

## The Emergence of Ideologies in the Post-Arab-Israeli Conflict: A Realist and Genealogical Geopolitical Analysis

Cahaya Mulyani Sakti<sup>1</sup>, Mohammad Izdiyan Muttaqin<sup>2</sup>, Hendra Kurniawan<sup>3</sup>

Universitas Indonesia, Indonesia

Email: cahaya.mulyani@ui.ac.id, moh.izdiyan@ui.ac.id, hendrakm@icloud.com

### ABSTRACT

Beyond the Middle East, this confrontation has evolved into a major international political issue with profound global repercussions. The shifting regional landscape and the realignment of alliances underscore the deep geopolitical dimensions shaped by the conflict. Rather than serving as neutral mediators, several global political actors have viewed this confrontation as an arena to consolidate and expand their influence in the Middle East, further intensifying the escalation. This phenomenon has fostered the emergence of diverse ideological movements responding to the conflict, particularly to the colonization undertaken by Zionist forces. This study examines how the Arab-Israeli conflict has shaped the modern global political order through a historical lens, leading to the emergence and transformation of ideological currents. Employing a qualitative approach that integrates historical analysis, case study, and genealogical discourse analysis within the frameworks of classical realism and geopolitical theory, the research traces the evolution of ideologies on both sides of the conflict. The findings reveal a complex landscape of ideological responses, categorized into Arab resistance movements (Pan-Arabism, Anti-Colonialism, Marxism/Arab Socialism), religion-based movements ( Hamas, Hezbollah, Jewish Anti-Zionism, Revisionist Zionism, Religious Zionism, Christian Zionism), and global movements (Neoconservatism, BDS). The study concludes that the Arab-Israeli conflict is not merely a territorial struggle but an ideological battle encompassing questions of identity, religion, and global power, which significantly complicates the pursuit of a just and lasting peace.

**KEYWORDS** Arab-Israeli Conflict, Zionism, Palestine, Middle East, Ideology.



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International

### INTRODUCTION

The Arab–Israeli Conflict stands as one of the most enduring and complex confrontations in modern international relations, with roots stretching back over a century and ramifications that continue to shape global politics (Amal, 2020; Pappé, 2017). What began as a local dispute over land and national self-determination in Mandatory Palestine has evolved into a multifaceted geopolitical struggle involving regional states, global powers, and numerous non-state actors. Its trajectory—marked by conventional wars, intifadas, diplomatic initiatives, and ongoing occupation—has not only redrawn the political map of the Middle East but has also profoundly influenced the foreign policies of major powers, international law, and global security paradigms (Setiawan et al., 2024; Pratiwi et al., 2022).

Since Israel declared its independence on May 14, 1948, a series of major wars have erupted, including the Arab–Israeli Wars (1948, 1956, 1967, 1973), the various Palestinian Intifadas, and subsequent international interventions (Pappé, 2006; Ali et

al., 2022). The regional political landscape then began to shift as countries such as Iran, Turkey, and the Gulf States—along with agreements like the Camp David Accords (1979), the Oslo Accords (1993), and the Abraham Accords (2020)—marked a transformation of alliances and political interests in the Arab world (Anziska, 2018; Baqai & Mehreen, 2021).

International political actors such as the United States and the Soviet Union (Russia) used this conflict as an arena to strengthen their respective influence in the Middle East, particularly during the Cold War. Even after the collapse of the Soviet Union, the conflict has remained a central factor in U.S. foreign policy and that of other Western nations (Ridha et al., 2024). Beyond the territorial disputes that reshaped the political map of the Middle East and the world, this conflict has also become a battleground of ideologies, radicalization movements, and the rise of Islamist groups—both as responses to and as forms of resistance against colonialism and imperialism (Davoudpour, 2024). Against this backdrop, this study aims to analyze how the Arab–Israeli conflict has influenced the modern world’s political landscape from a historical perspective, leading to the emergence of new ideologies both regionally and globally, ranging from resistance movements to support for colonialism and the violence perpetrated by Zionist groups in the Middle East, particularly in occupied Palestine.

The urgency of this research is underscored by the conflict’s enduring centrality to regional and global stability. The recent events of October 7, 2023, and the subsequent war in Gaza have tragically demonstrated the conflict’s potential to erupt with devastating force at any moment. In such a volatile context, understanding the deep-seated ideological drivers that shape the perceptions, goals, and actions of the various actors is not merely an academic exercise; it is a prerequisite for any meaningful attempt at conflict resolution. A peace process that ignores these powerful ideological currents—ranging from religious Zionism’s claim to divine land to Hamas’s principle of armed resistance—is unlikely to succeed. A comprehensive mapping of these ideologies is therefore essential for policymakers, diplomats, and civil society actors seeking to navigate the complexities of the conflict.

The novelty of this study lies in its integrated theoretical and methodological approach. It combines the structural lens of classical realism, focusing on the pursuit of power and national interest by states (Morgenthau, 1951), with the critical, deconstructive lens of Foucauldian genealogy (Foucault, 1980) to uncover the power relations embedded within ideological discourses. This dual framework allows for an analysis that simultaneously acknowledges the geopolitical strategies of states and the internal, discursive construction of ideologies of resistance and domination. Furthermore, by adopting a broad, comparative scope encompassing Arab, Islamic, Jewish, and Western ideological formations, this research provides a unique, panoramic view of the ideological landscape shaped by the conflict.

The primary purpose of this research is to conduct a comprehensive analysis of the emergence and transformation of key ideologies that have arisen in the context of

the post-1948 Arab–Israeli conflict. The specific objectives are: (1) to trace the historical evolution of the conflict and its key turning points that have served as catalysts for ideological production; (2) to identify and categorize the major ideological movements on both the pro-Palestinian and pro-Israeli sides; (3) to analyze the core tenets, historical roots, and strategic orientations of each ideology; and (4) to assess how these diverse and often competing ideologies have collectively shaped the conflict’s trajectory and continue to influence prospects for peace.

This research is expected to make significant contributions to the field. Theoretically, it offers a novel framework for analyzing protracted conflict by demonstrating the utility of combining realist and genealogical perspectives to understand the interplay between power politics and ideological discourse. Practically, the findings provide a valuable resource for scholars, students, policymakers, and practitioners. The comprehensive mapping of ideologies can serve as a foundational tool for understanding the motivations of key actors, anticipating potential flashpoints, and informing more nuanced and effective approaches to diplomacy, peacebuilding, and conflict resolution. By illuminating the deep ideological roots of the conflict, this study aims to contribute to a more realistic—and therefore more potentially productive—conversation about its future.

