



President Trump’s Veto Power and Palestine Peace Board Plan Switch-off The UN, EU, NATO and Other International Organizations

**By Osman A. Hassan
March 3, 2026**

Peace Board

The idea of a “Trump Peace Board” applied to Gaza and the broader Palestinian question represents a powerful metaphor for a radical shift in how peace, power, and diplomacy are imagined in the twenty-first century. In this conceptualization, Donald Trump appears as a CEO-President, directing strategy with the logic of executive decision-making rather than traditional diplomacy, while Benjamin Netanyahu functions as a principal implementing partner—sometimes portrayed as a secretary of policy execution within a coordinated U.S.-Israel framework aimed at reshaping the political future of Palestinian land, sovereignty, and governance.

This metaphor does not merely describe personalities; it dramatizes a structural transformation in global politics where unilateral executive power, bilateral strategic alignment, and transactional diplomacy begin to overshadow multilateral institutions such as the United Nations, the European Union, and NATO. Within this narrative, these organizations are perceived by critics as being symbolically “switched off,” not literally dismantled but politically sidelined in the most consequential decisions regarding Gaza and the Israeli–Palestinian conflict.



The Trump-as-CEO framework rests on a worldview that treats geopolitics as a negotiation arena rather than a moral-legal process. In this worldview, conflicts are not primarily historical tragedies or ethical dilemmas but disputes to be resolved through leverage, incentives, and decisive agreements. The “Peace Board” thus becomes analogous to a corporate boardroom where stakeholders are not equal sovereign actors but parties with varying degrees of influence, bargaining power, and dependence. Israel, backed by U.S. financial, diplomatic, and veto power in global forums, becomes the dominant operational partner, while Palestinians appear as a party expected to accept terms framed as pragmatic solutions to an otherwise intractable conflict.

**President Trump’s Veto Power and Palestine Peace Board Plan Switch-off The UN, EU,
NATO and Other International Organizations**

**By Osman A. Hassan
WardheerNews**

The CEO model assumes that strong leadership and bold deals can overcome decades of stalemate, yet it also raises profound questions about legitimacy, representation, and justice. One of the central claims embedded in this is that the United States, by virtue of its economic strength and consistent use of veto authority in international institutions, positions itself as both financier and guarantor of Israel's strategic security doctrine.

From this perspective, Washington's role is not neutral mediation but strategic partnership, shaping negotiations in ways that critics argue privilege Israeli security concerns and territorial control over Palestinian sovereignty claims. This perceived imbalance fuels the argument that a Trump Peace Board is less a neutral negotiation platform and more a calculated policy architecture designed to finalize long-standing strategic goals under the banner of ending conflict. Supporters would counter that U.S. involvement is indispensable precisely because no other power can guarantee security assurances or mobilize resources on a scale capable of stabilizing the region. This further suggests that the "plan" is not spontaneous but historically ripened in an accumulation of policies, alliances, and geopolitical calculations waiting for a moment of political opportunity. Elections, domestic political shifts, and regional normalization agreements create windows in which previously controversial proposals become operationally feasible. In this interpretation, the CEO-President and the Israeli Prime Minister are not improvising but executing a long-calculated strategy aligned with security doctrines, regional alliances, and domestic political imperatives. The narrative portrays the deal as ripe, scheduled, and opportunistic, ready to be implemented once political conditions align domestically and internationally.

Similarly, the analogy that compares peace negotiators to a predator mediating between itself and its prey reflects a deeply critical moral argument: that negotiations perceived as dominated by one side's strategic interests risk lacking credibility among the weaker party. Such a critique does not merely attack personalities; it questions whether asymmetrical power structures can ever produce genuinely balanced agreements. Sustainable peace, according to this line of thought, requires mediators who are seen as legitimate by both sides, not only powerful enough to enforce terms. If Palestinians perceive negotiators as structurally aligned with Israeli strategic goals, any proposed agreement risks being interpreted as imposed rather than mutually agreed, thereby undermining its long-term viability regardless of short-term enforcement.

