

Security or Expansion? Revisiting Israel's Actions in Palestine and Neighbouring Regions

Prof. (Dr.) Shajeer S^{1*}

¹Professor & Head, Department of Islamic History, University College, Thiruvananthapuram, Kerala, India

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36348/sjhss.2026.v11i04.006> | Received: 22.02.2026 | Accepted: 15.04.2026 | Published: 17.04.2026

*Corresponding author: Prof. (Dr.) Shajeer S

Professor & Head, Department of Islamic History, University College, Thiruvananthapuram, Kerala, India

Abstract

The Israel–Palestine conflict remains one of the most complex and contested issues in contemporary international politics. A central question in this debate concerns whether Israel's actions in Palestinian territories and neighbouring regions are primarily motivated by legitimate security concerns or reflect broader patterns of territorial expansion. This article examines the historical development of the conflict, focusing on the emergence of competing nationalist movements and the impact of colonial and postcolonial dynamics. It analyses how security has been constructed as a guiding principle in Israeli policy, while also exploring critiques that interpret these actions as forms of occupation and territorial consolidation. The study further considers the role of settlement expansion, military strategies, and administrative control in shaping the political and geographic landscape of the region. In addition to political analysis, the article incorporates the human dimension of the conflict, emphasizing how lived experiences influence perceptions of security, identity, and belonging among both Israelis and Palestinians. By bringing together these perspectives, the article highlights the complexity of the issue and the limitations of binary interpretations. The findings suggest that the distinction between security and expansion is not always clear-cut, as policies often reflect overlapping motivations and consequences. The article concludes that a nuanced and multidimensional approach is essential for understanding the conflict and for informing more balanced academic and policy discussions.

Keywords: Israel, Palestine, occupation, nationalism, security, expansion, Middle East politics, conflict, identity.

Copyright © 2026 The Author(s): This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0) which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium for non-commercial use provided the original author and source are credited.

INTRODUCTION

The question of whether Israel's actions in Palestine and neighbouring regions are motivated primarily by security concerns or by expansionist ambitions has long occupied the centre of scholarly, political, and public debate. It is not merely a question of policy interpretation; it is a question that shapes global discourse, influences diplomatic relations, and deeply affects the lives of millions of people in the region. At its core, this debate reflects two competing yet deeply interconnected narratives—each rooted in history, shaped by experience, and sustained by differing perceptions of reality.

For Israel, the argument of self-defence has often been framed as both necessary and unavoidable. The historical experiences of persecution, displacement, and conflict—combined with the geopolitical realities of a volatile region—have contributed to a strong emphasis on security within Israeli state policy. From this perspective, military operations, territorial control, and strategic measures are understood as essential for

ensuring survival and protecting citizens from ongoing and perceived threats. Security is not seen as an abstract concept but as a lived necessity, closely tied to fears of vulnerability and the memory of past conflicts.

For Palestinians and many observers, however, these same actions are experienced and interpreted in profoundly different ways. Rather than being viewed solely as defensive measures, they are often understood as part of a broader and continuing process of occupation, displacement, and territorial consolidation. The expansion of settlements, restrictions on movement, and the presence of military authority in daily life contribute to a perception of systematic control over land and people. For many Palestinians, the issue is not only political but deeply personal, affecting access to resources, freedom of movement, and the ability to maintain a sense of home and identity.

These contrasting perspectives reveal the complexity of the conflict and highlight the difficulty of arriving at a single, definitive interpretation. The same

event or policy can carry entirely different meanings depending on one's historical memory, political position, and lived experience. What is framed as security by one side may be experienced as restriction or domination by the other. This divergence is not simply a matter of disagreement; it reflects fundamentally different ways of understanding power, legitimacy, and justice.

Understanding this tension requires moving beyond simplified or binary explanations. It calls for a careful examination of historical developments, including the legacy of colonial intervention, the rise of competing nationalisms, and the impact of wars and political agreements. It also requires attention to identity—how individuals and communities define themselves in relation to land, history, and statehood. Equally important is the recognition of lived experience, as the realities of everyday life often reveal dimensions of the conflict that cannot be captured through political analysis alone.

