

## **IAGS Resolution on the Situation in Gaza<sup>1</sup>**

*Recognising* that, since the horrific Hamas-led attack of 7 October 2023, which itself constitutes international crimes, the government of Israel has engaged in systematic and widespread crimes against humanity, war crimes and genocide, including indiscriminate and deliberate attacks against the civilians and civilian infrastructure (hospitals, homes, commercial buildings, etc.) of Gaza, which, according to official UN estimates, at the date of this resolution, has killed more than 59,000 adults and children in Gaza;

*Recognising* that these crimes are estimated to have left many thousands of people buried under the rubble or otherwise inaccessible, and most probably dead; *Recognising* that this bombing and other violence is estimated to have injured more than 143,000 people, with many maimed;

*Recognising* that the actions of the Israeli government against Palestinians have included torture, arbitrary detention, and sexual and reproductive violence; deliberate attacks on medical professionals, humanitarian aid workers and journalists; and the deliberate deprivation of food, water, medicine, and electricity essential to the survival of the population;

*Recognising* that Israel has forcibly displaced nearly all of the 2.3 million Palestinians in the Gaza Strip multiple times, and demolished more than 90 percent of the housing infrastructure in the territory;

*Recognising* that the consequences of these crimes have included destroying entire families and multiple generations of Palestinians;

*Recognising* that Israel has destroyed schools, universities, libraries, museums, and archives, all of them essential to the continued existence of Palestinian collective well-being and identity;

*Recognising* that Israel has killed or injured more than 50,000 children and that this destruction of a substantial part of a group constitutes genocide, as emphasized in a joint declaration of intervention in the International Court of Justice case of *The Gambia v Myanmar* by six countries—Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, the Netherlands, and the United Kingdom—which states “that children form a substantial part of the groups protected by the Genocide Convention, and that the targeting of children provides an indication of the intention to destroy a group as such, at least in part. Children are essential to the survival of any group as such, since the physical destruction of the group is assured where it is unable to regenerate itself.”;

*Recognising* that Israeli governmental leaders, war cabinet ministers, and senior army officers have made explicit statements of “intent to destroy”, characterizing Palestinians in Gaza as a whole as enemies and “human animals” and stating the intention of inflicting “maximum damage” on Gaza, “flattening Gaza,” and turning Gaza into “hell”;

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://genocidescholars.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/08/IAGS-Resolution-on-Gaza-FINAL.pdf>.

*Recognising* that Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu has endorsed the current US President's plan to forcibly expel all Palestinians from the Gaza Strip, with no right of return, in what Navi Pillay, head of the UN Commission of Inquiry on the Occupied Palestinian Territory, has said amounts to ethnic cleansing;

*Recognising* that the deliberate destruction of agricultural fields, food warehouses, and bakeries and other violence that prevents food production, in conjunction with denial and restriction of humanitarian aid, indicate the intentional infliction of unlivable conditions resulting in starvation of Palestinians in Gaza;

*Acknowledging that, on 21 November 2024, the International Criminal Court issued arrest warrants for Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu and former Defense Minister Yoav Gallant of Israel, in the court's ongoing investigation opened on 3 March 2021, of crimes committed on Palestinian territory since 13 June 2014, charging them with crimes identified in the Rome Statute, in the Gaza Strip from at least 8 October 2023, including the starvation of civilians, intentionally directing attacks against a civilian population, murder, and persecution;*

*Whereas* Israel's actions in response to the October 7 attack and subsequent holding of hostages have not only been directed against the Hamas group responsible for these, but have also targeted the entire Gazan population;

*Acknowledging* that the International Court of Justice found in three provisional measures order in the case of South Africa v. Israel — January, March, and May 2024 — that it is plausible that Israel is committing genocide in its attack in Gaza and ordered Israel to take all measures within its power to prevent and punish the direct and public incitement of genocide and to ensure the provision of humanitarian assistance to civilians in Gaza;

*Acknowledging* that leading global international law organizations and UN bodies, including Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch, Forensic Architecture, DAWN, B'Tselem and Physicians for Human Rights, and the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Occupied Palestinian Territories, have conducted extensive investigations and issued reports concluding that Israel is committing genocide in Gaza;

*Acknowledging* that a number of Israeli, Palestinian, Jewish, and other scholarly experts working in Holocaust and Genocide Studies and in International Law have concluded that Israeli governmental and military actions constitute genocide;

*Acknowledging* that international civil society has a responsibility to prevent genocide by encouraging and assisting states to fulfil their obligations under the Genocide Convention to prevent, suppress, and punish genocide;

*Acknowledging* that putative security measures against members of a group are often pretext for mass killing and genocide as it has become in this case;

Therefore, the International Association of Genocide Scholars:

*Declares* that Israel's policies and actions in Gaza meet the legal definition of genocide in Article II of the United Nations Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (1948);

*Declares* that Israel's policies and actions in Gaza constitute war crimes and crimes against humanity as defined in international humanitarian law and the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court;

*Calls upon* the government of Israel to immediately cease all acts that constitute genocide, war crimes and crimes against humanity against Palestinians in Gaza, including deliberate attacks against and killing of civilians including children; starvation; deprivation of humanitarian aid, water, fuel, and other items essential to the survival of the population; sexual and reproductive violence; and forced displacement of the population;

*Calls upon* the government of Israel to comply with the Provisional Measures orders of the International Court of Justice;

*Calls upon* the state parties of the International Criminal Court to comply with their obligations, cooperate with the Court, and surrender any individual subject to an arrest warrant;

*Calls upon* all states to actively pursue policies to ensure respect for their obligations under international law, including under the Genocide Convention, the Arms Trade Treaty and international humanitarian law, with regards to Israel and Palestine;

and

*Calls upon* the government of Israel and all other United Nations members to support a process of repair and transitional justice that will afford democracy, freedom, dignity, and security for all people of Gaza.