The role of key advisers and strategists in shaping such peace frameworks is also significant. Figures like Steve Witkoff and Jared Kushner became emblematic of a new style of diplomacy rooted in business negotiation tactics, regional economic integration proposals, and the idea that prosperity could soften political resistance. This approach emphasized investment, infrastructure, and regional normalization as pathways to stability, suggesting that economic incentives might gradually reduce hostility and create conditions for political compromise. Many critics, however, argued that economic development without political rights risks appearing as a substitute for genuine sovereignty, potentially deepening grievances rather than resolving them.

The President Trump’s peace board “switch off” of the UN, EU, and NATO is best understood as a symbolic critique of declining multilateral influence rather than a literal dismantling of global institutions. For decades, UN resolutions, EU diplomatic initiatives, and international legal frameworks have shaped discourse on the conflict, yet their inability to enforce final settlements has generated widespread frustration. The CEO-style model capitalizes on this frustration, presenting itself as a decisive alternative to slow, consensus-driven diplomacy. It implies that peace will not emerge from endless negotiations and resolutions but from a decisive power-backed agreement capable of imposing order and guaranteeing compliance. However, this vision also contains a paradox.

While unilateral leadership can accelerate decisions, peace in Gaza requires more than enforcement; it demands legitimacy, local acceptance, and long-term reconciliation. Agreements perceived as externally engineered may secure temporary calm but often fail to address deeper historical grievances rooted in displacement, identity, and contested sovereignty. Without addressing these foundational issues, even the most sophisticated peace architecture risks becoming a framework for managing conflict rather than resolving it.

Another dimension and concerns perception identified in negotiation processes. As many critics argue that negotiators’ backgrounds, ideological orientations, or political affiliations influence the direction of policy proposals, shaping which priorities are emphasized and which grievances are minimized. While such perceptions are politically powerful, a responsible analytical approach must distinguish between legitimate critique of policy alignment and the dangerous oversimplification of reducing complex diplomatic strategies to ethnic or religious identity. Policy decisions are shaped by strategic calculations, institutional interests, domestic politics, and geopolitical alliances; attributing them solely to identity risks obscuring these broader structural factors and can undermine the possibility of nuanced, constructive critique. The Trump Peace Board narrative also reflects a deeper transformation in how global leadership is imagined. Traditional diplomacy relied on multilateral conferences, gradual confidence-building measures, and legalistic frameworks rooted in international law. The CEO model instead emphasizes speed, branding, and decisive announcements, presenting peace as a deliverable product rather than a gradual process. This approach resonates with political constituencies fatigued by decades of stalemate, but it also risks oversimplifying the complexity of entrenched conflicts that require societal healing, historical acknowledgment, and grassroots reconciliation in addition to elite-level agreements.

Moreover, the close strategic alignment between Washington and Jerusalem under this framework highlights the enduring centrality of U.S.–Israel relations in shaping the conflict’s trajectory. Financial aid, military cooperation, intelligence sharing, and diplomatic coordination create a partnership that significantly influences regional dynamics. Supporters of this alignment argue that Israel’s security is non-negotiable and that strong U.S. backing deters wider regional escalation. Critics counter that such unwavering support reduces incentives for compromise and reinforces asymmetrical negotiation dynamics, making it more difficult to achieve a solution perceived as just by Palestinians.

The “death” of international organizations, therefore, represents not their disappearance but a crisis of confidence in their ability to deliver decisive outcomes. The UN remains empty shell that continues to administer humanitarian programs, the EU remains a major donor and diplomatic actor, and NATO shapes broader regional security calculations. Their influence persists, yet the perception that decisive power now resides in bilateral executive alliances reflects a broader shift toward great-power pragmatism in global politics. In this emerging order, legitimacy is increasingly measured by effectiveness and enforcement capacity rather than universal endorsement.

Ultimately, the Trump Peace Board symbolizes a pivotal ideological contest: whether peace in Gaza and the broader Palestinian question should be pursued through unilateral executive power backed by strategic alliances, or through renewed multilateral frameworks grounded in international law and inclusive negotiation. The CEO-President model promises clarity, speed, and enforceability, yet risks sacrificing the perception of fairness and mutual consent essential for lasting reconciliation. Multilateral diplomacy promises legitimacy and inclusiveness but often struggles with slow progress and enforcement limitations. The enduring lesson is that no peace architecture whether corporate-style or institutionally multilateral can succeed if it neglects the lived realities, aspirations, and fears of the people most directly affected. Gaza is not merely a geopolitical file or a strategic asset; it is a densely populated human landscape marked by history, trauma, resilience, and contested narratives of justice.

