



RESEARCH ARTICLE

RECOGNITION OF THE STATE OF PALESTINE: IMPLICATION ON SUSTAINABLE PEACE IN JERUSALEM

CHUKWUEBUKA CHUKWUEMEKA AKUCHE

Department of Politics & International Relations, Lead City University, Ibadan, Nigeria

ABSTRACT

The recognizing of the State of Palestine continues to be a pivotal concern in the pursuit of enduring peace in Jerusalem, a city that represents profound political, historical, and religious rifts. Even after decades of talks and help from other countries, peace has not been reached because there are still questions about sovereignty, justice, and equality. The issue stems from the enduring power disparity between Israel and Palestine, the disputed status of Jerusalem, and the absence of a robust international consensus regarding the pathway to peace. The primary aim of this study is to analyze the impact of Palestinian statehood recognition on the prospects for enduring peace in Jerusalem and to delineate the obstacles that persistently impede reconciliation. The paper utilizes the constructivism and conflict transformation theory as its analytical framework, highlighting how local realities affect each other in a dynamic way. The study utilizes a qualitative methodology, relying on secondary data sourced from academic literature, official reports, and policy documents. The results show that recognition alone cannot bring about peace without addressing structural inequalities, political fragmentation, and socio-economic disparities. For peace to endure there must be justice, inclusive governance, and respect for Jerusalem's diverse religious and cultural heritage. The paper concludes that international collaboration and local involvement are essential for attaining stability and coexistence. It recommends that renewed multilateral diplomacy, socio-economic investment, and mechanisms for shared custodianship of Jerusalem's holy sites are necessary steps toward a lasting and inclusive peace.

Keywords: Jerusalem, Palestine, recognition, human security, conflict resolution

Corresponding Author

Chukwuebuka Chukwuemeka AKUCHE

Email Address: akuche.chukwuebuka@lcu.edu.ng

Received: 25/1/2026; **Revised:** 27/2/2026; **Accepted:** 23/3/2026; **Published:** 28/3/2026



1.0. INTRODUCTION

The recent recognition of the State of Palestine by some Western European countries (United Kingdom, France, Spain, and Portugal) constitutes one of the most persistent and contentious issues in international politics, intricately linked to the pursuit of enduring peace in Jerusalem. The Palestinian quest for statehood has endured for decades, marked by inconsistent international backing, regional rivalries, and intricate historical grievances. Jerusalem is the center of this conflict. It is a city that is very important to Jews, Christians, and Muslims in many ways (Hadžić, 2022). Its status still represents both the hopes for peace and the facts of division in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. So, recognizing the State of Palestine is more than just a diplomatic formality, it is part of a larger search for justice, equality, and legitimate statehood. The global discourse about recognizing Palestine shows how sovereignty is changing in the twenty-first century and how difficult it is for countries to agree on how to solve long-standing territorial and identity-based conflicts.

More than 130 countries have officially recognized Palestine since the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) declared it a state in 1988 (Anadolu Ajansi, 2025). This shows that Palestine has the right to self-determination and sovereignty. The United Nations General Assembly's decision in 2012 to give Palestine the status of a non-member observer state was a big step toward gaining international legitimacy. However, the recognition is still uneven and disputed, especially among Western powers that still see formal recognition as tied to the outcome of peace talks with Israel. The fact that not everyone recognizes Israel and Palestine has kept the diplomatic imbalance between the two countries going, making it harder to build peace in Jerusalem. The city is still a hotbed of competing claims. Israel sees it as its eternal and indivisible capital, while Palestinians see East Jerusalem as the rightful capital of their future state. This difference has made Jerusalem a battlefield in both a physical and symbolic sense, where issues of identity, heritage, and sovereignty come together (Munawar & Nassar, 2025).

Recognizing the State of Palestine has big effects on long-term peace in Jerusalem because it goes to the heart of political legitimacy and coexistence. For Palestinians, recognition confirms their historical presence, shared identity, and right to govern themselves, which helps to counteract feelings of being left out during long periods of occupation. However, for Israel and its allies, recognizing Palestine on its own, outside of negotiations, is often seen as a threat to Israel's security and diplomatic power (Freedman, 2021). These different points of view have led to a deadlock in international diplomacy, where symbolic acts of recognition coexist with ongoing violence, settlement expansion, and a loss of trust. Recognition, though symbolically potent, cannot replace substantive dialogue and reciprocal concession. The ongoing existence of unacknowledged borders, fragmented communities, and disputed sacred sites impedes the establishment of a unified and secure Jerusalem, illustrating the inadequacies of recognition devoid of reconciliation.

