

Veto Power and the Stagnation of International Law Enforcement (A Case Study of Aggression Against Palestine's Health Infrastructure)

Gharin Firkirani¹, Rahayu²

^{1,2}Master of Law, Faculty of Law, Universitas Diponegoro

ABSTRACT: The aggression launched by Israel aimed at infrastructure in the form of hospital health facilities in the Palestinian region has been qualified as a form of crime referring to the scope of humanitarian law, and in fact no entity has been given a judgment for the crime, even though the war has been going on for more than 75 years and then could not be controlled so that the implications are directed at the deaths of many civilians, women and children from the Palestinian state. This journal aims at the scope of finding answers to the question of why the UNSC is reluctant to realize judgments against individuals or groups who should be responsible for all forms of crimes committed in order to uphold humanitarian law and judge accountability for military aggression that has often been launched against Palestine. The method of this journal is a normative juridical method which in its definition is a method in order to find out the problems in this journal using casuistic and historical glasses. The conclusion of this journal is that the UNSC Veto Rights must then be reviewed and reconsidered as the main qualification aimed at the ICC in carrying out judgments on war crimes and crimes against humanity launched in the context of the Israeli war against Palestine.

KEYWORDS: Veto Power, Law Enforcement, Israeli Military Aggression, International Law.

I. INTRODUCTION

The Israel and Palestine conflict which has persisted for more than seven decades remains one of the longest and most uncontrolled armed confrontations in the modern international system (Ahmed lamin 2021). The longevity and intensity of this conflict have produced severe humanitarian consequences for Palestinian civilians who continuously experience bombardment displacement loss of life and systematic destruction of infrastructure including facilities essential to public welfare such as hospitals and medical centers (Mahwati and Nanda 2022). Although violations have also occurred on multiple sides the scale of harm experienced by Palestinian civilians particularly women and children has been significantly larger and more consistent.

International humanitarian law was created to regulate the conduct of warring parties and to minimize human suffering by ensuring that fundamental protections remain in force even during armed conflict. This body of law includes the Geneva Conventions their Additional Protocols and complementary human rights regulations which affirm the protection of civilians medical personnel humanitarian workers and civilian infrastructure that supports survival such as hospitals schools and emergency care facilities (Greenwood 2022). These safeguards exist not merely as legal instruments but as a moral commitment by the international community to uphold human dignity during war.

Despite this legal framework violations occur repeatedly. The United Nations Security Council UNSC has adopted various resolutions to reaffirm the legal protection of medical units including Resolution 2286 which explicitly prohibits attacks on hospitals and health workers and classifies such actions as serious breaches of international humanitarian law (Omar 2020). Yet these resolutions have had limited effect on the realities in Gaza where hospitals have been struck repeatedly causing devastating casualties and the collapse of essential medical services.

A widely documented incident is the bombing of Al Ahli Hospital in Gaza which generated extensive global condemnation but resulted in no formal legal accountability. Reports indicate that no military official or political leader has been prosecuted for the attack despite its clear violation of humanitarian norms and its substantial civilian toll (United Nations Meetings Coverage 2023). This absence of accountability highlights a deep structural gap between the existence of legal norms and the capacity or willingness of international institutions to enforce them.

A major factor contributing to this enforcement gap is the political dynamic within the UNSC. While many UN member states have expressed the need for protection and justice for Palestinians the permanent members of the Security Council notably the United States the United Kingdom and France have shown reluctance to support measures that could lead to judicial accountability for Israeli actions (Seikaly 2022). This reluctance reveals how geopolitical interests shape the application of international law particularly when accountability may negatively affect strategic allies.

Veto Power and the Stagnation of International Law Enforcement (A Case Study of Aggression Against Palestine's Health Infrastructure)

This selective application becomes more evident when comparing the Palestinian context to the international response to the Russian invasion of Ukraine in 2022. In the Ukraine case Western governments responded with urgency imposing sanctions coordinating international investigations and mobilizing diplomatic and humanitarian assistance to protect civilians and public infrastructure including medical facilities (Domlobov Nasution and Raudia 2022). The contrast between this strong response and the minimal action taken for Palestinians reflects double standards in global humanitarian policy.