Any plan that seeks to end the conflict must ultimately balance power with legitimacy, security with dignity, and strategic calculation with moral responsibility. Without this balance, even the most carefully calculated and politically timed “ripe deal” risks becoming another chapter in a long cycle of imposed solutions that stabilize temporarily but fail to reconcile fundamentally. Thus, the image of a CEO-President and a closely aligned prime minister finalizing and implementing a decisive plan captures both the allure and the danger of executive-driven peace. It reveals the growing appeal of decisive leadership in an era of diplomatic fatigue, while simultaneously warning that enduring peace cannot be engineered solely through power, finance, or veto authority. True resolution will require not only strategic agreements but also a transformation in trust, representation, and mutual recognition elements that no boardroom, however powerful, can impose without the consent and participation of the people whose future it seeks to define.

The Arab World and the State of Palestinian Two state solution

The Palestinian question stands as the longest-running and most intensely symbolic conflict in modern international relations, a wound in the conscience of the world that has festered for nearly a century. To its past, present, and future is to weave together a tapestry of profound historical injustice, unwavering resistance, geopolitical manipulation, and the tragic failure of international law and moral leadership. The history of Palestine is not merely a regional dispute; it is a mirror reflecting the deep hypocrisies of the international system, the selective application of justice, and the devastating consequences when might is allowed to supersede right.

This sprawling narrative through the intersecting lenses of the United Nations' paralysis, the weaponization of the American veto, the brutal mechanics of Israeli occupation, the collective failure of Arab leadership, and the emergence of new, troubling frameworks that threaten to finally liquidate the Palestinian dream of self-determination.

The historical roots of the Palestinian catastrophe, or Nakba, lie in the twilight of the colonial era, when the League of Nations and later the United Nations became instruments for the reordering of the world according to great power interests. The 1947 UN Partition Plan, Resolution 181, was a seminal moment that revealed the international community's willingness to solve the European Jewish question at the expense of the indigenous Arab population of Palestine.

The nascent United Nations, established to protect the rights of all peoples, proposed the division of a land where two-thirds of the population were Palestinian Arabs, granting the majority of the territory to a minority Jewish population. When the state of Israel was declared in 1948, it was born amidst the ethnic cleansing of over 750,000 Palestinians, an act of mass dispossession that created a refugee crisis which endures to this day. The international community, having facilitated this catastrophe, has since proven itself incapable of rectifying it, entrenching a permanent underclass of refugees across the Levant whose right of return, enshrined in UN Resolution 194, has been rendered a hollow slogan by decades of Israeli intransigence and international inaction.

At the heart of this international paralysis lies the United Nations Security Council and the veto power wielded by its five permanent members. While the Cold War saw the Soviet Union occasionally veto resolutions, the landscape since the mid-1960s has been overwhelmingly dominated by a singular dynamic: the United States using its veto to shield Israel from consequences and criticism. This is not an occasional divergence of opinion but a consistent, structural feature of the post-1967 world order. Since Israel's occupation of the West Bank, Gaza Strip, and East Jerusalem, the US has repeatedly and systematically blocked the international community's ability to enforce its own laws and resolutions. The official UN veto list maintained by the Dag Hammarskjöld Library documents this pattern with stark clarity. From condemning the deportation of Palestinian civilians in the 1980s, to blocking the dispatch of a Security Council commission to protect civilians in 1990, to repeatedly vetoing resolutions that would affirm Palestinian rights, condemn settlements, or deplore violence against Palestinians, the American veto has served as an impenetrable diplomatic shield.

