



REVIEW OF SOUTH AFRICA'S COMPLAINT REGARDING ISRAEL'S GENOCIDE IN GAZA

^{1*}Zahra Mirnami, ²Seyed Mohammad Hosseini

¹Master's Degree in Law, Islamic Azad University, Torbat Heydarieh Branch, Iran

²PhD in Law, Islamic Azad University, Torbat Heydarieh Branch, Iran

Corresponding author: Zahra Mirnami

ABSTRACT

Genocide is one of the most serious and complex international crimes, referring to actions aimed at the complete or partial destruction of a national, ethnic, racial, or religious group. This concept is particularly defined under the 1948 United Nations Convention and includes four specific types of acts: killing members of a group, causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of a group, deliberately inflicting living conditions calculated to destroy a group, and imposing measures to prevent births within a group. South Africa's complaint against Israel on charges of genocide in Gaza has been raised in response to ongoing human rights violations in this critical region. This complaint is not only viewed as an effort to draw global attention to the humanitarian situation in Gaza but also reflects South Africa's commitment to human rights and social justice. Given numerous reports from international organizations regarding human rights violations in Gaza, this research examines South Africa's complaint and its impact on international diplomacy and the human rights situation in the region.

Keywords: genocide, international law, Africa's complaint, Amnesty International

INTRODUCTION

Genocide is one of the most serious and complex international crimes, specifically referring to actions aimed at the complete or partial destruction of a particular national, ethnic, racial, or religious group. This concept holds special significance as a key subject in international law, particularly concerning human rights and global security. The term "genocide," equivalent to the Persian term (genocide), is derived from the combination of two words: "genos," meaning race or lineage, and "cide," meaning killing. This term was first coined in 1933 by Polish jurist Raphael Lemkin to describe crimes that led to the gradual destruction of human groups (Raphael, International Law, Vol. 1, p. 41). The term genocide was also utilized during the Nuremberg Trials to describe the brutal actions of Nazi criminals.

Genocide, as an international crime, is defined under the 1948 United Nations Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide. In its Article II, the convention defines genocide as any act committed with the intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnic, racial, or religious group.

The four types of acts specified in this convention include:

1. killing members of the group,
2. causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group,
3. deliberately inflicting conditions of life calculated to bring about the group's physical destruction, and
4. imposing measures to prevent births within the group (United Nations General Assembly, 1948).

This definition specifically emphasizes the intent and purpose of destroying a particular group, distinguishing it from other international crimes. Furthermore, the concept of genocide has been widely applied in the proceedings of the International Criminal Court and the International Court of Justice, serving as a legal standard for evaluating the behaviors of states and groups globally (Schabas, 2015, pp. 45-50).

Genocide specifically focuses on the destruction of a particular group, differentiating it from other international crimes such as war crimes and crimes against humanity. War crimes refer to serious violations of the laws of war, which may include attacks on civilians, torture, and inhumane treatment. On the other hand, crimes against humanity refer to acts committed systematically against civilian populations but do not have the specific intent to destroy a particular group. Therefore, while all these crimes constitute severe violations of human rights, genocide seeks the complete or partial destruction of a specific group (Schabas, 2009, pp. 45-50).

South Africa's complaint against Israel on charges of genocide in Gaza is part of a broader trend in the field of human rights and international diplomacy, specifically addressing ongoing human rights violations in occupied areas and military conflicts. Gaza, with a population of nearly two million and critical living conditions, is considered one of the most tense regions in the Middle East. Due to economic blockades, repeated wars, and political tensions, this area faces profound humanitarian crises. In this context, a report by Amnesty International (2021) clearly indicates that "Israeli airstrikes during recent conflicts have resulted in civilian casualties, damage to vital infrastructure, and a humanitarian crisis" (Amnesty International, 2021).

South Africa, as a country with a rich history of struggle against apartheid and human rights violations, has actively defended human rights and social justice on the global stage. Given its historical experience, South Africa is strongly committed to international human rights obligations, which is why it initiated a complaint against Israel regarding genocide in Gaza. This complaint was filed in 2021 and is seen as an effort to draw global attention to the humanitarian situation in Gaza and to pressure the international community to act in support of human rights. In this context, international organizations and human rights bodies continuously monitor the situation in Gaza, publishing numerous reports on human rights violations and humanitarian conditions in the region. For instance, a report by Human Rights Watch (2021) highlights civilian casualties and serious damage to infrastructure in Gaza, calling for investigations into these violations (Human Rights Watch, 2021). These reports not only emphasize the severity of the humanitarian crisis in Gaza but also warn governments and international entities that they must act to protect human rights.