Current as of 28 July 2025

Resolution passed 31 August 2025

### **Reactions to IAGS resolution on Gaza<sup>2</sup>**

Since the IAGS Gaza Resolution passed, there has been very broad interest by other scholars, from media outlets worldwide (e.g. [here](#), [here](#), [here](#), [here](#), and [here](#)), as well as at the [United Nations](#). Many Executive Board members also spoke directly to international media regarding the resolution, including its process and outcome. For instance, in English ([here](#), [here](#), [here](#), [here](#)), Arabic ([here](#)), French ([here](#)), German, and Spanish. This shows the

---

<sup>2</sup> <https://genocidescholars.org/reactions-to-iags-resolution-on-gaza/>.

important voice that IAGS has on the issue and reinforces the value of our association passing resolutions. While feedback has been overwhelmingly positive, there have also been attacks on social media as well as negative media coverage. As such broad attention is unusual, the IAGS EB would like to address some responses to the passing of the IAGS Gaza Resolution.

- The IAGS Gaza Resolution was passed through the standard process that has been applied to other resolutions, conforming with the IAGS By-Laws (which were themselves voted on by the membership). The resolution was subject to rigorous peer review through the Resolutions Committee, the Executive Board and the Advisory Board, going through multiple rounds of revision. Members were given 30 days to vote, with everyone receiving a personal vote, and multiple reminders sent out about the vote. Voting was anonymous, as is standard with any voting in IAGS. Members are encouraged, but not forced, to vote. The figure of membership who voted (28%) is within the usual range of votes received for a resolution, which falls between 25-34%. To pass, a resolution must receive at least two-thirds majority of those voting in favour, and this was well exceeded, with 86% voting in favour of the resolution. Town halls are not required by the by-laws, and have typically been hosted by resolution authors as educational sessions for historical events about which members might have little knowledge.
- IAGS has been the subject of a campaign to spam our membership, including with offensive fake names and email addresses (including of genocide perpetrators such as ‘Adolf Hitler’ or email addresses such as ‘fuckiags@retards’). As a result, the membership join option has been temporarily suspended.
- The Executive Board has also made the decision to temporarily disable the member directory, public and private, for the protection of IAGS members, out of concern for members potentially being targeted. The Executive Board is working closely with our IT team to assist with this issue, and will re-enable functions as soon as practicable and safe. Our primary priority is the safety of our members.
- The IAGS general email and members of the Executive Board have received a great deal of abusive hate mail and social media posts this week. Such responses are clearly unacceptable, and create an environment of harassment, bullying, and abuse. This has caused great stress and anxiety to members of the Executive Board. The work of the Resolutions Committee has also been the target of unfounded disparaging accusations. All members of IAGS are subject to the IAGS Code of Practice, which requires members to be treated with respect and courtesy. The Code of Practice also states: “Members must behave responsibly and ensure they conduct themselves in a manner which will not injure the reputation of the Association, its events, organisers, participants, or sponsors. All members must show integrity and professionalism in their conduct with IAGS and all other IAGS members.” This includes respect for members of any IAGS Boards and Committees, who give a great deal of their time on a voluntary basis to making IAGS a functional, active, and inclusive community. Breaches of the Code of Practice are subject to disciplinary action. If any members have been subject to abuse by another IAGS member and would like to make a complaint, please contact the Executive Board.
- IAGS’ membership is designed to be open to all who are committed to working on issues pertaining to genocide from a variety of disciplines and perspectives. We aim to be inclusive and democratic by keeping the door open to artists, advocates, independent

scholars, Indigenous scholars, global majority scholars, marginalized communities, and survivors. The goal is to include voices of those who may not have PhDs, official institutional affiliation, or the financial means to access “conventional” education that often privileges Global North forms of expertise. It is intended to circumvent any ivory tower privilege or gate keeping. IAGS’ membership is predominantly made up of scholars/academics from a wide range of disciplines, and with experts in the fields of genocide prevention, education and punishment, such as policymakers, NGO representatives and legal professionals. This is one of the significant advantages of IAGS, providing a networking opportunity between scholars and those in the practice of genocide prevention and punishment. Another dimension of IAGS inclusivity of expertise is the desire to make sure artists, community scholars, NGOs, survivors, and others, have a role in the overall work on education and prevention. We want to build a community of different populations with complimentary areas of focus and experience. If we err, it’s on the side of inclusivity. No system is perfect, but ours reflects our value of inclusion. The fact that this very democratic, inclusive policy is being exploited and criticised by trolls demonstrates their ignorance at the structures of scholarly organizations, and flies in the face of IAGS’ values (which attempts to include and champion minority voices/global majority voices that may not “look like” what we expect “expertise” to be). Some of these criticisms have amounted to racist attacks, by criticising IAGS for having a large percentage of members from the Middle East and Africa. IAGS values its diverse membership from around the world, and rejects this racist framing of our diverse membership as a negative aspect of our association.

- The goal of diversity and inclusivity in IAGS’ membership is also reflected in the affordable membership price options, which enable scholars to join who may otherwise be prohibited from joining due to financial constraints. IAGS is proud of offering affordable membership options to ensure diversity of membership.

Finally, we would like to reiterate that the overwhelming feedback on the resolution has been positive, engaged and supportive. We thank all those who participated in the resolutions process, to those who have reached out in support over the last few days and expressed that – however they voted in the resolution – they value IAGS as a community.

The IAGS Executive Board, 4 September 2025

September 5, 2025

## Reactions to IAGS resolution on Gaza<sup>1</sup>

Since the IAGS Gaza Resolution passed, there has been very broad interest by other scholars, from media outlets worldwide (e.g. [here](#), [here](#), [here](#), [here](#), and [here](#)), as well as at the [United Nations](#). Many Executive Board members also spoke directly to international media regarding the resolution, including its process and outcome. For instance, in English ([here](#), [here](#), [here](#), [here](#)), Arabic ([here](#)), French ([here](#)), German, and Spanish. This shows the important voice that IAGS has on the issue and reinforces the value of our association passing resolutions. While feedback has been overwhelmingly positive, there have also been attacks on social media as well as negative media coverage. As such broad attention is unusual, the IAGS EB would like to address some responses to the passing of the IAGS Gaza Resolution.