In this context, the question of “security or expansion” becomes less about choosing between two opposing explanations and more about understanding how these frameworks intersect and influence one another. Policies are often shaped by multiple motivations, and their consequences can extend beyond their stated intentions. By exploring these complexities, this article seeks to provide a more nuanced and human-centered understanding of Israel's actions in Palestine and neighbouring regions—one that acknowledges both the realities of security concerns and the lived consequences of prolonged occupation.

Historical Roots of Conflict

The origins of the Israel–Palestine conflict can be traced to the late Ottoman period, a time when the region was undergoing significant political, social, and intellectual transformation. For centuries, the area had been part of the Ottoman Empire, where diverse communities—Muslim, Christian, and Jewish—lived within a complex but relatively stable imperial framework. Identity during this period was shaped more by religion, locality, and community than by modern nationalism. However, by the late nineteenth century, this equilibrium began to shift as new political ideas and movements emerged.

It was during this period that both Zionist and Palestinian nationalist movements began to take shape, each rooted in distinct historical experiences yet focused on the same territory. Zionism developed in response to growing anti-Semitism in Europe and sought to establish a national homeland for the Jewish people in what was historically understood as their ancestral land. At the same time, Palestinian Arab identity began to crystallize in response to both internal changes within the Ottoman Empire and the increasing presence of Jewish settlers. As scholars have observed, these parallel developments laid

the groundwork for a conflict defined by “competing aspirations for self-determination on the same land” (Gelvin, 2020).

The collapse of Ottoman authority following the First World War marked a decisive turning point. With the end of imperial rule, the region entered a new phase under European control, most notably through the British Mandate system. British policies during this period played a critical role in intensifying tensions between Jewish and Arab communities. The Balfour Declaration of 1917, which expressed support for the establishment of a “national home for the Jewish people” in Palestine, created expectations and anxieties on both sides. While it was seen by Zionists as a step toward statehood, many Arabs viewed it as a disregard for their own political aspirations (Cleveland & Bunton, 2016).

During the Mandate period, migration, land purchases, and political mobilization increased significantly. Jewish immigration to Palestine grew, particularly in response to persecution in Europe, while Palestinian Arabs became increasingly concerned about demographic changes and loss of land. These developments led to rising tensions, periodic violence, and a deepening sense of mistrust between the two communities. As Khalidi (2006) notes, this period witnessed the gradual transformation of a shared geographic space into a contested political landscape, where coexistence gave way to competition.

The creation of the state of Israel in 1948 marked another critical turning point in the conflict. For Jewish communities, it represented the realization of a long-standing national aspiration and a refuge after centuries of persecution. For Palestinians, however, this moment is remembered as the Nakba, or catastrophe, which involved the displacement of hundreds of thousands of people from their homes. The war that accompanied Israel's establishment not only reshaped territorial boundaries but also left a legacy of trauma, loss, and unresolved grievances that continue to influence the conflict today (Pappé, 2006).

In the years that followed, the conflict evolved through a series of wars, uprisings, and political developments. The 1967 war, in particular, resulted in Israel's control over the West Bank, Gaza Strip, and East Jerusalem, introducing a new phase characterized by occupation and ongoing disputes over land and sovereignty. These developments further entrenched divisions and complicated efforts toward resolution.

What makes the historical roots of this conflict especially significant is the way in which they continue to shape contemporary realities. The past is not simply a background to the present; it is actively remembered, interpreted, and invoked by both sides. Narratives of displacement, survival, and belonging are passed down

through generations, influencing political positions and social identities.

Understanding these origins requires more than a chronological account of events. It involves recognizing the human experiences behind them—the hopes that drove nationalist movements, the fears that accompanied demographic change, and the lasting impact of war and displacement. It also requires acknowledging that both sides view history through deeply rooted perspectives that shape how they interpret the present.

