Journal of Media Horizons
ISSN: 2710-4060 2710-4052 Volume 6, Issue 4, 2025

ISRAEL-PALESTINE AS A GLOBAL FRONTIER: EMPIRE, RESISTANCE, AND THE CRISIS OF INTERNATIONAL LAW

Zarar Bin Saleem[*1], **Zeeshan Khurshid**[2]

[*1]*PhD Scholar (political science) University of Peshawar*
[2]*MPhil (political science)*

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17152208

Keywords
Israeli Palestine conflict, borderlands, settler colonialism, international law, resistance, global solidarity, decolonization, human rights, imperial legacy, sovereignty.

Article History

Received on 15 June 2025
Accepted: 04 September 2025
Published:18 September 2025

Copyright @Author

Corresponding Author: *
Zarar Bin Saleem

Abstract
The Israel-Palestine issue, which has frequently been imposed as a local territorial conflict is not relevant because it is more a world frontier, a meeting point of historical injustices, imperialism, and international legal contradictions. This paper analyzes the conflict in terms of the theory of borderlands and frontier and how the physical and symbolic borders of the Israel and Palestine mirror the larger Global North-South, empire-resistance and security-human rights conflicts in the world. The paper focuses on the long-term effects that the colonial structures (British Mandate and the Balfour Declaration) had on the region to identify how displacement, settlement growth and the disintegration of Palestinian autonomy have transformed the land into a place of continuous crisis.
The paper also examines different types of Palestinian resistance that have been armed, civil, cultural and digital and the ways in which they interrelate with the spatial politics of occupation, limiting movements, and legality. The weaknesses of international law through lack of enforcement of the United Nations resolutions and use of politics in the dispensation of justice through the International Criminal Court are criticized to show how the system has failed to function effectively in the worldwide humanitarianism. Lastly, the war is placed as symbolic and a strategic border of worldwide unity, where transnational action movements, intersectional justice movements and decentralized networks are reinventing advocacy and accountability. In this perspective the Israel-Palestine crisis is not merely a location of deep-rooted antagonism but a location of possible change necessitating a decolonial, ethical, and integrative re-definition of sovereignty and international interactions.

INTRODUCTION

The Israel-Palestine crisis has been one of the most protracted and high-profile crises in borderlands in the contemporary history. The conflict has developed over a long period of time because of its deeply rooted history of colonialism, religion, and territorial disputes, which have eventually developed into the long-standing struggle of national identity, statehood, and sovereignty. This is not a local or bilateral war but a frontier of the entire globe as the identity of imperialism, the tide of anti-colonial activism, and the failures of international law are at stake (Khalidi, 2020).

The core issue of the dispute is the British Mandate in Palestine crisis, after which there was the United Nations Partition Plan of 1947 and the formation of the state of Israel in 1948. This caused the displacement of more than 700,000

Palestinians which is still remembered as the Nakba or the catastrophe (Pappé, 2006). As Israel established its official statehood, Palestinians were turned into stateless people, and their right to land, identity, and sovereignty was rejected or excluded. The 1967 Six-Day War that left Israel in occupation of West Bank, East Jerusalem and Gaza, caused yet again more problems in terms of peace making and entrenched the occupation as a core part of the conflict (Morris, 2001).

This continued settlement and expansion underscores the weakness of international law. The fourth geneva convention does not allow the civilian population of an occupying authority to be transferred to the territory which it controls (International Committee of the Red Cross [ICRC], 1949). Although the international community unanimously believes that settlements in the occupied territories are illegal in Israel, the international law norms are hard to enforce. The International Court of Justice in 2024 reiterated that such settlements are against the international law and a major hindrance to peace (International Court of Justice [ICJ], 2024).

At the same time, anti-colonial struggle has been taking place in the conflict as well. Palestinian militant and political groups like the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) and Hamas have put forward their plight as a challenge to the settler colonialism. These resistance struggles can as well be viewed by different international prisms or perspectives such as being liberating or a threat to stability which further brings out the geopolitical complication of the conflict (Said, 1979). The Palestinian resistance has been framed as a struggle against colonialism, which identifies their movement with the larger global self-determination movements in the post-colonial situations.

This realization of the conflict between Israel and Palestine as a global problem, as opposed to a regional one, creates opportunities of creative international politics and collaboration founded on moral accountability. This paper shall examine how imperial histories, anti-colonial movements and the weakness of international law are combined in the Israel Palestine conflict and how the combination of these factors reveals the larger powers, identities and injustices of the modern world.

