



ALKEBULAN

A Journal of West and
East African Studies

Volume 5, Issue 1 (April)

Alkebulan: A Journal of West and East African Studies

<https://gnosipress.com.ng/index.php/alkebulan>

ISSN (Online): 2971-6187

Ubuntu-Based Collective Responsibility and the Israeli-Hamas Conflict: A Case for Restorative Justice in Asymmetric Warfare

Miebaka Nabiebu

Faculty of Law,

University of Calabar, Cross River State, Nigeria.

Email: mdlaw2004@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

The Israeli-Hamas conflict exemplifies the limitations of traditional international humanitarian law (IHL) in addressing protracted asymmetric warfare, where cycles of violence persist despite legal prohibitions on collective punishment and war crimes. This paper applies *Ubuntu-Based Collective Responsibility in International Humanitarian Law (UCR-IHL)*—a theoretical framework proposed by Dr. Miebaka Nabiebu—to analyze the conflict and propose restorative justice alternatives. Grounded in the African philosophy of *Ubuntu* (“I am because we are”), UCR-IHL challenges the individualistic, retributive focus of contemporary IHL by emphasizing three principles: (1) *communal accountability* for institutions and societies enabling violence, (2) *restorative justice* prioritizing reparations and reconciliation over punishment, and (3) *preventive obligations* through localized early-warning systems. Through a case study of the Israeli-Hamas conflict, the paper demonstrates how UCR-IHL could break the current impasse by addressing root causes—such as mutual dehumanization and historical trauma—while avoiding the pitfalls of collective punishment. The analysis highlights practical applications, including culturally grounded truth processes blending Palestinian *sulha* and Jewish *tikkun olam* traditions, cross-border civilian monitoring networks, and phased reintegration of combatants. Despite challenges posed by asymmetric power dynamics and political resistance, UCR-IHL offers a transformative pathway to sustainable peace, centering the interconnected humanity of both peoples. The paper argues that this framework provides a critical alternative to failed retributive models, aligning with growing demands from affected communities for justice systems that heal rather than perpetuate cycles of violence.

*Corresponding author:
Maxwell-Borjor Achuk Eba
raremaxxy@yahoo.com

Received: 20 June 2024
Accepted: 25 May 2025
Published: 25 May 2025

This is an open access
article distributed under
the Creative Commons
Attribution License CC-
BY-NC-4.0 ©2025 by
author
(<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>)

Keywords: Ubuntu philosophy; Restorative justice; Asymmetric warfare; Communal accountability.

INTRODUCTION

The Israeli-Hamas conflict stands as one of the most enduring and complex humanitarian crises in modern history, exposing critical limitations in the application of international humanitarian law (IHL) to protracted asymmetric warfare. Despite decades of legal interventions, UN resolutions, and peace initiatives, the cycle of violence persists, with recurring episodes of mass civilian casualties, infrastructure destruction, and mutual radicalization (Falk, 2021). The failure of conventional IHL frameworks to either prevent violations or deliver meaningful justice raises fundamental questions about the need for alternative approaches that address the root causes of this conflict rather than merely its symptoms. This paper argues that the dominant paradigm of individual criminal responsibility, as embodied in institutions like the International Criminal Court (ICC), is ill-equipped to resolve conflicts where violence is deeply embedded in collective historical narratives, institutional structures, and community dynamics (Drumbl, 2018).

At the heart of this impasse lies a fundamental tension between IHL's universalist aspirations and its Eurocentric foundations, which privilege retributive justice over restorative approaches more aligned with local cultural traditions (Mutua, 2001). Nowhere is this tension more apparent than in the Israeli-Hamas context, where Western legal frameworks are often perceived as externally imposed solutions that fail to resonate with either Jewish or Palestinian conceptions of justice (Kattan, 2023). The resulting legitimacy deficit undermines compliance on all sides, creating a vacuum filled by maximalist ideologies that perpetuate violence. This dynamic reflects what critical legal scholars describe as the “coloniality of international law”—its historical development as an instrument of power rather than justice (Anghie, 2005).

