

JUNE 2025

THE CASE FOR A MILITARY INTERVENTION TO STOP THE GAZA GENOCIDE

[PROTECT-PALESTINE.COM](https://protect-palestine.com)



CONTENTS

Summary	03
1. Israel’s Genocide against Palestinians	04
2. Failure of Diplomatic and Legal Mechanisms	06
3. Legal Justification for Military Intervention	09
4. Strategic Objectives	11
5. Precedents for Military Intervention	12
6. Moral Obligation to Act	14
7. Support for a Protective Force	16
8. Conclusion – The World Must Act Immediately	19
Frequently Asked Questions	20
Endnotes	24

GLOSSARY OF TERMS

Genocide Convention	Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide 1948
ICC	International Criminal Court
ICJ	International Court of Justice
R2P	Responsibility to Protect
UN	United Nations
UNGA	United Nations General Assembly
UNHRC	United Nations Human Rights Council
UNRWA	United Nations Reliefs and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees
UNSC	United Nations Security Council
UNSG	United Nations Secretary General

SUMMARY

The ongoing atrocities committed by the Israeli state against the Palestinian people constitute a clear case of genocide under international law. Since 1948, Israel has systematically displaced, murdered, and oppressed Palestinians through military occupation, illegal settlements, blockade warfare, and indiscriminate bombing campaigns. The situation in Gaza—where tens of thousands of civilians have been killed since October 2023—in the world’s most documented genocide, now demands urgent military intervention by the international community to prevent further annihilation.

Decades of negotiations and UN resolutions have failed to curb Israel’s violence. The U.S. and European states continue to arm and fund Israel, blocking ceasefire resolutions while Palestinians face starvation and mass executions. Israel has conducted its genocide of the Palestinian people with impunity, ignoring legally binding rulings of the International Court of Justice [ICJ], arrest warrants of the International Criminal Court [ICC] and disregarding Resolutions by the United Nations General Assembly [UNGA] and Human Rights Council [UNHRC].

When international law and diplomacy have failed, states must take military action to halt mass atrocities. A coalition of willing states committed to stopping the genocide, ending Israel’s unlawful occupation of Palestinian land and guaranteeing the Palestinian right to self-determination, must now establish a military force to break the siege on Gaza, enforce a no-fly zone, ensure unhindered flow of aid, blockade the supply of arms to Israeli ports and prevent Israel’s commission of further atrocities, without delay.

This brief sets out the legal, humanitarian necessity for military intervention, advises on immediate strategic objectives for a military intervention, gives background to historical precedents for such action and recommends that states form a coalition of the willing and establish a military force to conduct an intervention to stop Israel’s genocide of the Palestinian people.

1. ISRAEL'S GENOCIDE AGAINST PALESTINIANS

On 26 January 2024, the ICJ ruled that Israel was plausibly committing genocide in Gaza and issued provisional measures in the case *South Africa v. Israel* including a prohibition against a ground invasion in to Rafah and an obligation to allow unhindered humanitarian aid throughout Gaza.¹

That was more than a year and a half ago. Since then, Israel has only intensified its military assaults in Gaza. Genocidal acts that it continues to commit against the Palestinian population include:

- Killing members of the group (a conservative estimate puts the death toll at over 60,000 Palestinians in Gaza since October 2023; the Economist estimates that it could be as high as 109,000).²
- Causing Serious Bodily or Mental Harm (more than 70,000 people have been injured; thousands of Palestinian prisoners have been subject to torture and ill treatment).³
- Deliberately Inflicting Conditions of Life Calculated to Bring About Physical Destruction (blockades on food, water, and medicine; destruction of hospitals and schools; forcible displacement and forced starvation).⁴

In addition, the intent to commit genocide has been made abundantly clear by Israeli officials, including the Prime Minister, the President, senior cabinet ministers, as well as by military leaders. This has included statements blatantly declaring Israel's intent to proceed with the destruction of the Palestinian civilian population in Gaza, whether by death, starvation or ethnic cleansing, as well as calling Palestinians "*human animals*", advocating for "*erasure*", and invoking biblical annihilation rhetoric.⁵



The global consensus that Israel's actions in Gaza amount to genocide has grown exponentially over the past 20 months among international lawyers, genocide scholars, civil society organisations including Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch, and United Nations experts.⁶ In addition, Ireland and Spain have joined states of the Global South in acknowledging that Israel's actions in Gaza amount to genocide. Given the overwhelming body of evidence and documented crimes, even the Western mainstream media has done a U-turn, from initially justifying Israel's actions, to now calling them genocidal - in articles published by the editorial boards of the Financial Times, the Economist, the Independent and the Guardian, among others.⁷

Israel has also publicly confirmed an official policy of ethnically cleansing the remaining civilian population of Gaza, and is commissioning this policy in full public international view. Already in 2023, the Israeli Prime Minister vowed to turn Gaza into a “deserted island”. On 6 May 2025, after approval of plans for “conquest of Gaza”, Israeli Minister Bezalel Smotrich declared “Gaza will be entirely destroyed, civilians will be sent... to the south... and from there they will start to leave in great numbers to third countries”. He further declared: “We are destroying all that remains in Gaza; the world isn't stopping us”.⁸ On 11 May 2025, the Israeli Prime Minister said before the Foreign Affairs and Defense Committee of the Israeli Knesset “we are destroying more and more homes. They have nowhere to return to. The only inevitable outcome will be the wish of Gazans to emigrate outside of the Gaza Strip”.⁹