## **RESEARCH METHOD**

This study employs a qualitative approach that integrates historical analysis, case study, and genealogical discourse analysis within the theoretical framework of classical realism and geopolitical theory. The research design follows the principles of qualitative inquiry as outlined by Creswell and Poth (2018), emphasizing an interpretive and contextual understanding of the ideological dynamics arising from the Arab–Israeli conflict. Historical analysis is used to trace the evolution of the conflict and shifts in power structures through the stages of historical research as elaborated by Gottschalk (1985) and Kuntowijoyo (2008).

The framework of classical realism proposed by Morgenthau (1951) is applied to explain that state behavior is driven by national interests and the pursuit of power within an anarchic international system, while the geopolitical perspective articulated by Fawcett (2020) contextualizes the strategic significance of spatial domination in shaping regional and global political orders. Furthermore, the genealogical method formulated by Foucault (1980) is employed to uncover the underlying power relations embedded within ideological discourses of resistance, such as Palestinian nationalism, Pan-Arabism, and political Islam. In this context, the insights of Meijer and Kuus (2015) on geopolitical expertise and the authority of knowledge provide a critical lens through which to understand how the production of knowledge and power are intertwined in the formation of political discourse.

Data validity is ensured through triangulation between primary and secondary sources, while interpretive rigor is maintained through reflective analysis and

theoretical consistency. All interpretations are conducted ethically and neutrally to uphold academic integrity and objectivity throughout the research process.

## **RESULT AND DISCUSSION**

### **The History of the Arab–Israeli Conflict and Its Global Impact**

Following the end of World War II, Britain handed over the Palestine Mandate to the United Nations, which subsequently proposed the UN Partition Plan for Palestine (Resolution 181, 1947). The Zionist movement accepted the plan enthusiastically, while the Arab states rejected it, deeming the division unjust for the indigenous Arab–Palestinian population (Morris, 2008; Amal, 2020). On May 14, 1948, the Zionists declared the establishment of the State of Israel. The next day, a coalition of Arab states—Egypt, Jordan, Syria, Iraq, and Lebanon—responded by launching a military offensive against Israel (Shlaim, 2001; Smith, 2005). Israel ultimately won the war, seizing more territory than had been allocated by the UN, and approximately 700,000 Palestinians were displaced—an event known as An-Nakbah (the Catastrophe) (Pappé, 2006; Muhawi via Darwish, 2019:22). The war resulted in the West Bank falling under Jordanian control, Gaza under Egyptian administration, and the destruction of over 400 Palestinian villages (Akash et al., 2003:16; Gelvin, 2014; Middle East Eye, 2024).

In 1956, Egyptian President Gamal Abdel Nasser initiated the nationalization of the Suez Canal, previously controlled by Britain and France (Kunz, 1991; Varble, 2009; Kyle, 2011). In response, Israel, Britain, and France attacked Egypt on October 29, 1956 (Shlaim, 2000; Verbeek, 2020). Although Egypt suffered militarily, it achieved a diplomatic victory, as the United States and the Soviet Union pressured Israel to withdraw from the Sinai Peninsula by March 1957. Nasser emerged as a key leader in the Arab world, strengthening Arab nationalism (Karsh, 2013; Moeller, 2016; Chondros, 2024). Tensions escalated in the following years as Egypt mobilized troops in Sinai and imposed a blockade on Israel, culminating in the Six-Day War (Bregman, 2016; Shlaim, 2000). On June 5, 1967, Israel launched a preemptive strike against Egypt, Syria, and Jordan (Oren, 2002). Israel won the war and seized significant territories: the West Bank and East Jerusalem (from Jordan), Gaza and Sinai (from Egypt), and the Golan Heights (from Syria). The UN Security Council issued Resolution 242 (1967), calling for Israeli withdrawal from occupied territories; however, this was never fully implemented (Calvocoressi, 2008; Rosdiana, 2023).

The next major confrontation was the Yom Kippur War. On October 6, 1973, Egypt and Syria launched a surprise attack on Israel during the Jewish holy day of Yom Kippur, aiming to reclaim Sinai and the Golan Heights (Bar-Joseph, 2001; Herzog & Gazit, 2005; Rodman, 2013). Although Egypt initially succeeded in crossing the Suez Canal, Israel eventually prevailed militarily. The 1973 Oil Crisis, a response to Western support for Israel, demonstrated how the conflict could disrupt global economic stability, impacting international trade, energy security, and strategic maritime routes such as the Suez Canal (Kober, 2008; Zohar, 2022).

In 1982, Israel invaded Lebanon, citing the need to expel the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), install a pro-Israel government, and destroy the PLO’s military infrastructure in southern Lebanon (Collin, 1983; Gabriel, 1984; Fisk, 1990). On June 3, Israeli Foreign Minister Yitzhak Shamir called for the elimination of the PLO to advance the Camp David peace process. That same day, Israeli Ambassador Shlomo Argov was severely wounded in London in an attack attributed to the PLO, prompting a massive Israeli air campaign. Waves of F-16 bombings followed, with PLO units retaliating with rocket fire (Kumaraswamy, 2019; Mallison et al., 1983; Naor & Lewin, 2022; Khalidi, 1986). After years of war, Palestinians initiated grassroots resistance movements known as the Intifada. The First Intifada began with mass protests, strikes, and civil disobedience. Palestinians demonstrated, boycotted Israeli goods, and youth hurled stones at Israeli soldiers (Nassar & Heacock, 1990; Bar-Joseph, 2001; Farraj, 2017; Beinun & Hajjar, 2020). A pivotal moment was the establishment of Hamas in 1987, a more militant Islamic movement that emerged as a response to Zionist colonial domination (Tamimi, 2007; Caridi, 2012; Filiu, 2012; Baconi, 2018).

During this period, the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) declared Palestinian independence (1988) in Algiers and began diplomatic negotiations with Israel, culminating in the Oslo Accords (1993). The First Intifada formally ended with Oslo I (1993), which led to the creation of the Palestinian Authority (PA). However, Israel’s continued occupation led to the Second Intifada (2000–2005). Disillusionment grew over Yasser Arafat’s leadership, which failed to achieve full Palestinian sovereignty. After Arafat’s death, Mahmoud Abbas was elected president in 2005. The same year saw increasing tensions between Hamas and Fatah, culminating in the political split of the Palestinian government in 2007 (Quandt, 2005; Smith, 2010; Cohen-Almagor, 2018; Khalidi, 2020).

Next, the following table presents a series of attacks and resistance movements that have occurred in the Gaza Strip.

