river, the Euphrates- the land of the Kenites, Kenizzites, Kadmonites, Hittites, Perizzites, Rephaites, Amorites, Canaanites, Girgashites and Jebusites." However, this gift comes with a strict observance of some other verses (The Book of Numbers, Chapter 15; The Book of Judges, 11:22-25) in the Holy Bible. The religious Zionists believe that since they were not able to observe these verses, they have cast out. Yet, they also believe that Israel is their homeland and God will give their land to them but in a miraculous way. Their belief is based on the following verse: The Prophecy of Jeremias 32:37 "Behold I will gather them together out of all the lands to which I have cast them out in my anger, and in my wrath, and in my great indignation; and I will bring them again into this place, and will cause them to dwell securely." This may mean that the religious Zionists are, at the same time, religious Anti-Zionists. <https://www.ewtn.com/catholicism/library>.



During this course of events, the emergence of Theodor Herzl in the 1890s changed the direction of the Jewish goal in Palestine. On his side, he was frustrated by the anti-Semitism and suggested the solution of being free from it. Herzl convinced Jews to live in a Jewish land with a Jewish government and not to be assimilated into the society they live in; thus, from this option, the aim of Zionism was politically oriented. The journey of establishing the state of Israel started when Herzl organized the World Zionist Organization in 1896. The idea of political Zionism got high support from the Jews when Herzl published his book entitled "*The Jewish State*." In his book, Herzl (1896:41) says:

"We suddenly discover our strength. Yes, we are strong enough to form a state and, indeed, a model state... The Jews would not live in a ghetto in a new state... The state would be a testimony to enlightenment and emancipation; it would witness the birth of the modern Jew in a Jewish state... it would no longer be possible to scatter them all over the world. The Diaspora cannot take place again unless the civilization of the whole earth shall collapse."

The idea of Herzl for founding a state for Jews in the land of Palestine was against the focus of the Jewish Colonization Association, which provided financial assistance for the establishment of Jewish settlements in Argentina, Brazil, the United States, Canada, and Cyprus. According to Gans (2008), Herzl was criticised because this attempt would oppose to the universal traits of Judaism. However, to Herzl, a Jewish state would not be a luxury but a compensation for what was experienced throughout the history.

However, it was the Basle declaration that brought future hope to the Jews, especially Herzl, who visualized the Jewish state. The Jews' morale increased in the fifth congress of 1901, in which the Jews National Fund was introduced to buy land in Palestine. Funds would be collected from the Jewish Diaspora, especially in Britain, Germany, the United States, and Austria-Hungary. In these countries, small tin boxes were placed in shops, synagogues, offices, and public areas; consequently, Kfar Hittim (Grain Village) in Galilee was purchased through this fund. The Jewish National Fund succeeded in achieving various targeted goals despite misunderstanding that happened amongst the Zionists (Gilbert, 1998).

However, Gans (2008:13) states that in 1902, the unity of Zionists

broke up after Herzl accepted the offer from the British Colonial Secretary Joseph Chamberlin to make British East Africa, especially Uganda, a Jewish homeland:

“Herzl accepted this with the view that Uganda would be a temporary asylum for one million Russian Jews. The opposing side, under Nordau, insisted on the settlement in Palestine, for they saw Uganda was not Palestine, but Herzl replied, “Like Moses, he was leading the people to their goal via an apparent detour.” This led to the sixth Zionist congress, for some time known as “the Uganda Congress” in Basle, where the delegates were against any other place except Palestine; hence, Herzl had a hard time winning over Nordau’s decision. In the end, Herzl succeeded in persuading the 295 delegates to accept the Uganda plan 175 against and 99 abstained. The decision to establish the Jewish settlement in Uganda failed due to Herzl’s death on July 3, 1904.”⁴

Five years after Herzl’s death, the Jewish National Fund succeeded in buying land from Turks in 1909, where they established “later called Tel Aviv and today’s capital city of Israel” (Dowty, 2019).

