



**NEAR EAST UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF GRADUATE STUDIES
DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE**

**THE ROLE OF UNITED NATIONS IN THE MANAGEMENT OF THE ARAB-ISRAELI CONFLICT
DURING THE COLD WAR ERA: FUTURE POLITICAL CHALLENGES**

M.A THESIS

Mosheh Eyinna UGORJI

**Nicosia
December, 2021**

**NEAR EAST UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF GRADUATE STUDIES
DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE**

**THE ROLE OF UNITED NATIONS IN THE MANAGEMENT OF THE ARAB-ISRAELI CONFLICT
DURING THE COLD WAR ERA: FUTURE POLITICAL CHALLENGES**

M.A THESIS

Mosheh Eyinna UGORJİ

**Supervisor
Prof. Dr. Nur KÖPRÜLÜ**

**Nicosia
December, 2021**

Approval

We certify that we have read the thesis submitted by Mosheh Eyinna Ugorji titled “The Role of the United Nations in the Management of the Arab-Israeli Conflict During the Cold War Era: Future Political Challenges” and that in our combined opinion, it has been found satisfactory for the award of degree of Masters of Political Science.

Examining Committee	Name & Surname	Signature
Head of Committee:	Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ali DAYIOĞLU
Committee member:	Assoc. Prof. Dr. Dilek LATİF
Supervisor:	Prof. Dr. Nur KÖPRÜLÜ

Approved by the Head of Department

.....// 20...

.....
Prof. Dr. Nur KÖPRÜLÜ

Head of Department

Approved by the Institute of Graduate Studies

.....// 20...

Prof. Dr. Kemal Hüsnü Can BAŞER
Head of the Institute

Declaration

I hereby declare that all information, documents, analysis and results in this thesis have been collected and presented according to the academic rules and ethical guidelines of Institute of Graduate Studies, Near East University. I also declare that as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced information and data that are not original to this study.

Mosheh Eyinna UGORJI

...../...../ 2021

Acknowledgements

Special thanks to my supervisor Prof. Dr. Nur Köprülü for all her support, love and encouragement she has showed me all through my academic journey and in making this thesis possible to its conclusion.

I also want to acknowledge Dr. Zehra Azizbeyli and Dr. Bilge Azgın for their guidance as well.

On a final note, I wish to thank my family for their unconditional love and support throughout my academic journey. I love you from the depth of my heart.

Mosheh Eyinna UGORJI

Abstract

The Role of United Nations (UN) in the Management of the Arab-Israeli Conflict During the Cold War Era: Future Political Challenges

Mosheh Eyinna Ugorji

Masters, Department of Political Science

Supervised by Prof. Dr. Nur Köprülü

December, 2021, 84 pages

This thesis entitled “The Role of United Nations in the management of the Arab-Israeli Conflict during the Cold War Era”, investigates and elaborates the origin, cause(s), course and consequences of the Arab–Israeli Conflict as it ravages the Middle East region. It further brings to the fore the involvement and activities of the United Nations (UN), embarked upon with the aim of achieving peace at the international level as considered most strategic as at the time in the world. Certain efforts and arrangements were made to ensure durable peace, yet, the region is still erupt in conflict in variant forms. The UN has employed several mechanisms to put an end to the lingering crisis by passing a bulk of resolutions. Various peace accords were, however, signed among the conflicting parties such as the Camp David Accord I and II, and the Oslo Peace Process have not been sufficient to bring an end to the problem. This research work also highlight the successes recorded by the United Nations in managing the conflict as well as failures and difficulties encountered by the United Nations in its bid to manage the Arab – Israeli conflict.

Keywords: United Nations, Arab-Israeli Conflict, Arab-Israeli Wars, UN Resolution 242, UN Resolution 338, peace-keeping mission, Cold War

ÖZ

Soğuk Savaş Döneminde Arap-İsrail Uyuşmazlığının Yönetiminde Birleşmiş Milletler (BM)'in Rolü: Gelecekteki Siyasal Açmazlar

Mosheh Eyinna Ugorji

Yüksek Lisans, Siyaset Bilimi Programı

Tez Danışmanı Prof. Dr. Nur Köprülü

Aralık, 2021, 84 sayfa

Bu tez çalışması, Orta Doğu coğrafyasının en önemli sorunlarından birisini teşkil eden Arap-İsrail Uyuşmazlığının kökenini, nedenlerini ve sonuçlarını Soğuk Savaş dönemi özelinde detaylı bir şekilde araştırmaktadır. Bu çerçevede çalışma; İkinci Dünya Savaşı sonrasında dünya ölçeğinde ilk kez tüm ülkelerin dahil olduğu ve uluslararası düzeyde barışı sağlamak amacıyla kurulan Birleşmiş Milletler (BM)'in Arap-İsrail Meselesindeki rolünü ve faaliyetlerini ortaya koymaktadır. Soğuk Savaş döneminde BM, kalıcı barışı sağlamak için bazı çabalar ve düzenlemeler yürürlüğe koymuş olsa da Orta Doğu bölgesini derinden etkileyen Arap-İsrail Uyuşmazlığı hala devam etmektedir. BM, bir dizi karar hayata geçirerek (BMGK 242 ve 338 gibi) devam eden bu uyuşmazlığa son vermek için çeşitli mekanizmalar kullanmıştır. Örneğin; çatışan taraflar arasında Camp David I ve II gibi çeşitli barış anlaşmaları imzalanmış, ancak 1993'te imzalanan Oslo Barış Süreci dahi bu sorunu çözmeye yetmemiştir. Bu araştırma; BM'in uyuşmazlık/ çatışma yönetiminde kaydettiği başarıların yanı sıra Örgüt'ün Arap-İsrail çatışmasını yönetme çabasında karşılaştığı siyasal açmazları ve zorlukları da vurgulamaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Birleşmiş Milletler (BM), Arap-İsrail Uyuşmazlığı, Arap-İsrail Savaşları, BM Kararı 242, BM Kararı 338, barışı koruma misyonu, Soğuk Savaş

Table of Contents

Acceptance/ Approval	1
Declaration	2
Acknowledgements	3
Abstract	4
Öz	5
Table of Contents	6
List of Abbreviations	7

CHAPTER I

Introduction	10
Statement of the Problem	11
Objectives and Aims of the Study	12
Significance of the Study	12
Scope and Limitations	13
Research Methodology	13
Chapter Outline	14
Conclusion	15

CHAPTER II

Literature Review	16
Historical Background	16
The Middle East in Historical Perspective	19
Origin and Settlement of the Arabs in Palestine	21
Origin and Settlement of Jews in Palestine	23
The Establishment of the State of Israel, 1948	26

CHAPTER III

The United Nations and the Arab-Israeli Conflict During the Cold War	30
--	----

The United Nations and the Arab-Israeli Conflict in the 1948 War	30
The United Nations and the Arab-Israeli Conflict During the 1956 Suez Canal Crisis	33
The United Nations and the Arab-Israeli Conflict in the Six-Day war of 1967	35
The United Nations and the Arab-Israeli Conflict of 1973	37
The United Nations and the Arab-Israeli Conflict 1975-2015	40

CHAPTER IV

Assessment of the Role and Effectiveness of the United Nations in the Arab- Israeli Conflict	46
An Assessment of the Role of the United Nations in the Arab-Israeli Conflict	46
Strengths of the UN Diplomacy in the Arab-Israeli Conflict	48
Weakness of the UN Diplomacy in the Arab-Israeli Conflict	52

CHAPTER V

The Future Role of United Nations in the Mediation of Arab-Israeli Conflict: Future Political Challenges	56
Evaluation of Peace-Keeping Operations	56
Mediating the Arab-Israeli Conflict: Which Way?	57
Evaluation of US-led “Deal of the Century”	58
Future of the UN within the context of the Arab-Israeli Conflict	60

CHAPTER VI

Conclusion	63
References	67
Appendix	73
Plagiarism Report	78
Ethics Committee Approval	80
Curriculum Vitae	81

List of Abbreviations

CCP	Conciliation Commission for Palestine
GNP	Gross National Product
IDF	Israeli Defense Forces
OCL	Operation Cast Lead
PLO	Palestinian Liberation Organization
UN	United Nations
UNDOF	United Nations Disengagement Observer Force
UNEF	United Nations Emergency Force
UNGA	United Nations General Assembly
UNHRC	United Nations Human Rights Commission
UNOCHA	United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
UNSC	United Nations Security Council
UNSCOP	United Nations Special Committee on Palestine
US	United States
USSR	Union of Sovereign Socialist Republic
UNTCCP	United Nations Truce Consular Commission for Palestine
UNRWA	United Nations Relief and Welfare Agency

CHAPTER I

Introduction

The Arab-Israeli Conflict has historically been one of the fundamental problems located at the core of the Middle East region. The outbreak of the First Arab-Israeli War in 1948 following the establishment of Israel by the President David Ben Gurion have not only led to the influx of Palestinian refugees across the neighboring countries' borders; but also, escalated to the eruption of successive Arab-Israeli Wars in 1956, 1967, 1973 and also lately the Hezbollah-Israel War in 2006. These wars at the time was viewed by some scholars as the bedrock for another possible conflicts or wars, because it contributed to the death of notable leaders like Yitzhak Rabin (former Israeli prime minister from Labor Party who supported and signed peace making with the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) in 1993) and Anwar Sadat (former Egyptian president who became the first Arab leader recognizing Israel in 1979) and various assassination attacks. Despite the fact that Arab-Israeli Conflict has mostly occupied the agenda of the scholars as well as international system during the Cold War years, the former President of the United States (US), Donald Trump's decision to move US Embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem in 2017 has not long ago triggered the prevailing confrontational climate in the region. The claim over the annexation of the West Bank territories by former Israeli prime minister Benjamin Netanyahu has also lately been instrumental in making the effects of the unsettlement of the conflict across the Middle East region apparent and more visible than before.

The United Nations Organization (UN henceforth) since the eruption of the First Arab-Israeli War 1948-49 has been at the center of solving this disagreement and promoting peace and security in the region. Nevertheless, the UN and its affiliated agencies have attempted to bring an end to the conflict, the conflict still represents one of the oldest protracted conflicts at the global scale.

In light of these developments, one of the key discussions that have stimulated this thesis have, thus, been centered on the role of the UN and its resolutions (precisely the Resolutions of the UN Security Council (UNSC) in resolving this perennial conflict. Thus, it is imperative to analyze the previous and current efforts of the UN in bringing a settlement to the Palestine-Israeli Conflict and also the effectiveness

and capacity of the UN resolutions to mitigate this problem come into fore in writing this research.

The thesis in furtherance considers the future political challenges experienced in light of the inability of the international community in finding lasting solution to the issues around the Palestine Question, which has regenerated to local conflict leading to the rise of subsequent attacks between the armed group of Hamas and the Israeli government. In addition, the former President of the US, Donald Trump's proposal called "Deal of the Century" and the proclamation of Jerusalem as Israel's capital and the subsequent transfer of US Embassy to Jerusalem by the Trump's administration, further regenerated conflict within the region and further reflected the need for more UN's active intervention to device as a matter of urgency, a lasting peace in the region.

Statement of Problem

The issues around the Arab-Israeli conflict has dramatically resulted into wars in different periods. In fact, wars have been a part of human history since the beginning of human civilizations. Over the years, humans have been faced with various problems and war has always been a part of these problems. As wars seem almost inevitable, human beings have also tried to find a way in resolving conflict and maintaining peace through direct dialogue and other avenues, one of which is through international organizations especially in the 20th and 21st centuries. In this quest, the signing of the UN Charter aims to provide solutions and prevent possible conflicts and wars around the world. Since 1945, following the establishment of the UN, the Organization has been actively involved in the Middle East crisis, starting from the Palestine Question to the 2006 Lebanese-Israel War, all in a bid to find a lasting solution to the crisis within the region.

The first Peace keeping mission of the UN was the United Nations Special Committee on Palestine (UNSCOP) –a program established to investigate first-hand the issues around the Palestinian crisis, of which a report was presented suggesting a "two-state solution". Regardless of the efforts at achieving peace by the UN which includes, various efforts orchestrated by the UN to settle the problem underlying the discord between the Jews and Arabs still lingers with doubts as to the impossibility of a war or instability in the future. All attempts at achieving peace, though

instrumental, seem not to be enough which begs the question as to how effective the UN has been managing the conflict and finding lasting solution to the Arab-Israeli unending discord.

Objectives and Aims of the Study

The aim of this research project which employs basic and applied approaches will be to highlight the following;

- The role and effectiveness of the United Nations (UN) in solving the Arab-Israeli conflict particularly during the Cold War years;
- To identify whether the UN is more concern with *pacifist* means rather than *military* means (or using sanctions) in conflict resolution with regards to the Arab-Israeli conflict;
- This research is to cover the period of the Cold War (Post-World War II period to 1989/1990);
- An understanding to the activities of the United Nations and its future in combating crisis and maintaining international peace and security and foster co-operation between Israel and her neighbours.

Significance of the study

The two-state solution proposed by the UN bears a great significance in understanding the Arab-Israeli conflict due to the fact that it gave impetus to the already created divide which the Balfour Declaration (1917) had set in place. The Balfour Declaration was a very critical step by the British government to promise the establishment of a national homeland to the Jewish people in Palestine. The proposition was to create two states; one for the Arabs and also another state for the Jewish people in Palestine, while Jerusalem was placed under the supervision and administration of UN as a mandate. According to Parson (1997), at the creation of the UN Charter which came into effect on 24 October 1945, there appeared to be no predict that the question of Palestine would dominate the agenda of the Security Council and General Assembly. The Conflict, however, had penetrated the whole UN system to a greater extent than any other dispute and that, fifty years later, it would still be unresolved (Parson, 1997).

Another significant aspect to be considered is the root of the conflict revolving around the question of Palestine claimed by both the Jewish and the Arab peoples and the failure of the British rule who had the land under their control as a mandate under the guise of handling the lingering crisis and the handing over of the unresolved Palestinian issue to the newly formed UN to undertake its resolution leading to the creation of the United Nations Special Committee on Palestine (UNSCOP).

The strong opposition from the Arab nations to the UN partition plan significantly shows the fact that greater parts of the lands were carved out for the Israelis and the partition plan also failed to address the issue of a one-state solution proposed by the Arabs. Thus, this research will be significant in identifying some of the trends associated with this conflict following the involvement of the Arab states in the conflict as well as Western and the US' role during that period.

Scope and limitations of the study

The scope of this academic research was centred around the Arab-Israeli conflict from the post-1945 war periods up to the end of the Cold War era, while considering the role of UN from its inception which also happened to be in 1945 and still in existence up till date. The Arab-Israeli conflict is almost as old as the UN itself and has been intertwined with its development since the General Assembly (UNGA) voted on Partition in 1948 (Parson, 1997; Yapp 1995; Cleveland 2016). The conflict is a depiction of political and military tension which existed between the Arab countries of the Middle East and the state of Israel as a result of Israel's independence in 1948. This study has potential limitations which include, the time frame limitation of the research as it is conducted for a given period of time. And as a qualitative research, the process is time-consuming as well as limited interpretations.

Research Methodology

The method employed for this research include sourcing information from theoretical as well as historical studies from various academic sources which serves as guide in carrying out this research. Therefore, the basic method that will be used in this study will be the qualitative research methodology. Academic investigations were made in order to get an assessment of the subject matter from academic works of scholars of

political science as well as history to ascertain their thoughts and submission as regards the effectiveness of the UN especially to the Arab-Israeli conflict from the post-World War period (Cold War era). In addition, the UN resolutions will constitute largest part of the data that will be interpreted and discussed which would allow this study to achieve its main purposes.

Chapter Outline

Chapter 1: Introduction

Background of the study, statement of the problem, objectives and aims of the study, significance of the study, scope and limitations and research methodology topics are explained briefly in this chapter, in order to give more comprehensive information about this study.

Chapter 2: Arab-Israeli Conflict from a Historical Perspective

In this chapter, existing literature on the Arab-Israeli conflict and the historical background of the study with details on the historical emergence of Israel and Palestine. It considers the emergence and settlement of these two communities, while considering early backgrounds which laid the foundation for the conflict within the region

Chapter 2: The United Nations and the Arab-Israeli Conflict during the Cold War

This chapter discusses the historical conditions leading to the Arab-Israeli conflicts in the various intervals of occurrence and the roles played by the United Nations in the various war periods within the region. The chapter elaborates the main roots of the problem and discusses the proposed solutions including negotiations and decisions taken by the UN in mitigating the crisis.

Chapter 3: Assessment of the Role of the United Nations in the Arab-Israeli Conflict

In this chapter, the evaluation of the role of the United Nations in resolving the Arab-Israeli conflict will be specifically discussed to give a proper assessment as to whether the UN has contributed to the status quo as it were or has to a large extent achieved its aim of brokering peace within the Palestinian region and the Middle East

as the case may be. This chapter also considers the strength and weaknesses of the UN as regards the Arab-Israeli conflict to ascertain whether its choice of employing pacific means rather military means has achieved its desired peace agenda.