The difficulty of turning recognition into lasting peace is made worse by the fact that Jerusalem has a unique status. As a city that is holy to three major religions, its government needs to find a balance between national sovereignty and making it accessible to everyone. In practice, international recognition of Palestine could make diplomatic talks more legitimate by putting both sides on an equal footing again. However, the politicization of recognition frequently intensifies polarization, as



certain international entities employ it as a mechanism for strategic alignment rather than a sincere dedication to peace.

Thus, this brings up the question about how well recognition can mitigate the long-standing conflicts? Can the recent international recognition of Palestine's statehood by some Western European countries help bring about a fair and lasting peace in Jerusalem, or does it risk making things worse by making national stories more rigid? To answer these questions, there is a need to understand recognition as both a political tool and a moral statement based on fairness and equality.

The significance of this study resides in its examination of how the recognition of the State of Palestine affects the dynamics of peace in Jerusalem. It aims to examine whether recognition fosters inclusive dialogue and coexistence or exacerbates disputes regarding identity and territory. This study analyzes the diplomatic, legal, and ethical aspects of recognition, thereby enhancing broader discussions on conflict transformation and international legitimacy.

2.0. CONCEPTUALIZATIONS AND THEORITICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1. Conceptual Framework

The idea of state recognition is at the heart of international relations and is still important for understanding the Palestinian course. 'Recognition' in this context is when other countries or international organizations formally acknowledge that a political entity is a sovereign state that can make agreements with other countries under international law. It is a legal and political act that gives the international system legitimacy and acceptance. In the context of Palestine, recognition transcends mere legal acknowledgment, it represents a moral and political endorsement of the Palestinian right to self-determination (Shalbak, 2023). The process of recognition is, however, closely linked to issues of power, diplomacy, and historical narratives. The inconsistent recognition of Palestine illustrates that statehood is not solely determined by objective criteria such as territory, governance, and population, but also by geopolitical considerations and normative obligations among states (Kyriss, 2024).

Similarly, a conceptual analysis of *sovereignty* and *legitimacy* can help us understand the debate over Palestine's recognition better. *Sovereignty* means that a state has the power to rule its people and land without outside help (Uçkaç, 2025). For Palestine, sovereignty is still a goal that is hard to reach because of the lack of unified political control, territorial fragmentation, and occupation. On the other hand, *legitimacy* denote how people see rightful authority, both at home and abroad (Cohen, & Toland, 2024). Many countries see Palestine as a state, but its sovereignty is still limited by the fact that it is occupied and the fact that Israel has more power than Palestine. This duality between *de jure* recognition and *de facto* limitation highlights the intricacies of converting international recognition into substantive autonomy. Moreover, legitimacy is not a fixed entity, it is socially constructed through the interplay of norms, beliefs, and diplomatic practices. Consequently, recognition transforms into a locus of contention where international entities negotiate the parameters of inclusion and exclusion within the global framework (Akindoyin, 2024).

2.2. Theoretical Framework

Theoretically, this study utilizes the *Constructivist* and *Conflict Transformation* frameworks to elucidate the ramifications of Palestine's recognition for enduring peace in Jerusalem. Constructivism,



articulated by scholars like Alexander Wendt, posits that international politics is influenced not solely by material power but also by social norms, ideas, and identities (Zeli, 2024). From a constructivist viewpoint, recognition serves as a symbolic act that contributes to the formation of collective perceptions of legitimacy and statehood. Consequently, the acknowledgment of Palestine aids in the formulation of a collective narrative of justice and equality that contests prevailing discourses favoring one national identity over another. From this perspective, peace in Jerusalem is not merely the result of negotiated agreements but a reconfiguration of perceptions, significations, and relationships. In this context, recognition assists in redefining the moral and political parameters of belonging, thereby shaping how communities conceptualize coexistence and shared sovereignty.

