DOES ISRAEL COMMIT GENOCIDE CRIMES AGAINST PALESTINE?: PERSPECTIVE OF FORMER CHIEF PROSECUTOR OF THE INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL COURT

Prahoro Yudo Purwono
Universitas Indonesia, drpurwono369@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This research aims to elucidate the inferential meanings in the utterances of Luis Moreno Ocampo, an Argentine lawyer who served as the first Chief Prosecutor of the International Criminal Court (ICC) from 2003 to 2012, overseeing investigations into war crimes, genocide, and crimes against humanity; and the UpFront host during the interview. The implications of this study are to assist readers, particularly viewers and listeners of the UpFront program, in understanding the inferential meanings of the speakers, thereby enabling the broader community to fully comprehend the speakers' intentions and avoid misinterpretations of the discourse presented. The research method employed is qualitative research with a contextual meaning analysis (pragmatic) approach, following the relevance theory by Sperber and Wilson (2012a). The results of the research indicate that The 1st Speaker (and continuely written as SPK 1, refers to Up Front program host) aims to validate claims of Israeli involvement in war crimes and genocide during the UpFront program, by highlighting the pursuit of justice in the Israel-Palestine conflict. SPK 2 (the 2nd speaker, refers to Luis Moreno Ocampo) offers a broader perspective by acknowledging the responsibility shared between Hamas and Israel for the atrocities committed, rather than solely blaming one party. SPK 2 also intends to emphasize the challenges faced by international legal institutions such as the International Criminal Court in holding perpetrators accountable. Inferentially, SPK 2 seeks global cooperation to combat genocide and promote peace, particularly emphasizing the importance of collective action based on solidarity in addressing the ongoing humanitarian crisis.

Key Words: *Contextual Meaning, Inferential Meaning, Linguistic, Pragmatic, Relevance Theory*

ABSTRAK

Tujuan dari penelitian ini adalah untuk menjelaskan makna inferensial dalam ujaran Luis Moreno Ocampo, seorang pengacara asal Argentina yang menjabat sebagai Ketua Jaksa Penuntut Umum Mahkamah Pidana Internasional (ICC) dari tahun 2003 sampai 2012, yang mengawasi penyelidikan kejahatan perang, genosida, dan kejahatan terhadap kemanusiaan, serta pembawa acara UpFront saat wawancara berlangsung. Implikasi dari penelitian ini adalah untuk membantu pembaca, khususnya pemirsa dan pendengar program UpFront, dalam memahami makna inferensial dari para narasumber, sehingga memungkinkan masyarakat luas untuk memahami maksud dari para narasumber dan menghindari salah tafsir terhadap wacana yang disajikan. Metode penelitian yang digunakan adalah penelitian kualitatif dengan pendekatan analisis makna kontekstual (pragmatik), mengikuti teori relevansi dari Sperber dan Wilson (2012a). Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa Pembicara Pertama (selanjutnya ditulis SPK 1, merujuk pada pembawa acara Up Front) bertujuan untuk memvalidasi klaim keterlibatan Israel dalam kejahatan perang dan genosida dalam program Up Front, dengan menyoroti pencarian keadilan dalam konflik Israel-Palestina. SPK 2

(pembicara kedua, merujuk pada Luis Moreno Ocampo) menawarkan perspektif yang lebih luas dengan mengakui tanggung jawab bersama antara Hamas dan Israel atas kekejaman yang dilakukan, daripada hanya menyalahkan salah satu pihak. SPK 2 juga bermaksud untuk menekankan tantangan yang dihadapi oleh lembaga hukum internasional seperti Mahkamah Pidana Internasional dalam meminta pertanggungjawaban pelaku. Pada akhirnya, SPK 2 menekankan bahwa pada kasus ini, adanya kerja sama global untuk memerangi genosida dan mendorong perdamaian sangat diperlukan, khususnya tindakan kolektif berdasarkan solidaritas dalam mengatasi krisis kemanusiaan yang sedang berlangsung.

Kata Kunci: *Linguistik, Makna Kontekstual, Makna Inferensial, Pragmatik, Teori Relevansi*

INTRODUCTION

Relevance in pragmatics refers to how information is interpreted based on context and how speakers choose language that aligns with the listener's expectations, knowledge, and attention (Sperber & Wilson, 2012a). This concept is central to understanding how communication is efficient, allowing individuals to convey meaning with minimal effort and maximal impact. Pragmatics is fascinating because it explores literal and implied meanings, social cues, and how context shapes language use. Analyzing pragmatics reveals the complexity of human communication, showing how people understand each other beyond words. The researcher highlights how the relevance of conversations in pragmatic field between two or more parties can influence discourse practices in the mass media.