Chapter 4: The Future role of United Nations in the Mediation of Arab-Israeli Conflict

This Chapter discusses the activities of the UN in Arab-Israeli conflict in the post-Cold war period. It considers the future of the United Nations in the said conflict and the role of the UN to provide an arena for the conflicting parties to discuss their terms and provide opportunities to end the disputes on the way to sustainable peace. In achieving an improved peace-building which is one of the function of the UN, the international organization remains by far the most appropriate agency to oversee humanitarian aid play a leading role in post-war reconstruction in ensuring peace does not just represent the absence of peace but a peace with due justice, inclusiveness and unconditional respect for human rights.

Chapter 5: Conclusion

In this part of the thesis, final explanations are going to be given along with the main argument of the thesis accompanied by a brief summary of the chapters. The final findings are presented and suggestions for further research proposed with further recommendations.

CHAPTER II

Literature Review

This chapter gives a historical survey of the role of United Nations (UN) and the Arab-Israeli Conflict bearing in mind the significance of the Middle East region. It provides relevant information as to the emergence of the Arabs as well as the emergence of Jewish settlement within the region and a description of the land and people of what is now known as the Arab region.

Historical Background

The central feature of this academic research is centered around the Arab-Israeli conflict in post-1945 Cold War era and the impact of the role played by the UN in resolving the conflict and analyzing to what end has the UN been effective. The conflict revolves around the political and military tensions that existed between the Arab countries in the Middle East region and the declaration of the state of Israel an independent state on May 14, 1948.

The root cause of this perennial conflict is attributed to the question of Palestine in which the Jewish people and the Arab community lay claim to the failure of the British mandatory power in finding a solution. The British governed the Palestinian land as a mandate territory to resolve the lingering issues which stimulated them to bring the Problem to the newly formed UN. The UN in an attempt to offer a solution, created the UN Special Committee on Palestine (UNSCOP) in 1947. This Committee assessed the authority to suggest a two-state solution to bring end to the rivalry over the Palestinian territories.

Following the inquiry that was implemented by the UNSCOP, the solution of the problem was centered on establishing two states both for the Arabs and the Jews in Palestine. The status of Jerusalem was made an international to be administered by the UN. The resolution was accepted by the Jews, but was out-rightly rejected by the Arabs (Calvocoressi, 2006; Cleveland 2016).

The opposition from the Arab countries stemmed from the fact that a greater portion of the land was carved out for the Israelis and the plan also failed to address the issue of a one state solution as approved by the Arabs. Following the declaration, a state was created for the Jews by UNSCOP in 1947 and a formal declaration made by

David Ben Gurion in 1948 as an indication of the independence of Israel, thereby, resulted to an attack by the Arabs the following day, paving the way for the first Arab-Israeli war of 1948.

Hostilities and rigorous attacks and counter attacks had continued since the 1948-1949 Arab-Israeli war and the Arab countries and Israel fought wars in 1956 over the ambition of the Egyptian President Gamal Abdel Nasser over the concept of Arabism/ Nasserism (Cleveland 2018), which pitched Egypt against Israel, France and Britain over the nationalization of the Suez Canal but a combined pressure from the United States (US) and the Soviet Union (SU) brought an end to the hostility (Yapp, 1996).

The 1967 Six-Day war, which was a pre-emptive simultaneous attack followed suite, when some conditions Israel gave to attack the Arabs were met resulting to Israel launching a counter attack leading to the defeat of the Arab armies under six days. Afterwards, the UN asked the Arab states to recognize the state of Israel, but was declined by the Arabs.

Another major attack was the 1973 Yom Kippur war (also known as Fourth Arab-Israeli War), when the Arabs attacked the state of Israel on the feast of Yom Kippur. It was, in fact, a surprise attack on Israel. The post-1973 Arab-Israeli war marked an end to mostly formal hostilities in different ceasefire agreements which Israel had to sign with other Arab states in the region. The Peace Treaty of 1979 with Egypt led to the withdrawal of Israel from the Sinai Peninsula which was occupied by Israel since the 1948-1949 Arab-Israeli War.

Despite the different peace treaties like the Camp David Accord 1 and 11 and the Oslo Peace congress of which the UN were instrumental in ensuring its actualization through the US and other UN member states, traces of resentment and potential discord which may amount to future conflict still exist between the Arab nations and the state of Israel. It is this conflict that the UN is struggling with in order to provide a lasting solution and peace in the region.

According to Malcolm Yapp, he explained that the greatest changes occurred after 1950 and that internal and external factors were responsible for these changes (Yapp, 1996). The changes were attributed to the power struggle between the Ottoman and the different super European powers at the time.

Stanley Meisler's UN –the first fifty years, gives an insight of the political undertones which characterized the fifty years of the UN in the area of peacekeeping. It gives an explanation as to how the UN which was established at the same period the state of Israel was established was considered to be bias by both the Jews and the Arabs (Meislar, 1997). He further, highlighted, the event of the Suez Canal Crisis and the condemnation by the UN which was responsible in bringing to an end, Britain and France's domination in the Middle East.

The UN and the Palestine Refugees with Special Reference to Lebanon by Anthony Parsons gives insight into the resultant effect of the crisis as it gave rise to more Palestine refugee especially in Lebanon (Parsons, 1997). Parsons, tries to explain how effective the UN have been in resolving the crisis associated with refugees caused by the unresolved conflicts between state of Israel and the Arab states of which has disposed Palestine citizen into seeking refuge in Lebanon and also the effect this refugee condition has on Lebanon as a state.

Ruth Ladipoth (1992), takes a look at the effects of the UN Security Council Resolution 242 over the past 25 years to ascertain whether it was a right decision or not, or whether it has been able to proffer solutions or has considerable influenced the impending issues surrounding the Arab-Israeli conflict as she states that, the resolution has become the cornerstone for all stages in the settlement of the Arab-Israel conflict. In her analyses, the 1967 war which led to Israel's occupation of Arab territories including the Gaza Strip, Suez Canal, Golan Heights also was responsible for the rise in the refugee situation in the Middle East region. While, acknowledging that, the UN Security Council Resolution 242, helped in addressing the issues bordering on occupied territories by the Israelis, requesting their de-occupation of such territories. Resolution 242 as many scholar agrees remain one of the most fundamental (if not the most important) resolutions of the UN (Bennis, 1997). This is so because it encompasses all other resolutions as for the first time, the issue of territory demarcation was its central theme, which in some regards, reflected UN, sincerity and consideration for the Palestinian people (Miller, 2018).

In this regard, Beverley Milton-Edwards who gave a concise historical and contemporary analysis of the Middle East in her work, *Contemporary Politics in the Middle East*, identifies the remote and immediate factors which is responsible for the crisis in the Middle East and how foreign domination has subjected the region

forcefully into an unexplainable dilemma without hope for a possible solution or remedy for restoration (Milton-Edwards, 2011). She argues that the conflict within the region was not confined within the occupied territories alone but that it spread across board especially in regions where Israelis and Palestinians resided such as Lebanon, Cyprus, Rome, Munich and others.

The Middle East in a Historical Perspective

The Middle East region encompasses much of Western Asia; it is located around the area of the old world which serves as a meeting point of the three continents of Africa, Asia and Europe. It is historically regarded by most scholars as the cradle of civilization and the original home of some of the world's major religions; Christianity, Islam, and Judaism. In an attempt of explaining the land and people of the Middle East, three categories of definitions/explanation will be considered, which include; the geographical explanation; economic explanation; social explanation; political explanation; and cultural definition.

Geographical definition: The geographical explanation entails the location, size, climate and vegetation, natural and mineral resources, water bodies as well as the land and its embodiments. The Middle East comprises of the areas with the following historical names; Arabia, Anatolia, Asia Minor, Mesopotamia, Palestine, Persia and the Levant according to Okeke's description of the Middle East (Okeke, 2011: 3).

According to Milton-Edward, the geography of the region is still a topic of debate due to the vastness of its borders and boundaries, thereby, meaning different things to different people (Milton-Edwards 2011). However, she acknowledges that depending on what definition is applied, the Middle East stretches from Morocco in the West to Iran in the East including some parts of Sub-Saharan Africa, Turkey, Afghanistan, and the Arab Persian Gulf.

The Middle East encompasses such water bodies as the Black Sea, Red Sea, Caspian Sea, Mediterranean Sea, Persian Gulf and the Arabian Sea according to Okeke (2011). He further stated that the area of the Persian Gulf has land borders with Bulgaria and Greece in the North West, Turkmenistan and Georgia to the North, Afghanistan and Pakistan to the East and to the West, by Egypt while noting that on the map, the Middle East is at intersection of Latitudes 13N and 43N with longitudes 25E (Okeke, 2011: 4). The region comprises of vast desert, modern cities, snow-

capped mountain ranges and important natural resources including water, oil and natural gas (Milton-Edwards, 2011).

According to Okeke, the territorial size is estimated at 7.3 million squares with its land area comprising mostly of deserts, the Sahara Desert which covers almost the entire North-East Africa while, in South West Asia exist the Arabian Desert (Okeke, 2011). The climate varies in the Middle East as it relates to the terrain; for the desert areas, rainfall is limited and moderate on the Mediterranean coast but high in the mountainous region (Okeke, 2011). There is extremely high temperature in the desert which reaches a daytime of 45 degrees during Summer while the Mediterranean area experiences a moderate temperature especially around the Red Sea Coasts which ranges from 24 degrees around the month of January to 31 degrees in the hottest month of July (Okeke, 2011). Scarcity of water in the Middle East is attributed to its large desert area despite the surrounded by rivers like Nile, Tigris, Euphrates and Jordan rivers (Okeke, 2011).

Economic definition: The Middle region is well known in contemporary era for its large possession of oil and Natural gas which is one of its major source of wealth (Milton-Edwards, 2011). Most Middle East scholars has attributed the persistent conflict and continuous external interest in the region to the heavy presence of large deposit of oil and natural gas, which they claim given rise to both internal and external discord among nations (Milton-Edwards, 2011). According to Okeke, an estimation of 62% of the world's petroleum reserves was harboured in the Middle East with 25% situates in Saudi Arabia which also has 25% of natural gas as well (Okeke, 2011). However, Okeke identifies other resources available prior to the discovery of oil in the region such as Cotton, Wheat, Date, Sugar beet while Cattles were bred beginning from the twentieth century (Okeke, 2011).

Political definition: The Middle East has been described as a region that has experienced external political control from the Roman empire era to Turkish Ottoman control to Western Colonization (Milton-Edwards, 2011). Attaching a political definition to the region becomes almost impossible due to the inability to do so without attributing external clauses to it. However, Milton-Edwards also recognizes the internal administrative structures which is similar to that of the Turkish Ottoman system based on religion and kingship (Milton-Edwards, 2011). The king or ruler possessed both religious and cultural significance.

Cultural definition: According to Okeke, the oldest civilization exists in the ancient Sumer and Egypt which are both part of the modern day Middle East region as well as those of the Akkadians, the Amorites, Hebrew which can be dated to about 4000BC and had made innovations in the area of human technology and organized societies (Okeke, 2011).

The language of the Middle East consists of the Arab-Asiatic, Indo-European and Altaic, while majority speak Arabic with exception of Cyprus, Turkey and Israel (Okeke, 2011). The region is home to several religions of which Islam, Judaism and Christianity are the dominant religion. These religions according to Okeke are historically linked with Judaism being the oldest and dominant religion in Israel and out of which Christianity was founded by Jesus who he described as a Palestinian Jew at about 2000YBP and began as an offshoot of Judaism (Okeke, 2011).

Origin and Settlement of the Arabs in Palestine

Palestine according to Kimmerling and Midgal is the region between the Mediterranean Sea and the Jordan River. It is a country established around the West bank and Gaza strip and is considered an historical province under the Roman Empire from where Christianity was founded. It has been a country of Farmers with archaeological findings dated to about 8000BCE (Kimmerling and Midgal 2003: 3).

The early nomadic Bedouins of this area identifies themselves as the original Arabs owing to a historical tie with early Islamic communities. Although the term Arab was first introduced in the Assyrian Cuneiform that dated back to 853BC according to Calvocoressi, referring to a set of nomadic pastoralists (2006). In addition, he states that, their ancestors came out of Arabia in the 7th century AD and created an empire stretching from the Pyrenees along North Africa to the Middle east and into Central Asia, while only the area of the Byzantine Empire in present day Turkey remained outside the control of Arabs. This conquest according to was led by the second Caliph, Umar Ibn Abd al Khattab and his warriors who stamped Arabic and Islamic Culture to all of Syria, the fertile crescent and much of North Africa (Calvocoressi, 2006: 381).

Following British interest in the region, and in a bid to consolidate their hold, the British promised the Arabs an independent state, in order to gain their support in ensuring the defeat of the Ottoman empire through the Hussein-McMahon

correspondence (Milton-Edwards, 2011). In 1916, the Sykes-Picot agreement was signed representing a secret truce between Britain, France and Russia to divide the spoils of the Middle East among themselves consequent upon their defeat of the Ottoman Empire, if the Arabs supported their quest against the Turks which was later leaked by Russia following the Bolshevik revolution in 1917 (Milton-Edwards, 2011). With that support, victory was claimed over the Ottoman Turks in 1917 and 1918. However, modern Arab nationalism originated in the 19th and 20th century and has little or no historical basis to a common ancestry because prior to this period, Arabs identified themselves to families or tribes as asserted by most scholars including Beverly Milton-Edwards as the idea of Pan Arabism has been ascribed to the call for a united Arab state in the Middle East but not devoid of Western influence (Milton-Edwards, 2011).

According to Goldschmidt, the revolution against the absolute rule of the Ottoman Sultan Abd al-Hamid in 1908 and his dethronement gave momentum to the increased nationalist spirit among Turks and the Arabs. The 1913 Arab congress held in Paris called for a decentralized government of the Arab provinces and requested an official recognition of the Arabic language. Following the entry of the Ottoman Turks into World War 1 and its support of Germany and Austria in 1914, it became possible for Britain and France to become allies with the Arabs in order to weaken Turkish dominance while many Arabs believed that with the assistance of Britain and France, they could secure their independence. Such was the hope of the Arabs due to the series of letters known as the Hussein-McMahon correspondence in the year 1915, stating British promise to the Sheriff of Mecca to grant Independence to all Arab province under the Ottoman empire in return for the Arab to revolt against the Turks (Goldschmidt, 1996: 180).

The 1916 Arab revolution which was described as the greatest symbol of Arab nationalist aspiration by Milton-Edwards (2011), led by Sharif Hussein and his sons, with the assistance of T.E Lawrence, reflected a clearer indication that the Arabs, especially their leaders wanted both political and territorial independence after the war regardless of who won signifying their interest in engaging in the war in the beginning which was clearly known to the Allied forces of both Britain and France as Antonius (1969) clearly notes, that the after the Revolt, the Allied forces had

become aware of the causes Arab independence and the expectations that the victory of the Allied forces will bring about the desired motive of the revolution.

By 1919, a number of Christian-Muslim organizations were formed in view of pursuing Arab nationalism. It was an anti-British Jihadist militant organization that carried out several armed resistance attacks against the British and the Jews with its leader, Al-Qassam justifying violence on the grounds of religion (Goldschmidt, 1996). Additionally, Bassam Tibi had described the nationalist movements in the Middle East region as a twentieth century occurrence wrapped in a variety of factors ranging from anti-colonialism, romanticism, state building, self-determination, socialism and religion (Tibi, 1997). In 1920, the first Palestine Arab congress was held demanding for a government in Palestine which would be a representative of all Arab speaking residents in Palestine and an opposition to the fulfilment of the 1917 Balfour Declaration and it continued to plead the case until 1936 (Goldschmidt, 1996).

Resistance to continued Jewish migration into Palestine and the British occupation was expressed through various rioting on British facilities and Jewish settlements, hence, in 1937, the Peel Commission was established to investigate the Arab grievances and at the end, the commission suggested the division of Palestine into a Jewish and Arab state. However, in November, 1938, the commission on partition of boundaries complained that the solution was unworkable (Milton-Edwards, 2011). Following the new development, the British government held a meeting in 1939 due to the fear of the Arabs joining Germany in World War II, issued a white paper halting Jewish migration and the creation of an independent Arab state in ten years although, in reality, this was not the case.

Origin and Settlement of Jewish people in Palestine

The Jews had always maintained religious and physical ties to Israel. The word "Jews" is believed to have its origin from the biblical word "Yehudi" meaning "the people of the tribe of Judah or the people of the kingdom of Judah (Mansfield, 1992).