In the 21st century, this pattern has become even more stark. The US has vetoed resolutions demanding an end to Israeli military incursions in Gaza, condemning the assassination of Palestinian leaders, opposing the construction of the separation wall, and calling for the protection of Palestinian civilians. The recent war on Gaza, which began in October 2023, witnessed this dynamic in its most lethal form. As the world watched a campaign of systematic destruction unfold, one that legal scholars and UN experts would later term a potential genocide, the United States vetoed multiple calls for immediate ceasefires. The official record shows US vetoes on resolutions related to the situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question, on 18 October 2023, 8 December 2023, 22 December 2023, 20 February 2024, and 20 November 2024. An additional US veto occurred on 4 June 2025, and most recently on 18 September 2025.

These vetoes blocked resolutions demanding the lifting of humanitarian aid restrictions and prevented the Council from demanding a permanent end to the fighting.

The stated justification, that these resolutions did not explicitly condemn Hamas or recognize Israel's right to self-defense, rang hollow as the death toll mounted into the tens of thousands, famine was systematically imposed, and the healthcare system was annihilated. This has not been diplomacy; it has been diplomatic cover for a military campaign of annihilation, transforming the United States from a purported honest broker into a full-fledged military and political partner in the occupation and its worst excesses.

The American veto is not an isolated act but the capstone of a broader architecture of Israeli control and Palestinian subjugation. The occupation of the West Bank and Gaza, which began in 1967, has evolved from a temporary military administration into a permanent and deeply entrenched system of settler colonialism. In February 2026, the Israeli government advanced a measure of historic significance: for the first time since Israel occupied the territory in 1967, it created a mechanism to officially register large swaths of land in the West Bank under the state. This move applies to what is known as Area C, approximately sixty percent of the West Bank, home to an estimated 180,000 to 300,000 Palestinians and a settler population of at least 325,500. Far-right Finance Minister Bezalel Smotrich made the intent unmistakably clear, stating that the land registry would continue "the settlement and governance revolution across all parts of our land". The Palestinian Presidency declared that the decision violated international law and amounted to "de facto annexation of occupied Palestinian territory". Peace Now, an Israeli settlement watchdog, described the government's move as "a massive land grab in the West Bank" and warned that the process requires landowners to prove ownership in ways that are almost impossible for most Palestinians to do; if they fail, the land will be automatically registered as state land. This represents not merely settlement expansion but a formal, systematic dispossession enabled by a bureaucratic machinery designed to strip Palestinians of their land while maintaining a façade of legality.

In Gaza, the occupation took a different but equally devastating form. Following the 2005 "disengagement," Israel imposed a crippling air, land, and sea blockade, transforming the densely populated strip into what many called an open-air prison. The blockade, justified as a security measure, systematically de-developed the Gazan economy, destroyed its private sector, and rendered its population entirely dependent on international aid. The war that began in October 2023 has not been a rupture from this trajectory but its horrifying culmination. The destruction has been genocidal in scale and intent, with entire neighborhoods, universities, hospitals, and farms erased. More than 72,000 Palestinians have been killed and nearly 172,000 injured, with over 10,000 believed buried under the rubble due to Israel's genocidal campaign and the Israeli restrictions on entry of proper equipment. Yet, even amidst the rubble, new colonial visions have emerged. The Israeli government's long-term planning, which imagines the territory as a depopulated investment frontier for fossil fuel extraction and luxury real estate, reveals the settler-colonial logic of the project: destruction is not an end in itself but a prerequisite for erasure and replacement.

This is the transformation of a land and its people into a blank slate for capital accumulation, a vision of "reconstruction" that denies any Palestinian political rights or national aspirations.

The failure to counter this project does not lie solely with the Western powers; it must also be laid at the feet of the Arab and Muslim world. The Palestinian cause has long been declared the central issue of the Arab and Islamic worlds, a rallying cry for the masses, yet it has been betrayed by a leadership defined by division, cowardice, and self-interest. The Arab League, founded in 1945 with the noble aim of coordinating policy in support of key Arab causes, has devolved into a talking shop, its focus shifted from decisive action to the mere logistics of holding meetings.

The spirit of collective action that once drove the oil embargo or the unified diplomatic front has been supplanted by a landscape of competing national interests and a fear of confronting the United States or destabilizing cozy relationships with the West.