The historical character of the Israel-Palestine conflict has also given it a historic significance as a space of internationalism and civil society of the world. Such movements like Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions (BDS) make comparisons between Palestinian struggles and other instances of racialized oppression in history, like apartheid South Africa. The movements indicate the increasing realization by the people of the world that the conflict is not just a foreign policy crisis, but a question of global justice and human rights (Barghouti, 2011). By so doing, they highlight the significance of transnational solidarity to the construction of the discourse concerning protracted conflicts.

Yet, it is also this internationalization of the conflict that has made it polarized. The world superpowers usually do not control the issue of Israel and Palestine with respect to legal and humanitarian values, but in terms of strategic and ideological interests. As an example, the United States has been known to have contributed a lot of military and diplomatic aid to Israel, vetoing in the United Nations Security Council to protect it against any sanctions by the global community (Chomsky & Pappe, 2015). On the other hand, other nations like Iran and Turkey have placed themselves as the champions of the Palestinian cause, most of the times due to domestic or regional influence. This international political balancing game has also impeded the adoption of international resolutions and peace models.

The inability of international law to be used in this conflict as an effective mediator is symbolic of other larger structural weaknesses in international governance. Although, many resolutions of the United Nations have restated the rights of the Palestinians and denounced criminal acts committed by the Israelis, very few of them have led to any action policy or enforceable measures (UN General Assembly, 1974). This stalemate is indicative of a deeper contradiction between the law and politics within the international system a system that tends to be

overrun with the interests of the great states as opposed to the values it claims to represent.

In this regard, flux becomes the dynamic state of Israel-Palestine scenario. The geographical terrain of the area is in a constant flux, be it however through the settlement of Israeli people, the building of separation walls, or the forced settlement of Palestinian people in such locations as Sheikh Jarrah and Masafer Yatta (Amnesty International, 2022). Such shifts form a constantly shifting border territory where the notions of sovereignty, legality, and belonging are constantly questioned. Meanwhile, the political environment is also unstable with various governments and international organizations coming up and discarding peace plans, ceasefires, and diplomacies.

But despite this instability, there are possibilities. The changes to the international community mindset, particularly regarding the young generations and the diasporas, indicate the increased readiness to consider the alternatives to the conflict besides the two-state paradigm which failed. A growing demand is being made to look to models of equality, co-existence, and equal sovereignty that can take into consideration the realities lived by both Palestinians and Israelis (Abunimah, 2006). These concepts are still controversial yet they are an essential area of rethinking peace and justice within a decolonial post-imperial paradigm.

Most importantly, the Israel-Palestine conflict jeopardises the traditional concept of borders as such. The boundaries of the conflict are not clearly demarcated as in the case of traditional geopolitical boundaries but they are influenced by historical memory, religious attachment, and colonial cartography. Occupation or statehood, resistance or terrorism, civilian or combatant are all sometimes indistinct on the ground and in discourse in the international arena. These uncertainties reveal the shortcomings of the Westphalian system of states in dealing with contemporary conflicts particularly those with deep colonial overtones (Makdisi, 2008).

This confrontation is therefore, a border conflict in various ways: geographical, political, legal and symbolic. It shows how the 20 th century frameworks are inadequate to address the crises in the 21 st century, especially crises that have been driven by settler colonialism, competing nationalism, and unequal power dynamics. With the help of the imperial legacies, anti-colonial resistance, and international law, the current paper will argue that the Israel-Palestine crisis should be redefined as a global crisis of justice one that requires not only new policies but also new concepts of perceiving the world.

Perceiving Frontiers and Borderlands in the Prism of Israel-Palestine.

The notions of borderlands and frontiers have become known to the international studies as more than mere physical definitions of territorial boundaries between nation-states. Rather, they are perceived as arenas of contention, movement and spaces of transformation where identities are bargained, sovereignties questioned and ideologies implemented (Donnan and Wilson, 2010). The borders are usually permeable and socially constructed and manifest as a meeting point of various cultural, political, and economic forces. Meanwhile, frontiers are not so much concerned with geographical demarcation as with the past and its historical processes and the imaginary locations of expansion, conquest and projection of ideologies (Newman, 2006).