The disparity is also visible in academic and scientific spheres. Ukrainian researchers received extensive international support including protection programs and collaboration offers from global research communities. Meanwhile Palestinian researchers such as Sufyan Tayeh were killed during Israeli attacks with little international mobilization or protective intervention (Nazarovets and Silva 2022 Muhaimin 2023). This illustrates how political dynamics directly influence whose suffering is recognized and whose is ignored.

The United States remains central to this imbalance due to its strategic political and military alliance with Israel (Gilboa 2023). The US government frequently publishes detailed human rights reports on violations occurring in other states for example Indonesia yet remains largely silent regarding clear humanitarian law violations committed against Palestinians (United States Department of State 2021). Another illustration of selective enforcement is seen in the Netherlands which hosts the International Court of Justice ICJ. Despite having the institutional capacity to initiate legal scrutiny it has not taken meaningful steps to advance accountability for Israeli violations raising further questions about the neutrality of international legal structures (Zanotti et al 2023).

Insights from legal theory help explain these challenges. Goldstein argues that law enforcement especially in the international sphere often encounters structural obstacles even when legal norms are clearly defined (Mulyani 2017). Rahardjo similarly asserts that law is not only a set of formal rules but a value oriented process that must align with the aims of justice and societal wellbeing (Mulyani 2017). From the perspective of natural law theory as described by Aristotle legal obligations arise not merely from codified rules but from universally recognized moral principles shared by humanity (Khoirur Rizal Lutfi 2014). When viewed through this lens the ongoing impunity for attacks against Palestinian civilians and medical facilities represents not only a legal failure but also a profound moral breach.

Another central problem is the absence of action by institutions that are supposed to uphold global peace and justice. The International Criminal Court ICC has jurisdiction to prosecute war crimes crimes against humanity and severe violations of humanitarian law. However its effectiveness depends heavily on referrals by the UNSC and the cooperation of powerful states which is often limited by political considerations. As a result individuals who may bear responsibility for military decisions such as the Israeli leadership including the Prime Minister remain beyond the reach of prosecution despite substantial evidence of violations (Johnson 2023).

The introduction therefore exposes a distressing pattern in which international humanitarian law is repeatedly breached while the mechanisms intended to enforce it remain constrained by political alliances veto powers and selective commitment to justice. The Palestinian case demonstrates that the UNSC veto held by permanent members especially the United States functions as a structural barrier that prevents meaningful action including referrals to the ICC and the adoption of effective enforcement measures (Trahan 2020). This structural limitation ultimately perpetuates a cycle of impunity conflict and civilian suffering.

In sum the introduction reveals that while the legal framework for civilian protection is strong its enforcement is deeply flawed due to political interests geopolitical alliances unequal humanitarian responses and the unwillingness of powerful states to support accountability mechanisms when these mechanisms conflict with their strategic interests. The failure to address violations in Palestine reflects a broader crisis in the implementation of international humanitarian law and underscores the urgent need to reassess the UNSC veto system which continues to obstruct justice for victims of the conflict including those harmed in attacks on medical facilities hospitals and essential civilian infrastructure.

II. FORMULATION OF THE PROBLEM

1. How does the veto power function within the United Nations Security Council in cases involving Israel's military aggression against Palestinian hospitals?
2. To what extent can existing international legal frameworks ensure accountability for violations against protected medical facilities during armed conflict?

III. RESEARCH METHOD

This study employs a normative juridical research method which focuses on examining legal norms principles and doctrines relevant to international humanitarian law and the mechanisms for enforcing accountability within the Israel and Palestine conflict. The normative approach is supported by a casuistic analysis that interprets specific cases of alleged violations including attacks on medical facilities and civilian infrastructure to understand how existing legal norms are applied in real situations (Purwati 2020). In addition the study incorporates a historical approach to trace the evolution of the conflict and the development of international legal frameworks governing the conduct of war and the protection of civilians (Sihombing and Haditia 2022).