To prove those statements, the findings of previous article entitled "Finding Relevance in the News: The Scale of Self-reference." indicate the same thing. There is a correlation between awareness of news relevance and how news users refer to themselves as individuals and as part of groups or other aspects. This study also states a relationship between the perception of news relevance and how news users use self-reference to explain their reasons for assessing whether news is relevant (Barchas-Lichtenstein et al., 2021).

The second referenced study is titled "Newspaper headlines, relevance, and emotive effects," which finds that variations in linguistic expressions displayed in newspaper headlines (even when covering the same news), ambiguity, and creative style make conventions and regularities less applicable in explaining the elements that influence the interpretation of headlines. This study discusses the relationship between headline presentation and readers' emotions and experiential responses.

Consequently, it can draw conclusions and cognitive effects that are optimally relevant (as defined in relevance theory - pragmatic theory) (Ifantidou, 2023).

In general, the two studies above have different focuses. The first study focuses on relevance viewed from self-reference or persona deixis. In contrast, the second study focuses on how relevance in news is determined by the presentation of headlines and the emotions arising from that presentation. From the researcher's perspective, both studies have a gap that can be further explored. This gap pertains to the extent to which relevant research data, mainly linguistic data, can be understood and appropriate, especially when reviewed cognitively and communicatively, and its relevance to the discourse emerging in society.

The researcher aims to address this gap in subsequent research. According to the researcher, in the context of relevance in communication practices, inferential meaning in conversation is a crucial aspect to be discussed, especially regarding how an utterance or speech refers to things beyond the semantic meaning of a text or discourse. It can reveal the purpose of the discourse or at least how the discourse can influence its readers or interlocutors (Nicolle, 2022). Research on relevance, particularly inferential meaning, becomes intriguing when linked to currently trending topics.

One such trending and exciting topic is the Israel-Palestine conflict. This conflict is widely discussed internationally (Alashqar et al., 2023). Many countries support Palestine, while others support Israel (Matthes et al., 2023). In several media reports, on October 27, 2023, Israel launched airstrikes near Al-Shifa Hospital and the Indonesian Hospital in Gaza. Additionally, there are reports of casualties and infrastructure damage in Palestinian territories due to Israeli attacks. Related to these attacks, many accuse Israel of committing war crimes and genocide. However, determining whether Israel's actions constitute war crimes or genocide requires deeper investigation and substantial evidence. Therefore, an objective and unbiased assessment from competent authorities is needed to determine if Israel committed war crimes and genocide in this conflict.

This becomes particularly interesting when related to the discourse circulating in mass media. The main reason is that many parties express their opinions on Israel

and Palestine. One such figure is Luis Moreno Ocampo, former chief prosecutor of the International Criminal Court (ICC). In a program called UpFront, he was interviewed and asked to weigh in on and examine the allegations of genocide in the Israel-Palestine war.

UpFront is a program broadcast by Al Jazeera that addresses various global issues. Its format involves discussions between the host and expert guests and regularly features interviews with prominent figures. Its goal is to provide in-depth and diverse perspectives on contemporary issues. From the relevant research perspective, the questions posed by the host and Luis Moreno's answers are fascinating to examine, especially in terms of the inferential meaning present in the utterances delivered.

Based on the above exposition, the research question is: "What is the inferential meaning of the interview with Luis Moreno Ocampo on the UpFront program?" The research objective is to explain the actual inferential meaning intended by Luis Moreno Ocampo and the UpFront host during the interview. The implication of this research is to assist readers, particularly viewers and listeners of the UpFront program, in understanding the inferential meaning of the speakers. Consequently, the broader community will be able to fully grasp the speakers' intentions and avoid misinterpreting the discourse in the future.

The research method used is qualitative research with a contextual meaning analysis (pragmatic) approach, following Sperber and Wilson's relevance theory (Wilson & Sperber, 2002). The data source for this research is a 14-minute, 10-second interview video from the Al Jazeera website https://www.aljazeera.com/program/upfront/2023/12/1/former-icc-chief-prosecutor-israels-siege-of-gaza-is-a-genocide, titled "Former ICC chief prosecutor: Israel's siege of Gaza is a 'genocide'" and uploaded on December 1, 2023. The type of data collected includes the utterances from the conversation between the interviewer and Luis Moreno Ocampo. The total number of data points is 11 conversational exchanges. All data were collected using the observation and note-taking technique. The researcher carefully watched the video and transcribed the conversation that

occurred, then provided inferential meanings for each segment of the conversation that aligned with the context.

The collected data were then coded. Data 1 is coded as D1, Data 2 as D2, etc. The speaker also differentiates the conversational codes, with the interviewer coded SPK_1 and the interviewee, Luis Moreno Ocampo, coded SPK_2. The presented data were then processed through decoding, which involves breaking down the utterances and relating them to relevance theory (Wilson & Sperber, 2002) to determine the inferential meaning within the utterances, both in terms of speech context and communication context. The data will be analyzed focusing on the inferential meaning that emerges.

