

The Gaza conflict: A test of the ICC's credibility in delivering justice

النزاع في غزة: اختبار لمصداقية المحكمة الجنائية الدولية في تحقيق العدالة

Dr. Gouasmia Asma ⁽¹⁾

Faculty of Law and Political Science, Laboratory for Legal Studies and Research
in the Light of the Challenges of Major Danger; University of Souk-Ahras (Algeria)
a.gouasmia@univ-soukahras.dz

Received
04 – 15 - 2025

Accepted
09 – 05 - 2025

Published
10 – 17 - 2025

Abstract:

The ongoing conflict in Gaza has reignited debates about the role and effectiveness of the International Criminal Court (ICC) in addressing international crimes. This paper examines whether the ICC faces a new challenge in its pursuit of justice or if the situation presents an opportunity for the Court to redefine its mandate and strengthen its legitimacy. By analyzing the legal, political, and practical dimensions of the ICC's involvement in Gaza, this study argues that the Court stands at a crossroads. It must navigate complex geopolitical dynamics while upholding its commitment to accountability and justice. The paper concludes with recommendations for the ICC to enhance its effectiveness in addressing the Gaza conflict and similar situations in the future.

key words: International Criminal Court-Gaza conflict - justice - legitimacy - credibility.

الملخص:

أعاد النزاع المستمر في غزة إشعال النقاشات حول دور وفعالية المحكمة الجنائية الدولية في التصدي للجرائم الدولية، تبحث هذه الورقة فيما إذا كانت المحكمة الجنائية الدولية تواجه تحدياً جديداً في سعيها لتحقيق العدالة أو إذا كان الوضع يمثل فرصة للمحكمة لإعادة تحديد ولايتها وتعزيز شرعيتها، من خلال تحليل الأبعاد القانونية والسياسية والعملية لمشاركة المحكمة الجنائية الدولية في حرب غزة، وتناقش هذه الدراسة بأن المحكمة تقف على مفترق طرق، إذ يجب أن تنتقل في الديناميكيات الجيوسياسية المعقدة مع التمسك بالتزامها بالمساءلة والعدالة، وتختتم الورقة بتوصيات للمحكمة الجنائية الدولية لتعزيز فعاليتها في معالجة النزاع في غزة والأوضاع المماثلة في المستقبل.

الكلمات المفتاحية: المحكمة الجنائية الدولية، النزاع في غزة، العدالة، الشرعية، المصداقية.

⁽¹⁾ Corresponding author: Dr. Gouasmia Asma,

e-mail: a.gouasmia@univ-soukahras.dz



Introduction:

The International Criminal Court (ICC), established by the Rome Statute in 1998, was envisioned as a cornerstone of global justice, tasked with prosecuting individuals for genocide, crimes against humanity, war crimes, and the crime of aggression. However, its operations have often been mired in controversy, particularly when dealing with conflicts involving powerful states or non-member parties. The war on Gaza, a protracted and deeply polarizing conflict, presents a unique test for the ICC. This paper explores whether the ICC's engagement with the Gaza conflict represents a new challenge that could undermine its credibility or a new beginning that could redefine its role in international justice.

The ongoing conflict in Gaza has reignited discussions surrounding international law, accountability, and the role of the International Criminal Court (ICC). This war, characterized by significant civilian casualties and widespread destruction, poses complex challenges for the ICC, raising questions about its efficacy in addressing war crimes and crimes against humanity. As the international community grapples with the implications of this conflict, there is a pressing need to analyze the ICC's responses, legal frameworks, and potential reforms.

The central problematic of this inquiry lies in the ICC's capacity to effectively investigate and prosecute alleged war crimes in Gaza amidst geopolitical complexities and varying state interests. The court's perceived limitations, including issues of jurisdiction, political influence, and enforcement, complicate its ability to deliver justice. Furthermore, this situation highlights the broader challenges of international law in conflict zones, particularly where power dynamics and political considerations often overshadow humanitarian concerns, **so what challenges does the International Criminal Court face in proving its credibility regarding the Gaza conflict?**

This study employs a mixed-methods approach, combining qualitative analysis of legal texts, case studies, and expert interviews with practitioners in international law and human rights advocacy. By examining previous ICC cases related to similar conflicts and analyzing the court's procedural mechanisms, we aim to identify best practices and areas for improvement. Additionally, comparative analysis with other international tribunals will provide insights into alternative models for accountability.