The Arab Group at the UN Security Council, in February 2026, renewed its condemnation of Israel's measures aimed at asserting control over the West Bank, expanding settlements, enabling settler violence and forcibly displacing Palestinians. The group stated that Israel's actions amount to an attempt to eliminate the prospect of a Palestinian state and undermine peace efforts, and it called for concrete measures to compel Israel to reverse its policies. Yet these condemnations, while rhetorically powerful, have not translated into meaningful action. The Arab League, in September 2025, adopted a resolution led by Egypt and Saudi Arabia stating that peaceful coexistence in the Middle East cannot be achieved without a Palestinian state and an end to what it described as Israel's "hostile practices". The League warned that the failure to solve the Palestinian issue, along with Israel's continued occupation of Arab land, blocks any hope of peaceful coexistence in the region. The resolution reaffirmed the two-state solution and the 2002 Arab Peace Initiative, which offers full normalization in return for a complete Israeli withdrawal from territories occupied in 1967.

The pinnacle of this Arab failure is the normalization of relations with Israel through the Abraham Accords, brokered by the Trump administration. The United Arab Emirates, Bahrain, Morocco, and Sudan, by establishing full diplomatic and economic ties with Israel, shattered the long-standing Arab consensus that normalization would only come after a just resolution of the Palestinian conflict. This move, celebrated in Washington and Tel Aviv as a historic breakthrough for peace, was in reality a historic breakthrough for the occupation. It granted Israel full acceptance and legitimacy from key Arab powers while asking for absolutely nothing in return for the Palestinians. It effectively told the Palestinians that they were on their own, that their cause was no longer a barrier to Arab-Israeli cooperation, and that Arab capitals were more interested in security pacts and economic deals with the regional hegemonic power than in the liberation of Jerusalem. Egypt and Jordan already have peace treaties with Israel, and while Saudi Arabia froze its own normalization talks with Israel after the Gaza war began, the very willingness to consider normalization without Palestinian statehood represents a fundamental shift in Arab priorities. The Arab League meeting in Cairo in September 2025, which sought to address the Palestinian issue, was instead consumed by broader regional security concerns, illustrating how the Palestinian cause has been pushed to the margins of the Arab agenda, even as Gaza continues to suffer.

This leadership failure is mirrored in the paralysis of the Palestinian national movement itself. The division between Fatah, which controls the Palestinian Authority in the West Bank, and Hamas, which governs Gaza, has been a catastrophic gift to the occupation. The PA, born of the Oslo Accords, has long been criticized for its security coordination with Israel, a deeply unpopular policy that sees Palestinian security forces effectively policing the occupation on Israel's behalf. This has corroded the legitimacy of the PA among its own people, painting it as a subcontractor of the occupation rather than a vehicle for liberation.

As one analysis notes, around seventy-five to eighty percent of Palestinians in recent polling consistently demand that President Abbas resign, and at least ninety percent of the Palestinian people are not represented within prominent international frameworks for peace. The PA's leadership is seen as old, out of touch, and authoritarian, having postponed elections for nearly two decades. Its internal corruption and reluctance to hold elections have further eroded public trust and institutional legitimacy, creating a political vacuum. Multiple failed unity attempts and the existence of rival factions have undermined prospects for a unified Palestinian strategy or credible negotiating partner. Hamas, on the other hand, while maintaining its resistance credentials, led Gaza into the devastating 2023 war and subsequent grinding conflict, the consequences of which have been borne almost entirely by the civilian population. The inability of these factions to reconcile and present a unified national strategy, despite repeated attempts at mediation, has left the Palestinian people leaderless and fractured, their national aspirations held hostage to factional power struggles. The international community, particularly the US and Israel, has cynically exploited this division, using it as an excuse to avoid serious peace negotiations and to label any unified Palestinian demand as extremist.

Into this vacuum of leadership, international law, and moral clarity, new and dangerous frameworks are emerging. The most audacious of these is the "Board of Peace" initiative, launched in early 2026 by US President Donald Trump. Presented as a bold new plan to stabilize and rebuild Gaza, the Board, chaired by Trump and including figures like his son-in-law Jared Kushner, represents a complete privatization and Americanization of the peace process. It bypasses the United Nations, sidelining the Quartet and international law, and treats the conflict as a real estate development opportunity. The Board's first meeting in Washington in February 2026, where participating nations pledged support for reconstruction, was immediately condemned by Hamas and other Palestinian factions, who rightly pointed out that any political path or arrangements regarding Gaza must be based on a complete halt to Israeli aggression, the lifting of the siege, and the guarantee of Palestinian self-determination, not on American corporate bailouts.