Along with the constructivist view, the *conflict transformation theory* differs from conventional conflict resolution models that aim to terminate disputes via compromise. It emphasizes altering the fundamental social structures, relationships, and attitudes that perpetuate conflict (Adedeji, 2024). In the context of Jerusalem, the acknowledgment of the State of Palestine can function as a transformative instrument by validating Palestinian identity, facilitating inclusive dialogue, and rectifying asymmetrical power dynamics. However, if recognition is seen as biased or symbolic without any real changes on the ground, it could make people even more distrustful and divide them even more. For peace to last, recognition must come with real steps, such as fair access to resources, respect for human rights, and recognition of past wrongs. The change in the conflict in Jerusalem depends not only on diplomatic recognition but also on building empathy and a shared commitment to living together.

In combining these points of view, it becomes clear that recognition is both a political and a normative process that affects the course of peace efforts in Jerusalem. Constructivism emphasizes the way recognition reshapes legitimacy and identity, whereas conflict transformation stresses the necessity for structural and relational change to maintain peace. These frameworks together show how international diplomacy and local realities affect each other in a dynamic way. The recognition of the State of Palestine, essential for achieving moral and political equality, must transition from a mere symbolic endorsement to a genuine impetus for reconciliation. This necessitates a transition from perceiving recognition as an ultimate goal to comprehending it as an integral component of a more extensive transformative process designed to establish a just, inclusive, and enduring peace in Jerusalem.

3.0. METHODOLOGY

This study employs a qualitative research design to examine the ramifications of recognition of the State of Palestine on enduring peace in Jerusalem. The qualitative approach facilitates an in-depth and contextual comprehension of the historical, political, and socio-cultural determinants influencing the issue. The paper predominantly utilizes secondary data sourced. Content analysis is utilized to analyze these materials, concentrating on principal themes such as state recognition, sovereignty, human security, and conflict resolution.

The study employs a descriptive and analytical approach to investigate the progression of Palestinian statehood and the intricacies of peacebuilding in Jerusalem. The study analyzes various viewpoints from international relations, peace studies, and legal scholarship to discern patterns, contradictions, and policy implications within the discourse. The methodology offers a systematic and analytical



framework for comprehending the interplay of political recognition, power asymmetry, and socio-economic conditions in shaping the prospects for a just and enduring peace in Jerusalem.

4.0. PRESENTATION OF RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1. Historical Context of Palestinian Statehood and Jerusalem's Status

The historical development of Palestinian statehood and the disputed status of Jerusalem form the essence of one of the globe's most protracted and intricate conflicts. The Palestinian quest for self-determination originated during the late Ottoman and British Mandate eras, characterized by the conflict between Arab nationalism and Zionist ambitions over territorial claims (Bantekas, & Al-Thani, 2024). After World War I, the Ottoman Empire fell apart, and the League of Nations gave Britain control of Palestine in 1922.

The Balfour Declaration of 1917, which said that Britain supported the creation of a "national home for the Jewish people," set the stage for competing national claims. Arab Palestinians, who had lived in the area for hundreds of years, saw the arrival of Jewish immigrants and the British policy of helping them as a threat to their political and cultural identity (Agha, 2024). The increasing tensions led to a number of uprisings and violent clashes, which set the stage for decades of fighting over sovereignty, identity, and land (Agha, 2024). The United Nations Partition Plan of 1947 was the turning point. It suggested splitting Palestine into two separate Jewish and Arab states, with Jerusalem as an international city run by the UN. Jewish leaders agreed to the plan, but Arab states and Palestinian representatives did not. They thought it was unfair and not right.

The Nakba, or catastrophe, was the result of the Arab-Israeli War of 1948, which created the State of Israel and forced more than 700,000 Palestinians to leave their homes (Khamaysa, 2022). This mass displacement not only removed a lot of Palestinians from their ancestral homes, but it also broke up their political continuity, leaving them without recognized sovereignty. Afterward, Jordan took control of the West Bank and East Jerusalem, and Egypt took care of the Gaza Strip. The Palestinian national identity continued to develop in exile and under occupation, fueled by recollections of dispossession and the desire for return.