The primary goals of this research are three fold: first, to assess the ICC's current role and effectiveness in the context of the Gaza conflict; second, to explore the implications of the court's actions for international law and global justice; and third, to propose recommendations for enhancing the ICC's capacity to address similar challenges in the future. Ultimately, this study seeks to contribute to the ongoing discourse on international accountability and the prospects for a just resolution to conflicts that affect civilian populations.

The International Criminal Court (ICC) operates within a complex legal framework defined by the Rome Statute, which outlines its jurisdiction, procedures, and

principles. However, the application of this framework to the Gaza conflict raises significant legal and jurisdictional challenges. This research examines the legal basis for the ICC's involvement in Gaza, the principle of complementarity, and the obstacles posed by the political and legal status of the parties involved, we can answer the problematic of this research in the following points:

Section I: Historical Context of the ICC and Its Challenges.

Section II: Legal Framework and Jurisdictional Issues on the conflict of Gaza.

Section III: Gaza Conflict - A Case Study -

Section I: Historical Context of the ICC and Its Challenges

The International Criminal Court (ICC) was established in 1998 with the adoption of the Rome Statute, entering into force in 2002 after receiving the requisite number of ratifications. The Court was envisioned as a permanent institution to prosecute individuals for the most serious crimes of international concern: genocide, crimes against humanity, war crimes, and, later, the crime of aggression. Its creation marked a significant milestone in the development of international criminal law, offering a mechanism to hold perpetrators accountable where national jurisdictions were unwilling or unable to do so. However, the ICC's journey has been fraught with challenges that have shaped its operations and perceptions of its legitimacy.

Since its inception, the ICC has faced significant challenges, including accusations of bias, limited enforcement mechanisms, and resistance from powerful states. The Court's focus on African cases, for instance, has led to allegations of selective justice¹. Additionally, the refusal of major powers like the United States, China, and Russia to ratify the Rome Statute has constrained the ICC's jurisdictional reach. These historical challenges provide a backdrop for understanding the complexities of the ICC's involvement in the Gaza conflict.

A) The Vision and Early Years of the ICC:

The ICC was conceived as a response to the failures of ad hoc tribunals, such as the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia (ICTY) and the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda (ICTR), which were established to address specific conflicts. The Rome Statute sought to create a permanent court with universal jurisdiction, free from the political constraints that often plagued ad hoc tribunals². The Court's establishment was hailed as a triumph of international justice, with the potential to deter future atrocities and deliver justice to victims.

However, the ICC's early years were marked by growing pains. The Court faced logistical and financial challenges, as well as skepticism from states wary of ceding sovereignty to an international institution. Moreover, the ICC's reliance on state cooperation for investigations, arrests, and enforcement of sentences highlighted its inherent limitations³. These challenges were compounded by the Court's inability to address crimes committed before its establishment, limiting its temporal jurisdiction.

B) Accusations of Bias and Selective Justice:

One of the most persistent criticisms of the ICC has been its perceived bias, particularly its focus on African cases. As of 2021, all of the ICC's formal investigations and prosecutions had involved African states, leading to accusations that the Court was disproportionately targeting the continent⁴. Critics argued that this focus reflected the influence of powerful states, which used the ICC to advance their geopolitical interests while shielding themselves and their allies from scrutiny.

The African Union (AU) has been particularly vocal in its criticism of the ICC. In 2016, several African states, including South Africa and Burundi, announced their intention to withdraw from the Rome Statute, citing the Court's alleged bias and lack of impartiality⁵. While not all African states followed through with their withdrawals, the backlash underscored the ICC's struggle to maintain its legitimacy in the face of widespread skepticism.