In this context, the Israel-Palestine war is far beyond the possibility of a territorial conflict. It is a ward of the world in all its senses symbolically, politically and ideologically. In a symbolic sense, the land is of immense religious and historical importance to the Jews, Christians, and Muslims, and therefore is a globalized space of holy geography. On the political front, the disputable status of Jerusalem, the West Bank and Gaza Strip are indicative of rival accounts of national identity, sovereignty and historical justice. The battle is ideologically staged as a paradigmatic one between settler-colonial and anti-colonial factions, which draws parallels between the fight and other liberation struggles around the globe, as well as imperial and imperialist histories (Veracini, 2010).

Israel-Palestine borderland is a frontier space since it is characterized by a continual change by

settlements, reclassifying land legally, and demographic engineering. These mechanisms are closely interconnected with the idea of settler-colonialism as a specific type of colonialism that presupposes the replacement of the native population by the newcomers who want to have a permanent sovereignty over the territories. In contrast to the classical colonialism that uses resources and labor and, though, retains a separate metropole, settler-colonial regimes strives to make the aboriginal existence extinct and the settler reign commonplace (Wolfe, 2006). This reversal can be observed in the continued conquest of Palestinian territory, the creation of Jewish-exclusive settlements and the legal mechanisms employed to justify such acts in the case of Israel.

Complementary concept Empire aids in putting the practices of Israel in a wider historical perspective. The British Mandate of Palestine (19201948) established the principles of modern geopolitical conflict by adjusting the legal and territorial framework, favoring the Zionist settlement at the expense of the native claims (Khalidi, 2020). The current U.S. backing of military and diplomatic efforts by Israel is another indication of the imperial patronage that safeguards and increases the strength of settler-colonialism.

In this regard, resistance comes out as a complex phenomenon. The Palestinian resistance is not only armed and militant, but also cultural, legal and symbolic. It encompasses non violence activism, like the Great March of Return, the Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions (BDS) campaigns, and litigation in international courts. These modes of opposition are not merely to reclaim territory but also to reestablish Palestinian identity and historical narrative against erasure and displacement (Said, 1979; Barghouti, 2011).

Indeterminacy in the law is a critical contribution to the state of the frontier between Israel-Palestine. However, although there are many resolutions by the United Nations and international legal opinions, some of the international legal opinions by the international court of justice inclusive, there is still inconsistent enforcement of international law that is bound by politics. The unclear status of the Palestinian territories, the refusal of refugees to go back to their homeland as well as the designation of East Jerusalem are all the ways in which the legal categories are challenged, compromised or overlooked (ICJ, 2004). This legal gray area does not only continue the conflict but also naturalizes the exceptionality of the frontier, in which the law is suspended and power determines legality.

Therefore, the Israeli-Palestinian war should be seen not only as a delimitation issue but as a permanent boundary issue that represents the dynamics of the world of empire, resistance, legal ambiguity and the remaining history of decolonization. It shows that frontiers are not a thing of the past but inhabited area of ideological conflict and geopolitical re-arrangement.

Imperial and Colonial Legacies.

The modern-day conflict between Israel and Palestine is incomprehensible without looking back to its heavily imperial and colonial origins, especially those that were developed during the time of British Mandate and the following interventions of geopolitical character. The British Mandate (19201948), a period that Palestine was under occupation, was a significant period that entrenched the fractures and formed the basis of the establishment of Israel and the displacement of Palestinians. The main activity during this period was the Balfour Declaration in 1917, which was an official pronouncement by the British government exhibiting commitment to set up a Jewish nation in Palestine (British Government, 1917). This statement was made even though there was the existence of majority Arab people and their desires to self-determine. The Balfour Declaration was formulated using language that was ambiguous, which granted Britain the ability to continue making conflicting promises to both the Arabs and Zionists, a fact that led to tensions that would brew up in the following decades (Khalidi, 2020).

This contradiction was institutionalized under the British Mandate which promoted Jewish immigration and land acquisition at the expense of political rights of Palestinians (Segev, 2000).

The increasing population and economic dominance of the Jewish settlers enhanced the rivalry over the land and the available resources, as there was an ever-polarizing society. Zionist institutions were frequently accommodated by the administrative policies of Britain, and this asctained power in one way or another made the settler-colonial project stiffer than the native Palestinian people (Morris, 2001). The violent conflicts between Jewish and Arab nations during the 1920s and 1930s only made the region more unstable, which led to the Arab Revolt of 19361939 that was crushed by the British forces in the most cruel manner (Pappe, 2006).