In Goldschmidt's narrative, he noted that, after the Maccabean Revolt of 165BCE, an independent Hasmonean Kingdom was established and in 64CE, Israel was conquered by the Romans and it became a province and then during the Jewish-Roman wars of 66-135CE, the Jews were expelled by the Romans from the area and

it became a Roman province of Palestine, hence, necessitating Jewish migration and dispersal (Goldschmidt, 1996). Before the collapse of the Ottoman empire, the population of the Jews in the area around the modern state of Israel consisted of about 10,000 Jews and they lived primarily in Hebron and Jerusalem (Goldschmidt, 1996).

Immigration into Palestine by the Jews began in about 1882 according to Goldschmidt (1996). He described the migration as having its historical roots due to anti-Semitism and that agitations against the Jews had existed for several thousand years in the old Roman empire in which Jews were discriminated upon due to what he described as devotion to their religion. As a result, many Jews were made Roman citizens and discrimination against them was widely spread across the Roman empire and beyond.

Anti-Semitism was coined in 1879 and became widespread in Western and Central Europe while in other parts of Europe, it took different forms and climaxed into pogroms in the year 1881 due to a conspiracy that the Jews wanted to dominate the world (Goldschmidt, 1996: 240). The period between World War 1 and 11, saw an increased in anti-Semitism in the United States and an explosion in Germany during the reign of Adolf Hitler resulting in the seizure of Jewish properties and establishment of concentration camps where Jews were kept after been captured and then executed and throughout Europe, Jews were not safe as they became targets of international genocide (Freedman, 1991).

According to Jay Winter in his book, "Remembering War; The Great War Between Memory and History in the 20th Century", he notes that, between World War 1 and 11, about 5.6-5.9 million Jews, constituting two-thirds of the Jewish population of Europe, had been exterminated through massacre, systematic execution and starvation (Winter, 2006). In order to avoid persecution, many Jews residing in Russia migrated to the United States and while some went to Palestine which was under the Turkish Ottoman Empire with the support of a Jewish-French philanthropist known as Baron Edmond de Rothschild under Zionism (Milton-Edwards, 2011).

Zionism was a movement which grew out of anti-Semitic attacks, when in 1896, Theodore Herzl, a Hungarian born Jewish journalist tried to analyse the cause of

anti-Semitism and later proposed that, establishment of a Jewish state, will be the only solution in resolving the organized hatred against the Jews. Thus, Zionism was a movement with the aim to establish for the Jews a national home in Palestine which would be backed and recognized by international law (Goldschmidt, 1996).

As noted by Goldschmidt, the first Zionist congress was organized in the year 1897, in which Herzl secured audience with the Emperor of Germany, Wilhelm II and Sultan Abd al-Hamid II of the Ottoman Empire, but didn't get the needed support. Herzl, further began a diplomatic move to the West (Britain) in which an initial claim to a land in Uganda was offered but the Jews were keen on Palestine instead because, it was believed to have a spiritual and cultural connection to the Jews (Goldschmidt, 1996). Zionism was able to achieve a feat through the Balfour declaration which reads:

His majesty's government view with favour the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, with the best endeavours' to facilitate the achievement of this noble objective, it being clearly understood that nothing would be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of non-Jewish communities in Palestine or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country (Goldschmidt, 1996: 245).

The above declaration was a unilateral act by the British Government owing to its desire to gain Jewish support and win the war against Germany and her allies in World War 1 and also the importance of Palestine as a strategic region within the Arab world in which they believed that the establishment of a Jewish state in Palestine would give Britain the sole advantage of controlling of controlling the area (Sahliyah, 1992). The declaration of a Jewish state in Palestine was embodied in the July 1922, League of Nations Mandate for Palestine, setting forth a mechanism for the temporal administration of the Jewish state (Taylor, 1991).

The Wider Jewish Agency organization was set up in 1929 by Weizmann to garner support for Jews who were willing to migrate to Palestine and as a result, during the period of the British mandate, the organized settlement of Jews known as "Yishuv" increased from 50,000-60,000 and most migrants were Jews who had fled the pogroms and genocide in Europe (Goldschmidt, 1996). Following the mass evacuation of Jews in the 1930's from Europe to Palestine, the "Yishuv" became a

majority and had its goal of consolidating a national Jewish working class in Palestine and to hold on to a state of its own. The Jewish agency was responsible for controlled migration into Palestine and also served as a government on the Jewish settlement and agitated for the Jewish colonization of Palestine and armed struggle against the Arabs while a Jewish national fund was set up and many of the migrants purchased lands from the Arab owners (Goldschmidt, 1996).

The Establishment of the State of Israel, 1948

Britain had always had plans on fulfilling her promise to the Jews contained in the Sykes-Picot agreement of 1916 and the Balfour Declaration of 1917 while also trying to maintain its goodwill of the Arab world based on its oil-producing status and to retain her bases as well. Hence, the need for the mandate.

Managing the Palestinian territory as well as the Middle East in general by the Western world pose so much difficulties. As noted by Milton-Edwards (2011), it was not easy for Britain and France to manage these areas with a people of distinct languages, ideologies and culture. In the case of Palestine, the mandate status issued in 1922 was abandoned in the year 1948 as a result of Britain's inability to find a resolution to the emerging issues and crisis witnessed within the territory which they also had no plans of proposing a better solution as the case may be, despite trying the partition plan by the Peel Commission of 1937 (Milton-Edwards, 2011). The Peel Commission had proposed the division of Palestine into three separate regions; an Arab state, a Jewish state and Jerusalem (to be administered under British control including holy places like Bethlehem).

The Commission's recommendation lacked practicability and as a result of the potential second World War, with Britain looking to gain Arabs favour, issued a white paper in 1939 to halt the migration of more Jews into Palestine as Britain was apprehensive of a war with Germany if it granted asylum to the Jews facing the Nazi holocaust. Hence, the need to be in good terms with the Arabs in order to secure the oil riches in the Arab world (Goldschmidt, 1996).

One may argue that the Holocaust worked in favour of Zionism as they were able to achieve success as after the issuance of the white paper in 1939, the Zionist were able to also extend their diplomatic ties to the United State as the Zionist in the course of the war gained prominence as they were greatly supported by President

Franklin Roosevelt and his successor, Harry Truman (Goldschmidt, 1996). Goldschmidt asserts that the involvement of America in the Zionist course pitched it against Britain as the United States were kin with the idea of persuading the British Government to lift its ban on Jewish migration into Palestine immediately on the basis that some 10,000 Jews had escaped the Nazi Holocaust and at the long run the United States also accepted the proposal of David Ben Gurion who later became the world Zionist leader in 1945, to grant entry permits to the Jews (Goldschmidt, 1996).

Calvocoressi opined that the then British prime minister, Winston Churchill shared some sympathetic disposition towards the Jews and sought the approval of America in order to implement the British policies in the Arab world while the Americans as well were interested in assisting the Jews while trying to avoid any confrontation with Britain who may misinterpret their role as an act of imperialism (Calvocoressi, 2001).

Although, Britain was not in support of the 10,000 entry points proposed by David Ben Gurion, the Jews however, made issues worse by their involvement in what has been described as acts of terrorism in Palestine after World War II and thereby creating animosity from Britain (Karsh, 1997). However, the British government opted for an Anglo-American solution to the lingering issues and as a result a commission made up six Britons and Six Americans travelled to Palestine in order to have eye witness assessment of the problem. Following their arrival in Palestine, they took reports from five Arab states and the survivors of the Nazi Holocaust who were residing in the European camps and in 1946, its report was published highlighting the fact that 10,000 Jews were homeless in Europe and also pleaded that the Jews be allowed to migrate to Palestine while at the same time rejecting the idea of a partition plan and rather requested that the British Mandate continues (Milton-Edwards & Hinchcliffe, 2008). In furtherance, the report also encouraged the massive migration of Jews into Palestine and rejected the halting of Lands purchase by the Jews. However, the committee's recommendation in the report was rejected by the Truman's government except for the idea of a 10,000 Jewish migration entry points while the Arabs and the British government rejected the whole idea proposed by the committee (Brown, 1988). As at the time of the issuance of the report, a supposed Jewish terrorist group had attacked the British at Tel-Aviv with a counter attack by Britain in Palestine, and it became evident that Britain was getting tired of

the “Palestine Question” and also faced with the thought of halting the incessant attacks and violent riots. After the rejection of the Anglo-American report by Britain, the partition plan was revived as proposed by the Peel commission of 1937 and as a result a plan for two autonomous but not sovereign provinces were drafted by the United States ambassador Henry Grady and the British secretary of state Herbert Morrison and also granted 100,000 permits yearly once the partitioning takes effect (Calvocoressi, 2001).

The Jews on their part had rejected all forms of proposal but rather subscribed to discussing with Britain on a bilateral basis while Truman reiterated his support for the idea of a 100,000 permit of entry of the Jews into Palestine. Consequently, all effort to arrive at a consensus between America, the Jews and Britain proved abortive while terrorist attacks against British officials in Palestine persisted unabated (Brown, 1984).

Britain in February 1947 referred the Palestine Question to the newly formed United Nations while, the UN General Assembly set up the UNSCOP made up of 11 members who had to travel to Palestine to ascertain first-hand account of the situation. The UNSCOP came up with a partition plan adopted by the United Nations in November 1947 although, during the vote by the security council, Britain rather abstain from the ballot. The partition plan divided the lands into 3 as follows; about 56% was allotted to the proposed Jewish state, about 42% went to the Arabs while Jerusalem was made an international territory to be controlled by the United Nations. While the plan was accepted by the Jews, it was however rejected by the Arabs. Despite the UN lacking the legal mandate to create states, the Jews were in support of the idea of a Palestinian Arab state and the Jews got their state despite the contest through conquest (Milton-Edwards & Hinchcliffe, 2008; Cleveland 2016).

As a result of the decision of the UN and rejection of the proposal by the Arabs, fighting ensued between the Jews and the Arabs due to their desire to control the area allocated to both parties in the partition plan while Britain also lost the trust of both parties and control of the territory, hence, it declared an end to the Mandate on the 15th of May, 1948 leaving both parties to their fate (Milton-Edwards, 2011).

The Jews who had acquired sophisticated weapons to counter the invading forces of the Arabs and following the departure of Britain was able to achieve its aim of a

homeland with David Ben Gurion declaring the establishment of the state of Israel that same year. By implication, the new state was free way for the Jews around the world to lay claim to a land bearing its own distinct identity and laying the foundation for further crisis wars within the Middle East region.

This chapter is pertinent in providing historical understanding of the Middle East with regards to Israel and Palestine by providing historical information to their origination and thereby linking remote causes of the war to the immediate causes prompting the involvement of the UN in Palestinian question which is buttressed in further chapters.

CHAPTER III

The United Nations and the Arab-Israeli Conflict During the Cold War

In this chapter, the Arab-Israeli conflict in relation to the United Nations (UN) is going to be discussed. In order to understand the conflict without any shortcomings and misunderstandings, the source of the Arab-Israeli conflicts although, mentioned in chapter 1, will be analysed in the various sub-chapters of this chapter for better understanding and correlation of the study.

The United Nations and the Arab-Israeli Conflict in the 1948 War

Since the creation of the UN in 1945, it has been at the fore front of conflict resolution and management through the use of pacific means. It has created mechanisms for peaceful resolution of conflicts and has embarked on various peace keeping and peace maintaining missions to areas ravaged by war and conflicts. This is because the maintenance of peace will enhance international and global cooperation in economic and political development. One of the reasons behind the establishment of the UN has been, no doubt, the failure of the League of Nations, and thus to prevent another world war in the post-Second World War period. Hence, a framework for which warring parties would be brought together to negotiate with the UN as a mediator was part of the role of the organization.

Parsons (1997) notes that, when the United Nations Charter came into effect on 24 October 1945, not an individual (especially, scholars in International Relations field) rose to predict that the question of Palestine will be the most dominant agenda of both UN Security Council and General Assembly. This Question has dominated the agenda of the UN for more than 70 years and it is evident that it would not going to be resolved soon despite the exiting legal documents and resolutions.

More importantly, neither the consignment of the majority of the population expected the outcome of the conflict which has resulted in what appears to be permanent refugee status (Parsons 1997).

With the declaration of the state of Israel on the 14th of May 1948, after the end of the British mandate; David Ben Gurion –as the first prime minister of Israel– announced the establishment of the state of Israel. Immediately after the declaration, four Arab nations including Kingdom of Jordan, Syria, Egypt and Iraq carried out an

attack on the nascent state of Israel on the 15th of May 1948 and thus, became the first official Arab-Israeli conflict. The Arab states were enhanced by guerrillas of Palestinians; the war was marked by a decisive victory for the Israeli state in spite of the fact that they were fewer in number with an estimated population of less than one million as at 1948 (Okeke, 2011).

Okeke outlines factors that could be responsible for Israeli's victory as;

- The use of more sophisticated weapons and great adaptation to modern technologies, warfare and organization than the Arabs, owing to the fact that the Jews at the time had far reaching experiences in Europe in the course of their sojourning.
- They were more organized and had created a standing army known as the Israeli Defence Forces (IDF) and land army which controlled the naval, air and land army.
- The Arabs failed to fight under a single command because they were made up of armies of different nations, therefore, lacked a central coordination.
- The Jews believed they were fighting for survival and that their defeat meant complete extermination and annihilation, hence, it was necessary that they put in their effort to ensure victory and preserve the state of Israel
- The Arabs were not fighting a war of survival and it was easy for the Israelis intelligence to bribe them into parting with the Arab strategic military intelligence in relations to their military preparedness (Okeke, 2011: 144).

After the 1948-49 War, Israelis were able to acquire an extra 30% of territory different from what it was allocated by the United Nations in its partition plan of November, 1947 and Egypt also laid claim to the Gaza Strip, while Jordan took control of the West Bank and East Jerusalem, leaving Palestine with no state with greater percentage of Palestinians becoming refugees in neighbouring Arab states (Brown, 1984).

There was no treaty at the end of the conflict, rather an armistice agreement was signed between the Arab states of Egypt, Syria and Jordan with the state of Israel while Iraq refused to sign the agreement to withdraw its forces. Regardless of the

Armistice agreement, the collective Arab states refused to recognize the state of Israel and had in their objective its total destruction and establishment of an Arab state that would be dominated by the Palestine in the region (Okeke, 2011).

The UN's intervention was a call for a cease fire on the 15th of July 1948 through its security council that was appointed as a mediating force in the peace process by the UN General Assembly (UNGA). The UNGA passed the resolution 181 which called for the partition of Palestine into Arab and Jewish states, stating that its violation would amount to a breach of the peace under Chapter VII of the UN Charter (entitled *Actions with respect to threat to the peace, breaches of the peace and act of aggression*). It also created the UN Truce Consular Commission for Palestine (UNTCCP), which was created in order to that the issue of refugee be addressed. Also, the United Nations Relief and Welfare Agency (UNRWA) was also established to provide relief materials and aid to victims of the refugee problems created by the 1948 conflict and it has been at the frontline of the provision of assistance and a source of stability in the region. While on the 11th of May 1949, the United Nations admitted Israel as a permanent member of the UN, thereby recognizing the state of Israel (Okeke, 2011).

According to Phyllis Bennis, UN Resolution 181 presented that;

... international legitimacy on the nascent, borderless and still-expanding state of Israel, while postulating an abstract Palestinian state and protected international status for Jerusalem, neither of which were ever allowed to come into existence... the UN's own power remained derivative ... to what was granted or withdrawn, imposed or suspended, by the major powers whose creation the global institution (Bennis, 1997).

The armistice agreement of 1948 was supervised by the United Nations through the supervising and reporting agency which monitored the armistice line and the United Nations as well established an independent body known as the conciliation commission for Palestine (CCP) which hosted a neutral body in Switzerland to address the border issues arising between Israel and its Arab neighbours. It also advocated Jerusalem to be an international territory under UN's control and the return of Palestinian refugees.

The United Nations and the Arab-Israeli Conflict during the 1956 Suez Crisis

The Suez Canal crisis of 1956 also referred to as the tripartite aggression was a war between Israel, Britain and France against the Arab state of Egypt. The crisis which was based on the nationalization of the Suez Canal by the Egyptian president Gamal Abdel Nasser ended with the United Nations establishing a peace keeping force in the region (Ogbogbo & Nwobunwene, 2009).

According to Milton-Edwards, the event which led to the Suez Canal crisis began as a result of Gamal Abdel Nasser's Arab nationalist policies. One of his desires was to nationalize the Suez Canal and champion the Arab nationalist course in which Israel's occupancy of Palestine served as a threat to Arab nationalism ideology and movement. The Egyptian prime minister having ascended power in 1954, became a strong ally to the non-aligned movement following his desires to stay neutral during the cold war battle between the West and East as he desired weaponry from Czechoslovakia (one of the communist states during the Cold War) while desiring the US and British funding of the Aswan High Dam (Milton-Edwards, 2011).

