

THE ISRAELI-PALESTINIAN CONFLICT IN THE CONTEXT OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS THEORIES

Nina Elghali*

ABSTRACT

The Israeli-Palestinian conflict is seen as one of the complex geopolitical struggles that challenged many theories and approaches in international relations for decades. The two dominant schools in the field of International Relations, liberalism and Realism offer different frameworks that analyze the conflict. Realism highlights the nature of international system as anarchy, believing that security, power, and national interests of the state shall be prioritized to explain the tensions between Palestine and Israel. The principles of balance of power and security dilemma will reduce the violent cycle and peace can be achieved. In contrary, liberalism shifts its focus to cooperation emphasizing the roles of international organizations, economic interdependence, and democracy as a way for conflict resolution. While Realists emphasize on power struggle, Liberalism focuses on diplomatic relations and institutional frameworks. This article explores how both theories contribute to understanding the conflict between Israel and Palestine, explaining, and illustrating their strengths and weaknesses in addressing one of the longest and complex conflicts in modern history.

Keywords: Security, Power, Realism, Liberalism, Israeli-Palestine Conflict, Balance of Power, Institutions, State-Cooperation.

ÖZET

İsrail-Filistin çatışması, on yıllardır uluslararası ilişkiler alanındaki birçok teori ve yaklaşımı zorlayan karmaşık bir jeopolitik mücadele olarak görülmektedir. Uluslararası İlişkiler alanındaki iki baskın okul, liberalizm ve realizm, çatışmayı analiz etmek için farklı çerçeveler sunmaktadır. Realizm, uluslararası sistemin anarşi doğasını vurgular ve güvenlik, güç ve devletin ulusal çıkarlarının, Filistin ile İsrail arasındaki gerilimleri açıklamada öncelikle olduğunu savunur. Güç dengesi ve güvenlik ikilemi ilkelerinin, şiddet döngüsünü azaltacağı ve barışın sağlanabileceği inancını taşır. Buna karşılık, liberalizm iş birliğine odaklanır; uluslararası örgütlerin, ekonomik karşılıklı bağımlılığın ve demokrasinin çatışma çözümünde oynadığı rolleri vurgular. Realistler güç mücadelesini ön plana çıkarırken, liberalizm diplomatik ilişkiler ve kurumsal çerçevelere odaklanır. Bu makale, her iki teorinin de İsrail ve Filistin arasındaki çatışmayı anlamaya nasıl katkı sağladığını incelemekte, modern tarihin en uzun ve karmaşık çatışmalarından birini ele alırken güçlü ve zayıf yönlerini açıklamaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Güvenlik, Güç, Realizm, Liberalizm, İsrail-Filistin Çatışması, Güç dengesi, Kurumlar, Devlet-İşbirliği.

* İstanbul Nişantaşı Üniversitesi, Doktora Öğrencisi, ORCID: 0009-0007-1753-1253, e-mail: ninaal3101999@gmail.com

1. Introduction

Realism and Liberalism are seen to be one of the main theories that explain the state's behavior in the international system. However, the analyses of these theories provide different perspectives and explanations to understand the international politics. It is through addressing various concepts as power, cooperation, security, and conflict.¹ And in terms of long complex disputes like the conflict between Palestine and Israel, these two theories are seen to be used as a tool that offers diverse analysis to the possible reasons and results for this war, with elaborating the limitations of these two approaches when applied to the reality².

Realism

Realism in international relations is seen to be a theory that focuses on understanding the relations between states through struggle, power, and self-interest. The theory gained its popularity even more after the Second World War; however, its foundations date back to the Peloponnesian war. And now it is seen as one of the oldest theories and the most influential in the field of international relations.

Realism's foundations

Realism stands on many main foundations as such:

1. **The selfish nature of states:** realism believes that states are primarily acting by the sake of their own interests, and all states primarily interest should be to protect their security and maximize their power.
2. **The chaotic international system:** realists claim that the international system is a chaotic structure because of the absence of a higher authority. As for that there is no central authority to direct and organize the system, which encourages states to be self-responsible on providing their own security³.
3. **The importance of military power:** realism emphasizes on the powerfulness of the military forces. They believe that a powerful military would guarantee their security and achieve national interests. Military power is the main tool to defend the state and deter any possible threats.
4. **Constant struggle:** It is in the nature of states to get in conflicts with other states in the international structure, in that states are seeking to maximize their interests even if it means it will be at the expense of another state.