Based on the aforementioned content, the objective of this research is to examine South Africa's complaint against Israel on charges of genocide in Gaza and analyze its impact on international diplomacy and the human rights situation in the region. This study also seeks to

clarify South Africa's role as a leading country in supporting human rights and to investigate the challenges facing the international community in addressing human rights violations in Gaza.

IMPORTANCE OF THE TOPIC OF GENOCIDE IN INTERNATIONAL LAW

Genocide, as one of the most severe and complex violations of human rights, is considered not only a physical act but also a systematic attack on the identity, culture, and existence of a human group. This topic is particularly significant in the context of international law and international accountability mechanisms. Defined as an international crime under the 1948 United Nations Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, genocide is described in Article II of this convention as any act committed with the intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnic, racial, or religious group (United Nations General Assembly, 1948). This definition encompasses four specific types of acts: killing members of a group, causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of a group, deliberately inflicting living conditions calculated to bring about the physical destruction of a group, and imposing measures to prevent births within a group. This legal framework serves as the basis for the prosecution and trial of genocide crimes, particularly concerning the international responsibilities of states and individuals (Schabas, 2015, pp. 45-50).

A rapid and effective response from the international community to genocides is of paramount importance. History has shown that failure to respond promptly can lead to mass killings and widespread human rights violations. For example, during the Rwandan genocide in 1994, the global community, particularly the United Nations, failed to respond effectively despite multiple warnings, leading to the deaths of approximately 800,000 people (Power, 2002, pp. 215-220). These failures clearly indicate the need for establishing effective and rapid mechanisms to respond to crises and prevent genocides.

Genocides not only result in the killing of individuals but also lead to the destruction of the identity, culture, and history of a group. This is particularly evident in the genocide of Jews during World War II, where not only individuals were killed, but a rich culture and history were systematically destroyed (Friedländer, 1997, pp. 3-5). These harms affect not only the direct victims but also impact future generations, leading to the creation of traumatized and unstable societies.

International organizations such as the United Nations and the International Criminal Court (ICC) play a crucial role in protecting human rights and responding to genocides. These bodies can prevent genocides by establishing monitoring and accountability mechanisms and prosecuting offenders. The ICC, as an independent entity, is responsible for investigating and prosecuting genocide crimes and can act as an effective tool in addressing these types of violations (Bassiouni, 2015, pp. 201-210). Public education and awareness about genocide and human rights can help in preventing such violations.

By increasing public awareness and education about the history and consequences of genocide, it is possible to contribute to preventing the repetition of these atrocities. For instance, educational programs in schools and universities can help students become familiar with the concepts of human rights and genocide, thus guiding future generations toward respecting human rights and preventing collective violence (Hinton, 2018, pp. 45-50).

Despite the advancements made in the field of human rights and accountability for genocides, many challenges and obstacles remain. One such challenge is the lack of international consensus regarding the definition and recognition of genocides.

Additionally, some states may refrain from acting against genocides due to political or economic interests (Fein, 2017, pp. 12-15). This issue requires serious attention and action from the international community to prevent genocides and ensure that victims obtain their rights.

LEGAL FRAMEWORK OF SOUTH AFRICA'S COMPLAINT

The issue of genocide and human rights violations in Gaza has become one of the central issues in international politics, especially in recent years. In this context, South Africa, as a country that has experienced profound discrimination and racism in its contemporary history, has actively addressed the issue of genocide in Gaza and submitted an official complaint against Israel to the International Criminal Court (ICC) in 2021. This complaint followed Israel's military attacks on Gaza and widespread human rights violations in the region and is viewed as a symbolic act by South Africa to support human rights and international justice (Harris, 2021, p. 102).

