



Security vs. Humanity: The Erosion of Human Rights in the Israel-Palestine Conflict

Sitti Athiyah Syahbani Ashari

Jurusan Hubungan Internasional, Fakultas Ilmu Sosial dan Politik, Universitas Hasanuddin

Email: ozhabani475@gmail.com

Abstract: *All humans have human rights not because of gifts given to them by society or based on applicable positive law, but because they are human beings. Human rights violations if committed by anyone will be reciprocated by anyone whose rights are taken. As is happening now, human rights violations committed by the state of Israel against Palestine are a form of taking away other people's rights, especially the right to life and live in safety. Actions such as blockades, evictions, restrictions on mobility, and armed attacks have raised serious concerns from the international community regarding violations of international humanitarian law. This study uses a descriptive-analytical approach to evaluate the extent to which these security policies exceed the principles of civilian protection. It obtains a conclusion that security concepts is often used in defense of act that are against international norms and agreements after analyzing government reports, data from human rights organizations, and UN resolutions. These findings point the value of achieving a balance between state objectives and human rights protection as part of a sustainable security policy in the context of strategic security studies.*

Keywords: *Israel-Palestine Conflict, Human Rights Violations, International Humanitarian Law, Civilian Protection, Security vs. Human Rights, National Security Policy.*

1. INTRODUCTION

One of the wars that has had the most effects on Middle Eastern security and the dynamics of human rights around the world is the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, which has lasted for more than 70 years. In such a situation, there is frequently dispute over the interests of security and civilian protection. Israel claims the right to self-defense against the threats posed by Palestinian armed groups, particularly Hamas. Fortunately security-related actions including the blockade of Gaza, bombardment of civilian targets, mass arrests, and limitations on Palestinians' basic access have sparked significant concerns about human rights and international humanitarian law been violated.

The violations that have taken place during this conflict have been documented by a number of international organizations, including Human Rights Watch, Amnesty International, and the United Nations (UN). But these acts are frequently excused under the guise of counterterrorism and self-defense, which leads to a serious conflict between humanitarian principles and national security.

Examining the point to which security measures implemented during the Israeli-Palestinian conflict have weakened human rights, particularly for Palestinian civilians, is the goal of this study. This study will assess whether these actions are still within the range that can be morally and legally justified, or if they have gone beyond the bounds and turned into a type of structural oppression, using a descriptive approach and normative analysis of security policies,

international law, and human rights reports. Formulation of the Problem: What impact does Israel's security strategy have on Palestinian residents' human rights? In what ways has the ongoing violence resulted in violations of international humanitarian law? In what ways does the global community react to abuses of human rights?

2. THEORETICAL STUDY

Several distinct theoretical frameworks and legal approaches serve as the foundation for this study's analysis of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and its connection to human rights violations. In order to comprehend how the state in this example, Israel sees itself as the primary actor in anarchic international relations, traditional security theory with a realist foundation is applied. According to this viewpoint, the preservation of national existence and stability frequently serves as justification for offensive and oppressive state activities. This shows how the state frames a number of military actions, including the embargo, settlement development, and combat operations in Gaza, as part of its defense strategy against foreign threats, particularly Palestinian armed organizations.

However, this approach has been criticisms from the perspective of human security, which emphasizes that security consists of not only the state's existence but also people's safety and well-being. Threats to human security are not limited to military attacks; they also include offenses on the rights to life, food, health, education, and travel. According to this perspective, security measures that threaten people are considered to have fallen short of their moral and legal responsibilities to guarantee total human security.

This study references the principles of international humanitarian law, particularly the 1949 Geneva Conventions and their Additional Protocols, which delineate the obligations of states and armed groups to differentiate between combatants and non-combatants, prevent disproportionate harm, and safeguard civilians during armed conflict. Many military acts, such bombing heavily populated regions or limiting access to medical and humanitarian supplies, have the potential to violate these principles in the context of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

A statute method is employed to evaluate the legality of these activities in light of relevant international legal instruments in order to bolster the analysis. By using this method, the study not only analyzes the ethical and security-related practices that take place, but it also determines the degree to which these acts fall under the category of international law violations, such as war crimes and crimes against humanity.