2. FAILURE OF DIPLOMATIC AND JUDICIAL MECHANISMS

Over the past 20 months, there have been a range of diplomatic, legal and humanitarian efforts aimed at putting an end to Israel's genocide of the Palestinian population in Gaza. All of them, however, have failed to stop the genocide. These initiatives have included:

I. INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE RULING

In January 2024, the ICJ issued an interim ruling ordering Israel to take all measures within its power to prevent acts of genocide in Gaza.¹ Despite these legally binding orders, Israel continued and further expanded its military assaults, and the international community failed to enforce the Court's decision and hold Israel to account for its defiance of legally binding orders.

II. UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL RESOLUTIONS

Multiple resolutions calling for a ceasefire in Gaza have been proposed in the UNSC. Despite widespread calls for action, these resolutions have been repeatedly vetoed by the United States, a permanent member of the Security Council, including in December 2023, February 2024 and November 2024 and June 2025, thereby obstructing the Security Council's Charter duties to promote international peace and security.²



III. ARMS EMBARGO CALLS

In March 2024, the UNHRC adopted a resolution urging member states to impose an arms embargo on Israel in view of the crimes that it is committing in Gaza. However, these resolutions have been ignored by countries like the United States, United Kingdom and Germany, which are major suppliers of arms to Israel, leading to a lack of enforcement and continued military support.³

VI. ICJ ADVISORY OPINION & UNGA RESOLUTIONS

In July 2024, the ICJ issued an advisory opinion stating that Israel's occupation of the Palestinian territories is unlawful and that Israel is committing apartheid.⁴ In September 2024, the UNGA endorsed these findings and demanded that Israel end its occupation within 12 months, evacuate all settlers, and urged states to stop any business with Israeli settlements and suspend arms transfers.⁵ Despite this, Israel has taken no steps to evacuate from Palestinian territory and has continued illegal annexation of Palestinian land.⁶

V. HUMANITARIAN AID AND BREAKING THE SIEGE

There have been several humanitarian attempts to break the siege that Israel has imposed on Gaza, to deliver vital humanitarian aid to the over 2 million people there. This has included persistent calls by the United Nations Secretary-General and top humanitarian officials to let them in. These calls and pressure from States have failed to get aid in. In May 2025, a humanitarian vessel named *The Conscience*, part of the Freedom Flotilla Coalition, tried to sail to Gaza to deliver aid supplies but was attacked by Israel with drone strikes, forcing it to interrupt its mission. The Freedom Flotilla Coalition has now set sail again on board *The Madleen*, and Israeli officials have confirmed that the vessel will be confronted prior to arrival in Gaza.⁷

VI. ICC ARREST WARRANTS

When in November 2024, after years of dragging its feet on the Palestine case, the ICC finally issued arrest warrants for the Israeli Prime Minister and Defence Minister, a number of European states instead of agreeing to arrest the fugitives and surrender them to the ICC, announced that they would defy the Court's rulings and not enforce the arrest warrants. US President Trump's sanctions on ICC Prosecutor Karim Khan following the arrest warrants have significantly impaired the Court's work by making it difficult to conduct basic tasks.⁸

CONCLUSION

The combination of veto powers in the UNSC, lack of enforcement of ICJ rulings, opposition to arms embargoes, sanctioning of international accountability mechanisms, humanitarian aid blockades, and the complicity and acquiescence of major States, has allowed the situation in Gaza to become apocalyptic. It is manifestly clear that diplomatic and legal mechanisms to hold Israel to account- many of which rely on the support of these States for success- have failed to stop the genocide. When attempts to stop the genocide are consistently blocked in diplomatic and legal avenues, military intervention becomes necessary to enforce international law.

Beyond the genocide in Gaza, it is clear that Israel does not intend to abide by the UNGA Resolution demanding it to end its illegal occupation of Palestinian territory by the deadline of September 2025, following the July 2024 ICJ's Advisory Opinion that found Israel's occupation to be unlawful.

The continuation of the status quo—a status quo of structural violence, institutionalized racism and apartheid, land theft and brutality against the Palestinian people—will pave the way to more violence, which will tragically recur for years to come. The subjugation and occupation of millions of people cannot be maintained. The sooner the international community takes action to guarantee the Palestinian right to self-determination, the faster the occupation will end, lives and human suffering spared, and peace and justice prevail.

3. LEGAL JUSTIFICATION FOR MILITARY INTERVENTION

The 1948 Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide [Genocide Convention] imposes a clear and legally binding obligation on all State Parties not only to punish but also to prevent acts of genocide.¹ As affirmed by the International Court of Justice (ICJ) in the *Bosnia v. Serbia* 2007 judgment, this duty arises not only after genocidal acts have been proven beyond doubt, but when a state becomes aware, or should have become aware, of a serious risk that genocide is being or will be committed.²

This threshold has undoubtedly been crossed in Gaza, where substantial evidence—including that referenced in ICJ proceedings, reports by UN special rapporteurs, commissions of inquiry, and human rights monitoring organisations—demonstrate the ongoing commission of genocidal acts.³ The obligation to prevent genocide is owed to the international community as a whole and does not depend on regional alliances or the consent of the state committing genocide.