¹ Waltz, Kenneth *Theory of International Politics*. McGraw-Hill, 1979. Keohane, Robert & Nye, Joseph *Power and Interdependence*. Pearson, 2012.

² Tessler, Mark A *History of the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1994.

³ Morgenthau, Hans J. *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*. Alfred A. Knopf, 1948.

Schools of Realism:

Classical realism: It was found by thinkers like Hans Morgenthau that sees the behavior of the states stems from the greedy human nature.

Neorealism: was introduced by Kenneth Waltz in the seventies, it emphasizes on the international structure to analyze the states behavior, rather than human nature ⁴.

Defensive and offensive realism: the defensive realists tend to believe that states only seek protection for their security, and they will avoid any unnecessary conflicts. The offensive realists, however, see that states are seeking to fully maximize their power to ensure their survival ⁵.

Realism is seen by many to be a helpful tool that explains the states' behavior in a practical way, and it is also considered to be a main source in many state policies. Nevertheless, this theory has been criticized by many, as it seen to have a pessimistic view of the world, also it only focuses on conflict and power while ignoring the international cooperation for the sake of achieving peace⁶.

The realist ideology had a great influence on many states' foreign policies, whereas it promotes the idea of self-reliance, strengthening their own security and protecting their borders. In other words, we can see the influence of the realist thinkers on the security policies of many states to tackle any possible regional threats.

Liberalism:

Liberalism emerged as a reaction to the theories that focus on conflict and power such as the realist theory. Liberalism in international relations is a theory that emphasizes on cooperation and peace between states. Unlike realism, the liberal thinkers give a great importance to international organizations, international law and democracy to achieve international stability. The theory is seen more optimistic in comparison to realism. It gives an alternative view of the global structure where countries can live together in peace and harmony and work together to achieve the common good.

Liberalism's Foundations:

Just like realism, liberalism stands on a number of main foundations:

⁴ Waltz *Theory of International Politics*. McGraw-Hill, 1979.

⁵ Merashiemer, John J. *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*. W.W. Norton & Company, 2001.

⁶ Keohane, *After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World Political Economy*. Princeton University Press, 1984.

The importance of international organizations: Liberalism believes that international organizations (UN, World Trade Organization, European Union) play a main role in organizing states interactions, these institutions are believed to help strengthening the international cooperation among states through providing conflict solutions and executing the international law ⁷(Keohane, 1984)

Economic cooperation: liberalist thinkers consider the economic cooperation between states decreases the possibility of conflict. The more countries exchange trade with each other, the bigger the cost of war becomes; therefore, it pushes the countries towards peace for protecting the economic mutual interests ⁸

Democracy and peace: democracy is seen as one of the main pillars of liberalism, in that liberals believe that it is unusual to see any democratic countries get into war with one another, this ideology is referred as The Democratic Peace Theory. Liberalists ensure the spreading of democracy would decrease wars and contribute to creating a stable international structure ⁹.

Schools of liberalism

Many schools emerged under the liberalist theory, and the most prominent are as follows.

Institutional liberalism: This school emphasizes on the importance of international institutions for strengthening states' cooperation. According to this school, institutions are considered to be a tool to limit and organize the chaotic international system and provide platforms for conflict resolutions and peaceful negotiations ¹⁰.

Commercial liberalism: This school focuses on increasing trade exchange among different states that leads to reducing the possibility of future conflicts. In this case, states would have mutual economic benefits that would deter them to involve in any violent dispute with another state. The commercial liberalists see that countries with strong trade exchange with one another seem to be less triggered to join violent conflicts ¹¹.

Liberal democracy: liberalism claims that the wider democracy is spread the less conflict between states occur, in that democratic states do not get into conflict with one another leading towards stability and peace. Statistics shows

⁷ Keohane *After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World Political Economy*, Princeton. University, 1984.

⁸ Doyle, Michael W. *Liberalism and World Politics*. *American Political Science Review*, 80(4), s. 1151-1169, 1986.