Therefore, this study intends to provide a thorough analysis of the degradation of human rights in the Israeli–Palestinian conflict and emphasize the significance of international accountability in upholding justice amidst the protracted armed conflict by integrating traditional security theory, the concept of human security, the principles of international humanitarian law, and the legislative approach.

3. RESEARCH METHOD

This study combines a library research strategy with a descriptive qualitative method. This approach was used due to the study's primary goal of analyzing the Israeli-Palestinian conflict phenomena through theoretical and normative research, particularly in relation to security policies and their effects on human rights.

Official records from global organizations including the United Nations (UN), Human Rights Watch, Amnesty International, and reports from the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) are among the data sources used. Furthermore, to give empirical and real-world context for the analysis, references were also made to international legal documents like the 1949 Geneva Convention, Additional Protocols I and II, the 1998 Rome Statute, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and the Convention on the Rights of the Child.

The content analysis method, which involves closely scrutinizing the contents of documents and texts to find trends, storylines, and types of human rights breaches that take place under the guise of security rules, was used to analyze the data. The degree to which state acts (Israel) can be justified within the parameters of international humanitarian law is assessed using the normative approach. As a result, this approach enables scholars to examine the conflict from both a legal and strategic standpoint in a comprehensive way, and to make inferences grounded in globally applicable theories and rules.

4. RESULT AND DISCUSSIONS

A. Israel's Security Policy: Threat Narratives and Strategic Domination

Since the conflict started, the Israeli government has frequently arranged its military determines within an overall narrative of an existential danger to the Jewish state. This narrative has assisted in helping legitimize a number of safety policies, such as the establishment of the border barrier that the blockade of the territory of Gaza, and massive operations warfare such as Operation Cast Lead (2008-2009), Protection Edge (2014), and more most recent offensives in 2021-2023. The pre-emptive strike principle is central to

Israel's military doctrine, it emphasizes neutralizing any possible dangers before they occur—a tactic that has resulted in a markedly belligerent posture in the interest of domestic stability.

However, these acts have had a direct and often systematic negative effect on Palestinian civilian populations. The erection of the division barrier in the West Bank, for instance, has split villages, hampered the accessibility of education and healthcare facilities, and caused economic losses due to restricted movement. In Gaza, a decade-long air, sea, and land siege has resulted in a terrible humanitarian situation. According to the UN OCHA, 97% of Gaza's water is unsafe for consumption by humans, the health care system is severely undersupplied, and rates of unemployment are at 45%.

Israel has also implemented actions which are comparable to a collective sanction on the Palestinian civilian population, citing national security as justification. Such actions consist of the destruction of homes that belong to the families of assumed attackers, with no regard to their family members who were engaged, as well as the application of government detention laws without due legal process. Various human rights organizations have objected to such actions, claiming that Israel regularly fails to discriminate between fighters and non-combatants and responds to security concerns in excessive ways.

B. The Impact of Security Policies on Palestinian Civilian Life

Israel's militarized organizations policy toward security has resulted in widespread and lasting suffering for Palestinian citizens. According to the security of humans theory, such conditions constitute violation of basic human rights, including intimate, financial, medical, the environment, and political components. Due to data from the UN's Office responsible for the Coordinator of Humanitarian Aid (UN OCHA), more than 80% of Gaza's population depends on international humanitarian assistance to meet their essential daily requirements.

This instability is increased during situations caused by military escalated situations, such as Israel's operations Guard of the Wall in May 2021. In all, over 250 Palestinians were killed in just 11 days, that include 66 children and 39 women, according to the Gaza Ministry of Health. Around 1,900 human beings were hurt, and more than a thousand houses were destroyed. Schools, healthcare facilities, and clean drinking water systems sustained significant damage.

In addition to the physical harm, the ongoing war has caused significant psychological anguish among civilians, particularly children. According to a Save the Children survey, almost four out of every five children in Gaza suffer from psychological distress, including insomnia, chronic worry, and persistent terror. This reality demonstrates that a narrow

definition of security as protection from violent assaults fails to protect civilians while actively creating new kinds of danger that have become far more complicated and multidimensional.