Historically, South Africa's previous apartheid regime has been seen as a stain on the history of humanity; however, the South African government is now not only freed from the heavy burden of historical condemnation but is also striving to address one of the greatest collective sufferings of humanity, unprecedented since the establishment of the United Nations, by filing a lawsuit against Israel. Numerous facts have been presented regarding the occurrence of various severe international crimes committed by the Israeli regime and its agents and military against the Palestinian people. This regime has been accused of racial discrimination, war crimes, and gross human rights violations by various authors. However, there has never been an opportunity to prosecute these violations in an international judicial body. Although the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination has addressed Palestine's complaint against Israel, such hearings cannot be as effective as trials in the International Court of Justice. The case regarding the legality of the construction of the separation wall in the occupied Palestinian territories, which led to the issuance of an advisory opinion by the International Court of Justice in 2004, was the peak of international organizations' activities to document and provide a judicial narrative of human atrocities in Palestinian territories, especially the occupied areas (International Court of Justice, 2004). Recently, the United Nations General Assembly has requested another advisory opinion regarding the consequences of the prolonged occupation of these territories, and it is expected that the Court will respond positively to this request. Additionally, the situation in Palestine is under the scrutiny of the ICC prosecutor, and cases against some Israeli officials are likely to be opened in the coming years.

South Africa's lawsuit against Israel is significant for two reasons: it is the first time that a case has been opened against the Israeli government in an international judicial body to address state crimes against the Palestinian people, and it is the first time that the complainant, aware of its obligations, has asked the Court to also address its orders. The audience of this note is well aware of the distinction between the two courts in The Hague: the ICC will prosecute individuals responsible for committing crimes under its jurisdiction, while the International Court of Justice, as the main judicial body of the United Nations, will adjudicate the responsibility of the Israeli state. The 1948 Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide is one of the fundamental international documents in the field of human rights, establishing the obligations of states to prevent and punish genocide. Article 1 of this convention explicitly states that genocide, whether in times of peace or war, is considered a crime under international law, and all contracting states are obligated to prevent and punish it (United Nations, 1948). Therefore, South Africa, as a contracting state, has the right to request the International Court of Justice to address Israel's violations.

Article 9 of the Genocide Convention grants the International Court of Justice the authority to address disputes arising from the interpretation or application of this convention (United

Nations, 1948). In the South African case, this country has explicitly stated that based on this article, the Court has the jurisdiction to hear the complaint. The Court has also noted in the case of Gambia against Myanmar that a country's reservations cannot obstruct the Court's jurisdiction to address human rights violations (International Court of Justice, 2019).

Israel may claim that its military operations in Gaza are conducted within the framework of the right to self-defense. Article 51 of the UN Charter allows states to exercise the right of self-defense in the case of an armed attack against them (United Nations, 1945). However, the Court must consider that the right to self-defense cannot justify international crimes such as genocide. For example, in the case of the ICC regarding Libya, the Court emphasized that even in times of war, humanitarian principles must be observed, and violations of these principles can lead to international responsibility (International Criminal Court, 2012). One of the main challenges in this case is proving the existence of genocidal intent by Israel. The Genocide Convention explicitly states in its Article II that genocide includes acts committed with the intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnic, racial, or religious group (United Nations, 1948). The Court must examine sufficient evidence to substantiate this claim by South Africa. Political challenges may also impact the proceedings of this case. International support for Israel and political pressures may influence the Court's decisions. For instance, countries supporting Israel may seek to intervene in this case and attempt to influence the proceedings through diplomacy (Khan, 2021). South Africa's complaint against Israel can be seen as a turning point in human rights developments at the international level. This complaint could inspire other countries to respond to human rights violations and international crimes, contributing to the establishment of a new model for international lawsuits.

This case could create additional pressure on the United Nations and international bodies to address human rights violations and war crimes. For instance, in recent years, the UN General Assembly and the Security Council have frequently addressed the human rights situation in Palestine, and this complaint could help strengthen these efforts.

SOCIAL AND POLITICAL IMPACTS OF SOUTH AFRICA'S COMPLAINT

South Africa's complaint against Israel for alleged crimes against humanity and human rights violations in Palestine has significant social and political implications. These impacts could lead to profound changes in how the international community addresses issues related to Palestine and Israel. One of the primary effects of the complaint is its potential to raise public awareness about the human rights situation in Palestine. Given South Africa's history of struggle against apartheid, the country is recognized globally as a symbol of the fight against inequality and discrimination. This complaint may attract media attention and engage human rights activists regarding the plight of Palestinians, contributing to global campaigns advocating for human rights in the region (Bassiouni, 2015, pp. 451-466).