- The IAGS Gaza Resolution was passed through the standard process that has been applied to other resolutions, conforming with the [IAGS By-Laws](#) (which were themselves voted on by the membership). The resolution was subject to rigorous peer review through the Resolutions Committee, the Executive Board and the Advisory Board, going through multiple rounds of revision. Members were given 30 days to vote, with everyone receiving a personal vote, and multiple reminders sent out about the vote. Voting was anonymous, as is standard with any voting in IAGS. Members are encouraged, but not forced, to vote. The figure of membership who voted (28%) is within the usual range of votes received for a resolution, which falls between 25-34%. To pass, a resolution must receive at least two-thirds majority of those voting in favour, and this was well exceeded, with 86% voting in favour of the resolution. Town halls are not required by the by-laws, and have typically been hosted by resolution authors as educational sessions for historical events about which members might have little knowledge.
- IAGS has been the subject of a campaign to spam our membership, including with offensive fake names and email addresses (including of genocide perpetrators such as ‘Adolf Hitler’ or email addresses such as ‘fuckiags@retards’). As a result, the membership join option has been temporarily suspended.
- The Executive Board has also made the decision to temporarily disable the member directory, public and private, for the protection of IAGS members, out of concern for members potentially being targeted. The Executive Board is working closely with our IT team to assist with this issue, and will re-enable functions as soon as practicable and safe. Our primary priority is the safety of our members.
- The IAGS general email and members of the Executive Board have received a great deal of abusive hate mail and social media posts this week. Such responses are clearly unacceptable, and create an environment of harassment, bullying, and abuse. This has caused great stress and anxiety to members of the Executive Board. The work of the Resolutions Committee has also been the target of unfounded disparaging accusations. All members of IAGS are subject to the [IAGS Code of Practice](#), which requires members to be treated with respect and courtesy. The Code of Practice also states: “Members must behave responsibly and ensure they conduct themselves in a manner which will not injure the reputation of the Association, its events, organisers, participants, or sponsors. All

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://genocidescholars.org/reactions-to-iags-resolution-on-gaza/>.

members must show integrity and professionalism in their conduct with IAGS and all other IAGS members.” This includes respect for members of any IAGS Boards and Committees, who give a great deal of their time on a voluntary basis to making IAGS a functional, active, and inclusive community. Breaches of the Code of Practice are subject to disciplinary action. If any members have been subject to abuse by another IAGS member and would like to make a complaint, please contact the Executive Board.

- IAGS’ membership is designed to be open to all who are committed to working on issues pertaining to genocide from a variety of disciplines and perspectives. We aim to be inclusive and democratic by keeping the door open to artists, advocates, independent scholars, Indigenous scholars, global majority scholars, marginalized communities, and survivors. The goal is to include voices of those who may not have PhDs, official institutional affiliation, or the financial means to access “conventional” education that often privileges Global North forms of expertise. It is intended to circumvent any ivory tower privilege or gate keeping. IAGS’ membership is predominantly made up of scholars/academics from a wide range of disciplines, and with experts in the fields of genocide prevention, education and punishment, such as policymakers, NGO representatives and legal professionals. This is one of the significant advantages of IAGS, providing a networking opportunity between scholars and those in the practice of genocide prevention and punishment. Another dimension of IAGS inclusivity of expertise is the desire to make sure artists, community scholars, NGOs, survivors, and others, have a role in the overall work on education and prevention. We want to build a community of different populations with complimentary areas of focus and experience. If we err, it’s on the side of inclusivity. No system is perfect, but ours reflects our value of inclusion. The fact that this very democratic, inclusive policy is being exploited and criticised by trolls demonstrates their ignorance at the structures of scholarly organizations, and flies in the face of IAGS’ values (which attempts to include and champion minority voices/global majority voices that may not “look like” what we expect “expertise” to be). Some of these criticisms have amounted to racist attacks, by criticising IAGS for having a large percentage of members from the Middle East and Africa. IAGS values its diverse membership from around the world, and rejects this racist framing of our diverse membership as a negative aspect of our association.
- The goal of diversity and inclusivity in IAGS’ membership is also reflected in the affordable membership price options, which enable scholars to join who may otherwise be prohibited from joining due to financial constraints. IAGS is proud of offering affordable membership options to ensure diversity of membership.

Finally, we would like to reiterate that the overwhelming feedback on the resolution has been positive, engaged and supportive. We thank all those who participated in the resolutions process, to those who have reached out in support over the last few days and expressed that – however they voted in the resolution – they value IAGS as a community.

The IAGS Executive Board, 4 September 2025

September 5, 2025

## **Legal analysis of the conduct of Israel in Gaza pursuant to the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide**

### **VIII. Conclusions**

251. The Commission's analysis in this report relates solely to the determination of genocide under the Genocide Convention as it relates to the responsibility of the State of Israel both for the failure to prevent genocide, for committing genocide against the Palestinians in Gaza since October 2023 and for the failure to punish genocide. The Commission also notes that, while its analysis is limited to the Palestinians specifically in Gaza during the period since 7 October 2023, it nevertheless raises the serious concern that the specific intent to destroy the Palestinians as a whole has extended to the rest of the occupied Palestinian territory, that is, the West Bank, including East Jerusalem, based on Israeli authorities' and Israeli security forces' actions therein, and to the period before 7 October 2023. The events in Gaza since 7 October 2023 have not occurred in isolation, as the Commission has noted. They were preceded by decades of unlawful occupation and repression under an ideology requiring the removal of the Palestinian population from their lands and its replacement.

252. The Commission concludes on reasonable grounds that the Israeli authorities and Israeli security forces have committed and are continuing to commit the following actus reus of genocide against the Palestinians in the Gaza Strip, namely (i) killing members of the group; (ii) causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group; (iii) deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part; and (iv) imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group.