⁹ Russett, Bruce and John Oneal. *Triangulating Peace: Democracy, Interdependence, and International Organizations*. W.W. Norton & Company, 2001.

¹⁰ Keohane & Nye. *Power and Interdependence*. Pearson, 2012.

¹¹ Copeland, Dale C. *Economic Interdependence and Awar: A theory of Trade Expectations*. *International Security*, 20(4), s. 5-41. 1996.

that democratic states rarely involve in war against each other, which makes democracy a key factor for stability and peace ¹².

Liberalist theory has gotten attention of many researchers and decision makers in terms of understanding the importance of international cooperation and the ability to achieve peace through international institutions and trade exchange. It is also seen as an alternative to the pessimistic ideas that realism offers in the global structure. Nevertheless, liberalist ideology was not exempt of limitations and critiques, in that research see that liberalism treat the states as a rational structure where it always would favor cooperation instead of conflict. According to the critics, liberalism might have exaggerated its optimism about the ability of these institutions to resolve disputes, especially in terms of geopolitical competitions. The criticism also discusses that liberalism ignores the fact that countries sometimes act according to their own selfish interests even if that contradicts with the common good and stability of the region ¹³.

Liberalism has influenced many state policies especially after the cold war, whereas many countries sought to expand their international cooperation through creating institutions and developing new alliances through trade exchange. In that still liberalism is seen as one of the main theories of international relations, that provides a different perspective on how to attain state cooperation and peace among them.

2. ISRAELI-PALESTINIAN CONFLICTS

The war between Palestine and Israel is seen as one of the longest and the most complex conflicts in the modern history. The conflict's origin dates back to the beginning of the twentieth century, with the waves of migration of the Jewish communities from the west to the Palestinian lands and the Palestinians that reside on those lands ¹⁴. The tension between these two parties have arisen with the Balfour Declaration in the 1917 where Britain have strongly supported the formation of a national homeland for Jews in Palestine, this led to the exacerbation of the dispute between both communities even more ¹⁵.

The tensions between the immigrant Jews and the Palestinians continued until 1948, when it was officially the declaration of the establishment of the state of Israel. This declaration has switched the tensions between both communities into a war between the Palestinians, Israelis and the neighbor Arab countries that resulted with the

¹² Owen, John M.. *How Liberalism Produces Democratic Peace*. *International Security*, 19(2), s. 87-125. 1994.

¹³ Grieco Joseph M. *Anarchy and The Limits of Cooperation: A Realist Critique of the Newest Liberal Institutionalism*. *International Organization*. 42(3), s. 485-507. 1988.

¹⁴ Smith, Charles D. *Palestine and the Arab-Israeli Conflict: A History with Documents*. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's. 2009.

¹⁵ Khalidi, Rashid. *Palestinian Identity: The Construction of Modern National Consciousness*. New York: Columbia University Press. 1997.

displacement of hundreds of thousands of Palestinians¹⁶. And ever since, that area have witnessed various wars, conflicts, international interventions and many peace conventions that ended as a failure for providing a final solution¹⁷.

The conflict's reason is not only centered around the dispute over the land, but also included many complicated issues of identity, the right of the Palestinian refugees to return to their homes, human rights, security and the control of Jerusalem¹⁸. Despite the international initiatives and the various peace keeping processes, the Israeli-Palestine conflict is still a continuous challenge for the international community¹⁹.

Just like other conflicts, Israeli-Palestinian wars have paved a way for international relations theories to offer different perspectives on the matter.

For many decades the struggle of Israeli- Palestinian conflicts have affected millions of lives, it also played a role to be a testing ground to

understand the global politics by various theories²⁰.

3. CONFLICT ANALYSIS:

The Israeli-Palestinian conflict has set a real model for theories to explain and understand the dispute in depth, the conflict has included a complicated political, religious and geographical aspects that formed a challenge for the international community for decades²¹. Despite the difference between the Liberalist and the Realist theories both have proved to contribute important aspects to understand the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

Realist perspective:

According to the realist perspective in international relations, the Israeli-Palestinian conflict is essentially a power struggle motivated more by national interests and security concerns than by moral or ideological requirements. According to realism, nations (or political entities) must put survival and security first. In the anarchic international system, states frequently using force and calculated actions to protect their interests²². Through the lenses of power,

¹⁶ Morris, Benny. *The Birth of the Palestinian Refugee Problem Revisited*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2004.