Additionally, the complaint could lead to changes in international policies concerning Israel and Palestine. For instance, more countries may consider imposing economic or political sanctions against Israel or voting in favor of international resolutions regarding human rights (Khan, 2021, pp. 123-145). This case could encourage international organizations to strengthen their roles in addressing human rights violations. Given that the International Court of Justice and the International Criminal Court are recognized as important judicial bodies in this regard, the complaint could enhance the credibility and effectiveness of these institutions and lead to the establishment of a more effective mechanism for addressing human rights violations (International Court of Justice, 2004).

Moreover, South Africa's complaint against Israel has the potential not only to have profound impacts on the human rights situation in Palestine but also to trigger widespread social and

political changes at the international level. This action could increase public awareness, foster international solidarity, change attitudes, exert pressure on governments, and strengthen international institutions. Therefore, this complaint is viewed as a significant step toward the realization of human rights and social justice globally.

CHALLENGES AND OBSTACLES OF SOUTH AFRICA'S COMPLAINT

South Africa's complaint against Israel for human rights violations and potential crimes against humanity in Palestine faces numerous challenges and obstacles. These challenges can generally be categorized into legal, political, practical, and social groups, each of which impacts the proceedings of the complaint in various ways.

1. **Legal Challenges:** One of the main legal challenges is the complexity of proving the intent behind the alleged genocidal actions. The Genocide Convention requires clear evidence of intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnic, racial, or religious group. Gathering sufficient evidence to substantiate such claims can be difficult, especially in a politically charged environment where documentation of violations may be contested.
2. **Political Challenges:** The political landscape significantly affects the case, as many countries have differing stances on Israel and Palestine. Some states may support Israel due to strategic alliances or economic interests, which can hinder collective international action. Political pressures may influence the decisions of international bodies, potentially leading to biased outcomes.
3. **Practical Challenges:** The effectiveness of the judicial process can be hindered by bureaucratic delays, lack of resources, or insufficient political will among member states to enforce decisions made by international courts. Additionally, the ICC and ICJ may face difficulties in executing their mandates if member states are unwilling to cooperate with investigations or prosecutions.
4. **Social Challenges:** Public opinion on the Israel-Palestine issue varies widely across different regions and demographics. This divergence can impact the level of support for the complaint and can create divisions among civil society groups. There is a risk that the complaint may be overshadowed by ongoing conflicts or other global issues, diminishing its visibility and urgency.

In conclusion, while South Africa's complaint against Israel may hold significant potential for promoting accountability and human rights, it also faces substantial challenges that could impact its effectiveness and outcomes. Addressing these challenges will require strategic efforts from South Africa and the international community to ensure that the complaint is taken seriously and leads to meaningful action regarding the situation in Palestine.

Legal Challenges:

One of the most significant challenges in this case is proving the existence of serious human rights violations by Israel. For South Africa to succeed in this complaint, it must present strong evidence and documentation demonstrating these serious violations. This includes gathering evidence from events, testimonies from victims, and international documentation. However, security conditions and access restrictions to occupied areas may make it difficult to collect this evidence. For instance, reports from international organizations such as Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch frequently refer to human rights violations in Palestine, but gathering solid and credible evidence to substantiate these violations in the International Court of Justice (ICJ) is essential (Khalidi, 2020, p. 45).

In addition to this, the jurisdiction of the ICJ to hear this case presents another challenge. The Court can only address the case if both parties (South Africa and Israel) consent to its jurisdiction. Israel does not recognize the Court's authority and may refuse to accept its jurisdiction, which could become a major obstacle in processing the complaint (Al-Haq, 2021, p. 12). Furthermore, many countries, including Israel, have made reservations regarding international conventions. These reservations can limit the Court's jurisdiction to address cases and pose a significant challenge for South Africa (Murphy, 2019, p. 67).