Veto Power and the Stagnation of International Law Enforcement (A Case Study of Aggression Against Palestine's Health Infrastructure)

Data for this research were obtained through a systematic review of primary legal materials including international treaties UN resolutions and official documents from international organizations such as the United Nations and the International Criminal Court. Secondary materials including academic journals books and expert analyses were also utilized to strengthen the legal interpretation and theoretical foundation of the study (Greenwood 2022). The analysis emphasizes identifying gaps between legal norms and their enforcement particularly regarding the influence of the United Nations Security Council veto power and the political interests that hinder effective prosecution of humanitarian law violations in the Palestinian context (Trahan 2020).

IV. DISCUSSION

A. Analysis of the Role and Position of the Veto Power and Its Relation to the Stagnation of the Legal Enforcement Process regarding Israel's Military Aggression against Palestinian Hospitals

The Israeli military aggression that occurred in November 2023 resulted in the destruction of the operational capacity of the Indonesian Hospital in Gaza. This incident constitutes a clear violation of international humanitarian law as codified in the Geneva and Hague legal regimes which provide comprehensive protection for civilian infrastructure during armed conflict (Farhat et al 2022). The legal assessment of this event can be conducted through the framework of the Hague Regulations and the Geneva Conventions. The Hague system consists of several conventions and declarations commonly referred to as the Peace Conference Conventions which regulate the conduct of hostilities including the protection of non combatants and civilian property (Putra et al 2023).

The Israeli attack is specifically classified as a violation of Article 52 paragraph 2 of Additional Protocol I which guarantees general protection for civilian objects including hospitals and medical infrastructure (Al Uraidy et al 2021). As a state actor Israel bears full responsibility for the resulting destruction and harm inflicted upon civilians including women and children who form a significant portion of the victims (Wirottama et al 2020). Violations of this nature are subject to prosecution under international humanitarian law with the competent court theoretically being the domestic court of the perpetrating state. However such a mechanism becomes ineffective when the state itself is the party accused of the violations rendering domestic prosecution neither impartial nor feasible (Poissonnier and David 2020).

This challenge is further intensified when key political leaders such as Benjamin Netanyahu who serves as the Prime Minister of Israel are implicated in decisions that contributed to the planning or execution of military operations. Scholars argue that Netanyahu should be subject to judicial scrutiny before the International Criminal Court ICC due to his central role in determining Israeli military strategy (Johnson 2023). Neither Israel nor Palestine possesses the capacity or authority to properly adjudicate the attack on the Indonesian Hospital due to their direct involvement in the conflict and the absence of functioning impartial judicial institutions within the conflict zone.

Moreover United Nations Security Council Resolution 2467 outlines state obligations regarding accountability for humanitarian violations including conflict related sexual violence CRSV. This resolution mandates that responsible actors be prosecuted for violations of humanitarian norms and war law. However practical implementation is hindered due to the political gridlock within the Security Council particularly the reluctance of powerful states to support accountability measures in the Israel and Palestine context (Kyriakides and Demetriades 2022).

A significant legal concern arises when violations committed by state leaders are adjudicated not by the ICC but by domestic courts of the perpetrating state. Such a practice risks severe malpractice in the enforcement of international law since domestic courts lack neutrality and often refuse to apply international humanitarian law as part of their legal framework. This is precisely the situation with Israeli courts which are not inclined to adopt humanitarian law as a normative basis for adjudicating wartime actions (Madar 2023 Shikhelman 2023). As a result victims face major obstacles in obtaining justice especially at a time when Palestinian society is experiencing widespread destruction of public infrastructure limiting institutional capacity to pursue legal redress.

The political dimensions of this crisis are further complicated by the strategic alliance between Israel and the United States. The deep political and military cooperation between these states contributes to significant barriers in implementing international law especially in the context of war crimes investigations (Gilboa 2023). From a legal standpoint the body with the most legitimate authority to prosecute Israel for violations of humanitarian law is the International Criminal Court. Israel is accused of committing acts that undermine humanitarian principles and destroy essential public facilities in Palestine thus falling within the jurisdictional scope of the ICC (Alviana et al 2016). However for the ICC to exercise jurisdiction effectively the institution requires positive support from the permanent members of the Security Council which include states such as China the United States the United Kingdom France and Russia as well as non permanent members such as Japan Ecuador the United Arab Emirates Switzerland and Ghana (Gordon and Perugin 2019).

