

Journal of Humanity, Peace and Justice

Research Article

Open Access

“Crime of the Century”: Israel’s State Terrorism and International Law Violations in Gaza Strip



Gökhan Ak¹  

¹ Istanbul Topkapi University, Faculty of Economics, Administrative and Social Sciences, Department of Political Science and International Relations (English), Istanbul, Türkiye

Abstract


The military wing of the Hamas organization executed several assaults that had been planned for many years on different locations in the South-Israel territories on October 7, 2023 at 6:00 LT. Very swiftly and without hesitation, for the first time since the Yom Kippur war declaration in 1973, Israel officially declared war against not only Hamas, but also against all civilian people living in the Gaza Strip. Israel first violently attacked the Northern Gaza Strip in an unrelenting, unpredictable show of force that had not been seen before, carrying on with its violence at an increasing rate and effectiveness to the time of this writing. However, the Israel Defense Force (IDF), as the military of the State of Israel, demonstrated a large-scale disproportionate use of force in the fight against terrorism in the Gaza Strip. Thus, the State of Israel and its army surprised the entire world in their attacks against all of the non-combatants in the Gaza Strip without any target discrimination, not only intentionally, consciously, and unconstrained, but also violently, inhumanely, and without any recognizable pattern. All those wittingly and deliberately executed assaults on the civilians and non-combat infrastructure (such as hospitals, religious sites, schools, etc.) in the Gaza Strip proved that the main aim of Israel was not to fight against terrorism in the region, but to execute a purposeful ethnic cleansing in the whole Gaza territory. Since it can be seen that previous research into Israel’s crimes against humanity concerning brutal and unlawful assaults towards the Palestinian territories were not so extensive in the relates literature, this study will likely contribute in that vein to the field of social science. The aim of this research is to explore and put forth Israel’s possible war crimes against non-combatants in the Gaza Strip in the context of state terrorism and make evaluations on their possible impact on international politics.

Keywords

Israel, Gaza Strip · War · War Crimes · State Terrorism · Crimes against Humanity.



“ Citation: Ak, G. (2024). “Crime of the Century”: Israel’s State terrorism and international law violations in Gaza strip. *Journal of Humanity, Peace and Justice*, 1(1), 65-95. <https://doi.org/10.26650/hupej.2024.10.1.1468793>

© This work is licensed under Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License. 

© 2024. Ak, G.

✉ Corresponding author: Gökhan Ak gokhanak@topkapi.edu.tr



“Crime of the Century”: Israel’s State Terrorism and International Law Violations in Gaza Strip

“I cannot understand the passive response of the whole civilized world to this modern barbarism. Does the world not see that Hitler is aiming for war?”

Albert Einstein – 1933¹

Nature itself, including wildlife, wild animals, wild plants, and wild natural disasters, were never a direct threat to humanity since the beginning of our history as nature never purposely and intentionally harbors or fosters malicious actions and assaults against humans. However, humanity had been the victim of inhumane violence since the beginning of mankind (Lenta & Cormos, 2017). Nevertheless, this issue has caused a great dilemma for the thousands of years of our history because everything in nature is the outcome of something else, which presents the issue of human nature (Luban, 2004). It is thus difficult to say “in the history of civilization” because it is likely that the brutal nature of humanity has wiped out the history of civilization many times and for centuries.² What is even more painful and ironic about this issue is that neither the modern international law nor the supranational common institutions of humanity can prevent the consequences of this wild nature of mankind. Thus, armed conflicts, the best known of which is war, between societies has never ceased nor been prevented for centuries.

The notions of “conflict” and “war” is one of those oldest concepts of human life in our history. Even in the Prehistoric era (from 2.5 million B.C. to 600 B.C.), there were clashes, conflicts, and wars between early humans.³ Such a trend appears to be the unchangeable fate of mankind to many who work within the fields of political science and sociology, since politics has always been the symbolic origin of “power” and “rule” among human communities, giving an almost “divine” value to “race” and “nation” (Weitz, 2003). Thus, political issues, including state crimes, brutal violence, and crimes against humanity, have been directly related with human societies⁴ forever, as politics is namely a societal structure, as Luban (2004, pp. 90-91) emphasized:

Crimes against humanity assault one particular aspect of human being, namely our character as political animals. We are creatures whose nature compels us to live socially, but who cannot do so without artificial political organization that inevitably poses threats to our well-being, and, at the limit, to our very survival. Crimes against humanity represent the worst of those threats; they are the limiting case of politics gone cancerous. Precisely because we cannot live without politics, we exist under the permanent threat that politics will turn cancerous and the indispensable institutions of organized political life will destroy us. That is why all humankind shares an interest in repressing these crimes.

¹One of his amazing commentaries on Nazism; and for more information, see, (Pais, 1994)

²For a massive and admirably inclusive work, see, (Shelton, 2005)

³For more details, see, (Braudel, 1994; Bulliet et. al., 2005; Holton & Nasson, 2009; Quigley, 1979)

⁴Though an early and eclectic treatment, as a source still widely read and cited, see, (Chalk & Jonassohn, 1990) Also, for one of the best edited volumes on the issue, diverse and vigorously written throughout, see, (Gellately & Kiernan, 2003)



Therefore, being the best-organized political entity of our times, the states and their politicians should become responsible and rational while approaching to sort out both inter-societal and international issues which cause conflict. The state cannot act asymmetrically in coping with those conflicting issues and relations in society. If the state does so, then it will be the same as the origin of organized crime produced by an illegal organization, such as a terrorist organization, since terror is the best example of an asymmetric threat of our modern times. Herewith, the modern literature of political theory has added a new term into its toolbox in this manner, i.e. “state terrorism.”⁵ Thus, it should become a crystal-clear fact for the modern international community that a state could apply an official counter-terrorism procedure while dealing with a terrorist organization. In this context, it is ultimately vital to highlight that the main obstacles in constructing an indictment of terrorism against a state (Claridge, 1996) should dictate that the state is not a terrorist organization (Blakeley, 2009).

However, societies around the world have observed that state terrorism has been applied in one way or another at various cases over the history of mankind. This was a very common case during the discovery of new continents, such as Americas, or during the era of colonialism of the so-called great Powers of Europa, and many other cases that we could not recount here which have lasted for centuries.⁶ Therefore, it is possible to claim that state terrorism has been a systematic method of oppression for all those political entities ranging from ancient civilizations to empires and nation-states who seek hegemony, power, and rule. In this context, probably the most hateful, disgusting, and painful state crime against humanity (Bartov et. al., 2002; Jalloh, 2013), or namely, “state terrorism,” in world history relates to “genocide,” which is an outlawed act (Irvin-Erickson, 2017) which attempts the total annihilation of ethnic/national/disadvantageous groups. The term genocide comes from Raphaël Lemkin, while its official definition comes from international law with Article 2⁷ of the United Nations (UN) Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (CPPCG) (Schabas, 2009) of 1948.⁸

In this vein, the term “genocide” invented by the Polish Jewish lawyer Raphaël Lemkin in 1943,⁹ was defined by the author as: “The practice of extermination of nations and ethnic groups as carried out by the invaders.” (Lemkin, 1944, pp. xi-xii) Lemkin devised the term genocide as a response to the organized, mechanized, and institutionalized killings that were part of the Nazi Regime during the Second World War (Hobson, 2019, p. 11). Even though we differentiate genocide from Holocaust, all the mass murders committed by the Nazis during the Second World War were open acts of ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity in

⁵For more details, see, (Stohl, 1984, pp. 37-52; Glover, 1991, pp. 256-275)

⁶As one of “the most comprehensive treatment of Western responsibility for mass atrocity yet published” (stated by Richard Falk), see, (Jones, 2004). Also see, (Mann, 2005)

⁷Article II - In the present Convention, genocide means any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group, as such: (a) Killing members of the group; (b) Causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group; (c) Deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part; (d) Imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group; (e) Forcibly transferring children of the group to another group. See for detail, (United Nations, 1951, pp. 278-322)

⁸“Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide”, Approved and proposed for signature and ratification or accession by General Assembly resolution 260 A (III) of 9 December 1948 Entry into force: 12 January 1951, in accordance with article XIII, Available at https://www.un.org/en/genocideprevention/documents/atrocity-crimes/Doc.1_ConventiononthePreventionandPunishmentoftheCrimeofGenocide.pdf accessed on Dec. 22, 2023.

⁹Raphael Lemkin published his famous book ‘Axis Rule in Occupied Europe’ in 1944. He coined the new word “genocide” in his book’s preface dated November 15, 1943.



the context of genocide; hence, according to Lemkin, techniques of genocide could occur in various fields of human and social life, comprising political, social, cultural, economic, biological, physical, religious, and moral categories (Lemkin, 1944, pp. 82-89).

It is thus possible to observe previous instances in history of targeted actions aimed at the destruction of particular groups of people, including acts of various genocidal violence and massacres against indigenous individuals, such as: the Native Americans (Stannard, 1993), Africans (Kutlu, 2021), in the Americas (including Brazil, Paraguay, and the United States), Australia, Africa, Southeast Asia, Middle East (Jones, 2006), or genocide against Jews, Romans, Gypsies, some other small ethnic folks, disabled people in Europa, as well as the “Holocaust” (Hewitt, 2004), the systematic mass extermination of European Jewry by the Hitler’s Nazi regime in Germany before and during the Second World War (1933-1941-1945) (Bauer, 1980, p. 44), or the mass annihilation acts in the Russian territory against varied ethnic folks before, during, and after the Second World War, the Cambodian Genocide of 1975-1979, the Rwandan Genocide of 1994, and the Genocide in Bosnia of 1992-1995 (Rosenbaum, 1998) after the Second Great War (Sadat, 2013). All of these genocidal acts are certainly and without doubt “crimes of the centuries” committed against humanity (See, Badar, 2004; Ambos, 2011; Tekin, 2015).

Thus, the world witnessed all types of crimes against humanity committed during the Second World War, especially towards those millions of Jews exposed to miscellaneous mass atrocities by Hitler’s Nazi regime, such as murder, extermination, enslavement, deportation, imprisonment, torture, rape (and other gender-based or sex crimes), group-based persecution, enforced disappearance, apartheid, and “other inhumane acts of a similar character intentionally causing great suffering or serious injury to body or to mental or physical health (United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, no date). However, although Palestinians and Jews have been the common combative sides of a competing history since the founding of the State of Israel on the Palestine lands in 1948 (Berry & Philo, 2006), witnessing similar mass atrocities being committed by the State of Israel today against civilians residing in the Gaza Strip represents a truly frightening, devilishly horrific, and surprisingly ironic situation for many people around the world. That is the clear-cut case, because Jews were persecuted by Nazis who availed themselves of all means of genocidal atrocity, crime, tyranny, cruelty, and oppression between 1933-1945, and today Jews commit the same mass and genocidal persecutions, crimes, tyranny, cruelty, and oppression against the civilians of the Gaza Strip. This is a great and evilly ironic dilemma for the Jews and their state, since the State of Israel commits a “barbarization of warfare” (Jones, 2006, pp. 53-54) against the whole non-combatants residing in the Gaza Strip. Therefore, it is frightening to consider that the State of Israel has turned down a dark and sinister path on which there is no return.

Today, thousands of people living in the Gaza strip are ironically subjected to the same state oppression, terror and violent cruelty that the Jews were subjected to between 1933-1945 by the Nazis, but ironically, this time it is by the Jews themselves; hence, we witness a frightening similarity between state terrorism implemented by the Nazis against Jews for 12 years and ironically today, by the Jews against civilian residents of Gaza since October 7, 2023. Thus, the assaults of the Israel Defense Force which appear to be aiming at a total ethnic cleansing against the three million civilians of the Gaza Strip coincide with the brutal and



inhumanely violent Nazi war crimes that the Jews were subjected to during the Second World War, in terms of content, purpose and intention. In this line, it is possible to claim that those non-combatant civilians of the exclave-land of the Gaza Strip are currently pushed to their limits of existence in despair, destitute, and misery in front of the eyes of the international community, including its organizations and bodies of law.

In this context, after this introduction, the study will attempt to explore the conceptual basis of Israel’s “so-called” war on the Gaza Strip in the first chapter. After, the study will analyze some concepts, such as “State Terrorism,” “War Crimes,” and “Crimes against Humanity” in line with the Israel’s activities in the region. The study will conclude with the main findings, evaluations, views, and comments regarding the main analysis of the research problems.

Methodology and Literature Survey of the Research

The main problematic of this study will rest upon attempting to put forth Israel’s possible war crimes against non-combatants in the Gaza Strip in the context of state terrorism and make evaluations on their possible impact on international politics.

The content of this research includes Israel, Palestine, the Gaza Strip, Israel’s state terrorism towards Palestinians of the Gaza Strip and occupied lands, Israel’s policies towards the Palestinian territories, and Israel’s violent crimes against Palestine, including war crimes and ethnic cleansing.