The Responsibility to Protect [R2P] doctrine, unanimously adopted by the UN General Assembly at the 2005 World Summit, further reinforces this legal imperative.⁴ R2P holds that the international community has a collective responsibility to protect populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing, and crimes against humanity when a state is “*manifestly failing*” to do so.⁵ In cases where the state itself is the perpetrator—as is the case in Gaza—that responsibility becomes more urgent.⁶ R2P envisions a range of actions—from diplomatic pressure to sanctions and, ultimately, military intervention—in such cases.⁷ The failure of diplomatic channels, the paralysis of the UN Security Council due to veto use, and the continuing mass targeting of civilians justify invoking R2P’s most direct—but necessary—measure: military intervention.⁸



Further, under customary international law and interpretations of humanitarian intervention, states may lawfully use force on humanitarian grounds in extreme situations involving the most serious crimes—such as genocide—provided the intervention is necessary, proportionate, and a last resort.⁹ Historical precedents upheld this perspective when the Security Council was deadlocked and crimes against humanity were underway.¹⁰

The legal framework provided by the Genocide Convention, reinforced by ICJ jurisprudence and the R2P doctrine, as well as state practice in humanitarian interventions, collectively supports both the legality—and the necessity—of military intervention to halt the ongoing genocide in Gaza.¹¹ Failure to act would constitute a dereliction of legal duty and embolden future perpetrators by signaling that the prohibition on genocide is effectively optional.¹² States therefore have both a legal and moral obligation to intervene decisively to enforce international law and stop Israel's ongoing genocide of the Palestinian people.¹³

4. STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES

Israel's massacres of Palestinians continue on a daily basis. These killings are carried out through a range of aerial bombardments, drone attacks, tank projectiles, sniper shootings, and other explosive weapons.¹ Israel is also using forced starvation as a method of warfare throughout Gaza, with hundreds of thousands facing severe malnutrition.² Without military intervention, Israel will complete its policy of extermination or expulsion of the entire Palestinian population.

To stop the genocide, the immediate strategic objectives of military intervention must therefore include:

- Breaking the siege by securing, opening, and protecting all land and sea borders to facilitate the free flow of humanitarian aid into Gaza.³
- Enforcing a no-fly zone over Gaza to stop all aerial bombardment.⁴
- Blockading Israeli ports to halt weapons shipments.⁵
- Disarming Israeli military infrastructure used in attacks on civilians.⁶
- Imposing and safeguarding a permanent ceasefire.⁷
- Ensuring Israel's compliance with ICJ orders and UNGA resolutions requiring complete withdrawal from Palestinian territory.⁸

These objectives are both necessary and proportionate to stopping Israel's ongoing genocide of the Palestinian people and ensuring life-saving aid is delivered to over 2 million Palestinians in Gaza. Apart from these immediate objectives, a coalition of willing states must be prepared to protect the Palestinian people from further crimes, ensure Israel's compliance with international law, and provide security in the Palestinians' attainment and exercise of self-determination.



5. PRECEDENTS FOR MILITARY INTERVENTION

The deployment of military force to ensure international peace and security is the function of the UNSC but can still be conducted in compliance with international law when the Council is deadlocked.¹ In the case of Israel's genocide of Palestinians, the United States continues to veto any resolution that would hold Israel to account. This impasse has been circumvented in the following ways:

I. MILITARY INTERVENTION WITH GENERAL ASSEMBLY (GA) MANDATE UNDER UNITING FOR PEACE

When the UNSC is paralyzed by vetoes, the UN General Assembly (UNGA) may act under Resolution 377(A) (V) – known as “Uniting for Peace” – to recommend collective measures, including military action.² While such resolutions are not legally binding, they can catalyse intervention by coalitions of willing states. Historical precedents include:

- Korean War (1950), where UNGA support under “Uniting for Peace” led to a UN-sanctioned military response.³
- Suez Crisis (1956), during which the UNGA authorized deployment of UNEF I – an armed peacekeeping force.⁴



II. MILITARY INTERVENTION WITHOUT UN MANDATE

States have also intervened militarily without UN authorization, justifying their actions on humanitarian grounds:

- Cambodia (1978): Vietnam invaded Cambodia without Security Council approval to end the Khmer Rouge's genocidal regime.⁵
- Kosovo (1999): NATO initiated Operation Allied Force without a UN mandate to halt ethnic cleansing of Kosovar Albanians.⁶
- Rwanda (1994): France launched Operation Turquoise to establish a humanitarian safe zone to protect civilians and deliver aid amid genocide.⁷

Note that the State of Palestine can officially invite a coalition of States to intervene. Indeed, there are a number of precedents where interventions occurred after being requested by affected States, such as:

- Kuwait (1990–91): The exiled Kuwaiti government invited coalition forces following Iraq's invasion, leading to UNSC Resolution 678 and U.S.-led intervention.⁸
- Bosnia (1992): The Bosnian government requested international protection amid ethnic cleansing, prompting UNSC Resolution 743 and establishment of UNPROFOR.¹⁰
- Libya (2011): The Libyan National Transitional Council (NTC) requested intervention, resulting in UNSC Resolution 1973 and a NATO-enforced no-fly zone under R2P.¹¹

There is thus historical precedent for military intervention to halt genocide without UNSC approval. In the current situation—where the ICJ has found Israel is plausibly committing genocide, the ICC has issued arrest warrants for Israeli leaders, evidence of genocide and war crimes is both abundant and credible, and the U.S. continues to veto UNSC accountability efforts—the legal and moral necessity to act is straightforward.¹²

6. THE MORAL OBLIGATION TO ACT

There are moments in history when silence is complicity and inaction becomes a betrayal of our shared humanity. Today, as the world watches Israel's continued destruction of Palestinian life, culture, and dignity, we are faced with such a moment. Without a military intervention, Israel will complete its plan of extermination or expulsion of the Palestinian people. We must ask whether our consciences can bear the cost of standing by as a people are systematically erased.¹

Nelson Mandela, whose moral clarity transcends nations and generations, once declared, "*We know too well that our freedom is incomplete without the freedom of the Palestinians.*"² He understood that oppression anywhere threatens justice everywhere, and that to turn our eyes from suffering is to deny the essence of our collective humanity.³

What Israel is doing in Gaza and throughout Palestinian territory is not a conflict, it is the crushing of a captive population. We have seen the images: children buried beneath rubble, entire families wiped out overnight, and a people condemned to statelessness, siege, and despair. This is the calculated and deliberate annihilation of a people's right to exist.



When leaders choose peace by forcefully halting mass slaughter, they do not glorify war—they honour life. Intervention is not an act of aggression, it is the last resort of a humanity refusing to be indifferent. It is not done in the name of domination, but in the name of every child who deserves to wake up to the sunrise instead of a blazing fire. Stopping Israel's genocide is a duty upon all people who still believe in decency, in compassion and in the possibility that justice can triumph over brutality.⁴

History will not absolve those who stand by and watch. Just as the world now mourns failures during genocides that have taken place throughout history, so too will future generations judge our response to Israel's genocide of Palestinians.

7. SUPPORT FOR A PROTECTIVE FORCE

A wide range of both Palestinian and non-Palestinian political representatives, legal experts and commentators have publicly expressed support for the establishment of a coalition of the willing and for a protective force to stop Israel's genocide of the Palestinian people. Some notable examples include:

AHMED IBSAIS

*“If there is still a use for law, if there is still any value to the word humanitarian, then act like it. The last aid left is force. Gaza cannot wait any longer.”*¹



NICOLA PERUGINI, SHAHD HAMMOURI

*“States have the duty to stop genocide. Sending a peacekeeping force to Gaza and the West Bank would fulfil this obligation.”*²



RANIA KHALEK

*“If there were a time to invoke the Responsibility to Protect, it is now. If ever we needed a coalition of the willing to stop a Holocaust, it's today in Gaza.”*³



SOUTH AFRICA, MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS, NALEDI PANDOR

“We call for a UN Rapid Deployment Force in Palestine mandated to monitor the implementation of a ceasefire, cessation of hostilities and importantly protect civilians.”⁴

**UN EXPERTS**

“Accountability can no longer be deferred. The UN and States need urgently to establish an independent protection mechanism that Israel shall not stop - it has no sovereignty over the occupied territory, and it is about time States implement it. The people of the world are watching, and history will remember.”⁵

MICHAEL FAKHRI, UN SPECIAL RAPPORTEUR ON THE RIGHT TO FOOD

“If aid doesn’t enter Gaza now, 14000 babies may die. UN peacekeepers must step in.”⁶

**FRANCESCA ALBANESE, UNITED NATIONS SPECIAL RAPPORTEUR ON THE OCCUPIED PALESTINIAN TERRITORIES**

“I urge the UN to authorize the deployment of a protective presence in the occupied Palestinian territory.”⁷

CRAIG MOKHIBER

“UNGA - organize a protective force for Palestine.”⁸

**JEREMY CORBYN MP**

“Why isn't there a ‘coalition of the willing’ to stop the mass starvation and genocide in Gaza?”⁹

SAM HUSSEINI

“The UNGA should call out the genocide by name, strip Israel of its credentials [and] convene under Uniting for Peace to mandate a protection force.”¹⁰

**VIA CAMPESINA**

“States Must Immediately Deploy an International (Multi-Lateral) Humanitarian Aid Protective Force and Corridor to escort aid convoys, rebuild humanitarian access, and secure safe zones for aid distribution- – while mobilizing under the UN’s Right to Protect framework.”¹¹

8. CONCLUSION: THE WORLD MUST ACT IMMEDIATELY

The genocide in Gaza will not stop without direct military intervention. The law is clear, the moral duty is undeniable, and the mechanisms exist—what is missing is political courage.