The African philosophy of Ubuntu, articulated by Dr. Miebaka Nabiebu in his theory of Ubuntu-Based Collective Responsibility in IHL (UCR-IHL), offers a transformative alternative to this deadlock. Rooted in the Nguni maxim “Umuntu ngumuntu ngabantu” (“A person is a person through other persons”), Ubuntu provides an ethical framework that emphasizes interconnectedness, communal accountability, and restorative justice (Ramose, 2002). Unlike conventional IHL's focus on punishing individual perpetrators, UCR-IHL recognizes that in conflicts like Israel-Hamas, responsibility extends beyond discrete actors to include the social, political, and institutional ecosystems that sustain violence (Nabiebu, 2023). This perspective aligns with growing anthropological evidence that collective trauma and identity narratives play a pivotal role in perpetuating the conflict (Bar-Tal & Halperin, 2011).

The Israeli-Hamas conflict presents a particularly compelling case for applying UCR-IHL principles due to three distinctive characteristics. First, its asymmetric nature—featuring a powerful state military confronting a non-state armed group embedded in civilian infrastructure—defies traditional IHL categorizations (Byman, 2021). Second, the conflict's temporal duration (spanning generations) has created intergenerational trauma and entrenched victim-perpetrator dynamics that resist individual-focused justice models (Hass, 2020). Third, both societies possess rich indigenous traditions of conflict resolution (Jewish *tikkun olam* and Palestinian *sulha*) that remain marginalized in formal peace processes but could anchor restorative approaches (Abu-Nimer, 2003).

Conventional IHL mechanisms have struggled to address these complexities. The ICC's investigation into the situation in Palestine, while symbolically significant, faces political obstacles and risks exacerbating polarization by framing justice as a zero-sum contest between Israeli and Palestinian narratives (Shany, 2021). Meanwhile, the UN

Human Rights Council's repeated condemnations have done little to alter behavior on the ground, revealing the limitations of shaming tactics in protracted identity conflicts (Löwenheim, 2020). Even if prosecutions were successfully pursued, they would likely target mid-level operatives while leaving intact the ideological and institutional structures that perpetuate violence (Sfard, 2023).

UCR-IHL proposes a fundamentally different pathway by centering three innovative principles. First, its communal accountability model would examine how Israeli society's support for blockade policies and Hamas's governance strategies collectively enable violations, creating mechanisms for societal reckoning beyond individual prosecutions. Second, its restorative justice approach would prioritize truth-telling and reparations processes that address the historical trauma underlying current violence, drawing on both Jewish and Palestinian traditions of reconciliation. Third, its preventive obligations framework would empower grassroots early-warning systems, leveraging existing peacebuilding networks like Combatants for Peace to de-escalate tensions before they erupt into full-scale warfare (Chaitin & Steinberg, 2023).

This paper contends that UCR-IHL's greatest potential lies in its ability to transcend the binary framing of the conflict as a contest between two competing nationalisms. By recognizing both peoples' interconnected suffering and humanity—the essence of Ubuntu—the framework opens space for justice processes that acknowledge historical grievances without perpetuating cycles of retaliation. Such an approach could complement rather than replace existing IHL mechanisms, offering a culturally grounded supplement to the ICC's work while addressing its blind spots.

The urgency of this paradigm shift has been underscored by the catastrophic humanitarian consequences of recent escalations, which demonstrate the human costs of maintaining the status quo. As traditional legal and diplomatic frameworks repeatedly fail to secure either justice or peace, UCR-IHL emerges as a theoretically robust and practically viable alternative worthy of serious consideration by scholars, practitioners, and policymakers alike.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK: APPLYING UCR-IHL TO ASYMMETRIC WARFARE

The application of Ubuntu-Based Collective Responsibility in International Humanitarian Law (UCR-IHL) to the Israeli-Hamas conflict requires a fundamental rethinking of conventional legal approaches to asymmetric warfare. Traditional IHL frameworks, developed primarily for interstate conflicts between sovereign states, struggle to address the unique challenges posed by confrontations between state militaries and non-state armed groups (Bugnion, 2016). The Israeli-Hamas dynamic exemplifies this tension, where Israel's status as a powerful state actor clashes with Hamas's dual role as both a governing authority and an armed resistance movement in Gaza (Sayigh, 2021). UCR-IHL offers a more nuanced analytical lens by recognizing that in such conflicts, responsibility for violations extends beyond individual combatants to encompass the broader political, social, and institutional ecosystems that sustain violence (Nabiebu, 2023).