The importance of this study rests upon three basic aspects. Firstly, the latest war in the Gaza Strip has no similarity with the previous Israeli attacks on Palestine in terms of military operational goals, aims, and dimension. Secondly, in this context, Israel has begun to commit a brutal and violent war against people residing in the Gaza Strip aiming at the total extermination of the local residents. Thirdly, the state terrorism, crimes against humanity, and war crimes of the IDF have peaked in their assaults against the civilians of the Gaza Strip. Thus, even though there has been a wide range of research about Israel’s state terrorism and crimes in the Palestine territories in the related literature of the past and present, this research will also contribute to the related field of the social sciences as being the first clear example of genocide acts perpetuated by Israel so far in one of the whole Palestine territory like the Gaza Strip.

This study adopted a qualitative research methodology which was based on a deductive approach. The study employs the concepts of: a “descriptive” explanation of the concepts and relationships while dealing with the subject within the conceptual framework of the research, “causal” when looking into the facts behind the events, “theoretical” when extracting principles from the events that have occurred, and “historical” when examining the effect of past events and the effects of the current situation. Scientific studies based on information obtained from sources, such as libraries, archives, and the internet research related to the problematic of the study have all been employed at various degrees. Such scientific research methods as document analysis, content analysis, discourse analysis, grouping, and comparison were also used. In addition, the advanced research methods of hermeneutics and dialectics were also utilized in the secondary methodological context.

Within the scope of the literature review of the research, which generally adopted qualitative research methodology, secondary data sources were mainly used in terms of resource use within the framework



of obtaining scientific data. In this context, scientific (e-)books, scientific (e-)articles, scientific (published e-)dissertations, scientific proceeding (e-)books, and scientific (e-)reports of international organizations, NGOs, and think-tanks that were obtained from public and university libraries and/or virtual environments related to the subject were given priority, and accordingly included in the research for the scientific data. The aforementioned sources were then scanned and analyzed. In this way, the main and secondary sources that would support the findings of the research were obtained and read; the information in the sources was classified in accordance with the tentative outlines of the research. Everything was subjected to an analytical review and was imported into the research in accordance with ethical publication rules.

The Conceptual Basis of Israel’s “So-Called” War on the Gaza Strip

The concept of “war” is probably the utmost serious and critical event in the history of human civilization (See Brownlie, 1963; Von Clausewitz, 1976; Smith, 2007; Van Creveld, 1991; Gal-Or & Giesen, 2007; Ören, 2022). We hereby use the term “the history of human civilization” instead of “world history” on purpose, since war is great dilemma due to the fact that it is one of the most contractionary events in human history that contains intense and multilateral contrasts. In this context, states sometimes experience the reality that on one hand, war destroys civilizations, but on the other hand, it boosts the progress of the civilizations by enabling new scientific and technologic inventions throughout every aspect of life. Nevertheless, it is critical to remember that war is still the last resort in international relations to resolve mutual conflicts or, on the contrary, to realize national targets.

However, it would be better to not forget before declaring war that there is no “winner,” since war represents the most destructive and darkest sides of the human spirit by making use of all of our invented acts of savagery, atrocity, and brutality:

War is the spectacular and bloody projection of our everyday life. [We] can see what creates wars, and if we are interested in stopping wars, then we can begin to transform ourselves, who are the causes of war. (...) (Krishnamurti, 1954, p. 182); and without a transformation in ourselves, there are bound to be national and racial antagonisms, the childish quarrelling over ideologies, the multiplication of soldiers, the saluting of flags, and all the many brutalities that go to create organized murder (Krishnamurti, 1981, p. 57). (...) [Thus], what causes war –religious, political or economic? Obviously belief, either in nationalism, in an ideology, or in a particular dogma. (...) Obviously what causes war is the desire for power, (...) also the disease called nationalism (...) All these are the causes of war; (...) if you are greedy for power, (...) you are bound to produce a society which will result in destruction (Krishnamurti, 1954, p. 183).

Beside all these, “declaring war” is a much more serious matter than “making war” or fighting, in terms of its consequences. It is due to the fact that the state, while declaring war, should also become ready as well as discreet about the rules of fighting. This is because declaring war also includes committing to comply with the rules of war, or, in other words, agreeing to undertake all the legal conditions of the law of war. Those rules mainly include the prohibition of state terrorism, war crimes, and crimes against humanity during the



fighting. Therefore, if the state does not comply with those rules or violates some of them, especially when those violations are committed on the non-combatants, namely civilians, then it would mean that the state is practicing terrorism; in other words, it becomes an act of state terrorism.

In addition, every action of a state contrary to international law requires the international responsibility of that state to accord with international law. In this vein, a state bears responsibility for its war crimes and crimes against humanity and other unjust acts against non-combatants. Thus, in the aftermath of a war declaration, no matter what its reason will be, the state could not apply state terrorism and commit war crimes and/or crimes against humanity during the war. However, this does not appear to be the case for the still-ongoing war which was declared by Israel against the Gaza Strip, in the context of fighting against Hamas (BBC News, 2024), the acronym for Harakat al-Muqawama al-Islamiya (Islamic Resistance Movement).¹⁰

As it is known, the conflict between the local Palestinians residents and the State of Israel¹¹ have been ongoing since the establishment of Israel on May 14, 1948 (Metz, 1990; Adelman, 2008). There have been many armed clashes, fights, and wars between the Arab States and Israel after this event (Ben-Yehuda & Sandler, 2002; Bickerton, 2009). Many diplomatic efforts have also been carried out to solve the deep-rooted and decades-ongoing controversies and disputes in the region. The Arab-Israeli conflict was also nourished by all sorts of international terrorism in the Middle East as well as Israel’s revisionist and expansionist policies, including constant and brutal assaults on Palestinians for decades. Thus, the Middle East region, and particularly Palestine and Israel, have never been able to achieve well-being, stability, and peace since 1948. For this reason, the outcome of the struggle has been the regular shifting of the political borders in favor of Israel.

Considering these conflicts in the Middle East that have been ongoing for decades, the world has sometimes been anxious about the societal strife and contention between Palestinians and the State of Israel, as the tactics and behavior of the Israeli military and police forces’ against civilians in the Palestinian territories and occupied Palestinian lands has mostly been brutal and violent. However, these occurrences are the clear outcome of the state policies adopted by Israel and its governments since 1948. Because Israel has been so eager in expanding its territories across Palestinian regions since its establishment, their state terrorism has become a normal attitude for Israel, resulting in the fact that there has not been an official, independent, and sovereign State of Palestine from then until now.¹²

However, with the declaration of war in the context of fighting against terrorism by the State of Israel against the Hamas organization located in the Gaza Strip on October 7, 2023, a new era has commenced in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Interestingly, Israel has officially declared war for the first time since the Yom Kippur war declaration of 1973. Besides this unique case, following the horrible attacks of Hamas, without hesitation, the war declared by the Israeli government on October 7, 2023 was against not only Hamas, but

¹⁰The US State Department designated HAMAS as a foreign terrorist organization in October 1997. See for detail, (National Counterterrorism Center (NCTC), 2022)

¹¹See for detail, (Tessler, 2009; Laqueur & Schueftan, 2016; Elmal, 2023)

¹²“Lebanon’s Ambassador to the Netherlands, Abdel Sattar Issa, stated in his speech at the International Court of Justice (ICJ); “Lebanon and more than 140 members of the UN recognized the state of Palestine and East Jerusalem as its capital.” For more details, see, (Haber7Com, 2024a)



also all the civilians residing in the Gaza Strip. They justified this because the Gaza Strip is the main location of the Hamas organization, with many of its members located in the area.

However, this situation is not a valid reason for the Israeli government to declare war on the whole Gaza Strip claiming justification that many members of reside in the area. The Gaza Strip is a tiny coastal enclave¹³ land in the Levant bordering the Mediterranean Sea (40 km coastline) as well as two countries: Egypt (13 km borderline) and Israel (59 km borderline) (The CIA World Factbook, 2024). However, the Gaza Strip is a region with a length of 40 km and a width of 11 km, with a very densely populated area, of 2.3 million people residing in a total land area of 360 km² (The Associated Press, 2023). Thus, all of these extreme attributes make the Gaza Strip one of the most unique territories of the world.

Decades ago, Malcolm X (1990, p. 149) stated: “(...) Now, you’re not supposed to be so blind with patriotism that you can’t face reality. Wrong is wrong, no matter who does it or who says it...” Therefore, when we strive to decipher the hidden-agenda behind why the State of Israel has been so violent in the Gaza Strip, or what the final goals of the State of Israel could be, we are likely to explore a dark state bigotry, a blind state fanaticism, and a wild fundamentalism in the name of a “fake patriotism.” On account of that, it is a crystal-clear fact that the State of Israel is clearly acting from a wrong basis, no matter how it is handled or how it is accepted. In this context, the research will currently follow on by exploring Israel’s war on Gaza Strip in terms of state terrorism, war crimes and crimes committed against humanity.

“State Terrorism” and Israel’s “So-Called” War on Gaza

Terrorism is one of the most heinous and despicable crimes in history. Unlike other horrible crimes and threats, terrorism is uniquely normless, unpredictable, and unconstrained as an asymmetric threat. Thus, terrorism can be found in the toolbox of asymmetric kinds of warfare (Stepanova, 2008). Terror is a disgusting course of action to apply “threat and violence” to enable oppression, fear, horror, and anxiety, on people, animals, plants, and nature, or, in short, all living bodies of the world. The aim of terrorist action could be defined as achieving social, political, military, or economic gains (Şimşek, 2016, pp. 320).

The term “terror” is derived from the Latin word “terrere,” which means “extreme fear and anxiety, terror felt in the face of an unknown and unpredictable danger” (Öktem, 2004, p. 133). However, interestingly there are approximately 200 different definitions of the concept of terrorism, which has occupied the agenda of societies, states, and relations between states for centuries. Thus, terrorism, as a crime against humanity, could be recounted in its simplest definition: “Terrorism is the act of using force or threatening people in order to intimidate, deter, appall, overawe and discourage them into adopting certain thoughts and behaviors.” (Yılmaz, 2011, p. 32). In this simple definition, terrorism is depicted as an asymmetric, but direct means of intimidating the society, and using force for this purpose. Wherewithal, the terms of “terror” and “terrorism” are different concepts. Terror includes all kinds of violent acts and can be defined as organized and unregulated violent acts; yet terrorism is comprised of activities that target the current political power and regime, based on the violent actions of more than one person organized around an ideology that include a

¹³Not enclave, because the Gaza Strip has been under the de facto governing authority of the Islamic Resistance Movement (Hamas) since 2007. For more details, see, (The CIA World Factbook, 2024)



political element, that is, has an ideology and is directed to destroy the existing system through violence. The concept of terrorism is used in a very general way to express a long-term state of fear and terror; thus, the concept of terrorism refers to the strategy that aims to bring about this situation (Caşın, 2008, pp. 37, 102). As seen, while terror is a form of action, terrorism is a system which includes organized, systematic, and long-term actions (Demir, 2017, p. 8).

While terrorism is one of the most disgusting criminal acts found in human societies (Newman, 2006), there is also a very significant and critical aspect of terrorism. At the same time, definitions of the terms terror, terrorism, terrorist organization, terrorist generally indicate meanings which depend on the side they are viewed from. Almost every country seeks to define terrorism in a context appropriate to both its national goals and interests and also its own internal dynamics and external relations. Thus, when we consider the relations between states in accordance with our topic, the fact that there is no common definition of terrorism in the international political world (Saul, 2005, pp. 57-58) as well as international law (Galicki, 2005), or that each state utilizes terrorism in its own way and has different approaches to different terrorist activities, is one of the most disgusting aspects of terrorism. Accordingly, terrorism has become one of the most controversial crimes in today’s modern world (Lawless, 2008).

The terrorist attacks that took place in the United States of America (USA) on September 11, 2001, as well as the subsequent terrorist attacks in Southeast Asia, the Caucasus, the Middle East, and Europe, showed that the threats to the international community could come not only from wars between states, but also to a significant extent, they can originate from non-state actors. The material resources, weapons, and propaganda opportunities that terrorist organizations have acquired through their ability to operate without any area restrictions have caused terrorist acts to increase in recent times, with this phenomenon becoming perceived as a significant threat to international peace and security. In this context, the international community has observed for the last 30 years that, while some states directly support international terrorism from time to time as a method of political struggle to achieve their national interests, some states provide indirect support to international terrorism by tolerating terrorist organizations that organize, shelter, and operate in their countries (Kedikli, 2011, pp. 1-4). However, one of the unpredictable cases in considering who commits or supports terrorism on the state-level becomes what should be done if that unpredictable actor was state itself? The acts of the state that constitute direct or indirect support to international terrorism cause the violation of some obligations of international law.