The Balfour Declaration and the Idea of the State of Israel

Tel Aviv came to be known as the first all-Jewish city. There opened a Hebrew language high school, the Herzliya Gymnasium, named after Herzl. Two of the first streets of the new town were named after Herzl and Abad Ha’am. When war broke out in 1914, more than 2.000 Jews lived in Tel Aviv in fewer than two hundred dwellings (Gilbert 1998). However, the outbreak of World War I brought many changes in the region when Ottomans fought on Germany’s side, and the British gained support from the Jewish community under the persuasive power of Chaim Weizmann. Prior (1999) argues that for the Jews, gaining the assistance of a European power was critical. In order to be able to do that Weizmann claimed that the Jewish existence in

4 With these kind of statements one can observe the orientation of religious Zionism with political Zionism; that is Herzl’s reply about being like Moses.



the area would provide an efficient safeguard for the Suez Canal.

Therefore, the Balfour Declaration came to be the result of this trust, which secures the interests of the Jews in the area. It was drafted by the United Kingdom's Foreign Secretary, Arthur Balfour. Yet Harms and Ferry (2008) point out that the Balfour Declaration was debated and lobbied intensely. In order to form a Jewish state in Palestine and not to deprive non-Jewish population of their rights and privileges (Immell, 2010), the British part used an inadequate language.⁵ It was believed that this use of language would help bring about reconciliation between the Zionists, the anti-Zionists, the Americans, the Arabs and Shariff Hussein.

However, the declaration, in one way or another, planted the seeds of conflict not only in Palestine but also in the Middle East, because neither the Arabs' names nor their political rights were mentioned in the declaration. This led to increasing hostility between Arabs and Jews since Arabs were not ready to see the influx of Jewish migrants to Palestine. From here, the long-term friendship and solidarity between the Arab and the Jewish communities reached an end, as Gilbert (1998) argued by emphasizing that Arab hostility to Zionism had emerged before World War I, and intensified after it. In 1920, there were Arab protests against further Jewish immigration. As the tension increased between the Arabs and the Jews, in 1929, the Shaw Commission was set up to investigate the reason for unrest and conflict. Controlling and limiting the Jewish immigration to Palestine was the only suggestion of the Shaw Report. As a corollary of this, Jewish immigrants were temporarily stopped, but after a while, the situation relapsed. It was very difficult to stop the Jews from immigrating to Palestine during the inter-war period since they suffered a lot from the Nazi regime.

When Hitler came to power on 30 January 1933, the lives of Jews got worse. Hitler's policy of attacking on German Jews such as exclusion from their professions and driving them out of their villages and towns led to a sudden upsurge in immigration. The Jews were rushed to Palestine in large numbers.⁶ The pattern of immigration fluctuated dramatically. Not only was immigration from Germany encouraged by the new German authorities, but the restrictions on immigration to Palestine were minimal at that time. The

5 For the full content of the Balfour Declaration see Harms and Ferry, 2008, p. 69.

6 More than 60.000 Jews came to Palestine during 1930s. encyclopedia.ushmm.org/content/en/article/refugees.

resulting influx of refugees from Germany altered the demographic balance⁷ of Palestine Jewry (Farsakh, 2021). However, this Jewish situation, as well as the Great Depression, which increased the number of unemployed Arabs, did not stop the Arabs from revolting against the illegal Jewish immigrants. This continued till 1946 when a foundation for establishing Jewish settlement in Palestine was laid. This was part of a bigger plan, namely the idea of Greater Israel (Eretz Yisrael Hashlema). This is a Jewish policy to expand territory and sovereignty of Israeli state which consists the historic area from Palestine, Golan Heights, Jordan River and the Mediterranean Sea as the Jewish Promised Land and considered to be their divine right regardless of who settles on the land. Some people see this policy as a dangerous ideology that centers on ethno-supremacy and the marginalization of the land from indigenous Palestine people (Afarra, 2023 and Beloff, 2013).