At the core of this theoretical approach lies Ubuntu philosophy's conception of shared humanity, which provides an ethical foundation for analyzing the interconnected suffering of both Israelis and Palestinians. Unlike Western legal traditions that emphasize binary distinctions between perpetrators and victims, Ubuntu acknowledges the complex

ways in which communities become mutually entangled in cycles of violence (Ramose, 2002). This perspective proves particularly valuable in the Israeli-Hamas context, where generations of reciprocal trauma have created what Bar-Tal (2013) describes as a "conflict ethos" - a shared psychological framework that normalizes hostility and dehumanization. UCR-IHL's communal accountability principle challenges this status quo by creating mechanisms for societies to collectively confront their roles in perpetuating violence, rather than focusing solely on punishing individual offenders.

The restorative justice dimension of UCR-IHL addresses another critical gap in conventional approaches to the conflict. Current legal frameworks, whether through ICC prosecutions or UN investigations, tend to reinforce zero-sum narratives where justice for one side is perceived as injustice by the other (Shany, 2021). In contrast, Ubuntu-inspired processes would emphasize truth-telling and reconciliation mechanisms that acknowledge the historical grievances of both peoples while creating space for mutual recognition of suffering. This approach draws on indigenous conflict resolution traditions from both cultures, including the Jewish concept of teshuvah (repentance and repair) and the Palestinian sulha (mediation) practices (Abu-Nimer, 2003). By centering these culturally grounded practices, UCR-IHL could foster justice processes that resonate more deeply with affected communities than alien Western legal impositions.

UCR-IHL's preventive obligations framework offers innovative tools for breaking the conflict's cyclical nature. Conventional early warning systems in the region have typically relied on state-centric intelligence gathering, which often fails to detect or address the grassroots tensions that escalate into violence (Kaufman & Bisharat, 2022). A UCR-IHL approach would instead empower local peacebuilding networks, religious leaders, and civil society actors to serve as conflict mediators before tensions reach the boiling point. The success of initiatives like the Parents Circle-Families Forum, which brings together bereaved Israeli and Palestinian families, demonstrates the potential of such community-based prevention (Chaitin & Steinberg, 2023). Institutionalizing these efforts through formal recognition in IHL could significantly enhance their impact and scalability.

The theory's emphasis on collective responsibility also provides a framework for addressing one of the most contentious issues in the conflict - the role of external actors. From Iranian support for Hamas to U.S. military aid to Israel, third-party involvement has consistently fueled the conflict while escaping legal accountability (Byman, 2021). UCR-IHL's graduated responsibility model would create mechanisms for holding these enablers accountable, whether through diplomatic pressure, arms embargoes, or conditional aid agreements. This aspect is particularly crucial given how external weapons transfers and political support have repeatedly undermined ceasefire agreements (Human Rights Watch, 2023).

Critically, UCR-IHL does not propose replacing existing IHL frameworks but rather complementing them with culturally attuned restorative mechanisms. The Geneva Conventions' fundamental protections remain essential, but their implementation requires contextual adaptation to be effective in asymmetric conflicts (Mégret, 2016). By integrating Ubuntu principles with core IHL norms, the framework offers a path forward that respects legal universalism while acknowledging the particularities of the Israeli-Hamas context. This balanced approach may prove more sustainable than current models that oscillate between rigid legal formalism and complete political pragmatism.

UBUNTU-BASED COLLECTIVE RESPONSIBILITY IN THE ISRAELI-HAMAS CONFLICT: A RESTORATIVE JUSTICE APPROACH

The Israeli-Hamas conflict presents a profound case study for examining how Ubuntu-Based Collective Responsibility in International Humanitarian Law (UCR-IHL) could transform conventional approaches to warfare accountability. This protracted asymmetric conflict, now in its eighth decade, has resisted traditional legal solutions precisely because it embodies the complex communal dimensions that UCR-IHL is designed to address (Nabiebu, 2023). The conflict's cyclical violence, entrenched historical grievances, and mutual dehumanization demand precisely the kind of holistic, restorative approach that Ubuntu philosophy offers.

At its core, the conflict represents a fundamental breakdown of interconnectedness - the very concept that Ubuntu seeks to restore. Where Ubuntu teaches "umuntu ngumuntu ngabantu" (a person is a person through other persons), the conflict has fostered what Bar-Tal (2013) describes as "mutual denial of the other's humanity." This manifests in Israel's blockade policy that collectively punishes Gaza's 2.3 million residents and in Hamas's charter that denies Israel's right to exist. Conventional IHL, focused on individual culpability, struggles to address these systemic violations because they emerge from collective decisions by governments, militaries, and supporting societies (Drumbl, 2018). UCR-IHL's principle of communal accountability provides tools to examine how Israeli settlement policies approved by the Knesset and Hamas's governance choices in Gaza collectively enable violations that individual prosecutions cannot resolve.