In the last a few decades, terrorism has emerged as an effective parameter in shaping nation states politically, socially, economically, and culturally. Thus, in the recent decade, we observed that the states that have been the dominant actors in the international system use terrorism to shape their domestic and foreign policies, fostering a sense of fear and panic among their own citizens or the people of another nation by both directing the mass media and also directly using hard-power, including all sorts of conventional weapons. It is seen that nation states, which are influential in the global system, have transitioned from the fight against terrorism to state terrorism, with international organizations such as the United Nations being used in favor of advocating those horrible acts of state terrorism acts. These states which commit terrorism against any other state or individuals claim that they are fighting against terrorism; thus, the permanent



members of the UN Security Council (UNSC), namely the USA, UK, France, RF, and PRC, support those state terrorism assaults from the aggressor state by refusing any cease-fire or armistice between combatants. Thus, the five permanent members of the UNSC disregard and ignore all those acts of state terrorism, war crimes, and crimes against humanity committed by the aggressor states. Eventually, this situation turns all of them, aggressor states and international organizations, into a ruthless terrorist organization. State terrorism, defined as acts of terrorism directly carried out, encouraged, financed, and/or committed by governments, is a kind of terrorism carried out by the government against its own citizens, the people of another state, or in support of international terrorism. State terrorism is similar to non-state terrorism in that it involves politically, ideologically, or religiously-inspired acts of violence against individuals or groups. The main difference between state terrorism and non-state terrorism is that violence is carried out by the agents of the state itself (Yetgin & Baştuğ, 2021, pp. 955-956).

State terrorism refers to acts of terrorism carried out by a state against another state or its own citizens. It has been defined as premeditated, politically-motivated violence carried out by undercover agents against non-combatant targets (Pillar, 2001). It is implied that an attack by a government’s officially uniformed or other identifiable armed forces or state security is not terrorism (Falk, 2002: 11). These views are based on the condition that attack and action plans are made by secret agents in order to define it as state terrorism. However, in today’s international relations and politics, it can be seen that uniformed units can be used in addition to the action and attack plans of secret agents in the execution of state terrorism (Yetgin & Baştuğ, 2021, p. 960). Thus, when a state commits terrorism against another state or people of a political entity, then that aggressor state is responsible for the violation of international law. Thereby, as the subject of international law, if a state acts in violation of its international obligations, the responsibility of that state within the framework of the institution of international responsibility also comes to the fore. The rules of international liability law are a means of ensuring that actors within the domain of international law respect these principles (See Jennings & Watts, 1992, p. 500; Shaw, 1997, p. 541; Pazarıcı, 1994, p. 151), and those actors should consider the possible legal consequences of their aggressive acts and implementations more seriously.

Despite this, it is observed that terrorism practiced by states in almost every region of the world is more deadly and destructive than terrorism practiced by non-state actors. The main reason for this is as follows: Terrorism practiced by states is relatively superior in terms of the number of weapons, equipment, intelligence information, and personnel, and thus cannot be compared with non-state actors. Hence, although the terror practiced by states may appear to be a legal or just war, it is actually a kind of terror perpetrated by states against civilians (non-combatants) or soldiers (combatants), and from this point, state terrorism is subject to the laws of war due to the responsibilities of states regarding international law (Koncagül, 2021, p. 325).

As known, the USA and the UK are the biggest supporters of the State of Israel in all aspects of global relations (Freedman, 2012; Kolander, 2020), with the whole of Europe also contributing in this regard (Greene & Rynhold, 2018). In this context, Chomsky (2002, pp. 224-226) draws attention to the fact that the United States, which he identified as a sponsor of state terrorism, does not give any state the right to defend against



itself American aggression, which has become a doctrine, especially since the 1980s. The message of the doctrine is clear: no one has the right to defend against US terrorist attacks, and the US is a terrorist state “by right.” Accordingly, the US is legitimizing the organization of a terrorist army of proxies to subjugate unsubmitive people (Yağciner, 2006, pp. 106-107). Therefore, interestingly, it is a crystal-clear fact that, since 1967, Israel had committed crimes of aggression by illegally occupying the Palestinian territories, including the Holy City of Jerusalem, before annexing those lands to its original sovereign state territory (Kişi, 2023). The strange, meaningful, and ironic part of this matter is that the State of Israel has never faced with legal consequences of its practices that can be certainly identified as “state terrorism” in the occupied Palestinian territories as well as Jerusalem and West Bank (Antolinez, 2021). However, all of the evidence points to the fact that Israeli actions against Palestinians over the last several decades make them the aggressor of state terrorism. Accordingly, the entire international community has also concluded that the State of Israel has continued the same state terrorism approach since October 7, 2023 in their attacks against the whole Gaza Strip.

In this vein, as a striking outcome of this series of analysis and evaluations, it is valid to claim that there are strong reasons to consider the current Israeli assaults against all of the people living in the Gaza Strip as state terrorism. This is because of their “state terror” or “politics of violence,” actions which can be comprehensively defined as the use of military units other than legal security forces to protect the security of the state and public order, which is a phenomenon that emerged within the framework of internal elements, such as revolutions and uprisings. Today, such a policy has become the conflict strategy in line with the interests of Israel (Yağciner, 2006, pp. 103-105). Therefore, all of the violent assaults of the State of Israel against the Gaza Strip can be considered state terrorism based on the following criteria.

(1) In its simplest sense, state terrorism is a strategy of violence used by a State to achieve political goals (Koncağül, 2021, p. 331), with such policies being openly depicted by Israeli media:

According to the news of the Hebrew newspaper Maariv, Netanyahu prepared a draft road map with a group of businessmen that he will follow after ending his attacks on the Gaza Strip, where the humanitarian disaster is taking place. According to the first phase of the plan shared by Netanyahu with US officials and relevant parties, a military administration to be established in the Gaza Strip after the attacks end will handle the administrative affairs of the humanitarian aid and civilian population that will enter there during the transition period. (...) According to the plan, although the military administration will end its mandate, Israel will retain the right to intervene in Gaza, as in the occupied West Bank, under security pretexts. (TRTNews, 2024)

(2) We observe from the official declarations of the Israeli government that the State of Israel’s national interests are in line with its final national aims towards the Gaza Strip, which overlap with the state strategy highlighted above in (1): *“In the statement made by the Israeli Prime Minister’s Office on February 9, it was noted that Netanyahu instructed the army and security organization to prepare the necessary plan to attack the south of the Gaza Strip and displace approximately 1.5 million Palestinians who have taken refuge there.”* (Dünya Gazetta, 2024).



(3) We then observe that in order to achieve their national goals and objectives by carrying out a conscious and mass ethnic cleansing against the people of Gaza, the State of Israel has perpetuated its violent, brutal, and unmerciful aggressions and invasions against all of the non-combatants, namely civilians, residing in Gaza Strip regardless of target:

According to the news of Israeli State Television KAN, Netanyahu gave information about the attacks on the Gaza Strip in his meeting with the ministers in his government. “It will take six months for the Israeli army to finish the third phase of the war that started in the north of the Gaza Strip.” Netanyahu said, “As we said before, we said that the air (attacks) part would take 3 weeks, and so it happened. We said that the second part, consisting of land maneuvers, would take 3 months, and so it happened. Now, the third part, ‘control and purification’, will take 6 months.” he said. (NTV News, 2024a)

Therefore, it is clear that what the State of Israel’s aggressive and violent attacks against the Gaza Strip since October 7, 2023 is an example of ruthless state terrorism. There are many legal grounds to recount related to the state terrorism carried out by the State of Israel in the airstrikes and bombings of the Gaza Strip, which have left at least 36,379 civilians killed and 82,407 wounded as of June 2024, according to the Palestinian Health Ministry (Marsi et al., 2024).

Likewise, the next section of this study will discuss the issue of how this state terrorism perpetuated by the State of Israel in the name of their “so-called” war against Hamas has turned into an ongoing sequence of war crimes committed in the Gaza Strip since October 7, 2023.

“War Crimes” and Israel’s “So-Called” War on Gaza

War crimes are one of the most disgusting criminal acts of international relations. However, considering that war itself relates to killing, the crimes committed during war are much more serious and become a form of inhumane behavior multiplied, like a ‘crime’ within a crime. Because of this nature of war, many people are left wondering who can charge a nation state with a criminal act. This is one of the greatest dilemmas faced by humanity, as people have been committing such crimes against others since the dawn of time.

Completely rejecting the horrors and mass destruction of war and wishing for their elimination is not enough to put an end to wars in the world. Against those who argue that there are some values that people fight for, Magee (2000, p. 65) gives the best possible answer: “(...) *all wars are immoral and evil, no matter how sublime the things they fight for are.*” However, even such humane feelings have not been able to end wars, and even will not be able to in the future. War is, in fact, perhaps a struggle that human beings wage with their own souls first. However, since wars have been an integral part of human history and will probably never end, humanity has a responsibility to ensure that wars are fought at the highest possible moral level, at least to reduce the brutality of war. In this case, one might ask how it is possible to wage war without causing harm. There are those who argue that there no such provision is necessary and that everything is permissible in war, and there are those who say that rules, limitations, or moral concerns cannot (or should not) be talked about during war. For them, the battlefield is too heavy and terrible for a soldier to consider moral concerns: “(...) *once one starts fighting, there are no moral rules.*” (Magee 2000, p. 65) Soldiers will



kill without questioning, without being held responsible, without any concern for the values they fight for. There is no room for morality in war. This view turns the war into a complete “hell” (Sönmez, 2019, p. 31). On the other hand, there are those who take a middle path and believe that war can be waged for the sake of some important values, but war cannot be waged independently of moral concerns. Therefore, making the decision to go to war, declaring war, the methods to be used in war, and the responsibility of each person who dies on the battlefield must be the humane and legal responsibility of someone or others. Thus, even wars have limitations, morality, and virtue (Hathaway et.al., 2019).

When significant changes to the approach, definition, and nature of war took place in the beginning of the 19th century, it was witnessed that with these changes, civilians, rather than soldiers, who were traditionally the primary actors of wars, began to become targets of severe human rights violations. The destructive effects of wars began to be felt in cities and other public spaces starting from the mid-19th century, necessitating the emergence of some regulations regarding wars for the first time in human history (Karabulut, 2022). That brutal applications of war reached a critical point that required an answer in the aftermath of the two great World Wars that incurred major crimes against humanity, including genocides (Aksoy Ercümen, 2016).

In this context, it can be said that the first contracts regarding the “law of war,” which can be examined within the general law of states, began to emerge in the mid-19th century (Karabulut, 2022). As a result of those two centuries of war, the need for an international regulation regarding the rules to be followed during armed conflict and the protection of the parties or civilians emerged. In line with this need, the Geneva Convention, the first of which was achieved in 1864, was developed by taking into account the changing and diversifying threat elements according to modern conditions, with four subsequent important agreements prepared in this context being signed by many countries. These conventions form the basis of international humanitarian law today (Aksar, 2004; Aksoy Ercümen, 2016). The Fourth Geneva Convention is a completely new agreement and was adopted as a result of the massacre of civilians during World War II. Although the underlying logic of the Fourth Geneva Convention is the protection of civilians in occupied territories, it generally aims to protect civilians during the conflict.

International humanitarian law consists of rules that attempt to limit the methods and tools of the war. Its main aim is to limit the suffering caused by war by providing as much protection and assistance as possible to war victims. International humanitarian law, also known as the law of armed conflict or the law of war, is the legal practice to be applied during war and is evaluated under two separate headings: (1) Geneva Law,¹⁴ which was established to protect people who do not actively participate in the war, such as military personnel and civilians who are not participating in the war or are out of war; and, (2) Hague Law,¹⁵ which not only determines the rights and obligations of combatants in the management of military operations, but also limits the methods of harming the enemy (De Mulinen, 1987; Jabre et. al., 2016, pp. 8-11).

¹⁴For more details, see, The Geneva Conventions of 1949 and Hague Convention No. IV of 1907, Headquarters Department of the Army, No. 27-1, Washington D.C., 29 August 1975. Available at https://www.loc.gov/rr/frd/Military_Law/pdf/ASubjScd-27-1_1975.pdf accessed on Dec. 25, 2023.

¹⁵For more details, see, Hague Conventions of 1907, Convention (IV) respecting the Laws and Customs of War on Land and its annex: Regulations concerning the Laws and Customs of War on Land. The Hague, October 18, 1907, Geneva Conventions and Commentaries, International Committee of The Red Cross. Available at <https://ihl-databases.icrc.org/ihl/INTRO/195> accessed on Dec. 25, 2023.