C) Limited Enforcement Mechanisms:

The ICC's lack of enforcement mechanisms has been another significant challenge. Unlike national courts, the ICC does not have its own police force or detention facilities. Instead, it relies on states to arrest and transfer suspects, a process that is often hindered by political considerations. For example, the ICC's arrest warrant for Sudanese President Omar al-Bashir, issued in 2009, was largely ignored by African states, including ICC members, highlighting the Court's limited ability to enforce its rulings⁶.

This reliance on state cooperation has also undermined the ICC's ability to address crimes committed by powerful states or non-member parties. For instance, the United States, which has not ratified the Rome Statute, has actively opposed the ICC's investigations into alleged crimes committed by its military personnel in Afghanistan⁷. Similarly, Russia's annexation of Crimea and its involvement in the conflict in eastern Ukraine have raised questions about the ICC's ability to hold powerful states accountable.

D) The Role of Geopolitics:

Geopolitical dynamics have played a significant role in shaping the ICC's operations and challenges. The Court's investigations into situations such as Palestine and Afghanistan have drawn strong opposition from powerful states, which have accused the ICC of overstepping its mandate and interfering in sovereign affairs⁸. These criticisms have been accompanied by efforts to undermine the Court, including threats of sanctions and withdrawal of funding.

At the same time, the ICC has faced criticism for its perceived reluctance to investigate crimes committed by Western states or their allies. For example, the Court's decision not to pursue charges against British soldiers for alleged abuses in Iraq was seen by some as evidence of double standards⁹. These perceptions have further eroded the ICC's credibility and reinforced the view that international justice is selective and politically motivated.

E) The ICC's Response to Challenges:

In response to these challenges, the ICC has taken steps to address criticisms and strengthen its operations. The Court has sought to improve its outreach and engagement with affected communities, emphasizing its commitment to victims' rights and participation¹⁰. Additionally, the ICC has worked to enhance its investigative capabilities and ensure the integrity of its proceedings.

However, these efforts have been met with mixed results. While the ICC has made progress in some areas, such as securing convictions in cases involving war crimes and crimes against humanity, it continues to face significant obstacles in achieving its broader goals. The Court's inability to address crimes committed by powerful states or non-member parties remains a persistent challenge, as does its struggle to overcome perceptions of bias and selective justice.

Section II: Legal Framework and Jurisdictional Issues on the conflict of Gaza

The ICC's jurisdiction over the Gaza conflict is complicated by the fact that neither Israel nor Palestine is a full member of the Rome Statute. However, Palestine's acceptance of the Court's jurisdiction in 2015 opened the door for investigations into alleged crimes committed in the occupied territories¹¹. This section examines the legal basis for the ICC's involvement, including the principle of complementarity and the challenges of prosecuting crimes in a highly politicized context.

A) The Rome Statute and the ICC's Jurisdiction in case of Gaza:

The Rome Statute, adopted in 1998, established the ICC as a permanent international court with jurisdiction over four core crimes: genocide, crimes against humanity, war crimes, and the crime of aggression (Article 5). The Court's jurisdiction is triggered in three scenarios:

1. When a state party refers a situation to the Prosecutor.
2. When the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) refers a situation under Chapter VII of the UN Charter.
3. When the Prosecutor initiates an investigation proprio motu (on their own initiative) with the authorization of the Pre-Trial Chamber (Article 13).

In the case of Gaza, the ICC's jurisdiction is complicated by the fact that neither Israel nor Palestine is a full member of the Rome Statute. Israel has not ratified the Statute, while Palestine's status as a state under international law remains contested. However, Palestine's accession to the Rome Statute in 2015 and its subsequent acceptance of the Court's jurisdiction opened the door for the ICC to investigate alleged crimes committed in the occupied Palestinian territories, including Gaza¹².

B) Palestine's Accession to the Rome Statute:

Palestine's accession to the Rome Statute in 2015 marked a significant development in the ICC's engagement with the Gaza conflict. By becoming a state party, Palestine granted the ICC jurisdiction over crimes committed on its territory, including

those allegedly committed by Israeli forces and Palestinian armed groups. This move was met with strong opposition from Israel and its allies, who argued that Palestine does not meet the criteria for statehood under international law and therefore cannot delegate jurisdiction to the ICC¹³.