Before moving on to the results and discussion, the researcher must explain the relevance theory of Sperber and Wilson used to analyze the research data. The relevance theory, proposed by French scholar Dan Sperber and British scholar Deirdre Wilson, can be seen as a response and development to the classical Gricean pragmatic theory. This theory is rooted in a general view of human cognition and proposes that the human cognitive system tends to maximize relevance in communication. The relevance theory reveals that communicative principles are crucial in recovering an utterance's explicit and implicit content. In other words, in communication, humans tend to select and understand information that is maximally relevant to its context (Sperber & Wilson, 2012b; Wilson & Sperber, 2002).

Furthermore, this theory hypothesizes that pragmatics, which involves the procedures of understanding relevance theory, is a subset of the 'theory of human cognition' that encompasses various skills in interpreting what is in human thought. With this approach, relevance theory provides a foundation for understanding how humans actively engage in the communication process, selecting relevant information and using principles of relevance to understand the conveyed messages (Wilson & Sperber, 2022).

Relevance can be explained as a function or measure of two main factors: cognitive or contextual and processing effects. The first factor relates to the interaction between newly incoming stimuli and the cognitive system's pre-existing assumptions. The second factor pertains to the mental system's effort to interpret the

processed information satisfactorily. Thus, relevance is a degree (Sperber & Wilson, 2002; Wilson, 2003; Wilson & Sperber, 1986, 1988, 2002).

More specifically, relevance can be expressed as a balance between the cognitive effects or rewards produced by new information and the processing effort or costs expended by the cognitive system. This formula reflects the dynamic relationship between the cognitive benefits of new information and the mental effort required to process that information (Sperber & Wilson, 2012a).

In addition, communicative aspects can be divided into two models: the code model and the inferential model. According to the classical code model, communication occurs through the encoding and decoding messages. In this context, a communicator encodes a message into a signal, and the audience decodes the message using an identical copy of the code. Two main assumptions underlying this model in human verbal communication are that human language is a code, and these codes associate thoughts with sounds (Wilson & Sperber, 2002).

In contrast, the inferential model emphasizes communication's inferential or deductive process. In this model, communication involves encoding and decoding, an inferential process where the receiver actively seeks meaning and constructs their interpretation based on context and knowledge. The inferential model highlights the role of the reader or listener in generating meaning from the message, aligning with the view that communication is a cooperative process where participants strive to maximize relevance. In this model, the context, assumptions, and knowledge held by the reader or listener play a crucial role in understanding the conveyed message (Wilson & Sperber, 2002).

DISCUSSION

Before discussing the research findings, the following table summarizes the overall research findings.

Code	Conversation	Inferential Meaning
D1	00:00:04 SPK_1 Luis Moreno, Ocampo, thank you so much for joining us upfront.	Formal Protocol and as an Opening Gesture to Honor Guests

	00:00:09 SPK_2 My pleasure.	
D2	00:00:12 SPK_1 My very frustrating. What happened? Hamas October 7th attack and Israel's subsequent bombardment of Gaza have both been met with accusations of genocide, ethnic cleansing, and various other war crimes. But before we get into the specifics of these accusations, I wanted to ask if you could first briefly define what constitutes a war crime. 00:00:32 SPK_2 Well, war crimes are defined by the Geneva Convention and now by the Roman status. They limit how soldiers can behave during a war, which is a war crime. Then you have another type of crime: crimes against humanity and genocide. Crimes against humanity is a widespread or systematic attack against the civilian population, and that's why the Hamas attack is a crime against humanity. But in addition, you have a specific crime, genocide. 00:01:09 SPK_2 Genocide is an attack; It's a crime to destroy any group. And I believe that's important because genocide is a convention, and it's the convention that requires the state parties to prevent genocide. That's why genocide is so essential, because it's the only crime of these crimes that they have this obligation not just for not to commit the crimes. There are hundreds of 53 states and parties of the Genocide Convention, including the US and Russia, and almost all of the countries that are committed to preventing and punishing genocide. That's why genocide is so important.	SPK 1 inferentially wants the answer to who is guilty directly from SPK 2. SPK 2 inferentially answers that Israel and Hamas are guilty, and the international community should take part in preventing this war crime.
D3	00:01:57 SPK_1 How about ethnic cleansing? Some people have argued that what's happening, guys, is ethnic cleansing. How do you define that? 00:02:03 SPK_2 Any cleansing, cleansing, like a poem, is a poem. Any cleansing is a nice expression, but it's not a crime. Any cleansing is a warning used to avoid defining something as genocide. Why? Because if you are a state, if you are the US, and you say it's genocide, you must prevent it. 00:02:27 SPK_2	Both Israel and Hamas are guilty of this.