253. On incitement to genocide, the Commission concludes that Israeli President Isaac Herzog, Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu and then Defence Minister Yoav Gallant, have incited the commission of genocide and that Israeli authorities have failed to take action against them to punish this incitement. The Commission has not fully assessed statements by other Israeli political and military leaders, including Minister for National Security Itamar Ben-Gvir and Minister for Finance Bezalel Smotrich, and considers that they too should be assessed to determine whether they constitute incitement to commit genocide.

254. On the mens rea of genocide, the Commission concludes that statements made by Israeli authorities are direct evidence of genocidal intent. In addition, the Commission concludes that the pattern of conduct is circumstantial evidence of genocidal intent and that genocidal intent was the only reasonable inference that could be drawn from the totality of the evidence. Thus, the Commission concludes that the Israeli authorities and Israeli security forces have had and continue to have the genocidal intent to destroy, in whole or in part, the Palestinians in the Gaza Strip.

255. The Commission concludes that the State of Israel bears responsibility for the failure to prevent genocide, the commission of genocide and the failure to punish genocide against the Palestinians in the Gaza Strip.

## **Position Paper Destruction of Conditions of Life: A Health Analysis of the Gaza Genocide**

### **5. Conclusion**

110. Taken together, the facts and arguments presented above demonstrate that Israel's conduct satisfies three key acts enumerated in Article II of the Genocide Convention. In our area of expertise - the right to health - the legal and moral conclusion is unavoidable. The destruction of life-sustaining systems, the cumulative patterns of destruction, the bodily and mental trauma inflicted, and the direct killing of civilians, when understood in light of the implemented policy and the public rhetoric, make clear that Israel's campaign in Gaza constitutes genocide under international law.

111. We thus conclude that, based on the available evidence and the applicable legal standards under the Genocide Convention:

- Israel is committing acts under Article II(a), (b), and (c), including killing, inflicting serious bodily and mental harm, and deliberately imposing conditions of life intended to destroy the Palestinian population in Gaza, in whole or in part;
- There is sufficient evidence to establish that these acts are carried out with the specific intent required by Article II.

112. As an organization committed to the right to health and the principles of international humanitarian and human rights law, we are acutely aware of the limitations of compliance, let alone enforcement, within the international system. Despite multiple binding decisions and provisional measures issued by the ICJ, Israel has, to date, failed to comply with its obligations under international law, including those arising under the Genocide Convention. Third parties have generally not played a sufficient role in enforcing the underlying international rules. The international institutions entrusted with preventing and punishing genocide have been slow to act decisively, and their ability to enforce accountability remains uncertain.

113. Nonetheless, we believe that this determination's legal and moral weight cannot remain confined to expert forums. We call upon the relevant international bodies to initiate appropriate proceedings and investigations as mandated by international law. We further call upon states to act in accordance with their obligations under Article I of the Genocide Convention. While prevention may no longer be a real possibility, we remain concerned that the genocidal campaign is not over. Alongside the need for accountability and punishment, third parties should realize their duty to terminate it.

114. We recognize that the task of confronting genocide cannot be borne by legal institutions alone. In our domain - the protection of life, health, and dignity - we call for the mobilization of a global network of solidarity, especially among health professionals, humanitarian actors, and

---

<sup>2</sup> Authors: Prof. Itamar Mann, Aseel Aburass, Tirza Leibowitz, Guy Shalev. Physicians for Human Rights Israel (PHRI) is an Israel-based human rights organization working to advance the right to health for all under Israel's control, including Palestinians in the West Bank and Gaza, individuals without legal status in Israel, people held in Israeli incarceration facilities, and residents of Israel's social and geographic periphery. For over 37 years, PHRI has documented Israel's human rights violations and exposed the ways in which occupation and apartheid structurally undermine Palestinian health and dignity.

institutions charged with preserving public health. The destruction of Gaza's medical system, its urban and environmental collapse, and the deliberate targeting of the conditions necessary for human survival are matters that concern the global health community no less than the legal one.

## **Critici la adresa IAGS Resolution on the Situation in Gaza**

Scholars for Truth about Genocide, 5 September 2025

### **Legal, Antisemitism, History, Holocaust, and Genocide Scholars, Former Prosecutors, and Other Authorities including Descendants of Survivors, call on International Association of Genocide Scholars (IAGS) to Retract Resolution Accusing Israel of Genocide Amid Clear Misapplication of Law and History<sup>3</sup>**

On behalf of the undersigned individuals and organizations who exist to educate about antisemitism, international law, the Holocaust and genocide, and who cumulatively and actively work to enhance the prevention of genocide, we find that the International Association of Genocide Scholars (“IAGS”) resolution fails to accurately apply the law and facts of the war in Gaza.

Moreover, we are alarmed by the process that was taken to pass the resolution with reported promises of town-halls and dissenting opinions to be published, and those promises being broken. The resolution was passed with a total of 129 voting members, and about 107 voting in favor, out of over 500 members. The quieting of dissent is an alarming tactic used on such a controversial matter.

Genocide is the gravest offense known to humankind; to dilute its legal standards for ideological ends is a form of moral violence. It dishonors the memory of past victims, misleads the public about present atrocities, and obstructs efforts to avert future ones.

On October 7, 2023, Hamas invaded Israel and acted with the intent to destroy, in whole or in part, Jews and Israelis, as a national, ethnical, racial, or religious group, as such. Further, Hamas and their allied organizations took innocent people hostage and continue to hold hostages.

Thus, Hamas committed the crime of genocide and remains the only party to legally meet the requirements of the elements of the crime of genocide.

It is undoubtedly true that the war in Gaza has harmed a large number of people who would not have been harmed or killed but for this war. It is understood from available information that the death toll includes those who have been killed by both Israel and Hamas. It is further understood that Hamas has utilized the practice of human shielding as a systematic strategy to attempt to immunize itself from harm and to increase the harm of Palestinian civilians. This is a war crime committed by Hamas against the Palestinian people in Gaza.

---

<sup>3</sup> <https://www.scholarsfortruthaboutgenocide.com/>.