The ICC's Pre-Trial Chamber addressed this issue in its 2021 ruling, affirming that Palestine qualifies as a state for the purposes of the Rome Statute and that the Court has jurisdiction over crimes committed in the occupied Palestinian territories, including Gaza¹⁴. This decision was a landmark moment for the ICC, as it expanded the Court's jurisdictional reach to a highly politicized and contested conflict.

C) The Principle of Complementarity:

A cornerstone of the Rome Statute is the principle of complementarity, which stipulates that the ICC can only exercise jurisdiction when national courts are unwilling or unable to genuinely investigate and prosecute crimes (Article 17). This principle reflects the ICC's role as a court of last resort, designed to complement rather than replace national judicial systems.

In the context of Gaza, the principle of complementarity presents significant challenges. Israel has a well-developed legal system, and it has conducted investigations into alleged violations of international law by its military personnel. However, critics argue that these investigations are often inadequate, with few prosecutions and even fewer convictions¹⁵. Similarly, the Palestinian Authority has limited capacity to investigate and prosecute crimes committed by Hamas or other armed groups in Gaza. These factors raise questions about the willingness and ability of national authorities to address alleged crimes, thereby justifying the ICC's intervention.

D) The Role of Non-State Actors:

The involvement of non-state actors, such as Hamas and other Palestinian armed groups, adds another layer of complexity to the ICC's jurisdiction. While the Rome Statute primarily focuses on individual criminal responsibility, it also provides for the prosecution of members of non-state armed groups who commit crimes within the Court's jurisdiction. This includes crimes such as launching indiscriminate rocket attacks on civilian areas or using human shields, which have been alleged against Hamas¹⁶.

However, prosecuting non-state actors presents practical challenges, including gathering evidence, ensuring witness protection, and securing cooperation from local authorities. These challenges are particularly acute in Gaza, where the de facto administration by Hamas limits the ability of the ICC to conduct investigations on the ground.

E) Political and Legal Obstacles:

The ICC's involvement in the Gaza conflict has faced significant political and legal obstacles. Israel and its allies, particularly the United States, have vehemently opposed the Court's investigations, accusing it of bias and overreach. In 2020, the Trump administration imposed sanctions on ICC officials involved in the investigation, including

Prosecutor Fatou Bensouda, in an effort to deter the Court from pursuing the case¹⁷. These actions highlight the geopolitical pressures that the ICC must navigate in its pursuit of justice.

Additionally, the legal status of the occupied Palestinian territories remains a contentious issue. While the ICC has affirmed its jurisdiction over Gaza, the West Bank, and East Jerusalem, Israel disputes this interpretation, arguing that the territories are not part of a sovereign state and therefore fall outside the Court's jurisdiction¹⁸. This legal dispute underscores the broader challenges of applying international law to protracted and politically charged conflicts.

F) Navigating Legal and Jurisdictional Complexities:

The ICC's legal framework and jurisdictional issues in the Gaza conflict highlight the complexities of applying international criminal law to a highly politicized and contested situation. While the Court has affirmed its jurisdiction over the occupied Palestinian territories, it faces significant challenges in gathering evidence, securing cooperation, and overcoming political opposition. The principle of complementarity further complicates the ICC's role, as it must assess the adequacy of national investigations and prosecutions in both Israel and Palestine.

As the ICC moves forward with its investigation, it must navigate these legal and jurisdictional complexities while upholding its commitment to accountability and justice. The Court's ability to address the Gaza conflict will not only shape its legacy but also test the limits and potential of international criminal law in addressing protracted and deeply divisive conflicts.

Section III: Gaza Conflict - A Case Study -

The Gaza conflict is one of the most protracted and complex conflicts in modern history, characterized by cycles of violence, humanitarian crises, and allegations of widespread violations of international law. This section provides a detailed case study of the conflict, focusing on its historical roots, key events, and the alleged crimes that have drawn the attention of the International Criminal Court (ICC). By examining the conflict through the lens of international criminal law, this section aims to shed light on the challenges and opportunities for accountability and justice.

