

The decision of the International Court of Justice and the reshaping of the Palestinian cause on the global stage



Talal Abu-Ghazaleh

The decision of the International Court of Justice in the genocide case filed by the friendly Republic of South Africa against the Zionist entity carries the promise of reshaping the trajectory of the Palestinian cause on the global stage, specifically in the pursuit of justice and reaching a just solution to our just cause. In a historic turn of events, the Zionist entity is now within the scope of international legal scrutiny, binding to all countries. The Court decision does not only signals a shift in the dynamics of geopolitical accountability but also raises fundamental questions about the repercussions of the entity's behavior and the global response to its crimes. What adds to the significance of this matter is that it was issued by an overwhelming majority, where it was supported by 15 out of 17 members of the court.

Moreover, the court's rejection of the entity's motion to dismiss the case sends a strong signal, indicating implicit recognition by the court of the existence of genocide. It exposes the severity of the allegations against the entity, casting shadows over its actions and behavior, and presents a complex array of legal, ethical, and political considerations that will undoubtedly shape the course of future developments. Furthermore, the court's keenness in refraining from ordering an immediate cessation of hostilities (ceasefire) confirms that what is needed is addressing the comprehensive array of genocide crimes rather than merely ceasing military aggression.

The court also demonstrated a smart insight by recognizing that the scope of genocide extends beyond direct military means to incorporate a broader range of methods such as hunger, disease, thirst, epidemics, and other forms of life deprivation. This precise understanding acknowledges that Zionist genocide practices extend beyond traditional warfare.

It can be interpreted that the perceptible shift in the enemy's strategy, and its choice to resort to its usual tactic of attacking the court, reflects its acknowledgment of the potential threat posed by the court's rulings regarding its aggressive behavior. The other important Court strategic step, is that the decision does not only hold the Zionist entity accountable for genocide but also those who provide support for its crimes. However, the path to justice faces inherent challenges, as the decision to cease hostilities remains subject to factors beyond the court's jurisdiction. Recognizing that the court, as a judicial body, lacks the ability to enforce its decisions without support from the Security Council. Here, the anticipated U.S. veto complicates the prospects of implementing the decision.

One noteworthy aspect of the Court ruling is the demand for tangible evidence of commitment within a month - an unprecedented requirement pumping a sense of urgency and accountability into the resolution process. Away from United Nations resolutions, this condition challenges Israel to demonstrate its adherence to the stipulated arrangements within a specified timeframe, which may set a new standard for international diplomatic engagements.

This clear focus specifically highlights holding the Zionist entity accountable, moving away from broad generalizations like claims of self-defense. The essence of this analysis lies in the occupation's ability to resolve its issues by ceasing aggression because the right to self-defense does not apply to an occupying power, particularly one which is also stands accused of committing Genocide. Regarding the Zionist entity, a seismic shift is expected to reverberate across the political scene in Israel, where Netanyahu's future is at stake. This decision, loaded with implications, has the potential to dismantle Israel's own foundations as a colonial force and a genocidal power. Netanyahu's immediate response to the court's rulings reveals serious concerns, exposing weaknesses within the Israeli military and fear of possible sanctions resulting from the court's decisions. When Netanyahu emphasizes the necessity for the entity to boost its domestic arms industry, this response not only fails to acknowledge the profound impact of international legal mechanisms on Israeli military capabilities but also reflects recognition that court decisions could prompt a global reassessment of supplying the entity with arms.