The Six-Day War in 1967 was another important turning point in the path to Palestinian statehood and the political status of Jerusalem. Israel took control of the West Bank, East Jerusalem, the Gaza Strip, and other Arab lands, which effectively ended Jordanian and Egyptian rule (Karsh, 2022). Israel's annexation of East Jerusalem in 1980 and its declaration as the "eternal and indivisible capital" of the Jewish state made the city's problems even worse. Through a number of United Nations resolutions, the international community has always rejected Israel's claims to Jerusalem on its own. Instead, it has said that the status of the city must be decided through negotiation. For Palestinians, East Jerusalem is both the spiritual center of their nation and the political center of the state they want to create. The city's historical and religious importance makes it even more important in the larger fight for recognition and self-determination.

The Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) officially announced the creation of the State of Palestine in 1988, with Jerusalem as its capital. This statement was a strategic and symbolic claim of sovereignty and legitimacy that showed a shift from revolutionary struggle to diplomatic engagement.



That same year, the UN General Assembly recognized the PLO's declaration and gave Palestine the status of an observer state. In 2012, the UN made Palestine a non-member observer state, which further strengthened this recognition. This was a way of recognizing Palestine's statehood in principle. Many countries saw the move as a moral victory for the Palestinian cause, but it also showed how limited symbolic recognition can be. Even though the international community was behind them, things on the ground did not change much. The Israeli occupation continued, settlements grew, and Palestinians were still limited in their movement within Jerusalem and the West Bank (Karsh, 2002).

The status of Jerusalem is still a very important and hotly debated topic in all peace talks. For Israel, controlling Jerusalem means fulfilling historical and religious goals that are part of Jewish culture. For Palestinians, East Jerusalem is the political and spiritual heart of their national identity. The two claims show that there are not only different stories about the past, but also bigger discord over what is right and wrong in international law. The Oslo Accords of the 1990s briefly rekindled aspirations for a negotiated resolution, acknowledging reciprocal rights and responsibilities between Israel and the PLO (Siebols, 2025). However, the agreements did not settle Jerusalem's final status, which has since become one of the most contentious issues in peace talks. The ongoing growth of Israeli settlements, along with sporadic outbreaks of violence, has further diminished trust and compromised the viability of a two-state solution.

4.2. Recognition of Palestine and Its Implications for Peacebuilding in Jerusalem

The acknowledgment of the State of Palestine constitutes a vital aspect of the ongoing dialogue regarding peacebuilding in Jerusalem. It is a discourse situated at the convergence of international law, diplomacy, and ethical governance, illustrating the global community's endeavors to resolve one of the most persistent conflicts of contemporary times. In this context, recognition is more than just acknowledging political sovereignty; it is a group agreement that the Palestinian people have the right to self-determination, identity, and justice.

As of now, more than two-thirds of the countries that are members of the United Nations have recognized Palestine as a state. This gives it formal legitimacy in the international system. Nonetheless, the ramifications of such recognition for peacebuilding in Jerusalem are intricate and diverse. Recognition has symbolic significance that validates Palestinian legitimacy however, it also incites political tensions that can either promote or obstruct initiatives for sustainable peace, contingent upon the framing and implementation by both local and international stakeholders (Badarin, 2021).

Recognizing Palestine has changed the way countries deal with the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. It has given the Palestinian leadership a way to work with international organizations, especially the United Nations, the International Criminal Court, and a number of regional groups. This involvement has helped Palestine claim its rights under international law and bring attention to problems like occupation, settlement expansion, and violations of human rights around the world.

The symbolic elevation of Palestine's status in the international community has also changed the moral balance of the conflict, making it harder for stories that have historically downplayed Palestinian claims to hold up. For many peace advocates, recognition is a moral duty and a necessary first step toward equalizing the two sides in any negotiation process (Hicks, 2021). The international



community's recognition of Palestine as a sovereign entity reinforces the notion that peace cannot arise from domination but must be founded on mutual respect and equality.

However, while recognition makes Palestine more visible diplomatically, its real-world effects on the ground in Jerusalem are still limited by geopolitical realities. The city is still a place of fierce conflict, where symbolic gestures of recognition often clash with the established systems of occupation and control. The growth of Israeli settlements, the destruction of Palestinian homes, and the limits on access to religious and cultural sites all make it less likely that people will be able to live together peacefully. Recognition alone cannot get rid of these structural barriers to peace.