The UN Decision of Partition, Israeli Statehood, and the Afterwards

After the World War II, the British government brought the issue of Palestine before the assembly of the United Nations, which opened a special session in 1947 to hear the arguments. Yet Gilbert (1998) states that the speech given by an American Zionist, Abba Hillel Silver, was sufficient to explain the process itself, because in his speech he mentioned that the Jews were their allies during the war and they sacrificed a lot for the victory of European powers. Hence, he continued his speech with careful choice of words hoping that it would highlight common prospects of the Jews with the Europeans.

As a result of the speedy recognition of the state of Israel by the United Nations, it was thought that the Great Powers had provided a permanent solution between the Palestinians and the Jews. Instead, the United Nations ended up making things worse. The decision of the United Nations did not ensure constant peace in the region because, after the partition, the organization did not station the peacekeeping forces on both sides. According to Khalidi (2020), the reason for this was there was already a state apparatus functioning for decades on the part of Israel because they already had used their military power against the weakened

7 Between 1929 and 1939, Arab population decreased from 83% to 70% and the population of the Jews increased from 17% to 30%. www.un.org/unispal/document/auto-insert-206581/



Palestinians. They only needed a formal sovereignty by the European powers. As a result, Palestinians decided to restore their sovereignty in the form of a strong resistance soon after the state of Israel was officially proclaimed on May 14, 1948. Therefore, the creation of the Israeli state went hand in hand with the outbreak of endless conflicts between the Arabs and the Jews, resulting in the influx of Palestinian immigration to the Arab countries and different parts of the world, deaths of innocent civilians, and destruction of properties from both sides. Immell (2010) argues that though the Jewish people had secured a victory and fulfilled the Zionist dream in doing so, it created many regional problems, like the emergence of Palestinian refugees. Thus, over the next years, the Arab nations would fight a series of wars with Israel and would consistently deny Israel's right to exist as a sovereign state in the area.

To this day, the Arabs have not stopped thinking that Israel is the enemy and Israel have not stopped thinking that "land for peace" formula will not work and these all became clear at the time of one of the most important milestones in the history of relations between the Palestinians and the Israelis, namely the Oslo Accords in 1993, which made the situation much more complicated in the region (Vatikiotis, 2013). Vatikiotis also points out that the opponents of the Oslo Accords are, at the same time, political exiles. He states that some of these political exiles are well known. One is Dr. Anis Sayegh, director of the PLO Research Center in Beirut and the Gulf, and the other is Dr. Edward Said of Columbia University, a late-comer to both Palestine and the PLO.

So, one should comprehend that all these developments make sure that the Palestine question is something more than a territorial issue. For instance, Edward W. Said, the writer of the book "The Question of Palestine" (1980) and who opposed the Oslo Accords, firmly states that the issue is rooted in the complex narratives of colonialism. Said is a Palestinian intellectual and scholar who experienced exile while feeling responsible for the situation in the Middle East (Said, 2000). He wrote articles, attended conferences, and negotiated the peace talks between the two sides throughout his life. He recommended that the Palestinian narrative is marginalized in mainstream media and institutions, and this attitude serves the denial of Palestinian rights in the region.

Additionally, he believed that the peace process, since the beginning,

has perpetuated a segregated view of the future. He emphasized that the people do not focus on peace and justice but on war and security. This is why he spent a great deal of time speaking out for the cause of the Palestinians. Therefore, his significant contributions to the Palestine question's discourse should be considered. These contributions are based on challenging orientalist stereotypes and advocating for Palestinian self-determination. In his powerfully stated sentences in the book *Orientalism* (1978), Said explored how the Western world distorted and dehumanized the culture and history of Arabs. These distortions and dehumanizations are not innocent at all because they are the same colonial powers who assisted the Israeli government in terms of arms and funds. Since the conflict between Israel and Palestine continues today, one can see how deeply rooted are Said's arguments in this book. Moreover, this point of view helps us to bring the possible solution proposals for 'one-state' and 'two states' into consideration.

Solution Proposals

The Israeli-Palestinian question became one of the world's trending stories from the 1940s to the present day. The situation emerged as a question of land and self-determination in the region whereby the Jews claim that the land of Palestine is their original homeland, and Palestinians see the region being their original land as well. Indeed, the region's history shows that the earliest inhabitants were Canaanites, the ancestors of both the Arabs and the Jews. In the divine books, these two nations descended from the sons of Abraham. That is to say, the modern Palestinians and Jews came from the same path, but they differed in cultural and religious beliefs.