The termination of the British rule gave the United Nations the centre stage with the 1947 Partition Plan, which suggested that Palestine be subdivided into two distinct states, one Jewish and the other Arab with Jerusalem under the control of the international community. Jewish leaders agreed to this plan but Arab representatives disagreed and considered it as a colonialist plan ignoring the rights of Palestinian majority (UN General Assembly, 1947). When the British Mandate expired in 1948, the declaration of the State of Israel was followed by the mass exodus of Palestinians a phenomenon which Palestinians call Nakba or catastrophe (Pappé, 2006). More than 700,000 Palestinians were displaced or displacing their houses during the conflict that has resulted in the long-standing refugee crisis, which is still not over (Khalidi, 2020).

This frontier-making occurred not only with settlement but also with displacement and continued after 1948. Instead, it has been perpetuated by the very process of the constant expansion of Israeli settlements in the West Bank and East Jerusalem, and systematic re- mapping of Palestinian space. The settler-colonial rationality of such developments is to produce facts on the ground, which will change the demographic and geographic realities in Israel-Palestine, making it difficult to achieve Palestinian sovereignty (Wolfe, 2006). The addition of the building of physical barriers like the separation wall combined with limitations on the movement of the Palestinians further consolidate the disintegration of Palestinian land and life (Amnesty International, 2022). Such actions lead to a vibrant and conflictual border, as the territoriality of Palestinians and their human rights is in danger on a daily basis.

The world superpowers especially the United States and European nations have been playing important roles in the formulation and shaping of the course of the conflict. Since the 1960s, the U.S. has been the key diplomatic and military ally of Israel supplying it with billions of dollars of aid and vetoing any resolution by the United Nations Security Council that criticizes Israel (Chomsky and Pappé, 2015). This coalition has strengthened the Israeli settlement policies and limited the international pressure to bring Israel to book on international law. The European powers have been more ambivalent because of their respective histories of imperialism. Although critics have been pointing out settlement building and support of a two-state solution, European states in most cases keep a strong economic and political alliance with Israel as a complicated juggle between encouraging human rights and strategic goals (Falk, 2014).

These imperial and colonial legacies are still present in the realities on the ground as well as the discourse on the Israel-Palestine conflict internationally. The dispute of policies in the British Mandate, and the partitions and displacement violence and the continued intervention of the global powers demonstrate how colonialism and empire are not only historical pre-conditions, but are also active agents of the current frontier-making of this disputed region.

The Politics of the Border and resistance.

The resistance in the Israel-Palestine conflict takes several forms including armed struggle, civil and cultural resistance, among others, which all intertwine with the disputable nature of the borders in the region. Traditionally, armed struggle is part and parcel of Palestinian nationalistic struggles to challenge the Israeli occupation and demand the right to self-determination. Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) came into being in 1964 but initially

employed armed struggle as one of its key strategies since it was the symbol of Palestinian political and military retaliation against Israeli domination (Morris, 2001). The same applies to Hamas, a militant resistance group that was organized in 1987 during the First Intifada and had a political viewpoint based on Islamist ideologies (Milton-Edwards and Farrell, 2010). The two groups also, though having internal ideological differences, highlight the continuation of violence as a reaction against the territorial dispossession and state violence.

Civil resistance (nonviolence) is another major and more evident form of contestation, which has been associated with armed struggle. Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions (BDS) movement which was initiated by the Palestinian civil society in 2005 and is a form of international civil resistance which is strategic in forcing Israel to adhere to international laws and respect the Palestinian rights (Barghouti, 2011). BDS suggests economic, academic, and cultural boycotts in the style of the anti-apartheid movement in South Africa to use the support of the rest of the world to undermine the policies of Israel, in particular, settlement building and military occupation (Pappé, 2014). This type of resistance emphasizes the way Palestinians use international networks to politicize the border even outside the physical space and make it turn into a symbolic location of international struggle.

The field of resistance is further extended by cultural and digital resistance. Film, art, and literary creations have emerged by Palestinians challenging mainstream discourses and expressing occupation and dispossession (Abu-Lughod, 2007). The use of social media sites magnifies these voices and Palestinians are recording and publishing daily facts about life in occupation as they live it without the mainstream media filter (Khamis & Vaughn, 2011). Digital activism is applied by global solidarity movements to form transnational networks, which place the border conflict into a larger context of justice and human rights (Hanafi and Tabar, 2014). These are not only cultural but also digital manifestations of the challenge to the erasure of Palestinian identity on a symbolic level.