In this sense, the historical roots of the Israel–Palestine conflict are not only about competing claims to land but also about competing memories, identities, and aspirations. These intertwined histories continue to define the conflict, making it one of the most complex and enduring issues in modern international politics.

Security as a Justification

From Israel's perspective, security has remained not only a central concern but the defining principle shaping state policy and national consciousness. Since its establishment in 1948, Israel has operated within a regional environment marked by conflict, uncertainty, and recurring violence. Surrounded at various moments by neighbouring states that challenged its legitimacy, and shaped by a collective memory of persecution—most notably the Holocaust—Israeli leadership has consistently framed security as an existential necessity rather than a strategic choice. As scholars note, this sense of vulnerability has deeply influenced Israeli political thinking and policy formation (Gelvin, 2020). In this context, the protection of the state and its citizens is often understood as inseparable from the very survival of the nation itself.

This emphasis on security is reflected in a wide range of policies and practices. Military preparedness has remained a cornerstone of Israeli strategy, with a strong and technologically advanced defence system designed to respond rapidly to threats. Border controls, intelligence operations, and surveillance mechanisms are similarly justified as essential tools for maintaining national safety. In territories such as the West Bank and along the borders of Gaza, security measures—including checkpoints, barriers, and restricted zones—are presented as necessary to prevent attacks and ensure stability. Historians have pointed out that these practices are often framed as defensive responses within a highly unstable regional context (Cleveland & Bunton, 2016). Supporters argue that such measures are not expressions of aggression but rather attempts to manage ongoing risks.

Historical experience plays a crucial role in shaping this perspective. The memory of past wars, including those of 1948, 1967, and 1973, as well as more

recent conflicts and uprisings, reinforces a sense of vulnerability. Periods of violence, such as the Intifadas, have contributed to a perception that threats are not only external but can also emerge within contested territories. As Shlaim (2000,) argues, Israeli strategic thinking has often been guided by the belief that pre-emptive strength is necessary to deter potential threats. These experiences have strengthened the conviction among many Israelis that security cannot be taken for granted and must be actively maintained.

In this context, actions that might be viewed by others as aggressive or expansionist are often interpreted within Israel as preventive or defensive. Military operations, for example, are frequently justified as efforts to neutralize threats before they materialize. Similarly, policies such as targeted strikes or incursions into neighbouring areas are framed as necessary to deter future attacks. This logic of pre-emption reflects a broader strategic approach in which waiting for threats to fully emerge is considered too risky in a region characterized by volatility and rapid escalation.

Supporters of this view further argue that Israel operates in a uniquely challenging geopolitical environment. The presence of non-state actors, shifting regional alliances, and ongoing instability contribute to a sense that threats are both real and continuous. As Bregman (2016,) observes, Israeli security policy has evolved in response to both conventional warfare and asymmetric threats, requiring constant adaptation and vigilance. In such a setting, security is not a temporary concern but a permanent condition that shapes decision-making at every level of governance.

At the same time, the concept of security extends beyond military considerations. It also encompasses psychological and social dimensions, influencing how individuals and communities perceive risk and safety. For many Israelis, security is deeply personal, tied to everyday experiences of uncertainty and the desire for normalcy in a region often marked by conflict. This human dimension helps explain why security remains such a powerful and enduring justification for state policy.

However, this emphasis on security is not without controversy. While it provides a framework for understanding Israeli actions, it also raises important questions about proportionality, long-term consequences, and the impact on other populations. Nevertheless, from the Israeli perspective, security continues to function as a central and compelling rationale—one that is rooted in history, reinforced by experience, and sustained by ongoing regional dynamics.

