

the

pestd

Journal of Politics and Development

ISSN 2632-4911

Volume 16 ■ Number 1 ■ Winter 2026



the rest: journal of politics and development

Previously published as Journal of Global Analysis (JGA)

Editors-in-Chief:

Ozgur TUFEKCI, Professor | Karadeniz Technical University, Türkiye & CESRAN International

Rahman DAG, Professor | Marmara University, Türkiye & CESRAN International

Associate Editor:

Alessia CHIRIATTI, Dr. | Istituto Affari Internazionali, Italy

Marco MARSILI, Dr. | Ca' Foscari University, Italy & CESRAN International

Orkhan VALIYEV, Associate Professor | Khazar University, Azerbaijan & CESRAN International

Assistant Editor:

Ekrem OK, Dr. | Agri Ibrahim Cecen University, Türkiye & CESRAN International

Rabia BUYUKPINAR, Dr. | Zonguldak Bulent Ecevit University, Türkiye & CESRAN International

Editorial Board

Sener AKTURK, Professor | Koç University, Turkey

Enrique ALBEROLA, Professor | Banco de España, Spain

Mustafa AYDIN, Professor | Kadir Has University, Turkey

Ian BACHE, Professor | University of Sheffield, UK

Kee-Hong BAE, Professor | York University, Canada

Mark BASSIN, Professor | Sodertorn University, Sweden

Alexander BELLAMY, Professor | Uni. of Queensland, Australia

Richard BELLAMY, Professor | Uni. College London, UK

Andreas BIELER, Professor | University of Nottingham, UK

Pinar BILGIN, Professor | Bilkent University, Turkey

Ken BOOTH, Professor | Aberystwyth University, UK

Stephen CHAN, Professor | SOAS, University of London, UK

Nazli CHOUCRI, Professor | MIT, USA

Judith CLIFTON, Professor | Universidad de Cantabria, Spain

John M. DUNN, Professor | University of Cambridge, UK

Kevin DUNN, Professor | Hobart and William Smith Colleges, USA

Can ERBIL, Professor | Boston College, USA

Stephen Van EVERA, Professor | MIT, USA

Marc FLEURBAEY, Professor | Princeton University, USA

Bulent GOKAY, Professor | Keele University, UK

Ayla GOL, Professor | York St John University, UK

Stefano GUZZINI, Professor | Uppsala Universitet, Sweden

Tony HERON, Professor | University of York, UK

Raymond HINNEBUSCH, Professor | Uni. of St Andrews, UK

John M. HOBSON, Professor | University of Sheffield, UK

Michael KENNY, Professor | University of Sheffield, UK

Cécile LABORDE, Professor | University College London, UK

Scott LUCAS, Professor | University of Birmingham, UK

Kalypto NICOLAIDIS, Professor | University of Oxford, UK

Ziya ONIS, Professor | Koc University, Turkey

Alp OZERDEM, Professor | George Mason University, USA

Danny QUAH, Professor | London School of Economics, UK

José Gabriel PALMA, Professor | Cambridge University, UK

Jenik RADON, Professor | Columbia University, USA

Oliver RICHMOND, Professor | University of Manchester, UK

Ibrahim SIRKECI, Professor | Regent's College London, UK

Ian TAYLOR, Professor | University of St Andrews, UK

Ali WATSON, Professor | University of St Andrews, UK

Stefan WOLFF, Professor | University of Birmingham, UK

Biröl YESILADA, Professor | Portland State University, USA

Hakan YILMAZKUDAY, Professor | Florida International University, USA

The Rest: Journal of Politics and Development is published on behalf of the Centre for Strategic Research and Analysis (CESRAN) as an academic e-journal. The articles are brought into use via the website of the journal (<https://therestjournal.com/>). CESRAN and the Editors of The Rest: Journal of Politics and Development do not expect that readers of the review will sympathise with all the sentiments they find, for some of our writers will flatly disagree with others. It does not accept responsibility for the views expressed in any article, which appears in The Rest: Journal of Politics and Development.

** The surnames are listed in alphabetical order.*

the rest: journal of politics and development

Previously published as Journal of Global Analysis (JGA)

INDEXING & ABSTRACTING

Columbia International Affairs Online (CIAO)

EBSCO Publishing Inc.

EconLit

IDEAS

Index Islamicus

Lancaster Index to Defence & International Security Literature

Peace Palace Library

Ulrich's Periodicals Directory

TABLE OF CONTENTS

RESEARCH ARTICLES

- 6** Navigating Duality: The Struggle for Self-Determination of Palestine and in Postcolonial Post-Westphalian Global Order
By Janees Rafiq
- 20** Strategic Resource Nationalism and the Role of Rare Earths in EU Economic Security
By Upasna Mishra
- 32** Dignity, Responsibility and Reciprocity: A Framework for Non-International Armed Conflicts
By Samuel Jesus
- 45** American Populism, American Personhood
By Colin Anthony Smith MacNairn
- 67** Analysis of Emerging Powers Joining to International and Regional Organisations: Intentions and Implications
By Mojtaba Eskandari, Farhad Farahani, Somayeh Hamidi, Sara Torabian
- 78** Understanding the Politics of the Denial of Genocide Recognition: The Case of the Rohingya
By Nahian Salsabeel & Faria Ulfath Leera
- 95** Between Realism and Constructivism: Theorising Foreign Policy Shifts After the Israel-Gaza War
By Abeeta Hilal & Meha Pant
- 107** Russia's Fragile Balance of Global and Regional Alliances: The Formation and Evolution of the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation
By Ilias Tasopoulos
- 122** Emerging Powers' Engagement in International Organizations: The Case of Vietnam's Multilateral Diplomacy
By Tran Chi Trung & Hoang Hien Thuong
- 135** Parliamentary Diplomacy and Normative Contestation after Coups d'État in West Africa
By Nádia Teresa dos Santos Loureiro
- 150** The Humanitarian Emergency Dilemma: Exploring the Consequences of Financial Cuts on Relief Efforts and At-Risk Communities
By Calistus Abang
- ### BOOK REVIEW
- 162** Jurgen Habermas
A New Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere and Deliberative Politics
By Atilla Kılınç



International Think-tank www.cesran.org

Consultancy

Research Institute

CESRAN International is headquartered in the UK

CESRAN International is a member of the United Nations Academic Impact (UNAI)

CESRAN International is a think-tank specialising on international relations in general, and global peace, conflict and development related issues and challenges.