Milton-Edwards acknowledges that the victory of Egypt over Britain leading to Egypt's independence in 1922, had given Egypt control over the Suez Canal which served as a major economic source for Britain and Egypt respectively (2011).

The Cold War politics was at its heightened stage during this period, following the dominance and expansion interest of both the West and East in the Middle East region. The ideological warfare between the capitalist states (Western bloc led by the US) and the communist states (led by the USSR) intensified, following the friendship of Egypt – a leading figure in the unification of Arab state, with the communist country. The US displeased with the situation, decided to renege on its promise towards the Aswan High Dam project, thereby, resulting into Egypt angrily nationalizing the Suez Canal and transferring its ownership from France and Britain to itself (Ogbogbo & Nwobunwene, 2009).

The Egyptian pan-Arabist president Gamal Abdel Nasser decided to use the profit accrued from the Canal amounting to about \$25 million per annum to construct the Aswan High Dam, stating that the dam belonged to Egypt and sought to compensate its French and British shareholders. It also promised that no nation would be denied passage along the Canal (Taylor, 1991).

The British and French were concerned over the possible loss of access to the canal and could not afford to do so due to the economic and strategic relevance of the canal as a source of passage for crude oil going to Egypt and they demanded that the Egyptian government reverse its policy. Regardless of their demand, the Egyptian government was adamant. Hence, Britain and France decided to result into seeking joint military action (Meouchy & Slugglet, 2004).

Okeke notes that, at the time of the Suez Canal crisis, Israel was already pitched against Egypt. Egypt had in the year 1949, prevented any ship carrying cargo and any Israeli vessel to and from Israel through the Suez Canal. Egypt also had closed the straits of Tiran, thereby, blockading the Gulf of Aquaba, making it impossible for the ships to have access to the Red Sea (Okeke, 2011).

While analysing the 1956 War, Okeke further wrote that, on October 29 1956, the Israelis invaded the Sinai Peninsula and on the 30th of October, Britain and France ordered the belligerents to withdraw from the Canal, but Nasser-led government refused to accept the order, hence, the following day, an attack was launched by the combined forces of the British and French on various Egyptian military bases and under seven days the Egyptian air force was decimated, while, the Israelis captured and took control of the entire Peninsula while, British and French forces took charge of canal. In response to this defeat and assault, Nasser responded by sinking 40 ships berthed in the Suez Canal and completely closed the waterways. Israel were able to regain access to the Suez Canal following its withdrawal from the Gaza strip (Okeke, 2011).

In light of this, the UN according to Meisler, had earlier intervened in the crisis before the fighting broke out because France and Britain had presented the case before the UN Security Council. The Security Council recommendation was that there should be a non-discriminatory policy of passage along the Canal, respect for Egypt's sovereignty that the canal should be isolated from politics of any nation, tolls should be fixed and managed by Egypt and its shareholders and that a specific amount be set apart as a special fund to develop the canal and finally, all issues in relation to the canal be resolved arbitrarily (Meisler, 1995).

Meisler further explains that, the US and the USSR had issued a draft document through the Security Council calling for a ceasefire and the withdrawal of Israel from

Egyptian territories and the resolution was vetoed by Britain and France while the UN General Assembly through its Security Council called for an emergency session of the Assembly in order to address the crisis. On November 1956, a proposal for an emergency international United Nations Force was adopted with the aim of securing and supervising the ceasefire. On November 6 of same year, a ceasefire agreement was reached and by the 10th of November of same year as well, a special emergency session of the General Assembly decided to transfer the Suez Canal issue to the regular session of the General Assembly. On November 16, attended by 25 nations offered to contribute men to the United Nations Emergency Force (UNEF) while, on the 24th of November, the UN requested the withdrawal of British, French and Israeli troops from Egypt and the Geneva Assembly also made plans for the Suez Canal to be cleared (Meisler, 1995). The event of 1956, marked the first UN peacekeeping operation by the UNEF with approximately 4,000 troops stationed between the opposing forces while, the Security Council resolution 95 was also passed supporting Israel's position and ability to use the Suez Canal according to Meisler (1995).

The United Nations and the Arab-Israeli Conflict in the Six Day War of 1967

Ogbogbo & Nwobunne (2009) described the Six-Day War as a pre-emptive simultaneous attack launched by Israel against the Arab states comprising; Egypt, Jordan and Syria. According to them, it changed the outlook in international relations as it has been in the Middle East as the war resulted into changing a regional confrontation into that which involved super powers.

The origin of the 1967 War according to Yapp, may be found first in the continuation of the unresolved problems of frontiers and refugees which had existed since 1948, due to the fact that, the problem of the refugees had indeed worsened as their number had risen through natural increase and the Palestinians as well, could not be regarded as purely refugee after the creation the creation of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) in 1964 (1991).

From the early periods of 1965, the Palestinians had assumed a political and military might and carried out several raids from Syria and Jordan into Israel; also, the arms race embarked upon by both Israel and the Arab states had made them spend about 4%-6% of their Gross National Product (GNP) to acquire arms and ammunitions for

which each state needed in order to maintain a balance of terror and viewed each other as an enemy (Yapp, 1991).

Yapp in furtherance, explains that, the Suez Canal crisis of 1956 was also a trigger factor for the 1967 war stating that, after the 1956 war, Israel had withdrawn from the Sinai but had troops retained in the Straits of Tiran and the Gaza Strip which necessitated the UNEF to take charge of the area and as such, the fact that the Strait of Tiran was still open to Israel's shipping was a source of resentment from the Egyptians and other Arab states (Yapp, 1991).

The Jordan waters were not left out as the Kingdom created an Arab military alliance in order to prevent Israel from carrying out its irrigation plans in the Negev waters and the military alliance was viewed by the Israelis to be a potential threat to the security of Israel. Following these reserved resentments, Egypt began to mobilize against Israel from May 1967 and requested the withdrawal of the UNEF and on the 22nd of May, Egyptian government closed the Straits of Tiran against Israeli shipping (Midgal, 1980).

Israel led and launched an attack on the 5th of June and defeated the combined forces of Egypt, Syria and Jordan to their surprise and occupied the whole of mandatory Palestine, the Sinai, Golan Heights and the Egyptian oil fields as Yapp (1991), described the event as one which came as a surprise as the speed and comprehensiveness of the Israeli victory accrued on the 10th of June within six days, took all by surprise. He notes that, the victory was achieved through the use of air power to destroy the Arab air forces on the first day and subsequently in combination with Israeli armour and other ground forces, the Arab forces were defeated (Yapp, 1991: 418). Ogbogbo & Nwobunwenne (2009) also share similar claims on account of this event as they recount the mannerism of the war.

The UNSC in an emergency session held on the 10th of June 1967, according to Miesler (1995), called for a ceasefire by putting forward a resolution which would set a formula for permanent peace known as the Resolution 242, which was adopted unanimously by the Security Council on November 22 1967. The Resolution 242 in Meisler's description was the best known Security Council Resolution in the first fifty years of the UN, which thus states; "a just and lasting peace in the Middle East" should include the application of two principles, which includes, firstly, the

evacuation of Israeli forces from the lands occupied and the acknowledgement of “the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of every state in the area and their right to live in peace within a secure and recognised boundary, free from threats or acts of force” (Meisler, 1995:181).

In this context, the UNSC Resolution 242 according to Malcolm Yapp, further affirmed the necessity of free navigation in international waterways, finding a just solution of the refugee problem and guaranteeing the territorial rights and political independence of each state within the area through measures which included the creation of demilitarized zones (Yapp, 1991: 420).

In calling for a just settlement of the refugee problem, the UN in its report, mandated Israel to ensure the security and safety of the victims who had been affected by the military operations by taking account of their welfare. Also, Israel was charged to facilitate the return of all persons who had been displaced (UNSC Resolution 242, 1967).

The Resolution 242 was accepted by Egypt, Jordan and Israel according to Ogbogbo & Nwobunwenne (2009) but Israel perceived that the withdrawal of Israeli’s from the occupied territories necessitated a negotiation, thereby, maintaining that, Israel acceptance of the Resolution on the basis that only direct negotiations with the Arab states and a peace treaty which would be comprehensive can settle the withdrawal process and the problems associated with the refugee crisis.

However, the Resolution was rejected by Syria and the PLO because, the former felt the Resolution was borne out of the demand made by the Arab countries led by Nasser for Israel’s withdrawal following its unexpected defeat, while, the latter criticized the Resolution, stating that its focus was solely on the issue of refugee, thereby, excluding all other relevant issues (Milton-Edwards, 2011). Milton-Edwards (2011) also highlights that, the six-day war left a gap in the unification of the Arab states as well as the resignation of Gamal Abdel Nasser as the president of Egypt, thereby, creating a vacuum in the leadership of Arab nationalist pursuit.

The United Nations and the Arab-Israeli Conflict of 1973

The 1973 Arab-Israeli war otherwise referred to as the Yom-Kippur war, was an armed confrontation between Israel and the Arabs states of Egypt and Syria with the

Arabs states wedging the war in a bid to take back the territories captured by Israel and it had occupied after its victory during the six-day war of 1967. The war was named Yom-Kippur as an indication of its occurrence on Israel's holiest day (Ogbogbo & Nwobunwenne, 2009).

According to Goldschmidt (1996), the longstanding rivalry between the Jews and the Arabs over the question of Palestine was responsible for the long-standing rift turned into conflicts; the Arab state has been in constant opposition to the state of Israel and have always had its agenda of pursuing the Arab cause of which Palestine was a part of. He further notes that, during the six-day war, following Israel's victory, the Israelis had annexed strategic Arab territories like the Sinai Peninsula and the Gaza Strip, formerly administered by Egypt, the Golan Heights, former under Syria's control and East Jerusalem as well as the West Bank formerly under Jordan's administration. However, he opines that, despite the passage of the Resolution 242 by the UN, which mandated Israel to withdraw from the occupied territories and its mandate for Israel to be recognized as a state by the Arab countries, none of the parties adhered to the directives of the Resolution, rather, reprisal attacks, continued along the borders. For instance, Nasser launched a campaign on the Suez Canal in 1969 which brought in the war of attrition which was not a full-scale war due to the US intervention in brokering a ceasefire in 1970.

Anwar al-Sadat succession of Abdel Nasser changed the status quo of Egypt's international relations with regards to Arab-Israeli relations as Anwar Sadat opted for diplomatic means to ensure Israel's withdrawal from the occupied territories but to a dead end and consequently, he prepared the military for war due to Israel's refusal to withdraw for fear of the security of the state of Israel, if it was to withdraw (Ogbogbo & Nwobunwenne, 2009). According to Goldschmidt (1996), Arabs refusal to recognize the state of Israel was responsible for Israel's refusal to withdraw and also, it led to the fortification of Israel's military positions in the Arab territories which they had occupy.

On October 6 1973, Egypt and Syria launched a surprise attack on Israel as Israel was said to have been caught unawares, as they were not in anticipation of the attack. Nevertheless, Goldschmidt (1996), in analysing the event, opines that, despite Israel's unpreparedness, Syria and Egypt were unable to take advantage of the

vulnerability of the Israelis as the armies of Egypt and Syria had irregular and inaccurate communications and it inhibited their chance of victory.

In response to the attack, Israel was able to quickly mobilize troops and launched coordinated attacks in all directions, to reclaim the land that Syria had captured and overran its borders; they also attacked Egypt and crossed the Suez Canal surrounding the Egyptian third army and as a result, the war brought the Soviet Union and the US to what could be described as a “near confrontation” because both blocs had supplied weapons to the Arab states and Israel respectively (Goldschmidt, 1996).

Following the continued armed confrontation between the Arabs states of Egypt and Syria against Israel, the Soviet Union and the United States met with the Security council of the UN and it led to the adoption of Resolution 338 (1973). The resolution was a reaffirmation of Resolution 242, which demanded for a just and enduring peace in the Middle East, hence, a ceasefire was reached on the 22nd of October, 1973 (UN Facts, 2008).

In this regard, the Resolution 338 of (1973) reads thus; The Security Council of the UN “*Calls upon all parties to the present fighting to cease all firing and terminate all military activity immediately, no later than 12 hours after the moment of the adoption of this decision, in the positions they occupy ...*” (UN, 2008).

According to the UN Facts (2008), the Security Council reconvened on the 24th of October, 1973 and formulated a modality which established a new peace keeping force known as the Second United Nations Emergency Force II (UNEF II) in a bid to finding a lasting solution to the Arab-Israeli conflict.

The United States and Soviet Union under the patronage of the United Nations, led an international peace keeping conference which and Israel, Egypt and Jordan in the attendance, excluding Syria. The US and the Soviet Union involvement led to a disengagement of forces between Egypt and Israel in January, 1974 and Israel with Syria in May, 1974. And this disengagement was made possible through the assistance of two United Nations peacekeeping forces under the supervision of UNEF II ensuring their redeployment. Israel and Syria signed a separate disengagement agreement in May, 1974 which led to the creation of the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force (UNDOF) while the Palestine Liberation

Organization in 1974, was granted an observer status by the General Assembly as well (UN Facts, 2008: 4).

The United Nations and the Arab-Israeli Conflict 1975-2015

With the end of major wars as a result of ceasefire agreement in 1973, conflicts shifted from the regional Arab-Israeli conflict to a more concentrated local Israel-Palestinian conflict from 1974. Although, there were attempts of renegotiation, like in 1977, where Egyptian President, Anwar Sadat began negotiations with Israel (Ogbogbo & Nwobunwenne, 2009).

The UN in 1981, decided to host an international conference on the Palestinian question which officially took place in 1983 and adopted by acclamation on a Declaration on Palestine and approved a programme of action as well for the achievement of Palestinian rights. It also recommended measures to be taken by states in resolving the conflict (UN Facts, 2008).

In 1987, the world witnessed Palestinian engagement in demonstrations, economic boycotts and tax resistance demanding for independence and also for the withdrawal of the military that had occupied the Gaza Strip and the West Bank. Israelis response led to the intifada witnessing lots of casualties between 1987 and 1993 and as a result, the UN Security Council, Secretary General and the General Assembly of the UN, adopted Resolution number 605 (1987), condemning the killings of the Palestinians and human rights violation (UN Facts, 2008).

The Security Council in furtherance, adopted four resolutions which bordered on the issue of deportation of Palestinians. In the Resolution 607 (1988), Resolution 608 (1988), Resolution 636 (1989) and 641 (1989), it urged Israel to stop the deportation of Palestinians and to ensure the safety for those deported and immediately return them to the occupied territories (UN Facts, 2008: 28)

According to UN Facts (2008: 30) in 1991, during the on-going Gulf war, Iraq fired missiles into Israel with the aim of uniting the Arab world against Israel and liberate Kuwait. However, Israel, refused to launch a counter attack on the advice of the United States in order to prevent an escalation in an armed conflict. Rather, a peace conference was convened by the United States and the Soviet Union with the UN as an observer.

The UN created a multi-lateral working group that began to investigate on regional issues and the conference also had its basis on Resolution 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) which were all focused on a comprehensive peace settlement and by 1992, the UN became a full extra-regional participant in the talks with the Secretary General, appointing Under-secretary General Chinmaya Gharelaha of India as a special representative to the Middle East to co-ordinate the role of the UN on matters where the UN had expertise, such as, arm control, regional security, economic development, refugee, environment and water (UN Facts, 2008:35).

In September 1991, Israel alongside Palestine, signed the Oslo Accords, otherwise known as the declaration of principles or Oslo Accords I. According to Milton-Edwards (2011), this accord was a recognition of the PLO as a legitimate representative of the Palestinians; it consequently promised an end to terrorism by the Palestinians towards Israel, the state of Israel was recognized officially, denouncement of the desire to destroy Israel and an end to violence.

The UN General Assembly was in support of the Accord and it also called on the UN to play a prominent role in the peace negotiations and also provide further assistance to the Palestinians in the areas of economy and technology (UNISPAL, 2012).

These nations pledged the sum of \$2.4 billion on the 1st of October 1993 to finance economic and social development in the course of a five-year period in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip. The West Bank was divided into areas A, B, C under the Oslo II agreement with area A under full Palestinian control and security (UNSC, 1993).

According to UN Facts (2008), in March 1996, suicide bombings in Israel were condemned by the UN while, a Summit of peace makers was convened by the UN reiterating the negotiation process. Based on the escalation of hostilities, the General Assembly convened its tenth emergency meeting in April 1997 expressing dissatisfaction over Israel's violation of the Geneva Convention on human rights and also called for the parties to enforce the convention in Jerusalem and the occupied territories.