Expansion and Occupation

At the same time, critics argue that Israel's actions extend beyond immediate security concerns and

reflect broader patterns of territorial expansion and long-term control. From this perspective, the occupation of Palestinian territories is not viewed as a temporary or purely defensive measure, but as a sustained system that has reshaped both land and life over decades. The expansion of settlements in the West Bank, the fragmentation of Palestinian territories, and the imposition of restrictions on movement are often cited as key features of this system. These developments have altered not only the physical geography of the region but also its demographic and political landscape, creating realities that are difficult to reverse. As Pappé (2006) argues, the early stages of the conflict involved processes of displacement that continue to influence patterns of control and territorial organization in the present.

Settlement expansion has become one of the most visible and contested aspects of this process. Over time, Israeli settlements have grown in number and size, often supported by infrastructure such as roads, security zones, and administrative frameworks that integrate them into the broader state system. Critics argue that this expansion is not merely incidental but forms part of a deliberate strategy that complicates the possibility of a contiguous Palestinian state. As Finkelstein (2003) notes, the expansion of settlements has contributed to the fragmentation of Palestinian territories, making political and economic coherence increasingly difficult. For many Palestinians, the presence of settlements is experienced not only as a political issue but as a daily reality that affects access to land, resources, and mobility.

The concept of occupation, however, extends far beyond the physical presence of settlements or military forces. It encompasses a broader system of control that shapes political, economic, and social life. In the West Bank, checkpoints, administrative divisions, and permit systems regulate movement and access, influencing everything from employment opportunities to education and healthcare. As Khalidi (2006) observes, these structures create a situation in which Palestinian autonomy is limited, even in areas where local governance exists. The result is a layered system in which authority is shared but uneven, with significant power remaining in external hands.

In Gaza, the situation reflects a different but equally complex form of control. While Israel withdrew its settlements in 2005, the region remains subject to blockades, restricted movement, and periodic military conflict. These conditions have significant humanitarian and economic consequences, affecting infrastructure, access to resources, and everyday life. B'Tselem (2017) highlights, the restrictions imposed on Gaza have contributed to a situation where economic development and normal social functioning are severely constrained. For residents, this translates into a constant struggle to maintain stability in the face of limited opportunities and recurring disruptions.

Beyond material conditions, the experience of occupation also has profound psychological and social effects. Living under conditions of uncertainty, restriction, and limited autonomy can shape how individuals and communities perceive their future. Feelings of frustration, insecurity, and displacement are often interwoven with broader political narratives, reinforcing a sense of injustice and resistance. At the same time, these experiences are not uniform; they vary across regions, communities, and individuals, reflecting the complexity of life under occupation.

These realities raise fundamental questions about sovereignty, rights, and the future of Palestinian statehood. If a state is to be defined by control over territory, governance, and population, then the conditions created by occupation pose significant challenges to its realization. The fragmentation of land, the limitation of political authority, and the ongoing expansion of settlements all complicate the prospects for a viable and independent Palestinian state.

At a broader level, the debate over expansion and occupation reflects differing interpretations of intent and outcome. For critics, the patterns of territorial control suggest a long-term strategy that extends beyond immediate security needs. For others, these same developments are framed within a context of security and strategic necessity. This divergence highlights the complexity of the issue, where policies can be understood in multiple ways depending on perspective.

In this sense, expansion and occupation are not merely political or territorial concepts; they are lived realities that shape everyday experiences, influence identities, and define possibilities for the future. Understanding them requires not only analysing policies and structures but also engaging with the human dimensions of the conflict—how people live, adapt, and respond within these conditions.

The Human Dimension

Beyond political arguments and strategic calculations, the Israel–Palestine conflict is deeply human, shaped by the everyday experiences, fears, and aspirations of those who live within it. For Israelis, security concerns are not abstract policy considerations but are closely tied to lived memories of violence, conflict, and vulnerability. Generations have grown up with the awareness of wars, missile threats, and sudden escalations that can disrupt ordinary life. As a result, the desire for safety is embedded in daily routines, influencing everything from urban planning to education and public behaviour. Scholars have noted that Israeli society has been profoundly shaped by a “security-oriented consciousness” rooted in historical experiences and ongoing regional tensions (Gelvin, 2020). This consciousness reinforces the belief that vigilance and preparedness are essential for survival.