The main business objective/function is that we provide expertise at an international level to a wide range of policy making actors such as national governments and international organisations. CESRAN with its provisions of academic and semi-academic publications, journals and a fully-functioning website has already become a focal point of expertise on strategic research and analysis with regards to global security and peace. The Centre is particularly unique in being able to bring together wide variety of expertise from different countries and academic disciplines.

The main activities that CESRAN undertakes are providing consultancy services and advice to public and private enterprises, organising international conferences and publishing academic material.

Some of CESRAN's current publications are:

- THE REST: Journal of Politics and Development (tri-annual, peer reviewed) www.therestjournal.com
- Novus Orbis: Journal of Politics and International Relations (biannual, peer reviewed) www.dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/novusorbis
- Journal of Conflict Transformation and Security (biannual, peer reviewed)
- Political Reflection Magazine (quarterly) www.politicalreflectionmagazine.com (2010-2023)
- CESRAN Paper Series
- CESRAN Policy Brief
- Turkey Focus Policy Brief

CESRAN International also organises an annual international conference since 2014. Until 2023 it was called as “International Conference on Eurasian Politics and Society (IEPAS)”. From 2023, it was renamed as “CESRAN: Annual Conference on International Studies”.

<https://cesranconference.org/>

- **Ranked among the top 150 International think tanks**

Navigating Duality: The Struggle for Self-Determination of Palestine and in Postcolonial Post-Westphalian Global Order

the rest:
journal of politics and development
2026 | vol 16(1) | 6-19
www.therestjournal.com

Janees Rafiq

Model Institute of Engineering & Technology, Jammu
janees.llb@mietjammu.in, 0000-0002-4907-1008

KEYWORDS

Palestine,
Ukraine,
UN,
Human Rights,
Self-determination,
International Law

ABSTRACT

The Charter of the United Nations has postulated its faith in the international community to ensure prompt and effective action; however, the UN has failed to discharge its duties towards maintaining or restoring global peace and harmony through its specific powers, including the use of humanitarian intervention. The ongoing crises in Ukraine and Palestine have highlighted the sheer apathy and ineffectiveness of international law, particularly its capacity to enforce special powers for gross human rights violations in Ukraine and Palestine. Although both Ukraine and Palestine are entitled to self-determination, the West's response has been starkly different for each. Ukraine has received extensive support from Western states, while in the case of Palestine, the occupying state appears to benefit from Western protection, despite the International Court's characterisation of the situation as a potential genocide against Palestinians. This disparity raises critical questions about the impartiality of international law, which theoretically holds no bias among nation-states. The research paper is based on a doctrinal study of how, in a globalised world, powerful nations' divergent responses to conflicts in Ukraine and Palestine further illustrate duplicity and inconsistency. While it remains a vital tool, it is also susceptible to political biases rooted in colonial-era legacies, particularly visible in Western states' selective responses. Addressing this issue requires confronting the remnants of a colonial mentality that persists within the Western application of international law. The author will focus on a fundamental question: how to decolonise the application of international law to ensure equitable treatment in situations like Palestine, where the application appears markedly different from Ukraine.

Received July 16, 2025
Revised August 11, 2025
Accepted October 13, 2025

Introduction

In today's world, nations face a variety of global challenges, from geopolitical conflicts to humanitarian crises. How nations address these issues not only reflects their foreign policy priorities but also affects the broader context of international relations. Analysing these responses is critical to understanding the complexities of international politics. Recent events, such as the Russia-Ukraine conflict that began on February 24, 2022, and the escalation of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict that followed on October 7, 2023, demonstrate the challenges of managing global crises. While the international community supports adherence to humanitarian principles in these situations, the

actions of Western powers, including the United States of America, Great Britain, and the European Union, demonstrate that there are a range of approaches that sometimes seem contradictory.

This study aims to examine the complexities of modern international relations by analysing the responses of major Western countries to the Russia-Ukraine and Israel-Palestine conflicts. By examining the underlying dynamics driving these responses, we aim to provide meaningful insights for practitioners and policymakers. While previous studies have examined the specific details of Western countries' approaches to international conflicts, this study focuses on

This paper sheds light on the disparity in international responses to the conflicts in Ukraine and Palestine, providing insight into the political and historical backgrounds that have influenced the inconsistency. This study contributes to international relations by providing a better understanding of the variables that influence how Western states respond to international conflicts. What is unique is its comprehensive assessment of the interplay of various factors that influence Western foreign policy. In particular, the study examines the relationship between cooperation, historical relationships, and other state influences that influence Western actions during crises. The study examines the Western sphere, focusing on specific conflicts and providing detailed information on decision-making processes and legal outcomes through the doctrinal analysis of the data published by various international organisations and news agencies.