The May 2021 escalation illustrates this dynamic vividly. When clashes over Sheikh Jarrah evictions and Al-Aqsa access escalated into full-scale conflict, the violence followed predictable patterns: Israeli airstrikes killed 260 Palestinians (including 66 children), while Hamas rockets killed 13 Israelis (OHCHR, 2021). Traditional IHL analysis focused on whether specific strikes violated proportionality principles, but UCR-IHL would examine deeper questions: How did Israeli public support for hardline policies enable the government's response? How did Hamas's political calculations exploit civilian suffering? As Ramose (2002) argues, Ubuntu demands we see these not as isolated violations but as fractures in shared humanity requiring communal repair.

The Great March of Return protests (2018-2019) demonstrate how UCR-IHL's preventive obligations differ from conventional IHL. When Israeli snipers killed 223 Palestinian protesters, including medics and journalists (Amnesty International, 2019), legal debates centered on whether each shooting met IHL's "imminent threat" standard. A UCR-IHL approach would have activated cross-border mediation networks earlier, leveraging existing relationships between Israeli trauma centers and Gaza hospitals, or joint veterans' groups like Combatants for Peace (Chaitin & Steinberg, 2023). These community-based prevention mechanisms embody Ubuntu's proactive conception of responsibility - preventing harm before it occurs through sustained relationship-building.

Hamas's governance of Gaza reveals how UCR-IHL's restorative justice could transform accountability. The group's diversion of construction materials to military tunnels reflects collective choices that harm Gaza's civilians. While IHL can only condemn this as a violation, UCR-IHL would implement community oversight committees and public reconciliation processes where leaders account for misused resources (Nabiebu, 2023). Similarly, Israel's blockade policy - approved by successive governments and supported by much of the public - requires communal reckoning beyond individual officials. Ubuntu's restorative approach, drawing on both Jewish teshuvah (repentance)

and Palestinian sulha (mediation) traditions, could create pathways for such accountability (Abu-Nimer, 2003).

The conflict's historical dimension particularly benefits from UCR-IHL's long-term perspective. Where conventional IHL examines discrete violations, Ubuntu philosophy understands justice as an ongoing process of relationship-mending (Tutu, 1999). This explains why ICC investigations into the 2014 Gaza War failed to deter future violence - they addressed symptoms rather than the intergenerational trauma fueling the conflict (Hass, 2020). UCR-IHL would couple legal accountability with intercommunal healing projects, like joint Israeli-Palestinian oral history initiatives that acknowledge mutual suffering while rebuilding connections severed by violence.

Ultimately, the Israeli-Hamas conflict demonstrates why UCR-IHL's innovations are urgently needed. By addressing collective responsibility, prioritizing restoration over retribution, and empowering local peacebuilders, it offers pathways out of the current impasse that conventional IHL cannot provide. As this case study shows, only by recognizing both peoples' interconnected humanity - the essence of Ubuntu - can sustainable justice emerge from this generations-long tragedy.

IMPLEMENTATION CHALLENGES AND PATHWAYS FOR UCR-IHL IN THE ISRAELI-HAMAS CONTEXT

The application of Ubuntu-Based Collective Responsibility (UCR-IHL) to the Israeli-Hamas conflict presents both profound opportunities and significant challenges that require careful consideration. At the conceptual level, the theory's emphasis on communal accountability must navigate the well-established framework of individual criminal responsibility that dominates contemporary international law. The Rome Statute's foundational principle of individual culpability creates inherent tensions with UCR-IHL's collective approach, particularly in contexts like Gaza where political and military leadership structures are deeply intertwined. This tension becomes especially acute when considering how to hold Hamas's decision-making bodies accountable without falling into the trap of collective punishment that the theory explicitly rejects. However, as emerging scholarship on transitional justice suggests, these apparent contradictions may be resolved through complementary processes that combine individual prosecutions with community-level truth and reconciliation mechanisms (Nabiebu, 2023).

Political realities in the region pose equally significant obstacles to implementation. Israel's historical resistance to international judicial oversight, particularly regarding its military operations in Gaza, creates substantial barriers to any external justice mechanisms. Simultaneously, Hamas's governance approach, which often blurs the lines between political and armed wings of the movement, complicates efforts to establish clear accountability processes. These political challenges are compounded by the physical separation between Israeli and Palestinian communities, with the blockade regime and separation wall creating literal and psychological barriers to reconciliation. Yet within these constraints, grassroots initiatives have demonstrated remarkable resilience, offering potential models for how UCR-IHL principles might take root even in unfavorable political conditions. Organizations that bring together bereaved families from both sides have maintained dialogue through multiple cycles of violence, suggesting that community-based reconciliation can persist despite political opposition (Chaitin, 2021).