Physical border infrastructure Thousands of miles of border infrastructure have been constructed between Israel and Palestinian territories. It consists of the separation wall (or the apartheid wall as critics refer to it), checkpoints, and a sophisticated permit and travel control system that governs the movement of Palestinians (Human Rights Watch, 2021). The wall itself has been largely criticized by the international bodies such as the International Court of Justice as the breach of the international law and the instrument of the de facto annexation (ICJ, 2004). Checkpoints in the West Bank are strongly limiting access to jobs, health care and education, disaggregating Palestinian social and economic existence (Amnesty International, 2022). Since 2007, the Gaza Strip is under the strict Israeli blockade that has severely restricted the flow of goods, people, and aid, which is also one of the factors that led to the humanitarian crisis and heightened the psychological and physical effect of the siege on its population (UN OCHA, 2023).

These corporeal displays of control and rejection are symbolic, as well, indicators of spatial expression of Palestinian statelessness and discontinuous sovereignty. In spite of the international resolutions endorsed in many countries about accepting Palestinian rights to self-determination and statehood, the Palestinians are in a legal and political liminal state. The West Bank is in sections controlled to varying levels of Israeli and Palestinian Authority and Gaza is controlled by Hamas but restricted by Israel forming patchwork of contested controls (Roy, 2011). This fracturing makes it hard to exercise sovereignty, and it comes at the cost of Palestinians living in a condition of borderlessness that deprives them of the trappings of the full rights and protections of citizenship (Morris, 2019).

Altogether, resistance in Israel-Palestine is tightly connected with the politics of the border where material barriers play the role of both the tools of control and the representation of the larger conflicts over identity, sovereignty and justice. Since armed struggles, international boy cotts, and culture wars, Palestinian resistance still

challenges the meaning and purpose of borders in this long struggle not only with territorial occupation but with the borders themselves.

International Law in Crisis.

The Israel-Palestine conflict has served as one of the trials of the boundaries and inconsistencies of the international law. Although the international legal system is intended to facilitate conflict resolution in cases of dispute, safeguard civilians, and enforce human rights, the current occupation of Palestinian lands has shown its failure to enforce and remain impartial. Primary legal tools and determinations such as the United Nations Security Council Resolutions and the Geneva Conventions are clear models of dealing with the conflict, but they are mostly symbolic because of the absence of practical implementation and selective application.

Resolution 242 (1967) of UN Security Council issued following the Six-Day War demanded the withdrawal of Israeli military forces on the occupied territories in the recent conflict and recognized the right of each state in the region to live peacefully (UN Security Council, 1967). The General Assembly enacted a resolution which was known as resolution 194 (1948) which observed the right of the Palestinian refugees to go back to their homes or compensate them (UN General Assembly, 1948). Although the two resolutions are fundamental in the international legal approach in solving the conflict, none of them has materialized decades after adoption. Israel has not completely left the occupied lands and Palestine refugees have not gotten the right to their return. Such a stalemate highlights the weakness of international law in the event that mighty players do not comply and the lack of mechanisms to enforce the law or politically limited.

Clearly stated occupational duties of occupying powers may be found in the Geneva Conventions suggestively, especially, the Fourth Geneva Convention relating to the protection of civilian individuals in war situations. Article 49 forbids the deportation of a civilian population of an occupying power into occupied territory and the Israeli settlements of the West Bank and East Jerusalem are a crime against the international law (International Committee of the Red Cross [ICRC], 1949). In its 2004 advisory opinion, the International Court of Justice (ICJ) again declared the separation wall and Israeli settlements as illegal (ICJ, 2004). However, Israel has been accused of settling freely, and this shows a major fault between law and politics.

The International criminal court (ICC) has tried to curb such violations by conducting formal investigations. In 2021, the ICC decided to launch an investigation into probable war crimes committed in the occupied Palestinian territories, including the actions of Israeli forces, as well as Palestinian forces, such as Hamas (ICC, 2021). Nevertheless, the probe has been met with a lot of political criticism especially by Israel and its supporters. Not being a signatory to the Rome Statute, the United States has also publicly disagreed with the ICC in its jurisdiction over Israel, which has further weakened the credibility and effectiveness of the Court (Kersten, 2021). These efforts of the ICC are the indicators of the promise and the weakness of international legal accountability in asymmetric wars.