Political Challenges:

One of the largest political challenges is the diplomatic pressure from countries that support Israel. These countries may attempt to use their influence in international organizations to prevent the case from being addressed. For example, they may work within international forums such as the United Nations to pass resolutions favorable to Israel or to block resolutions supporting South Africa's complaint (Baker, 2021, p. 22). Such pressures can manifest as threats of economic or political sanctions or even diplomatic pressures in international forums. Countries supporting Israel may also use their economic leverage to pressure South Africa. This pressure could include threats to reduce economic aid, investments, or trade relations. For instance, if pro-Israel countries feel that South Africa's complaint could harm their economic interests, they may take actions to reduce trade and economic cooperation with South Africa (Khan, 2021, p. 130). South Africa's complaint could provoke negative reactions from pro-Israel countries. These nations may resort to sanctions or political actions against South Africa, which could adversely affect the country's international relations. Such reactions may manifest as reduced economic assistance, diminished trade relations, or even a decline in political cooperation (Khan, 2021, p. 130).

These political challenges could also lead to internal impacts. External pressures may influence political decision-making in South Africa and put the government under pressure to withdraw its complaint. This situation could lead to internal tensions and disagreements among various political parties and groups. Consequently, the South African government might face internal challenges that could reduce public support for the complaint and the country's foreign policies. Overall, South Africa's complaint against Israel faces multiple political challenges, including diplomatic pressures, negative reactions from pro-Israel countries, and impacts on domestic politics. For the complaint to succeed, South Africa will require effective strategies to manage these challenges and maintain its international relations.

Practical Challenges:

One of the most significant practical challenges in this complaint is the collection of credible and documented evidence to substantiate human rights violations in Gaza and other areas occupied by Israel. For the complaint to succeed, South Africa needs evidence demonstrating serious human rights violations by Israel. This evidence may include eyewitness reports, photographs, videos, and international documentation. However, security conditions and lack of access to various areas can impede the collection of this evidence (Amnesty International, 2020). Ongoing conflicts and unsafe conditions in Palestinian territories, particularly in Gaza, can hinder human rights organizations' ability to gather reliable evidence. Many NGOs and human rights activists may be unable to access affected areas due to security risks, which could lead to a decrease in the quality and quantity of available evidence. For instance, during critical times, such as wars or military operations, collecting evidence becomes extremely difficult, potentially resulting in an inability to present a strong case in the International Court of Justice.

In addition to challenges related to evidence collection, cases in the International Court of Justice are typically time-consuming, often taking years to reach a conclusion. This lengthy process may delay justice for victims of human rights violations and exacerbate pressures and crises in the region (Bassiouni, 2015, p. 455). Delays in the judicial process may lead to the loss of evidence and reduce victims' motivation to pursue their complaints.

Moreover, in a situation where time is of the essence and the human rights situation in Palestine remains critical, delays in addressing the complaint could result in missed opportunities for positive changes in the human rights landscape. For example, over time, eyewitnesses may become unavailable to testify due to security conditions or social pressures, which could undermine the credibility of the case. These practical challenges not only affect the complaint's process but also impact the victims of human rights violations. Victims expecting justice may become disheartened due to a lack of progress in the complaint and the lengthy judicial process. This disillusionment could lead to a decrease in their motivation to participate in the judicial process and provide evidence. Additionally, when victims feel their voices are not being heard, it may result in a loss of trust in the international judicial system and human rights institutions.

Social Challenges:

South Africa's complaint can contribute to raising public awareness regarding the human rights situation in Palestine. This complaint may serve as a catalyst for public discussions about human rights violations and war crimes committed by Israel. Media, NGOs, and human rights activists may utilize this complaint as a tool to draw attention to the plight of Palestinians and launch awareness campaigns. This increased awareness could lead to the formation of a stronger social movement advocating for Palestinian rights (Khalidi, 2020). However, South Africa's complaint may also face social opposition and criticism. In some countries, there are groups and organizations that strongly support Israel and may react negatively to this complaint. Such reactions could include organizing protests, issuing statements of opposition, and exerting pressure on governments to prevent them from supporting South Africa's complaint (Khan, 2021, p. 130). These oppositions can lead to social divisions in certain countries. For instance, in countries with diverse communities holding varying views on Israel and Palestine, this complaint may exacerbate social and political tensions. Pro-Israel groups might criticize their own governments for supporting South Africa's complaint, which can create social and political rifts (Baker, 2021).