Violent protests which broke out in the year 2000, otherwise known as the *Al-Aqsa Intifada* (or second Palestinian uprising), over the visit of Ariel Sharon to the sacred temple; this led to clashes between the Israelis and Palestinians and took the

intervention of the Security Council of the UN through Resolution 1322 (2000), which urged Israel to abide by the fourth Geneva Convention and the resumption of peace negotiation (UN Facts, 2008: 36).

Following Kofi Annan, the then UN Secretary General's visit to the region where he met with both leaders of Palestine and Israel, a Summit chaired by the United States President Bill Clinton and Hosni Mubarak was held which produced a format for an end to the conflict and renewed effort towards peace and on December 1st 2000, the General Assembly resolved to be committed to the principle of land for peace and full implementation of Resolution 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) and also requested the removal of Israel's forces from the West Bank (Ogbogbo & Nwobunwenne, 2009).

In March 2001, the Security Council met and considered the option of establishing a UN Observer Force in the occupied territories of the Palestinians that would provide security for the civilians, but was not successfully carried out as the United States voted against it and as a result, violence continued unavoidably, thereby, necessitating a fact-finding committee which was to provide a report and consulted with the United Nations Secretary General (UN Facts, 2008). This report known as the Mitchell report produced in April 2001, focused on the need for the rebuilding of confidence between the Israelis and Palestinians and the need for them to end violence by focusing on existing agreements (CIE, 2015).

In June and August, 2001, there were suicide attacks in Israel with Israel retaliating and re-introducing extra-judicial killings on accused Palestinian militants. The increased violence led to the Security Council adopting the Resolution 1397 (2002), which demanded immediate cessation of all acts of violence including the acts of terror, provocation, incitement and destruction and reaffirming a vision of a region where two states can co-exist side by side within secure and recognized borders (United Nations facts, 2008: 38).

Operation Defensive Shield was carried out by Israel following a suicide bombing attack which killed 30 Israelis at a Passover dinner which led to the adoption of Resolution 1402 on the 30th of March, 2002 by the UN and a ceasefire. Nevertheless, the violence continued and Resolution 1403 (2002) was adopted demanding the immediate implementation of a ceasefire and the withdrawal of troops (UN Facts, 2008).

Despite the diplomatic moves, Israeli forces re-occupied Bethlehem which resulted to heavy casualties and Palestinian refugee camps were demolished. Thus, leading to UN's adoption of Security Council Resolution 1405 (2002) which expressed concern over the Palestinian refugee camps and also welcomed initiative for a fact-finding mission to investigate the events (Stein, 2002).

Meanwhile, the Middle East Quartet was launched in April 2002, comprising of a representative of the European Union for the Common Foreign and Security Policy represented, Javier Solana, foreign ministers of the United States and Russia while the Secretary General was the representative of the UN. The Quartet was to employ international efforts to search for a peaceful solution to the Middle East crisis and in 2003 it issued what was known as "*The Road Map for Peace*" (CIE, 2015).

The Road Map for Peace issued by the Quartet presented a performance to a permanent two-state solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict based on the foundations of the Madrid Conference, Security Council Resolution 242 (1967), Resolution 338 (1973) and Resolution 1397 (2002). The road map was accepted with reservations by the Israelis and the Palestinians as reference point to end the conflict. Consequently, the Quartet continued to meet regularly through the facilitations of the United Nations Special Coordination for the Middle East Peace Process and the Security Council through the adoption of Resolution 1515 in November 2003, endorsed the Roadmap (UN Facts, 2008).

Various forms of violence erupted from March 2004 to February, 2005 in which a meeting was held by the Quartet in March in order to facilitate support for Palestinian institution building. The secretary General of the UN also paid a visit to the region for further talks with the Palestine with the Palestinians and Israeli leaders, while Israel also withdrew its forces from the West Bank and the Quartet was enhanced the handover of economic assets to the Palestinian authorities (Louer, 2006).

The electoral events of January 2006 brought in the Hamas movement which did not recognise Israel and the various peace agreements, which led to Israel halting all economic assistance to the Palestinians and also the escalation of violence which continues with Israel's attack on Gaza Strip (Kober, 2008).

The war in Gaza between Israel and Palestine (Hamas) began on 27 December 2008 and ended 18th January 2009 through a unilateral ceasefire by Israel. According to Zanotti et. al (2009) On December 27, 2008, Israel launched a major military campaign dubbed “Operation Cast Lead” (OCL) against Hamas in the Gaza Strip. The Israeli offensive came in response to marked increased Palestinian rocket fire following the expiration of a six-month ceasefire on December 19. On January 3, 2009, Israel began a ground offensive into Gaza. Despite international pressure to halt the fighting (including the passage of UN Security Council Resolution 1860 on January 8), the conflict continued until January 18, when Israel unilaterally ceased fire and Hamas followed suit shortly thereafter. Israel’s technological superiority and reliance on heavy armor and firepower contributed to a wide disparity in casualties approximately 1,440 Palestinians have died (with some organizations estimating that at least half of the dead are civilians), compared with 13 dead (including four civilians) on the Israeli side (Kanaaneh, 2008).

Following the attack, the US responded by sending a fact-finding mission to investigate the violation of human rights in the occupied Gaza Strip and recommended that indicted persons be prosecuted while the United Nations Human Right Council (UNHRC) on the other hand, mandated Israel to carry out repairs on the Palestinian occupied territories (Zanotti et. Al, 2009).

On the 14th of November, 2012, Israel launched Operation Pillar Defense (OPD) which was an eight-day Israeli Defense Forces (IDF) operation in the Gaza Strip over the killing of Ahmed Jabari – the chief of the Gaza military wing of Hamas by an Israeli airstrike which also led to an emergency session of the UN Security Council over the attack but failed to reach a decision (<https://www.reuters.com>). In response to the attack, on the 29th of November 2012, the General Assembly of the United Nations under Resolution 67/19 in a 138-9 vote (with 41 in absentia), moved Palestine to a non-member observer status in the United Nations reaffirming the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination and to independence in their State of Palestine on the Palestinian territory occupied since 1967 (UNISPAL 2012).

Based on the violations of ceasefire agreements between Hamas and the IDF, the parties constantly fired rockets into the different territories. For instance, on the 12th of June 2014, three Israeli teenagers were reportedly kidnapped in the West Bank by Hamas militants and were murdered which led to Israel’s invasion of Gaza on the 8th

of July with the aim of destroying Gaza's rocket into Israel according to NPR News, (2014). The conflict ended on the 26th of August 2014 with a ceasefire agreement reached between Hamas and Israel.

On the 14th of September 2015, 136 of the 193 member states of the UN recognized the state of Palestine as sovereign over the West Bank and the Gaza Strip and consequently, those that failed to recognize the state of Palestine recognized the PLO as the representative of the Palestinian people (Makovsky, 1996).

CHAPTER IV

Assessment of the Role and Effectiveness of the United Nations in the Arab-Israeli Conflict

The resolution of the long-standing conflict in the Middle East between the Arabs and Israeli and the Palestinians is of utmost concern to the United Nations. The primary responsibility of the UN which is to maintain peace and world security by seeking avenues to ensure that the use of force in conflict resolution is minimized to the barest minimum began in 1948 with the Arab-Israeli conflict. The UN over the years has continued to in one way or other, involve itself with the Palestinian question even in the contemporary period.

An Assessment of the Role of the UN in the Arab-Israeli Conflict

The United Nations (UN) through various mechanisms and agencies has been involved in the mediation and resolution of the Arab-Israeli conflict. The UN has been able to manage the conflict to a reasonable extent; the management of economic and security arrangement has been able to limit the impact of the conflict on civilians. According to Sellwood (2009), without the intervention of the UN, the refugee crisis would have worse, due to the fact that the UN has been able to manage security arrangements in disputed areas pending when the conflicts are resolved through its peace keeping operations. Sellwood further states that, the United Nations has been able to provide support in technical and political areas; its support has kept electoral processes on track in spite of the conflict and it has also helped to resolve disputed boundary issues through the use of UN cartographers who had initiated efforts to demarcate along international agreed lines (Sellwood, 2009: 7).

Parsons, acknowledges the efforts of the UN in resolving the crisis associated with refugees caused by the unresolved conflicts between state of Israel and the Arab states of which has disposed Palestine citizen into seeking refuge in Lebanon and also the effect this refugee condition has on Lebanon as a state (Parsons, 1997).

Englander (2009) states that, through the efforts of the UN employing pacific means of conflict resolution, it has been worked out short term arrangement deals and ceasefires between conflicting parties; it has tried to prevent misunderstandings and attacks from turning into full blown conflicts; it has also provided ideas based on the

resources available to it and legitimacy and through these mechanisms, it has been able to provide advice and ideas to diplomatic partners such as the Middle East Quartet, which was instrumental in drafting the “Roadmap” which has been a framework for the Israeli Palestinian peace process.

The United Nations, has been able to provide authoritative information and analysis in monthly briefings and reports on the implementation of Security Council Resolutions and representatives of the UN, provide information on developments to Security Council members and parties (Ogbogbo & Nwobunwenne, 2009). Through the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (UNOCHA), the UN monitors closures along the West Bank and Gaza and the information from their activities enables the UN quartet and other representative to effectively engage in informed dialogue with the Israelis and Palestinian Arabs (Parsons, 1997).

According to Ladipoth (1992), the Resolution 242 was merely a recommendation rather than an enforcement, because it was adopted under the UN Charter Chapter VI (entitled *Pacific Settlement of the Disputes*) rather than Chapter VII in which delegates pointed out that regarding the settlement of a dispute –the persistence of which is likely to threaten the maintenance of universal peace and security. UNSC Resolution 242, however, stipulated that Israeli occupancy of the lands required to be ended which would lead to a ceasefire after the 1967 Six-day war.

The Resolution 181 of the General Assembly in 1948, created a sharing formula for the co-existence of Israel and Palestine. Although, according to Parsons (1997), Ladipoth (1992) and other Middle East scholars, the Resolution 181 laid the groundwork for the consequent wars which rocked the region in the post 1945 era.

Ogbogbo & Nwobunwenne (2009) notes that, despite the goals that the UN has reached in resolving the Arab-Israeli conflict; parties to the conflict had perceived the UN in different light. For instance, Israel was unable to accept the fact that the Organization is a neutral mediator, terming the UN as a biased organization. Adding that, it suspects the UN, appears to be a successive Israel government (Sayigh, 1997).

The UN had decried the fact that much of the United Nations committee and agencies were exclusively devoted to the Palestinian question, these agencies include Israel had perceived to work against UN’s interest as well as the United Nations Relief and Welfare Agency for the Palestinian Refugees (UNRWA) – adding that the

Resolutions are one-sided and domineering and that most of the Resolutions are initiated by the Arab Group states that belong to the two largest blocs in the assembly which Israelis perceive to offer automatic support for resolutions presented by their members (Geronik, 2011).

Like the Israelis, the Palestinian Arabs have considered the United Nations to be biased in their resolution of the conflict for reasons which include as opined by scholars such as Fawaz Gerges (1991), Phyllis Beniss (1992) and Anthony Parsons (1997), the dominance of the Security Council by the United States, causing the lack of implementation of resolutions in favour of the Arabs.

Most Middle East scholars suggests that the structures of the UN need to be reformed as it is still a reflection of the geopolitics of 1945 (Milton-Edwards, 2011). The Palestinians believe that the UN Security Council is made up of the US and other Western powers as permanent members with the political will to veto any motion as the Palestinians believe that United States is pro-Israel and vetoes any decision that is not in the interest of Israel (Gerges, 1991),

The Arabs content that the current set-up of the United Nations cannot create fair negotiations and this has led to the situation whereby the stronger is favoured over the weaker and Israel through its relationship with the United States can make the United Nations not carry out its function (Milton-Edwards, 2011).

The Palestinians are of the view that the UN ought to set a timeline which would be used to implement the resolutions made by the Security Council in relation to the conflict and that it is important that a series of international conferences e held with all stakeholders present and hosted by a truly independent United Nations; it is important that the parties be asked to agree on the best way forward and peace brokered through a relationship that would involve the Israelis and Palestinian Arab that would not be one-sided in its approach (Ogbogbo & Nwobunwenne, 2009).

Strengths of the UN Diplomacy in the Arab-Israeli Conflict

Looking at various pacific means employed by the UN as described by Ladipoth (1992), one can deduce certain strength from the actions of the UN especially in response to various wars and how they were able to achieve ceasefires.

The Partition Plan (Resolution 181 of 1947), although created more discord, was responsible for the creation of what is now known as the Jewish State of Israel and could have possibly created an Arab State of Palestine, if it had not been rejected by the Palestinians and the Arab States according to the Jerusalem Centre for Public Affairs (2017). It also adds that, the resolution granted sovereignty and independence to the supposed created states by terminating British Mandate, thereby, ending imperialism in the region.

The Resolution 194 of UN General Assembly of 1948 provides that “the refugees wishing to return to their homes should be permitted to do so at the earliest possible date” and that “compensation should be paid for the property of those choosing not to return.” Resolution 194 was routinely and unanimously readopted every year (Bennis, 1997). The UN Mediation and Armistice Agreement of 1948 was able to achieve a ceasefire agreement and issue a demand for the components of the UN resolution 181 to be respected and adhered to (UN, 2021).

According to Waage (2011), the armistice was intended to provide the basis for later peace negotiation which was intended to commence within a year but did not. Hence, the armistice was to lay the foundation for further negotiations and talks and initiated border lines.

During the Suez Canal Crisis, the UN by 31st of October 1956, the Assembly was convened in a special session, since the Council itself was deemed paralyzed and unable to act due to France and Britain’s involvement in the war. The Assembly called for an Israeli withdrawal, and established the UN Emergency Force, UNEF, the first UN peacekeeping operation in order to restore peace within the region (Bennis, 1997).

The Resolution 242 (1967) of the UN Security Council was initiated following the six-day war which resulted in Israel’s occupancy of Arab territories and resultantly refugee crisis in mostly Lebanon. The resolution according to Ladipoth (1992), demanded the de-occupancy of territories acquired by the Israelis and also requested that the provisions of the Resolution 181 with regards to boundaries be respected. One important impact of the Resolution 242, was its concern to address the refugee crisis which the six-day war had manifested.

Ladipoth (1992) states that, in November 1967 the United Arab Republic (i.e. Egypt) urgently requested an early meeting of the Security Council "to consider the dangerous situation prevailing in the Middle East as a result of the persistence of Israel not to withdraw its armed forces from all the territories which it occupied as a result of the Israeli aggression committed on 5 June 1967 against the United Arab Republic, Jordan and Syria" and in answer to the request, the Security Council was duly convened and debated the crisis in its meetings of 9, 13, 15, 16, 20 and 22 November. During the meetings of the UN Security Council, two draft resolutions were proposed: one jointly submitted by Mali, Nigeria and India; and second one was submitted by the US. Later on two more draft resolutions were submitted as well, one by Great Britain on November 16th and the other one by the Soviet Union on November 20th; but only the Britain's draft was voted and was unanimously carried out (UN Doc. S/8227 of 7 November 1967).

According to Beniss (1997), it was after the six-day war, that the UN concerned itself primarily with the humanitarian and economic needs of the Palestinian refugees. UNRWA's mandate was repeatedly extended, and various resolutions called on Israel to comply with earlier.

Following the October 1973 war, Security Council Resolution 338 called for a cease-fire in the current conflict and for full implementation of Resolution 242. Also in 1973-74, a series of resolutions were passed that were to shape future UN positions, and reflect continuing international understandings. These included the first report of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories, the application of the Fourth Geneva Convention to Israel's occupation, the call for an international peace conference on the Middle East sponsored by the UN, the addition of the Palestine issue to the regular session of the General Assembly, and in 1974, inviting the Palestine Liberation Organization to participate in plenary meetings and later to join in the work of all Assembly-led bodies as a full observer (Beniss, 1997).

On 13 November 1974, Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) Chairman Yasser Arafat, according to Beniss, addressed the Assembly in New York. His "gun and olive branch" speech became emblematic of Palestine's emerging international diplomatic legitimacy. Following his speech, Assembly Resolution 3236 reaffirmed the "inalienable rights," including the right of self-determination, national

independence and return. November 29th was designated as the International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian People. The next year, the Assembly adopted Resolution 3379, identifying Zionism as a form of racism and racial discrimination (Beniss, 1997).

In 1978, Israel invaded south Lebanon, aiming to destroy the Palestinian infrastructure there. The Security Council established the UN Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) and passed Resolution 425, which called for the full and complete withdrawal of Israeli troops. UNIFIL's actual mandate focused on confirming the expected withdrawal of Israel, and helping Lebanon to restore its authority in the South (Sharp, 2009).