One of the key problems of the Israel-Palestine situation is the problem of selective enforcement and institutional impunity. Although the international law is theoretically universal, the application of this law is usually pegged on geopolitical interests. Israel has always enjoyed this shield of powerful allies especially the United States who has exercised its veto power in the UN Security Council to block the resolutions to condemn the actions of Israel (Chomsky and Pappé, 2015). This protection has developed a legal two-way system where other states committing crimes against others can be prosecuted and those committing the same crime by a state that is strategically a good partner, can be left alone or justified. Consequently, it undermines the reputation of the international institutions, particularly in the eyes of the marginalized or colonized people who feel that law is an instrument of domination, and not a source of justice.

In this legal front both Israel and Palestinian participants are playing what is known as lawfare

the strategic application of legal tools to serve political interests. Israel invokes most of the time the self-defense clause in Article 51 of the UN Charter to justify military activity in Gaza or West Bank claiming that it is acting in self-defense (UN Charter, 1945). Simultaneously, Palestinian leadership and human rights agencies have also resorted to international courts and other institutions to catalogue and question the activities of Israelis as war crimes through legal language as a means of nonviolent action (Falk & Tilley, 2017). In such a manner, international law is not only a location of conflict but also a source of legitimacy of contradicting accounts.

Overall, the Israel-Palestine conflict illustrates how the crisis of international law: a framework with good ideas but lacking in political pragmatics and structural inequality. Law will always be an instrument of more symbol than transformation until the international legal norms are applied uniform and neutral in situations that are fundamentally asymmetrical with one side having disproportionate power and protection.

Israel-Palestine Global Frontier.

The IsraelPalestine dispute goes beyond what is local in its region entity, playing out as a world frontier which mirrors and exacerbates more general geopolitical, ideological, and humanitarian tension. The long-running crisis is a reflection of the larger binarisms of the international order, in terms of North or South, empire or resistance, and security or human rights. Being a regional manifestation of the world fault lines, it has turned to be an iconic and material location of both the failures of international regulation and the dawn of transnational solidarity.

The military asymmetry between the state which is militarized and technologically advanced, and the population who are stateless and fragmented is similar to the structural inequalities found in the relationship between global North and South. Israel, through the assistance of the Western forces, specifically the United States and the European Union, in certain aspects, is a model of securitized nationalism with the backing of the global capital and military might. Conversely, Palestinians are an embodiment of the dispossessed of the Global South, who are in the struggle of survival and self-determination, freedom on the occupation and exile conditions (Khalidi, 2020). The fact that the discussion of Israeli issues of security have been more privileged and Palestinian human rights have been marginalized in international discourse is representative of the larger conflict in world governance in which security discourses tend to take priority over humanitarian considerations (Falk, 2014).

The Israel Palestine crisis has also revealed rifts in global humanitarian rule. International organizations like the United Nations and the International criminal court have passed resolutions, advisory opinion and reports denouncing the occupation and requesting the application of the international law (ICJ, 2004; UNGA, 1948). However, their failure or rejection to implement such mandates demonstrates a world system where the strong are usually able to get away with crimes. Palestine is thereby an object of research in the design constraints of the peacebuilding, transitional justice, and multilateral diplomacy under the absence of the political will of hegemonic actors (Chomsky and Pappé, 2015).

At the same time, Palestine has become a symbolic boundary to any global solidarity movements which identify their causes with anti-colonial movements. The Palestinian cause is seen as a continuation of their struggles against imperial domination by many post-colonial states and activist networks in the Global South. South Africa, Venezuela and Malaysia are the few countries that have placed themselves on record in favor of Palestinian rights connecting the Palestinian cause with other larger criticisms of neocolonialism and western hegemony (Said, 1992).

The symbolic authority of Palestine is specifically apparent in the increasing intersectionality of the Global North activism. Other movements like Black Lives Matter have made explicit links between their own efforts to oppose racial injustice and the Palestinian movement,

including due to similar experiences of being surveilled, militarized, and dispossessed (Erakat, 2020). An example of this is the 2020 George Floyd protests, in which many rallies in support of Palestine were observed, both in speech and deed. This overlap has contributed to the formation of cross-racial, cross-national and cross-religious alliances that have made Palestine a universal symbol of struggle against any type of oppression.

The Palestinian solidarity movement has also added new frontiers in its activism which have helped increase its reach and influence. The method of turning to international law tools through legal battles, such as the use of universal jurisdiction to prosecute alleged Israeli war crimes and petitions to the ICC, is strategic (Falk and Tilley, 2017). In the meantime, the use of cyber-activism and digital organizing has enabled decentralized networks of proponents to circumvent the digital gatekeepers of the traditional media and enhance Palestinian voices around the world. Hashtags like FreePalestine and SaveSheikhJarrah have gathered millions of people on the internet and that is how effective online solidarity can be in influencing the masses and pressuring institutions (Khamis & Vaughn, 2011).