The IAGS resolution imparts that *all* of the deaths that have occurred in Gaza are a result of Israel's conduct, and acts as a means to excuse Hamas from having agency for its own actions.

Further, the IAGS resolution stipulates without any justification that Israel has committed “indiscriminate and deliberate attacks against the civilians and civilian infrastructure (hospitals, homes, commercial buildings, etc.).” However, to make such a conclusion requires the negation of Hamas' well-documented use of civilian and humanitarian infrastructure for the purpose of waging war. It is well-established that Hamas has weaponized hospitals, mosques, schools, civilian homes, even humanitarian zones. Under various provisions of international law, including but not limited to the Fourth Geneva Convention's articles 19 & 28, and the Additional Protocol I to the Geneva Convention's article 51(7), this conduct would cause such places to lose the protections that they would normally benefit from.

Hamas members have openly admitted to this strategy. It has been repeatedly shown that Hamas has warned civilians to not leave Gaza City. Ignoring Hamas' conduct only causes more harm to Palestinian civilians who are meant to be protected.

The IAGS resolution further states: “*Recognising* that Israel has killed or injured more than 50,000 children and that this destruction of a substantial part of a group constitutes genocide.” What it misses is that Hamas allegedly utilizes children as combatants, and that children make up about 50% of Gaza's population, a significantly higher proportion than nearly any other place in the world. This would cause problems in the analysis of “significant portion” when the total number of deaths and injuries in Gaza, as of the writing of this statement, constitute 224,217 total casualties (total deaths reported 63,557 and total injuries reported 160,660 per Palestinian media sources). Resulting in 22% of total casualties being children, well under the proportion of children in the population in Gaza. What's important to further note about the casualty numbers is that it includes a significant portion of combatant casualties without differentiation between civilians and combatants.

The IAGS resolution further cites the issuance of arrest warrants by the International Criminal Court (“ICC”) for Prime Minister Netanyahu and former Defense Minister, Yoav Gallant, while ignoring that the ICC's Pre-Trial Chamber I (“PTC I”) expressly rejected the warrants for Netanyahu and Gallant for the crime against humanity of extermination, a lower threshold crime, saying: “On the basis of material presented by the Prosecution covering the period until 20 May 2024, the Chamber could not determine that all elements of the crime against humanity of extermination were met.”

The authors of the IAGS resolution further state that the International Court of Justice (“ICJ”) determined in the first provisional measures in the *South Africa v. Israel* case that Israel's actions were “plausibly genocide.” *However, this grossly misrepresents what the ICJ determined and is a misstatement of the plausibility determination. The ICJ correctly found that Palestinians, as a distinct national group, have plausible rights under the Genocide Convention that can plausibly be infringed, not that genocide had been committed.* The author of that decision, ex-ICJ president, Joan Donoghue, clarified the matter on the BBC.

Even further, the IAGS resolution cites various organizations that have accused Israel of genocide by, as put by B'Tselem, “adopt[ing] a broader analytical framework.” This “broadening” of the analytical framework exists to stretch the required intent from *dolus specialis* to a more inclusive intent such as *dolus eventualis*, where a party knew that their conduct could cause some harm but not necessarily act with the intent to cause that harm.

All of these accusations willfully ignore the established jurisprudence around the Genocide Convention and the commission of the crime of genocide. In *Bosnia v. Serbia* (2007) para. 373, the ICJ stated: “The *dolus specialis*, the specific intent to destroy the group in whole or in part, has to be convincingly shown by reference to particular circumstances, unless a general plan to that end can be convincingly demonstrated to exist; and for a pattern of conduct to be accepted as evidence of its existence, it would have to be such that it could *only* (emphasis added) point to the existence of such intent.”

In Gaza, there are numerous other plausible explanations for the intent of military operations in Gaza. From Hamas’ weaponization of civilian and humanitarian infrastructure, their documented booby-trapping of buildings, the tunnels that are longer than the London Underground, to the continued holding of hostages.

Another critical failure of the IAGS resolution is that it not only fails to establish the elements of genocide, it does not set the legal standard for which genocide must be proven. Genocide at the ICJ must be proven fully conclusively, meaning there can be no other possible explanation. Because other reasonable explanations exist to Israeli conduct in relation to understanding Hamas’ conduct and its legal obligations, it cannot be that the legal standard has been met. Since the legal standard cannot be met, it cannot thus be considered to be genocide under any application of the law until such time that standard is met.

Another fatal error of the IAGS resolution is that it fails to consider the steps that Israel itself has taken to prevent civilian harm. It assumes without justification that Israel’s conduct must be genocidal while ignoring the conduct of Hamas. Numerous non-Israelis have entered Gaza and observed first-hand IDF targeting protocols to determine adherence to the legal standards and have yet to conclude that Israel is engaging in wilful violations of international law. Further, information has been collected that has demonstrated that early in the war Israel tightened its proportionality assessments to reduce civilian harm.

It is critical that we not water down the legal elements of genocide for the purpose of advancing ideological positions and bias. Holocaust and genocide scholars can have legitimate concerns about Israeli conduct in Gaza without working to disparage the very legal standards that exist to protect people from these crimes. The IAGS resolution neglects to impart any culpability for the consequences of Hamas’ own actions, attempting to force such responsibility onto Israel. Without demanding agency for Hamas’ actions, it is difficult to ascertain genocidal conduct.

The genocide allegation has been soundly and persuasively rejected by leading scholars, retired western military authorities, war crimes prosecutors, and other observers.

Finally, the IAGS never mentions that this war could end if Hamas were to release all of the hostages they continue to illegally hold in Gaza and lay down their weapons.

For these reasons, we demand that the IAGS immediately rescind its resolution. To persist in such distortion is to forsake the most elementary standards of law and scholarship. It reduces the Association to farce, erodes the integrity of genocide studies, and undermines the very meaning of the crime itself.

As the United Nations General Assembly affirmed in Resolution 96 of 11 December 1946, genocide “shocks the conscience of mankind, results in great losses to humanity in the form of cultural and other contributions...and is contrary to moral law and to the spirit and aims of the United Nations.”