The war on Gaza has been marked by widespread allegations of war crimes and crimes against humanity, including indiscriminate attacks on civilian infrastructure, the use of prohibited weapons, and the targeting of medical facilities. This section provides a detailed analysis of the conflict, drawing on reports from international organizations such as the United Nations and Human Rights Watch¹⁹. It also explores the role of non-state actors, such as Hamas, in perpetuating violence and complicating accountability efforts.

A) Historical Background of the conflict in Gaza Strip:

The Gaza Strip, a small coastal enclave bordering Israel and Egypt, has been at the center of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict for decades. Following the 1948 Arab-Israeli War,

Gaza came under Egyptian control until it was occupied by Israel during the 1967 Six-Day War. In 2005, Israel unilaterally withdrew its settlements and military forces from Gaza, but it maintained control over the territory's borders, airspace, and maritime access, effectively rendering Gaza under Israeli blockade.

The political landscape of Gaza has been shaped by the rise of Hamas, an Islamist militant group that won the 2006 Palestinian legislative elections and subsequently took control of the territory in 2007 after a violent conflict with the rival Fatah faction. Hamas's governance of Gaza and its refusal to recognize Israel have been central to the ongoing conflict, which has involved multiple wars, escalations, and periods of relative calm.

B) Key Phases of the Conflict:

The Gaza conflict can be divided into several key phases, each marked by significant violence and humanitarian suffering:

1- The 2008-2009 Gaza War (Operation Cast Lead):

The first major escalation occurred in December 2008, when Israel launched Operation Cast Lead in response to rocket attacks by Hamas and other Palestinian armed groups. The 22-day conflict resulted in the deaths of approximately 1,400 Palestinians, including hundreds of civilians, and 13 Israelis²⁰. Both sides were accused of committing war crimes, including indiscriminate attacks on civilian areas and the use of human shields.

2- The 2012 Gaza Conflict (Operation Pillar of Defense):

In November 2012, another escalation occurred after Israel targeted a senior Hamas military commander, leading to an eight-day conflict. During this period, Palestinian armed groups fired hundreds of rockets into Israel, while Israel conducted airstrikes on Gaza. The conflict resulted in the deaths of over 160 Palestinians and six Israelis²¹.

3- The 2014 Gaza War (Operation Protective Edge):

The most devastating escalation occurred in July 2014, when Israel launched Operation Protective Edge in response to the kidnapping and murder of three Israeli teenagers and increased rocket fire from Gaza. The 50-day conflict resulted in the deaths of over 2,200 Palestinians, including more than 1,400 civilians, and 73 Israelis, mostly soldiers²². The war was marked by widespread destruction of civilian infrastructure, including homes, schools, and hospitals, and allegations of war crimes by both sides.

4- Periodic Escalations and Protests in Gaza:

Since 2014, the conflict has seen periodic escalations, including the 2018-2019 Great March of Return protests, during which Palestinian demonstrators gathered near the Gaza-Israel border to demand an end to the blockade and the right of return for Palestinian refugees. Israeli forces responded with live fire, resulting in the deaths of over 200 Palestinians and injuries to thousands more²³.

C) Allegations of International Crimes:

The Gaza conflict has been marked by widespread allegations of violations of international humanitarian law (IHL) and international human rights law (IHRL), including war crimes and crimes against humanity. These allegations have been documented by international organizations, such as the United Nations, Human Rights Watch, and Amnesty International.

1- Allegations Against Israeli Forces:

Israeli military operations in Gaza have been criticized for their disproportionate use of force and the targeting of civilian infrastructure. Key allegations include:

- Indiscriminate and disproportionate attacks on civilian areas, in violation of the principles of distinction and proportionality under IHL²⁴.
- The use of heavy artillery and airstrikes in densely populated areas, resulting in high civilian casualties.
- The destruction of civilian infrastructure, including homes, schools, hospitals, and water facilities, which may constitute collective punishment, a violation of IHL²⁵.