States that claim to uphold international law and value civilian life must form a coalition of the willing and undertake a military intervention to:

1. Impose a no-fly zone to stop Israeli airstrikes.
2. Break the siege to allow food, water, medicine and aid into Gaza.
3. Blockade Israeli Ports to ensure arms are prohibited from entering.
4. Disarm Israel's genocide war machine through targeted strikes if necessary.
5. Enforce a permanent ceasefire.
6. Ensure Israel complies with international law including rulings of the ICJ and Resolutions of the UNGA for Israel, including all Israeli settlers, to evacuate from Palestinian territory.
7. Provide protective security to Palestinians in the exercise of their right to self-determination.

States do not need approval of the UNSC, nor is it necessary to wait for a Resolution of the UNGA. The legal authority for a military intervention already exists within the Genocide Convention and is supported by R2P and customary international law. States must therefore act immediately to conduct a military intervention to stop Israel's genocide of the Palestinians people.

FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

Q1. WHICH STATES WOULD TAKE PART IN A MILITARY INTERVENTION?

Under the Genocide Convention, all states have an obligation to prevent and punish genocide. In addition to states' legal obligations, a wide range of states have made political commitments to Palestinian liberation, including:

- The Hague Group for Palestine : a coalition of states committed to enforcing international law obligations upon Israel to end its illegal occupation of Palestine and to guarantee the Palestinian right to self-determination (Belize, Bolivia, Colombia, Cuba, Honduras, Malaysia, Namibia, Senegal, and South Africa)
- The Organisation of Islamic Cooperation (OIC): a coalition of states with an “unwavering commitment to support the Palestinian people in their struggle to regain their rights and to liberate their land and to establish their national independent sovereignty and state” (Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Brunei, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Chad, Comoros, Côte d'Ivoire, Djibouti, Egypt, Gabon, Gambia, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lebanon, Libya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Mozambique, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Palestine, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Suriname, Syria, Tajikistan, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, Uzbekistan, Yemen).
- States backing South Africa's claim at the ICJ that Israel is committing genocide (Nicaragua, Colombia, Libya, Mexico, Spain, Turkey, Chile, Maldives, Bolivia, Ireland)

To fulfill their legal and political obligations, a group of states should form a coalition of the willing with the purpose of conducting a military intervention to stop Israel's genocide of Palestinians.

Q2. DOES A MILITARY INTERVENTION NEED TO BE AUTHORISED THROUGH THE UN?

No—states do not need to wait for UN approval to act. The Genocide Convention imposes an independent legal obligation on all nations to stop genocide, regardless of UN processes. However, the UN can still play a role:

- General Assembly Resolutions under the United for Peace provision can recommend a protective force to stop the genocide and demonstrate global support for a military intervention.
- UN mechanisms can be used to isolate Israel diplomatically.

But waiting for the UN means more Palestinian deaths. States with the political will must form a coalition and act now.

Q3. WOULD A MILITARY INTERVENTION BE A DECLARATION OF WAR AGAINST ISRAEL?

No. A military intervention to halt genocide is not an act of war under international law—it is a legal and humanitarian obligation. The distinction is critical: The Genocide Convention (1948) obligates all states to "prevent and punish" genocide (Article I). This duty exists independently of UN processes. The UN Charter (Article 2(4)) prohibits aggressive war but military force is permissible to stop mass atrocities under customary international law.

Israel may frame intervention as "war" but:

- Israel is unlawfully occupying Palestinian territory and has been ordered to evacuate.
- The ICJ has ordered Israel to prevent and halt genocide — intervention enforces this ruling, not attacks on Israel's sovereignty.
- Genocidal states forfeit sovereignty claims over their crimes (see UNGA Resolution 96(I)).
- Military action to stop genocide is legally distinct from war. It is a policing action under international law—like arresting a dictator for crimes against humanity. States must act without fear of false "war" labels while the Palestinians face extermination.

Q4. HAMAS SHOULD JUST RETURN THE HOSTAGES, ISN'T THAT AN EASIER WAY TO END THIS?

Israel has repeatedly and consistently rejected the return of all the hostages. This includes three consecutive votes at the United Nations General Assembly in which Israel rejected plans to release all of the hostages on the basis that it would require a “humanitarian pause” to Israel’s military aggression in Gaza. In addition, Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu has stated that Israel’s plan to ethnically cleanse the Palestinian population of Gaza will continue regardless of whether the hostages are returned. Israel’s genocidal onslaught in Gaza is the culmination of a long stand policy of ethnic cleansing, unlawful occupation, apartheid and genocide of the Palestinian people.

Q5. A MILITARY INTERVENTION BY STATES IS UNREALISTIC, ESPECIALLY GIVEN HOW LITTLE STATES HAVE DONE SO FAR. WHAT’S THE POINT IN MAKING THIS DEMAND?

A military intervention is now a legal, humanitarian and ethical necessity, and there a wide range of states capable of conducting such an intervention. The realistic approach to stopping the genocide is for a coalition of states to conduct a military intervention. Without this, Israel will finalise the extermination and expulsion of the Palestinian people.