The aggression also undermines Palestinian diplomatic relations and weakens its political capacity to engage with other states. In contrast Israel benefits economically from its status as a major global weapons producer with countries including its ally the United States depending on Israeli military technologies. This creates a significant imbalance in international support with

Veto Power and the Stagnation of International Law Enforcement (A Case Study of Aggression Against Palestine's Health Infrastructure)

Palestine placed in a structurally disadvantaged position within international political and economic systems (Preston 2019). The United States openly supports Israeli policies which are considered by many as reflective of colonial tendencies in the Palestinian region.

Members of the UN Security Council who are expected to take decisive action to address the aggression instead fail to meet expectations. Ethically the Security Council is prohibited from obstructing the implementation of international law or blocking accountability for humanitarian violations on the basis of political or diplomatic interests. Nevertheless the Council has not activated mechanisms that would ensure enforcement of international humanitarian law in the case of the attack on the Indonesian Hospital and other abuses (Husam 2019). The Security Council has not even exercised its veto authority to accelerate humanitarian law enforcement which further weakens the system of accountability (Omar 2020).

It is essential to recognize that the use of the veto cannot be justified when it contradicts *jus cogens* norms. *Jus cogens* represents fundamental norms of international law that cannot be derogated under any circumstances. The veto is also invalid when it weakens collective action to address severe human rights violations or when it is unrelated to the protection of fundamental principles of international law (Trahan 2020). Therefore any use of the veto that obstructs accountability for grave humanitarian violations should be considered illegitimate.

The ICC may exercise jurisdiction when violations involve crimes against humanity genocide or war crimes. There are two primary qualifications for jurisdiction. First the crime must be committed by a national of a state party to the Rome Statute or occur within the territory of a state party. Second the case may be referred by the UN Security Council based on an adopted resolution (Akande and Tzanakopoulos 2018). In the case of Palestine although Israel is not a party to the Rome Statute Palestine has acceded to it and thus actions that occur on Palestinian territory may fall under ICC jurisdiction if procedural requirements are met.

According to Article 7 paragraph 3 of the UN Charter decisions of the Security Council related to the resolution of international disputes require the affirmative vote of nine members including all five permanent members unless the matter is procedural. This structure gives the permanent members disproportionate influence over the enforcement of international humanitarian law including in cases such as the attack on the Indonesian Hospital (Millenio 2021). When examined through natural law theory international law is understood as deriving from universal principles recognized by all humanity. This perspective reinforces the argument that the veto should not restrict action against humanitarian violations such as the Israeli aggression against the Indonesian Hospital in Palestine (Alexander 2023).

Therefore the use of the veto by Security Council members should be reevaluated particularly in the context of humanitarian law enforcement. Neither Israel nor Palestine can independently impose punishment for violations of humanitarian law committed during the attack on the Indonesian Hospital and Israel is not a party to the Rome Statute which further complicates legal proceedings (Sánchez Morales 2020). Structural reforms to the veto system are urgently needed to ensure that the mechanisms for humanitarian law enforcement are not obstructed by political interests. Justice requires that actors responsible for violations receive fair prosecution without interference from geopolitical alliances.

The inadequate capacity of the ICC to act on the aggression against Palestinian health facilities especially the Indonesian Hospital reveals major weaknesses in the implementation of humanitarian law. The Security Council has so far restricted itself to issuing resolutions on Gaza without initiating judicial mechanisms to prosecute individuals responsible for the escalation of civilian casualties. This demonstrates a broader failure in the global system of humanitarian law enforcement which remains heavily influenced by political interests rather than normative legal obligations (Galingging 2010).