	If you say, it's that the cleansing nothing happened, it's OK.	
D4	00:02:30 SPK_1 So let's let's talk about this idea of genocide. According to Palestinian health officials, as of this recording, Israel has killed over 15,000 Palestinians. Around 40% of that number are children. They've bombed hospitals, schools, refugee camps. Israeli army spokesperson Daniel Haggadi, in fact, openly admitted that the quote emphasis is on damage and not on accuracy. 00:02:57 SPK_1 And, of course, this is all in addition to Israel preventing nearly all food from coming in, all fuel from coming in. People argue that this is a form of collective punishment. My question is, is there an actual genocide taking place? 00:03:12 SPK_2 Well, let me summarize. The standard should be a reasonable basis to believe it's very low. We're not in a Court of Justice. It's understood that if I were a prosecutor, I would start an investigation when there are reasonable bases on which to believe in the Israel conflict. You have Hamas committing war crimes, including today; the hostages are a war crime, crimes against humanity, and the crimes committed on October 7th in Israel, and probably genocide because Hama has the intention to destroy Israelis as a group. The Israeli reaction also includes many crimes. 00:03:53 SPK_2 Identifying the word crime is complicated because each bombing needs to be evaluated. But there is something very clear, the siege of Gaza itself, that extermination or persecution is a crime against humanity, and it's a form of genocide. Article 6C, or see the Genocide Convention, defines that you don't need to kill people to commit genocide. The rules say inflicting conditions to destroy the group is genocide. So, creating the siege itself is a genocide, and that is very clear that Israel won the siege. 00:04:33 SPK_2 It's very clear. And the intention to destroy the people. Many officers from the Israeli government are expressing genocidal intentions. That is why it's easy to say and the reasonable base to believe Israel is committing genocide in Gaza just on the	Israel is committing genocide, but under international law, it must be investigated first. There is a suspicion here that SPK 2 leans more towards Israel committing war crimes. SPK 2 wants no new crimes.

	siege. Then, each bombing and each of the killings should be properly investigated. 00:05:01 SPK_2 But come on, we have already cleared that the siege itself is a genocide. And that's why this is Fire should not conform to a new genocide, please.	
D5	00:05:14 SPK_1 You talked about Hamas also being engaged in war crimes. Of course. On October 7th, they killed hundreds of Israeli civilians at a music festival. They've also kidnapped civilians. These included babies, children, the elderly, and the disabled. 00:05:29 SPK_1 I mean, we can agree that prima fashion those are war crimes, no? 00:05:34 SPK_2 Exactly. Hamas October 7th is a war crime because you're attacking civilians. It's a crime against humanity because it's a, it's a it's planned attack against the civilian population. It's a genocide because the killings were intended to destroy Israeli groups, and that's the genocide, and that's why the October 7th attack is a war crime. It's against humanity, and it's a genocide. I'm the regional.	SPK 2 claims to be neutral and wants this war to end soon.
D6	00:06:02 SPK_1 Could you say a bit more about why this constitutes genocide? I mean, some people have argued that they are engaged in an act of resistance intended not to destroy Jewish people as an ethnicity, nationality, or race but to defeat a nation-state that is attempting to occupy them. They're defeating an occupying power. 00:06:23 SPK_2 Well, I am influenced because when I was a prosecutor, I was involved for three years in the Palestine, Israeli conflict. Seeing what happened today is so painful; those days were hopes. And I remember Hamad sent me a professor working with them, and he explained to me that Hamad believed Jewish people should not be in Palestine. It's not just about protecting Gaza. Hamad believed there should not be any Jews in Palestine. 00:06:53 SPK_2 That's why, for them, killing the Jews in Israel is part of the	What Hamas did is a war crime, and it's so cruel.