While there is no expectation that states that have been complicit in Israel’s genocide of the Palestinian people would take part in a military intervention to stop Israel, we should avoid a Western centric view on what states around the world are capable of. There are many states that have never recognised Israel, do not trade with Israel, and

accept the ICJ ruling that Israel in committing apartheid, unlawful occupation and have provided political commitments to stopping Israel's genocide of the Palestinian people.

A military intervention does not require all states to be involved; it requires only a coalition of willing states who would fulfil the demand made by billions around the world to stop the genocide. It is reasonable to expect that a group of states can form a coalition of the willing to undertake this mission, and that is what we must demand.

ENDNOTES

1. ISRAEL'S GENOCIDE AGAINST PALESTINIAN PEOPLE

- 1 International Court of Justice, Order of 26 January 2024, Application of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (South Africa v. Israel), paras. 18–21, 36–37, <https://www.icj-cij.org/case/192/orders>.
- 2 The Economist, “How Many People Has Israel Killed in Gaza?,” The Economist, April 27, 2024, <https://www.economist.com>.
- 3 United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA), “Gaza Strip: Humanitarian Impact,” updated regularly, <https://www.ochaopt.org>; see also Human Rights Watch, “Palestine: Detainees Abused in Israeli Custody,” January 2024, <https://www.hrw.org>.
- 4 Amnesty International, “Israel Defying ICJ Ruling to Prevent Genocide by Failing to Allow Adequate Humanitarian Aid to Reach Gaza,” February 26, 2024, <https://www.amnesty.org>.
- 5 Patrick Wintour, “Gaza Will Be Entirely Destroyed, Israeli Minister Says,” The Guardian, May 6, 2025, <https://www.theguardian.com>.
- 6 This includes the United Nations Special Rapporteur on the Situation of Human Rights in the Palestinian Territories Occupied Since 1967 (March and October 2024 reports), the United Nations Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food (July 2024 report), the United Nations Special Rapporteur on Violence Against Women (February 2025 press statement), the United Nations Special Rapporteur on the Right to Adequate Housing (March 2024 report), the United Nations Special Rapporteur on the Human Rights to Safe Drinking Water and Sanitation (December 2024 statement to HRW), the United Nations Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Palestinian People and Other Arabs of the Occupied Territories (November 2024 report).
- 7 Editorial Board, The Financial Times, “Israel Must Heed the World’s Warnings,” May 2025; The Economist, “Stop the Destruction of Gaza,” May 2025; Editorial Board, The Independent, “This Is Genocide,” May 2025; The Guardian, “Editorial: Gaza’s Ruins,” May 2025.
- 8 Patrick Wintour, “Gaza Will Be Entirely Destroyed,” The Guardian.
- 9 Knesset Foreign Affairs and Defense Committee, “Committee Minutes, 11 May 2025,” <https://www.knesset.gov.il> (accessed June 2025).

2. FAILURE OF JUDICIAL AND DIPLOMATIC MECHANISMS

- 1 International Court of Justice, Order of 26 January 2024, Application of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (South Africa v. Israel), paras. 18–21, 36–37, <https://www.icj-cij.org/case/192/orders>.
- 2 See, e.g., “US Vetoes Security Council’s Gaza Ceasefire Resolution,” BBC News, 21 November 2024; Agence France-Presse, “US Vetoes UN Security Council Push to Call for Ceasefire in Gaza,” The Guardian, 20 November 2024; and Al Jazeera, “US Again Vetoes Gaza Ceasefire Draft,” 9 December 2023, demonstrating repeated U.S. vetoes. [bbc.com](https://www.bbc.com) [theguardian.com](https://www.theguardian.com) [aljazeera.com](https://www.aljazeera.com)
- 3 UN Human Rights Council, “Resolution Urging Arms Embargo on Israel,” March 2024. (UNHRC press release)
- 4 International Court of Justice, Legal Consequences arising from the Policies and Practices of Israel in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, Advisory Opinion, July 2024. Available from: <https://www.icj-cij.org>

5 United Nations General Assembly, Resolution A/RES/ES-10/24, “Follow-up to the ICJ Advisory Opinion on the Legal Status of the Occupied Palestinian Territory,” September 2024. The resolution endorsed the Court’s findings and called for concrete action from member states. See also: UN Press Release, “General Assembly Demands Israel Withdraw from Occupied Palestinian Territories,” September 2024.

6 Human Rights Watch, Israel: Continued Settlement Expansion Violates International Law, November 2024. Also see Amnesty International, Israel’s Apartheid against Palestinians: A Cruel System of Domination and a Crime against Humanity (London: Amnesty International, 2022).

7 Reports from Freedom Flotilla Coalition and human rights media (May 2025) document the attack on The Conscience and Israeli assurance that Madleen will be intercepted.

8 Reuters, “US Imposes Sanctions on Four ICC Judges After Israeli Warrant,” 5 June 2025; see also Financial Times reporting; Trump-era sanctions on ICC Prosecutor Karim Khan in February 2025 further undermined court operations.[reuters.com](https://www.reuters.com)[ft.com](https://www.ft.com)

3. LEGAL JUSTIFICATION FOR MILITARY INTERVENTION

1 Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, 1948.