This study draws on existing cases and previous research to uncover the interplay of interests, values, and ideals that drive Western responses to conflicts around the world. It seeks to explore the central question: What are the similarities and differences in Western responses to these conflicts? How do these factors influence responses to the human dimensions of these problems? By addressing these questions, the study aims to deepen our understanding of the forces that influence foreign policy decisions, highlighting the interconnectedness of geopolitical dynamics, conflict responses, and commitment to human rights.

Russia-Ukraine Conflict

The conflict between Russia and Ukraine stems from a complex history involving the status of Crimea and the separatist movement in eastern Ukraine. The conflict began after Ukraine gained independence in 1991 and escalated with Russia's annexation of Crimea in 2014, leading to a deterioration in relations between the two countries. The main driving force behind this conflict is the ongoing separatist movement in the Donetsk and Luhansk regions of eastern Ukraine (Sergei, 2022). In 2014, pro-Russian separatists declared independence, leading to conflict with the Ukrainian government. Russia is accused of supporting and transporting the separatists, but denies direct involvement.

Tensions have been rising since 2022, as Russia has been massing troops on the Ukrainian border, raising the risk of an invasion. The military buildup is seen as a response to Ukraine's growing engagement with the West, including its accession to NATO and closer ties with the European Union. This situation highlights the ongoing geopolitical rivalry between Russia and the West, with Ukraine caught in the middle of this power struggle (Ekman, 2023). In February 2022, Russia launched a large-scale invasion of Ukraine on several fronts, resulting in widespread destruction, heavy casualties, and mass displacement. The international community has strongly criticised Russia's actions, reimposed sanctions, and provided aid to Ukraine. This conflict has global consequences, including enormous economic and humanitarian impacts (Dodds et al., 2023). The long-term outcome remains uncertain, with lasting impacts on Ukraine's infrastructure and population.

Israel-Palestine Conflict

The Israeli-Palestinian conflict began in the late 19th century, during the rise of nationalist movements such as Zionism and Arab nationalism. In 1917, the British government issued the Balfour Declaration, which expressed support for the creation of a Jewish state in Palestine (Regan, 2017). This declaration encouraged Jewish immigration to the region. On November 29, 1947, the United Nations adopted Resolution 181, which called for the termination of the British Mandate for Palestine on August 1, 1948, and the partition of Palestine into separate territories for Jews and Arabs, and a significant area of Jerusalem, including Bethlehem, under international control. Under this plan, the Jews were given the coastal areas near Tel Aviv, areas near the Sea of Galilee, and parts of the Negev Desert, while the Arabs were given the rest of Palestine, including a small area near Jaffa. The UN General Assembly approved the plan by 33 votes in favour, 13 against, and 10 abstentions (Bregman, 2002).

Following the UN resolution, Israel declared independence on May 15, 1948, leading to the first Arab-Israeli War the following day. The conflict created at least two major problems that continue to fuel the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. First, it displaced at least 700,000 Palestinians and caused a humanitarian crisis. Second, the war led to the division of the region into Israel, the West Bank, and Gaza (Almassri, 2023).

The Six-Day War between Israel and the Arab League in 1967 resulted in Israel occupying the West Bank, East Jerusalem, the Gaza Strip, and the Sinai Peninsula. This has led to further tensions between Israel, the Arab states, and Palestine (Laron, 2018). These tensions continued until 1993, when the two sides reached the Oslo Accords, which aimed to promote peace. However, the implementation of the agreement faces serious challenges. Violence between Israel and Palestine has escalated, as seen in the Second Intifada in 2000, which was marked by attacks and widespread violence (Barari, 2003).

The establishment of Israel in the West Bank in the 2000s led to further conflict, and two wars in the Gaza Strip in 2008–2009 and 2014 resulted in heavy casualties on both sides (Cohen et al., 2017). Despite efforts to initiate peace talks, the conflict continued throughout 2010, leading to a new conflict on October 7, 2023 (Sergei, 2022). This latest escalation was caused by attacks by the Palestinian Authority and Hamas in Gaza since 2007 (Tivadar, 2022).

Comparative Analysis Of Western Countries’ Reactions To The Russian-Ukrainian And Israeli-Palestinian Conflicts

This study focuses on data collected during the four months of each campaign. The Russia-Ukraine conflict runs from February to May 2022, and for the Israel-Palestine conflict, it runs from October 2023 to January 2024 (see Table 1). The data includes diplomatic communications, policy actions, and related statistics, providing a comprehensive analysis of the response of Western countries at this critical juncture.

Table 1: Response of Western Nations to the Russia-Ukraine Conflict

Nation	Diplomatic Stand	Policy Action	Humanitarian Action	Civilian Casualties
United States of America	Condemned Russia’s actions and expressed support for	Provided \$800 million security assistance package to Ukraine (U S Department of Defense, 2022)	Called for an immediate ceasefire (Reuters, 2023) Approved more than \$225 million in	The number of civilian casualties, as verified by the

	Ukraine's sovereignty (Cavandoli and Wilson, 2022)	Imposed sanctions on Russia, directed towards the individuals and institutions involved in the conflict (Karazanishvili, 2024)	humanitarian assistance (Office of Press Relations, 2022) Proposed a draft resolution to the UNSC intended to end Russian military actions (Security Council Report, 2022).	OHCHR, amounted to 17,882 from February to June 2022. This total includes 9,728 individuals who were killed and 8,154 who sustained injuries (Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, 2024).
United Kingdom	Condemned Russia's actions and provided support for Ukraine (Humeniuk, 2022)	Imposed sanctions on Russia, directed towards the individuals and institutions involved in the conflict (Timofeev, 2022) Provided £2.3 billion in military support to Ukraine (Mills, 2024).	Called for an immediate ceasefire (Sharma, 2022) Provide £1.5 billion in humanitarian and economic aid since February. Voted in favour of a draft resolution aimed at stopping the war.	
European Union	Condemns Russia's military aggression against Ukraine (EU Directorate-General for Communication, 2022).	Imposed sanctions on Russia, including restrictions on trade and investment (Sanus et al., 2024) Provide €500 million in military equipment to Ukraine (Clapp, 2022)	Called for an immediate ceasefire (European Parliament, 2022) Provided €143 million worth of humanitarian aid (ECHO, 2023) Submitted a draft resolution to the UN General Assembly that demanded the withdrawal of all Russian military forces from Ukraine (European External Action Service, 2022)	

This table outlines the responses of various Western countries to the Russia-Ukraine conflict during the initial months of 2022. The data focuses on their diplomatic stands, policy actions, humanitarian efforts, and the impact of the conflict on civilian casualties during this period.