At the same time, for Palestinians, the conflict is experienced through a different but equally intense set of realities. Daily life under conditions of occupation often involves restrictions on movement, limited access to resources, and a persistent sense of uncertainty about the future. Checkpoints, barriers, and administrative controls affect the ability to travel, work, study, and maintain social connections. For many, these are not occasional disruptions but ongoing features of everyday life. Khalidi (2006) observes that, such conditions create a sense of constrained existence, where autonomy is limited and opportunities are shaped by external control.

These lived experiences cannot be reduced to abstract debates about territory or policy. Families divided by borders, communities affected by recurring violence, and individuals navigating complex systems of control all contribute to the human dimension of the conflict. In many cases, personal histories are marked by displacement, loss, or adaptation to changing circumstances. For Palestinians, the memory of displacement—often passed down through generations—remains a central element of identity. For Israelis, collective memory includes not only the founding of the state but also the broader historical experiences that shaped the need for a homeland. Pappé (2006) argues that , these competing narratives of memory and belonging continue to influence how each side understands the present.

The psychological impact of the conflict is also significant. Living in an environment characterized by uncertainty and periodic violence can affect mental health, social relationships, and perceptions of the future. Children growing up in such conditions often internalize these realities, shaping their understanding of identity and conflict from an early age. As Finkelstein (2003, p. 47) notes, the human consequences of prolonged conflict extend beyond immediate physical effects, influencing long-term social and emotional well-being.

At the same time, it is important to recognize that these experiences are not uniform. Within both Israeli and Palestinian societies, there are diverse perspectives, shaped by differences in geography, socioeconomic status, and personal experience. Some individuals encounter the conflict more directly, while others experience it more indirectly. This diversity highlights the complexity of the human dimension, reminding us that there is no single narrative that can fully capture the reality of life in the region.

Despite these differences, a common thread runs through these experiences: the desire for stability, dignity, and a sense of normalcy. Whether expressed through the pursuit of security or the demand for freedom and rights, these aspirations reflect shared human concerns. As B'Tselem (2017) emphasizes, the conflict is not only about political arrangements but also about

the conditions under which people live and the possibilities available to them.

In this sense, the human dimension of the conflict reveals layers that go beyond political or territorial disputes. It highlights how identity, memory, and lived experience are shaped by ongoing conditions, influencing how individuals and communities understand themselves and others. Recognizing this dimension is essential for any meaningful engagement with the conflict, as it brings into focus the human realities that underlie broader political debates.

Between Security and Expansion

The distinction between security and expansion in the context of Israel's actions is not always clear-cut; rather, it exists within a complex and often overlapping framework shaped by history, perception, and political necessity. Policies that are presented as defensive—such as the construction of barriers, the maintenance of military presence, or the expansion of strategic settlements—may also produce long-term territorial and demographic consequences that resemble expansion. As scholars have noted, the ambiguity lies in the fact that the same policy can serve multiple purposes simultaneously, making it difficult to separate intent from outcome (Gelvin, 2020). This overlap complicates efforts to categorize Israel's actions in simple or binary terms, as both security and expansion can coexist within a single strategy.

From one perspective, security-driven policies are responses to real and perceived threats, shaped by historical experiences and ongoing tensions. From another perspective, these same policies can alter the physical and political landscape in ways that extend beyond immediate defense. The expansion of settlements, for example, may be justified in terms of strategic depth or protection, yet it also contributes to the consolidation of territorial control. As Finkelstein (2003) argues, the cumulative effect of such measures often reshapes realities on the ground, creating conditions that are difficult to reverse and that influence future political possibilities.

