

Impact of Israel –Iran conflict on Indian economy

Dr. Anil Kumar

Associate Professor in Economics Government College Barsar

ABSTRACT

The Israel and Palestine skirmish has gained regional and global attention for long period of time. It continues to shimmer in spite of the efforts of worldwide leaders, the United Nation and other regional and international bodies to abate it. United Nation (UN) has been finding out compatible solution for aggrieved parties. However, no agreement has so far been signed to meet the interests of both the suffering Nation. Their rigidity to protect the interest of their nations and passion and misapprehension to knock the head of each other off easily becomes an albatross to reach at a harmonious agreement. The efforts to stem the contentious issues has not put any concrete effects in the region. The role of Russia and Turkey is also important to ensure an enduring nostrum to establish peace in the middle -east.

Keywords Israel -Palestine conflict, United Nations, United States, Russia, Turkey, Arab Nations

INTRODUCTION

Israel is a single Jewish population country in the world that is situated just east of the Mediterranean Sea. The Palestinians are Arabic that hail from the land Israel. They occupied one part of the territory which was earlier a part of Israel. The occupied territory by the Arabic people, which was earlier a part of the Israel, is known as Palestine. The people who live in this territory (Palestinians) want to establish a state by that name on all or part of the same land. The major Israeli-Palestinian conflict is over who gets what land and how it is controlled. The occupation of the territory formerly known as Palestine by the Israelis continues to cause widespread debates especially over the legality of their displacement of the Palestinian population and their allowing the Palestinian refugees the right to return. Furthermore, the Israelis are not willing to allow the Palestinians to have a formal form of government over a specific territory like every other nation in the world. The conflict is very complex in nature in the sense that even within both communities (Israeli and Palestinian) there are radical divisions which makes it difficult for decisions to be reached and also to abide with these decisions. Thus, the debates are reoccurring both within and outside the territory. This and many more issues of contention as would be discussed in this paper Varying resolutions from the United Nations and precedents from international laws have been invoked on the parties to the conflict but have been consistently neglected by the warring parties. This paper aims to look into some of the narratives to the conflict and the arrays of solutions from within and outside Israel that have been both successful and unsuccessful to ascertain the prevailing situation and what lays ahead for both parties and the region as a whole.

BRIEF HISTORY

Some writers attribute the start of the Israeli/Palestinian conflict to the Second World War that saw atrocities that led to the death of over six million Jews and the migration of millions of Jews in a mass „Zionist“ movement. This mass movement saw the repatriation of occupied by Palestinians under the colonial rule of the British. This led to a bitter struggle between the Israelis and the Palestinians as they embroiled in one of the most tragic and intractable conflicts in the world today (SBS News, 2019). However, the conflict between these two groups can be traced to about half a century prior to the Second World War. The area known as Israel today was officially Palestine starting 1917 (SBS News, 2019) as they made up the majority of the populace in the area then with a few Jews and Turks were also resident there. SBS (1882 to 1948) News reports that there had been large scale movements of Jews into the area in several „Aliyahs“ resulting in surges in the numbers of Jews then residing in the region making it a major attraction for other Jews around the world to want to return home. These movements were sparked by embittered Jews who were fleeing oppression in eastern Europe around 1881 especially from Russia at a time also marked by the “writings of Moses Hess, Judah Alkalai, Zvi Hirsch Kalischer and Theodor Herzl” about Zionism in building a national home for the Jews in Ottoman ruled Palestine (Morris, 2004:9).

The Zionist movement back to this region was a conscious, calculated and planned strategy that emanated from the first Zionist congress that was held in Basel, Switzerland in 1897 (Jewish Virtual Library, n.d.). This meeting had at the top of its agenda the finding and repatriation of Jews to a permanent home which was in an area inhabited by majority Palestinians. This move was later supported by a British Declaration (the Belfour Declaration) in 1917 affirming Palestine to be a national home for the Jewish returnees despite apprehensions and rebuffs by the Palestinians (SBS News, 2019; BBC, 2019; Morris, 2004) after they had taken over the area as a colony with the defeat of the Ottoman empire in the first world war (BBC, 2019). For the Jews, it marked a return to their ancestral home while for the