	strategy, and that, I'm sorry, it's genocide because it's an attack trying to destroy a group. In this case, Israel is in Palestine.	
D7	00:07:13 SPK_1 OK. The Hamas charter was updated, as you know, in 2017. This is an update from the 1988 charter, and in it, they explicitly state Hamas affirms that its conflict is with the Zionist project, not with the Jews. Because of their religion, Hamas does not wage a struggle against the Jews because they are Jewish but wages A struggle against the Zionists who occupy Palestine. I'm not here to argue whether that's true or not, but if we were to assume that that was true for a moment, would that then nullify the argument of genocide as a legal matter? 00:07:45 SPK_2 As I said, I am using it as a standard, which is not so high. It's reasonably based to believe that it's standard to start an investigation. According to that standard, for me, the genocide should be investigated in the case of Hamas, and maybe they adjusted, and maybe they now are not trying to do that. Still, this event found that they wanted to kill these people to remove them and expel the Israeli people from the land. So that is, for me, that provides reason to believe that it's genocide. I'm not saying it's a conviction because that's the point. To convict one of the Hamas leaders for genocide, you need a proper trial. 00:08:32 SPK_2 You must offer the Hamas leader the opportunity to explain his arguments, present evidence, and then the judges. To convict, a person will have to meet a higher standard. They have to go beyond the result and doubt standard. It's highly standard. Otherwise, I'm talking about nonsense.	It is difficult and troublesome to convict Hamas leaders of the crime of genocide because there must be proof. It is also possible that Hamas will not be punished and will escape the international court.
D8	00:08:49 SPK_1 One of the things I've also been wondering about is whether Palestine is a member of the ICC. Hamas could be prosecuted for war crimes under that premise. Israel, however, is not a signatory to the ICC, and it has not ratified the Rome Statute. So, what jurisdiction does the ICC have to investigate and or prosecute Israel? 00:09:12 SPK_2 The International Criminal Court has jurisdiction in Gaza, the West Bank, and E Jerusalem. That long process started in my time and ended in 2021. The court accepted that court. The	What happened is very complicated.

	investigation had to mitigate crimes committed in Gaza, the West Bank, and E Jerusalem. That means any kind of committee in these places for any person could be mitigated by the International Criminal Court. 00:09:42 SPK_2 That's why the International Criminal Court could mitigate Israel's committing crimes in Gaza. And I would suggest, Even more importantly, what's happening in Gaza, which is massive. It was happening with the bank because the West Bank has more influence on the needs of security of Israel, and I'm shocked that this man is a means of security. The person with means of security is read today. Israel's armed Forces rejected him as a soldier because he was an extremist. 00:10:16 SPK_2 He's a man who was investigated and convicted of hate. So this man, an extremist settler, is providing weapons to settlers and running activities in the West Bank, fueling the company. That's why, for me, in the same way, it's so appealing and awful what happened in Gaza; it's incredible that in the West Bank, there's no more violence because this person, the means of security, has influence, there is providing weapons to settlers and they are almost, I understand more than 200 people killed. So that's why, for me, Gaza is one awful scenario, but the West Bank is also very important, and you must understand.	
D9	00:10:57 SPK_1 Should he particularly be investigated? Should Itamar bin Gavir, in particular, be investigated for war crimes? 00:11:03 SPK_2 Mr. Gavir should be mitigated absolutely yes on what he's doing providing weapons to cetera is he inciting cetera to violence. I read that he was using the police to crush the meeting of the family meeting with those who were liberated from jail and also the incarceration. They are now people incarcerated in the West Bank. So, all these activities should be mitigated, prevented, and stopped. 00:11:34 SPK_1 In March 2023, the ICC issued Russian President Vladimir Putin an arrest warrant. Russia, however, is not a signatory to the court, and aside from the warrant restricting Putin's travel	Investigations are possible, but arresting and imprisoning perpetrators of genocide is complicated. The International Criminal Court has no power to go that far.

	to signatory countries, he's faced no consequences. So, can the ICC do anything to prosecute non-members? Can anything be enforced? 00:11:55 SPK_2 Well, you have to understand that the enforcement of the International Criminal Court's core decisions is in the states' hands. So President Putin was indicted, and no one is trying to arrest him. But he could not. He had to stop flying to South Africa or Brazil because Brazil and South Africa could arrest him. And in fact, that happened with President Bashir. 00:12:20 SPK_2 When I indicted President Bashir for genocide, he went to South Africa to show he was free. But he had escaped because the judge from South Africa ordered him to be arrested. So, arresting is the most complicated thing. But the answer to your first question was, can I just investigate bank crimes? Absolutely yes. Can you indict people? Absolutely yes. Arresting is a different matter. But my point is ICC is doing what it should do, and it's very important. However, criminal law is a last resort and should not be the first resource.	
D10	00:12:57 SPK_2 So what I feel we are lacking is the commitment of the international community, including bigger states, to make Israel and Hama respect the law. Look, since September, the UN Advisor on Prevention of Genocide has been alerting about five genocides ongoing in two months. So that's why the problem is today, the state, the states are not respecting the legal boundaries, and we'll kill civilization. We're not just killing individuals in Gaza on the West Bank or in Armenia. We are killing civilization. 00:13:34 SPK_2 And that's why it's not just about Israelis or Armenians or Darfur people or Tigre people in Ethiopia or Rohingya in Myanmar. It's about civilization. We are going to a catastrophe. So it's time to change the game. And we need leaders, not just prosecutors or judges.	SPK 2 communicates that it wants the countries of the world to wisely help Palestine-Israel stop the war and the genocidal crimes.
D11	00:13:55 SPK_1 Luis Moreno Ocampo, thank you so much for joining me upfront. 00:13:58 SPK_2	A form of formality to close the event.