**Table 1.** Series of Resistance Movements and Attacks in Gaza

Year	Operation	Trigger	Impact	Source
2008–2009	Cast Lead	Hamas took control of Gaza (2007)	Thousands of casualties, massive destruction of infrastructure	B’Tselem (2021)
2012	Pillar of Defense	Israel assassinated Ahmed Jabari (Hamas)	Eight-day war, Egyptian-brokered ceasefire	HRW (2012)
2014	Protective Edge	Kidnapping of three Israeli teenagers	Fifty-day war, thousands of casualties, widespread devastation	UN OCHA (2014)
2021	Guardian of the Walls	Escalation of tensions in East Jerusalem	Hundreds of casualties, heightened tensions	Al Jazeera (2021)

Year	Operation	Trigger	Impact	Source
2023	Al-Aqsa Flood (Tufan al-Aqsa)	Hamas resistance operation against Israel	Tens of thousands of casualties, war escalation	HRW (2023)

*Source: Author's elaboration*

The Nakba (Catastrophe) led to the displacement of hundreds of thousands of Palestinians following the establishment of Israel, resulting in the loss of most Palestinian territories (Akash et al., 2003:16; Pappé, 2006; Gelvin, 2014). In 1967, during the Six-Day War, Israel successfully occupied the West Bank, Gaza Strip, and the Golan Heights (Bregman, 2016; Shlaim, 2000). Subsequently, in 1979, Egypt became the first Arab state to sign a peace agreement with Israel, a deal that granted Israel diplomatic recognition while Egypt regained the Sinai Peninsula (ElBaradei, 1982; Bassiouni, 1980; Meron, 1980; Podeh, 2015; Ginat & Mahajneh, 2021). However, several countries, such as Iran and Syria, remained confrontational toward Israel. Meanwhile, Egypt (1979), Jordan (1994), and later the UAE, Bahrain, and Morocco (2020) normalized relations with Israel through the Abraham Accords (Vakil & Quilliam, 2023; Fakhro, 2024; Mason, 2024). The rivalry between Iran and Saudi Arabia further intensified, as Iran supported groups such as Hezbollah and Hamas, while Saudi Arabia leaned toward diplomatic solutions (Muchsin, 2015; Derajat & Kurniawan, 2018).

The Arab-Israeli conflict contributed to the outbreak of other wars, including the Lebanese Civil War (1975–1990) (Gabriel, 1984; Fisk, 1990; O'Ballance, 1998) and the Syrian Civil War (Phillips, 2016). Israel has carried out several airstrikes in Syria, primarily to counter Iranian and Hezbollah influence, while regional powers such as Iran and Saudi Arabia have exploited the instability to expand their geopolitical influence (Terrill, 2014). The prolonged conflicts in Palestine, Syria, Yemen, and Iraq have produced large waves of refugees, complicating social and economic dynamics in host countries such as Lebanon, Jordan, and Turkey (Chatty, 2010; Rother et al., 2016; Beaujouan & Rasheed, 2020; El-Abed, Najdi, & Hoshmand, 2023).

On a global scale, the United States has consistently supported Israel through military aid and diplomatic backing, while the Soviet Union before its collapse supported Arab states (Bar-Noi, 2003; Ginor & Remez, 2017; Golan, 1974; Norton, 1990; Kochavi, 2018). After the Cold War, the U.S. remained the dominant actor in Middle Eastern policy, but Russia reasserted its influence, particularly in Syria (Fernandez, 2005). The conflict has caused deep global polarization, with countries like the U.S. and parts of Europe supporting Israel, while Iran, Turkey, and several nations in the Global South have expressed support for Palestine, each driven by their own strategic and ideological interests (Zehra, 2025). The issue has repeatedly drawn UN attention, resulting in resolutions such as UN Resolution 242 (1967) and Resolution 338 (1973). Meanwhile, international judicial bodies such as the ICJ and ICC have increasingly become involved in addressing legal and humanitarian aspects of the conflict (Kent et al., 2024).

In 1973, the oil crisis erupted after Arab countries imposed an oil embargo on Western nations that supported Israel (Jacob, 2017; Merrill, 2007; Yergin, 1991; Shwadran, 2019). The conflict destabilized the Gulf and Red Sea regions, key routes for global oil trade. The embargo caused oil prices to surge from around \$3 per barrel to over \$12 per barrel within a short period. The impact was far-reaching high inflation, economic recession, and major shifts in global energy policy (Licklider, 1988; Merrill, 2007). Western nations sought alternative energy sources, expanded oil exploration outside the Middle East, and adopted energy efficiency policies. In the Gulf and Red Sea, the crisis elevated the geopolitical importance of energy trade routes, encouraged Gulf states to play a greater role in the global economy, and strengthened ties between Middle Eastern oil producers and consumer nations in Asia and Europe (Yergin, 1991; Putri, 2014; Zulkifli & Hakeem, 2022).

### **The Emergence of Ideologies**

The Arab-Israeli conflict has had a profound impact on the political dynamics of the Middle East since the mid-20th century (Fernandez, 2005; Kent et al., 2024; Zehra, 2025), particularly in the politicization of identity and ideology. The conflict strengthened both Arab nationalism and Islamic solidarity in support of Palestine. Furthermore, the rise of Pan-Arabism, led by Gamal Abdel Nasser in Egypt, emerged as a political and ideological response to Israel (Kunz, 1991; Varble, 2009; Kyle, 2011). Movements such as Hamas, Hezbollah, and other jihadist organizations framed Israel's occupation of Palestine and the broader struggle against it as symbols of global resistance (Morgenthau, 1948; Said, 1979; Gregory, 2004; Walt, 2002). By collecting historical documents, archival records, and writings from key thinkers and movement leaders, along with relevant academic literature, this study identifies the formation and transformation of ideologies that emerged following the Arab-Israeli conflict, which began militarily in 1948. Employing Michel Foucault's genealogical approach, the research explores how discourses and social practices have shaped the evolution of ideology (Foucault, 1977; Howarth, 2000; Karlsen & Villadsen, 2015; D'Cruz, 2024).

#### **1. Arab Resistance Movements**

In supporting the Palestinian struggle, Palestinian nationalism centered on building a national identity and establishing an independent Palestinian state. This aspiration was institutionalized through the founding of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) in 1964, which later gained international recognition, including non-member observer state status at the United Nations in 2012 (Gelber, 1988; Quandt, 2005; Smith, 2010; Cohen-Almagor, 2018; Khalidi, 2020).

#### **Pan-Arabism**

Pan-Arabism, as an ideology emphasizing the unity of Arab nations against imperialism and Zionism, played a crucial role in shaping the foreign policies of Arab states, particularly within the context of the Arab-Israeli wars and the formation of the Arab League. The defeat of the Arab states in the 1948 Arab-Israeli War, which not only consolidated the establishment of Israel but also resulted in the exodus of more than 700,000 Palestinians, became a pivotal moment of reflection for the Arab world.