Thus, according to the historical facts, it is not wise for the Jews to claim self-determination in Palestine per se. The Jews' argument concerning national determination in Palestine does not hold water, because the modern Jews came to Palestine as immigrants with their nationalities of European countries like Germany, Poland, Russia, and others. After landing in Palestine, they bought land from the indigenous people and started their activities, especially farming. In fact, these immigrant Jews, who came mainly from Europe, were strangers to the region. Then why and how could a stranger who bought and conquered the land claim



self-determination in the region? If the region was their homeland, why did they buy the land? However, this was done deliberately to legalize the occupation of the land of Palestine after what was known as the Balfour Declaration in 1917. This meant that the creation of the Jewish state depended highly on the support of big powers and was finally blessed by the United Nations. Therefore, the major cause of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict is based on neither religious beliefs nor ethnicity, but its main cause is the “occupation” of the Palestinian land by the Zionists.

The support that Israel secured from the big powers makes them somehow innocent, and the Palestinians who seek self-determination have become terrorists. This is a double standard, because, for many years in Palestine, the Israelistate has committed actions that are against universal human rights. Unfortunately, the UN Security Council remains silent. Surprisingly, the Western media broadcast these immoral and illegal actions done by the Israelistate in a biased way and perpetuate using of the word “conflict” to give the impression that the occupier and the occupied are equals in terms of resources, international support, and even the possession of the same weapons. Moreover, the question of the right to self-determination for the Palestinians is undermined by the Zionist government and its allies. Since the creation of the Jewish state, Palestinians have become valueless, with no dignity, and lack international support to attain their self-determination. This brings us to the real question: What should be done?

The question of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict has been discussed by many writers and politicians whereby they suggested possible solutions. Some proposed “one-state” solution, under which both communities -Palestinians and Jews- will live together within the borders of the same state. The others argued that the two-state solution is the best alternative considering the urgent need for stability in the area.

As for the one-state solution, the new state will not be based on race, ethnicity, and religion. This view can be taken into consideration if there is an aim of creating political unity between Palestinians and Jews. According to Pappé (2010) and Khalidi (2006), the realization of two-state solution requires more effort than thought. Besides, there are difficult issues to be bargained over such as borders, sovereignty of the new state, and refugees. In spite of the deep desires of both parties for having their own states, Pappé and Khalidi, separately, stressed that the stronger par-

ty will continue to impose its will on the weaker one. Because two states solution has always been the preference of Zionists. This idea of two-state still guides the political system of Israel today. The creation of two states would enable the Zionists to expand the settlement project and increase the volume of violence against Palestinians.

On the other hand, one-state solution is revisited these days but has always been met with hesitation. AsKhalidi (2006) pointed out, there are many different views on one-state solution. Many observers think that current events will eventually lead to a one-state formation since, on the one side, there will remain no Palestine to be created as a state due to the continuing annexation of the land by Israel, and on the other, the population of Palestinians is growing. However, if this happens then how will the parties overcome their distrust against each other or what will be the constitutional structure or the political arrangements? Questions like these need answers in order one-state solution to be realized. However, despite these questions, Pappé (2010) believes that this is the only moral, not just political, settlement that contains, and answers, all the outstanding problems involved in the ongoing conflict.

As a result, it can be said that it is not easy to determine the choices for the destiny of these people but what other solutions are proposed, all should aim to cease the feud immediately and permanently. There is a silver lining that these two peoples are descendants of the same ancestor. Therefore, it may be expected that the future holds high hopes for the next generations who are well aware of this fact.