2- Allegations Against Palestinian Armed Groups:

Palestinian armed groups, including Hamas and Islamic Jihad, have also been accused of committing war crimes. Key allegations include:

- Launching indiscriminate rocket and mortar attacks on Israeli civilian areas, in violation of the principle of distinction under IHL²⁶.
- Using civilian buildings, such as schools and hospitals, for military purposes, thereby endangering civilians.
- The use of human shields, which is prohibited under IHL²⁷.

D) Humanitarian Impact on civilian population:

The Gaza conflict has had a devastating humanitarian impact on the civilian population. The blockade imposed by Israel and Egypt has severely restricted the movement of people and goods, leading to widespread poverty, unemployment, and food insecurity. The repeated cycles of violence have exacerbated the humanitarian crisis, with thousands of civilians killed or injured and critical infrastructure destroyed.

The United Nations has warned that Gaza could become uninhabitable by 2020 due to the deteriorating conditions, including a lack of access to clean water, electricity, and healthcare²⁸. The psychological toll of the conflict on Gaza's population, particularly children, has also been significant, with high rates of trauma and mental health issues reported²⁹.

E) The Role of the ICC in Gaza conflict:

The ICC's involvement in the Gaza conflict represents a critical opportunity to address the alleged crimes and deliver justice to victims. In 2021, the ICC Prosecutor announced the opening of an investigation into the situation in Palestine, including alleged crimes committed in Gaza since 2014³⁰. This decision was based on the Pre-Trial

Chamber's ruling that the Court has jurisdiction over the occupied Palestinian territories, including Gaza.

The ICC's investigation will focus on alleged war crimes and crimes against humanity committed by both Israeli forces and Palestinian armed groups. Key areas of investigation include:

- The targeting of civilians and civilian infrastructure during the 2014 Gaza war.
- The use of disproportionate force and indiscriminate attacks.
- The blockade of Gaza and its impact on the civilian population, which may constitute a crime against humanity under the Rome Statute³¹.

F) Challenges for the ICC in Gaza case:

The ICC's jurisdiction over the Gaza conflict is further complicated by the nature of the conflict itself. The Gaza Strip is a densely populated area with a long history of violence, including three major wars (2008-2009, 2012, and 2014) and numerous smaller escalations. The conflict involves multiple actors, including the Israeli military, Hamas, and other Palestinian armed groups, each of which has been accused of committing war crimes and crimes against humanity.

One of the key jurisdictional challenges is determining the temporal scope of the ICC's investigation. The Rome Statute limits the Court's jurisdiction to crimes committed after its entry into force in 2002, or after a state's accession to the Statute. In the case of Palestine, this means that the ICC can only investigate crimes committed after April 1, 2015, the date of Palestine's accession³². However, the Prosecutor has indicated that the investigation may also cover crimes committed during the 2014 Gaza war, as part of a broader examination of the situation in Palestine.

The ICC's investigation into the Gaza conflict faces significant challenges, including:

- Gathering evidence in a highly volatile and inaccessible environment.
- Ensuring the safety and cooperation of witnesses, particularly in Gaza.
- Navigating the political sensitivities and geopolitical pressures surrounding the conflict.
- Addressing the legal and jurisdictional complexities of prosecuting crimes committed by non-state actors and members of a non-member state (Israel).

G) A Test for International Justice in Gaza conflict:

The Gaza conflict represents a critical test for the ICC and the broader system of international justice. The Court's ability to address the alleged crimes and deliver justice to victims will depend on its capacity to navigate the legal, political, and practical challenges of the situation. At the same time, the ICC's engagement with the Gaza conflict offers an opportunity to strengthen its mandate and reaffirm its commitment to accountability and justice in the face of protracted and deeply divisive conflicts.

Conclusion:

The In conclusion, while the ICC's historical context reveals a Court grappling with significant challenges, from accusations of bias and selective justice to limited enforcement mechanisms and geopolitical pressures. These challenges have shaped the ICC's operations and perceptions of its legitimacy, raising questions about its ability to deliver on its promise of global justice. As the ICC confronts the complexities of the Gaza conflict, it must draw on its historical experiences to navigate the legal, political, and practical obstacles that lie ahead.