¹⁷ Shlaim, Avi. A. *The Iron Wall: Israel and the Arab World*. W.W. Norton & Company. 2001.

¹⁸ Abu-Lughod Lila. *Nakba: Palestine, 1948, and the Claims of Memory*. New York: Columbia University Press. 2007.

¹⁹ Tessler *A History of the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press. 1994.

²⁰ Smith. *Palestine and the Arab-Israeli Conflict: A History with Documents*. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's. 2009.

²¹ Tessler. *A History of the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press. 2009.

²² Morgenthau. *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*. Alfred A. Knopf. 1948.

security, and the balance of power, the Realist perspective focusses on understanding the conflict between Israel and the Palestine and illustrate the reasons behind the conflict.

The State as the Primary Actor in Anarchy

In the Realist view, the international system is anarchic. which means that there is no supreme authority to resolve disputes or uphold the international law. States behave primarily in their own interests due to the absence of a central authority, especially when it comes to security²³. For securing their survival, both Israel and Palestine feel the need to engage in a direct conflict. It is crucial for Israel to protect its security and territorial integrity from both internal and external threats²⁴. Similar to this, Israeli military presence, settlement growth, and territorial control frequently thwart Palestinians' aspirations for self-determination and the creation of a sovereign independent state²⁵.

The Security Dilemma

A fundamental principle of realist theory is the security dilemma, which states that when X takes a step to increase its security, Y becomes insecure and the conflict frequently escalates²⁶. Both sides of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict could be given as an example:

Security Concerns for Israel: Border security and defense against the attacks coming from the Palestinian groups like Hamas are the main drivers of Israel's military operations and territorial expansions, especially in the West Bank and East Jerusalem²⁷. To safeguard its citizens, Israel keeps a highly developed military and intelligence system, although these measures frequently incite Palestinian resistance and anger²⁸.

Palestinian Security Concerns: Israel's military force, settlement growth, and blockade of Gaza are seen by Palestinians as an essential danger. The conflict is made worse by the Palestinian organizations, especially Hamas, who use resistance as a key element of their strategy. This resistance frequently takes the form of asymmetric warfare, such as rocket assaults and suicide bombings²⁹.

²³ Waltz *Theory of International Politics*. McGraw-Hill. 1979.

²⁴ Pappé, Ilan. *The Ethnic Cleansing of Palestine*. Oneworld Publications. 2006.

²⁵ Khalidi. *The Iron Cage: The Story of the Palestinian Struggle for Statehood*. Beacon Press. 2006.

²⁶ Herz John H. *Idealist Internationalism and the Security Dilemma*. World Politics, (2), 157-180. 1950.

²⁷ Pappé, *The Ethnic Cleansing of Palestine*. Oneworld Publications. 2006.

²⁸ Hass, Amira. *Drinking the Sea at Gaza: Days and Nights in a Land Under Siege*. Metropolitan Books. 2010.

²⁹ Savigh, Yezid. *The Palestinian Armed Struggle*. Cambridge University Press. 2011.

Both sides' actions Israel enhancing its military power and the Palestinians using guerilla warfare create a never-ending cycle of reprisals that worsen the security situation and obstructs peace³⁰.

National Interests and Power

Realists contend that each actor acts in the best interests of their country and that the main driving force behind state behavior is the desire for power³¹. Both parties Israel and Palestine are driven by firmly held national interests:

Israeli National Interests: Israel believes that controlling important strategic areas is essential to its survival. Its security strategy is supported by its military might and solid international ties, especially with the United States³². For Israel, retaining authority over disputed territories such as the West Bank and Jerusalem is essential for both security and national identity³³.