In some countries, support for Israel may be perceived as part of national or cultural identity. This perception can lead to feelings of threat among pro-Israel groups and provoke stronger reactions. In such conditions, South Africa's complaint may be viewed as a challenge to the national and cultural identity of some countries, potentially leading to social and political tensions (Khan, 2021).

CONCLUSION

Genocide, as one of the most severe and complex violations of human rights in human history, is not only regarded as a physical act but also as a systematic attack on the identity, culture, and existence of a human group. This concept holds particular significance within the framework of international law and the 1948 United Nations Convention, which specifically addresses the prevention and punishment of genocide. According to the provided definition, genocide includes actions such as killing members of a group, causing serious bodily or mental harm, creating conditions of life that are intended to destroy a group, and preventing births within a group.

South Africa's complaint against Israel for genocide in Gaza has been raised in the context of ongoing human rights violations and humanitarian crises in this critical region. Given South Africa's history in the struggle against apartheid and its commitment to human rights principles, this complaint is viewed as an effort to draw global attention to the humanitarian situation in Gaza. Utilizing its historical experiences, particularly regarding human rights violations, South Africa seeks to create a strong voice in the international arena to compel the global community to act and hold accountable those responsible for such violations. Gaza, with a population of nearly two million and critical living conditions due to economic

blockades and military conflicts, is recognized as one of the hotspots for human rights violations in the Middle East. Numerous reports from international organizations, such as Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch, emphasize the severity of the humanitarian crisis and systematic human rights violations in this region. These reports specifically highlight civilian casualties and serious damage to infrastructure, underscoring the need for investigation and accountability in this context.

On the other hand, this complaint functions not only as a legal action but also as a diplomatic tool that can amplify international pressures on governments and international bodies to take effective actions in support of human rights. This could serve as a model for other countries and human rights organizations to respond to similar violations and prevent the recurrence of such atrocities.

Ultimately, genocide, as an international crime, requires global awareness and accountability. The international community must play its role in protecting human rights by adopting effective policies and actions, especially in the face of humanitarian crises. This includes strengthening international mechanisms to prevent genocide, supporting victims and survivors, and holding perpetrators accountable. In this regard, commitment to human rights principles and human values should be prioritized to prevent the recurrence of historical atrocities and to move towards a more just and humane future.

REFERENCES

1. Amnesty International. (2021). *Israel and the occupied Palestinian territories: 2021 report*. Retrieved from
2. Harris, D. (2021). The role of South Africa in international human rights advocacy: A case study of the Gaza conflict. *Journal of African Studies*, 15(2), 102-105.
3. Human Rights Watch. (2021). *A threshold crossed: Israeli authorities and the crimes of apartheid and persecution*. Retrieved from
4. International Committee of the Red Cross. (2016). *International humanitarian law: Questions and answers*. Retrieved from United Nations. (1948). *Convention on the prevention and punishment of the crime of genocide*. Retrieved from
5. Khalidi, R. (2006). *The iron cage: The story of the Palestinian struggle for statehood*. Beacon Press.
6. Morris, B. (2001). *Righteous victims: A history of the Zionist-Arab conflict, 1881-2001*. Knopf.
7. Said, E. W. (1992). *The question of Palestine*. Vintage Books.
8. OCHA. (2018). *Humanitarian needs overview: Gaza Strip*. Retrieved from Humanitarian Needs Overview 2018.pdf
9. Ardabili, A. (2011). *Religious and sectarian prejudices from the perspective of Islamic jurisprudence* (p. 41). Zaeem Publications.
10. Mir Mohammad Sadeghi, H. (2003). *Examining crimes against humanity in former Yugoslavia with special attention to crimes against women* (p. 28). Dadgasht Publications.
11. Shariati Bagheri, M. J. (2008). *International criminal law* (9th ed., p. 70). Jungle Publications.
12. Schabas, W. A. (2009). *Genocide in international law: The crimes of crimes* (pp. 45-50). Cambridge University Press.
13. Schabas, W. A. (2015). *An introduction to the international criminal court* (pp. 45-50). Cambridge University Press.
14. Power, S. (2002). *A problem from hell: America and the age of genocide* (pp. 215-220). Basic Books.