United States of America

The United States strongly condemns Russia's actions and reiterates its support for Ukraine's sovereignty and territorial integrity, stressing that Ukraine has the right to determine its own future without external interference. In response to Russia's military aggression, the United States has positioned itself as a strong partner of Ukraine, providing moral and political support in international forums, including the United Nations.

In response to the United States, Russia has adopted a comprehensive policy package, including a significant \$800 million in security assistance to Ukraine. The program is aimed at building Ukraine's military capacity and securing critical defence infrastructure. The United States has also imposed tough sanctions on Russia, targeting individuals and companies involved in the conflict. The sanctions are designed to put economic pressure on Russia and weaken its ability to continue its military operations. The United States has also submitted a resolution to the UN Security Council calling on Russia to immediately cease its military operations in Ukraine.

The United States has also provided significant humanitarian assistance, providing more than \$225 million in response to the humanitarian crisis escalating due to the conflict. This assistance is aimed at supporting those displaced and providing food, medicine, and other essential services to those affected by the ongoing violence.

United Kingdom

Like the United States, the United Kingdom condemned Russia's actions and expressed strong solidarity with Ukraine. The UK stressed the importance of Ukraine's sovereignty and territorial integrity, with other countries calling on Russia to cease its military aggression and respect international law.

Britain has played a major role in supporting Ukraine with weapons and economic assistance. The British government has imposed sanctions on Russia, particularly on individuals and entities it considers responsible for the war. These sanctions are part of a broader Western strategy to isolate Russia economically and politically. In addition, the UK has provided £2.3 billion in military assistance to strengthen Ukraine's defence capabilities. This assistance has included weapons, training, and equipment to help Ukraine defend itself against Russian aggression.

The UK has also played a key role in the relief effort, providing £1.5 billion in aid and economic assistance since the start of the conflict in February 2022. This assistance is designed to address the urgent needs of people affected by the conflict, including refugees, internally displaced people, and communities facing food, medical supplies, and shelter shortages.

European Union

The European Union strongly condemns Russia's military actions against Ukraine and unconditionally supports Ukraine's right to self-determination and territorial integrity. The EU's diplomatic efforts are aimed at isolating Russia internationally and strengthening the Ukrainian government in all political negotiations, at the United Nations and other forums.

The EU has imposed a series of sanctions against Russia, including trade restrictions, financial measures, and a ban on certain types of investment. These measures are aimed at damaging the Russian economy and limiting its ability to support military operations. In addition, the EU has provided Ukraine with €500 million in military equipment to help it strengthen its defences against Russian aggression.

The European Union has allocated \$143 million in aid to Ukraine in response to the humanitarian crisis. This humanitarian aid is intended to address immediate humanitarian needs, including medical assistance, food, and support for refugees and displaced people.

This comprehensive response by Western countries reflects the coordinated efforts of the Russian and Ukrainian conflict, combining the efforts of officials, the military, and the people. It highlights the diversity of Western responses, which focus on sanctions, military assistance, and meeting people's needs. At the same time, the figures for civilian deaths are a stark reminder of the human suffering caused by conflicts and underline the need for the international community to work towards reducing suffering and finding peaceful solutions.

The joint efforts of the UK, the EU, and the US demonstrate the West's united stance on the Russia-Ukraine conflict. By condemning Russia's actions, imposing targeted sanctions, and providing strong support for Ukraine, these countries are reinforcing their commitment to upholding international law, protecting Ukraine's sovereignty, and seeking a peaceful resolution. Despite their growing social clout, the UK and the EU continue to support Ukraine and have stressed the need for solidarity and cooperation to address one of Europe's security challenges.

Table 2: Response of Western Nations to the Israel-Palestine Conflict

Nation	Diplomatic Stand	Policy Action	Humanitarian Action	Civilian Casualties
United States of America	Strongly condemned Hamas' attacks on Israel (Zanotti and Blanchard, 2023).	Provided military aid to Israel by sending 244 cargo planes and 20 ships carrying over 10,000 tons of weapons and other military equipment (AOAV, 2024).	No call for a ceasefire. Vetoed a UNSC resolution that would have called for "humanitarian pauses" and "immediate humanitarian ceasefire". Provided \$100 million worth of humanitarian assistance for Palestinian in the West Bank (UN News, 2023).	The reported casualties from the war between Hamas and Israel since October 7, 2023, based on United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (UNOCHA) reporting, indicate that approximately 1,200 Israelis were killed, 5,431 Israelis were injured, 22,313 Palestinians in Gaza were killed, and 57,296 Palestinians in Gaza were injured (Statista, 2024).
United Kingdom	Condemned the Hamas attack and reaffirmed the UK's unequivocal support for Israel (Reuters, 2023).	Deployed two Royal Navy ships, surveillance aircraft, and other military resources to offer practical assistance to Israel (Lovatt, 2024).	No call for a ceasefire. Abstained from voting on a UN Security Council resolution that called for "humanitarian pauses, (Pons Rafols, X., 2024)" Allocating almost 87 million pounds of additional funding and urging Israel to increase aid flow through various routes (Mada, 2023).	
European Union	The EU strongly condemns multiple indiscriminate attacks by Hamas in Israel (Council of the EU, 2023).	N/A	No call for a ceasefire. Called for humanitarian pauses (Al Jazeera, 2023) Commitment to humanitarian aid for Gaza by allocating €125 million in humanitarian assistance for civilians in Gaza (ECHO, 2023) EU welcomes UN Security Council resolution on Gaza aid 9 Delegation of the EU to the UN, 2024)	