The true nature of this "peace" initiative has been revealed in subsequent leaks and reports, which detail a plan for the construction of a massive, permanent US military base in southern Gaza. Spanning approximately 350 acres, with dimensions of 1,400 meters by 1,100 meters, and designed to house 5,000 multinational soldiers as part of an "International Stabilization Force," this base would transform Gaza into a permanently occupied and militarized zone under direct American command.

The base will be ringed by twenty-six trailer-mounted armored watch towers, include bunkers with elaborate ventilation systems where soldiers can shelter, a small arms range, and a warehouse for military equipment for operations, with the entire perimeter covered by barbed wire. Contracting documents for the base were issued by the Board of Peace and prepared with the aid of US officials. The documents include a "Human Remains Protocol" which would see all work stopped immediately if human remains or cultural artifacts are found, a provision that acknowledges the thousands of Palestinians believed to be buried under the rubble in Gaza.

This is not peace-building; it is colonial fortress-construction. It envisions Gaza not as a sovereign territory to be rebuilt by and for its people, but as a strategic military outpost, a launching pad for further regional control, and a dumping ground for a multinational force that would effectively pacify the population and protect the interests of the occupier. The plan calls for the International Stabilization Force to enforce disarmament in the strip. Reports also indicate that Washington is planning to enlist Israeli-backed gangs and criminal organizations to serve as a local police force in Gaza, including smuggling and aid-looting militias, a plan that some US Army officials opposed as "ridiculous". The fact that this is being planned under the rubric of "reconstruction" and "stability" is a grotesque perversion of humanitarian language, reducing the Palestinians to a security problem to be managed by foreign troops. Indonesian officials have reportedly offered to send up to 8,000 troops, and Pakistani officials have also offered peacekeepers, though they noted that disarming the resistance is "not our job".

This "Board of Peace" model exemplifies the triumph of the "economic peace" paradigm, a concept long championed by Kushner, which seeks to bribe Palestinians into accepting permanent subjugation. It posits that if the economy is good enough, the occupation can be made bearable. This neoliberal fantasy, which also underpinned the Oslo process, is a deliberate strategy to depoliticize the conflict. It aims to turn a struggle for national liberation and fundamental rights into a series of technical problems, infrastructure deficits, unemployment rates, and water shortages to be solved by foreign donors and international consultants. The goal is to manage the conflict, not resolve it; to pacify the population, not liberate it. The Trump plan, with its military base and its investment conference aesthetics, is the logical endpoint of this thinking: the complete and final erasure of Palestinian political existence, replaced by a fenced-off, militarized Bantustan managed by an American CEO and secured by foreign mercenaries. US Ambassador to Israel Mike Huckabee made the administration's position explicit, stating that there is "no room" for a Palestinian state "unless there are some significant things that happen that change the culture," and suggesting that if such a state ever emerges, it should be carved out of "a Muslim country" rather than the occupied territories.

The international community's response to these developments has been, predictably, weak and divided. While the UN Security Council, in early 2026, stressed the need for stabilizing peace in Gaza and containing instability in the West Bank, its pronouncements carry little weight when its most powerful member is actively undermining its charter. UN Secretary-General Antonio Guterres condemned Israel's move to register West Bank land as a flagrant violation of international law. The European Union called it a "step in the wrong direction".

These are the murmurs of a paralyzed institution. Even the most well-intentioned UN officials become historical records of injustice, not instruments of prevention.

The role of the Global South has been somewhat more principled, with countries like Pakistan, Somalia, and Indonesia consistently condemning Israeli actions and, in Indonesia's case, even offering troops for a stabilization force, though the intent behind such offers remains ambiguous in the shadow of the US-led plan. However, this moral outrage has yet to translate into effective counter-power. The architecture of global governance remains skewed in favor of the Western alliance, and until that is fundamentally challenged, the Palestinians will continue to suffer the consequences.