This event exposed the political and military weaknesses of Arab regimes, reinforcing the conviction that Arab unity was the only path to confront Western colonialism and Zionist expansion. Within this context, Pan-Arabism emerged as a powerful ideology promising to restore the dignity and strength of the Arab world (Gelber, 1988; Hudson, 1969; Dawisha, 2003; Farah, 2019).

The leading proponent of this ideology was Gamal Abdel Nasser, the Egyptian leader who rose to prominence after the 1952 Revolution. Nasser promoted the idea of Arab unity as part of a broader struggle to liberate Palestine and resist imperialism, placing the Palestinian issue at the heart of Pan-Arab rhetoric as a symbol of collective Arab resistance. Nasser's charisma and revolutionary agenda attracted support from other Arab states such as Syria and Iraq, which were influenced by similar ideologies through the Ba'ath Party (Hourani, 1991; Gelvin, 2007). The establishment of the United Arab Republic (1958–1961) represented a concrete manifestation of this vision, although its short-lived existence revealed the inherent challenges of achieving Arab solidarity against Western dominance and Zionism.

Nevertheless, the high hopes placed on Pan-Arabism began to fade after the defeat in the 1967 Six-Day War (Bregman, 2016; Shlaim, 2000). This loss not only humiliated the Arab military forces but also undermined the legitimacy of Pan-Arabism as a collective resistance strategy. The failure prompted widespread criticism and the search for alternative ideologies, including state-based nationalism and political Islamism. Despite this ideological shift, the Palestinian struggle remained a central element in regional political discourse, even though it was no longer primarily articulated through the framework of Pan-Arabism (Khalidi, 1997).

### **Anti-Colonialism Movement**

The anti-colonial movement provided an ideological foundation for the Palestinian struggle by rejecting Israeli occupation and foreign domination (Massad, 2006). The aftermath of the 1948 war and the establishment of the Zionist state not only led to mass displacement and humanitarian crises in Palestine but also triggered a new wave of radical anti-colonialism across the Arab world. Many Arab intellectuals and political leaders began to interpret the conflict not merely as a territorial dispute but as a manifestation of modern colonialism, embodied by the Zionist project and backed by Western imperial powers such as Britain and the United States. Within this framework, the Palestinian cause came to be seen as an integral part of the global struggle against colonialism and foreign domination.

This anti-colonial ideology provided both the moral and political foundation for numerous Palestinian liberation movements most notably Fatah and the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine (PFLP) which combined Arab nationalism with revolutionary Third Worldist theories (Sayigh, 1997; Khalidi, 1997). The movement framed Zionist occupation within the same paradigm as French colonialism in Algeria or British colonialism in Egypt, thereby legitimizing armed resistance as a legitimate form of national liberation. This discourse was also influenced by global anti-imperialist thinkers such as Frantz Fanon and Che Guevara, who emphasized the

necessity of revolutionary violence to dismantle colonial structures. For Palestinians and their supporters, the struggle was not merely about reclaiming land, but also about resisting a global system that perpetuated colonial domination in new forms. This narrative fostered solidarity between Palestine and other Third World nations, especially during the Cold War era, when international support for anti-colonial struggles reached its peak (Lockman, 2004; Gresh, 1988).

The Palestinian liberation movement was thus not isolated; it became part of a broader network of anti-colonial and anti-imperialist movements worldwide. Palestine emerged as a symbol of resistance against structural injustices in the postcolonial order, a sentiment reflected in international platforms such as the 1955 Bandung Conference and the Non-Aligned Movement. Hence, the Arab-Israeli conflict should not be understood solely as a matter of national identity, but also as part of a larger decolonization project that rejected all forms of foreign domination whether through military occupation or global political-economic intervention (Farsoun & Aruri, 2006).

### **Marxism and Arab Socialism**

This ideology opposed imperialism and global capitalism, giving rise to leftist movements supported by the Soviet Union during the Cold War (Kristeva, 2010). The Arab-Israeli conflicts, particularly after the defeats of 1948 and 1967, catalyzed the rise of Marxism and Arab Socialism as alternatives to traditional nationalism, which had failed to confront imperialism and Zionism effectively. Many Arab intellectuals and activists came to perceive the Zionist project as part of global capitalist expansion and Western imperial domination in the Middle East. Within this framework, Arab Socialism, promoted by leaders such as Gamal Abdel Nasser, emphasized economic self-reliance, nationalization of resources, and resistance to foreign domination. Simultaneously, Marxist ideology flourished within Palestinian resistance movements, particularly through leftist groups such as the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine (PFLP), founded in 1967 by George Habash. The PFLP combined Arab nationalism with Marxist class analysis, advocating armed revolutionary struggle as the means to liberate Palestine and dismantle the capitalist structures sustaining occupation (Sayigh, 1997; Gresh, 1988).

During the Cold War, leftist Palestinian movements such as the PFLP and Arab communist parties received political, military, and ideological support from the Soviet Union and other Eastern Bloc states. This support not only strengthened their internal position within the Palestinian liberation movement but also elevated the Palestinian issue as part of the global anti-imperialist agenda. The Soviet Union viewed the Arab-Israeli conflict as a geopolitical confrontation between Western capitalist powers and progressive Third World nations striving for independence and social justice. Within this perspective, the Palestinian struggle was framed as a legitimate people's revolution against colonialism and global capitalist expansion (Khalidi, 1997; Lockman, 2004). Therefore, Marxism and Arab Socialism not only shaped the political and military strategies of the Palestinian resistance but also provided an ideological

framework linking the Palestinian cause with broader international liberation movements in Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

## **2. Religion-Based Resistance Movements**

The emergence of religion-based resistance movements in the Palestinian struggle reflected a shift from secular nationalism toward ideologically driven activism rooted in Islamic principles. These movements arose in response to the perceived failures of secular and pan-Arab approaches to liberate Palestine and counter Israeli occupation. The fusion of faith and resistance became a source of moral legitimacy and social mobilization among Palestinians, emphasizing jihad as both a spiritual and political duty. Among the most prominent of these movements is Hamas, founded in 1987 during the First Intifada as an offshoot of the Muslim Brotherhood, combining armed resistance with extensive social and political engagement in Palestinian society (Gunning, 2008; Milton-Edwards & Farrell, 2010).

### **Hamas**

Hamas embodies both armed and socio-political resistance against Israeli occupation and has led the struggle in Gaza since 2007, building extensive social networks across Palestine with support from various Islamist groups (Gunning, 2008). Unlike the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine (PFLP), which was founded on Marxist and Arab Socialist principles, Hamas (Ḥarakat al-Muqāwamah al-Islāmiyyah) emerged as an Islamist response to Israeli occupation and as a reaction to the perceived failure of secular-nationalist strategies. Founded in 1987 as an offshoot of the Muslim Brotherhood, Hamas combines armed jihad against Israel with Islamic-based social and religious programs.