Conclusion

Historical records show that the conflict between Israeli and Palestinian parts, in one way, has always been different from the conflicts all around the world. It has been affecting not only two groups of people but also the whole Middle East and the other regions long before the globalization became a phenomenon in social studies. This is the same reason why none of the answers help difficult questions at the local, regional or global scales in today's world. This is, again, the same reason why all the steps taken remain shallow. In addition to all of these, no progress can be made and it is getting worse day by day before the eyes of the whole



world. It is everybody's business and nobody's business at the same time.

In the article, it can be seen from the historical outline that all turning points and all milestones has brought the humanity to the edge of barbarism and, in this age, the existence of Palestinian people are being denied of their most basic rights each and every time. Something critical needs to be done. This is because the hidden -but not so hidden- agenda of Zionists continue to serve their aims. And no one on the earth seems to be able to cope with this military muscle neither physically nor religiously and philosophically. From now on, only good intentions of the good people can save this critical situation. However, this is not about the amount of humanitarian aid and donations for the Palestinians. This is about being a human and demanding the same thing both for ourselves and for the people at the other corners of the world in a responsible way. Therefore, this vicious cycle of aggression should immediately be channelled into an effort for the realization of a common ground for the future prospects.

Due to these necessities, the article contains the steps defining the establishment of a Jewish state in Palestine on the basis of biblical verses with the interpretation of political intentions. Accordingly, the use of religious language helps from the beginning because the first settlers named all the settlements including the word Zion as a reference to the ancient city promised to Jewish people by God. Yet, in time, the political intentions grew stronger enough to make religious Zionists oppose to the idea of the establishment of Israel as a state. Additionally, this political ambition has gone hand in hand with the military power before and after the formal introduction of Israel to the international community. This is the reason Palestinians have always seen Israelis as occupiers from the beginning. And they are still longing for the remedy to the root causes that will end the occupation and bring formal recognition as a sovereign nation. As an attempt to consider these demands, the article tries to address the two solution proposals namely "one-state" and "two-state." It seems that the one-state solution is more popular among the leading scholars who are worried about the well being of the people in the region. Since the prerequisites for the realization of "two-state" solution are already in motion, one-state solution seems to deserve a chance in order to give an immediate end to the humanitarian drama taking place everyday for almost five decades.

References

- Alfarra, J. (2023). *From scratch: 'Greater Israel'*. www.middleeastmonitor.com. November 17,2023.
- Beloff, M. (1994). *The Diaspora and the peace process*. Israel Affairs, (1), 27-40.
- Chomsky, N. and Pappé, I. (2010). *Gaza in crisis: Reflections on Israel's war against the Palestinians* (First Edition). Haymarket Books.
- Dowty, A. (2019). *Arabs and Jews in Ottoman Palestine: Two worlds collide* (First Edition). Indiana University Press.
- Farsakh, H. L. (2021). *Rethinking statehood in Palestine: Self-determination and decolonization beyond partition* (First Edition). University of California Press.
- Gans, C. (2008). *A just Zionism: On the morality of the Jewish state* (First Edition). Oxford University Press.
- Gilbert, M. (1998). *Israel: A history* (First Edition). William Morrow and Company, Inc.
- Halwani, R. and Kapitan, T. (2008). *The Israeli-Palestinian conflict: Philosophical essays on self-determination, terrorism, and the one-state solution* (First Edition). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Harms, G. and Ferry, M. T. (2008). *The Palestine-Israel conflict: A basic introduction* (Second Edition). Pluto Press.
- Hellinger, M., Isaac, H. and Bernard S. (2018). *Religious Zionism and the settlement project: Ideology, politics, and civil disobedience* (First Edition). SUNY Press.
- Herzl, T. (1896). *The Jewish state*, MidEastWeb PDF Edition <http://www.middleeastweb.org>.
- <https://www.encyclopedia.ushmm.org/content/en/article/refugees>
- <https://www.ewtn.com/catholicism/library>
- <https://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/anti-zionism-among-jews>
- <https://www.un.org/unispal/document/auto-insert-206581/>
- Immell, M. (2010). *Perspectives on modern world history: The creation of the state of Israel* (First Edition). Gale Cengage Learning.