An institution dedicated to Holocaust remembrance and the prevention of atrocity cannot indulge political bias or bad faith misrepresentation of the law, legal negligence without betraying history, dishonoring the victims, and endangering the very future it professes to safeguard.

---

## **ACADEMIC ENGAGEMENT NETWORK<sup>4</sup>**

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE<sup>5</sup>

September 9, 2025

**MORE THAN 500 SCHOLARS AND OTHER PROFESSIONALS DEMAND  
INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF GENOCIDE SCHOLARS RETRACT  
RESOLUTION<sup>6</sup>**

AEN faculty members and legal experts, former prosecutors, spearhead letter demanding IAGS rescind its resolution accusing Israel of committing genocide in Gaza.

WASHINGTON, DC (September 9, 2025) – More than 500 distinguished legal, antisemitism, history, Holocaust, and genocide scholars, former prosecutors, and practitioners today sent a letter condemning the International Association of Genocide Scholars’ (IAGS) recent resolution accusing Israel of committing genocide in Gaza. Academic Engagement Network (AEN) faculty spearheaded a broad campaign to amplify the letter’s impact, including creating Scholars for Truth about Genocide, collecting signatures, and working with colleagues across the country to build support for the statement within the wider genocide-prevention community.

Signatories include Eli Rosenbaum, former US Department of Justice war crimes prosecutor; Jeffrey Mausner, former Nazi war crimes prosecutor with the US Department of Justice; Alan

---

<sup>4</sup> AEN is a national organization that mobilizes networks of university faculty and administrators to counter antisemitism, oppose the denigration of Jewish and Zionist identities, promote academic freedom, and advance education about Israel. More at <https://academicengagement.org/> and <https://www.facultyagainstantisemitism.org/>.

<sup>5</sup> Media Contact: [aen@berlinrosen.com](mailto:aen@berlinrosen.com).

<sup>6</sup> [https://academicengagement.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/09/FINAL\\_AEN-IAGS-Letter-Release\\_-\\_September-9-20252.pdf](https://academicengagement.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/09/FINAL_AEN-IAGS-Letter-Release_-_September-9-20252.pdf).

Dershowitz, prominent civil rights attorney; Norman J.W. Goda, Braman Professor of Holocaust Studies at the University of Florida and an AEN faculty member; The Honorable, Professor Irwin Cotler, former Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada and Canada's first Special Envoy on Combatting Antisemitism and Preserving Holocaust Remembrance, and many more.

The letter denounces a “clear misapplication of law and history” in IAGS’s adoption of the resolution, criticizing the organization for passing it under questionable circumstances – with only 129 members voting, with 107 in favor, among an organization of over 500 members – and for failing to honor earlier pledges to host town halls and publish dissenting views. The letter further asserts that “genocide is the gravest offense known to humankind; to dilute its legal standards for ideological ends is a form of moral violence,” one that “dishonors the memory of past victims, misleads the public about present atrocities, and obstructs efforts to avert future ones.”

Moreover, the letter argues that the IAGS’s resolution distorts both Hamas’s conduct and Israel’s legal obligations, suggesting that all deaths in Gaza are attributable to Israel while erasing Hamas’s role and failing to demand agency for its actions. It underscores Hamas’s use of civilian infrastructure – including hospitals, mosques, schools, homes, and humanitarian zones – for military purposes, which forfeits protected status under the Fourth Geneva Convention. And it further notes that the resolution misrepresents rulings by the International Criminal Court and the International Court of Justice.

“It’s critical that no one abuses the law for ideological gain and bias,” said Elliot Malin, International Humanitarian Attorney and the letter’s lead author.. “The Genocide Convention’s protections were drafted in response to the Nazi’s systemic murders of the Jews, Roma, and others, to prevent the most serious crime imaginable: the intentional destruction of people for who they are. People can have feelings about the war in Gaza and want it to end without weaponizing the Convention when its legal elements have not been met. It is deeply troubling that IAGS misapplied and misrepresented the law – an approach that helps no innocent people and only compounds their suffering. While I am saddened this effort was necessary, I am grateful that serious experts have stepped up to resist this ideological distortion.”

“As a founding member of what became IAGS, I can say unequivocally that this resolution does not reflect the majority of genocide scholars,” said Mia Bloom, Professor of Communication and Middle East Studies at Georgia State University and an AEN faculty member. “Fewer than a third of members voted in favor, and membership itself is no longer limited to serious scholars of genocide. To single out Gaza while remaining silent on the October 7th atrocities, and failing to issue comparable statements on the other cases of mass ethnic violence, IAGS exposed itself as a virtue-signaling, faux academic body rather than a credible scholarly association.”

“The Academic Engagement Network is proud to support and amplify this important letter, which represents the voices of leading legal, historical, and genocide scholars,” said Miriam Elman, Executive Director of AEN. “Our faculty members have been at the forefront of this effort to ensure that IAGS and the wider public understand the gravity of what’s at stake. AEN

stands firmly with our faculty members in affirming that scholarship must be guided by rigorous standards of empirical accuracy and academic integrity, not distorted for ideological ends.”

AEN is comprised of nearly 1,500 faculty members on nearly 350 campuses who combat antisemitism, promote academic freedom, and advance education about Israel. Its Faculty Against Antisemitism Movement (FAAM), launched after October 7th, empowers AEN faculty members, as well as other academics who choose to get involved, to stand against antisemitism, the denigration of Jewish identity, and anti-Israel bias on their campuses and to collectively urge university leaders to take appropriate action. More than 25,000 faculty nationwide have become active in FAAM over the last year.