Palestinians it was an incursion into their land ensuing resultant violence between Jews and Arabs (BBC, 2019) and also between the Arabs and the British against the Arabs and later a refusal by the British of more Jewish immigration in favour of the Arabs. The hitherto peaceful coexistence that existed between the Jews, Turks and Palestinians slowly gave way to conflicting and competitive relationships. But in patience and submission the Jews kept coming in smaller numbers to serve as workers, farmers and to some extent, even slaves to the then occupants of Palestine till their number kept surging higher and higher with the ever-increasing aliyahs. These conflicts saw the displacement of Palestinian populations and more competition over scarce resources. Of significance is the Arab revolt in 1936 which Galnoor (1995:35) believes “placed the possibility of establishing a Jewish State on the political agenda” despite earlier discussions on the issue in 1934 of likely geographic separation between the Israelis and the Palestinians. This led to further discussions by the British colonialist and an onward proposal to the League of Nations in 1937 for ratification which led to a subsequent postponement on any decisions with regards to partitioning (Galnoor, 1995). After the second world war, the British relinquished their colonial obligation over Palestine leaving the UN with the task of finding a solution to the statehood and governance debacle inherent in the region especially with the conflicts that have arisen due to the Jewish population surge as most Jews that were displaced during the second world war were afraid of moving back to their old habitations because of anti-Semitic fears leaving the UN with the obligation to find a place to repatriate them (United Nations, 1947).

The 1947 report of the UN Special Committee on Palestine (UNSCOP) stated that despite offering to resettle the displaced Jews in other countries, they were met with stiff resistance as a majority of them affirmed they were not going to settle in any other country except Palestine. The Arabs wanted a unitary Palestinian state, some members of the UN committee advocated for a federal state with shared powers which was rejected by both the Jews and Arabs and the other part of the committee opted for two independent states which was very much accepted by the Israelis to the disgust of the Palestinians (Isseroff, 1947). This led the UN under the auspices of the UNSCOP to come up with a partition plan that opted for both Israeli and Palestinian states living side by side with Jerusalem being marked as a neutral international zone because of the contentious issues surrounding it.

The plan made provisions for an economic union between the Israelis and the Palestinians (United Nations, 1947). This purported promulgation was however unsatisfactory to the Palestinians stating the illegality of taking their lands and relinquishing it to the Jews. As such, because of the refusal by Arabs both within and outside Palestine, the UN partition plan was not implemented (Galnoor, 1995). Galnoor pointed out that the conditions for partitioning were not exactly favourable to Israel but was acceded to by the Jewish leadership then because their desire for statehood far outweighed any other benefits that could have accrued to them at that point in time. So, despite the omission of Galilee, winding boundaries, not enough agricultural land, likely rise in population due to the return of more Jews, proximity to large Arab populations and the high propensity for conflicts with its Arab neighbours, the Israelis were happy to have a partition deal. Israel was given “de facto” recognition by some nations while others gave it “de jure” recognition. By 1991 however, the PLO became the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people and participated in the Madrid conference and later on at the Oslo negotiations that climaxed in the signing of the Oslo Accords in 1993 (Hasan, 2017; Nasrallah, 2013) costing the lives of about 1500 Palestinians, 185 Israelis (Hasan, 2017) and over 60000 injured (Nasrallah, 2013).

THE ISSUES IN CONTENTION

The Israeli-Palestinian conflict has obviously become complex because of the layers of parties involved: The Israelis and the Palestinians are primary. Then the Arabs, the Muslim world and Christendom. There are also the geopolitical interests of world powers notably the US, Russia and the EU. All of these have varying interests but the issues generally relate to the status of Israel and Palestinians in the area that was once a British protectorate before 1947. Reliefweb (2007), a humanitarian information portal of the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) published an article outlining the core issues in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict which are captured below. What Palestinians consider their right of return to historic Palestine constitutes one prominent issue. In the wake of the establishment of the state of Israel in 1947 and the war that broke out between them and the Arabs, about 800,000 Palestinians fled their habitations and had become refugees in the Gaza Strip area and various parts of the Middle East. They have been agitating for a return to their homeland which has since been taken over by Israelis who are not willing to accept their return.

The second issue is that of Jerusalem which Israel claims to be their eternal capital. It was under the sovereignty of Jordan until the 1967 war when Israel took it in war and since then have exercised control over it. The Palestinians claim it as their capital as well. More so, it is the third most holy place of the Islamic faith. While to the Jews, it is the site of the temple, for the Muslim Arabs, the Dom of the Rock is the site from where Mohammed ascended into heaven is in Jerusalem. Whoever has sovereignty over the city is therefore a contentious issue. Thirdly is the issue of what constitutes Palestinian and Israeli borders. Palestinians would have Israel withdraw from all areas post 1948-49 war particularly the border separating Israel from the West Bank. They would accept nothing less than this. Israelis on the other hand are not willing to concede, citing security considerations with reference to the 2005 withdrawals which area militant Palestinian groups used to launch missiles into Israel on a daily basis. The Palestinians also want Israel to