C. Assessment Based on International Humanitarian Law

From a legal sense, Israel's security strategy raises severe concerns about potential transgressions of international human rights law. The 1949 Geneva Conventions, particularly the 4th Treaty in the Protection of civilians in Time of War, clearly state the every party to a conflict have to protect civilian populations by offering access to fundamental necessities. These agreements are further elaborated upon in the additional protocol I and II, which describe the important values of worth, proportion, and necessity as criteria for determining the legitimacy of military acts.

On the rule of distinction, the military must clearly distinguish between combat and non-combatants. However, multiple Israeli airstrikes targeted residential neighborhoods, claiming that they are utilized by terrorist organizations for maintaining weapons or coordinate operations. A significant example is Israel's 2021 bombing on a building holding Al Jazeera and the Press Association's offices, which Israel said was utilized by Hamas. No public confirmation was offered to support up this allegation. This raises concerns regarding the violations of the multipurpose target doctrine, which is under international law, must be employed with extreme discretion while balancing against the risk of harm to civilians.

Furthermore, the 1998 Rome Statute, also known which serves as the legal that supports for the International Crimes Court (ICC), defines intentional target of humans or civilian facilities as a war crime. Since the ratifying the Statute of Rome in 2015, Palestinian has given permission to the International Criminal Court (ICC) to start investigating alleged violations committed by the Israeli military and Palestinian military groups. In 2021, the ICC Prosecutor started an official investigation on possible human rights violations fully dedicated in the occupied Palestinian territories since 2014, such as incidents in Gaza, the West Bank, and East Jerusalem.

D. Disparities in Accountability Within the International System

Despite the fact that protecting civilians during armed conflict is expressly required by international law, the political realities of global governance frequently make it difficult to enforce. Due in major part to vetoes by strong member nations, especially the United nations, the UN Security Council has often failed to adopt legally binding resolutions regarding the

Israel-Palestine conflict. The United States' diplomatic and military backing of Israel has essentially established a "political shield" that restricts the application of international law.

The UN General Assembly's resolutions denouncing Israeli activities, however, are not enforceable by law and have no enforcement procedures. The idea that international regulation is enforced selectively and only works successfully against regimes with little political support is exacerbated by this discrepancy. Because of this, human rights and humanitarian law abuses in the context of the Israel-Palestine conflict are mostly unpunished and unaffected by the law.

E. Synthesis: The Tension Between State Security and Humanitarian Concerns

From a conceptual standpoint, the Israel-Palestine conflict draws attention to a basic conflict between the more inclusive ideas of human security and the exclusivist frame of state security. Israel has the right, on the one hand, to defend its people against armed assaults. However, as stated in several international legal agreements, this right cannot be applied in defense of acts that cause great suffering to civilian populations. Israel's military-centric strategy has often not only failed to bring up lasting peace but also escalated violent cycles, stoked extremism, and threatened regional stability.

According to this study, humanitarian concerns have been pushed out of the policymaking process in favor of a dominant security narrative. The outcome is not true peace but rather a type of structural oppression maintained by military might and political authority when state security can be used as a broad rationale to repress the rights to life, the freedom of movements, and the right to legal protection.

F. Theoretical Reflection: The Security Paradox in the International System

A non-constructivist examination of the Israel-Palestine conflict demonstrates the pervasiveness of realism security thinking. But in reality, this framework has time and time again fallen short of bringing about lasting peace. Israel, the state in this instance, has a monopoly on using force to protect its sovereignty, but it frequently disregards the idea that a state's legitimacy cannot be upheld by causing unarmed civilian populations to suffer for an extended period of time.

The selective implementation of international norms makes this dilemma. When it comes to applying international humanitarian law, major powers like the United States and some European nations regularly provide double standards. Sanctions and constitutionally binding resolutions are swiftly implemented as a reaction to an invasion of Ukraine by a power such as Russia. In contrast, equivalent measures are rarely used in response to Israeli activities, and are frequently thwarted by diplomatic pressure or veto power. These contradictions cast

considerable doubt on the international community's actual commitment to international human rights and the rule of law.

According to critical security theory, this clash highlights the pressing need to reinterpret security from a human-centered rather than a state-centric perspective. The maintenance of a dignified life, including access to justice, healthcare, work, and education, is a component of true security, which goes beyond the mere lack of rocket fire. The international system will not have achieved its most basic goal if these essential components are not guaranteed.