15. Fein, H. (2017). *Accounting for genocide: National responses and Jewish victimization during the Holocaust* (pp. 12-15). Transaction Publishers.
16. Annan, K. (1999). *The responsibility to protect: Report of the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty*. Retrieved from Report.pdf
17. Mamdani, M. (2001). *When victims become killers: Colonialism, nativism, and the genocide in Rwanda* (pp. 3-5). Princeton University Press.
18. Dawson, G. (2015). *The responsibility to protect: A global political and legal perspective* (pp. 78-80). Routledge.
19. Bellamy, A. J. (2015). *The responsibility to protect: A defense* (pp. 45-50). Oxford University Press.
20. Krause, K., & Jütersonke, O. (2005). *Peace, security and development in the 21st century: The role of the United Nations* (pp. 123-125). Routledge.
21. United Nations Security Council. (2014). *Report of the Secretary-General on the protection of civilians in armed conflict*. Retrieved from
22. United Nations Human Rights Council. (2015). *Report of the independent commission of inquiry on the 2014 Gaza conflict*. Retrieved from
23. Amnesty International. (2020). *Israel: 'No Safe Place': The Impact of Israel's Military Operations on Civilians in Gaza*. Retrieved from Amnesty International.
24. Bassiouni, M. C. (2015). *Accountability for Human Rights Violations: The Role of International Criminal Justice*. *Journal of International Criminal Justice*, 13(3), 451-466.
25. International Court of Justice. (2019). *The Gambia v. Myanmar*. Retrieved from ICJ.
26. Khan, M. (2021). *The Political Dimensions of International Law: The Case of Israel and Palestine*. *International Law Review*, 23(2), 123-145.
27. United Nations. (2020). *Report on the situation of human rights in the Palestinian territories*. Retrieved from UNGA.
28. International Court of Justice. (2004). *Legal Consequences of the Construction of a Wall in the Occupied Palestinian Territory*. Retrieved from ICJ.
29. Al-Haq. (2021). *The Legal Framework for Accountability: A Guide for Palestinian Civil Society*. Al-Haq. Retrieved from Al-Haq.
30. Bassiouni, M. C. (2015). *Accountability for Human Rights Violations: The Role of International Criminal Justice*. *Journal of International Criminal Justice*, 13(3), 451-466.
31. Khan, M. (2021). *The Political Dimensions of International Law: The Case of Israel and Palestine*. *International Law Review*, 23(2), 123-145.
32. United Nations. (2020). *Report on the situation of human rights in the Palestinian territories*. Retrieved from UNGA.
33. International Court of Justice. (2004). *Legal Consequences of the Construction of a Wall in the Occupied Palestinian Territory*. Retrieved from ICJ.
34. Al-Haq. (2021). *The Legal Framework for Accountability: A Guide for Palestinian Civil Society*. Al-Haq. Retrieved from Al-Haq.
35. Amnesty International. (2020). *Israel: 'No Safe Place': The Impact of Israel's Military Operations on Civilians in Gaza*. Retrieved from Amnesty International.
36. Baker, C. (2021). *Diplomatic Pressures and International Law: The Case of Israel and Palestine*. *International Relations Journal*, 45(3), 15-30.
37. Khalidi, R. (2020). *The Hundred Years' War on Palestine: A History of Settler Colonialism and Resistance, 1917-2017*. Metropolitan Books.
38. Murphy, R. (2019). *The Impact of Reservations on the Effectiveness of International Treaties*. *International Law Studies*, 95, 65-80.
39. Brownlie, I. (2008). *Principles of Public International Law*. Oxford University Press.
40. International Law Commission. (2001). *Draft Articles on Responsibility of States for Internationally Wrongful Acts*. United Nations.
41. Schachter, O. (1983). *The Law of State Responsibility: A General Overview*. *Revue générale de droit international public*.

42. International Court of Justice (ICJ). (1986). *Military and Paramilitary Activities in and against Nicaragua (Nicaragua v. United States of America)*, ICJ Reports.
43. International Court of Justice (ICJ). (1999). *Case Concerning the Application of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (Bosnia and Herzegovina v. Serbia and Montenegro)*, ICJ Reports.
44. Zamir, E. (2010). The Role of Compensation in International Law. *The European Journal of International Law*.