AEN members across the country have founded groups to publicly speak out against antisemitism and anti-Israel bias, to mentor students, advise university administrators, and host educational programming. Examples include: UCLA’s Jewish Faculty Resilience Group; Yale’s Forum for Jewish Faculty & Friends; UIUC’s Faculty for Academic Freedom and Against Antisemitism; Columbia’s Jewish Faculty and Staff Supporting Israel; George Washington University Faculty and Staff Against Antisemitism and Hate; California State University at Northridge’s Matadors Against Antisemitism; and Indiana University’s Faculty and Staff for Israel. AEN faculty members at UPenn, UCLA, Yale, Harvard, Stanford, Dartmouth, UC Berkeley, the University of Cincinnati, and MIT have also organized faculty solidarity and educational missions to Israel. By networking faculty and sharing materials and best practices, AEN hopes to empower many more of these faculty groups and missions to sprout up across the country

---

American Jewish Committee, September 3, 2025

**Sara E. Brown, “In the Rush to Vilify Israel, Genocide Scholars Ignore the Truth”<sup>7</sup>**

- The resolution also ignores Israel’s *unprecedented measures* to avoid civilian casualties, often giving up the strategic advantage while targeting Hamas terrorists. This is mind-boggling, given that Israel is setting new, vigorous standards of urban warfare that will hopefully change such engagement for the better by reducing civilian casualties.
- Every civilian death in this war is a tragedy, but the data cited in the IAGS resolution not only fails to differentiate between civilians and combatants, but also relies entirely on Hamas-produced statistics. Using reports from a singular biased source is not just academically lazy, it recklessly distorts the data.
- The IAGS resolution also conveniently ignores the publicly stated aims of the Israeli government, which include disarming Hamas, ensuring that terrorists do not govern Gaza again and returning the 48 remaining hostages in order to heal the survivors and properly bury those who were murdered. These aims are not genocidal.

---

<sup>7</sup> <https://www.ajc.org/news/in-the-rush-to-vilify-israel-genocide-scholars-ignore-the-truth>.

- Rather than advance scholarly discourse on a gravely important topic, the political leanings and prejudices of the IAGS leadership mean they have turned away from the mission of the association — to “further research and teaching about the nature, causes, and consequences of genocide.” Instead, they offer fodder to the people who will read this resolution and leverage it to justify hurting Jews

The Washington Institute for Near East Policy, September 2, 2025

### Robert Satloff, "A Charade in Academic Garb"<sup>8</sup>

- Everyone should read the *resolution* approved August 31 by the International Association of Genocide Scholars (IAGS) declaring that “Israel’s policies and actions in Gaza meet the legal definition of genocide.” From its opening paragraph, it reflects what I believe to be one of the most egregious examples of the dereliction of scholarly responsibility in recent history. That’s the one that cites UN statistics for the total number of adults and children killed in Gaza since October 7, 2023, as 59,000, without making any differentiation between combatants and non-combatants. A useful rule of thumb is that any discussion of the Gaza war that fails to separate out the number of just-killed Hamas terrorists from overall fatality statistics is irredeemably flawed...
- Indeed, except for two brief subordinate clauses, Hamas does not appear at all in the resolution—not for its own genocidal acts (which merely earn the one-word description “horrific,” without further detail or condemnation); not for its policy of maximizing its own civilian casualties; not for its systemic embedding within civilian population and infrastructure; not for its failure to provide civilians with access to the underground shelters that protected its fighters; not for its confiscation and hoarding of food designated for civilians, etc. How odd for IAGS, an organization that in March 2016 passed a resolution condemning ISIS for a list of genocidal crimes, every one of which was later committed by Hamas.
- Its findings are totally and completely derivative of the work of others. Those “others” include, for example, Francesca Albanese, the notorious “UN special rapporteur on the situation in the occupied Palestinian territories” accused by the US government of “virulent anti-Semitism and unrelenting anti-Israel bias.” Her work is first cited as proof of torture by the Israel Defense Forces and then as validation of the genocide accusation. And those “others” also include Navi Pillay, the disgraced former chair of the UN Human Rights Council whose Commission of Inquiry on Israel, on which IAGS based its accusation of Israel’s “sexual violence” toward Palestinians and who is cited by name on the charge of “ethnic cleansing,” was roundly rejected by the Biden administration for its extreme bias. Elsewhere, the IAGS resolution not only relied on multiple reports by Human Rights Watch and Amnesty International—organizations that have long shown deep-seated animus toward Israel—but went one step further by inflating the accusations made in those reports. For example, the IAGS resolution accuses Israel of “deliberate” attacks on medical professionals, although the cited HRW report never actually made such a claim.
- Did the 86 percent of IAGS members who voted to endorse it actually read it? Did any of those august scholars take the time to examine its underlying citations? On closer

---

<sup>8</sup> <https://www.washingtoninstitute.org/policy-analysis/charade-academic-garb>.

inspection, that 86 percent number is itself a bit of a ruse. Evidently, only 28 percent of IAGS' approximately 500 members participated in the vote on the resolution. This means that a resolution condemning the Jewish state for "genocide" was approved with the support of only one-fifth—20 percent—of the organization's membership<sup>9</sup>.

---

*Times of Israel*, 5 September 2025

**Menachem Z. Rosensaft, "Why the genocide resolution is fundamentally flawed"<sup>10</sup>**

- My issues with the IAGS resolution are its implacable hostility toward Israel and the fact that it blatantly misstates the law of genocide in a transparent attempt to score points against Israel.
- While the IAGS resolution does make a passing reference at the outset to “the horrific Hamas-led attack of 7 October 2023, which itself constitutes international crimes,” Hamas is then deliberately airbrushed out of the resolution, as if Israel has not been and is not waging a war against that very terrorist organization whose avowed goal is Israel’s utter destruction.
- Nowhere in the IAGS resolution is there even an allusion to, let alone explicit mention of, the facts that it is Hamas, not Israel, that has used Palestinian civilians in Gaza, including children, as human shields; that it was Hamas, not Israel, that established military installations behind schools and hospitals, making them legitimate targets in Israel’s wholly legitimate efforts to eliminate the threat posed by such military installations; that by all reliable accounts, Hamas bears more than its fair share of responsibility for preventing the distribution of humanitarian aid in Gaza.
- I, for one, have seen no evidence of Israelis raping Palestinian women and girls or committing sexual violence against them. We all know, the world knows, that Hamas terrorists savagely raped Israeli women and girls on October 7, 2023, and that Israeli women hostages were sexually abused by Hamas members while captive in Gaza. And yet the IAGS resolution accuses Israel of “sexual and reproductive violence” against Palestinians while blatantly, deliberately ignoring Hamas’ sexual violence against Israeli women and girls.
- As regards the law of genocide, the IAGS resolution studiously ignores the fact that under the 1948 Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, this particular crime requires the “intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group, as such.”