Its ideology rests on the rejection of the State of Israel's legitimacy and advocates for the establishment of an independent Palestinian state grounded in Islamic principles. In its founding charter (1988), Hamas portrays the Palestinian conflict not merely as a territorial dispute, but as an existential and religious struggle against Zionist colonialism supported by foreign powers (Mishal & Sela, 2000; Tamimi, 2007). Hamas also strongly criticizes the secular approaches of the PLO and Fatah, which it perceives as overly conciliatory in political negotiations with Israel.

Despite its distinct ideological foundation, Hamas integrates anti-imperialist rhetoric within its narrative of resistance. In many of its statements and strategies, Hamas equates Israeli occupation with colonialism and situates it within the broader Western and American domination of the Islamic world. In this sense, the Palestinian struggle is framed as part of a global jihad against Western oppression and political hegemony. Unlike leftist groups that drew support from the Eastern Bloc, Hamas gained sympathy and backing from Islamic or anti-Western states, notably Iran, especially after the 1990s, despite doctrinal differences between Sunni and Shia Islam. Moreover, Hamas has strengthened its domestic legitimacy among Palestinians through extensive networks of social welfare, education, and healthcare services, positioning itself not only as a resistance movement but also as an alternative governing authority with a strong grassroots base (Roy, 2011).

## **Hezbollah**

Although based in Lebanon, Hezbollah has played a significant role in resistance against Israel, particularly through expelling Israeli forces from southern Lebanon in 2000 (Norton, 2007). Hezbollah emerged in response to the Israeli military invasion of Lebanon in 1982, as well as from the rise of Shi'a political Islam following the Iranian Revolution of 1979. The movement was founded by networks of Lebanese Shi'a clerics inspired by Ayatollah Khomeini's teachings, adopting the doctrine of Wilāyat al-Faqīh (Guardianship of the Jurist).

From its inception, Hezbollah positioned itself as an Islamic resistance movement against Israeli occupation in southern Lebanon and as a protector of Lebanon's Shi'a community from foreign domination and Western hegemony. In its ideological discourse, Hezbollah depicts Israel as a colonial project supported by global imperialism and calls for total resistance as the only viable means of liberating Arab lands from occupation (Norton, 2007; Harik, 2004). Thus, despite its Lebanese origins, Hezbollah's agenda aligns closely with the Palestinian struggle and situates the movement within a broader regional resistance framework.

Hezbollah became a symbol of effective anti-Israeli resistance, particularly after successfully forcing Israel's withdrawal from southern Lebanon in 2000 and during its confrontation with Israeli forces in the 2006 Lebanon War. These achievements strengthened Hezbollah's image as a defender not only of Lebanon but also of the broader Muslim and Palestinian cause. Hezbollah receives substantial support from the Islamic Republic of Iran, including military training, funding, and weapons supplies. In his speeches, Hezbollah's leader, Sayyid Hassan Nasrallah, frequently links the organization's struggle with that of the Palestinians and condemns political compromises with Israel. Consequently, Hezbollah has shaped its identity as part of a transnational anti-colonial and anti-imperialist movement, opposing not only Israeli occupation but also the influence of the United States and its regional allies across the Middle East (Saad-Ghorayeb, 2002) (Alagha, 2025).

## **Jewish Anti-Zionism**

This movement is represented by groups such as *Neturei Karta* and *Jewish Voice for Peace*, which oppose Zionism on the grounds that it contradicts Jewish teachings or functions as a colonial project an argument reflected in their activism against Israeli policies and their support for Palestine (Ellis, 2009). The Jewish anti-Zionist movement arises from the conviction that the Zionist project and the establishment of the State of Israel contradict the core principles of Judaism, particularly its emphasis on universal justice and its rejection of exclusive nationalism. One of the most vocal groups within this movement is *Neturei Karta*, an ultra-Orthodox Jewish community that believes Jews have no right to establish a state before the coming of the Messiah. They reject the legitimacy of Israel and regard its founding as an act of rebellion against divine will (Weiss, 2008). Alongside *Neturei Karta*, the movement also finds strong expression among progressive Jewish circles such as *Jewish Voice for Peace* (JVP), based in the United States. JVP rejects Zionism as an ideology used to justify

settler colonialism and the oppression of the Palestinian people, and actively participates in the Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions (BDS) campaign against Israel (Makdisi, 2010).

Although differing in theological and political approaches, both groups demonstrate that not all Jews support the policies of the Israeli state or the ideology of Zionism. In various international forums and protest movements, they express solidarity with the Palestinian people and call for an end to occupation and human rights violations committed by Israel. Jewish anti-Zionism also challenges the dominant narrative that criticism of Israel is inherently anti-Semitic, emphasizing instead that opposing colonialism and apartheid is part of the moral and spiritual values of Judaism itself (Butler, 2012). Thus, this movement enriches the landscape of resistance against Israeli occupation by revealing the plurality of voices within the Jewish community.

### **Revisionist Zionism**

This movement is more militant and expansionist, rejecting compromise with Palestine and giving rise to Israel's right-wing factions such as *Likud* and the settlement movement in the West Bank (Shindler, 2015). Revisionist Zionism emerged in the early twentieth century as an ideological current within the Zionist movement, formed in response to the moderate approach of mainstream Zionism. Led by Vladimir Jabotinsky, Revisionist Zionism emphasized the use of military force and the establishment of a Jewish state across the entire territory of the historic *Eretz Yisrael*, including all of Mandatory Palestine, without compromise with the Arab Palestinian population. The movement rejected negotiation-based approaches and prioritized territorial expansion and the creation of a strong Jewish national identity through armed strength (Laqueur, 2003).

This ideology later gave birth to paramilitary organizations such as *Irgun* and *Lehi*, which carried out violent operations against Palestinians and British colonial authorities before the establishment of the State of Israel in 1948 (Morris, 2001). After Israel's founding, the principles of Revisionism continued through right-wing political parties, particularly *Herut* and later *Likud*, which became dominant forces in Israeli politics from the late 1970s onward. *Likud*, founded by Menachem Begin, inherited the spirit of Revisionism through its rejection of the two-state solution and its promotion of expansionist policies, including the aggressive construction of Jewish settlements in the occupied West Bank (Peleg, 1997). The settlement movement represents the concrete manifestation of Revisionist ideology, which not only rejects territorial compromise but also denies the collective rights and legitimacy of the Palestinian people. Within the broader Arab-Israeli conflict, Revisionist Zionism has played a crucial role in shaping Israel's modern settler-colonial character and in obstructing peace efforts based on justice and the recognition of Palestinian rights.