5. CONCLUSION

The integrity of the international legal and normative order is still under threat from the Israel-Palestine conflict. It is a test of whether global governance mechanisms can preserve justice values in the face of power imbalances, rather than just a territorial or ideological conflict. It requires both political will and the courage to redefine protection in a way that values human rights and the sovereign equally in order to stop this conflict going ahead. This requires addressing long-standing prejudices, examines approaches to enforcement, establishing an environment in which accountability is independent of geopolitical ties. Then and only then can the values of international law and human rights become a reality.

REFERENCE

- Agung Tri Wicaksono, Jabbar, A. A. N. B., & Fatwa, A. F. (2023). Problematika ICC dalam menjatuhkan sanksi kepada Israel dalam perspektif hukum internasional. *Jurnal Hukum, Politik dan Ilmu Sosial*, 3(1), 207–224. <https://doi.org/10.55606/jhpis.v3i1.3210>
- Ardiata, Z. F., Dantes, K. F., Ardhya, S. N., & Setianto, M. J. (2022). Pandangan hukum humaniter internasional terhadap konflik perseteruan bersenjata Israel-Palestina. *Ganesha Law Review*, 4(2), 24–32.
- Aulawi, M. H., & Sherliana, A. (2025). The principle of responsibility to protect: Its significance and implementation in Israel-Palestine conflict. *Uti Possidetis: Journal of International Law*, 6(1), 34–70. <https://doi.org/10.22437/up.v6i1.34814>
- Baranovich, N., & Moorthy, R. (2020). Human security and the Israel-Palestine conflict: External vs. internal perspectives. *Journal of International Studies*, 6, 82–96. <https://e-journal.uum.edu.my/index.php/jis/article/view/7910>
- Benvenisti, E. (1994). Responsibility for the protection of human rights under the interim Israeli-Palestinian agreements. *Israel Law Review*, 28(2–3), 297–317.

- Cohen, H., & Dudai, R. (2013). Human rights dilemmas in using informers to combat terrorism: The Israeli-Palestinian case. In *Terrorism and human rights* (pp. 213–227). Routledge.
- Habibillah, E. I. (2023). Pengaruh kebijakan PBB dalam konflik Palestina-Israel. *Jurnal Tapis: Jurnal Teropong Aspirasi Politik Islam*, 19(1), 28–46. <https://doi.org/10.24042/tps.v19i1.16761>
- Hajjar, L. (1997). Cause lawyering in transnational perspective: National conflict and human rights in Israel/Palestine. *Law & Society Review*, 31(3), 473–504.
- Jannah, D. R., & Mahfud, M. (2023). The International Criminal Court's jurisdiction over Israel's blockade on the Gaza Strip: Examining the crime of aggression. *Student Journal of International Law*, 3(1), 1–20.
- Mahwati, T., & Nanda, A. R. (2022). Analysis of the Palestinian and Israeli conflict in the perspective of international humanitarian law. *International Law Discourse in Southeast Asia*, 1(1), 23–42. <https://doi.org/10.15294/ildisea.v1i1.56873>
- Scher, C., & Van Den Hoek, J. (2025). Active InSAR monitoring of building damage in Gaza during the Israel– Hamas war. *Remote Sensing Letters*, 16(5), 200–218. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2506.14730>
- Shalbak, I. (2023). Human rights in Palestine: From self-determination to governance. *Australian Journal of Human Rights*, 29(3), 492–510.
- Sitompul, A. (2023). War crimes in Palestine from the perspective of the International Criminal Court (ICC). *International Asia of Law and Money Laundering (IAML)*, 2(4), 158–162. <https://doi.org/10.59712/iaml.v2i4.72>
- Soraya, N., Muhammad, A., & Ladiqi, S. (2024). ICC jurisdiction: Against Israeli war and humanitarian crimes targeting Palestinian civilians 2023. *Jurnal Media Hukum*, 31(1), 59–77. <https://doi.org/10.18196/jmh.v31i1.20938>
- van Steenberghe, R. (2024). The armed conflict in Gaza, and its complexity under international law: Jus ad bellum, jus in bello, and international justice. *Leiden Journal of International Law*, 37(4), 983–1017. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0922156524000220>