The war, which began on October 7, 2023, was the result of a violent struggle by Hamas, which has controlled the Gaza Strip since 2007. It is a dangerous cycle of violence and revenge. The death toll of subsequent wars closely mirrors the death toll of those wars, according to the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs. About 1,200 Israelis were killed, and 5,431 others were injured. Palestinian casualties were the worst, with 22,313 people killed and 57,296 injured in Gaza alone. These figures show the immense suffering experienced by both Israelis and Palestinians because of the war.

United States of America

The United States strongly condemns Hamas' attacks on Israel. The United States government has expressed its strong support for Israel and reaffirmed the country's right to defend itself against terrorism and military action. Reiterating our commitment to Israel's sovereignty and our responsibility to ensure the security of its citizens.

In terms of military support and policy, the United States has taken the necessary measures to assist Israel in its defence efforts. It has provided extensive military assistance, including 244 aircraft and 20 ships, all carrying more than 10,000 tons of ammunition and other highly dangerous weapons. The aid is intended to support Israel's defence and to combat Hamas more effectively. In addition, the United States used its veto power in the United Nations Security Council to block a resolution that would have "frozen humanitarian aid" and "immediately stopped humanitarian aid." This action demonstrates the United States' position that it will not allow Israel to stop its military operations against Hamas.

While the United States has refused to call for a ceasefire, it has instead shifted to providing humanitarian assistance. The United States has provided \$100 million in humanitarian assistance to Palestinians in the West Bank. While the United States has focused on providing military assistance to Israel, this assistance is aimed at alleviating the dire humanitarian situation in the Palestinian territories.

United Kingdom

Britain condemned the Hamas attack and expressed its strong support for Israel. The British position is like that of the United States, emphasising Israel's right to defend itself against military attacks. The United Kingdom has made it clear that it will join Israel's efforts to attack Hamas and ensure the safety of its citizens.

Britain has provided significant military support to Israel. This has included the release of two Royal Navy warships, surveillance aircraft, and other military assets used to assist Israel's defence efforts against Hamas. Although Britain did not intervene directly militarily, it supported Israel by providing vital resources for Israel's defence.

Britain did not call for an armistice or participate in military intervention, but it played a major role in humanitarian efforts. Britain showed its intention to halt military action by abstaining from a UN Security Council resolution calling for "humanitarianism." However, the UK has allocated £87 million in additional humanitarian funding to support relief efforts in the region. The UK has also called on Israel to regulate the flow of humanitarian aid in different ways to reduce the suffering of civilians in Israel and Gaza.

European Union

The European Union strongly condemned Hamas' attacks on Israeli civilians. The EU's political response stressed the importance of protecting human lives and combating terrorism. The EU called for a reduction in violence while supporting Israel's right to defend itself against the most serious threats.

The EU did not provide direct military assistance to Israel, but the government continued to do so. The EU's focus on humanitarian assistance and diplomacy was to address the wider impact of the conflict. It did not involve military intervention or providing Israel with special weapons.

In terms of humanitarian aid, the EU is active in supporting the Palestinians in Gaza. The EU called for a “humanitarian mechanism” to ensure aid is delivered and alleviate the suffering of civilians caught up in the conflict. The EU released 125 million euros in humanitarian aid to Gaza. The purpose of this financial support is to solve the problems faced by the people in the area, providing food, medicine, and shelter for the soldiers involved. In addition, the EU expressed its support for the UN Security Council resolution to provide humanitarian assistance to Gaza, demonstrating its commitment to aiding those in need.

Although they condemn the war and do not call for its end, Western countries still try to solve the humanitarian crisis by providing aid. The United States has pledged to provide \$100 million in aid to the Palestinians affected by the war, demonstrating its commitment to alleviating the suffering of the people. Likewise, while the UK strongly supports Israel, it also recognises the urgent need for aid and has provided £87 million in humanitarian aid. The EU's support has also increased, providing 125 million euros in humanitarian aid, confirming its understanding of the seriousness of the situation and its determination to help Gaza. Overall, the contributions from the United States, the United Kingdom, and the European Union underscore the importance of international cooperation and solidarity in delivering critical assistance to people still affected by ongoing conflicts.

Western Responses to International Conflicts: A Comparative Analysis

Faced with two different geopolitical issues - Russia's invasion of Ukraine and Israel's confrontation with Hamas - Western countries such as the US, UK, and EU are united in condemning the aggressors, while expressing their differences based on their values and results. In both countries, the international community has expressed strong condemnation of the actions of Russia and Hamas. It has called for an immediate ceasefire, emphasising the urgency of ending the fighting and finding a diplomatic solution. This common position demonstrates the West's commitment to peace and stability in this conflict.