The asymmetric power dynamics between Israel and Hamas present another layer of complexity for implementing restorative justice approaches. Israel's military superiority and Hamas's political control over Gaza create fundamentally unequal conditions for any reconciliation process. This imbalance raises critical questions about whether genuine restorative justice is possible when one party holds significantly more power than the other. Some scholars argue that power asymmetries must first be addressed before meaningful reconciliation can occur, while others maintain that restorative processes themselves can begin to rebalance relationships over time (Falk, 2021). In practice, this might involve starting with less politically charged issues where cooperation is more feasible, such as joint environmental projects or humanitarian initiatives, before addressing core political disputes.

Cultural and religious differences add further dimensions to the implementation challenge. While Ubuntu philosophy shares important common ground with both Jewish and Palestinian traditions of conflict resolution, these parallels cannot mask deep theological and cultural differences that shape each community's understanding of justice. The Jewish concept of teshuvah (repentance) and the Palestinian practice of sulha (mediation) both emphasize restoration and reconciliation, but they emerge from distinct historical experiences and worldviews that require sensitive navigation (Abu-Nimer, 2003). Religious leaders and cultural interpreters from both communities would need to play central roles in adapting UCR-IHL principles to local contexts, ensuring that any restorative processes resonate authentically with those they aim to serve.

Despite these formidable challenges, potential pathways for implementation do exist. Small-scale pilot programs in mixed communities could test restorative approaches in less politically charged environments before expanding to more contentious areas. Existing legal mechanisms, such as victim participation programs in international courts, might incorporate UCR-IHL principles gradually, creating space for communal accountability within established frameworks. Educational initiatives could introduce Ubuntu ethics to new generations on both sides, planting seeds for long-term cultural change. The global diaspora communities, somewhat removed from daily violence yet deeply connected to the conflict, might serve as important bridges for reconciliation efforts.

The current fragile ceasefire, while precarious, offers a critical opportunity to begin experimenting with these approaches. Historical experience suggests that periods following intense violence often create unexpected openings for innovation in justice mechanisms (Mégret, 2016). By initiating small but meaningful restorative processes during these lulls, practitioners could demonstrate the viability of UCR-IHL approaches before the next inevitable crisis. This might involve supporting existing people-to-people initiatives, documenting their impacts, and using these examples to build broader support for restorative justice at policy levels.

Ultimately, implementing UCR-IHL in this context requires moving beyond conventional approaches to justice and conflict resolution. The theory's emphasis on interconnectedness and mutual responsibility challenges the zero-sum thinking that has dominated the Israeli-Hamas conflict for generations. While the path forward is undoubtedly difficult, the alternative—perpetual cycles of violence met with increasingly ineffective legal responses—is morally unacceptable and practically unsustainable. The profound wisdom of Ubuntu philosophy, combined with the resilience of local

peacebuilders, may yet point the way toward a more just and sustainable future for both peoples.

CONCLUSION: TOWARD A TRANSFORMATIVE JUSTICE PARADIGM FOR THE ISRAELI-HAMAS CONFLICT

The Israeli-Hamas conflict stands as a sobering testament to the limitations of conventional international humanitarian law in addressing protracted asymmetric warfare. After seven decades of cyclical violence, repeated ceasefire violations, and failed peace initiatives, it has become abundantly clear that new approaches to justice and accountability are urgently needed. Ubuntu-Based Collective Responsibility in International Humanitarian Law (UCR-IHL) offers precisely such an innovative framework—one that moves beyond the narrow confines of individual culpability to address the systemic and communal dimensions of this intractable conflict.

At its core, the Israeli-Hamas conflict represents a profound rupture in human interconnectedness—the very foundation of Ubuntu philosophy. Where Ubuntu teaches that "I am because we are," the conflict has institutionalized mutual denial of this shared humanity through policies of separation, blockade, and recurring violence. Traditional legal approaches have failed to heal this rupture because they focus narrowly on assigning blame for discrete violations while ignoring the historical trauma, collective narratives, and institutional structures that perpetuate the conflict (Bar-Tal, 2013). UCR-IHL's great contribution lies in its capacity to address these deeper dimensions through its three interlocking principles of communal accountability, restorative justice, and preventive obligations.