B. Analysis of the Role and Status of International Law in the Legal Enforcement Process regarding Israel's Military Aggression against Palestinian Hospitals

The United Nations (UN) holds a significant influence in the enforcement of international law (Hakimi, 2017) and serves as a manifestation of the role and position of international legal norms. These norms provide regulation for interstate relations, wartime conduct, and the protection of human rights (Grewe, 2003). Acts of aggression intentionally directed at civilians are considered universally condemned and morally reprehensible (Lanza, 2022), requiring reinforcement of ethical standards. The fundamental aim of humanitarian law is the establishment of peace for humanity by mitigating the effects of war (Greenman, 2020). The escalation of the Israel-Palestine conflict has rendered international problems increasingly complex (Sánchez Morales, 2020), necessitating the involvement of multiple international organizations, including but not limited to ILO, FAO, UNICEF, UNDO, UNESCO, UNHABITAT, UNEP, UNMAS, UNIDO, UNODC, UNFPA, UNRWA, WHO, UN Women, WF, OHCHR, ITC, UNCTAD, UNOCHA, and UNSCO (UNSCO, 2023). Amid this protracted conflict, the UN is compelled to adopt and issue resolutions as a mechanism to address and mediate disputes (Smith et al., 2023). Historically, the UN General Assembly Resolution 181 of 1947 declared the division of Palestinian territory to create a state of Israel. However, this resolution indirectly triggered armed conflict between Israel and neighboring Arab states, prompting the UN to issue subsequent resolutions, including Resolution 242, which addressed Middle Eastern peace initiatives. Despite these efforts, such resolutions have failed to yield positive outcomes in terms of establishing sustainable peace.

Veto Power and the Stagnation of International Law Enforcement (A Case Study of Aggression Against Palestine's Health Infrastructure)

The UN continued its attempts through the adoption of Resolution 338 in 1973, emphasizing ceasefire arrangements and urging parties to comply with Resolution 242. More recently, the UN Security Council issued Resolutions 1402 and 1403 in 2022, calling for diplomatic and dialogue processes to be promptly implemented (Muhammad Jamaluddin & Erik Ilham Habibillah, 2020). In response to Israeli military aggression against Palestinian territories, which disrupted operational functions in facilities such as Indonesian hospitals in Palestine, the UN proposed a Permanent Ceasefire Resolution between Israel and Palestine. This resolution aimed to prevent violations of humanitarian principles and establish a secure environment. Although there was consensus among most UN members, the resolution ultimately failed due to a veto exercised by the United States, a permanent member of the UN Security Council (Dewantara et al., 2023).

The exercise of veto power demonstrates the obstruction it poses to the International Criminal Court (ICC) in prosecuting actors responsible for war crimes and human rights violations. It effectively hinders the enforcement of humanitarian law and impedes the protection of vulnerable populations, including women and children, amid the Israel-Palestine conflict. The role and authority of international law appear insufficient when countered by the veto power, as evidenced by the U.S. veto that nullified the proposed Permanent Ceasefire Resolution (Ricarte, 2023).

As a result, the Permanent Ceasefire Resolution failed to achieve its objectives. Its ineffectiveness contributed to a rise in war casualties, underlining the urgent need for the enforcement of international law, particularly humanitarian law, through the ICC. Prosecution under international law is essential for curbing conflict escalation, reducing civilian casualties, and preventing egregious violations of human rights (Millenio, 2021). The continuation of humanitarian crises is inevitable if perpetrators are not held accountable. The actions of Israeli soldiers have been characterized as some of the most heinous crimes under international standards, reflecting a complete disregard for justice for civilian victims in Palestine (Ho, 2019).

The UN, established in the aftermath of World War II, bears a moral responsibility to uphold peace among all human communities. The targeting of health infrastructure, such as hospitals—which should serve as safe spaces for treating victims—constitutes a violation of human rights and a form of humanitarian crime. Furthermore, the colonization and intimidation of Palestinian civilians, including aerial bombardment in Gaza, constitute breaches of human rights and warrant intervention by the UN, notwithstanding the obstacles posed by Security Council vetoes (Dewantara et al., 2023).