Sanctions have become a common tool used by the US, UK, and EU to express their disapproval and pressure on the perpetrators. Regarding Russia's actions in Ukraine, economic sanctions reinforce the West's determination to hold Russia accountable for its actions. The implementation of these sanctions reflects the unity of diplomacy and the overall response to the aggression. In terms of political action, military support has been a key element of the Western response to both wars. The United States, the United Kingdom, and the European Union have provided military assistance to the countries involved. For example, the United States has not only condemned Russia's actions but has also approved \$800 million in aid to help resolve the urgent problems in Ukraine, demonstrating a strong commitment to supporting allied countries. Similarly, the UK has provided \$2.3 billion in aid, and the European Union has decided to double funding for the Ukrainian Armed Forces, supporting joint efforts to strengthen military capabilities.

Humanitarian aid became a core element of the Western response, highlighting a shared commitment to reducing the human toll caused by the conflicts. However, the approach varied among the Western nations. The US committed to substantial increases in humanitarian assistance for Ukraine, while the UK concentrated more on providing economic aid, and the European Union contributed additional funds to support both military and humanitarian needs. These differences reflect a nuanced understanding of the unique challenges each conflict presents. Despite these variations, the response to Ukraine remained largely unified, with the US, UK, and EU collaborating through diplomatic channels at the UN to address the crisis. In contrast, the Israeli-Hamas conflict revealed more distinct differences in approach. The US notably vetoed a UN Security Council

resolution calling for a humanitarian pause, and the UK abstained from voting on it. None of these countries called for a ceasefire, indicating varied diplomatic positions on resolving the conflict.

Interstate dynamics play a crucial role in shaping how Western states respond to humanitarian crises in conflict zones, affecting both the similarities and differences in their approaches. When examining Western responses to conflicts like the Russia-Ukraine war and the Israeli-Palestinian issue, it becomes evident that these interstate factors interact complexly with humanitarian principles and international law. These factors include political alliances, historical relationships, economic interests, and cultural ties, all of which influence how states view and address global crises. While shared values and alliances often result in coordinated actions and solidarity, differing interests and historical contexts can lead to varied or nuanced responses from Western countries.

Humanitarian aid is a key component of Western conflict resolution, supporting collective efforts to reduce war-related deaths. However, approaches have varied across Western countries. The United States has pledged to significantly increase funding for Ukraine, while Britain has focused more on economic assistance, and the European Union has provided additional funding to support military and humanitarian needs. The distinction reflects a better understanding of the unique challenges presented by each conflict. Despite the differences, Ukraine's response has been largely unified, with the United States, the United Kingdom, and the European Union working through diplomatic channels at the United Nations to resolve the issue. However, the conflict between Israel and Hamas has shown a difference of opinion. The United States blocked a UN Security Council resolution calling for a humanitarian ceasefire, and Britain defended it. Neither country has called for a ceasefire, indicating different diplomatic positions on the resolution of the conflict.

State power plays a major role in shaping the way Western countries respond to humanitarian aid in conflict zones, affecting them in different ways and in different ways. When you consider the Western response to conflicts such as the Russia-Ukraine war and the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, these countries work in a complex way with the principles of humanitarian aid and international law. These factors include political affiliation, historical ties, economic interests, and cultural ties that influence how countries view and address global issues. While shared values and common interests often lead to coordinated action and cooperation, different interests and histories can lead to different or inconsistent responses from Western countries.

Humanitarian issues and conflict have long been intertwined, creating complex issues that require urgent attention and decision-making. At the heart of these issues is the need to adhere to the principles of humanitarian law, also known as the laws of war or international humanitarian law (IHL). Humanitarian law provides a framework for the dynamics of armed conflict, with rules and regulations aimed at alleviating the suffering of victims and protecting fundamental human rights. It protects non-combatants and regulates conduct during war to reduce suffering and protect humanity. The importance of humanitarian law is based on the promotion of respect for humanitarian values and the influence of social attitudes on appropriate conduct in war, emphasising the important role it plays in reducing the costs of armed conflict and protecting the right to peaceful coexistence.

The International Committee of the Red Cross (2024) stated that the United States, the United Kingdom, and the European Union have ratified or signed several humanitarian law treaties. These treaties are designed to protect individuals and groups from harm during war. Some of the most important treaties ratified or signed by the three organisations are:

1. The 1949 Geneva Conventions, which focus on the protection of the wounded, sick, and persons at sea.
2. The 1977 Additional Convention, which provides for the protection of victims of international war, and

3. The 1977 Additional Convention II, which governs the protection of victims of non-international armed conflicts.

In the context of the conflict between Russia and Ukraine, the West has shown a strong commitment to humanitarian values. The condemnation of Russia's actions and the call for an immediate end to the conflict reflect the recognition of the devastating impact of the war on civilians. In addition, the decision to punish individuals and groups involved in the conflict demonstrates their determination to hold perpetrators accountable. In particular, the provision of military and humanitarian assistance by the United States is based on the principles of the Geneva Conventions on the protection of civilians and the provision of essential assistance in times of war.

In the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, the West also expresses concern about human rights, although its actions are largely political. Despite Israel's strong support, the United States has provided significant humanitarian assistance to the Palestinians affected by the conflict, recognising the humanitarian crisis. Similarly, the United Kingdom and the European Union have pledged to increase humanitarian aid, demonstrating their understanding of the need for assistance in conflict-affected areas.

However, balancing human rights issues is not easy, especially when regional interests conflict with public interests. For example, the United States voted in favour of a United Nations resolution to intervene in Israel's war with Hamas, raising concerns about the need for territorial boundaries and the health implications. As the United States strengthens its position by emphasising Israel's security, this raises questions about Western cooperation in promoting humanitarian policy on important issues.