Meanwhile, the push for recognition of Palestinian statehood continues in other forums. In June 2025, a UN conference on the two-state solution, led by France and Saudi Arabia, was postponed after Israeli airstrikes on Iran triggered a twelve-day war . French President Emmanuel Macron stated that the postponement "cannot undermine our determination to move forward with the implementation of the two-state solution" and reaffirmed his determination to recognize the state of Palestine. Many countries already recognize Palestine as a state, and a new wave of recognitions could trigger a cascade of global support. Recognition would serve as a powerful symbol of growing international frustration with Israel's obliteration of Gaza and apartheid-like domination of the West Bank, and it would help anchor the debate about the Israeli-Palestinian conflict in international law . However, as scholars Marc Lynch and Shibley Telhami caution, recognition cannot be an end unto itself; if formal recognition becomes a substitute for defending the primacy of international law and addressing the core realities of Palestinian suffering, it would be at best a hollow gesture and at worst an epic misallocation of scarce international political capital .

Looking to the future, the picture is grim but not entirely without resistance. The project of the Trump Board of Peace and the Gaza military base represents the most serious attempt yet to impose a final, colonial solution on the Palestinian people. If successful, it would mean the end of any hope for a sovereign Palestinian state, transforming Gaza into a permanent international protectorate under de facto Israeli and American control, while the West Bank is slowly digested by settlements. The two-state solution, already on life support, would be declared dead, replaced by a reality of fragmented, militarized enclaves with no sovereignty, no army, and no control over their resources or borders. Few Israelis today disagree with the Israeli ambassador to the United Kingdom, who bluntly asserted in mid-2025 that "the two-state solution is over" . This was arguably true long before Hamas's attack on Israel in 2023; all the territory west of the Jordan River has long constituted a single state under Israeli rule, where the land and the people are subject to radically different legal regimes, and Palestinians are permanently treated as a lower caste .

Some scholars and activists are therefore turning to alternative models of governance, such as confederation or federative arrangements, or the one-state solution. A confederal approach would allow two distinct entities to maintain sovereign authority over certain matters while mutually sharing other institutions—economic zones, security forces, infrastructure—across borders.

For a confederation to work, both parties would need to move away from zero-sum ambitions and instead accept shared responsibility, flexible borders, and the existence of parallel sovereignties. However, the Israeli-Palestinian context complicates such comparisons, given the perpetual asymmetry of power: Israel is a recognized, sovereign state with one of the world's most advanced armies and nuclear capabilities, robust international alliances, and control over borders, airspace, and resources throughout the territory, while Palestinians lack a sovereign state, exercise only limited self-administration in fragmented areas, and are deeply dependent on foreign aid. Critics argue that confederation could enable further fragmentation of Palestinian governance, creating a patchwork quilt of disconnected zones, and allowing Israel to maintain ultimate control while eschewing responsibility for Palestinian wellbeing.

Yet, the Palestinian spirit of resistance, which has survived the Nakba, multiple wars, and decades of occupation, has not been extinguished. The mass protests that greet American plans, the resilience of Gazans digging through the rubble with their bare hands, and the steadfastness of communities in the West Bank facing down settler violence are all testaments to an unbroken will. The future of Palestine ultimately rests not in the hands of the "Peace Boards" or the Security Council, but in the hands of the Palestinian people themselves and the global solidarity movement that supports them. The Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions movement, inspired by the South African anti-apartheid struggle, has grown into a global force, challenging corporate complicity and demanding accountability. On university campuses and in streets around the world, a new generation is rejecting the narrative of their parents and grandparents, recognizing the struggle for Palestinian freedom as inextricably linked to struggles for justice everywhere.

Furthermore, the changing demographics and politics of the region may yet yield new dynamics. While current Arab leadership has failed, the Arab publics have not. Poll after poll shows that the Palestinian cause remains deeply resonant with ordinary people across the Middle East, and the recent war in Gaza has only intensified this sentiment. This popular anger could eventually force the hands of reluctant regimes, or, in a more transformative scenario, it could be part of a broader wave of popular mobilization that reshapes the political landscape of the Arab world from within. The survival of royal families and authoritarian presidents is not guaranteed, and any future, more democratic Arab order would almost certainly be far more supportive of Palestinian rights.