dismantle the settlements on Palestinian territories which constitutes Jewish enclaves on their land. The Israelis however would want to maintain so-called settlement blocks close to major Palestinian settlements. The fourth is security concern for Israel. Whereas Security Council Resolution 242 of November 22, 1967 calls for Israel to withdraw its armed forces from Palestinian territories, it is concerned about the activities of militant groups such as Hamas, the Islamic jihad and the armed wing of the Fatah movement. The Palestinian authority can hardly guarantee control of the activities of these groups against Israel. Implementing this provision thus becomes a challenge for Israel. Tal-Landman (2010) has added a fifth issue which is the recognition of Israel as the State of the Jewish People. This is not just the recognition of the existence of the state but also the acceptance of its existence.

This translates into recognition of Palestinians and Jews as national groups in the context of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. He notes that: "It goes beyond de facto existence of political entities, and aims rather at a recognition of their existence de jure: a recognition of the rights upon which their political existence is based, and specifically, the right of each state to sovereign self-determination on the basis of a national collective identity which therefore grants them the right to political self-determination". At another level, this is a demand that the Palestinian side not only recognize the right of the Jewish people to a national homeland, but also the right to establish its country as a Jewish state in the land of Israel. This recognition will absolve Israel of any wrongdoing to the Palestinians in establishing themselves in Palestine as a Jewish state since they have a right to do so. This obviously strikes at the very root of the agitation of the Palestinians. Attempts at resolving the issues using conventional conflict resolution mechanisms where conflict parties are willing to compromise while seeking to maximize their own interest do not seem to have succeeded in this case (Landman, 2010). This is the uniqueness of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict is that no formula that is mutually acceptable has been found to both sides.

LEGAL FRAMEWORKS FOR RESOLUTION

Laws of Natural Right and self-determination: this law of national right was first propagated by an English philosopher known as John Locke in 1689 when he postulated that all individuals are equal in the sense that they are born with inalienable natural rights which he argues is God given (Constitutional Rights Foundation, 2001). These rights are life, liberty and property in man's pursuit of happiness. When the UN committee on Palestine was constituted to look into the conflicts in the area to recommend a way forward, they undertook widespread consultations including Zionist/Israeli organizations and Arab organizations/countries from within and outside the area (United Nations, 1947). The Arab organizations however, boycotted such consultations citing the Law of Natural Rights to be allowed to come into play especially since the British colonialist had withdrawn their mandate (United Nations, 1947). Veritable examples of the Natural Law were already at play in nations that had achieved independence such as the United States who used the law to campaign for their independence.

They thus advocated for the Palestinian natural rights should be recognized by the UN and they should be giving full independence (United Nations, 1947). In addition to their natural rights, the Arabs also declared their rights to self-determination which is one of the principal ideologies upon which the UN charter was established. The right to self-determination also an inalienable right that must be enjoyed by everyone absent of any form of discrimination as enshrined in Article 1(2) of the said UN charter (Koechler, 2000). These rights, continues Koechler, were hitherto enjoyed by the Palestinians during the Ottoman Empire and as a colony under the British mandate with projections of gaining independence as a sovereign state. He thus argued the violation of the sovereign right to self-determination of the Palestinians at the termination of the British mandates faulting the decision of the UN to implement a "juscogens" resolution 181 putting the Palestinians in a "de-facto" position of a divested sovereignty ceding very vast Palestinian territories to Israel. This action has singlehandedly denied the people of Palestine their sovereignty, natural rights and rights to self-determination estranging them from territories that belonged to them, sources of livelihood and dignity as a people (Koechler, 2000). Despite the passage of the proposal in the UNGA, the parties involved in the conflict were not in support of the resolution (Reut Institute, 2007) at all with the Palestinians not being consulted even though they were likely to go with the decision of the Arab coalition.

The Arab coalition voted against the resolution as they still stood their ground in refusing to recognize Israel as a state and also wanting the sovereignty and rights of the peoples of Palestine to be upheld. Israel at that time was not a member of the UN and as such could not even vote but still expressed their displeasure to the resolution especially on issues bordering around the return of Palestinian refugees who they deemed to be a risk to their own internal security as they wanted to be given an opportunity to decide who returns (Reut Institute, 2007). The Israelis had other nations who recognized them and supported their plight with a solidarity vote against the resolution. However, they only formed a minimum and the resolution was passed (United Nations, 1948).