Thank you.	

Table 1. Table of Inferential Meaning of Interviewees

From Table 1, it can be explained that both Israel and Hamas have committed genocide. The dominant inferential meaning confirms that, indeed, Israel and Hamas have committed war crimes. Another inferential meaning that emerges is the implication that these war crimes should cease, the ICC's inability to prevent or apprehend perpetrators in this case, and the ICC's role primarily as a mediator and diplomatic solution provider.

Then, if further discussed, one example of data that demonstrates the definition of genocide and why both sides are guilty is the provision of the definition of genocide by SPK 2 in D2. The definition of genocide and the culpability of both sides in the Palestine-Israel conflict are exemplified in the discourse of SPK 2 in D2, a data point illustrating the complex dynamics of this protracted issue. The discussion in D2 is part of a broader examination of the conflict, framed within a dialogue between SPK 1 and SPK 2 in the context of the Upfront program. This program aims to provide an in-depth understanding of SPK 2's perspective on the contentious and deeply rooted conflict. The interaction begins with prompts such as 'My very frustrated' and 'What happened?', which inject a sense of urgency and curiosity, driving SPK 2 to provide a thorough and reflective response.

Theoretically, the dialogue in D2 can be analyzed through the lens of Sperber and Wilson's relevance theory. Relevance theory posits that communication is driven by pursuing the most relevant information, balancing cognitive effort and contextual effects (Wilson & Sperber, 2002). In the case of SPK 2's discourse, the prompts used by SPK 1 are designed to maximize relevance by evoking responses that provide significant insights into the speaker's views on genocide and the broader conflict. This interaction exemplifies how relevance is negotiated and achieved in real-time communication, aligning with Sperber and Wilson's assertion that effective communication relies on the mutual understanding of shared contextual cues.

In addition to relevance theory, previous research on pragmatics and discourse analysis provides further insight into the dynamics of this interaction. For instance,

studies Giles (2016) on conversational style and power dynamics highlight how the framing of questions can influence the depth and direction of responses.

Similarly, Goatly (2022) work on discourse markers underscores the importance of linguistic cues in structuring conversations and guiding the flow of information. In the context of SPK 2's discourse, the initial prompts serve as discourse markers that signal the importance of the ensuing dialogue and set the stage for a critical examination of the conflict. Furthermore, research by Leotti et al (2021) on critical discourse analysis emphasizes the role of power and ideology in shaping discourse. The dialogue in D2 reflects underlying power dynamics and ideological positions, as SPK 2's responses are shaped by the need to address the sensitive and politically charged nature of the Palestine-Israel conflict. This aligns with van Dijk's assertion that discourse is a site of struggle where different viewpoints and power relations are negotiated and contested (van Dijk, 2012).

As the dialogue unfolds, SPK 2 meticulously delineates the parameters governing the definition of genocide and war crimes, drawing upon established legal frameworks such as the Geneva Conventions and the Rome Statute. These conventions serve as guiding principles dictating the conduct of armed forces during times of conflict, delineating the boundaries of acceptable behavior and the realm of punishable offenses. Within this context, SPK 2 elucidates the nuanced distinctions between crimes against humanity and genocide, highlighting the gravity of both categories within the broader spectrum of international law.

Inferentially, both through explicit verbal articulation and nuanced communication cues, SPK 1's underlying query revolves around the validation of Israel's potential legal culpability for acts constituting genocide. SPK 2, aware of this implicit inquiry, embarks on a detailed exposition of the legal definitions of war crimes and genocide, seeking to provide clarity and context to SPK 1's line of questioning. Moreover, SPK 2 unequivocally asserts that the actions perpetrated by Hamas constitute egregious violations against humanity, thus broadening the scope of guilt beyond the confines of state actors.

In weaving these intricate threads of dialogue, it becomes apparent that SPK 2's overarching intention transcends the mere attribution of guilt to Israel alone. Instead,

SPK 2 underscores the imperative of holding all perpetrators of atrocities accountable, irrespective of their affiliations or allegiances. By contextualizing the discourse within the specific temporal framework of the conflict, particularly referencing the attacks of October 7, 2023, SPK 2 endeavors to shed light on the multifaceted nature of guilt within the context of the Palestine-Israel conflict.

This additional layer of insight provided by SPK 2 enriches the communicative exchange. By elucidating the broader ramifications of the conflict and emphasizing the shared responsibility in addressing acts of violence and injustice, SPK 2 navigates the discourse toward a more comprehensive understanding of the complexities inherent within the Palestine-Israel conflict. Simply put, the inferential meaning of the question and answer in D2 is that both Israel and Hamas must stop the attacks because it is genocide, and thus, both sides must make a ceasefire and stop this prolonged conflict. Because if we refer to the definition of genocide, Israel and Hamas have committed the crime of genocide.