In 1982 as well, the UN intervened May 1982, when Israel began new air strikes against the PLO in Lebanon, quickly followed by a full-scale invasion. UNIFIL positions were overrun, and Beirut was surrounded and under siege throughout the summer. Concerned about the need to protect the civilian population in Beirut, the Security Council authorized a team of military observer (Beniss, 1997).

The Security Council Resolution 678, had been proposed in response to the October killing of at least twenty-two Palestinians by Israeli military authorities on the steps of the Haram al-Sharif (Beniss, 1997). Following the adoption of Resolution 672, which called for and Resolution 672, calling for only a representative of the secretary-general to investigate Israeli's military attack which killed 22 Palestinian civilians in October 1990, was unanimously accepted. The Secretary-General's special representative after its brief trip, made a report to the Council. After which, a new resolution was drafted in response to that report, aimed at broadening UN involvement in protecting Palestinians living under occupation.

The Resolution condemned Israel's policy of expelling, or deporting, Palestinians, and demanded that the practice cease and that those expelled to be allowed to return according to Beniss (1997). He further notes that, this move by the UN, for the first time, it would have placed the Council on record supporting an international peace conference long called for by the General Assembly, to solve the crises of the Middle East.

The United Nations Interim Force on Lebanon (UNIFIL) in South Lebanon, which was deployed in 1978 to “confirm Israel's withdrawal and assist the Lebanese

Government to regain its authority”, according to Parsons, has been unable to fulfil its mandate but its presence has provided a certain element of security for the civilians in its area (Parsons, 1997).

Weakness of the UN Diplomacy in the Conflict

Though the United Nations is made up of more than one hundred sovereign states, the organization has been said to be in control and under the influence of Western powers among which is the US, but the reality is that the structure of the UN has helped in solidifying and institutionalizing this hegemony (Fukuyama, 2002).

The UN Organization which is made up of two main decision-making bodies; the General Assembly and the Security Council. The Security Council has been known to wield powers regarding matters affecting international peace and security and out of the five permanent members of the Security Council, three of them are core capitalist and western states i.e. France, Britain and US.

The permanent members of the Security Council according to Beniss (1997), only accepts matters which are pro-West and vetoes any resolution of the UN which is antithetical to the West. The influence of the US in the UN on matters regarding the Palestinian question and Israel’s dominance within the region has according to most scholars including, Milton-Edwards (2011), Ladipoth (1992), Beniss (1997) and others, limits the ability of the UN to effectively carry out sanctions and also actively resolve the issues around the Palestinian question. Most of the time like Beniss (1997) notes that; Washington’s goal is to engage the UN, involving it, forcefully or otherwise, in a US-orchestrated initiative.

Parsons (1997), questions the usefulness of the partition plan (Resolution 181), stating that, adopting it was not surprising but that, in the international arrangement of 1947, its failure was almost visible. Adding that, at the creation of the UN, only 51 independent states were considered founding members; which had qualified for membership due to their role in the war in support of the Allied powers against the Axis powers to ensure the victory of the former before the cessation of hostilities, although only just a few nations were active participants in World War II, together with six additional states such as Yemen, Afghanistan, Pakistan, Sweden, Thailand and Iceland who were already members between October 1945 and November 1947. The empires of Europe were still very much intact and there were only four African

members (52 today), one of which was South Africa which was part of the Western bloc while the other was Liberia which was at the mercy of American pressure, both politically and otherwise. Furthermore, of the 13 Asian member states as of the time, ten, including the Arab states, opposed the resolution; China, maintained abstinence; the Philippines, under pressure, succumbed, same as Liberia and voted in favour; Thailand, abstained from voting.

Thus, the West, led by the US, enjoyed substantial power in the United Nations and to a large extent, the wider world and could have taken more informed decisions following observations and outright rejection of the Resolution 181 (II) by the Arab Palestinians.

One other weakness of the UN diplomacy in the Arab-Israeli conflict is the inability to enforce sanctions and take strict decision on parties involved in the breach of peace agreements which they had agreed upon. Parsons (1997), Ladipoth (1992), Deniss (1997), Milton-Edwards (2011) and others share similar thought on the decision-making effectiveness of the UN. For instance, as Parsons (1997) notes that, judging from all indications, from the 1950s until 1967, no effective effort was made by the UN or its bodies or states to resolve the Arab-Israeli Dispute.

Another weakness to consider is the global power play at the time (the Cold war dynamics) which replicated in the slow and sometimes weak intervention of the UN in the Arab-Israeli conflict. During the Suez Crisis of 1956, a pattern developed which reflected Soviet support for the Nasserist and Baathist regimes which were anti-imperialistic, non-aligned and in practise a republican socialism especially states like Egypt, Syria and, after 1958, Iraq; while the monarchies and other traditionalist states such as Jordan, Saudi Arabia and the Gulf States maintained an uneasy friendship with the West thus incurring status which she termed "imperial loyalist" and of its Zionist protector. (Parsons, 1997). Hence, the activities of the world powers translated in the mannerism of the UN in its decision making.

The Arabs were perceived as having been at fault following their rejection of the UN General Assembly's recommendation of the Resolution 181 (partition), which the Israelis had accepted. Hence, Israel was seen as democratic nation who had survived the onslaught of autocratic enemies, while, the Arabs were to be blamed for their refusal to recognize Israel's existence and negotiate peace after the defeats of 1948-

49 and 1956. The non-aligned as well as anti-imperialist and nationalist perceptions of the Arab states during the Cold War era had always affected the function of the UN especially the Security Council.

The issue of refugee which the war times of the Arab-Israeli conflict generated, though, the UN had put in effort to address it, still has not been resolved as Parsons argues that the political as against the functional aspect of the refugee problem was relegated by the international community long before Madrid and Oslo agreements (Parsons, 1997). Although Resolution 194 (III) of 1948, Resolution 212 (III) and Resolution 302 (IV) of 1949, were adopted to address the issue refugees, Lebanon as much as Jordan and Turkey are still faced with the issue of Palestinian refugees (Milton-Edwards, 2011). Parsons (1997) opines that, although there was considerable sympathy for the plight of the refugees, it was restricted by the effectiveness of the propaganda line that their status was manipulated as a wager in the wider Arab/Israeli dispute.

The attacks on Lebanese territory and two major invasions in 1978 and 1982, in effect had little or no deterrent or provided solution due to alignments of the powers constituting the Security Council as most scholars admit. In light of this, Parsons (1997) stated that, successive Israeli governments since the early 1970s have maintained justifiably confident that US vetoes or threats of vetoes in the Security Council would serve as enough shield against any action, such as economic sanctions, by the international community, even against over-critical language. While describing the UN General Assembly and other UN organ resolutions as less effective.

This is so because according to Parsons (1997), General Assembly resolutions are only serves as recommendations and lack enforcement capacity, and only a few of their recommendations in controversial cases are fulfilled, even when they are adopted by the majority of the Assembly.

Following the assessment of the UN's efforts and involvement in the Arab-Israeli Conflict, the next chapter aims to analyse the future political challenges that the said conflict is affected. One of the most critical development since the end of the Cold War was the end of the bi-polar world and the uncontested position of the US in the post-1990 era. Despite the fact that, the US attempted to diversify its policy-making

towards the region by adding democratization as well as solving the Arab-Israeli conflict, throughout the last three decades no any progress have been reached with the exception of the Oslo Accords signed in 1993 with regard to the Palestine-Israeli Dispute.

The next chapter, in line with this aim, examines the future political challenges that is apparent for the continuation of the problem. One of the vital developments that have motivated this thesis to argue this point drives from the Deal of the Century plan of the US. The Deal of the Century which was announced by the former US President Donald Trump has been not only opposed by the Palestinians, but also by various states as well as the European Union, on the basis of the claim that it would nullify the “two-state solution”.

CHAPTER V

The Future Role of United Nations in the Mediation of Arab-Israeli Conflict: Future Political Challenges

As aforementioned in the previous chapters, the UN historically operates within the Middle East with various organizations such as the UNTCOP, UNDOF, UNIFIL all in a bid to curtail violent situation within the region, especially as it concerns Arab-Israeli conflict. This chapter, in this regard, aims to discuss the future role of the UN – as a global neutral actor– as well as the political challenges existing in mediating in the Arab-Israeli conflict.

Evaluation of Peace-Keeping Operations

In evaluating peace-keeping missions of the UN, Paul Diehl (1993), identifies two factors –which are; observation of peace-keeping mission to ascertain whether, it limits armed conflicts or not and secondly to observe whether or not its contributes to conflict resolution or not. In same regard, Johansen (1994) opposes Diehl’s assertion by arguing that Peacekeepers should not be held responsible for conflict, as such may be considered unnecessary. Hence, he questions why limited number of peace-keepers should be held responsible for the actions of others, while adding that peace-keepers are not designed for peace-building and as a result should not be responsible for peace-building. Whichever the case, it remains the core principle of the UN to maintain peace and foster world security, which they do through peace-keeping and peace-building. These two instruments are complimentary according to Galtung (1969). Diehl, however, argues that peacekeepers should be evaluated on the basis of their abilities to prevent conflict and sustain peace, because it remains a valid way in which peace-keeping operations can be evaluated (1993). Moreover, peace-building capacity of international organizations represents a positive peace, which shows the absence of violence in as much as violent traces may be eminent. This refers to the fact that the withdrawal of peace-keepers from a peace-keeping operation should reflect the success of such mission, if not such mission remains a waste or failure. This phenomenon is, however, not existed in the case of the Arab-Israeli conflict.

The UN, began its first-ever peace-keeping mission in Palestine, following the Arab-Israeli War of 1948-49 and has continued to carry out such operations in different forms, under different names and applying different approach with same vision to

maintain peace. It has also engaged in various peace-building initiatives such as the Oslo Peace (1993) as well as various resolutions carried out in a bid to build and maintain peace within the region. As Druckman, et.al (1997) agrees, that both peace-building and peace-keeping are valuable tools and complimentary, although they may serve different purposes.

In another perspective, Bratt (1996) developed four different points of evaluation combining indicators of both Diehl's and Brown approaches. In Brown's case, there are three points of evaluation – did peace-keeping operation facilitated its mandate? did the operation achieve a conflict resolution? and did the operation successful prevented or limit armed conflict? (Brown, 1993). Additionally, Bratt's evaluation indicates that; mandate performance, conflict resolution, conflict containment and limiting casualties. For Bratt, conflict containment is determined by the operation's capacity to prevent third parties from intervening in conflict while, limiting casualties is determined with comparing deaths before deployment of the peace-keepers and after deployment and in this case casualties include both military and civilians (Bratt, 1996).

In the case of the UN, it has rather tried through the use more pacific means, rather than military means to manage the Arab-Israeli conflict (Parsons, 1997). In most cases where sanctions or the use of force should have applied by the UN to ensure implementation of UN resolutions and prevent flagrant decline of UN decisions and recommendation especially on the part of Israel, such sanctions are neither carried out or applied in a minute proportion. Milton-Edwards (2011) attributes this to the influence of external power, especially the hegemonic role of the US at the international system.

Mediating the Arab-Israeli Conflict: Which Way?

Mediation in the Arab–Israeli conflict has necessitated a large number of international missions and in most cases resulted in the loss of lives. The resultant of this quasi-fatal situation arises from the source of its difficulties which include the tragically irreconcilable narratives the parties involved; the almost total lack of trust and empathy amongst them; and to some large extent, the similarities of their fears and hopes (Choukri-Fishere, 2008). Undoubtedly, described as the major conflict in the Middle East, and with its impact ravaging on international peace and security, the

Arab–Israeli Conflict requires urgent mediation. Although, Israel has constantly upheld that the conflict should be best dealt with directly and in exclusion by the parties, devoid of little or no external interference. However, Choukri-Fishere (2008) argues that several past attempts to resolve the Arab–Israeli conflict reveals that successful mediation has resulted in five indispensable tasks of the negotiation process such as establishing contact regarding instance when the parties involved lacks the ability to declare it at the beginning of the process and exploration of positions to ascertain the existing amount of convergence and therefore reaching a supposed target.

Furthermore, without a mediator, or coalition of mediators, equipped with the ability carry out these five tasks, it becomes difficult for parties to reach and implement peace agreements. The fate of the current episode of the peace process, which started in Annapolis in November 2007, to a large extent is largely dependent on the US preparedness to step up its mediation role to address the issue.

In this regard, Thomas Weiss (2016) states that global or transnational issues such as terrorism, refugee movements, climate change, and economic crises as evidence for the need of international management. In light of this, Allison Miller states that the Middle East remains one of the region facing issues that borders on the entire aforementioned list, as well as many others issues both political and socio-economical (Miller, 2008).

Furthermore, Miller argues that, despite the criticisms facing the UN from actors within the international community, either from individual citizens or media platforms, or official governing bodies, though sometimes UN criticism appears to be valid and necessary, does not reduce or depreciate the fact that there have been important contributions made by the UN in the Middle East region. Adding that, there are more actions and contributions that the UN could do towards ensuring regional stability and security in the Middle East. He also stresses that the UN operates under strained resources on highly complex issues that often involve power struggles among various external blocs, which have geopolitical and economic interests in the region (Miller, 2018).

Evaluation of the US-led “Deal of the Century”

Towards the end of January 2020, US administration under President Donald Trump and his Middle East team, after a long delay, presented the political component known as the “Deal of the Century” which proposes or claims to provide for a comprehensive and definite solution or settlement of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict through a two-state solution. It claims to complement the economic component which had been presented in Manama, Bahrain, in June 2019. Additionally, it claims that, after a successful peace deal, the economic component is to lead to massive levels of investment in Palestine and the region, which will in turn trigger a boost in development according to Muriel Asseburg (2020). However, Muriel further notes that in reality the proposed “Deal of the Century” was an enforcement of a one-state solution, rather than the proposed two-state solution owing to the fact that it would permanently establish Israeli security responsibilities and grant legitimacy to Israel in the ownership and control of about 30 per cent of the West Bank. According to the Trump administration’s proposal, the State of Palestine would not have a territory to lay claim to. Instead, its islands would be merged by bridges, tunnels, and transit routes – which would be all under the control of Israel. Adding that, Jerusalem will remain the undivided capital of Israel which was meant to be a territory under UN supervision did not reflect the policy as one that laid the basis for peace negotiation (Asseburg, 2020).

Palestinian reaction to the proposed “Deal of the Century” reflected their dissatisfaction and displeasure of the proposed President Trump’s deal. A senior official Saeb Erekat of PLO had described the deal as a suspicious US plan to settle the Palestinian-Israel conflict while also stating that Palestinians will take the supposed U.S proposal substantially aimed at resolving the decades-long Israel-Palestine conflict to the International Court of Justice (ICJ) in order to seek to get an ICJ endorsement that this plan appears contrary to international legitimacy resolutions that East Jerusalem is an occupied territory (Anadolu Agency, 2018). Palestinians were concerned about the implication which the proposed deal will have on the Palestinian people, if it was implemented (Dorsey, 2020).

As stated by James Dorsey in his work “What the Deal of the Century Tells Us About the World We Live in”, the critical issue with the US proposed Deal of the Century with regards to the Israeli-Palestinian peace plan is not whether it has the

potential to resolving what appeared to be one of the world's almost irreconcilable conflicts or not but that more importantly is the fact that Israel will, in violation of international law, be empowered sufficiently to singularly annex occupied territory and take steps towards creating an ethnically more homogenous state by transferring a significant proportion of the Jewish state of Israeli-Palestinian population to what the plan envisions as a future Palestinian entity. Adding that following President Trump's endorsement of the annexation and populations transfers which violate the Fourth Geneva Convention, has put Israel at the mercy of an emerging new world order dominated by capitalist leaders (Dorsey, 2020).

Additionally, after Palestine objection to the Plan, the Israeli government will receive a green light enabling them to go ahead with annexation. While others on the right say that the plan, according to the details of the deal published, is good for Israel as it will give it the opportunity to assert its status in the areas under discussion. The left wing on the other hand, was concern at the timing of the proposed deal, not necessary the social impact, but the political effect it could have on their party with regards to former prime-minister of Israel Benjamin Netanyahu's stay in power asking why the US administration is in such a hurry and can't wait five more weeks before publishing the deal, until after the upcoming elections (Yellinek, 2020). Whichever positions taken by both wings, it appears that both were either in support or was missing the point.

In this regard, in accordance with the Middle East Monitor (MEMO) 2020, the proposed "Deal of the Century" was rejected by the UN sighting that, the organization remains committed to upholding due process while reiterating that the Israeli-Palestinian conflict should be solved based on UN resolutions and international law as stated by Stephane Dujarric, a spokesperson for the UN Secretary-General.