### **Religious Zionism**

This ideology views Israel as the divinely promised land in Jewish teachings and supports the territorial expansion of Israel on religious grounds, contributing significantly to Jewish settlement projects in the West Bank (Gorenberg, 2006). Religious Zionism is a branch of Zionist ideology that merges Jewish nationalism with the belief that the Land of Israel (*Eretz Yisrael*) is a divine inheritance granted to the Jewish people, as articulated in sacred texts such as the Torah. Unlike secular Zionism, which justified the establishment of Israel on historical and cultural grounds, Religious Zionism interprets the Jewish return to the land as part of a divine plan and a messianic process.

The movement gained significant momentum after the 1967 Six-Day War, during which Israel captured the West Bank, East Jerusalem, and other territories considered sacred in Jewish tradition (Bregman, 2016; Shlaim, 2000; Najamuddin & Purnamasari, 2023). This victory was seen by adherents of Religious Zionism as evidence of divine intervention and theological justification for establishing Jewish settlements in these areas (Aran, 1991; Inbari, 2012). The movement played a central role in promoting Jewish settlement projects in the West Bank, often through organizations such as *Gush Emunim*, which regarded the establishment of settlements as a religious duty.

Religious Zionism has also provided the ideological foundation for many right-wing political parties, such as *The Jewish Home* and the *Religious Zionist Party*, which oppose territorial compromise with Palestine and advocate for the annexation of occupied territories. By grounding expansionist policies in religious justification, Religious Zionism has reinforced Israel's expansionist politics and complicated peace efforts by transforming a geopolitical conflict into a theological one (Sprinzak, 1991). In this context, Religious Zionism contributes to the deepening intractability of the conflict by framing the land as a divine right that cannot be negotiated (Hershkowitz, 2022; Peled, 2022; Lustick, 1988; Mashiach, 2020).

### **Christian Zionism**

This movement originates from evangelical groups in the West and provides strong support for Israel based on their religious interpretations, exerting a major influence on U.S. foreign policy (Sizer, 2004). Christian Zionism is an ideology that developed among evangelical Christian communities (Spector, 2009), particularly in Western countries, which strongly support the State of Israel based on their biblical interpretation. For adherents of Christian Zionism, the establishment of the State of Israel in 1948 and its subsequent territorial expansion are viewed as the fulfillment of biblical prophecy and as part of God's divine plan in the history of human salvation. In this worldview, the land of Israel is seen as belonging to the Jewish people, and their return to it is interpreted as a sign of the coming of the Messiah and the realization of an eschatological destiny (Liebman, 2002; Cohn-Sherbok, 2006).

Christian Zionism has had a significant influence on the foreign policy of the United States, where many evangelical groups urge the U.S. government to offer

unwavering support for Israel in international forums and through substantial military and economic aid (Goldman, 2018; Inbari, Bumin, & Byrd, 2021). The influence of Christian Zionism has become increasingly evident in recent decades, as organizations such as *Christians United for Israel* (CUFI) have become among the largest pro-Israel lobbying groups in the United States, with millions of followers mobilizing political support for Israel (Spector, 2009; Goldman, 2018).

The appeal of Christian Zionism is also reflected in Israel's reliance on political and financial backing from Western countries particularly the United States which has become Israel's key partner in shaping and implementing its foreign policy. However, despite the extensive support that Christian Zionism offers to Israel, the movement has been widely criticized for denying Palestinian rights and for its lack of awareness regarding the political complexities of the region especially concerning the plight of Palestinian refugees and the ongoing occupation of contested territories (Gellman, 2009).

### **3. Global Movements**

The emergence of global movements related to the Israel–Palestine conflict reflects a growing international awareness of issues concerning justice, human rights, and modern forms of colonialism. These movements have developed beyond the boundaries of the Middle East and are rooted in transnational solidarity with the Palestinian struggle, which is widely regarded as a symbol of resistance against oppression and global injustice. Support for this cause has arisen not only from developing countries but also from civil society, academics, activists, and international institutions across the world who highlight human rights violations and Israel's occupation policies. Moreover, global media and digital networks have accelerated the dissemination of alternative narratives that challenge the dominance of Western mainstream discourse surrounding the conflict.

#### **Neoconservatism**

This ideology has been advanced by the United States and the West, viewing Israel as a strategic ally an outlook reflected in pro-Israel U.S. policies, including billions of dollars in annual aid and the consistent use of veto power against anti-Israel resolutions at the United Nations (Muravchik, 2007; Kristol, 1995; Fukuyama, 2006). Neoconservatism is a political ideology that emerged in the United States during the 1970s and 1980s, emphasizing the importance of military strength, foreign intervention, and support for strategic allies, particularly Israel, in the Middle East (Williams, 2005; McGlinchey, 2009). For neoconservatives, Israel is regarded as a principal ally with significant strategic value for U.S. interests both in terms of regional security and global stability.

Neoconservatism has strongly influenced U.S. foreign policy by promoting a staunchly pro-Israel stance, including the allocation of billions of dollars in annual military aid and consistent political backing for Israel in international forums, particularly at the United Nations, where the U.S. has frequently exercised its veto power against resolutions deemed unfavorable to Israel (Kagan, 2003). This ideology

became especially evident in U.S. foreign policy after the Cold War, notably during the administration of George W. Bush. Neoconservatives supported aggressive policies toward states perceived as threats to U.S. interests, often positioning Israel as a key partner in Middle Eastern foreign policy.

This approach was also reflected in the 2003 Iraq War, which some analysts viewed as part of a broader strategy to bolster Israel and stabilize the region through regime change in states considered hostile to Western interests (Feith, 2008). Neoconservatism, therefore, views Israel not merely as a key ally but as an integral part of a wider foreign policy framework that prioritizes global dominance and strategic influence across the Middle East.

### **Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions (BDS)**

The global movement calls for economic, academic, and cultural boycotts of Israel to end the occupation of Palestine, having successfully raised international awareness and influenced the policies of several global institutions (Barghouti, 2011). The Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions (BDS) movement is an international campaign launched in 2005 that seeks to exert economic, academic, and cultural pressure on Israel in response to its occupation policies and violations of Palestinian rights. Inspired by the anti-apartheid struggle in South Africa, BDS aims to isolate Israel globally by boycotting goods and services linked to it, urging corporations to withdraw investments (divestment), and pressuring governments and international institutions to impose sanctions. The movement has garnered widespread support from pro-Palestinian groups, human rights activists, and several countries and international institutions that believe economic and diplomatic pressure can help end the occupation and promote justice for the Palestinian people (Pappe, 2015). Although the movement has achieved success in raising international awareness about the Palestinian issue and prompting major companies to sever ties with Israel, BDS has also faced significant opposition particularly from the Israeli government and Western nations.