The researcher found that all of this data is interrelated and continuous, which forms one main conclusion: war crimes must be stopped, and this can only be done by countries worldwide, for example, such as D9. From D9, it can be seen that an inferential intention or meaning appears. SPK 1's question about how international criminal law is enforced against criminals in the international community, in speech, wants an answer as to whether there is anything that the ICC can do regarding the crime of genocide that the perpetrators have committed. On the other hand, communicatively, SPK 1's question also indicates doubts about the role of the ICC and what the ICC has done in this regard. Given the importance of stopping the genocide, the ICC has yet to play a visible role in Israel-Palestinian peace efforts. In this case, in terms of communication, SPK 1 wants a possible solution to be presented.

SPK 1's question was then answered by SPK 2, who concluded that without an agreement (in this case, a state's signature on a convention or international law), it would be difficult to make an arrest. The International Criminal Court can issue a warrant or order an indictment, but not necessarily an arrest. This answer is then contextually relevant to SPK 1's question.

Then, there is a further answer from SPK 2 on D9, which emphasizes inferentially that what is underlined in this case is not the Hamas and Israeli parties to the Palestinian-Israeli conflict in 2023 but the genocide and war crimes that occurred. So that genocide cases in Israel and Palestine must be stopped. However, because Israel is not a signatory member of the convention, it will be difficult to make arrests or follow-up. Thus, if a conclusion is drawn, the International Criminal Court (ICC) is difficult to take action because international regulations hinder it, so then countries in the world should wisely help Palestine-Israel stop the war and genocide crimes that occur. This answer is relevant in the context of communication because it shows the real role and solution of the International Criminal Court (ICC) in resolving the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, as same as relevance theory stated (Wilson & Sperber, 2002).

From a pragmatic perspective, SPK 2's responses in D9 illustrate how communication serves as a platform for advocating solutions and mobilizing support for addressing complex geopolitical issues (Nicolle, 2022; Wharton et al., 2022; Williams et al., 2021). By framing the discussion in terms of the role and limitations of international institutions like the ICC, SPK 2 emphasizes the need for collective action and diplomatic efforts to halt the perpetuation of violence and human rights abuses in the region. This aligns with previous research on pragmatic strategies for conflict resolution, which emphasizes the importance of framing issues in ways that promote understanding, empathy, and cooperation among stakeholders (Khalil & Al-Zubaidi, 2022, 2023; Wang, 2019, 2023).

CONCLUSION

Based on the discussion provided, it can be extrapolated that SPK 1's underlying objective during the Upfront program is to seek validation regarding the alleged involvement of Israel in acts constituting war crimes and genocide. This inquiry indicates a more profound quest for accountability and justice within the context of the Palestine-Israel conflict. By probing into the potential legal ramifications of Israel's actions, SPK 1 aims to shed light on the extent of guilt and the corresponding recourse available through international legal mechanisms. In response, SPK 2 offers a nuanced perspective beyond the mere attribution of blame to Israel alone. Through a comprehensive analysis of the conflict

dynamics, SPK 2 asserts that both Hamas and Israel bear responsibility for perpetrating acts of genocide and war crimes. This acknowledgment underscores the complexity of the situation and the shared guilt of multiple actors in perpetuating violence and human rights abuses. Furthermore, SPK 2 delineates the inherent challenges faced by international legal bodies, such as the International Criminal Court (ICC), in effectively addressing cases of genocide. While the ICC holds the authority to issue indictments, the practical impediments to apprehending perpetrators pose significant hurdles. SPK 2's elucidation of these obstacles underscores the need for concerted international efforts to overcome such challenges and ensure accountability for atrocities committed during the conflict. In emphasizing the role of proactive international engagement, SPK 2 underscores the importance of collective action in combating genocide and promoting peace. The call for assistance from nations worldwide highlights the interconnectedness of global responses to humanitarian crises and the imperative of solidarity in addressing mass atrocities.