The law of war and international humanitarian law are directly related and connected with each other. By this, the first time that armed conflicts were generally included within the scope of international law was with the “Declaration of Paris” dated 1856, which introduced four rules regarding naval combats. However, during the Second World War, the international community witnessed major crimes against humanity including war crimes that reached to genocide, going through very painful experiences in this context. Therefore, until the 1949 Geneva Conventions, which are still valid today, the area of interest of international law was limited to “interstate and certain intensity of armed conflicts” which was referred to as “war.” For this reason, in international law, the rules regulating armed conflicts and the legal effects of these conflicts both between the warring states and on third states are discussed under the name called “the law of war” (Sav, 2015, pp. 17-25; Pazarcı, 2000, p. 127). Accordingly, the progress to regulate rules of war in international law as well as international humanitarian law had not paved a swift way until the end of Second World War. Until this Great War of the 20th century, which had been a real milestone in this regard, we follow the process in two main contexts: the period until the First World War and the period until the Second World War. However, the judicial codification studies on the prohibition and humanization of war after the Second Great War increased in a very short of time. In this context, it can be seen that serious steps were taken regarding the codification of the law of war, especially after the Second World War. Hence, it can be clearly stated that the year 1945 emerged as a turning point in terms of the prohibition of war. So much so that, after the Second World War, the “use of force,” which was considered a “right” in international law for a long time so far, was strictly banned in line with the serious approach and attitudes of the winners of the Second Great War in order to prevent new wars in Europa, and thus, the monopoly on the legitimate use of force was left to the United Nations Security Council (Aslan, 2008, pp. 242, 246).

The law of war, which aims to regulate war and all kinds of armed conflicts, has two different meanings, one narrow and the other broad. In a narrow sense, the law of war specifies the rules of international law that warring parties must comply with, including the protection of individuals during armed conflicts. In a broad sense, the law of war is not limited only to acts of armed conflict and the protection of individuals, but also covers the legal effects of armed conflicts, which are considered within the scope of traditional war law, on the relations of the warring parties and third states (Aslan, 2008, p. 262). However, it is also an obvious fact that, even if it is not expressly included in bilateral or multilateral agreements, the warring parties must comply with established practices, principles of humanity and other matters required by public conscience (Meray, 1965, pp. 457-573). This is because, regarding the binding power of the rules of the law of war, as a rule, the same issues as those regarding the binding power of other rules of international law are valid. Nonetheless, in practice, warring parties violate the rules of the law of war and such violations go unpunished. Still, it can be seen that most of these rules are followed. As a sanction against those who do not comply with the rules of war law, compensation is made after the war and war criminals are tried and punished (Meray, 1979, pp. 162-167). However, the more and more frequent use of criminal justice institutions to deal with serious violations of international humanitarian law reflects an increasingly shared commitment within the international community to address impunity for serious crimes. This development



can be seen as being part of a process that Gerry Simpson has called the “juridification” of war (Kastner, 2015, p. 47; Simpson, 2007, pp. 132-157).

The aim of the law of war is to reduce the brutality caused by war to the lowest level possible. In order to achieve this goal, a number of rules have been determined, both in international agreements and international custom. In this regard, the following three rules must be applied in all kinds of wars, battles and armed conflicts: (1) In war, actions that cause unnecessary pain and suffering will be avoided; (2) Prisoners, sick and wounded, and civilians captured by the enemy will be treated humanely; (3) The main goal will be to restore and maintain peace as imminent as possible (Anonymous, 1987, pp. 16-17; Meray, 1979, pp. 247-263). When the rules of war law are examined, it is seen that they are based on three basic principles. These are, respectively, the “military necessity,” “prevention of unnecessary pain and suffering,” and “proportionality” principles (Aslan, 2008, p. 266).

It is then plausible to emphasize that, in accordance with 1949 Geneva Protocols, Article 51, there is an attempt to apply three main principles in international law in terms of armed conflict tools and methods. These are: (1) Prohibition of unnecessary suffering and death in conflicts; (2) Prohibiting some behaviors that constitute abuse of trust during conflicts; (3) It is the principle that it is forbidden to target non-combatant people and civilian places during conflicts (Best, 1980; Geneva Protocols, 1989).

In this regard, it is also prohibited to attack cities, towns, and any settlements with any vehicle or to randomly bombard such places. It is also necessary to avoid bombing buildings devoted to worship, fine arts, scientific and charity work, historical monuments, hospitals, and places where the wounded and sick are collected. Additionally, plundering an occupied city is prohibited. It has also been accepted that cultural assets should be protected (Öktem, 1998, p. 140). As can be seen, attacking civilians, buildings, and property is prohibited and constitutes a war crime. In this context, it is essential that the war be fought within the framework of legal rules and that the sick, wounded, prisoners of war, and civilians are not harmed. This is because war should be fought among the armed forces within the framework of humane rules. It is not legally acceptable to torture and torment sick, wounded, war prisoners, and civilians who are not armed, and to subject such people to inhumane behavior such as killing. Such behavior is considered a war crime (Aslan, 2008, p. 271).

In this vein, in accordance with the 1949 Geneva Protocols, Article 3/1, the lives and physical and spiritual integrity of people who are outside the conflict or who do not directly participate in the conflict will be respected. These people will be protected in all situations and treated humanely, without any negative discrimination (Geneva Protocols, 1989). In accordance with 1907 Hague Convention (IV) on war on land, Annex-Articles 22 and 23 as well as 1949 Geneva Protocols, Article 35/1 and 48, 57 and 58, parties to a conflict and their armed forces do not have an unlimited choice of methods and means of warfare. It is prohibited to use combat methods and tools that will cause unnecessary losses or excessive damage. The parties of a conflict must always separate civilians from combatants in order to protect civilians and property. Civilians cannot be the target of attacks. Attacks must be directed only at military targets (Hague Conventions, 1907).

Beside all these aspects, particularly following September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks in America, it is considered legal to fight a war for the purpose of defense or the order between states with the advice and



decision of an authorized body. The right determined by such laws and practices is called the “right of war,” (Ari, 1997, p. 419; Dinstein, 1995; 1996, p. 2), or in another naming, “just war.”¹⁶ However, the violent and brutal assaults perpetuated by the State of Israel against the Gaza Strip in the fight against terrorism has turned into a “so-called war,” or namely, a “fake war.” A better definition can be derived from the current unlawful armed conflicts observed in the Russia-Ukraine war for instance, a “beyond-war concept,” instead of campaigning an “unlawful” battle, or that is to say, an “unjust” war in the context of “right to war”, even though Russian leader Putin says he has the right to war because Ukraine becoming a NATO state would put Russia in a difficult position, and it would also break the prior agreements. It is due to the clear fact that there stands no validity and legal basis of Israeli attacks on Gaza since the State of Israel puts forth its clear intention of committing a total ethnic cleansing in the Gaza Strip against all people residing there, without any justification.

As can be clearly seen, both law of war and international humanitarian law put forth and dictate prohibitions and orders which aim to distinguish civilians and belligerents, and thus limit all probable effects of not only war, but also all sorts of armed conflicts. All parties of the conflict are obliged to fulfill the principles of unnecessary interference, guarantee of humanly treatment, and distinction between belligerent and non-belligerents during a conflict. It is always forbidden to target civilians. Armed forces are obliged to prevent civilian casualties. Therefore, in accordance with the mandatory provisions of international humanitarian law, states engaged in war must protect civilians (particularly women and children), journalists, civil defense personnel, foreign citizens, non-combat infrastructures, and such locations as hospitals, religious centers, school buildings, cultural assets, prisoner and refugee camps, martyrdoms, and natural environment during the war (Simpson, 1997, pp. 1-30; Hajizada, 2007).

However, those violent and brutal Israeli assaults on the Gaza Strip and against the civilians residing in this region are clearly proof of war crimes. Since October 7, 2023, the IDF has continuously bombed the whole Gaza territory without any care, attention, or concern for civilians; thus, the State of Israel has killed more than 35,000 non-combatant civilians including mainly children, women and elderly persons living in Gaza through an unjust war. The IDF also bombed hospitals, cemeteries, schools, religious sites, refugee camps, and even those migrating people who were travelling on the “so-called” secure deportation routes from their homelands to the southern part of the Gaza Strip. In this regard, for instance, Israeli Military Prosecutor Yifat Tomer-Yerushalmi openly stated that the IDF have committed war crimes in Gaza, adding that some of the practices of the Israeli soldiers in the Gaza Strip are criminal, with an investigation being launched into the issue (Haber7com, 2024b). Accordingly, information obtained by the *Haaretz* newspaper indicates that the Israeli Army occupies Gaza homes, before burning them down. *Haaretz* emphasized in this vein that the IDF commanders have ordered Israeli soldiers to set fire to abandoned Gaza homes without legal approval, and thus, several hundred have already been irreparably damaged in the Gaza Strip (*The Haaretz*, 2024).

In this regard, the Republic of Türkiye officially declared on February 24, 2024 that, since October 7, 2023, the State of Israel has increased its oppression many times over and committed one of the greatest massacres and genocides the world has ever seen in Gaza, namely within the Palestinian lands. The State of

¹⁶For differences between “just war” and “unjust war,” see, (Akehurst, 1987, pp. 256-280)



Israel continues to commit a wide range of war crimes. In this context, Israel has committed war crimes and crimes against humanity in its attacks the against people of Gaza. Thus, Israel, as can be clearly observed since October 7, by bombing ambulances and hospitals, have committed the crime of “deliberately attacking health and transportation units,” which is defined as a war crime in Article 8 of the Rome Statute. Israel also violated Article 25 of The Hague Convention by bombing civilians and civilian infrastructure. Hence, by bombing religious sites, places of worship, and architectural structures, Israel again violated Article 4 of The Hague Convention. International humanitarian law norms state that civilians’ access to basic needs such as water, food, and medicine should be ensured/not denied. In this vein, the State of Israel violated Article 23 of Geneva Convention No. 4 by cutting off the flow of food, electricity, and fuel to Gaza and blocking humanitarian aid to the region. This is a crime that is also included in Article 7 of the Rome Statute and is considered a “crime against humanity.” In addition, it is also known that Israel uses certain weapons that are prohibited by various conventions, such as phosphorus bombs, which are also considered war crimes in Article 8 of the Rome Statute. No matter the cost, Türkiye declared that it will continue to demonstrate, with evidence, Israeli war crimes and its state policy of genocide not only in Gaza but in all of Palestine, so far for decades (TRTHaber, 2024a).

South Africa filed a genocide case against Israel at the International Court of Justice (ICJ) in The Hague in February 2024. In the Court, conventions to discuss the Israeli occupation at the request of the United Nations were also held in that manner. On the second day of the hearing at the International Court of Justice, delegations from South Africa, Saudi Arabia, the Netherlands, and Belgium spoke. Stating that forced displacement constitutes a “war crime” according to the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, the Dutch delegation stated that the occupation is “temporary in nature,” and that if this situation is permanent, it can be described as “annexation.” Belgium stated that Israel wants to change the demographic structure of Palestinian lands (NTV News, 2024b). On his turn on February 26, 2024, Türkiye pointed out in the related convention of the Court that the reactions would increase exponentially if the injustices and double standards that Palestinians have been exposed to for decades continue, adding: *“Israel should be held responsible for all actions that violate human rights and international law.”* Subsequently, Türkiye stated that approximately two million Palestinians were forcibly displaced in Gaza, highlighting in this vein that Israel’s actions in Gaza have turned into collective punishment for those residing there (Haber7com, 2024c).

Last but not the least, in the coming section, we will continue with the same approach to explore the crimes against humanity committed in Gaza by highlighting those views of Norwegian Professor Mads Gilbert. Professor Gilbert has touched upon Israel’s trial at the ICJ on the grounds that the State of Israel violated the 1948 Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (United Nations, 1951) in Gaza, and clarified by emphasizing that he has many arguments on this very critical matter (TRTHaber, 2024b):

For me, it is enough to see how the Israeli occupation army starves, dehydrates, freezes, bombs and maims the Palestinian people in Gaza. For me, this is a war crime and goes beyond any atrocity I have ever seen in my life. This is much more than just a military operation. This is the punishment of the



entire population, which makes collective punishment illegal. This is an attack on civilians, women, children, the elderly, anyone who does not carry weapons, and an all-out war against the Palestinian healthcare system, which is against international law. I must emphasize that starvation is a weapon of mass destruction, I must clearly outline that driving people to hunger and thirst is a pre-planned evil and the saddest way to attack the will of resistance of the Palestinian people. I must underline that the State of Israel is pursuing a colonialist attack policy against the Palestinian people, and thus Israeli government is forcing the people to leave Gaza by starving them. We must see and understand that the Palestine-Israel issue is not a difficult conflict, it is a difficult occupation. According to international law, Israel, which is responsible for the health care, education and security of the occupied population, has never met these responsibilities, always passing the bill to the international community, but Israel does not refrain from attacking the United Nations Relief and Works Agency (UNRWA), which works for Palestinian refugees for decades. I am appalled that Western governments have not stopped Israel with sanctions, boycotts and peaceful political means, as they did against Russia for the invasion of Ukraine. I am hence shocked and outraged. These double standards are deeply shameful for all those who call themselves friends of the human race, friends of humanity and defenders of international law. I should highlight that a new language is now being used in the international relations and politics, and in that vein, concepts such as “colonization”, “apartheid”, and “racism” should be used more frequently, because these concepts explain the policies of the USA and Israel. I think we are in a new era of neo-colonialism, which is very dangerous, an era where power, not right, defines right. We are going back to the law of the jungle, where the strongest can do whatever they want, without any restrictions, without respect for international law and basic human values.