Palestinian National Interests: The creation of an independent state free from Israeli occupation is the main goal of the Palestinian people. Various groups, including the Palestinian Authority (PA) and Hamas, have distinct strategies for attaining statehood and work towards this goal. While Hamas promotes more militant resistance, occasionally openly calling for the destruction of Israel, the PA seeks a two-state solution based on the pre-1967 boundaries³⁴. Another crucial problem that impedes negotiations is the Palestinians' demand for the right of return for refugees³⁵.

Balance of power:

The balance of power is a fundamental tenet of realism, according to which governments take action to keep any actor from gaining excessive power in order to preserve their own security³⁶. Israel has the most military might in this conflict, whereas the Palestinians are far less powerful, especially when it comes to the conventional weapons. The conflict is shaped by this power disparity in multiple ways:

Israeli Military Superiority: Israel's military might guarantee both its ability to tackle outside threats and its supremacy in conventional local conflict. However, as military success does not mean political peace, Israel has

³⁰ Tilly, Charles. *The Politics of Collective Violence*. Cambridge University Press. 2003.

³¹ Mearsheimer. *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*. W.W. Norton & Company. 2001.

³² Guelke Adrian. *Israele And Palestinian Territories*. " *In the Comparative Politics of the Northern Ireland Conflict*. Routledge 2007.

³³ Shlaim,. *The Iron Wall: Israel and the Arab World*. W.W. Norton & Company. 2006.

³⁴ Farsakh, Leila. *Palestinian Identity and the Struggle for Self-Determination*. Oxford University Press. 2005.

³⁵ Khalidi. *The Iron Cage: The Story of the Palestinian Struggle for Statehood*. Beacon Press. 2006

³⁶ Waltz. *Theory of International Politics*. McGraw-Hill. 1979.

failed to secure a long-term security or a settlement of the conflict despite its military superiority³⁷. Palestinian groups continue to rebel against Israel's military presence and settlement practices in Gaza and the West Bank³⁸.

Palestinian Resistance: To offset Israel's military advantage, the Palestinians, especially groups like Hamas, fight asymmetrically. This includes unconventional techniques including guerrilla warfare, suicide bombers, and rocket attacks. These strategies enable Palestinians to carry on their fight for political recognition and sovereignty, even though they do not jeopardize Israel's military supremacy³⁹.

The war is sustained by this power disparity because, although Israel's military might allow it to maintain its borders, it has not been able to quell Palestinian resistance or reach a definitive peace agreement.

From a realist perspective, the Israeli-Palestinian conflict is essentially a fight for national interests, security, and power. The fundamental realist principles of survival and power-seeking are reflected in the conduct of both Israel and the Palestinians, who are motivated by deeply held territorial claims and security concerns. With both sides trapped in a security dilemma that feeds the cycle of violence. The ongoing imbalance of power and the involvement of other parties guarantee that the war will never be resolved.

Liberalist Perspective

The possibility for collaboration, the function of international organizations, and the significance of democratic government, human rights, and economic interdependence are the main focusses of the liberals view on international relations. Liberalism is more hopeful about the prospect of resolving conflicts and emphasizes the significance of institutions, norms, and collaboration in attaining peace. In contrast to realism, which emphasizes on conflict and power struggle⁴⁰. The liberalist view on the Israeli-Palestinian issue places a strong emphasis on international cooperation, diplomatic efforts, and the function of international organizations in promoting a peace.

The role of international organizations and norms

Liberalism emphasizes how crucial international organizations are for fostering collaboration and providing channels for dispute resolution ⁴¹. International organizations have made substantial efforts to mediate peace in the Israeli-

³⁷ Pappé. *The Ethnic Cleansing of Palestine*. Oneworld Publications. 2006

³⁸ Mearsheimer & Walt. *The Israel Lobby and U.S. Foreign Policy*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux. 2006.

³⁹ Sayigh. *The Palestinian Armed Struggle*. Cambridge University Press. 2011.

⁴⁰ Keohane. & Nye. *Power and Interdependence*. Pearson. 2012.

⁴¹ Keohane *After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World Political Economy*. Princeton University Press. 1984

Palestinian conflict, as the United Nations (UN), the European Union (EU), and the Quartet on the Middle East, which consists of the United States, the EU, Russia, and the UN.