REFERENCES

Alashqar, M. M., Rahim, A. A., & Aziz, A. S. A. (2023). War Crimes In Gaza Strip From Year 2008 2021: Individual Criminal Responsibility Under The Legal Framework Of Rome Statute Of The International Criminal Court. *Journal Of International Studies(Malaysia)*, *19*(1). Https://Doi.Org/10.32890/Jis2023.19.1.3

Barchas-Lichtenstein, J., Voiklis, J., Glasser, D. B., & Fraser, J. (2021). Finding Relevance In The News: The Scale Of Self-Reference. *Journal Of Pragmatics*, *171*. Https://Doi.Org/10.1016/J.Pragma.2020.10.001

Giles, H. (2016). Communication Accommodation Theory. In *The International Encyclopedia Of Communication Theory And Philosophy*. Https://Doi.Org/10.1002/9781118766804.Wbiect056

Goatly, A. (2022). Register And The Redemption Of Relevance Theory. *Pragmatics. Quarterly Publication Of The International Pragmatics Association (Ipra)*. Https://Doi.Org/10.1075/Prag.4.2.05goa

Ifantidou, E. (2023). Newspaper Headlines, Relevance And Emotive Effects. *Journal Of Pragmatics*, *218*. Https://Doi.Org/10.1016/J.Pragma.2023.09.013

Khalil, H. H., & Al-Zubaidi, N. A. G. (2022). Constructing Carcinogen Risk In Scientific Discourse Through Ideological Conflict: A Cognitive Pragmatic

Analysis. *Theory And Practice In Language Studies*, *12*(8). Https://Doi.Org/10.17507/Tpls.1208.04

Khalil, H. H., & Al-Zubaidi, N. A. G. (2023). The Construction Of Spatial Invasion Of Carcinogen Risk In Scientific Discourse: A Corpus-Based Study. *Gema Online Journal Of Language Studies*, *23*(1). Https://Doi.Org/10.17576/Gema-2023-2301-11

Leotti, S. M., Sugrue, E. P., & Winges-Yanez, N. (2021). Unpacking The Worlds In Our Words: Critical Discourse Analysis And Social Work Inquiry. *Qualitative Social Work*. Https://Doi.Org/10.1177/1473325021990860

Matthes, J., Schmuck, D., & Von Sikorski, C. (2023). In The Eye Of The Beholder: A Case For The Visual Hostile Media Phenomenon. *Communication Research*, *50*(7). Https://Doi.Org/10.1177/00936502211018596

Nicolle, S. (2022). Communicated And Non-Communicated Acts In Relevance Theory. *Pragmatics. Quarterly Publication Of The International Pragmatics Association (Ipra)*. Https://Doi.Org/10.1075/Prag.10.2.04nic

Sperber, D., & Wilson, D. (2002). Pragmatics, Modularity And Mind-Reading. *Mind And Language*, *17*(1–2). Https://Doi.Org/10.1111/1468-0017.00186

Sperber, D., & Wilson, D. (2012a). Introduction: Pragmatics. In *Meaning And Relevance*. Https://Doi.Org/10.1017/Cbo9781139028370.002

Sperber, D., & Wilson, D. (2012b). Pragmatics, Modularity And Mindreading. In *Meaning And Relevance*. Https://Doi.Org/10.1017/Cbo9781139028370.016

Van Dijk, T. A. (2012). Knowledge, Discourse And Domination. In *Pragmaticizing Understanding: Studies For Jef Verschueren*. Https://Doi.Org/10.1075/Z.170.10dij

Wang, Y. (2019). Proximization Theory And The Construction Of International Values: A Case Study Of President Xi Jinping's Speech At The 70th Session Of The Un General Assembly. *Journal Of Language Teaching And Research*, *10*(6). Https://Doi.Org/10.17507/Jltr.1006.24

Wang, Y. (2023). China's Building Of International Discourse System Against Covid-19 Pandemic—From The Perspective Of Proximization Theory. *Journal Of Language Teaching And Research*, *14*(2). Https://Doi.Org/10.17507/Jltr.1402.15

Wharton, T., Jagoe, C., & Wilson, D. (2022). Relevance Theory: New Horizons Foreword By Tim Wharton, Caroline Jagoe And Deirdre Wilson. In *Journal Of Pragmatics* (Vol. 194). Https://Doi.Org/10.1016/J.Pragma.2022.03.012

Williams, G. L., Wharton, T., & Jagoe, C. (2021). Mutual (Mis)Understanding: Reframing Autistic Pragmatic "Impairments" Using Relevance Theory. *Frontiers In Psychology*, *12*. Https://Doi.Org/10.3389/Fpsyg.2021.616664

Wilson, D. (2003). Relevance And Lexical Pragmatics. *Italian Journal Of Linguistics*, *15*(2).

Wilson, D., & Sperber, D. (1986). Pragmatics : An Overview. *Clcs Occasional Paper, No 16*.

Wilson, D., & Sperber, D. (1988). Representation And Relevance. *Mental Representations: The Interface Between Language And Reality.*

Wilson, D., & Sperber, D. (2002). Truthfulness And Relevance. *Mind*, *111*(443). Https://Doi.Org/10.1093/Mind/111.443.583

Wilson, D., & Sperber, D. (2022). On Grice's Theory Of Conversation *. In *Conversation And Discourse: Structure And Interpretation*. Https://Doi.Org/10.4324/9781003291039-11