Therefore, peace needs to be backed up by long-term international involvement and systems of accountability that deal with the root causes of the conflict. Without real progress in ending the occupation and making sure that everyone in Jerusalem has a fair say in government, recognition could just be a symbolic act that makes people more frustrated instead of bringing them together. So, peacebuilding needs more than just political support for Palestinian statehood. It also needs to change the things that keep inequality and exclusion going (Hicks, 2021).

Recognition has consequences that go beyond the immediate territorial disputes and into the larger psychological and cultural aspects of the conflict. For Palestinians, recognition validates their identity and historical justice, bolstering their collective memory and resilience amid displacement and marginalization. However, for many Israelis, outside recognition of Palestine without a negotiated settlement raises worries about security, legitimacy, and the weakening of the Jewish state's claims to Jerusalem. This difference highlights how complicated the link between trust and recognition is.

The real peacebuilding needs recognition to be part of a framework of dialogue and reconciliation that takes into account the hopes and fears of both communities. Unilateral acts of recognition would not keep the peace in Jerusalem. Instead, there needs to be a process that includes mutual acknowledgment, empathy, and shared responsibility. Thus, recognition ought not to be viewed as the culmination of a political struggle but rather as a fundamental step towards re-envisioning coexistence and collaboration among peoples with interconnected histories.

The efficacy of recognition as a peacebuilding instrument is significantly contingent upon the international community's dedication to convert moral support into tangible action. Along with recognition, there should be diplomatic pressure to uphold international law, support negotiations that include everyone, and protect the rights of all people living in Jerusalem. The European Union, the Arab League, and the United Nations all have a very important role to play in making sure that recognition leads to constructive dialogue instead of division. When recognition is used to promote justice and equality instead of geopolitical alignment, it can help change the way conflicts happen. The long-term effect of recognizing Palestine is that it could create a moral and legal framework that forces both sides to work together on equal terms. This would create the conditions for lasting peace in Jerusalem.

4.3. Obstacles to Sustainable Peace in Jerusalem

One of the most challenging tasks in global politics is the elusiveness of lasting peace in Jerusalem. The city is a reflection of the historical, religious, and political intricacies of the Israeli-Palestinian



conflict and serves as a microcosm of the region's larger fight for sovereignty, justice, and coexistence (Akindoyin, 2024). Peace in Jerusalem has been elusive, even after decades of talks, ceasefire agreements, and mediation from external countries. The (October, 2023) ongoing violence, lack of trust, and political deadlock show how hard it is to bring people together because of deep-seated structural and psychological problems. These problems are complex and linked to each other. They include territorial disputes, rigid ideologies, economic inequality, religious symbolism, and the breakdown of international consensus.

The issue of territorial sovereignty represents a major impediment to peace in Jerusalem. Both Israelis and Palestinians are of the view that the city is their capital, and they base their claims on history, religion, and national identity (Najjar, 2025). The international community has strongly condemned Israel's annexation of East Jerusalem after the 1967 war and its later declaration of the city as its "eternal and undivided capital." The United Nations has always said that East Jerusalem is still occupied land and that the final status of the area must be decided through talks. For Palestinians, East Jerusalem is the political and spiritual center of their national goals (Krylov, 2022).

For Israel, controlling the city is an important part of its sense of historical redemption and statehood. The resulting zero-sum perceptions of sovereignty make compromise extraordinarily difficult. The ongoing growth of Israeli settlements in and around East Jerusalem makes the chances of peace even less likely by breaking up Palestinian territories, making it harder to create a contiguous Palestinian state, and making people in the area angry (Krylov, 2022).

The big difference in power between Israel and Palestine is another major challenge for long-term peace. Israel has been able to take control of Jerusalem and most of the West Bank because its military and economy are stronger than those of its neighbors and it has strong international alliances, especially with the United States (Akindoyin, 2024). In contrast, Palestinians are still politically split between the Palestinian Authority in the West Bank and Hamas in Gaza. This makes it harder for them to present a united front in peace talks.