“Crimes Against Humanity” and Israel’s “So-Called” War on Gaza

At first, it will not be wrong to claim that the Palestinian cause regarding recent Israeli Gaza assaults is a trickling genocide, slow but relentless. To put forth the possible evidence of this claim, we only need to highlight the related commentary and interpretive remarks expressed by a former Zionist Jew, Miko Peled, whose grandfather took part in the founding of Israel, and whose father was a general in the Army. Grew up as a believing Zionist Jew, he saw everything clearly when he joined the Israeli army, which raised questions in his mind. Israel’s invasion of Lebanon in 1982 was a turning point for him, with Peled stating openly, freely, and bravely that (Ertekin Yıldız, 2024):

...those who remain silent are also a part of the genocide committed by Israel in Gaza. I was influenced not only by Zionist propaganda, but also much more in this regard. Everyone always talked about the state, how we supported the state and how we made sacrifices. What is the Israeli army, it is a major terrorist organization. It’s not an army, I started to understand that while I was inside... What they did was terrorism... The 1982 invasion of Lebanon was a major terrorist act. The invasion of Lebanon and the killing of many civilians, that is, the massacres, happened while I was a soldier. A few years after that, I decided to become an activist. (...) There is a huge difference between what I was told in Israel and what I heard from the Palestinians. The fact that the story is completely opposite. The difference



between what I believe is real and what they believe is real is as big as night and day. I started investigating myself because not all Palestinians could be lying. I couldn’t continue as a Zionist after what I heard. Will I continue with racist, genocidal Israel or with my Palestinian friends who stand for justice, humanity and human rights? And so I made a choice. (...) In 2013, I visited the Gaza Strip. However, it took me 14 hours to get to Gaza, which is an hour away from Jerusalem. I had to go from Jerusalem to Sinai, from Rafa to Gaza... But I had to go through a tunnel. Rafah is a tunnel. There are Israeli settlements an hour, ten minutes away from Gaza. There is electricity, water, medicine and food, there are no problems and there are roads; But inside the Gaza Strip, it was worse than the prison because everything was destroyed.

Crimes against humanity are international crimes that concern all people, even humanity in its conceptual usage, rather than just a conflict between two people or between a person and a state. The “never again” discourse is both the expression of the international law’s desperation against ferocity, and the expression that the international law is the unique remedy. Humanity should remember the 20th century with the smell that comes before death. Here, in this period, “crimes against humanity” had become the later given name of the ferocity on the papers. Even if the historical usage dates back to old times, the tortures that Nazi Germany did to both its own people and the people of the lands it occupied would be recorded to Nuremberg Status as “crimes against humanity,” a type of crime type highlighted for the first time. A year later, “crimes against humanity” were also mentioned in the Tokyo Charter, which determined the judgment for the crimes the Japanese committed during the Second World War. From this point forward the public opinion against this crime type would become sharper. From 1950 until 1993, the term “crimes against humanity” was not used in a war crime judgement. However, in this period, the concept went through a maturation period. At the end of the 20th century, at the Status constituted for the crimes committed in the former Yugoslavia and Rwanda, the concept of “crimes against humanity” was evaluated broader based on the experiences of the former period. Afterwards, the term received its final shape in the Rome Status. War crimes and crimes against peace, which have lost their actuality with the decline of international war events, have given way to crimes against humanity, actions that states or groups can also commit against their own population. To understand such crimes which are committed today, and will unfortunately be committed in the future, it is necessary to go back to the historical origin of the concept (Arslan, 2020, p. ii; Bassiouni, 1993).

Acts that constitute crimes against humanity were first defined in the Nuremberg Charter, Control Council Law No. 10, in the Tokyo Charter, and in the statutes of ad hoc tribunals. Acts prohibited in the latest Rome Statute are defined in detail. Today, in order to determine the material elements of crimes against humanity, international criminal law first requires that these crimes be committed within a specific, general context; once these conditions are met, the individual material elements differ for all crimes (Cassese, 2008, p. 109). Therefore, legally defining the general context in which crimes against humanity are committed is more important than identifying individual crimes. The context of crimes against humanity as defined today includes: “Acts committed as part of a widespread or systematic attack against any civilian population.” (Günal, 2013, p. 51)



The deliberate and systematic destruction of an entire people or ethnic group has been called the “crime of all crimes.” One is not able to comprehend rampant mass violence against a group of defenseless civilians solely aimed at annihilating them. Yet, mass violence has always been a part of the history of mankind. The 20th and 21st centuries have even seen the worst episodes of mass violence, despite all pretensions of civilization (Have & Boender, 2012, p. 7). Thus, crimes against humanity could be handled by the international community as a persistent modern atrocity. Thus, we selected the wording “crime of the century” in place of the term “crimes against humanity,” depicting such an act as one of the most brutal and complex mass crimes of the circa two-century-long modern human history for it is really the most heinous, disgusting, wild, and conscious crime in recent history (Bassiouni, 2011). Accordingly, we highlight the last two centuries in modern civilization history in our attempts to shift attention to the most interesting political ideology, fascism, which had been in a symbiotic relationship with crimes against humanity for so long. Fascism as the root political ideology of crimes against humanity has nurtured the brutality in each of the political ideologies, ranging from communism to socialism, from conservatism to fundamentalism, even in the liberal democratic ideology. Our last claim could be verified in the thought of Hannah Arendt. According to Arendt (1993, p. 81):

A world ruled by a single sovereign who holds the monopoly of centralized power and violence in whatever form, and who is not controlled by other sovereigns, would not only be a frightening tyranny but also signify the end of all political life as we know it. (...) Such a structure that holds the means of violence will not be a hope for the future of our civilization, on the contrary, it will mean a frightening tyranny and thus political life as it is known will completely disappear.

This is the “post-truth” global politico-security (Fridlund, 2020; Barrera et. al., 2020; Dorosh et. al., 2021) situation that we witness in the various American, Russian, British, or French military-political interventions in various geographies of the world in the aftermath of Cold-War. “Post-truth politics” indicates a contemporary state of public distrust around the legitimacy of knowledge, shaped by the hybrid media and political-level landscape (Galpin & Vernon, 2023, p. 1).

In spite of the promises made after the Second World War to eliminate the commission of atrocities against the world’s people, crimes against humanity continue to persist. Indeed, they are perhaps the most ubiquitous and horrifying offenses committed in modern times. Notwithstanding, an understanding of both the theoretical basis and the application of crimes against humanity to particular cases has been rendered difficult by an absence of a consistent definition and uniform interpretation. In the 1990s and 2000s, several ad hoc international criminal tribunals were established to respond to the commission of atrocity crimes, including crimes against humanity, in specific regions of the world in conflict, such as the former Yugoslavia, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, and Cambodia. Building upon this legacy, in 1998, a new institution — the International Criminal Court (ICC) — was established to take up the task of defining crimes against humanity and other atrocity crimes, and preventing and punishing their commission (Sadat, 2012, p. 3).

Thus, of all the problems confronting humankind during the last quarter of the 20th century, none is more significant or urgent than the mass killing of defenseless citizens by human beings acting as agents of,



or with the tolerance of, their governments. It is perhaps not surprising, then, that an unflinching review of past centuries — with their mounting death tolls from wars, revolutions, massacres, as well as famine and disease resulting from human malevolence and negligence — led William James (1970, p. 5), in his celebrated 1910 essay titled “The Moral Equivalent of War,” to conclude that “history is a bath of blood.” However, a number of analysts have concluded that the number of human beings deliberately killed by other human beings during the 20th century is far greater than for any other equivalent period of time in history. The “bath of blood” that James discovered in his study of many past centuries has become a veritable ocean of blood in just a few decades (Markusen, 2000, pp. 97-98).

In the context of the material elements of crimes against humanity, it is possible to briefly emphasize the following. First of all, it is essential to underline that crimes against humanity are not isolated and occasional acts, but widespread or systematic actions (Cassese, 2008, p. 98). The element of prevalence emphasizes the existence of a large number of victims harmed by crime or the geographical prevalence of victimization. It is about attacks that do not meet the conditions, but nevertheless constitute seriousness in terms of planning and organization. The other important problem in terms of determining the general context of crimes against humanity is the nature of the “attack.” It no longer makes any difference in terms of contemporary international criminal law whether the attack was made during wartime or peacetime. The act of crime against humanity must involve violence or can be considered a crime against humanity without needing to involve violence, as in the case of imposing the “Apartheid” regime of South Africa (deGuzman, 2011, pp. 130-131). Regarding the need for the existence of a general policy, it is also important in terms of the material element of crimes against humanity. Therefore, according to the Rome Statute, the existence of a state or institutional policy is necessary for crimes against humanity to be considered committed (Güna, 2013, p. 53; Cassese, 2008, pp. 123-126).

Again, a belief that the attack on civilians, in other words non-combatants, is against a “civilian population” rather than against randomly selected individuals is sufficient for the crime to constitute a crime against humanity. Therefore, it is found in all definitions of crimes against humanity that the targeted population must be “civilian” (Delmas-Marty et. al., 2009). Therefore, it does not seem possible to extend these rules to those who fight during an armed conflict (deGuzman, 2011, p. 132). According to the Convention: “(a) Killing of members of the group; (b) Causing serious harm to the physical or mental integrity of group members; (c) Intentionally subjecting the group to conditions of life likely to result in its partial or total destruction of its physical existence; (d) taking measures aimed at preventing births within the group; (e) Forcibly transferring the children of this group to another group” is sufficient to constitute the crime of genocide (Güna, 2013, pp. 51-55, 58).

Although the nature of the groups protected in the crime of genocide is controversial, the material elements of the crime are quite clear. The victims of acts prohibited by the crime of genocide mostly consist of individuals. However, the main value that the norm protects is religious, racial, national, and ethnic groups. Therefore, the individuals chosen by the perpetrator of genocide while committing the crime must have been chosen because they belonged to one of the groups mentioned above (Gaeta, 2011, p. 110; Güna, 2013, pp. 58-59). Evaluating the elements of the crime of genocide, Larry May states that there are two ways in



which an individual’s actions can be attributed to the crime of genocide, the first of which is that the individual’s actions involve deliberate participation in a group’s plan to destroy another group, the other way is that the individual’s actions involve a plan by one group to destroy another group and being aware that one could have prevented this plan but not doing anything about it. According to May, in both cases, the element that enables the defendant’s actions to be defined as genocide is intent (May, 2010, p. 167). Indeed, when the material elements that constitute genocide are evaluated on their own, it is not possible for the perpetrator’s actions to be characterized as genocide. However, if there is a special intention that produces the crime of genocide, it is possible to qualify the committed act as genocide. Therefore, defining the moral element in the crime of genocide is more important than defining the material element, with it not being possible to conceptually separate the material element from the moral element (May, 2010, p. 166; Günal, 2013, p. 60).

After all this information, while we can put forth the findings that prove that the State of Israel has been committing crimes against humanity, amounting to genocide, because of its violent and brutal assaults on the whole civilians residing in Gaza Strip since October 7, 2023, we can surely claim that the State of Israel is committing serious crimes against humanity, including genocide and urbancide in the Gaza Strip by deliberately, purposely, planned, and willingly trying to exterminate the whole people residing in Gaza through all means of ethnic cleansing. In this respect, the IDF kills all people living in the Gaza Strip regardless of target. Additionally, Israel has targeted settlements, hospitals, schools, mosques, and churches in its attacks on Gaza (Anatolian Agency, 2024). Thus, it is crystal-clear that nearly all those people are non-combatants, namely civilians. The IDF is not fighting against an army of another state in the Gaza Strip, but are committing an ethnic cleansing against the people of Gaza in the “fake” name of counter-terrorism. Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu claimed that they would “change the Middle East” with their attacks on Gaza. In his statement on October 9, Israeli Defense Minister Yoav Gallant announced that the Gaza Strip would be under full siege and that electricity, food, and fuel would not be allowed into the region. Israeli forces prevented humanitarian aid from entering Gaza in the following days, cutting off the flow of electricity, food, and fuel. In his statement on October 10, Gallant announced that Israeli forces “lifted all restrictions and launched a full attack” on Gaza (Anatolian Agency, 2024).

This factual situation of a “fake,” “beyond-war,” or “post-truth” concept of war in Gaza had been recently highlighted by the Brazilian President Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva when he attended the African Union summit held in Addis Ababa, the capital of Ethiopia. In his speech there, he compared Israel’s attacks in Gaza to those of Adolf Hitler. Arguing that what happened to the Palestinian people in the Gaza Strip has never happened at any time in history, he claimed, and added; “In fact, it happened when Hitler decided to kill the Jews.” Lula said that there was no war between soldiers in Gaza; thus, this was not a war, but a genocide. After Brazilian President Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva accused the Israeli government of committing genocide in Gaza, Israel declared Lula “persona non grata” (BBC News Turkish, 2024).