Several countries, including the United States, have enacted laws prohibiting boycotts of Israel or penalizing individuals and organizations involved in BDS campaigns (Barghouti, 2011). Nevertheless, the movement has succeeded in drawing global attention to the injustices faced by the Palestinian people and has influenced the policies of various international institutions, including academic bodies that have chosen to reduce engagement with Israel. In this regard, BDS remains a relevant instrument of Palestinian resistance, despite its controversial nature across different parts of the world.

The following table presents a summary of the emergence of various ideologies across different aspects, movements, and strategies as consequences of the Arab–Israeli conflict in the Middle East.

**Table 2.** The Emergence of Ideologies as a Consequence of the Arab–Israeli Conflict

Aspect	Movement/Entity	Description	Ideas and Strategies
Arab Resistance Movements	<b>Pan-Arabism</b>	The unity of Arab nations against Zionism and imperialism.	Arab unity, anti-imperialism, anti-Zionism.
	<b>Anti-Colonialism Movement</b>	Resistance against Zionist occupation and global colonialism.	Anti-imperialism, armed resistance.
	<b>Arab Marxism and Socialism</b>	Opposition to imperialism and global capitalism.	Marxism, Arab socialism, anti-capitalism.
Religion	<b>Hamas</b>	Islamic religious resistance movement against Israel.	Establishment of a Palestinian state based on Islamic principles; resistance through jihad.
	<b>Hezbollah</b>	Shia Islamic resistance against Israel in Lebanon, supporting Palestine.	<i>Wilāyat al-Faqīh</i> , anti-colonialism, focus on the Palestinian cause.
	<b>Jewish Anti-Zionism</b>	Opposition to Zionism and the founding of Israel based on Jewish teachings.	Rejection of Zionism, support for Palestine, opposition to colonialism and apartheid.
	<b>Revisionist Zionism</b>	Expansionist ideology rejecting compromise with Palestine.	Territorial expansion of Israel, rejection of the two-state solution.
	<b>Religious Zionism</b>	Faith-based Zionism supporting Israel’s territorial expansion.	The Land of Israel as a divine inheritance; Jewish settlements in the West Bank.
	<b>Christian Zionism</b>	Support for Israel based on Christian theology.	Endorsement of Israel as part of the divine plan of salvation.
Global	<b>Neoconservatism</b>	The United States and the West support Israel as a strategic ally.	Political, military, and economic support for Israel.

Aspect	Movement/Entity	Description	Ideas and Strategies
	<b>Global Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions (BDS) Movement</b>	International campaign to pressure Israel.	Boycott, divestment, and sanctions to isolate Israel globally.

*Source: Author's elaboration*

## CONCLUSION

The various ideologies that have emerged in response to the Israeli–Palestinian conflict reveal the diversity of perspectives shaping political and social dynamics in the Middle East and the international arena. Each ideology, whether aligned with pro-Israel or pro-Palestinian positions, reflects the complexity of this conflict and has had a significant impact on international policymaking. Zionism, in its secular, religious, revisionist, and Christian forms, represents a nationalist vision that views Israel as the legitimate homeland of the Jewish people, justified through historical, religious, or political narratives. The Zionist movement has profoundly influenced Israeli policy and strengthened the state's legitimacy on the global stage, although it has often faced criticism for its disregard of Palestinian rights.

Christian Zionism demonstrates a powerful influence on U.S. foreign policy, frequently resulting in political and financial support for Israel based on specific religious interpretations. Conversely, Palestinian resistance ideologies, including Marxism, Arab Socialism, and the Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions (BDS) movement, emphasize opposition to Israeli domination and colonialism while demanding justice for the Palestinian people. The BDS movement, as a global campaign advocating boycotts, divestment, and sanctions against Israel, has succeeded in raising international awareness and pressuring several global institutions to adopt firmer positions toward Israel.

## REFERENCES

- Alagha, Joseph. (2025). *The shifts in Hizbullah's ideology: religious ideology, political ideology, and political program*. Routledge.
- Ali, M., Mustafa, G., & Ahmad, T. (2022). Arab Israel conflict: Historical analysis. *Annals of Human and Social Sciences*, 3(1), 27–36. [https://doi.org/10.35484/ahss.2022\(3-I\)04](https://doi.org/10.35484/ahss.2022(3-I)04)
- Amal, I. (2020). The Future of Israel-Palestinian Conflict: Either One State or Two? *Jurnal Global & Strategis*, 14(1), 63-78.
- Anziska, S. (2018). *Preventing Palestine: A Political History from Camp David to Oslo*. Princeton University Press.
- Aran, G. (1991). Jewish Zionist fundamentalism: The bloc of the faithful in Israel (Gush Emunim). In M. E. Marty & R. S. Appleby (Eds.), *Fundamentalisms observed* (pp. 265–344). University of Chicago Press.