The UN's significant involvement is particularly evident in its role during the partitioning of Palestinian territory to facilitate the creation of the state of Israel, as outlined in Resolution 181 of 1947. While consensus was achieved among most UN members at that time, the long-term consequences have exacerbated the Israel-Palestine conflict, resulting in protracted violence and higher civilian casualties, extending to the present day. The Security Council must prioritize humanitarian concerns over ethnic, religious, and political divisions, ensuring the protection of human rights without obstruction from veto powers, as mandated by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (Sumertha et al., 2017).

A pattern emerges whereby states may intentionally neglect their obligations under international law if compliance yields no tangible benefit to their national interests. States are prone to disregard international regulations during conflicts if their adversaries lack the capacity for effective diplomacy or international advocacy. Consequently, decisive action by the UN Security Council is required, including the responsible exercise of veto power, free from political considerations (Stephan, 2022).

From a natural law perspective, international law binds all legal actors and receives recognition across the global community. Consequently, addressing Israel's aggression against health infrastructure in Palestine could be pursued through the ICC, regardless of Israel's non-ratification of the Rome Statute or Palestine's non-membership in the UN (Kasim, 2021). The veto power primarily functions as an obstruction to the realization of international law as a tool for positive harmonization and constructive legal order. According to M. Kusumaatmadja's constructive law theory, veto power inherently hinders the enforcement of international law, particularly in humanitarian contexts (Aulia, 2019).

In summary, the UN's capacity to enforce international law faces substantial limitations due to the politicization of veto power. The Israel-Palestine conflict exemplifies how humanitarian law can be undermined when political interests supersede moral imperatives. Continuous violations of human rights, targeting of health facilities, and attacks on civilians underscore the urgency for international legal mechanisms to hold perpetrators accountable. Without such enforcement, conflicts persist, civilian suffering escalates, and the fundamental objectives of international law—peace, justice, and the protection of human dignity—remain unrealized. The imperative for an impartial and robust application of international law, free from political interference, is essential to prevent further humanitarian catastrophe and to restore credibility to international legal institutions.

V. CONCLUSIONS

In conclusion, the United Nations plays a pivotal role in upholding international law and humanitarian principles, yet its effectiveness is significantly constrained by the political mechanisms inherent in the Security Council, particularly the veto power. The protracted Israel-Palestine conflict demonstrates the limitations of UN resolutions in enforcing peace and protecting civilians, as exemplified by the repeated failure of ceasefire initiatives despite broad international consensus. The veto exercised by permanent members, most notably the United States, illustrates how political interests can override humanitarian imperatives, obstructing the

Veto Power and the Stagnation of International Law Enforcement (A Case Study of Aggression Against Palestine's Health Infrastructure)

prosecution of war crimes and undermining the enforcement of international humanitarian law through institutions such as the International Criminal Court. This structural limitation perpetuates human suffering, particularly among vulnerable populations including children and women, and allows egregious violations of human rights to persist unchecked. The escalation of hostilities, the targeting of health infrastructure, and the continued disregard for civilian protection highlight the urgent need for reform in the international legal framework to ensure impartiality, accountability, and effective enforcement. The UN's moral responsibility, rooted in its historical mandate post-World War II, necessitates decisive action to prioritize human rights over political considerations. Only through strengthening the impartial application of international law and mitigating the obstructive impact of veto power can the UN fulfill its role in preventing humanitarian crises, reducing civilian casualties, and restoring the credibility of international legal institutions.