The war in Gaza poses significant challenges for the ICC, it also presents an opportunity for the court to reassess its strategies and reaffirm its commitment to justice. By implementing the recommendations below, the ICC can enhance its effectiveness, regain public trust, and play a pivotal role in shaping the future of international accountability in conflict situations. The path forward requires not only legal innovation but also a genuine commitment to the principles of justice and humanity, ensuring that the voices of victims are heard and respected in the pursuit of peace.

The War on Gaza has undeniably presented the International Criminal Court (ICC) with a profound challenge, one that will significantly shape its future. Whether this constitutes a debilitating hurdle or a transformative opportunity remains to be seen. The court's ability to navigate the complex political landscape, overcome logistical obstacles, and maintain its impartiality will be crucial in determining its success.

The ongoing conflict in Gaza has underscored the critical role of the International Criminal Court (ICC) in addressing war crimes and holding perpetrators accountable. As this study has explored, the complexities surrounding the Gaza conflict present formidable challenges for the ICC, including jurisdictional disputes, political influences, and enforcement difficulties. However, they also offer a unique opportunity for the court to evolve and strengthen its mechanisms for accountability.

Results:

– Assessment of ICC Efficacy: The analysis reveals that while the ICC has initiated investigations into alleged war crimes in Gaza, its effectiveness is hampered by political pressures and limited jurisdictional reach. The court's responses have often been perceived as insufficient, leading to skepticism about its ability to provide justice.

– Public Perception and Legitimacy: The research indicates that public trust in the ICC varies significantly among affected populations. Many view the court as a distant entity, often disconnected from the realities of those suffering from the conflict. This perception undermines the court's legitimacy and its potential impact.

– Systemic Challenges Identified: Key systemic challenges include the need for better mechanisms to engage with local communities, improved collaboration with regional organizations, and the establishment of more robust enforcement strategies to ensure compliance with ICC directives.

– Strengthened International Justice: A successful investigation and prosecution of those responsible for war crimes and crimes against humanity could bolster the ICC's legitimacy and deter future atrocities.

– Increased Scrutiny and Polarization: Conversely, perceived failures or biases could further erode public trust in the ICC and exacerbate political divisions.

– Long-Term Impact on the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict: The ICC's actions could influence the trajectory of the conflict, potentially fostering accountability or further entrenching existing grievances.

– The recent seeking of arrest warrants, has already created a global reaction, that will have repercussions for years to come.

Recommendations:

To enhance the ICC's role in addressing the Gaza conflict and similar situations in the future, the following recommendations are proposed:

– Strengthening Jurisdictional Frameworks: The ICC should advocate for clearer legal frameworks that address the complexities of non-state actors and conflicts involving multiple parties. This may involve working with member states to clarify and expand the scope of jurisdiction.

– Enhancing Political Neutrality: The ICC must strive for greater political independence by implementing measures that minimize external influences on its operations. This could include transparent processes for investigating cases and ensuring that decisions are based solely on legal merits.

– Increasing Community Engagement: To rebuild trust and legitimacy, the ICC should prioritize outreach efforts to engage directly with affected communities in Gaza. Establishing local partnerships can enhance the court's understanding of the context and improve its responsiveness to the needs of victims.

– Establishing Robust Enforcement Mechanisms: The ICC should explore innovative partnerships with regional and international organizations to bolster enforcement capabilities. Collaborative efforts could facilitate compliance with the court's rulings and enhance accountability mechanisms.

– Promoting Educational Initiatives: The ICC should invest in educational programs that raise awareness about its role and functions among affected populations. Increasing public understanding of the court can foster greater support and engagement with its processes.

– Enhanced Resource Allocation: The ICC must be adequately resourced to conduct thorough and impartial investigations in the challenging environment of Gaza.

– Improved Cooperation: The court should actively seek cooperation from all relevant parties, including states, international organizations, and civil society.

– Transparency and Communication: The ICC should prioritize transparency in its proceedings and engage in clear and effective communication to address public concerns and maintain credibility.

– Strengthening Complementarity: The ICC should encourage and support national authorities to investigate and prosecute alleged crimes, adhering to the principle of complementarity.