Future of the UN within the context of the Arab-Israeli conflict

Resolving the longstanding Israeli-Palestinian conflict requires a combination of parallel measures by the two parties and the international community, rather than pre-mature responses, according to the suggestion of a senior United Nations official for the Middle East peace to the Security Council, as the 15-member organ examined

following recent developments, including Israel's plan to build new settlements in the occupied Palestinian land (UN Press, 2021). On the other hand, Tor Wennesland, Special Coordinator for the Middle East Peace Process, underlined the need to avoid approaching the current situation in an incident by incident case scenario rather than as an independent issue, during a quarterly debate. Adding that a more holistic combination of parallel steps by the Government of Israel, the Palestinian Authority and the international community is needed, he said, arguing that such a framework would begin to address key political, security and economic challenges that are preventing progress (UN Press, 2021).

Mr. Lazzarini –Commissioner-General of UNRWA stated that “until there is a political solution to the conflict, only a strong UNRWA can bring a sense of normality” into the lives of Palestinians. He underscored the need for reliable and sufficient funding for its work in delivering essential services, such as education” (UN, Press, 2018). This is evident in the fact as Miller (2018) had argued that much is expected of the UN and this case, not just the UN but the parties involved as well.

Scholars like Milton-Edwards (2011) and Edward Said (1978) among others, have described the inability of the UN to effectively enact sanctions against defaulting parties in the Arab-Israeli conflict with special reference to Israel due to external influence (within the Security Council) which in most cases cripples the effort of the UN, is a cause for concern if UN is to effectively mediate in the Arab-Israeli conflict. It is not enough for the UN to only condemn but to also act, hence, Beniss (1997) argues that more needs to be done by the UN in ensuring peace within the region. Others such as Taylor Seybolt (2010) argue that, there is need for reconstruction of the UN (and its authority) with reference to the Security Council's possession of the ability of decision making as it reduces the effectiveness of the UN especially when global powers interest is involved.

Special Coordinator Tor Wennesland said, describing a situation in the Occupied Palestinian Territory (OPT) that continues to deteriorate, with no progress towards a two-State solution, described the situation as an “increasingly desperate reality” shaped by extremists and unilateral actions on all sides, that threaten to heighten risks for Palestinians, Israelis and the entire region (UN Press, 2021). His statement reads;

“Israeli and Palestinian civilians are in constant suffering and paying a dear price for the persistence of the conflict, including the protracted occupation” (UN Press, 2021).

Meanwhile, activities such as settlement, evictions, Palestinian property seizures and movement restrictions, resultantly deepens the violence cycle as Israeli civilians are continuously killed and injured in Palestinian attacks, with the UN maintaining that following the several night confrontations between Israeli and Palestinians, it remains pertinent to ensure that the parties involved in such violence must be held accountable and swiftly brought to justice (UN Press, 2021).

This chapter aimed to examine the future political challenges that the Arab-Israeli dispute as well as the Palestine-Israeli Dispute will encounter following the US’ decision to move its embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem which was implemented in 2018; and the announcement of the Deal of the Century in 2019. As stated by Köse, the idea of the US to empower the Palestinians with the implementation of the Deal of Century would damage the idea of peace (SETA, 2020). In other words, the Deal of the Century which excluded the Palestinians from the overall process of drafting the Plan would nullify the two-state solution for the settlement of Palestine-Israeli Problem. Moreover, Israel’s normalization of its relations with the United Arab Emirates (UAE), Bahrain and Morocco would also empower the political position of Israel within the region, which would, however, lead to a decline in the political power of the Palestinians in the future negotiation processes.

CHAPTER VI

Conclusion

The primary argument of this research work is to examine and explore the Arab-Israeli conflict by referring to its historical trajectories and considering the role played by the United Nations (UN) in ensuring peace at both the regional and international levels. This thesis, therefore, addresses to what extent the UN contributes to the settlement of peace and security in the Middle East and the future political challenges that exist in front of solving the Palestine Question. The main question of this therefore research asks to what extent does the UN's intervention brings about peace and security within the region or does it contribute to the status quo? Within this context, in this thesis, a qualitative research method was employed and benefited entirely from secondary data. In meeting its objectives, starting from the creation of the UN in 1945, the Palestinian Question has been at the fore-front of her affairs and has remain a core issue till date. Although, the crisis had taken different forms and dimensions, it still appears unresolved as violent crisis still erupt within the region, as fight against terrorism has also heightened. The role of the UN in resolving the conflict is discussed and analyzed.

With this aim; Chapter 1 of this thesis focuses on existing literature on the Arab-Israeli conflict and the historical background of the study with details on the formation of Israel and emergence of rivalry over the historic lands of Palestine. This section of the thesis then considers the emergence and settlement of these two distinct communities, while considering early backgrounds which laid the foundation for the conflict within the region. The Arab-Israeli conflict and the role of the UN is discussed in Chapter 2. This chapter discusses the historical conditions leading to the Arab-Israeli conflict in the various intervals of occurrence and the roles played by the UN in the aftermath of the Arab-Israeli Wars. The chapter hence elaborates the main roots of the problem and discusses the proposed solutions including negotiations and decisions / resolutions taken by the UN in mitigating the crisis. The various war periods were discussed in different sub-topics to give a clearer understanding of the periods mentioned. The following Chapter (Chapter 3), gives an assessment of the role of the UN, to considers it weaknesses and strength in mediating in the Arab-Israeli conflict. This Chapter, in this regard, reveals loop-holes and constraint

especially with regards to external influence which serves as a setback to the UN which has made it appear less pro-active in restoring peace within the region of discussion. From this point of view, not only does external factors limit the UN, but power blocs interest remains a thorn on UN's flesh in navigating the issues around the Arab-Israeli conflict. Although, some considerable advantages and successes of the UN was illustrated too. Chapter 4, takes us to what the future holds for the UN in respect to the Arab-Israeli conflict considering the new dimensions the conflict has taken and the sporadic growth of terrorism around the world. This Chapter analyses peace-keeping and the impact of the UN peace-keeping operations within the region in order to maintain peace and stability and as well the resultant refugee crisis being one of the arears of focus of the UN, which the conflict within this region has overwhelmingly contributed to.

From the analyses of the findings of this thesis, it is quite apparent, that UN's peace-building and capacity building have not been fully employed in achieving peace and security with regards to the Palestine Question. As stated in Chapter 4, it has been proposed that political solution –which is centred on “two-state solution” –remains the only way to end this transnational conflict. Having said that the UN has not been an effective actor either soft or hard power in bringing an end to the Arab-Israeli Conflict entirely. In addition, the resolutions that has been passed by the UN Security Council 242 and 338 in the aftermath of 1967 Six Days War did neither bring a settlement on the conflict nor reinforce the belligerent parties to negotiate for the normalization of relations. Furthermore, the Palestinian refugee problem, which has become the resultant effect of the war necessitates a serious attention from the UN and the international community at large. The refugee crisis has further heightened clashes and instabilities in neighbouring states – namely Jordan, Lebanon and others. If the Palestine conflict is not properly addressed and the political challenges are not encountered, likelihood of further migration and instabilities would inevitably appear soon.

Within this context, the “two-state solution” as proposed by the UN in the 1940s retains its salience for the settlement of the Palestine-Israeli Conflict. Hence, there is need for the implementation practically (both *de jure* and *de facto*) both Israel and Palestine Authority to be recognized by each other the Palestine as sovereign states as proposed by the UN, while, the Arab states should in all magnitude do same to

Israel. The recommendations of the UN Resolution 242 and the “land for peace” recommendation should be revisited with the UN taking a stronger stand in ensuring the enforcement of those recommendation and carrying out sanctions, if need be, on parties that may flaunts its decision. As a matter of fact, the future of the occupied territories of Palestine and status of the refugees in West Bank stand as the key challenges in front of the solution of the Problem. The implementation of the UNSC Resolutions of 242 and 338 still retain its significance not only in building peace in the region entirely, but also to enhance the normative and hard capabilities of the UN in building peace in post-conflict societies.

This study also depicted the fact that the UN and international community did not demonstrate a willingness position in bringing genuine or enforceable solutions to the Arab-Israeli Problem not only during the Cold War era, but also throughout the post-Cold War period. While the UN performed a peace-keeping position in the Middle East via implementing United Nations Emergency Forces (UNEF I and II) and United Nations Forces in Lebanon (UNIFIL), the Organization could not go beyond the *limits of its peace-keeping* role after the end of the Cold War. Unlike in the cases of Bosnia-Herzegovina and Kosovo, where the UN and international community (including the EU and NATO) have undertaken significant capacity and peace-building efforts under the scope of “peace-enforcement”, the Palestine-Israeli Conflict have been deprived from these institutional and legal mechanisms.

As earlier mentioned, the main question of this thesis is to ascertain how successful UN’s role in the Arab-Israeli conflict? In a nutshell, the UN pursued a policy of fostering peace and stability in the region, as Miller (2018) states, further attempts need to be put in force which would also thwart the criticism over the conduct of the UN. Furthermore, the role and effectiveness of the UN towards the Arab-Israeli also constraint by the political challenges that emerged with the extra-regional powers within the international system and also regional politics that appears to be a hindrance to the UN-led further activities.

In this regard, the “Deal of the Century” which was proposed by US President Trump, in many ways, may nullify the “two-state solution” for the settlement of the Problem. The key reason behind this future scenario, is the potential obstacles that would hinder the full-functioning of the two-state solution and durable peace in the entire Middle East. As stated in chapter 4, the “Deal of the Century” further deepens

the crisis due to its undue advantage it provides for the Israel at the expense of the Palestinian population as it grants rights for the occupation and claim of Palestinian lands by her neighbours. By extension, the proposed Deal, may trigger global crisis in the global political system as the position of the US may appear as suspected by most factions to be anti-Palestinian or anti-Arab as has always been the “nucleus” of most academic work and debates. Thus, the Deal which is a US-backed policy remains one of the most vital political challenge in maintaining the peace and security at the regional level. For instance, the UN special co-ordinator for the Middle East Peace Process, Nickolay Mladenov, in his address to the Security Council in April 2017 stated that “a perfect storm has captured the Middle East and continues to obstruct international peace”, hence making it a threat to world peace (Romenzi, 2017).

This thesis, in light of these developments, aims to address the question “To what extent the UN involvement in the Middle East has been successful? And what sort of political challenges exist in solving this perennial conflict. During the Cold War of which this thesis focuses on, the power struggle at the global political system was a depriving factor to the extent at which the UN could effectively enforce its resolutions and take rational actions with regards to the Arab-Israeli Conflict. This can be explicitly observed with the interference of US in the regional matters regarding the Arab-Israeli conflict. It was only after the Cold War, that the UN showed more realistic efforts by boycotting the decisions of the US and preventing US proposed policies and agendas which perhaps were not sufficient. On the application of the Palestinian Authority to become one of the full members of the UN was accepted by the UN General Assembly in 2012 with a qualified majority, but it was not agreed by the UN Security due to the US’ veto power.

evertheless, one can either describe the UN’s efforts of peace-making as successful or as a failure, but would expect more actions and effective mediation on the part of the UN in furtherance of building peace and security in the region. This thesis also put forward the argument that there exist political challenges in front of the settlement of the Arab-Israeli dispute.

References

- Anadola Agency (2018): Palestinians to take Donald Trump's "Deal of Century" to the ICJ. Retrieved from <https://www.aa.com.tr/en/middle-east/palestinians-to-take-trump-s-deal-of-century-to-icj/1045717>.
- Asseburg, M. (2020): After the Presentation of Trump's Vision for the Middle East, Europeans Need to Weigh In. Retrieved from <https://www.swp-berlin.org/en/publication/trumps-deal-of-the-century-for-the-middle-east>.
- Beniss, P. (1997): The United Nations and Palestine: *Partition and its Aftermath*. Arab Studies Quarterly, Summer 1997, Vol. 19, No. 3 (Summer 1997), pp. 47-76. Pluto Journals.
- Bratt, D. (1996): Assessing the Success of UN Peacekeeping Operations. *International Peacekeeping*, 3(4), 64-81.
- Brown, L. C. (1984): *International Politics and the Middle East: Old Rule Dangerous game*. I. B Tauris: London.
- Brown, L. C. (1988): The June 1967 War. *A Turning Point?* In Lukacs Y. Battah, A. (eds).
- Diehl, P.F. (1993): *International Peacekeeping*. John Hopkins University Press London.
- Dorsey, J (2020): What the Deal of the Century tell us about the world we live in. Retrieved from <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/339014805>
- Druckman, D. et. al (1997): Evaluating Peacekeeping Missions. *Mershon International Studies Review*, 41(1), 151-165.
- Calvacoressi, P. (2001): *World Politics, 1945-2000*. Pearson Publishers: India.
- CIE. (2002): Mitchell's Report. Retrieved from <http://www.Israel ed.org/resources/documents/Mitchell-report>.
- Choukri-Fishere, E. (2008): *Against Conventional Wisdom: Mediating the Arab-Israeli Conflict*. The Oslo Forum Network of Mediators. Centre for Humanitarian Dialogue.
- Cleveland, W. (2004): *A History of the Middle East*. Westview Press: CO.

- Englander, O. (2009): *Converging for Peace: The United Nations and the Israel-Palestine Peace Process*. International Centre for the Study of Radicalization and Political Violence-London.
- Freedman, L. (1993): *The Gulf Conflict, 1990-1991: Diplomacy and War in the New World Order*. Faber and Faber: London.
- Fukuyama, F. (2016): *The Demand for Identity and the Politics of Resentment*. Macmillan, USA.
- Galtung, J. (2010): *Peace Studies and Conflict Resolution: The Need for Transdisciplinarity*. *Transcultural Psychiatric*, 47(1), 20-30.
- Gerges, A.F. (1991): *The Study of Middle East International Relations: A Critique*. *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies*, Vol. 18, No. 2 (1991), pp. 208-220
Published by: Taylor & Francis, Ltd.
- Geronik, A. (2020): *Israel Studies*. Vol. 25, No. 1 (Spring 2020). Indiana Press. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.2979/israelstudies.25.1.04>
- Goldschmidt, A. (2001): *A Concise History of the Middle East*. West View Press: Colorado.
- Kanaaneh, H. (2008): *A Doctor in Galilee. The Story of a Palestinian in Israel*. Pluto Press: London.
- Kash, E. (1997): *Fabricating Israeli's History: "The New Historian"*. Frank Cass: London.
- Kimmerling, B & Midgal, J. (2003): *The Palestine People; A history*. Harvard University Press.
- Kober, A. (2008): *The Israeli Defenses in the Second Lebanon War: Why the Poor Performance?* *Journal of Strategic Studies*, Vol 31:1, PP. 3-40.
- Loeur, L. (2006): *To be an Arab in Israel*. Charles Hurst and Company: London.
- Ladipoth, R. (1992): *Security Council Resolution 242 at Twenty-Five*. Retrieved from <https://www.cambridge.org/core>.
- Manfield, P. (1992): *History of the Middle East*. Penguin: Harmondsworth.

- Makovsky, D. (1996): *Making Peace with the PLO: The Rabin Government's Road to the Oslo Accord*. Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Meouchy, N & Sluglett, P (eds) 2004: *British and French Mandates in Comparative Perspective*. Brill: Laiden.
- Middle East Monitor (2020): UN rejects US deal of the century. Retrieved from <https://www.middleeastmonitor.com/20200129-un-rejects-us-deal-of-the-century/>.
- Miller, A. (2018): *The United Nations and Middle Eastern Security*. Retrieved from <https://www.e-ir.info/2018/11/25/the-united-nations-and-middle-eastern-security>.
- Milton-Edwards, B. (2011): *Contemporary Politics in the Middle East*, 3RD edn. Polity Press: UK.
- Milton-Edwards, B & Hinchcliffe, P. (2008): *Conflict in the Middle East Since 1845*. 3rd edn. Routledge: Abingdon.
- Meisler, S. (1995): *United Nations; The First Fifty Years*. Atlantic Press: New York.
- Ogbogbo C.B.N & Nwobunwenne S.C.F (2009): *Unsettled Waters; A Preliminary Guide to the Third World in International Relations*. Esil Press: Nigeria.
- Okeke, O.E (2011): *The Middle East Since 1917*. African Entrepreneurship and Leadership Institute.
- Parson, A. (1997): *The United Nations and the Palestine Refugees with Special Reference to Lebanon*. *Journal of Refugee Studies* Vol. 10. No. 3 1997.
- Pokharel, T. (2016): UNIFIL. Oct 3. <https://unifil.unmissions.org/lebanese-soldiers-join-un-peacekeepers-peacerelay-march>.
- Reuters (2012): UN Holds Emergency Session on Israel Strikes, Takes No Action. Retrieved from <https://www.reuters.com/article/Israel-palestinians-un-council/update-6>.
- Reuters (2021): *Hamas and Israel; A History of Confrontation*. Retrieved from <https://www.Reuters.com/world/Middle-East/Hamas-Israel-history-confrontation-2021-05-14/>.