They tend to be leaderless and grassroots and globally networked, a major departure on the hierarchical types of activism of the past. They involve student movements, campus academic boycotts, divestment campaigns in university campuses globally, in which Palestine is ever being presented as a litmus test on ethical consistency in human rights discourse (Barghouti, 2011). The decentralization of platforms also implies the fact that now decentralized Palestinian resistance is no longer embodied by formal political organizations, but by scattered, imaginative, and cross-cutting communities globally.

In this regard, Israel-Palestine is not only a geographical or national contradiction, but it is a frontier zone in which the world ideologies, technologies, legal regimes, and solidarities collide and compete. It shows how the existing world order has not succeeded in providing justice and how the emergence of new forms of resistance to collectivity can open opportunities.

Conclusion

Israel-Palestine war is one of the most apparent fault lines in the international order a frontier between not only territories and sovereignty, but also ideas, ideologies, and international justice. It is not just a conflict over boundaries but an expression of unsettled imperialist past, unequal treatment of the law and the bare inequalities in world politics. Although the formal institutions such as peace talks and UN resolutions have failed repeatedly to provide a just solution, the continued struggle has turned out to be an effective prism through which one can see the deeper malfunctions of the international system.

However, due to the long-standing violence and stalemate, there have arisen new possibilities. Palestine is now a potent icon of international solidarity, bringing many struggles of race, class and geography together. It provides a common ground to people who want to have a stop to settler-colonialism, military state force, and institutionalized injustice. Since student-led movements to digital activism, the world is rewriting the way it interacts with international law, human rights, and sovereignty. These are not limited to the courts of law or the diplomatic tables and are thriving in the cultural production, grassroots organizing and the digital scene. It is here that resilience and justice narratives are constructed and shared, and alternative models of understanding conflict and peace are provided to state-centric models.

The Palestine symbolic power is seen in its capacity to carry the local realities to international upheavals. It links the communities opposing marginalization and existing in Indigenous struggles against land to the racial justice movements in West. Such intersectionality brings about a more intersectional concept of global injustice that cannot be unquestioning of the hierarchies of value present in international institutions. By so doing, Palestine is not just a border of struggle but also a border of imagination in which the images of justice,

freedom and solidarity are constantly being reworked.

The inability of the conventional approaches in diplomatic and lawful arenas to bring about a sustainable peace underscores the need to revisit the principles by which international interactions are founded. Peacebuilding that is ethical and decolonial should ensure it places the voices of the most affected in the center, acknowledge historical injustices and must be dedicated to equity and not just stability. This involves making everyone accountable, irrespective of the political interests and making sure that human rights will not be preceded by strategic interests.

The bottom line is that the Israel-Palestine border presents a moral reckoning. It poses the question of whether the world community is ready to stop talk, and start changing the world realistically. Taken seriously, this conflict presents not just a critique of the present order of the world, but a vision of what it might become a place that is more concerned about justice rather than power, inclusion rather than domination, and humanity rather than division.

REFERENCES

Abu-Lughod, L. (2007). *Nakba: Palestine, 1948, and the claims of memory*. Columbia University Press.

Abunimah, A. (2006). *One country: A bold proposal to end the Israeli-Palestinian impasse*. Metropolitan Books.

Amnesty International. (2022). *Israel's apartheid against Palestinians: Cruel system of domination and crime against humanity*. https://www.amnesty.org/en/latest/campaigns/2022/02/israels-system-of-apartheid/

Barghouti, O. (2011). *Boycott, divestment, sanctions: The global struggle for Palestinian rights*. Haymarket Books.

British Government. (1917). *The Balfour Declaration*. Retrieved from https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/balfour-declaration-1917

Chomsky, N., & Pappé, I. (2015). *On Palestine*. Haymarket Books..

Donnan, H., & Wilson, T. M. (2010). *Borderlands: Ethnographic approaches to security, power, and identity*. University Press of America.

Erakat, N. (2020). *Justice for Some: Law and the Question of Palestine*. Stanford University Press.

Falk, R. (2014). *Palestine and the International Criminal Court*. Pluto Press.

Falk, R. (2014). *Palestine: The legitimacy of hope*. Just World Books.