What the State of Israel is doing in Gaza against the people living there by overseeing the civilians and taking civilian lives is unquestionably a genocide against the people of Gaza since these residents are being killed by the IDF in an unconstrained, normless, and disproportionate manner which resembles an ethnic



cleansing. Thus, all of the Israeli actions, deeds, and implementations in Gaza should be assessed as a crime against humanity as well as a modern tragedy of genocide. Therefore, there is a need to prosecute Israel for state terrorism against the Palestinians in Gaza (Ari, 2023).

Eventually, a critical development at the beginning of 2024 has paved the way for the global acceptance and legal sanctions against Israel’s genocidal actions in Gaza. In this context, the first hearing in the case filed by the Republic of South Africa at the International Court of Justice on charges of genocide against Israel was held on January 10, 2024. While the South African lawyers defending the claim made their presentations to the court, the Israeli legal committee made its defense on January 12, 2024. After Hamas’s October 7 raid, Israel’s attacks on the Gaza Strip, which had continued for months, came to the world’s agenda in a different way on January 11, 2024. The first hearing in the genocide case filed by the Republic of South Africa against Israel at the International Court of Justice (ICJ) took place on January 11, 2024. Israel, which killed more than 35,000 civilians in its attacks on Gaza, sat in the defendant’s chair for the first time. On the first day of the hearing in The Hague, the South African legal panel shared its allegations with the judges along with their justifications, saying about Israel “that its conscious actions against Gaza residents carry genocidal intent” (Hürriyet, 2024). As of the time of this writing, the case against Israel for committing genocide is still ongoing at the International Criminal Court.

Conclusion

Before starting conclusion part of this study, after witnessing, all the actions of state terrorism, war crimes, and crimes against humanity committed by the State of Israel, before an international community which has been blind, deaf, and dumb regarding Israel’s actions, one cannot help but ask whether humanity has died.

In the history of the world, the geography where the concepts of “religion,” “war,” and “peace” have come together most frequently has been the Middle East region. Although all religious beliefs of the past normally foresee and suggest absolute “peace,” in the ancient Middle East region, which was the starting point of the three monotheistic religions of Judaism, Christianity, and Islam, this has been even more important since 1948 when the modern state of Israel emerged onto the political stage. It has been seen that the new nation has become the subject of much more violence, blood, and injustice. The main reason for this is that this new state of Israel, established by England, France, and the US in the Middle East, did not accept its initial political borders and adopted and implemented expansionist policies in its region with a fascist and racist ideological understanding. In this sense, the Israeli state system, starting from May 14, 1948, began to occupy the lands of the indigenous Palestinian people, who had existed for centuries in the lands where it was founded, by taking away their lands at every opportunity. As a matter of fact, these unjust and unlawful acts of Israeli aggression and occupations have continued to increase every year along with the endless Israeli state terrorism, before reaching its highest and bloodiest level with the Israeli military operations launched on the Gaza Strip on October 7, 2023. Therefore, it is likely to put forward the first main findings affecting the issue of this international problem that has been going on actively for nearly 75 years between Palestinians, the State of Israel, and the Arabs in the Palestinian lands in the Middle East:



1. It is evaluated that the definition of the international problem, which had been existed in the Middle East since 1948, and has been generally defined as the “Palestine Problem” in the literature since then, is erroneous, and that it will be more appropriate to call this problem as the “Aggressive Israel Problem.”
2. The main reason for this is that the conflicts, clashes, and even wars that have been taking place between Palestinians, Israel, and the Arab states in the Middle East since 1948 are actually a doctrine of geopolitical state terrorism with expansionist purposes, which includes the unilateral and unlawful policies and initiatives implemented by the State of Israel in the region.
3. For this reason, within the scope of the expansionist and aggressive policies that it has implemented in its region at every opportunity since 1948, the State of Israel has adopted a general “national goal” and made it a “state policy” to deny Palestinians the right to live in their own lands.

Hence, it will be more accurate to read the all-out war that the State of Israel launched on October 7, 2023, against the 365 km² Gaza Strip and the approximately 2.5 million people living there, in the context of the detailed analysis and main evaluations presented above. The Gaza Strip, where a very dense Palestinian population lives, is one of the primary target geographies of the expansionist Israeli state policies. In this respect, behind this state oppression, torment, and terror that the State of Israel has inflicted on people in Gaza since October 7: (1) “The Problem of Aggressive Israel;” (2) Israel’s aim to completely annex the Gaza Strip to its existing state territory, as appropriate and if possible; (3) Thus, Israel’s strategy to realize its expansionist goals in its region; (4) Ultimately, there is a desire to continue aggressive military operations and deport all people from Gaza until there are no people left living in Gaza — regardless of their identity.

Therefore, we can put forth the following critical and analytical evaluations about the Israeli attacks on the Gaza Strip that began on October 7, 2023:

1. Israel’s all-out war against the people living in Gaza and its unlimited attacks have been frequently called in the literature as the “2023 Hamas-Israel War” or the “2023 Israel-Palestine War.” It is certainly emphasized that defining the issue in different ways is quite wrong, as such definitions may hinder both the understanding of the main historical, political, and legal issues affecting the issue, as well as failing to capture the essence of the issue.
2. Israel’s brutal and merciless attacks on the Gaza Strip and its civilian inhabitants since October 7, 2023 are considered to be the result of the Israeli state’s expansionist, Zionist-based, and unlawful racist-nationalist and fascistic state policies.
3. Therefore, when the all-out war waged by Israel on Gaza is evaluated in terms of international law of war and humanitarian law, it is seen that the Israeli army attacks carried out without limitation, proportion and international law norms against the civilian population living in Gaza. In other words, the treatment of non-combatants places the State of Israel in the position of a “terrorist country” that practices “state terrorism.”
4. When considering Israel’s (state) support of terrorism, its possession of weapons of mass destruction (such as nuclear bombs), and Israeli officials’ threats to use these weapons against civilians in Gaza, it is evaluated that all of these combined with factors such as Israeli tyranny, when necessary, on its own



territory and even Israeli citizens following the Hamas attacks of October 7, 2023 against Israel territories, put the State of Israel in a “rouge state” situation.

5. In addition, it is evaluated that the Israeli state’s violent and brutal military attacks against all civilians in Gaza regardless of target, contrary to the laws of war, and its policies of denying any right to life for the residents of Gaza in this region, put Israel in a “fascist state” situation.
6. With an all-out war mentality, the Israel Defense Force is waging an unlimited, unpredictable, and disproportionate war in the Gaza Strip, contrary to the principles and imperative provisions of the international law of war, and contrary to the principle that “even war has a virtue, morality, and humane method.” In the context of military operations carried out by the IDF, it is evaluated that the relevant Israeli civil-military bureaucrats who are responsible for all of these actions, and the murder of the civilian population, namely non-combatants, with monstrous feelings should be investigated and tried for their crimes by the Israeli courts in terms of National Criminal Law regarding the charge of “first degree premeditated murder.”
7. Since the IDF’s military operations against non-combatants (civilians) as well as non-combat locations, including hospitals, religious centers, and schools, in the Gaza Strip have caused large-scale civilian deaths and material losses by carrying out brutally direct, systematic, and purposeful military attacks on civilian facilities that are obliged to be protected in war in accordance with the strict articles of the Law of War, it is evaluated that the relevant Israeli civil-military bureaucrats who are responsible for these crimes should be investigated and tried immediately at the International Criminal Court within the scope of “war crimes” committed against non-combatants in Gaza in the context of international Law of War.
8. The IDF’s direct, ruthless, and violent military attacks against all the people living in the Gaza region, with a understanding of conscious and mass extermination, without regard to living or non-living targets, can be evaluated as not only an “ethnic cleansing operation,” but also an “ethno-crime” as well as “urban-cide” in the Gaza Strip. For this reason, it is evaluated that the State of Israel and the relevant Israeli civil-military bureaucrats should be immediately brought in front of the International Criminal Court, and should be investigated and tried in this Court as state officials who have “committed crimes against humanity” in the context of global criminal law crimes, such as intentional killing, intentional injury, psychological and physical torture, and torment or enslavement against the Gaza Strip and the people living in this region.

Thus, if the above analyses regarding the “Aggressive Israel Problem” are realized as predicted in the coming period, it will be very useful in getting rid of the “desperation syndrome” that the international community, politics, and organizations are in today, helping them to regain their lost prestige. On the other hand, it is evaluated that another benefit of the realization of the mentioned proposals to the international community may be the increase in cooperative, consensual, and just attitudes and understandings on a global scale, which will enable international politics and law to operate in a much better and fairer manner in the coming periods.



Last but not the least, even though some pain is so great that it takes the breath away, we wish to recount that even the worst darkness disappears in dim light, while the suffering in Gaza grows, the world continues to remain silent. However, if the international community refrains from describing all those brutally and violently inhumane military assaults committed by the State of Israel against the Gaza Strip as state terrorism, war crimes, and crimes against humanity, then this approach and attitude may mean that all these crimes and terrorism perpetuated by Israel against Gaza never happened, at least in the eyes of Western politicians and the United Nations. This is a very critical outcome since this situation will most probably provide a very suitable basis for the same people to claim that solutions to the international problems cannot be found and peace agreements cannot be drawn up.



Peer Review	Externally peer-reviewed.
Conflict of Interest	The author have no conflict of interest to declare.
Grant Support	The author declared that this study has received no financial support.

Author Details

Gökhan Ak (Asst. Prof. Dr.)

¹ Istanbul Topkapi University, Faculty of Economics, Administrative and Social Sciences, Department of Political Science and International Relations (English), Istanbul, Türkiye

 0000-0003-0674-9699  gokhanak@topkapi.edu.tr

References

- Adelman, J. (Ed.). (2008). *The Rise of Israel: A History of a Revolutionary State*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Aksar, Y. (2004). *Implementing International Humanitarian Law*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Akehurst, M.A. (1987). *A Modern Introduction to International Law*. 6th ed. London: Unwin Hyman Ltd.
- Aksoy Ercümen, M. (2016). Savaşın Değişen Doğası ve Cenevre Sözleşmeleri (The Changing Nature of War and the Geneva Conventions). 22 August, INSAMER Food-for-thought Paper. Available at https://insamer.com/tr/savasin-degisgen-dogasi-ve-cenevre-sozlesmeleri_346.html accessed on Jan. 10, 2024.
- Ambos, K. (2011). Crimes against Humanity and the International Criminal Court. In L.N. Sadat (Ed.), *Forging a Convention for Crimes against Humanity* (pp. 279-304), New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Anatolian Agency (AA). (2024). İsrail’in Gazze’deki 100 günlük yıkımına savaş suçları ve soykırım davası damga vurdu (War crimes and genocide trial marked Israel’s 100-day destruction in Gaza). 14 January 2024. Available at <https://www.aa.com.tr/tr/dunya/israilin-gazzedeki-100-gunluk-yikimina-savas-suclari-ve-soykirim-davasi-damga-vurdu/3108408#> accessed on Jan. 10, 2024.
- Anonymous. (1987). Silahlı Kuvvetler İçin Savaş Hukuku Bilgisi (Information on the Laws of War for Armed Forces). Ankara: Genel Kurmay Başkanlığı Basımevi.
- Antolinez, D.S. (2021). ‘Israel’s attacks on Palestinians qualify as state terrorism’. Anatolian Agency (AA), Americas, Middle East, 13 May 2021. Available at <https://www.aa.com.tr/en/americas/-israel-s-attacks-on-palestinians-qualify-as-state-terrorism-/2239676#> accessed on Jan. 24, 2024.
- Arendt, H. (1993). *Men in Dark Times*. New York: A Harvest Book Harcourt Brace & Company.
- Arı, T. (1997). *Uluslararası İlişkiler* (International Relations). 2nd ed. İstanbul: Alfa Basım Yayım Dağıtım.
- Arı, Y. (2023). Bir İnsanlık Suçu ve Soykırım Trajedisi: İsrail’in Filistinlilere Uyguladığı Devlet Terörü Nedeniyle Yargılanması Gerektiğine Dair Bir Değerlendirme (A Crime against Humanity and the Tragedy of Genocide: An Assessment on the Need to Prosecute Israel for State Terrorism against the Palestinians). *Darulhadis İslami Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 5, Aralık, 16-38.
- Arslan, E. (2020). *Uluslararası Hukukta İnsanlığa Karşı Suçlar* (Crimes against Humanity in International Law). Published MA Thesis. T.C. Hatay Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi, Institute of Social Sciences, Hatay.