- Khalidi, R. (2007). *The iron cage: The story of the Palestinian struggle for statehood* (First Edition). Oneworld Publications.
- Khalidi, R. (2020). *The hundred years' war on Palestine: A history of settler colonial conquest and resistance, 1917-2017* (First Edition). Metropolitan Books.
- Prior, M. (1999). *Zionism and the state of Israel: A moral inquiry* (First Edition). Routledge.
- Said, W. E. (1978). *Orientalism* (First Edition). Pantheon Books.
- Said, W. E. (1980) *The question of Palestine* (First Edition). Vintage Books.
- Said, W. E. (2000). *Out of place: A memoir* (First Edition). Knopf.
- Vatikiotis, P. J. (2013). *Peace by the end of the century? A personal gloss on the Arab-Israeli peace process* (First Edition). Taylor and Francis Online. 5-12.

Extended Abstract

The history of relations between Palestine and Israel goes back to the ancient periods when there was no region known as Palestine. The region known as Canaan was renamed by the Emperor Hadrian as Palestina. The area was already dwelt with different cultural identities like Philistines, Judahites, Samaritans, Moabites, Arabs, and Phoenicians.

Jews are descendants of the prophet Abraham's son, Isaac. Additionally, "Israel" stands for the grandson of prophet Abraham, Jacob. However, the geography is equally important for Muslims and Christians also. From the first encounter with the Muslims to the late years of the Ottoman Empire, different societies lived together mostly in peace and harmony but the land of Palestine was divided into three provinces called Jerusalem, Nablus, and Acre in the following years.

Yet today if a person looks at modern maps of the area, he or she will not be able to see Palestine but Gaza Strip and West Bank representing Palestine. On the other hand, the state formed in 1948 in the area is found very easily on the maps. This is of course the result of a bias shared by the defendants of the historical rights of the Jews over the region. However, the area is called the Holy Land since it has importance for all three Abrahamic religions.

For the Jews, it is the promised land. The name Zion is found in the Holy Bible and over time, the people of Israel adopted this name as a mean to their connection with the Messianic hope of redemption. In time, it became associated

with the ideology known as Zionism, which advocated the restoration of the Jews to the Land of Palestine. The organization of the movement, however, was founded in 1897 by Theodor Herzl. And it is this foundation that led to the course of events and formed a special terminology about the area for more than a hundred and fifty years.

This is why there is a gigantic collection of academic works related to the issue. In order to get some ideas even about current agenda taking place in the area, one would get buried under a pile of texts concerning only the suggestions or only the history. Another difficulty is that the recent developments presented by the media can be questioned for their objectivity, too.

Under these circumstances, it seemed to be necessary to outline the past events that led to the catastrophe and therefore analyze negotiations held with the help of foreign powers who have been trying to preserve their own interests in the region for a long time.

Nonetheless, in order to develop a more insightful perspective about this deeply rooted problem, here, the writers of the article have tried to avoid engaging in the past in the form of some truth-seeking effort but they looked into the past as learning new lessons to lay down a precondition for a peaceful coexistence. This also stems from the fact that the meta narratives of both sides are always conflicting. However, if one focuses on negotiations and their requirements to be fulfilled or not, it would be sufficient in terms of understanding the degree of willingness by the both parties to live together in peace in the area. This approach brings up the subject of Zionism as an ideology.

The comprehension of Zionism is considered to be a must in terms of understanding the ideology paving the way to establish the state of Israel. Moreover, its changing content and the basis of justification over the years must be observed so that one can develop a thorough review of the matter. Also this everlasting polarization and war climate inevitably creates inflexible ideas and stringent moral codes since there seems to be no authority existing to evaluate the situation for the equal benefit of two sides.

In this story, some people may identify themselves with Jews as a scattered community and some people may identify themselves with displaced population of Palestinians. However, we should keep an open mind that there are possible scenarios beyond these identifications. In consequence, in this article, the transition of Zionist intentions from a religious one into a political one will be observed because it might be argued that this concept of historical rights has been used only for the Jews to legalize the occupation over Palestine. This analysis helps the readers to develop an understanding of scholarly work on the subject to see whether it is possible to coexist.