CAMP DAVID ACCORDS (CDA)

This accord was organized by the United States government in September 1978 in a two weeks secret talks that led to the signing of series of agreements between the Prime Minister of Israel Menachem Begin and the President of Egypt Anwar Sadat at the presidential retreat of President Jimmy Carter known as Camp David (History, 2018). The accords

looked to trail-blaze a path to peace in the Middle East by encouraging the withdrawal of Israel from the Arab territories it occupied in the region in exchange for the recognition of Israel by its neighbours all in an effort to ensure the security of the region. The agreements provided for self-rule for the Palestinians in Gaza and the West Bank (both occupied territories) as a positive step towards a sovereign Palestinian state; the implementation of resolution 242 – Israeli withdrawal from troops it overtook during the six day war; acknowledgment of the rights to full autonomy of the Palestinians; instatement of full diplomatic relations between the two nations; and partnership on the usage of the Suez Canal and Straits of Tiran to the benefit of both nations (History, 2018).

OSLO ACCORDS

The Oslo Accords signed on the 13th September 1993 (and the second in 1995) saw the leaders of Israel and Palestine come to a negotiated agreement to that allowed for both sides to recognize each other – Israel as a state that is officially recognized by the Palestinians and also Israel recognizing Palestine under the leadership of the Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO) with the authority to govern (though limited) the Gaza Strip and the West Bank with the potential for a more sustainable deal within a five year period (SBS News, 2019; History, 2018). The parleys between the warring groups that led to this agreement started with secret meetings in Norway so as to avoid any backlash that could come up as a result of the various controversies on both divides that could impact on the negotiations because of the extremes that several parties held on both sides (History, 2018)

CONCLUSION

The skirmish between these two countries has been persisting despite a serious efforts of United Nations Security Council and general assembly. These two worlds' prominent agencies passed resolution to maintain peace in the region, however they have not been applied by both the countries. They are confused regarding which one of them is most suitable for the interest of their respective countries. Arabian waning support to the Palestinians and the abiding support of the United States for the Israeli opened up new frontiers in Israel Arab relations which enhance the plight of the Palestinians. All the countries have been anticipating a peace deal to maintain a peace in the regions to foster an economic relationships, economic development. It helps to ensure freedom, rights and justice to the people of the middle-east countries. The world continues to anticipate a peace deal that will finally put the region at peace, foster mutually beneficial relationships, development and ensure freedoms, rights and justice. The subjugation of the rights of the Palestinians will fester the misgivings and the animosity. It will facilitate the killings, destructions, hatred and conspiracies to annihilate the people of each counties as their enemies. Russia, Turkey, United Nations, European Union, United States are needed to play an apathetic role to evolve a lasting solution to maintain peace in the region. In essence, the road to peace in the region is very sinuous and arduous. It is important for both the countries to mutually establish an acceptable solution to ensure freedoms, rights, fairness, peaceful life and dignity of the innocent people of the region. The peace is needed to facilitate the trade not in the Middle East but in all the continents to elevate the living standard of the people.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Aljazeera (2003, December 4)The second intifada. Retrieved April 22, 2020, from AJImpact: <https://www.aljazeera.com>
- [2]. BBC. (2019, May 14). Eurovision 2019: The Israeli-Palestinian situation explained. Retrieved April 7, 2020, from BBC News: <https://www.bbc.com>
- [3]. Constitutional Rights Foundation. (2001)the declaration of independence and natural rights. Retrieved April 13, 2020, from Constitutional Rights Foundation: <https://www.crf-usa.org>
- [4]. Galnoor, I. (1995). The partition of Palestine: Decision crossroads in the Zionist movement. Albany, New York: State University of New Yourk Press.
- [5]. Haberman, C. (1994, October 27). The Jordan-Israel accord: the overview. Retrieved April 20, 2020, from The New York Times: <https://www.nytimes.com>
- [6]. Israel Ministry of Foreign Affairs. (2013, July 20). Israel-Syria armistice agreement. Retrieved April 14, 2020, from Israel Ministry of Foreign Affairs: <https://www.mfa.gov.il>
- [7]. Isseroff, A. (1947, September 1). Report of UNSCOP - 1947. Retrieved April 13, 2020, from Mid West Web: <https://www.mideastweb.org>
- [8]. Jerusalem Post. (2012, August 24). Egypt affirms commitment to Israel peace treaty. Retrieved April 20, 2020, from The Jerusalem Post: <https://www.jpost.com>.
- [9]. May, A. (2017, September 29). What is Yom Kippur? How do Jews observe it? Retrieved April 21, 2020, from USA Today: <https://www.usatoday.com>