Britain's decision to reject a UN Security Council resolution calling for a ceasefire in the Palestinian-Israeli conflict demonstrates its concern about the difficulties of negotiations. While the United Kingdom acknowledges the humanitarian crisis in Gaza, its refusal demonstrates an unwillingness to take unconventional measures that could damage its long-standing relationship with Israel. The decision highlights the delicate balance the UK faces between supporting Israeli security concerns and meeting the needs of the Palestinian people, revealing the complex relationship between national interests and humanitarian priorities.

Similarly, the EU's approach to the Israel-Hamas conflict also demonstrates a cautious approach to rural areas. While the EU advocates for a humanitarian aid freeze and encourages them to reduce it, it is wary of agreeing to a ceasefire or taking strong measures that could strain its relations with Israel and other regional actors. The EU's reluctance to act reflects the ongoing challenges and difficulties of combining legal solutions with humanitarian objectives in a complex political environment.

In short, Western responses to Ukraine's conflicts with Israel and Hamas demonstrate varying degrees of commitment to humanitarian principles. Although calls for violence, ceasefires, and humanitarian aid demonstrate compliance with international law and ethical concerns, problems arise when national interests collide with human needs. This underscores the importance of carefully examining the West's response to the world's most critical situations.

Conclusion

A comparative analysis of Western responses to the Russia-Ukraine and Israel-Palestinian conflicts highlights the complexity of international relations and the importance of a new understanding of the factors that influence national policy decisions. This study adopts Stephen J. Andriole's behavioural analysis of foreign policy, which takes a systematic approach to analysing various aspects of foreign policy, focusing on independent variables, confounding variables, and behavioural aspects.

This study demonstrates that interstate factors play a significant role in shaping Western responses to international conflicts, demonstrating the complex interplay between alliances, historical challenges, and strategic strategies that respond to conflict. The study also reveals the diverse patterns of engagement with international law by Western states, often choosing to apply international law in ways that suit their strategic interests. For example, they have demonstrated strong faith in their people's values, criticised Russia's abuses in Ukraine, and supported measures such as ceasefires and peace orders through diplomatic and humanitarian efforts. However, their response to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict is less significant. Despite acknowledging the need for humanitarian assistance, Western states have been less effective in promoting peace, refusing to call for a ceasefire, and hoping to withdraw or veto resolutions in the UN Security Council aimed at easing tensions and initiating peace talks. The findings provide valuable insights into the complexity of Western foreign policy and provide a deeper understanding of the motivations behind decisions that are useful to policymakers, academics, and the public.

However, this study has its limitations, as it focuses only on conflicts that are specific to Western actors. Future research could be extended by including other stakeholders across conflict types and examining domestic political factors that influence foreign policy choices. Such efforts should seek to explore the responses of various actors, examine multiple conflict situations, and explore the domestic political factors that influence foreign policy decisions.

References

- Action on Armed Violence (AOAV) (2024) Who is arming Israel? A briefing review of the UK, US and other arms suppliers to Israel. London: Action on Armed Violence (AOAV).
- Almassri J (2023) Forced migration: The 1948 Palestinian Refugees. *Hadtudományi Szemle* 16(1): 5–15.
- Al Jazeera (2023) EU leaders call for ‘humanitarian pauses’, aid corridors in Israel-Gaza war. Available at: <https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2023/10/26/eu-leaders-call-forhumanitarian-pauses-aid-corridors-in-besieged-gaza>
- Barari HA (2003) The Al-Aqsa Intifada as seen in Egypt. *Civil Wars* 6(3): 86–106.
- Bregman A (2002) *Israel’s wars: A history since 1947*. New York: Routledge.
- Cavandoli S and Wilson G (2022) Distorting fundamental norms of international law to resurrect the Soviet Union: The international law context of Russia’s invasion of Ukraine. *Netherlands International Law Review* 69(3): 383–410.
- Clapp S (2022) Implementation of the strategic compass. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.2861/888903>
- Cohen RS, Johnson DE, Thaler DE, Allen B, Bartels EM, Cahill J and Efron S (2017) Lessons from Israel’s Wars in Gaza. Available at: https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_briefs/RB9975.html
- Council of the EU (2023) Statement by the High Representative on behalf of the European Union on the attacks against Israel. Available at: <https://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/press/press-releases/2023/10/07/statement-by-the-highrepresentative-on-behalf-of-the-european-union-on-the-attacks-against-israel/>
- Delegation of the European Union to the United Nations in New York (2024) EU Statement, Delegation of the European Union to the United Nations in New York. Available at: https://www.eeas.europa.eu/delegations/un-new-york_en?s=63
- Dodds K, Taylor Z, Akbari A, Broto VC, Detterbeck K, Inverardi-Ferri C, Ok Lee K, Mamadouh V, Ramutsindela M and Yuan Woon C (2023) The Russian invasion of Ukraine: Implications for politics, territory and governance. *Territory, Politics, Governance*, 11(8): 1519–1536.
- Ekman P (2023) Painful moments and realignment: Explaining Ukraine’s foreign policy, 2014–2022. *Problems of Post-Communism* 71(3): 232–244.
- European Parliament (2022) European Parliament resolution of 1 March 2022 on the Russian aggression against Ukraine. *Official Journal of the European Union*, C125(2). Available at: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A52022IP0052>
- EU Directorate-General for European Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid Operations (ECHO) (2023) EU increases humanitarian aid to Gaza by €25 million. Available at: https://civil-protection-humanitarian-aid.ec.europa.eu/news-stories/news/eu-increaseshumanitarian-aid-gaza-eu25-million-2023-11-06_en
- European External Action Service (2022) UN General Assembly demands the Russian Federation withdraw all military forces from the territory of Ukraine. Available at: https://www.eeas.europa.eu/eeas/un-general-assembly-demands-russian-federationwithdraw-all-military-forces-territory-ukraine_und_en