Regarding the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, the UN has enacted a number of resolutions, most notably one that calls for the creation of a Palestinian state alongside Israel (UN General Assembly Resolution 181, 1947). However, political differences have hindered the UN's efficacy, particularly in the Security Council, where the US has frequently rejected resolutions that criticize Israel⁴². The European Union Through both direct diplomatic involvement and financial assistance, the EU has taken a more active role in enhancing peace. The European Union has backed the two-state solution and provided incentives for both parties to engage in negotiations, including financial support for the PA to help establishing⁴³. However, the EU's participation has been limited by both external players' influence and internal disagreements.

Despite their difficulties, liberals believe that these institutions pave a way for negotiations, norm-setting for achieving peace.

Democratic Peace Theory

Democratic peace theory illustrates that democratic states are more likely to settle disputes with diplomatic negotiations rather than going to war⁴⁴. Although their political systems differ significantly, both Israel and the Palestinian states have democratic aspects in the Israeli-Palestinian relation.

Israel: Israel is a democratic nation with a free press, regular elections, and a functional political system. Foreign policy discussions are made possible by its democratic structure, and civil society has played a significant role in promoting peace initiatives like the Oslo Accords of the 1990s⁴⁵. However, the occupation of Palestinian lands frequently impedes Israeli democracy, and internal conflicts over how to strike a balance between security and Palestinian rights further impede the state from achieving peace.

Palestine: Hamas, which controls Gaza, and the Palestinian Authority (PA), which rules portions of the West Bank, share political authority over the Palestinian territories. Although the PA is criticized for its authoritarian and corrupt methods, it is more in line with liberal democratic ideals⁴⁶. However, Hamas does not follow the same democratic

⁴² Gordon Neve. *Israel's Occupation*. University of California Press. 2012.

⁴³ Keohane, & Nye, *Power and Interdependence*. Pearson. 2012.

⁴⁴ Russett & Oneal *Triangulating Peace: Democracy, Interdependence, and International Organizations*. W.W. Norton & Company. 2001.

⁴⁵ Shalev, Michael. *The Political Economy of Israel's Peace Process*. Palgrave Macmillan. 2000.

⁴⁶ Robinson, Glenn. E. *Building a Palestinian State: The Incomplete Revolution*. Cambridge University Press. 2004.

ideals and operates under an Islamist political ideology. It is more difficult for Palestinians to put up a united front in talks with Israel and in the international arena because of this internal political division⁴⁷.

Promoting democratic reforms in the Palestinian territories may increase the likelihood of peace, according to liberalist theory. A clearer road towards a two-state solution and more fruitful negotiations with Israel may result from Palestinians being able to forge better democratic institutions and more cohesive leadership.

Cooperation and Economic Interdependence

Liberalism highlights how economic interconnectedness may foster peace by raising the cost of war and adopting collaboration. Both sides of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict have strong economic linkages that might be used to promote peace including trade and labor exchange. Because Palestinians work in Israel and Israel supplies commodities to Palestinian territory, Israel and Palestine are economically connected. Opportunities for economic collaboration exist in sectors like agriculture, water, and energy, despite obstacles like the Israeli siege of Gaza and travel restrictions. Furthermore, the goal of foreign aid for economic growth, particularly from the World Bank and the EU, is to support Palestinian institutions and create the necessary environment for statehood. According to liberalism, encouraging such collaboration may result in real advantages for both parties, which would encourage harmony and lessen the probability of conflict.

International law and human rights

Liberalism emphasizes how crucial international law and human rights are to settling disputes. Both sides have experienced serious human rights abuses in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, including Israeli military operations in Gaza and the West Bank and Palestinian travel restrictions. When it comes to matters like the legitimacy of Israeli settlements and the rights of Palestinian refugees to return to their homes in international law is crucial. Liberalism promotes respect for international legal standards because they believe it can serve as a basis for negotiation and peace. A settlement based on international law and human rights might help end the violence and protect the interest of all parties, setting the stage for a peaceful, negotiated settlement.

4. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, despite looking at the Israeli-Palestinian conflict from different angles, realism, and liberalism both provide insightful analysis about the issue. Realists see the conflict as a continuous struggle between Israel's military superiority and Palestinian aspirations for sovereignty, highlighting the crucial role of power, security, and national interest. Realism also emphasizes how challenging it is to achieve peace with the anarchic nature of the international systems. Where states place a higher priority on security and survival. Liberalism, on the other hand, focuses on the possibility of collaboration through international organizations, economic interdependence, human rights

⁴⁷ Gordon, *Israel's Occupation*. University of California Press. 2012.

frameworks, and diplomacy. It recognizes the potential of finding a solution by negotiation, emphasizing the value of international cooperation, democratic institutions, and the rule of law. Lastly, liberalism is seen to be optimistic about the possibility of peace through collaboration and international institutions, whereas realism views the conflict as firmly rooted in power dynamics. Despite the differences, both views agree that finding a solution requires the involvement of other states, either for their interest or for enhancing economic interdependence to reach a constant peace.

References

- Abu-Lughod, L. (2007). *Nakba: Palestine, 1948, and the Claims of Memory*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Copeland, D.C. (1996). Economic Interdependence and Awar: A theory of Trade Expectations. *International Security*, 20(4), 5-41.
- Doyle, M. W. (1986). Liberalism and World Politics. *American Political Science Review*, 80(4), 1151-1169.
- Feldman, R. (2021). *The Middle East and the United States: History, Politics, and Ideologies*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Farsakh, L. (2005). *Palestinian Identity and the Struggle for Self-Determination*. Oxford University Press.
- Gershoni, I., & Jick, E. (2004). *The United States and Israel: Cultures in Conflict*. Wiley.
- Gordon, N. (2012). *Israel's Occupation*. University of California Press.
- Grieco J.M. (1988). Anarchy and The Limits of Cooperation: A Realist Critique of the Newest Liberal Institutionalism. *International Organization*. 42(3), 485-507.
- Hass, A. (2010). *Drinking the Sea at Gaza: Days and Nights in a Land Under Siege*. Metropolitan Books.
- Herz, J. (1950). Idealist Internationalism and the Security Dilemma. *World Politics*, (2), 157-180.
- Khalidi, R. (1997). *Palestinian Identity: The Construction of Modern National Consciousness*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Khalidi, R. (2006). *The Iron Cage: The Story of the Palestinian Struggle for Statehood*. Beacon Press.
- Kaufman, R. (2017). *Israel and Palestine: Peace or Apartheid*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Keohane, R. O. (1984). *After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World Political Economy*. Princeton University Press.
- Keohane, R. O., & Nye, J. S. (2012). *Power and Interdependence*. Pearson.
- Makovsky, D. (2009). *The Peace Puzzle: America's Quest for Arab-Israeli Peace, 1989–2011*. Brookings Institution Press.
- Mearsheimer, J. J. (2001). *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*. W.W. Norton & Company.

- Mearsheimer, J., & Walt, S. (2006). *The Israel Lobby and U.S. Foreign Policy*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Morgenthau, H. J. (1948). *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*. Alfred A. Knopf.
- Morris, B. (2004). *The Birth of the Palestinian Refugee Problem Revisited*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Owen, J.M. (1994) How Liberalism Produces Democratic Peace. *International Security*, 19(2), 87-125.
- Pappe, I. (2006). *The Ethnic Cleansing of Palestine*. Oneworld Publications.
- Pipes, D. (2010). *Iran: A New Approach*. Yale University Press.
- Robinson, G. (2004). *Building a Palestinian State: The Incomplete Revolution*. Cambridge University Press.
- Russett, B., & Oneal, J. (2001). *Triangulating Peace: Democracy, Interdependence, and International Organizations*. W.W. Norton & Company.
- Sayigh, Y. (2011). *The Palestinian Armed Struggle*. Cambridge University Press.
- Shalev, M. (2000). *The Political Economy of Israel's Peace Process*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Shlaim, A. (2001). *The Iron Wall: Israel and the Arab World*. W.W. Norton & Company.
- Smith, C. D. (2009). *Palestine and the Arab-Israeli Conflict: A History with Documents*. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's.
- Tessler, M. (1994). *A History of the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Tilly, C. (2003). *The Politics of Collective Violence*. Cambridge University Press.
- Waltz, K. N. (1979). *Theory of International Politics*. McGraw-Hill.