2 International Court of Justice, Application of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (Bosnia and Herzegovina v. Serbia and Montenegro), Judgment, 26 Feb. 2007; see especially that Serbia had “failed to prevent genocide,” recognizing the duty once a serious risk is known.[icj-cij.org/en/wikipedia.orgelgaronline.comicj-cij.org](https://www.icj-cij.org/en/wikipedia/orgelgaronline.comicj-cij.org)

3 See reports from UN special rapporteurs, independent commissions of inquiry, and human rights NGOs, as referenced in South Africa v. Israel ICJ proceedings.

4 United Nations, World Summit Outcome (A/RES/60/1), paras.138–139 (24 Oct. 2005), unanimously adopting R2P.[un.org/en/wikipedia.org](https://www.un.org/en/wikipedia.org)

5 Ibid.; Global Centre for the Responsibility to Protect, “What is R2P?” [globalr2p.org/en/wikipedia.org](https://www.globalr2p.org/en/wikipedia.org)

6 UN R2P framework explicitly addresses scenarios “where the state itself is perpetrating mass atrocities.”[en.wikipedia.org](https://www.un.org/en/wikipedia.org)

7 Ibid.

8 The concept of R2P includes military intervention when peaceful means fail and authorities are unwilling or unable to protect.[en.wikipedia.org/cjl.uchicago.edu](https://www.en.wikipedia.org/cjl.uchicago.edu)

9 Customary international law supports humanitarian intervention under principles of necessity, proportionality, and last resort, especially in genocide contexts.

10 See historical precedents where states intervened despite Security Council deadlock, citing practice supporting moral–legal duties to stop mass atrocities.

11 The convergence of Genocide Convention duties, ICJ jurisprudence, and R2P doctrine forms a robust legal basis for intervention.

12 Without enforcement, the prohibition against genocide risks becoming optional, undermining future accountability.

13 The combination of international legal obligations and moral imperative compels decisive action to halt genocide.

4. STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES

1 Reports from humanitarian and media outlets document ongoing daily killings by Israeli forces using airstrikes, drones, tanks, and snipers. See, e.g., New Yorker, “Why Ehud Olmert Thinks His Country Is Committing War Crimes” (June 6, 2025); The Guardian, “At least 27 Palestinians killed by Israeli fire at food point” (June 3, 2025); The Guardian, “Palestinians gunned down while trying to reach food aid site in Gaza” (June 1, 2025).[newyorker.com](https://www.newyorker.com)[theguardian.com](https://www.theguardian.com)[theguardian.com](https://www.theguardian.com)

- 2 A UN-backed report found acute malnutrition among Gaza's children nearly tripled after an aid blockade, with starvation-related deaths reported among children and the elderly. Reuters, 5 June 2025. The UN Special Committee reported that Israel was "using starvation as a method of war."[reuters.com](https://www.reuters.com/world/middle-east/un-special-committee-reports-israel-using-starvation-war-2025-06-05/)[aljazeera.com](https://www.aljazeera.com)
- 3 Human Rights Watch and the UN Committee on genocide-related warfare methods confirm Israel imposed a blockade on essential aid, severing all land and sea access.[hrw.org](https://www.hrw.org/news/2025/06/05/israel-blockade-essential-aid)[aljazeera.com](https://www.aljazeera.com)
- 4 Calls for a no-fly zone appear in scholarly and NGO proposals as a measure to halt recurrent air strikes, supported by recognized principles of humanitarian intervention.[lawreview.uchicago.edu](https://www.lawreview.uchicago.edu/article.php?id=10.2156/lr.2025.52.1.1)[aljazeera.com](https://www.aljazeera.com)
- 5 Reports link the blockade to international weapons resupply continuing through Israeli ports, fueling civilian attacks. See UN statements and investigative reporting.[reliefweb.int](https://www.reliefweb.int/)[aljazeera.com](https://www.aljazeera.com)
- 6 Investigations, including by the UN Special Committee and Human Rights Watch, identify Israeli military infrastructure explicitly targeted in civilian-populated areas.[hrw.org](https://www.hrw.org/news/2025/06/05/israeli-military-infrastructure-targeted)[aljazeera.com](https://www.aljazeera.com)
- 7 Permanent ceasefire demands are grounded in repeated UN Special Session resolutions and ICJ provisional orders.[icj-cij.org](https://www.icj-cij.org/)[cij-cij.org](https://www.cij-cij.org/)
- 8 ICJ orders and UNGA advisory opinions explicitly require Israel's withdrawal and compliance with international law.[icj-cij.org](https://www.icj-cij.org/)globalr2p.org