The theory's emphasis on communal accountability provides crucial tools for examining how entire societies become complicit in cycles of violence. In the Israeli context, this means looking beyond individual soldiers or commanders to consider how legislative decisions, public opinion, and institutional cultures enable military policies that violate international law. For Hamas, it involves examining how governance choices and ideological indoctrination contribute to civilian suffering. This broader conception of responsibility does not absolve individuals of culpability but rather situates their actions within larger collective frameworks that must be transformed for lasting peace to emerge (Nabiebu, 2023).

Restorative justice, as envisioned by UCR-IHL, offers a path out of the current impasse where legal actions are perceived as victor's justice by the opposing side. The ICC's investigations, while important for establishing individual accountability, have been rejected by Israel as biased while failing to satisfy Palestinian aspirations for justice. A restorative approach could complement these efforts by creating spaces for mutual acknowledgment of suffering, cooperative reparations programs, and community-based reconciliation initiatives. The remarkable work of grassroots groups like Combatants for Peace demonstrates that even amid ongoing conflict, former enemies can find common ground through shared recognition of mutual humanity (Chaitin, 2021).

The preventive obligations dimension of UCR-IHL may hold particular promise for breaking the conflict's destructive cycles. Rather than waiting for violations to occur and then reacting, this principle emphasizes proactive community-based prevention through early warning systems, cross-border mediation networks, and joint civilian peacebuilding initiatives. Such approaches could help de-escalate tensions before they erupt into full-scale violence, addressing one of the conflict's most persistent patterns. Implementing

UCR-IHL in this context will undoubtedly face significant challenges, from political resistance to logistical barriers. Yet the alternative—continuing with approaches that have consistently failed to deliver either justice or peace—is morally and practically untenable. Small-scale pilot programs, gradual legal reforms, and educational initiatives can begin laying the groundwork for more comprehensive implementation over time. The global community has both a moral obligation and practical interest in supporting these efforts.

Ultimately, the Israeli-Hamas conflict demands nothing less than a paradigm shift in how we conceptualize justice in protracted asymmetric conflicts. UCR-IHL provides the framework for such a transformation—one that recognizes the interconnectedness of all parties, addresses the systemic roots of violence, and prioritizes healing over retribution. While the path forward will be long and difficult, the theory's profound wisdom, grounded in African philosophy yet universally relevant, may yet light the way toward a more just and peaceful future for both Israelis and Palestinians. As Archbishop Desmond Tutu, who brought Ubuntu principles to South Africa's truth and reconciliation process, often reminded us: "Without forgiveness, there is no future" (Tutu, 1999). For the Israeli and Palestinian people, that future remains worth striving for.

REFERENCES

- Abu-Nimer, M. (2003). *Nonviolence and peace building in Islam*. University Press of Florida.
- Amnesty International. (2019). *Great March of Return: A reckless Israeli policy using excessive force against Palestinian demonstrators*. <https://www.amnesty.org>
- Bar-Tal, D. (2013). *Intractable conflicts: Socio-psychological foundations and dynamics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Chaitin, J. (2021). *The dialogic approach in the Israeli-Palestinian context*. Springer.
- Drumbl, M. A. (2018). *Atrocity, punishment, and international law* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Falk, R. (2021). *Human rights horizons: The pursuit of justice in a globalizing world*. Routledge.
- Hass, A. (2020). *The trauma of genocide: The long-term psychological consequences*. Yale University Press.
- Lederach, J. P. (2005). *The moral imagination: The art and soul of building peace*. Oxford University Press.
- Mégret, F. (2016). The humanitarian problem with international criminal justice. *International Review of the Red Cross*, 98(3), 799-823. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S181638311700035X>
- Nabiebu, M. (2023). *Ubuntu-based collective responsibility in international humanitarian law* [Unpublished manuscript].
- OHCHR. (2021). *Report on the 2021 escalation in the OPT and Israel* (UN Doc. A/HRC/48/84). United Nations.
- Ramose, M. B. (2002). *African philosophy through Ubuntu*. Mond Books.
- Shany, Y. (2021). The ICC and the Israel-Palestine situation: Between law and geopolitics. *International Criminal Law Review*, 21(3), 412-439. <https://doi.org/10.1163/15718123-bja10065>
- Tutu, D. (1999). *No future without forgiveness*. Image.
- Weizman, E. (2017). *Hollow land: Israel's architecture of occupation* (2nd ed.). Verso.