

International Justice

in the Face of Western Protection of the Entity



Talal Abu-Ghazaleh

The controversy surrounding the International Criminal Court's decision to issue arrest warrants against the occupation leaders reflects the broader challenges in seeking justice in a highly politicized international environment.

The court's decision to issue these warrants against the war criminal Netanyahu and his minister Gallant was unfortunately complicated by the intervention of the British government which raised objections to the court's jurisdiction in this matter, questioning the court's legal authority to issue such warrants.

This objection from a major power has disrupted the process and highlighted a significant diplomatic obstacle. The United Kingdom's stance reflects broader skepticism among Western powers regarding the court's role in addressing issues related to the entity, which is often shielded from international legal scrutiny by its allies.

The British objection can be seen as part of a historical pattern where powerful states, especially those allied with the entity, attempt to limit the scope of international legal mechanisms that could hold Zionist leaders accountable for their crimes against the

Palestinian people. This raises doubts about the neutrality of international justice when it comes to an entity that is accustomed to impunity while constantly violating international law.

However, the situation took a surprising turn with the change in the British government. The new government, led by Keir Starmer, withdrew the objection, thus removing a significant obstacle from the way of the court's proceedings. This move was decisive as it allowed the court to proceed with considering the arrest warrants without being hindered by the objections of a major international player.

The delay caused by the initial British objections was not without consequences, as many countries and individuals from various backgrounds submitted memoranda either supporting or opposing the warrants, especially since the court is required to thoroughly review all these submissions before issuing its final decisions, which has slowed down the progress of the case. This reflects the complexities of international legal processes, particularly when they deal with sensitive political issues such as the Israeli occupation.

However, this controversy highlights the ongoing struggle for justice and accountability in the context of the Israeli occupation. The initial objection by the British government is seen as further evidence of Western double standards when it comes to the entity.

Although these legal proceedings are crucial for addressing the long-standing grievances of the Palestinian people, the hope remains that powerful states will refrain from further interventions so that the court and other international bodies can hold the Zionists accountable for their crimes.