REFERENCES

- 1) Abtahi, H., & Dawson, G. (2016). The anatomy of the Milošević trial (2001–2006). *Journal of International Humanitarian Action*, 1(1), 1–35. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41018-016-0004-x>
- 2) Ahmed lamin. (2021). ISRAEL-PALESTINE CONFLICT: THE WORLD'S MOST INTRACTABLE CONFLICT. *International Journal of Language & Literature*, 1–11.
- 3) Akande, D., & Tzanakopoulos, A. (2018). Treaty Law and ICC Jurisdiction over the Crime of Aggression. *European Journal of International Law*, 29(3), 939–959. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ejil/chy059>
- 4) Al Uraidy, A., Istri, T., Widyantari, D., & Dewi, P. (2021). Penyerangan Koalisi Arab Saudi Terhadap Yaman Dalam Perspektif Hukum Humaniter. *Jurnal Kertha Desa*, 9(3), 38–50.
- 5) Alexander, A. (2023). Filling the Gaps: The Expansion of International Humanitarian Law and the Juridification of the Free-Fighter. *Journal of International Humanitarian Legal Studies*, 14(2), 274–303. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1163/18781527-bja10075>
- 6) Alviana, M., Kaimuddin, A., & Zamzami, A. (2016). Pelanggaran HAM Dalam Sengketa Bersenjata Di Palestina Oleh Israel Dalam Perspektif Hukum Internasional. *Dinamika*, 28(14), 5192–5211.
- 7) Astuti, M. (2018). Efektivitas Hukum Humaniter Internasional Dalam Melindungi Cagar Budaya Di Negara Konflik. *DE LEGA LATA: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum*, 3(1), 96–107. <https://doi.org/10.30596/dll.v3i1.3143>
- 8) Aulia, M. Z. (2019). Hukum Pembangunan dari Mochtar Kusuma-atmadja: Mengarahkan Pembangunan atau Mengabdikan pada Pembangunan? *Undang: Jurnal Hukum*, 1(2), <https://doi.org/10.22437/ujh.1.2.363-392> CNBC INDONESIA. (2023). RS Indonesia Gaza Lumpuh Total Diserang Israel, 3 WNI Selamat. CNBC INDONESIA <https://www.cnbcindonesia.com/news/20231127121151-8-492288/rsindonesia-gaza-lumpuh-total-diserang-israel-3-wni-selamat>. (diakses, 15 Oktober, 2023)
- 9) Dewantara, J. A., Sulistyarini, Afandi, Warneri, & Efiani. (2023). Pelanggaran HAM Dalam Konflik Israel dan Palestina Berdampak Terhadap Hilangnya Hak Asasi Manusia Khususnya Hak Anak di Palestina. *Jurnal Kewarganegaraan*, 7(1), 19–25
- 10) Dibu, W., & Moges, A. (2019). Assessment of the International Criminal Court's Prosecutor Role in Darfur Crisis, Sudan (the case of Omer Al-Bashir). *International Journal of Multicultural and Multireligious Understanding*, 6(3), 1034. <https://doi.org/10.18415/ijmmu.v6i3.995>
- 11) Dibu, W., & Moges, A. (2019). Assessment of the International Criminal Court's Prosecutor Role in Darfur Crisis, Sudan (the case of Omer Al-Bashir). *International Journal of Multicultural and Multireligious Understanding*, 6(3), 1034. <https://doi.org/10.18415/ijmmu.v6i3.995> E. N.
- 12) Domloboy Nasution, & Raudia, Z. (2022). Proceedings of the International Conference on Sustainable Innovation on Humanities, Education, and Social Sciences (ICOSI-HESS 2022). In Proceedings of the International Conference on Sustainable Innovation on Humanities, Education, and Social Sciences (ICOSI-HESS 2022). Atlantis Press SARL. <https://doi.org/10.2991/978-2-494069-65-7>.
- 13) Farhat, S. A., Nurdin, R., & Basir, S. M. (2022). Attacks Against Civilian Objects: An Analysis Under International Humanitarian Law. *Hasanuddin Law Review*, 8(1), 60–78. <https://doi.org/10.20956/halrev.v8i1.3548>
- 14) Furqon, A. F. (2022). Use of Nuclear Weapons in Humaniter Law Enforcement Perspective. *Indonesian Journal of Multidisciplinary Science*, 1(9), 1090–1100. <https://doi.org/10.55324/ijoms.v1i9.165>
- 15) Galingging, R. (2010). Prosecuting Acts of Terrorism As Crimes Against Humanity Under the Icc Treaty. *Indonesian Journal of International Law*, 7(4), 747–774. <https://doi.org/10.17304/ijil.vol7.4.245>
- 16) Gilboa, E. (2023). US-Israel relations at 75. *Israel Affairs*, 29(3), 473–491. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13537121.2023.2206210>