- Aslan, M.Y. (2008). Savaş Hukukunun Temel Prensipleri (Basic Principles of the Law of War). *TBB Dergisi* (Journal of TBB), (79), 235-274.
- Badar, M.E. (2004). From the Nuremberg Charter to the Rome Statute: Defining the Elements of Crimes against Humanity. *San Diego International Law Journal*, 5(73), 73-144.
- Bartov, O., Grossmann, A., & Nolan, M. (Eds.). (2002). *Crimes of War: Guilt and Denial in the Twentieth Century*. New York: New Press.
- Bassiouni, M.C. (1993). The History of the Draft Code of Crimes against the Peace and Security of Mankind. *Israel Law Review*, 27(1), 247-267.
- Bassiouni, M.C. (2011). *Crimes Against Humanity: Historical Evolution and Contemporary Application*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Bauer, Y. (1980). Genocide: Was It the Nazis’ Original Plan?. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, (Reflections on the Holocaust: Historical, Philosophical, and Educational Dimensions), (450), July, 35-45.
- BBC News. (2024). What is Hamas and Why Is It Fighting with Israel in Gaza?. 13 February 2024. Available at <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-middle-east-67039975> accessed on Feb. 14, 2024.
- BBC News Turkish (2024). İsrail, Gazze’de soykırım yapıldığını söyleyen Brezilya lideri Lula’yı ‘istenmeyen kişi’ ilan etti (Israel declared Brazilian leader Lula, who said there was genocide in Gaza, as ‘persona non grata’). 19 February 2024. Available at <https://www.bbc.com/turkce/articles/cd18p8p29jqo> accessed on Feb. 24, 2024.
- Ben-Yehuda, H., & Sandler, S. (2002). *The Arab–Israel Conflict Transformed: Fifty Years of Interstate and Ethnic Crises*, Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Berry, M., & Philo, G. (2006). *Israel and Palestine: Competing Histories*. London: Pluto Press
- Best, G. (1980). *Humanity in Warfare*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Bickerton, I.J. (2009). *The Arab–Israeli Conflict: A History*. London: Reaktion Books.
- Blakeley, R. (2009). State Terrorism in the Social Sciences: Theories, Methods and Concepts. In R. Jackson, E. Murphy, and S. Poynting (Eds.), *Contemporary State Terrorism: Theory and Practice* (pp. 12-27). Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- Barrera, O., Guriev, S., Henry, E., & Zhuravskaya, E. (2020). Facts, Alternative Facts, And Fact Checking in Times Of Post-Truth Politics. *Journal of Public Economics*, 182, February, 1-19.
- Braudel, F. (1994). *A History of Civilizations*. Trans. Richard Mayne. New York: The Penguin Press.
- Brownlie, I. (1963). *International Law and the Use of Force by States*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Bulliet, R.W., Crossley, P.K., Headrick, D.R., Hirsch, S.W., Johnson, L.L., & Northrup, D. (2005). *The Earth and Its Peoples: A Global History*. 3rd ed. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Cassese, A. (2008). *International Criminal Law*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Çaşın, M.H. (2008). *Uluslararası Terörizm (International Terrorism)*. Ankara: Nobel.
- Chalk, F., & Jonassohn, K. (1990). *The History and Sociology of Genocide*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Chomsky, N. (2002). Uluslararası Terörizm: Görünüş ile Gerçek (International Terrorism: Appearance vs. Reality). C. Güzel (ed.), *Silinen Yüzler Karşısında Terör (Terror in the Face of Erased Faces)*. (pp. 217-228). Ankara: Ayraç Yayınevi.
- Claridge, D. (1996). State Terrorism? Applying a Definitional Model. *Terrorism and Political Violence*, 8(3), 47-63. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09546559608427363>
- deGuzman, M.M. (2011). Crimes Against Humanity. In W.A. Schabas and N. Bernaz (Eds.). *Routledge Handbook of International Criminal Law* (pp. 121-137). New York: Routledge.
- De Mulinen, F. (1987). *Handbook on the Law of War for Armed Forces*. Geneva: ICRC Pubs.
- Demir, C.K. (2017). *Ayaklanmalar ve Ayaklanmalara Karşı Koyma: Kavramlar, Stratejiler ve Ülke Tecrübeleri* (Uprisings and Countering Uprisings: Concepts, Strategies and Country Experiences). Ankara: Nobel.
- Delmas-Marty, M., Fouchard, I., Fronza, E., & Neyret, L. (2009). *Le crime contre l’humanité*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- Dinstein, Y. (1995). *War, Aggression and Self Defence*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dinstein, Y. (1996). The Distinctions between War Crimes and Crimes against Peace. In Y. Dinstein, and M. Tabory (Eds.). *War Crimes in International Law* (pp. 1-18). The Hague/Boston/London: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.
- Dorosh, L., Astramowicz-Leyk, T., & Turchyn, Y. (2021). The Impact of Post-Truth Politics as a Hybrid Information Influence on the Status of International and National Security: The Attributes of Interpretation and the Search for Counteraction Mechanisms. *European Politics and Society*, 23(3), 1-24.

- Dünya Gazetta.A (2024). ‘Refah’a saldırı’ planı İsrail kabinesinin önünde (‘Attack on Rafah’ plan is before the Israeli cabinet). 26 February 2024. Available at <https://www.dunya.com/dunya/refaha-saldiri-plani-israil-kabinesinin-onunde-haberi-718808> accessed on Feb. 27, 2024.
- “Elmalı, B. (2023). *From Past to Present: The Israeli-Palestinian Conflict*. İstanbul: TRT WORLD Research Centre Publishing.”
- Ertekin Yıldız, S. (2024). Eski Siyonist Yahudi: İsrail’in Gazze’de yaptığı soykırım, sessiz kalanlar da bir parçası (Former Zionist Jew: Israel’s genocide in Gaza, those who remain silent are also a part of it). TRT Haber (Dünya), 06 March 2024. Available at <https://www.trthaber.com/haber/dunya/eski-siyonist-yahudi-israilin-gazgede-yaptigi-soykirim-sessiz-kalanlar-da-bir-parcasi-842410.html> accessed on Mar. 10, 2024.
- Falk, R. (2002). Ending The Death Dance. *The Nation*, 29 April, 11-13.
- Freedman, R.O. (ed.). (2012). *Israel and the United States: Six Decades of US-Israeli Relations*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Fridlund, P. (2020). Post-truth Politics, Performatives and the Force. *Jus Cogens*, 2, 215-235.
- Gaeta, P. (2011). Genocide. In W.A. Schabas and Nadia Bernaz (Eds.). *Routledge Handbook of International Criminal Law* (109-119). New York: Routledge.
- Galicki, Z. (2005). International Law and Terrorism. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 48(6), 743-757.
- Gal-Or, N., & Giesen, K-G. (2007). The Concept of War. *Peace Review*, 19(2), 149-156. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10402650701353240>
- Galpin, C., & Vernon, P. (2023). Post-truth politics as discursive violence: Online abuse, the public sphere and the figure of ‘the expert’. *The British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, October, 1-21. Available at <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/13691481231202641> accessed on 23.02.2024.
- Gellately, R., & Kiernan, B. (Eds.). (2003). *The Specter of Genocide: Mass Murder in Historical Perspective*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Geneva Protocols. (1989). *International Law Concerning the Conduct of Hostilities, Collection of Hague Conventions and Some Other International Instruments*. Geneva: ICRC Pubs.
- Glover, J. (1991). Chap. 10 - State Terrorism. In R.G. Frey and C.W. Morris (Eds.), *Violence, Terrorism and Justice* (pp. 256-275). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Greene, T., & Rynhold, J. (2018). Europe and Israel: Between Conflict and Cooperation. *Survival*, 60(4), July, 91-112. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00396338.2018.1495432>
- Günel, H. (2013). *Hannah Arendt Düşüncesinde İnsanlığa Karşı Suçların Temellendirilmesi* (Basis for Crimes Against Humanity in the Thoughts of Hannah Arendt). Published Doctorate Thesis, T.C. İstanbul University İnstitute of Social Sciences, İstanbul.
- Haber7Com. (2024a). More than 140 members of the UN have recognized the state of Palestine and East Jerusalem as its capital. 22 February 2024. Available at <https://m.haber7.com/dunya/haber/3393293-bmmin-140tan-fazla-uyesi-filistin-devletini-ve-dogukudusu-baskenti-olarak-tanidi> accessed on Feb. 24, 2024.
- Haber7Com. (2024b). Israeli Military Prosecutor: Our army committed war crimes in Gaza. 22 February 2024. Available at <https://m.haber7.com/dunya/haber/3393060-israilli-askeri-savci-ordumuz-gazgede-savas-suclari-iledi> accessed on Feb. 24, 2024.
- Haber7Com. (2024c). It’s Turkey’s turn to speak at the International Court of Justice!. 26 February 2024. Available at <https://m.haber7.com/dunya/haber/3394087-uluslararası-adalet-divanında-soz-sirasi-turkiyede> on Feb. 27, 2024.
- Hague Conventions. (1907). Convention (IV) respecting the Laws and Customs of War on Land and its Annex: Regulations Concerning the Laws and Customs of War on Land. The Hague, 18 October 1907. Geneva: ICRC Pubs.
- Hajizada, M. (2007). *Uluslararası İnsancıl Hukukta Sivillerin Korunması* (Protection of Civilians in International Humanitarian Law). Published MA Thesis. T.C. İstanbul University İnstitute of Social Sciences, İstanbul.
- Hathaway, O.A., Strauch, P.K., Walton, B.A., & Weinberg, Z.A.Y. (2019). What is a War Crime?. *The Yale Journal of International Law*, 44(1), 53-113.
- Have, t-W, & Boender, B. (2012). Introduction. In B. Boender and W. ten Have (Eds.). *The Holocaust and Other Genocides: An Introduction* (pp. 7-13). Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Hewitt, W.L. (Ed.). (2004). *Defining the Horrific: Readings on Genocide and Holocaust in the Twentieth Century*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.
- Hobson, J. (2019). Three Theoretical Approaches to Lemkin’s Definition of Genocide. *Genocide Studies and Prevention: An International Journal*, 13(1), 11-18. <https://doi.org/10.5038/1911-9933.13.1.1592>
- Holton, R., & Nasson, W.R. (Eds.). (2009). *World Civilizations and History of Human Development*. Oxford: EOLSS Publishers/UNESCO.



- https://www.un.org/en/genocideprevention/documents/atrocity-crimes/Doc1_ConventiononthePreventionandPunishmentoftheCrimeofGenocide.pdf accessed on Dec. 22, 2023.
- Hürriyet. (2024). ‘Soykırım’ davası başladı... İsrail Gazze’de çizgiyi aştı (‘Genocide’ trial has begun... Israel crossed the line in Gaza). 12 January 2024. Available at <https://www.hurriyet.com.tr/dunya/soykirim-davasi-basladi-israil-gazgede-cizgiyi-asti-42389518> accessed on Jan. 22, 2024.
- Irvin-Erickson, D. (2017). *Raphaël Lemkin and the Concept of Genocide*. Philadelphia, PE: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Jabre, K., Babic, N., & Bouvier, A. (2016). *International Humanitarian Law*. Handbook for Parliamentarians N° 25 Prepared by the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC). Geneva: ICRC Pubs.
- Jalloh, C.C. (2013). What Makes a Crime against Humanity a Crime against Humanity?. *American University International Law Review*, 28(2), 381-442.
- James, W. (1970). The Moral Equivalent of War. In R.A. Wasserstrom (Ed.). *War and Morality* (pp. 4-14). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Co.
- Jennings, R., & Watts, A. (eds.). (1992). *Oppenheim’s International Law*, Vol. 1. 9th ed. London: Longman.
- Jones, A. (Ed.). (2004). *Genocide, War Crimes and the West: History and Complicity*. London: Zed Books.
- Jones, A. (2006). *Genocide: A Comprehensive Introduction*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Jones, A. (2006). Chapter 3: Genocides of Indigenous Peoples. In *Genocide: A Comprehensive Introduction* (pp. 67-100). London and New York: Routledge.
- Karabulut, U. (2022). Kudüs’te Savaş Hukuku ve Toplumlararası Yeni Düzenin Oluşumu (1914-1920). (Law of War and the Formation of the New Intercommunal Order in Jerusalem (1914-1920)). XVIII. Türk Tarih Kongresi. VIII. Cilt: Hukuk ve Diplomasi, Türk-Ermeni İlişkileri. (pp. 203-214). Ankara: TTK Yayınları.
- Kastner, P. (2015). Domestic War Crimes Trials: Only for Others - Bridging national and International Criminal Law. *University of Western Australia Law Review*, 39(1), 29-50.
- Kedikli, U. (2011). *Devlet Destekli Terörizm Nedeniyle Devletin Uluslararası Sorumluluğu* (International Responsibility of the State for State-Sponsored Terrorism). Published Doctorate Thesis, T.C. Ankara University Institute of Social Sciences, Ankara.
- Kiş, E. (2023). 1948’den Bugüne, Tarihi ve Siyasi Yönleri ile “İsrail-Filistin Sorunu” (Historical and Political Aspects Of The "Israel- Palestine Conflict" From 1948 To Today). *MTU Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 3(1), 262-274.
- Kolander, K. (2020). *America’s Israel: The US Congress and American-Israeli Relations, 1967-1975*. Kentucky: University Press of Kentucky.
- Krishnamurti, J. (1954). On War. *First and Last Freedom* (pp. 182-185). New York: Harper & Brothers.
- Krishnamurti, J. (1981). Education and World Peace. In *Education and Significance of Life* (pp. 49-61). San Francisco, CA: HarperOne.
- Kutlu, O. (2021). US history riddled with massacres, genocide. *Anatolian Agent (Anadolu Ajansı)*, World-Americas, 02 June 2021. Available at <https://www.aa.com.tr/en/americas/us-history-riddled-with-massacres-genocide/2261696#> accessed on Dec. 08, 2023.
- Laqueur, W., & Schueftan, D. (2016). *The Israel-Arab Reader: A Documentary History of the Middle East Conflict*. New York: Penguin Books.
- Lawless, M. (2008). Terrorism: An International Crime. *Canadian Military Journal*, 9(2), 27-39.
- Lemkin, R. (1944). *Axis Rule in Occupied Europe: Laws of Occupation, Analysis of Government, Proposals for Redress*. New York: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace (also, New York: Columbia University Press).
- Lemkin, R. (1944). Chapter IX: Genocide. In *Axis Rule in Occupied Europe: Analysis, Proposals for Redress* (pp. 79-95). Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.
- Lenta, O., & Cormos, V-C. (2017). Aggression and Violence, Corrosive Factors of Humanity. *Postmodern Openings*, 8(1), June, 57-65. <https://doi.org/10.18662/po/2017.0801.05>
- Luban, D. (2004). A Theory of Crimes Against Humanity. *The Yale Journal of International Law*, 29(85), 85-167.
- Magee, B. (2009). *Büyük Filozoflar: Platon’dan Wittgenstein’a Batı Felsefesi*. (The Great Philosophers: An Introduction to Western Philosophy). Çev.(Trans.) A. Cevizci. İstanbul: Paradigma Yayınları.
- Malcolm X. (1990). Prospects for Freedom in 1965. In G. Breietman (Ed.), *Malcolm X Speaks: Selected Speeches and Statements* (pp. 147-156). New York: Grove Press.
- Mann, M. (2005). *The Dark Side of Democracy: Explaining Ethnic Cleansing*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Markusen, E. (2000). Genocide and Total War: A Preliminary Comparison. In I. Wallimann and M.N. Dobkowski (Eds.). *Genocide and the Modern Age: Etiology and Case Studies of Mass Death* (pp. 97-123). Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.