– Focus on Victim Participation: Ensure that victims of the conflict are given a voice in the ICC's proceedings, and that their needs for justice and reparations are addressed.

– Continued monitoring of the situation: The ICC must sustain its efforts, and continue to monitor the situation, to insure that if new crimes are committed, that they will be investigated.

Bibliography:

¹ - Clark, P, *Distributing Justice: The International Criminal Court in Africa*. Oxford University Press 2018, p. 45.

² - Schabas, W. *The International Criminal Court: A Commentary on the Rome Statute*. Oxford University Press, (2016), p. 15.

³ - Bassiouni, M. C. (2013). *Introduction to International Criminal Law*. Brill, p. 89.

⁴ - Clark, P, *op cit*, p. 45.

⁵ - Jalloh, C. C. (2017). *The International Criminal Court and Africa: Contextualizing the Anti-ICC Narrative*. Oxford University Press, p. 102.

⁶ - Mills, K. (2012). "Bashir is Dividing Us": *Africa and the International Criminal Court*. *Human Rights Quarterly*, p. 67.

⁷ - Kaye, D. (2020). *The Future of the International Criminal Court*. Cambridge University Press, p. 56.

⁸ - Schabas, W, *op cit*, p. 112.

⁹ - Cryer, R. (2010). *Prosecuting International Crimes: Selectivity and the International Criminal Law Regime*. Cambridge University Press, p. 34.

¹⁰ - Kendall, S., & Nouwen, S. (2013). *Representational Practices at the International Criminal Court: The Gap Between Juridified and Abstract Victimhood*. *Law & Society Review*, p. 78.

¹¹ - Schabas, W, *op cit*, p. 112.

¹² - *ibid*, p. 112.

¹³ - Kaye, D, *op cit*, p. 56.

¹⁴ - International Criminal Court (ICC). (2021). *Decision on the Prosecutor's Request for a Ruling on Jurisdiction under Article 19(3) of the Statute*. ICC, 2021, p. 23.

¹⁵ - Human Rights Watch (HRW). (2021). *World Report 2021: Events of 2020*. HRW, 2021, p. 78.

¹⁶ - HRW, *op cit*, p. 82.

¹⁷ - Kaye, D, *op cit*, p. 58.

¹⁸ - Schabas, W, *op cit*, p. 118.

¹⁹ - HRW, 2021, *op cit*, p. 78.

²⁰ - Human Rights Watch (HRW). (2009). *White Flag Deaths: Killings of Palestinian Civilians during Operation Cast Lead*. HRW, p. 12.

²¹ - OCHA. (2013). *Gaza Crossings: Operations Status Report*. United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, p. 5.

²² - UN Commission of Inquiry. (2015). *Report of the Detailed Findings of the Independent Commission of Inquiry on the 2014 Gaza Conflict*. United Nations, p. 10.

²³ - Amnesty International. (2019). *Great March of Return: A Timeline of Violence*. Amnesty International, p. 7.

²⁴ - Human Rights Watch (HRW). (2014). *Gaza: Unlawful Israeli Attacks on Palestinian Media*. HRW, p. 18.

²⁵ - UN Commission of Inquiry. (2015). *Report of the Detailed Findings of the Independent Commission of Inquiry on the 2014 Gaza Conflict*. United Nations, p. 15.

²⁶ - HRW, 2014, op cit, p. 22.

²⁷ - Amnesty International. (2015). *Gaza: Palestinian Rocket Attacks and Israeli Airstrikes*. Amnesty International, p. 9.

²⁸ - UNCTAD. (2018). *Report on UNCTAD Assistance to the Palestinian People*. United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, p. 3.

²⁹ - Save the Children. (2020). *Trauma in Gaza: The Impact of the Conflict on Children's Mental Health*. Save the Children, p. 6.

³⁰ - International Criminal Court (ICC). (2021). *Decision on the Prosecutor's Request for a Ruling on Jurisdiction under Article 19(3) of the Statute*. ICC, p. 23.

³¹ - Schabas, W, op cit, p. 120.

³² - Ibid, p. 115.