- Romenzi, A. (2017): UN News. April 2017. Retrieved from <https://news.un.org/en/story/2017/04/555662-middle-east-engulfedperfect-storm-one-threatens-international-peace-warns-un>.
- Sahliyeh, E. (1988): *In Search of Leadership: West Bank Politics Since 1967*. Brookings Institute: Washington DC.
- SETA (2020). Talha Köse, Trump plan will empower extremists, damage idea of peace”, 1 February, 2020. <https://www.setav.org/en/trump-plan-will-empower-extremists-damage-idea-of-peace/>
- Sharp, J.M. (2009): US Foreign Assistance to the Middle East; *Historical background, Recent Trends and the FY2010 Request, Washington, DC*. Congressional Research Service.
- Sayigh, Y. (1997): *Armed Struggle and the Search for a State; The Palestinian National Movement 1949-1993*. Claredon Press: Oxford.
- Sellwood, O. (2009): *The Role of the United Nations in the Middle East Conflict Prevention*. Centre on International Cooperation- New York.
- Shabi, R. (2009): *Not the enemy, Israel’s Jews from Arab Lands*, New Heave Yale University Press.
- SIPRI (2002): *Yearbook 2002, Armaments, Disarmament and International Security*. Stockholm: SIPRI.
- Stein, K. (2002): *Heroic Diplomacy: Sadat, Kissinger, Carter, Begin and the Quest for Arab-Israeli Peace*. Routledge.
- Taylor, A. R. (1991): *The Superpowers and the Middle East*. Syracuse University Press: Syracuse.
- Tibi, B. (1997): *Arab Nationalism: Between Islam and Nation State*, 3rd edn. Macmillan: London.
- Tripartite (2017): <https://unifil.unmissions.org/unifil-head-chairs-regular-tripartite-meeting-laf-and-idfofficials>.
- UNHCR (n.d): <http://www.reporting.unhcr.org>.

- UNIFIL Fact Sheet (2019). <https://peacekeeping.un.org/en/mission/unifil>.
- UN News (March 2, 2017); <http://www.un.org/apps/news/story.asp>.
- UN News (March 30, 2018): <http://www.un.org/apps/news/story.asp?NewsID>
- UN News (May 21, 2019): <http://www.un.org/apps/news/story.asp?NewsID>
- UN Press (2102): United Nations Insist on Peaceful Resolution. Retrieved from <https://www.un-press.org>
- UN Resolutions on Palestine and the Arab-Israeli Conflict vols. 1-4 (1947-1991). Institute for Palestinian Studies: Washington DC.
- United Nations (n.d.): United Nations Peace-keeping. Retrieved from <https://peacekeeping.un.org/>.
- United Nations. (2008): The Question of Palestine and the United Nations. Retrieved from www.un-peacemaker.org.
- United Nations General Assembly (1946): Resolution 181 (1946) of 10 January 1946. S/RES/181 (1946). Retrieved from <https://Britannica.com/United-Nations-General-Assembly>.
- United Nations General Assembly (2012): Resolution 67/19 adopted by the General Assembly on the Status of Palestine. Retrieved from <https://www.unispal.un.org>.
- United Nations peace maker (2019): Egyptian-Israeli General Armistice Agreement retrieved from <https://peacemaker.un.org/egyptisrael-generalarmistice>
- Waage, H. H. (2011): *The Winner Takes All; The 1949 Island of Rhodes Armistice Negotiation Revisited*.
- Weiss, G.T. (2012): *What's Wrong with the United Nations and How to Fix it*. Polity Press: London.
- Winter, J. (2006): *Remembering War; The Great War Between Memory and History in the 20th Century*.
- Yapp, M.E. (1991): *The Near East Since the First World War*. Longman: New York.

Yellinek, R. (2020): Trump's "Deal of the Century" generates Plenty of Debate in Israel. Retrieved from <https://www.mei.edu/blog/trumps-deal-century-generates-plenty-debate-israel>

Zanotti, J. et. al (2009): Israel and Hamas Conflict in Gaza (2008-2009). Retrieved from Congressional Research Service 7-5700.

Appendix I

The Resolution 181 which reads as follows;

Part I

Future constitution and government of Palestine

A. TERMINATION OF MANDATE, PARTITION AND INDEPENDENCE

1. The Mandate for Palestine shall terminate as soon as possible but in any case, not later than 1 August 1948.

2. The armed forces of the mandatory Power shall be progressively withdrawn from Palestine, the withdrawal to be completed as soon as possible but in any case not later than 1 August 1948.

The mandatory Power shall advise the Commission, as far in advance as possible, of its intention to terminate the Mandate and to evacuate each area. The mandatory Power shall use its best endeavors to ensure that an area situated in the territory of the Jewish State, including a seaport and hinterland adequate to provide facilities for a substantial immigration, shall be evacuated at the earliest possible date and in any event not later than 1 February 1948.

3. Independent Arab and Jewish States and the Special International Regime for the City of Jerusalem, set forth in part III of this plan, shall come into existence in Palestine two months after the evacuation of the armed forces of the mandatory Power has been completed but in any case, not later than 1 October 1948. The boundaries of the Arab State, the Jewish State, and the City of Jerusalem shall be as described in parts II and III below.

4. The period between the adoption by the General Assembly of its recommendation on the question of Palestine and the establishment of the independence of the Arab and Jewish States shall be a transitional period.

B. STEPS PREPARATORY TO INDEPENDENCE

1. A Commission shall be set up consisting of one representative of each of five Member States. The Members represented on the Commission shall be elected by the General Assembly on as broad a basis, geographically and otherwise, as possible.

2. The administration of Palestine shall, as the mandatory Power withdraws its armed forces, be progressively turned over to the Commission; which shall act in conformity with the recommendations of the General Assembly, under the guidance of the Security Council. The mandatory Power shall to the fullest possible extent co-ordinate its plans for withdrawal with the plans of the Commission to take over and administer areas which have been evacuated.

In the discharge of this administrative responsibility the Commission shall have authority to issue necessary regulations and take other measures as required. The mandatory Power shall not take any action to prevent, obstruct or delay the implementation by the Commission of the measures recommended by the General Assembly.

3. On its arrival in Palestine the Commission shall proceed to carry out measures for the establishment of the frontiers of the Arab and Jewish States and the City of Jerusalem in accordance with the general lines of the recommendations of the General Assembly on the partition of Palestine. Nevertheless, the boundaries as described in part II of this plan are to be modified in such a way that village areas as a rule will not be divided by state boundaries unless pressing reasons make that necessary.

4. The Commission, after consultation with the democratic parties and other public organizations of The Arab and Jewish States, shall select and establish in each State as rapidly as possible a Provisional Council of Government. The activities of both the Arab and Jewish Provisional Councils of Government shall be carried out under the general direction of the Commission.

If by 1 April 1948 a Provisional Council of Government cannot be selected for either of the States, or, if selected, cannot carry out its functions, the Commission shall communicate that fact to the Security Council for such action with respect to that State as the Security Council may deem proper, and to the Secretary-General for communication to the Members of the United Nations.

5. Subject to the provisions of these recommendations, during the transitional period the Provisional Councils of Government, acting under the Commission, shall have full authority in the areas under their control, including authority over matters of immigration and land regulation.

6. The Provisional Council of Government of each State acting under the Commission, shall progressively receive from the Commission full responsibility for the administration of that State in the period between the termination of the Mandate and the establishment of the State's independence.

7. The Commission shall instruct the Provisional Councils of Government of both the Arab and Jewish States, after their formation, to proceed to the establishment of administrative organs of government, central and local.

8. The Provisional Council of Government of each State shall, within the shortest time possible, recruit an armed militia from the residents of that State, sufficient in number to maintain internal order and to prevent frontier clashes.

This armed militia in each State shall, for operational purposes, be under the command of Jewish or Arab officers resident in that State, but general political and military control,

including the choice of the militia's High Command, shall be exercised by the Commission.

9. The Provisional Council of Government of each State shall, not later than two months after the withdrawal of the armed forces of the mandatory Power, hold elections to the Constituent Assembly which shall be conducted on democratic lines.

The election regulations in each State shall be drawn up by the Provisional Council of Government and approved by the Commission. Qualified voters for each State for this election shall be persons over eighteen years of age who are: (a) Palestinian citizens residing in that State and (b) Arabs and Jews residing in the State, although not Palestinian citizens, who, before voting, have signed a notice of intention to become citizens of such State. Arabs and Jews residing in the City of Jerusalem who have signed a notice of intention to become citizens, the Arabs of the Arab State and the Jews of the Jewish State, shall be entitled to vote in the Arab and Jewish States respectively.

Women may vote and be elected to the Constituent Assemblies. During the transitional period no Jew shall be permitted to establish residence in the area of the proposed Arab State, and no Arab shall be permitted to establish residence in the area of the proposed Jewish State, except by special leave of the Commission.

10. The Constituent Assembly of each State shall draft a democratic constitution for its State and choose a provisional government to succeed the Provisional Council of Government appointed by the Commission. The constitutions of the States shall embody chapters 1 and 2 of the Declaration provided for in section C below and include inter alia provisions for:

(a) Establishing in each State a legislative body elected by universal suffrage and by secret ballot on the basis of proportional representation, and an executive body responsible to the legislature;

(b) Settling all international disputes in which the State may be involved by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice, are not endangered;

(c) Accepting the obligation of the State to refrain in its international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity of political independence of any State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations;

(d) Guaranteeing to all persons equal and non-discriminatory rights in civil, political, economic and religious matters and the enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms, including freedom of religion, language, speech and publication, education, assembly and association;

(e) Preserving freedom of transit and visit for all residents and citizens of the other State in Palestine and the City of Jerusalem, subject to considerations of national security, provided that each State shall control residence within its borders.

11. The Commission shall appoint a preparatory economic commission of three members to make whatever arrangements are possible for economic co-operation, with a view to

establishing, as soon as practicable, the Economic Union and the Joint Economic Board, as provided in section D below.

12. During the period between the adoption of the recommendations on the question of Palestine by the General Assembly and the termination of the Mandate, the mandatory Power in Palestine shall maintain full responsibility for administration in areas from which it has not withdrawn its armed forces. The Commission shall assist the mandatory Power in the carrying out of these functions. Similarly, the mandatory Power shall co-operate with the Commission in the execution of its functions.

13. With a view to ensuring that there shall be continuity in the functioning of administrative services and that, on the withdrawal of the armed forces of the mandatory Power, the whole administration shall be in the charge of the Provisional Councils and the Joint Economic Board, respectively, acting under the Commission, there shall be a progressive transfer, from the mandatory Power to the Commission, of responsibility for all the functions of government, including that of maintaining law and order in the areas from which the forces of the mandatory Power have been withdrawn.

14. The Commission shall be guided in its activities by the recommendations of the General Assembly and by such instructions as the Security Council may consider necessary to issue. The measures taken by the Commission, within the recommendations of the General Assembly, shall become immediately effective unless the Commission has previously received contrary instructions from the Security Council.

The Commission shall render periodic monthly progress reports, or more frequently if desirable, to the Security Council.

15. The Commission shall make its final report to the next regular session of the General Assembly and to the Security Council simultaneously.

C. DECLARATION

A declaration shall be made to the United Nations by the provisional government of each proposed State before independence. It shall contain inter alia the following clauses:

General Provision

The stipulations contained in the declaration are recognized as fundamental laws of the State and no law, regulation or official action shall conflict or interfere with these stipulations, nor shall any law, regulation or official action prevail over them

(<https://unispal.un.org/dpa/dpr/unispal.nsf>).

Resolution 194 of UN General Assembly of 1948 provides that "the refugees wishing to return to their homes should be permitted to do so at the earliest possible date" and that

"compensation should be paid for the property of those choosing not to return." Resolution 194 was routinely and unanimously readopted every year (Bennis, 1997).

The UN Mediation and Armistice Agreement of 1948 was able to achieve a ceasefire agreement and issue a demand for the components of the UN resolution 181 to be respected and adhered to. The Egyptian-Israeli Armistice Agreement was one of a series of agreements concluded under the aegis of UN mediator Ralph Bunche, as empowered by UN Security Council resolution 1080 to facilitate the transition from the present truce to permanent peace in Palestine. The armistice includes an agreement by the parties to adhere scrupulously to the injunction of the Security Council against resort to military force in the settlement of the Palestine question. The agreement stipulates that the Armistice Demarcation Line shall not be construed in anyway as a political or Territorial boundary and is delineated without prejudice to the final settlement of the Palestine question (UN Peacemaker, 2019).

THE ROLE OF UNITED NATIONS IN THE MANAGEMENT OF THE ARAB-ISRAELI CONFLICT DURING THE COLD WAR ERA: FUTURE POLITICAL CHALLENGES

ORJİNALLİK RAPORU

% 18	% 16	% 11	% 5
BENZERLİK ENDEKSİ	İNTERNET KAYNAKLARI	YAYINLAR	ÖĞRENCİ ÖDEVLERİ

BİRİNCİL KAYNAKLAR

1	www.un.org İnternet Kaynağı	% 1
2	unispal.un.org İnternet Kaynağı	% 1
3	A Parsons. "The United Nations and the Palestine refugees with special reference to Lebanon", Journal of Refugee Studies, 09/01/1997 Yayın	% 1
4	www.lpdc.gov.lb İnternet Kaynağı	% 1
5	Submitted to Yakın Doğu Üniversitesi Öğrenci Ödevi	% 1
6	fas.org İnternet Kaynağı	% 1
7	www.swp-berlin.org İnternet Kaynağı	% 1
8	www.hdcentre.org İnternet Kaynağı	% 1
9	Ndl.ethernet.edu.et İnternet Kaynağı	<% 1
10	www.scribd.com İnternet Kaynağı	<% 1

7 www.swp-berlin.org % 1
İnternet Kaynağı

8 www.hdcentre.org % 1
İnternet Kaynağı

9 Ndl.ethernet.edu.et <% 1
İnternet Kaynağı

10 www.scribd.com <% 1
İnternet Kaynağı

11 en.wikipedia.org <% 1
İnternet Kaynağı

12 "A Guide to Documents on the Arab-
Palestinian/Israeli Conflict: 1897-2008", Brill,
2009 <% 1
Yayın

13 news.un.org <% 1
İnternet Kaynağı

14 www.mei.org.in <% 1
İnternet Kaynağı

15 www.ameu.org <% 1
İnternet Kaynağı

16 www.asmeascholars.org <% 1
İnternet Kaynağı

17 www.cic.nyu.edu <% 1
İnternet Kaynağı

18 www.questia.com <% 1
İnternet Kaynağı

19 openparliament.ca <% 1
İnternet Kaynağı

20 web.archive.org <% 1
İnternet Kaynağı

archive.org 1

APPENDIX B

12.01.2022

Dear Mosheh Eyinna Ugorji

Your project **“The Role of United Nations in the management of the Arab-Israeli Conflict During the Cold War Era: Future Political Challenges”** has been evaluated. Since only secondary data will be used the project it does not need to go through the ethics committee. You can start your research on the condition that you will use only secondary data.

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Direnç Kanol

Rapporteur of the Scientific Research Ethics Committee



Note: If you need to provide an official letter to an institution with the signature of the Head of NEU Scientific Research Ethics Committee, please apply to the secretariat of the ethics committee by showing this document.

CURRICULUM VITAE

MOSHEH EYINNA UGORJI

+2348160606962 |mosheleyinna@gmail.com

Osisioma LGA, Nigeria

PROFILE SUMMARY

Highly dynamic and results-oriented, with experience in production management, communication management and entrepreneurship in a fast-paced and content-driven setting. Articulate communicator. Proficient in providing administrative support to executives, performing office and clerical duties. Strong interpersonal skills with a solid track in team-building. Displays outstanding ability to plan, coordinate, and implement practices and procedures to bring significant improvements in processes towards the successful attainment of goals.

EDUCATION

M. Sc Political Science - Near East University TRNC	2021
B.Sc. History and Diplomacy – University of Portharcourt, Rivers State, Nigeria	2019
Senior School Certificate Examination (SSCE) - Great Heritage College, Lagos State, Nigeria	2012
First School Leaving Certificate (FSLC) - Command Children School, Lagos State, Nigeria	2005

SKILLS HIGHLIGHTS

Research and investigative skills with excellent attention to detail and observational ability and a talent for finding obscure information.

Proven ability to manage, plan and administer a range of administrative operations across many different departments.

Strong leadership skills, superior analytical skills, team management, result-oriented, and interpersonal skill.

Skilled at Interacting effectively with cross-functional departments to streamline operations and achieve business success in fast-paced environments.

WORK EXPERIENCE

2018-2019

Michy's enterprise. Self owned

Dealer in wholesale and distribution of drinks (alcoholic and non-alcoholic)

2013-2014

Sound Foundation Academy. Educator

Subject teacher with great impact on student's improvement in learning.