5. PRECEDENT FOR MILITARY INTERVENTION

- 1 See UNGA Res. 377(A)(V), Uniting for Peace (Nov. 3, 1950); this mechanism empowers the General Assembly to recommend military force when the UNSC fails due to a P5 veto.[legal.un.org](https://www.legal.un.org/en/wikipedia.org/opil/ouplaw.com)[wikipedia.org](https://www.wikipedia.org)[opil.ouplaw.com](https://www.opil.ouplaw.com)
- 2 Ibid.; see UNGA Res. 377(B)(V), 377(C)(V); for analysis, see Security Council Report, Security Council Deadlocks and Uniting for Peace (Oct. 2013).[legal.un.org](https://www.legal.un.org/securitycouncilreport.org)[securitycouncilreport.org](https://www.securitycouncilreport.org)
- 3 UNGA's Korean War action is directly tied to "Uniting for Peace," which enabled member states to assist South Korea following a UNSC impasse.[legal.un.org](https://www.legal.un.org/en/wikipedia.org)[wikipedia.org](https://www.wikipedia.org)
- 4 UN use of "Uniting for Peace" during the 1956 Suez Crisis led to the first armed UN peacekeeping deployment, UNEF I.[commonslibrary.parliament.uk](https://www.commonslibrary.parliament.uk)
- 5 Vietnam invaded Cambodia in December 1978 without UN authorization, citing the need to stop Khmer Rouge atrocities.[digitalcommons.nyls.edu](https://www.digitalcommons.nyls.edu/en/wikipedia.org/law.yale.edu)[wikipedia.org](https://www.wikipedia.org)[law.yale.edu](https://www.law.yale.edu)
- 6 NATO's Operation Allied Force (March–June 1999) was a humanitarian intervention without UNSC approval, launched to halt ethnic cleansing in Kosovo.[nato.int](https://www.nato.int/en/wikipedia.org/friendsofeurope.org)[wikipedia.org](https://www.wikipedia.org)[friendsofeurope.org](https://www.friendsofeurope.org)
- 7 France's Operation Turquoise (1994) established a humanitarian safe zone in Rwanda during the genocide, without UNSC sanction.[law.yale.edu](https://www.law.yale.edu)
- 8 After Iraq invaded Kuwait in 1990, the exiled Kuwaiti government invited coalition intervention; UNSC Resolution 678 authorized the military response.[legal.un.org](https://www.legal.un.org/en/wikipedia.org)[wikipedia.org](https://www.wikipedia.org)
- 9 Vietnam cited appeals from Cambodian refugees as justification for its intervention in Cambodia.[law.yale.edu](https://www.law.yale.edu/globalr2p.org)[globalr2p.org](https://www.globalr2p.org)
- 10 The Bosnian government formally requested international protection in 1992, leading to UNSC Resolution 743 and UNPROFOR's deployment.[legal.un.org](https://www.legal.un.org/en/wikipedia.org)[wikipedia.org](https://www.wikipedia.org)
- 11 Libya's NTC requested international intervention in 2011; UNSC Resolution 1973 authorized NATO's no-fly zone, invoked under R2P.[legal.un.org](https://www.legal.un.org/en/wikipedia.org)[wikipedia.org](https://www.wikipedia.org)
- 12 See ICJ South Africa v. Israel (Jan. 26, 2024) provisional measures; ICC arrest warrants (Nov. 2024); and U.S. vetoes in UNSC proceedings.[legal.un.org](https://www.legal.un.org/en/wikipedia.org/nato.int)[wikipedia.org](https://www.wikipedia.org)[nato.int](https://www.nato.int)

6. MORAL OBLIGATION TO ACT

1 See United Nations Office on Genocide Prevention and the Responsibility to Protect, Framework of Analysis for Atrocity Crimes (New York: United Nations, 2014), which outlines warning signs and legal obligations regarding state-perpetrated mass atrocities.

2 Nelson Mandela, quoted in Speech at the International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian People, Pretoria, South Africa, December 4, 1997. Archived by the United Nations:

<https://www.un.org/unispal/document/auto-insert-184194/>

3 See Martin Luther King Jr., Letter from a Birmingham Jail (1963), where he stated: “Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere.”

4 For moral and legal arguments regarding humanitarian intervention to prevent genocide, see Gareth Evans and Mohamed Sahnoun, The Responsibility to Protect: Report of the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (Ottawa: International Development Research Centre, 2001).

7. SUPPORT FOR A PROTECTIVE FORCE

1. Ahmed Ibsais, Military intervention must be used to stop the genocide in Gaza, The Guardian, 23rd May 2025

2. Nicola Perugini, Shahd Hammouri , A protective force must be deployed to occupied Palestine, Al Jazeera, 28th April 2025

3. Rania Khalek, Journalist, X Post, 18th May 2025

4. South African Minister for International Relations and Cooperation, Naledi Pandor, National Assembly House of Parliament, 7th November 2023

5. UN Special Rappourteurs, Stop the clock on madness, Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, 2nd June 2024

6. Michael Fakhri, UN Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food, If aid doesn’t enter Gaza now, 14,000 babies may die. UN peacekeepers must step in, The Guardian, 22nd May 2025

7. Francesca Albanese, United Nations Special Rapporteur on the Occupied Palestinian Territories, X Post, 12th April 2025

8. Craig Mokhiber, X Post, 18th April 2025

9. Jeremy Corbyn MP, X Post, 10th May 2025

10. Sam Hussein, X Post, 3rd June 2025

11. Via Campesina, Urgent Call to Action: Extermination by Starvation and Collapse of Life in Gaza, 9 April 2025