This complexity is further intensified by the broader geopolitical context in which the conflict exists. Israel's actions cannot be understood in isolation; they are deeply embedded in a network of international alliances, regional rivalries, and global power dynamics. Support from major powers, particularly in terms of military aid and diplomatic backing, plays a significant role in shaping policy decisions and outcomes. At the same time, regional conflicts and shifting alliances influence perceptions of threat and opportunity, reinforcing the emphasis on security while also affecting territorial strategies (Shlaim, 2000).

The role of neighbouring countries and non-state actors also adds layers of complexity to the situation. Conflicts involving groups operating across borders, as well as tensions with neighbouring states, contribute to a sense of instability that shapes Israeli decision-making. In such an environment, policies are often formulated with both immediate and long-term considerations in mind, blurring the line between defence and strategic positioning. As Bregman (2016, p. 210) observes, Israel's regional engagements reflect a continuous effort to balance deterrence, control, and adaptation in response to evolving threats.

At the same time, the interplay between security and expansion is not only a matter of policy but also of perception. Different actors interpret the same developments in fundamentally different ways. For Israeli policymakers and supporters, actions are often framed within a narrative of survival and necessity. For Palestinians and many observers, these actions may be experienced as encroachment and control. This divergence highlights the importance of perspective in shaping how policies are understood and judged.

Human experience further complicates this distinction. Policies that are justified in terms of security may have significant social and economic consequences for those living under their impact. Restrictions on movement, changes in land use, and the presence of military infrastructure can affect daily life in ways that extend beyond their stated purpose. These effects contribute to a perception that security measures are not neutral but are embedded within broader systems of control.

Moreover, the historical dimension of the conflict reinforces this overlap. Past events, including wars, displacement, and political agreements, continue to influence present decisions. Policies are often shaped by lessons drawn from previous experiences, where the line between defence and expansion was itself contested. This continuity suggests that current actions are part of an ongoing process rather than isolated responses.

In this sense, the question of whether Israel's actions are motivated by security or expansion cannot be answered through a simple distinction. Instead, it requires an understanding of how these two frameworks interact, overlap, and evolve over time. Recognizing this complexity allows for a more nuanced analysis—one that acknowledges the multiple factors shaping policy and the diverse ways in which it is experienced.

Ultimately, the interplay between security and expansion reflects the broader nature of the conflict itself: dynamic, layered, and resistant to easy categorization. It underscores the need to move beyond binary interpretations and to engage with the conflict as

a multifaceted reality shaped by history, politics, and human experience.

CONCLUSION

The question of whether Israel's actions are driven primarily by security concerns or territorial expansion cannot be reduced to a single, definitive explanation. It exists within a deeply layered historical and political context where fear, survival, identity, and power are all intertwined. For many Israelis, security is not an abstract concept but a lived reality shaped by decades of war, regional hostility, and the persistent threat of violence. Policies that appear aggressive from the outside are often framed internally as necessary precautions to ensure national survival and protect civilian life.

At the same time, for Palestinians and many observers, the expansion of settlements, control over land, and restrictions on movement are experienced as forms of dispossession and domination. These actions are not seen as temporary security measures but as part of a broader pattern that reshapes geography and alters the prospects for a viable Palestinian future. This perspective is rooted in lived experiences of displacement, limited autonomy, and ongoing uncertainty about rights and statehood.

What makes the situation particularly complex is that these narratives are not mutually exclusive—they coexist and, in many ways, reinforce each other. Security measures can lead to expansion on the ground, while expansion can intensify insecurity and resistance. Each side interprets the other's actions through its own historical memory and present-day realities, creating a cycle where fear and mistrust continue to deepen.

To truly understand the conflict, it is essential to move beyond simplified, binary interpretations. Reducing it to "security versus expansion" risks overlooking the human dimension—the everyday lives affected, the generational trauma carried forward, and the competing aspirations for dignity, safety, and self-determination. It also obscures the role of political leadership, international actors, and shifting regional dynamics that continue to shape outcomes.