- Marsi, F., Siddiqui, U., Harb, A., & Osgood, B. (2024). Israel’s war on Gaza updates: ‘Life draining out of Gaza’-UN on aid attack. *Aljazeera*, 29 February 2024. Available at <https://www.aljazeera.com/news/liveblog/2024/2/29/israels-war-on-gaza-live-mass-killing-of-children-in-slow-motion-ngo> accessed on Mar. 01, 2024.
- May, L. (2010). *Genocide: A Normative Account*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Meray, S.L. (1965). *Devletler Hukukuna Giriş* (2 Cilt) (Introduction to International Law) (2 Vols). Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi SBF Yayını.
- Meray, S.L. (1979). *Uluslararası Hukuk ve Örgütler* (International Law and Organizations). 2nd ed. Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi SBF Yayını.
- Metz, H.C. (Ed.). (1990). *Israel: A Country Study*. 3rd ed. Washington, D.C.: Department of the Army (Federal Research Division, Library of Congress) Publications.
- National Counterterrorism Center (NCTC). (2022). Hamas. Foreign Terrorist Organizations, Counter-Terrorism Guide. As of September 2022. Available at https://www.dni.gov/nctc/ftos/hamas_fto.html accessed on Jan. 04, 2024.
- Newman, E. (2006). Exploring the “Root Causes” of Terrorism. *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism*, 29(8), 749-772.
- NTV News. (2024a). Statement from Netanyahu on Gaza: The 3rd phase of the war will last 6 months. 23 January 2024. Available at <https://www.ntv.com.tr/dunya/netanyahudan-gazze-aciklamasi-savasin-3uncu-asamasi-6-ay-surecek,9ldVJA8pdUeijKDgGMfpQg> on Jan. 24, 2024.
- NTV News. (2024b). Israeli occupation hearing in The Hague: Forced displacement is a war crime. 20 February 2024. Available at https://www.ntv.com.tr/dunya/laheyde-israil-igali-durusmasizorla-yerinden-etme-savas-sucudur,PRT5Fp_jA0WtRyZuWGu5zw on Feb. 21, 2024.
- Öktem, E. (1998). Silahlı Çatışma Halinde Kültür Varlıklarının Korunması: Bosna Hersek Örneği (Protection of Cultural Heritage in Case of Armed Conflict: The Example of Bosnia and Herzegovina). In F. Sönmezoğlu (Ed.). *Uluslararası Politikada Yeni Alanlar, Yeni Bakışlar* (New Areas, New Perspectives in International Politics) (pp. 129-166). İstanbul: Der Yayınları.
- Öktem, E. (2004). *Uluslararası Hukukta Terörizm: Tanım Sorunu ve Milli Bağımsızlık Hareketleri* (Terrorism in International Law: Definition Problem and National Independence Movements). *İstanbul Ticaret Üniversitesi Dergisi* (Journal of İstanbul Ticaret University), (5), 133-147.
- Ören, E. (2022). The Just War in Political Thought: from Cicero to Grotius. *Cankırı Karatekin University Journal of the Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences*, 12(3), 88-204.
- Pais, A. (1994). *Einstein Lived Here*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Pazarcı, H. (1994). *Uluslararası Hukuk Dersleri* (Courses of International Law), III. Kitap (III. Book). Ankara: Turhan Kitabevi.
- Pazarcı, H. (2000). *Uluslararası Hukuk Dersleri* (Courses of International Law), IV. Cilt (Vol. IV). Ankara: Turhan Kitabevi.
- Pillar, P. (2001). *Terrorism and US Foreign Policy*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Rosenbaum, A.S. (Ed.). (1998). *Is the Holocaust Unique? Perspectives on Comparative Genocide*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Sadat, L.N. (2012). Crimes Against Humanity in the Modern Age. Legal Studies Research Paper Series, Paper No. 11-11-04. Washington, D.C.: Washington University in St. Louis.
- Sadat, L.N. (2013). Crimes Against Humanity in the Modern Age. *American Journal of international Law*, 107(334), 334-377.
- Saul, B. (2005). Attempts to Define ‘Terrorism’ in International Law. *Netherlands International Law Review*, 52(1), 57-58.
- Sav, Ö. (2015). *Uluslararası İnsancıl Hukuk Açısından Savaş ve Barış Hukuku* (War and Peace in terms of International Humanitarian Law). Ankara: Türkiye Barolar Birliği Yayınları.
- Schabas, W.A. (2009). *Genocide in International Law: The Crime of Crimes*. 2nd ed. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Shaw, M.N. (1997). *International Law*. 4th ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Shelton, D. (Ed.). (2005). *Encyclopedia of Genocide and Crimes Against Humanity* (3 vols). Detroit, MI: Macmillan Reference.
- Simpson, G.J. (1997). War Crimes: A Critical Introduction. In T.L.H. McCormack, and G.J. Simpson (Eds.). *The Law of War Crimes: National and International Approaches* (pp. 1-30). The Hague, London, Boston: Kluwer Law International.
- Simpson, G.J. (2007). *Law, War and Crime: War Crimes, Trials and the Reinvention of International Law*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Smith, R. (2007). *The Utility of Force: The Art of War in the Modern World*. New York: Vintage.
- Sönmez, S. (2019). *Michael Walzer ve Haklı Savaş Problemi* (Michael Walzer and Just War Problem). Published MA Thesis. T.C. Hacettepe University Institute of Social Sciences, Ankara.
- Stannard, D.E. (1993). *American Holocaust: The Conquest of the New World*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Stepanova, E. (2008). *Terrorism in Asymmetrical Conflict: Ideological and Structural Aspects*. SIPRI Research Report No. 23. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

- Stohl, M. (1984). National Interests and State Terrorism in International Affairs. *Political Science*, 36(1), 37-52. <https://doi.org/10.1177/003231878403600104>
- Şimşek, M. (2016). Terörizm: Kavramsal Bir Çalışma (Terrorism: A Conceptual Study). *Academic Sight International Refereed Online Journal*, (54), March-April, 319-335.
- Tekin, S. (2015). The Origins of Crimes against Humanity: From Nuremberg To Rome. *Erciyes University Faculty of Law Journal (ERÜHFD)*, 10(2), 149-171.
- Tessler, M. (2009). *A History of the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict*. 2nd ed. Indiana: Indiana University Press.
- The Associated Press (AP). (2023). The Gaza Strip: Tiny, Cramped and as Densely Populated as London. World News, 6 December 2023. Available at <https://apnews.com/article/israel-gaza-hamas-war-90e02d26420b8fe3157f73c256f9ed6a> accessed on Dec. 23, 2023.
- The CIA World Factbook. (2024). Gaza Strip. Explore All Countries, Middle East, 20 February 2024. Available at <https://www.cia.gov/the-world-factbook/countries/gaza-strip/#geography> accessed on Jan. 05, 2024.
- The Haaretz*. (2024). Haaretz Exclusive | Israeli Army Occupies Gaza Homes – Then Burns Them Down. By Yaniv Kubovich in Haaretz | Israel News. 31 January 2024. Available at <https://www.haaretz.com/israel-news/2024-01-31/ty-article/.premium/israeli-army-occupies-gaza-homes-then-burns-them-down/0000018d-6021-d16e-a39f-7f3f01e30000> accessed on Feb. 01, 2024.
- TRTHaber. (2024a). Fahrettin Altun: Israel continues to commit war crimes. 24 February 2024. Available at <https://www.trthaber.com/haber/gundem/fahrettin-altun-israil-savas-suclari-islemeye-devam-ediyor-839867.html> accessed on Feb. 25, 2024.
- TRTHaber. (2024b). Norwegian professor: What happened in Gaza is beyond all the cruelty I have seen in my life. 27 February 2024. Available at <https://www.trthaber.com/haber/dunya/norvecli-profesor-gazgede-yasanlar-hayatimda-gordugum-tum-zulumlerin-otesinde-840447.html> accessed on Feb. 28, 2024.
- TRTNews. (2024). İsrail basınına göre Netanyahu, Gazze saldırıları sonrası için aşamalı bir plan üzerinde çalışıyor (According to the Israeli press, Netanyahu is working on a phased plan for the aftermath of the Gaza attacks). 31 January 2024. Available at <https://www.trthaber.com/haber/dunya/israil-basinina-gore-netanyahu-gazze-saldirilari-sonrasi-icin-asamali-bir-plan-uzerinde-calisiyor-833508.html> accessed on Feb. 02, 2024.
- United Nations (UN). (1951). Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide. Adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 9 December 1948. In UN Treaty Series 1951 No. 1021. (pp. 278-322). New York: United Nations Publications. Available at <https://treaties.un.org/doc/publication/unts/volume78/volume-78-i-1021-english.pdf> accessed on Dec. 22, 2023.
- United States Holocaust Memorial Museum. Definitions: Types of Mass Atrocities. Washington, D.C. Available at <https://www.ushmm.org/genocide-prevention/learn-about-genocide-and-other-mass-atrocities/definitions> accessed on Dec. 07, 2023.
- Quigley, C. (1979). *The Evolution of Civilizations: An Introduction to Historical Analysis*. Indianapolis: Liberty Press.
- Van Creveld, M. (1991). *The Transformation of War*. New York: The Free Press.
- Von Clausewitz, C. (1976). *On War*. Eds. and Tr. M. Howard and P. Paret. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Weitz, E.D. (2003). *A Century of Genocide: Utopias of Race and Nation*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Yalçın, S. (2006). Soğuk Savaş Sonrası Uluslararası Terörizmin Dönüşümü ve Terörizmle Mücadele (The Transformation of International Terrorism and the Struggle against Terrorism in the Post-Cold War Era). *T.C. Süleyman Demirel University Journal of Social Sciences Institute*, 2(4), 98-119.
- Yetgin, M. A., & Baştuğ, M. (2021). Devlet Terörizmi Bağlamında Tarihsel Vakaların İç ve Dış Etkilerinin Analizi: BM Güvenlik Konseyi Üyeleri Örneği (Analysis of Internal and External Effects of Historical Cases in the Context of State Terrorism: Case of UN Security Council Members). *İstanbul Aydın University Journal of Social Sciences*, 13(4), 955-980.
- Yılmaz, S. (2011). *Terör ve Türkiye: Düşünce, Strateji, Eylem* (Terrorism and Türkiye: Thought, Strategy, Action). İstanbul: Kum Saati.