---

<sup>9</sup> ”Sustineri relevante pentru standardele etice ale autorului: ”My critique of the IAGS resolution should not be misread as an endorsement of Israeli strategy and tactics in Gaza or indifference to the terrible human toll in this conflict. Neither characterizes my view of this hellish war. Rather, my outrage is directed at a scholarly organization that lent its reputation to an indictment of Israel that more closely resembled a lynching than a judicious academic inquiry.”

<sup>10</sup> <https://blogs.timesofisrael.com/why-the-iags-resolution-is-fundamentally-flawed/>.

- In other words, one cannot as a matter of applicable international law infer an intent to commit genocide from actions or even a pattern of conduct that are the result of another intention altogether, such as, in the case of Israel in its war against Hamas in Gaza, the intention to eliminate a murderous terrorist organization – Hamas – as an existential threat to Israeli civilians.
- What is needed most at this critical moment is a fair-minded approach that envisions at least a pathway to an end to the Israel-Hamas war. What we decidedly do not need is the IAGS' ostrich-like self-righteousness that places the onus for Palestinian civilian deaths and suffering in Gaza exclusively on Israel's shoulders and that studiously absolves Hamas of any responsibility for the carnage<sup>11</sup>

---

Quillette, 11 September 2025

### Elliot Malin, "The Genocide Scholars Who Can't Define Genocide"<sup>12</sup>

- *Genocide* is an act undertaken with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnic, racial, or religious group, as such. If you cannot establish a specific intent to commit this crime (such an intent is known in legal parlance as *dolus specialis*), you cannot establish genocide. The IAGS resolution did not even attempt to establish such an intent, relying instead on statements made by other entities and by extrapolating from what the organisation B'Tselem has described as a "broader analytical framework." However, legally, genocide requires a fully conclusive finding, meaning that no other explanation exists for the event or events in question other than the intent to commit the crime of genocide. This does not apply here, as there are alternative explanations for the casualties in Gaza that the IAGS fails to recognise.
- It is undisputable that Hamas has utilized civilian and humanitarian infrastructure for the purpose of waging war. This conduct deliberately places Palestinian civilians directly in harm's way, in contravention of the Fourth Geneva Convention (GCIV) and the Additional Protocols I to the Geneva Conventions (API). For example, under GCIV art. 18–20, when a combatant party to an armed conflict uses a hospital as a base from which to conduct military operations, the hospital loses the protections that would otherwise be

---

<sup>11</sup> O probă împotriva interpretării observațiilor critice ale lui Menachem Z. Rosensaft la adresa IAGS resolution drept expresie a unui *partis pris*: "I join the IAGS in being horrified by the suffering of Palestinian civilians in Gaza over the course of the past 23 months. We know, the world knows, that women, children and the elderly have been subjected to the violence of a war over which they have no control whatsoever. We know, the world knows, that hospitals throughout Gaza have been rendered inoperative, alongside the destruction of homes, schools, and pretty much the entire territory's infrastructure. We know, the world knows, that Palestinian civilians in Gaza, including children, have not received the necessary food and medicine to which they are entitled under every conceivable principle of international humanitarian law. We know, the world knows, that Palestinian children have suffered and are suffering, have died and are dying needlessly throughout this war."

<sup>12</sup> <https://quillette.com/2025/09/11/the-genocide-scholars-who-cant-define-genocide-iags-israel/>.

afforded to it. After issuing a prior warning to the hospital in question, that hospital can become a valid military target. Further, GCIV art. 28 and API art. 51(7) explicitly state that military forces can legitimately attack a combatant party even if civilians are present. There is a prohibition against using human shields, but if combatants choose to take refuge behind their civilians, it is still legal to strike them in those places.

- The IAGS resolution included a paragraph claiming that the International Court of Justice (ICJ) has made the determination that Israel is committing a plausible genocide in Gaza. However, this is false. The ICJ found only that Palestinians have plausible rights that may be infringed, and that the conflict involves a dispute between two states who are both parties to the Genocide Convention. The reason for this is that Palestinians are a distinct national group, and national groups are protected under the Genocide Convention. The ICJ therefore made the correct determination: but what the Court stated is that Palestinians must be protected from genocide and plausible rights exist to that effect, not that Israel is committing a genocide against them.
- Disturbingly, many people seem to want there to be a genocide in Gaza, as it provides them with a means of demonising Israeli Jews or Jews in general. But that is the last thing that anyone should desire. No one should want Palestinians to be the victims of genocide. Israel's intent to destroy Hamas, a political terrorist organisation, is not genocidal in the slightest. Hamas members are not a protected group and cannot be said to be victims of genocide. Meanwhile, the failure to discuss the harm to which Hamas exposes Palestinian civilians, through their conduct of the war, only helps perpetuate further harm against Palestinians. It grants Hamas a free pass to continue to embed themselves among civilians and employ human shields because declarations like that of the IAGS suggest that such cynical tactics are working. If people truly care about Palestinians, they must decry the conduct of Hamas—and that also means being honest about Israeli conduct<sup>13</sup>.

---

<sup>13</sup> Representativ pentru fondul etic al criticilor: "One can reasonably hate the war in Gaza and want it to end. It is reasonable to believe that too many Palestinian civilians have been killed over the course of this war. It is also reasonable for individuals to decry Israeli war efforts that they find morally repugnant. But it should be possible to do all this without degrading the strict legal parameters that define genocide. In doing so, we may cause even more harm to innocent people because these legal parameters exist to protect people and shenanigans like that of the IAGS only serve to weaken them."