In the immediate term, however, the obstacles remain immense. Israeli governments since 2022 have become the most right-wing and maximalist in the country's history, openly rejecting Palestinian statehood and advancing policies of settlement expansion, annexation, and consolidation of Jewish sovereignty over all contested territory. Key far-right ministers now wield significant power, mainstreaming exclusionary ideologies and blocking even limited autonomy for Palestinians. The Palestinian leadership remains deeply fragmented, with the PA ruling autocratically in the West Bank and Hamas isolated in Gaza. Externally, regional Arab states and international actors have shown increasing frustration with this paralysis and regularly call for leadership renewal and unity, but these calls have not translated into effective pressure.

The United States, under the Trump administration, has made its opposition to Palestinian statehood explicit. The State Department sent a cable in June 2025 urging governments not to participate in the UN conference on the two-state solution, stating that the United States "opposes any steps that would unilaterally recognize a conjectural Palestinian state, which adds significant legal and political obstacles to the eventual resolution of the conflict and could coerce Israel during a war, thereby supporting its enemies". This position represents a fundamental shift in American policy, moving from a purported commitment to a two-state solution to active opposition to Palestinian self-determination.

The International Court of Justice, in its July 2024 advisory opinion, declared that "Israel is under an obligation to bring to an end its unlawful presence in the Occupied Palestinian Territory as rapidly as possible". The ICJ affirmed the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination and stressed that occupation cannot nullify this right. Yet this opinion, like so many before it, remains unenforced, a testament to the gap between international law and international power.

The historical trajectory of Palestine is a testament to the brutality of unchecked power and the complicity of a world order built on selective morality. The UN, crippled by the American veto, has been transformed from a protector of the oppressed into a stage for their betrayal. The official record shows that the United States has used its veto power repeatedly and consistently to block Security Council action on Palestinian rights, most recently in September 2025 . The Israeli occupation, with its settlements, its military bases, and its siege, has become a permanent feature of the landscape, evolving into a sophisticated system of apartheid and settler colonialism. The February 2026 move to register West Bank land as state property represents a formal step toward de jure annexation, a "massive land grab" that will lead to the dispossession of thousands of Palestinians. The Arab world, with some exceptions, has traded its principles for patronage, its unity for self-preservation, and its honor for security pacts. The Arab League continues to issue statements affirming the necessity of a Palestinian state, but these statements ring hollow as Gulf states deepen their security cooperation with Israel and Saudi Arabia signals its willingness to normalize ties without Palestinian statehood.

And now, the international community, led by a reckless American administration, is proposing not peace, but a final liquidation of the Palestinian cause under the cynical banner of the "Board of Peace." This board, with its planned military base of 5,000 troops, its barbed wire perimeter, its armored watch towers, and its recruitment of criminal gangs as local police, is not a path to peace . It is a blueprint for a high-tech, multinational occupation designed to make the subjugation of Palestine permanent and profitable. Palestinian-Canadian lawyer Diana Buttu posed the essential question: "Whose permission did they get to build that military base?". The answer, of course, is that they did not ask the Palestinian people, because in this new world order, the Palestinians are not subjects of rights but objects of management.

The only hope that remains is that the forces of resistance, both within Palestine and across the globe, are strong enough to tear up this blueprint and demand, once and for all, that justice be done. For until it is, there will be no peace in Palestine, and no peace in the world that has abandoned it. The path forward requires not just the recognition of Palestinian rights, but their enforcement; not just statements of condemnation, but consequences for violations; not just new leadership, but new systems of accountability.

As one Palestinian activist observed, the most basic right for any individual is to be a citizen of at least one state, and Palestinians are still looking for their first citizenship. This is the core of the Palestinian question: a people denied the most fundamental right of political existence, subjected to occupation, dispossession, and now, potentially, to permanent military occupation under the guise of peace. The world that allows this to happen forfeits any claim to moral authority, and the history that will be written of this era will not be kind to those who stood by in silence.

Osman Ali Hassan

Email: abayounis1968@gmail.com