A more meaningful approach lies in acknowledging these overlapping truths and engaging with the complexity rather than avoiding it. Recognizing the legitimacy of security concerns while also addressing issues of justice, rights, and equality is not easy, but it is necessary. Sustainable solutions will require not only political agreements but also a willingness to understand the fears and hopes that drive both sides.

Ultimately, any path toward peace depends on moving from rigid narratives to empathetic understanding—where security is not pursued at the

expense of justice, and aspirations for statehood do not ignore the need for coexistence. Only by holding these tensions together, rather than choosing one over the other, can space be created for genuine dialogue and the possibility of a more stable and humane future.

REFERENCES

- Abunimah, A. (2006). *One Country: A Bold Proposal to End the Israeli-Palestinian Impasse*. Metropolitan Books.
- B'Tselem. (2017). *The Occupation of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip*. B'Tselem Report.
- Baconi, T. (2018). *Hamas Contained: The Rise and Pacification of Palestinian Resistance*. Stanford University Press.
- Bar-Joseph, U. (2005). *The Watchman Fell Asleep: The Surprise of Yom Kippur and Its Sources*. SUNY Press.
- Bergman, R. (2018). *Rise and Kill First: The Secret History of Israel's Targeted Assassinations*. Random House.
- Bregman, A. (2016). *Israel's Wars: A History Since 1947*. Routledge.
- Carter, J. (2006). *Palestine: Peace Not Apartheid*. Simon & Schuster.
- Cleveland, W. L., & Bunton, M. (2016). *A History of the Modern Middle East* (6th ed.). Westview Press.
- Cordesman, A. H. (2006). *Arab-Israeli Military Forces in an Era of Asymmetric Wars*. Praeger.
- Erakat, N. (2019). *Justice for Some: Law and the Question of Palestine*. Stanford University Press.
- Falk, R. (2014). *Palestine: The Legitimacy of Hope*. Just World Books.
- Finkelstein, N. G. (2003). *Image and Reality of the Israel-Palestine Conflict*. Verso.
- Gelvin, J. L. (2020). *The Israel-Palestine Conflict: A History* (5th ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Gorenberg, G. (2006). *The Accidental Empire: Israel and the Birth of the Settlements, 1967-1977*. Times Books.
- Inbar, E. (2008). *Israel's National Security: Issues and Challenges Since the Yom Kippur War*. Routledge.
- Khalidi, R. (2006). *The Iron Cage: The Story of the Palestinian Struggle for Statehood*. Beacon Press.
- Khalidi, R. (2013). *Brokers of Deceit: How the U.S. Has Undermined Peace in the Middle East*. Beacon Press.
- Khalidi, R. (2020). *The Hundred Years' War on Palestine: A History of Settler Colonialism and Resistance, 1917-2017*. Henry Holt.
- Khalidi, W. (1992). *All That Remains: The Palestinian Villages Occupied and Depopulated by Israel in 1948*. Institute for Palestine Studies.
- Kretzmer, D. (2002). *The Occupation of Justice: The Supreme Court of Israel and the Occupied Territories*. SUNY Press.
- Lustick, I. S. (1980). *Arabs in the Jewish State: Israel's Control of a National Minority*. University of Texas Press.
- Mearsheimer, J. J., & Walt, S. M. (2007). *The Israel Lobby and U.S. Foreign Policy*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Morris, B. (2008). *1948: A History of the First Arab-Israeli War*. Yale University Press.
- Pappé, I. (2006). *The Ethnic Cleansing of Palestine*. Oneworld.
- Quigley, J. (2010). *The Statehood of Palestine: International Law in the Middle East Conflict*. Cambridge University Press.
- Said, E. W. (1992). *The Question of Palestine*. Vintage Books.
- Shehadeh, R. (2008). *Palestinian Walks: Notes on a Vanishing Landscape*. Scribner.
- Shlaim, A. (2001). *The Iron Wall: Israel and the Arab World*. W. W. Norton.
- Weizman, E. (2007). *Hollow Land: Israel's Architecture of Occupation*. Verso.