In a perspective, lack of unity among Palestinian leaders has hurt public trust and made peace efforts less credible. Tensions are made worse by the economic and social differences between Israelis and Palestinians living in Jerusalem. Israeli neighborhoods have modern infrastructure and access to government services, but Palestinian neighborhoods often do not get enough attention, building permits, or public investment. These disparities engender daily grievances that exacerbate the perception of injustice and exclusion among Palestinians, thereby eroding confidence in both local and international peace initiatives.

Religious symbols and competing sacred stories make the divide even deeper and make it harder to come together. Judaism, Christianity, and Islam all hold Jerusalem in very high regard. It is home to the Western Wall, the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, and the Al-Aqsa Mosque. Having control over these holy places is important for both spiritual and political reasons. Any perceived threat to religious access or custodianship can incite significant unrest, exemplified by recurring confrontations at the Temple Mount or Haram al-Sharif. Political actors on both sides are using religious identity as a tool, which makes tensions worse and makes it harder to find a practical solution (Katz, 2024). When people try to frame the conflict in purely territorial terms, they often miss the deep spiritual aspect of it, where faith and identity are tied to collective memory.



International dynamics also play a big part in keeping the deadlock going. The weakening of a unified international consensus, especially since some Western countries recognized Jerusalem as Israel's capital, has made multilateral peace efforts less credible. The breakdown of global diplomacy has led to unilateral actions taking the place of cooperative engagement, which has made stakeholders even less trusting of each other. Conflicts in Syria and Lebanon, as well as changing alliances in the Middle East, have made people less interested in the Palestinian issue and made it less important to settle the status of Jerusalem. The peace process could get stuck for a long time if there is not regular, unbiased mediation backed by international law.

5.0. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

One of the world's longest-lasting and most complicated conflicts is about whether or not to recognize the State of Palestine and what that would mean for lasting peace in Jerusalem. Jerusalem is a city of great religious, cultural, and historical importance. It represents the hopes and conflicts of two groups of people who both want it to be their capital. Recognizing Palestine as a state is more than just a diplomatic achievement. That is, it is also a moral and political acknowledgment of the Palestinian people's right to choose their own future. However, recognition alone does not guarantee peace. It must be accompanied by practical measures that address the root causes of the conflict, such as land disputes, social and economic inequality, and political exclusion. If these underlying issues are not dealt with, recognition could just be a meaningless gesture that does not change the lives of the people who are affected. This means that any peace process for Jerusalem must make sure that the city is governed fairly, that everyone has equal access to resources, and that the city's multicultural and multi-religious character is protected.

To actualized a lasting peace in Jerusalem, everyone involved needs to be truly committed. Both Israelis and Palestinians need to show political will and moral courage to put aside their past grievances and work toward a vision of coexistence based on recognizing each other's rights and treating everyone equally. Settlement expansion, displacement, and movement restrictions continue to make it harder to make progress toward peace. In the same way, divisions within Palestinian political groups make it harder for them to negotiate as a group and make it less likely that they will be able to represent themselves as a group. So, any long-term peace plan must include internal political reform and unity within Palestine.

International actors also have an important part to play in bringing peace and stability to Jerusalem. The world needs to do more than just say they support a two-state solution; they need to be committed to consistent, fair involvement. This means making sure that everyone follows international law, stopping actions that make the occupation worse, and supporting organizations that encourage conversation and living together peacefully. In this vein, diplomacy should not just be about ceasefire agreements. Rather, it should also be encompass making the world a safer place for people, making the economy fairer, and making politics more open to everyone. To make sure that the peace process does not just become a series of temporary political deals, sustained multilateral cooperation is necessary. Instead, it should become a full framework that protects the rights and hopes of both peoples.

Also, because Jerusalem is important to many cultures and religions, its government needs to respect the city's diverse identity. Any peace deal must include ways to protect holy sites and guarantee



freedom of worship. Setting up a system of shared custodianship with international oversight could help ease tensions and strengthen Jerusalem's status as a city of universal heritage rather than private ownership.