- Baqai, H., & Mehreen, S. (2021). Abraham Accords: A journey from Arab-Israeli to Palestinian-Israeli conflict. *JISR Management and Social Sciences & Economics*, 19(1), 113-126. <https://doi.org/10.31384/jirmsse/2021.19.1.8>
- Beinin, J., & Hajjar, L. (2020). *Palestine, Israel, and the politics of popular culture*. Duke University Press.
- Chondros, C. (2024, February 8). The Suez Canal Crisis of 1956. National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Department of Economics and Political Sciences.
- Collins, C. (1982). Chronology of the Israeli Invasion of Lebanon June-August 1982. *Journal of Palestine Studies*, 11/12, 135–192. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2538347>
- Dawisha, A. (2003). *Arab Nationalism in the Twentieth Century: From Triumph to Despair*. Princeton University Press.
- Davoudpour, A. R. (2024). The dynamics of conflict in the Middle East: Actors, instruments of tension, and the role of sectarian violence and the Israel-Palestinian war. *Journal of Iranian International Legal Studies (IIntbar)*, August 2024. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.13293690>
- Derajat & Kurniawan (2017). Normalisasi Hubungan Israel dan Arab dalam Konteks Israel-Palestina. *Journal Intermestic: Journal of International Studies*, 1(2), 155. Diakses dari [https://www.academia.edu/124521647/Normalisasi\\_Hubungan\\_Israel\\_dan\\_Arab\\_dalam\\_Konteks\\_Israel\\_Palestina](https://www.academia.edu/124521647/Normalisasi_Hubungan_Israel_dan_Arab_dalam_Konteks_Israel_Palestina)
- Diana, R. (2023). Perang Enam Hari (Perang Arab-Israel Tahun 1967). *Edu Sociata: Jurnal Pendidikan Sosiologi*, 6(2).
- ElBaradei, M. (1982). The Egyptian-Israeli Peace Treaty and Access to the Gulf of Aqaba: A New Legal Regime. *American Journal of International Law*, 76(3), 532–554. doi:10.2307/2200785
- Fernandez, E. S. (2005). The United States and The Arab-Israeli Conflict: (Un) Forging Future Peace. *International Social Science Review*, 80(1/2), 41–50. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41887213>
- Finnemore, M., & Sikkink, K. (1998). International norm dynamics and political change. *International Organization*, 52(4), 887–917. <https://doi.org/10.1162/002081898550789>
- Gresh, A. (1988). *The PLO: The struggle within*. Zed Books.
- Gunning, J. (2008). *Hamas in Politics: Democracy, Religion, Violence*. Hurst & Company. DOI: 10.13140/2.1.2108.7045
- Holilul Azfa, S. (2022). Normalisasi Hubungan Israel dengan Negara-Negara Arab terhadap Keberlangsungan Konflik Israel-Palestina. [Makalah Ujian Akhir Semester, Universitas Islam Negeri Sunan Gunung Djati Bandung].
- Hourani, A. (1991). *A History of the Arab Peoples*. Belknap Press.
- Jones, M. (2017). *Political geography: Territory, state, and society*. Routledge.
- Kumaraswamy, P. R. (2019). *Historical dictionary of the Arab-Israeli conflict*. Rowman & Littlefield.

- Mallison, W. T., Walker, G. K., Murphy, J. F., & Paust, J. (1983). Aggression or Self-Defense in Lebanon in 1982? Proceedings of the Annual Meeting (American Society of International Law), 77, 174–189. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25658173>
- Massad, J. (2006). The Persistence of the Palestinian Question: Essays on Zionism and the Palestinians (1st ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203965351>
- Minhajuddin, & Umam, A. K. (2023). Implikasi normalisasi hubungan diplomatik negara-negara Timur Tengah dengan Israel terhadap prospek kemerdekaan Palestina: Telaah konstruktivisme. *Intermestic: Journal of International Studies*, 8(1), 184-208. <https://doi.org/10.24198/intermestic.v8n1.10>
- Moeller, E. (2016). The Suez Crisis of 1956 as a Moment of Transnational Humanitarian Engagement. *European Review of History: Revue européenne d'histoire*, 23(1-2), 136-153. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13507486.2015.1111306>
- Morgenthau, H. J. (1951). In defense of the national interest. Alfred A. Knopf.
- Morris, B. (2008). 1948: A history of the first Arab-Israeli war. Yale University Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt1np9bm>
- Muchsin, M. A. (2015). Palestina dan Israel: Sejarah, Konflik dan Masa Depan. *Jurnal MIQOT*, 39(2), 398. Diakses dari <https://media.neliti.com/media/publications/155247-ID-palestina-dan-israel-sejarah-konflik-dan.pdf>
- Najamuddin, & Purnamasari, F. D. (2023). Dinamika Politik Timur Tengah: Pengaruh Perang Enam Hari terhadap Geopolitik Asia Barat Daya (1967). *Pustaka Legacy*, 2(1), 13–25.
- Nashir, A. (2024). Kepentingan dan Posisi Strategis Indonesia dalam Peta Geopolitik Indo-Pasifik. *Intermestic: Journal Of International Studies*, 8(2), 636-655. doi:10.24198/intermestic.v8n2.11
- Naor, D., & Lewin, E. (2022). The 1982 Lebanon War 40 years on. *Israel Affairs*, 28(3), 413–427. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13537121.2022.2066845>
- Oktorino, N. (2014). Konflik Bersejarah: Enam Hari yang Mengguncang Dunia (Kisah Perang Arab-Israel 1967). Jakarta: PT Elex Media Komputindo.
- Onuf, N. (2012). *World of Our Making: Rules and Rule in Social Theory and International Relations* (1st ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203722428>
- Pratiwi, F. I., Syarafi, M. A. R., & Nauvarian, D. (2022). Israeli-Palestinian conflict beyond resolution: A critical assessment. *Jurnal Ilmu Sosial dan Ilmu Politik*, 26(2), 168-188.
- Putri, F. D. E. (2014). Krisis Minyak Tahun 1973-1974 di Negara-Negara Industri Sebagai Penggerak Tata Ekonomi Dunia Baru. *AVATARA Jurnal Pendidikan Sejarah*, 2(1), 42-57.
- Ridha, M. R., Ritan, N. M. P., & Asmunandar. (2024). Pengaruh kebijakan luar negeri Amerika di Timur Tengah pasca Perang Dingin (1991-2001). *Jurnal Hubungan Internasional*, 1(1), 1-20

- Rosdiana. (2023). Perang Enam Hari (Perang Arab-Israel Tahun 1967). *Edu Sociata: Jurnal Pendidikan Sosiologi*, 6(2), 45-58.
- Sempa, F. P. (2017). *Geopolitics: From the Cold War to the 21st century* (1st ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203790816>
- Shindler, C. (2015). *The Rise of the Israeli Right: From Odessa to Hebron*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139022514>
- Sprinzak, E. (1991). *The ascendance of Israel's radical right*. Oxford University Press.
- Verbeek, B. (2020, September 28). The 1956 Suez Crisis as a Perfect Case for Crisis Research. *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Politics*. Retrieved 10 Feb. 2025, from <https://oxfordre.com/politics/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780190228637.001.0001/acrefore-9780190228637-e-1619>.
- Weiss, Y. (2008). *Neturei Karta: Jewish fundamentalism and the challenge to Zionism*. In M. E. Marty & R. S. Appleby (Eds.), *Fundamentalism and the state* (pp. 187–208). University of Chicago Press.
- Wicaksono, A. (2023). Implikasi Normalisasi Hubungan Diplomatik Negara-Negara Timur Tengah dengan Israel terhadap Isu Palestina. *Intermestic: Journal of International Studies*, 8(1), 184-208.
- Zakariah, M. H. (2006). British dan Perang Enam Hari 1967 Arab-Israel. *Jebat: Malaysian Journal of History, Politics & Strategic Studies*, 33.
- Zohar, E. (2022). The Yom Kippur War: Politics, Diplomacy, Legacy. *Israel Affairs*, 28(4), 1–17.
- Zulkifli, N., & Haqem, D. (2022). The OPEC Oil Shock Crisis (1973): An Analysis. *Asian Journal of Research in Business and Management*, 4(1), 1-10.