Falk, R., & Tilley, V. (2017). *Israeli practices towards the Palestinian people and the question of apartheid*. United Nations ESCWA. https://www.unescwa.org/publications/israeli-practices-palestinian-people-apartheid-occupations

Hanafi, S., & Tabar, L. (2014). Palestinians in exile: Transnationalism, power and politics. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 40*(7), 1065–1081. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2013.867438

Human Rights Watch. (2021). *A threshold crossed: Israeli authorities and the crimes of apartheid and persecution*. https://www.hrw.org/report/2021/04/27/threshold-crossed/israeli-authorities-and-crimes-apartheid-and-persecution

International Committee of the Red Cross. (1949). *Geneva Convention relative to the protection of civilian persons in time of war (Fourth Geneva Convention)*. https://ihl-databases.icrc.org/en/ihl-treaties/gciv-1949

International Court of Justice (ICJ). (2004). *Legal consequences of the construction of a wall in the Occupied Palestinian Territory: Advisory opinion*. https://www.icj-cij.org/en/case/131

International Court of Justice. (2024). *Legal consequences arising from the policies and practices of Israel in the occupied Palestinian territory, including East Jerusalem*. https://www.icj-cij.org/en/case/2024

International Criminal Court. (2021). *ICC opens investigation into the situation in Palestine*. https://www.icc-cpi.int/news/icc-opens-investigation-situation-palestine

Kersten, M. (2021). *Justice in conflict: The ICC's Palestine investigation and the limits of legal accountability*. *Foreign Policy*. https://foreignpolicy.com/2021/03/03/icc-palestine-israel-investigation-war-crimes/

Khalidi, R. (2020). *The hundred years' war on Palestine: A history of settler colonialism and resistance, 1917–2017*. Metropolitan Books.

Khamis, S., & Vaughn, K. (2011). Cyberactivism in the Egyptian revolution: How civic engagement and citizen journalism tilted the balance. *Arab Media & Society, 14*. https://www.arabmediasociety.com

Makdisi, S. (2008). *Palestine inside out: An everyday occupation*. W. W. Norton & Company.

Milton-Edwards, B., & Farrell, S. (2010). *Hamas: The Islamic resistance movement*. Polity Press.

Morris, B. (2001). *Righteous victims: A history of the Zionist-Arab conflict, 1881–2001*. Vintage.

Morris, N. (2019). Statelessness and sovereignty: Palestinian political status in flux. *Middle East Journal, 73*(2), 197–215. https://doi.org/10.3751/73.2.11

Newman, D. (2006). The lines that continue to separate us: Borders in our 'borderless' world. *Progress in Human Geography*, 30(2), 143–161. https://doi.org/10.1191/0309132506ph596pr

Pappé, I. (2006). *The ethnic cleansing of Palestine*. Oneworld Publications.

Pappé, I. (2014). *The idea of Israel: A history of power and knowledge*. Verso Books.Roy, S. (2011). *Hamas and civil society in Gaza: Engaging the Islamist social sector*. Princeton University Press.

Said, E. W. (1979). *The question of Palestine*. Vintage Books.

Segev, T. (2000). *One Palestine, complete: Jews and Arabs under the British mandate*. Henry Holt and Company.

UN Charter. (1945). *Charter of the United Nations*. https://www.un.org/en/about-us/un-charter

UN General Assembly. (1948). *Resolution 194 (III): Palestine–Progress report of the United Nations mediator*. https://www.un.org/unispal/document/auto-insert-179464/

UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (UN OCHA). (2023). *Gaza: Humanitarian overview*. https://www.ochaopt.org/content/gaza-humanitarian-overview

UN Security Council. (1967). *Resolution 242 (S/RES/242)*. https://www.un.org/securitycouncil/content/resolutions-adopted-security-council-1967

United Nations General Assembly. (1947). *Resolution 181 (Partition Plan)*. https://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/RES/181(II)

United Nations General Assembly. (1948). *Resolution 194 (III): Palestine–Progress report of the United Nations mediator*. https://www.un.org/unispal/document/auto-insert-179464/

United Nations General Assembly. (1974). *Resolution 3314 (XXIX) on the Definition of Aggression*. https://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/RES/3314(XXIX)

Veracini, L. (2010). *Settler colonialism: A theoretical overview*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Wolfe, P. (2006). Settler colonialism and the elimination of the native. *Journal of Genocide Research, 8*(4), 387–409. https://doi.org/10.1080/14623520601056240

IEER Institute for Excellence in Education & Research