In conclusion, a long-lasting peace in Jerusalem needs a broad plan that includes political recognition, social justice, and respect for different cultures. Recognizing the State of Palestine is an important step toward restoring balance and respect to the peace process, but it must be followed by real efforts to fix long-standing wrongs. To have real peace, we need to be able to understand each other, take responsibility, and work together to build a future based on equality and respect for each other. The promise of Jerusalem as a peaceful city can only come true if both groups, with help from the rest of the world, choose dialogue over division and cooperation over conflict. Jerusalem can only become a symbol of coexistence and hope for future generations if it can move past its history of conflict.

Conflict of Interest

The author declares that no conflict of interest exist on this manuscript.

REFERENCES

- Adedeji, A. O. (2024). Transformation theory and peacebuilding: Evaluating strategies for addressing the Niger Delta conflict. *Asian Review of Social Sciences*, 13(1), 23–31.
- Agha, Z., Esson, J., Griffiths, M., & Joronen, M. (2024). Gaza: A decolonial geography. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 49(2), e12675.
- Akindoyin, D. (2024). A critical analysis of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and its impact on the continent of Africa. *LAJOCSE: Lagos Journal Of Contemporary Studies in Education*, 2(3).
- Anadolu Ajansi. (2025). *Timeline: Countries recognizing the State of Palestine since 1988*. <https://www.aa.com.tr/en/middle-east/timeline-countries-recognizing-state-of-palestine-since-1988/3696119>
- Badarin, E. (2021). Recognition of states and colonialism in the twenty-first century: Western Sahara and Palestine in Sweden's recognition practice. *Third World Quarterly*, 42(6), 1276–1294.
- Bantekas, I., & Al-Thani, M. (2024). Self-determination and territorial agreements in the Middle East: From the Ottomans to colonial rule. *Emory International Law Review*, 39, 77.
- Cohen, R., & Toland, J. D. (Eds.). (2024). *State formation and political legitimacy*. Taylor & Francis.
- Freedman, J. (2021). The recognition dilemma: Negotiating identity in the Israeli–Palestinian conflict. *International Studies Quarterly*, 65(1), 122–135.



- Hadžić, F. (2022). Space and place of Jerusalem; sociology of religion and inter-cultural sociopolitical peace and conflict. *Journal of Islamicjerusalem Studies*, 22(1), 47–72.
- Hicks, D. (2021). *Dignity: Its essential role in resolving conflict*. Yale University Press.
- Isaac, D. (2024). *A critical analysis of the Israeli–Palestinian conflict and its impact on the continent of Africa*.
- Karsh, E., Glickman, G., & Inbar, E. (2022). *Rethinking the Six-Day War*. Begin-Sadat Center for Strategic Studies.
- Katz, Y. (2024). Identity politics and religion in modern society. *International Journal of Scientific and Management Research*, 7(09), 49–60.
- Khamaysa, I. S. (2022). *Traumatic experiences of the catastrophe–nakba–after 72 years as perceived by the first generation*. Universidad de Granada.
- Krylov, A. V. (2022). The UN and the Middle East settlement—Mission: Impossible. In *Turning points of world transformation: New trends, challenges and actors* (pp. 139–155). Springer Nature Singapore.
- Kyris, G. (2024). The recognition of a right to statehood and Palestine. *Ethnopolitics*, 1–11.
- Munawar, N. A., & Nassar, I. (2025). Decolonizing the sacred: The politics of heritage in Jerusalem. *Heritage Memory and Conflict Journal*, 5(1), 1–22.
- Najjar, R. (2025). *Planning capital cities under regional conflict: Paradoxical urban spaces – Jerusalem as a paramount model*.
- Shalbak, I. (2023). Human rights in Palestine: From self-determination to governance. *Australian Journal of Human Rights*, 29(3), 492–510.
- Siebols, Y. (2025). *From historical resolution to intractable conflict: A historical analysis into the evolution of Israel’s security culture as manifested in its practices towards Palestinians during the Oslo process (1993–2000) and the Second Intifada (2000–2005)* (Master’s thesis).
- Uçkaç, M. (2025). Examining international space law from the perspective of the concept of “sovereignty.” *EuroGlobal Journal of Linguistics and Language Education*, 2(4), 86–100.
- Zeli, A. (2024). Postmodern international relations: Postmodernism beyond social constructivism. *International Journal of Social Science and Education Research Studies*, 4(08).