- EU Directorate-General for Communication (2022) Joint Press Statement on Russia's aggression of Ukraine. Available at: https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/en/statement_22_1321
- EU Directorate-General for European Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid Operations (ECHO) (2023) EU increases humanitarian aid to Gaza by €25 million. Available at: https://civil-protection-humanitarian-aid.ec.europa.eu/news-stories/news/eu-increaseshumanitarian-aid-gaza-eu25-million-2023-11-06_en
- Humeniuk NH (2022) Stylistic aspects of the UK Prime Minister Boris Johnson's Address to the Nation on the Russian Invasion of Ukraine. *Southern Archive (Philological Sciences)*, 90.
- Karazanishvili T (2024) Russia-Ukraine war: US policy and its implications on global world order. *Journal of Social Sciences* 9(1): 31–50.
- Laron G (2018) *The six-day war: The breaking of the Middle East*. Cumberland: Yale University Press
- Lovatt H (2024) *UK policy towards the Israel-Gaza War*. Beirut: The Institute of Palestine Studies
- Mada K (2023) Britain disburses 87 million pounds sterling to Gaza. Available at: <https://www.kompas.id/baca/english/2023/12/01/en-inggris-kucurkan-87-juta-poundsterlingke-gaza>
- Mills C (2024) *Military assistance to Ukraine since the Russian invasion*. London: The House of Commons Library.
- Office of Press Relations (2022) The United States announces additional humanitarian assistance to Ukraine. Available at: https://pl.usembassy.gov/usaid_assistance_ukraine/
- Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (2024) Two-year update - protection of civilians: Impact of hostilities on civilians since 24 February 2022. The Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights.
- Office of Press Relations (2023) U.S. mobilizes \$100 million in life-saving humanitarian assistance for urgent needs in Gaza and the West Bank. Available at: <https://www.usaid.gov/news-information/press-releases/oct-18-2023-us-mobilizes-100-millionlife-saving-humanitarian-assistance-urgent-needs-gaza-and-west-bank>
- Pons Rafols X (2024) The war in Gaza and the Israeli-Palestinian conflict: A turning point in the midst of an endless cycle of violence. *Peace & Security*, Available at: <https://rodin.uca.es/handle/10498/32054>.
- Regan B (2017) *The Balfour Declaration: Empire, the mandate and resistance in Palestine*. Great Britain: Verso Books
- Reuters (2023) Britain's Sunak says London 'unequivocally' stands with Israel. Available at: <https://www.reuters.com/world/britains-sunak-says-london-unequivocally-stands-withisrael-2023-10-08/>
- Sanus E, Akgül-Açıkmeşe S and Karaoguz HE (2024) The EU's autonomous sanctions against Russia in 2014 versus 2022: How does the bureaucratic politics model bring in the institutional "balance of power" within the EU? *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies* 62(5): 1278-1295.
- Security Council Report (2022) Ukraine: Vote on draft resolution. Available at: <https://www.securitycouncilreport.org/whatsinblue/2022/02/ukraine-vote-on-draftresolution.php>

- Sergei G (2022) The Russia-Ukraine war in the study of historical law & conflict of state security area. *International Journal of Law Reconstruction* 6(2).
- Statista (2024) Israel & Palestinian territories: Number of fatalities & injuries caused by the Israel & Hamas war 2023. Available at: <https://www.statista.com/statistics/1422308/palestinian-territories-israel-number-fatalitiesand-injuries-caused-by-the-israel-and-hamas-war>
- Tivadar LM (2022) The Gaza Strip and the Israel-Hamas conflict: From 2008 until nowadays. *Acta Musei Napocensis. Historica*
- Timofeev I (2022) Britain's sanctions policy: Institutional design and targeting Russia. *Herald of the Russian Academy of Sciences* 92(6): 504–511.
- UN News, (2023). Israel-Gaza crisis: US vetoes Security Council resolution. <https://news.un.org/en/story/2023/10/1142507>
- U S Department of Defence (2022) Fact Sheet on U.S. security assistance for Ukraine. Available at: <https://www.war.gov/News/Releases/Release/Article/3007664/fact-sheet-on-us-security-assistance-for-ukraine-roll-up-as-of-april-21-2022/#:~:text=On>



the

rest

Journal of Politics and Development

ISSN 2632-4911

CALL FOR PAPERS

ABOUT

- ✓ **The Rest: Journal of Politics and Development** publishes theoretical, conceptual, and empirical analyses on global governance, contemporary world politics, global political economy, global south, environment, civil wars, terrorism, migration, conflict management, and human security from a variety of interdisciplinary methodologies and approaches.
- ✓ **The Rest Journal** particularly welcomes issues, regions, and subjects that have remained or been excluded from mainstream analysis of world politics.
- ✓ There are no article processing charges or submission fees for any submitted or accepted articles.
- ✓ **The Rest: Journal of Politics and Development** is abstracted and indexed in the following databases and indexes:
 - *Columbia International Affairs Online (CIAO)*
 - *EBSCO Publishing Inc.*
 - *EconLit*
 - *Lancaster Index*
- ✓ **Period Months:**
 - January
 - July
- ✓ **Editors:**
 - Ozgur TUFEKCI
 - Rahman DAG
- ✓ **Associate Editors:**
 - Alessia CHIRIATTI
 - Marco MARSILI
 - Orkhan VALIYEV
- ✓ **Assistant Editor:**
 - Ekrem OK
 - Rabia BUYUKPINAR



Submission Link
www.therestjournal.com



www.cesran.org

the

pestd

Journal of Politics and Development

ISSN 2632-4911

Volume 16 ■ Number 1 ■ Winter 2026

