



Beyond Neutrality, Normalization, and Complicity at Times of the Genocide: Psychologists for Palestine

Francesco Tommasi¹ · Davide Giusino² · Matthijs Bal³ · Sandiso Bazana⁴ · Angelo Benozzo⁵ · Margherita Brondino⁶ · Andreina Bruno⁷ · Daniela Converso⁸ · Chiara Corvino⁹ · Roberto De Vogli¹⁰ · Giuseppina Dell'Aversana¹¹ · Chiara Destefanis¹⁸ · Hilda Du Plooy⁶ · Francesca Esposito¹² · Laura Galuppo¹³ · Sven George¹⁴ · Silvia Gilardi¹ · Mara Gorli¹⁵ · Giada Mignolli⁶ · Ambra Natati⁶ · Margherita Pasini⁶ · Camilla Ponti¹⁹ · Silvio Carlo Ripamonti¹³ · Armando Toscano¹⁷ · Luca P. Vecchio¹¹ · Guido Veronese¹⁶ · Chiara Volpato¹¹ · Milica Vukelić²⁰

Received: 20 January 2026 / Revised: 5 March 2026 / Accepted: 16 March 2026
© The Author(s) 2026

Abstract

We have been witnessing the perpetuation of violent and cruel aggression against the Palestinian people by Israel. At the international level, there have been sparse individual or collective initiatives within the field of psychology to demonstrate solidarity with Palestine and against the genocide in Gaza, yet the question of Palestine remains ambiguous, and the possible stance of psychology as a research field and scientific institution on the matter is still unclear. This ambiguity and uncertainty about the position of psychology reflects neutrality claims. However, this neutrality normalizes and silences the current violations of human rights and the suffering of the Palestinian people, rendering psychology a silent complicit actor in the genocide. In this contribution, we address this silence of psychology by looking at the international juridical norms on the violation of human rights. Following the juridical concept of *jus cogens*, we discuss the responsibility of psychology in relation to the question of Palestine. With this juridic diagnosis, we continue by presenting how psychology can advocate for human rights. We propose to rethink and redefine psychology from the perspective of protecting human rights, to situate psychology for Palestine. This work is our humble form of resistance, and we hope that our paper can encourage reflections on the role of psychology in the context of emerging global conflicts and genocides.

Keywords Palestine · Genocide · Human rights · Responsible psychology

Introduction

Although the numbers are often heard, they never seem sufficient to fully grasp the horror of the genocide and the occupation of Palestinian territory. Nevertheless, we present them once again. As we write, in December 2025, the number of Palestinian deaths exceeds

Extended author information available on the last page of the article

71,200 (UN/OCHA, 2025), in addition to 217 journalists (Sinan, 2025), 120 academics (Hall, 2025), and nearly 250 humanitarian workers, including 179 members of UNRWA (United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East, NBC, 2025, UNRWA, 2025). Recent studies have argued that data might be different with counts of Palestinian deaths being more than 100,000 (Gómez-Ugarte et al., 2025) since the start of the genocide in Gaza on October 7 after the attack on Israel by the militant group Hamas that resulted in approximately 1,200 deaths (including 33 children), 5,400 wounded, and the abduction of 280 civilians and soldiers (UN/OCHA, 2025). These atrocities, condemned by the international community and human rights organizations as crimes against humanity, did not occur in a vacuum. As outlined in a document submitted to the ICJ by the South African government, these events must be placed in the “broader context of Israel’s conduct towards the Palestinians during its 75 years of ‘apartheid’, its 56 years of belligerent ‘occupation’ of Palestinian territory, and its 16 years of ‘blockade’ of Gaza.” (ICJ, 2024a, b, c). 80% of those who have died since October 7, 2023, are civilians, and 70% are women and children who died in their homes or other shelters. Approximately 60% of Palestinians living in Gaza have lost a family member, while the number of seriously and non-seriously injured is around 100,000, with the highest per capita rate of amputations in the world (UN/UN News, 2024). Added to this is the problem of a lack of resources. Since February 2024, approximately 2.2 million people have been lacking food and medical care, and between September and December 2024 alone, 19,000 children were treated for acute malnutrition. The list could go on by including (a) the number of people killed and kidnapped, (b) the years, months, and number of people deported, deceased, and forced to emigrate since the Nakba of 1948, (c) the number of missiles, bullets, armed forces, and vehicles used by Israel to invade Gaza, or (d) the number of times Israel violated the ceasefire established in early October 2025. And we could continue with data on the number of operators, volunteers, associations, non-profit organizations, collectives, politicians, and states that have in some way attempted to oppose the genocide. But the horrific list would still be incomplete and inaccurate, as the genocide and the apartheid inexorably continue.

Witnessing the genocide, we ask ‘what can we do as psychologists’, a question for which the silence of scientific societies, journals, and research networks only serves to cast doubt on the social responsibility of psychology. Broken by sporadic initiatives of single groups of scholars (e.g., De Vogli et al., 2025), publications (Abuward et al., 2025; Cavazzoni et al., 2025; Taysir Dabbagh et al., 2025; Veronese et al., 2025) and statements by scientific associations (European Association of Community Psychology, ECPA, 2025; Division 48 of the American Psychological Association, Society for the Study of Peace, Conflict, and Violence 2025; Italian Association of Psychology, AIP, 2025), the academic silence of psychology that has continued until now normalizes the Palestinian situation and jeopardizes the social responsibility of the academic world, as well as the professional and sociopolitical value of psychology. Even more so, silencing and normalizing the genocide turns into a form of complicity (Abdelnour & Abu Moghli 2021; Said, 1978; Said & Hitchens, 2001; Tommasi, 2025).

This review aims to break this silence and address the question of Palestine (Said, 1979) from a juridical and academic perspective in psychology. We maintain that psychology is regarded as a discipline for people, and as such, we emphasize the centrality of human rights to psychology. To do so, we not only refer to the abstract notion of human rights, but also to relevant international legal norms, with reference to the institutions of the United Nations

(UN) and the International Court of Justice (ICJ). From this perspective, we highlight how psychology is positioned, as an academic and professional discipline, on the issue of human rights. From here, the paper attempts to articulate the contributions of psychology in opposing all forms of violation of people's right to existence and to work by all means to protect human rights.

The Way we Approach the Question of Palestine

The present work follows a theoretical-analytical approach based on criteria of argumentative consistency and binding normative references. The method used consists of the systematic reconstruction of the interconnections between psychology, professional ethics, and international law, taking the principles and norms of the UN and the ICJ as an empirical and normative frame of reference. In this sense, our analysis follows a recognized methodological framework (i.e., ICJ norms) that allows us to draw conclusions consistent with legal sources and perspectives on the social responsibility of psychology.

Against any suspicious position, we wish to make some clarifications about the aim and the position of the present paper. First, this work may be subject to a series of criticisms, particularly for addressing an issue that is still *sensitive*. In fact, the issue is the subject of social and political discussion and debate, which in some cases risks being repressed by the organizations and institutions where psychologists and academics work. This bitter condition, which forces silence, requires us to acknowledge and support all those who, for work and social reasons, find it difficult or impossible to take a public stance on the question of Palestine.

Second, another element that requires attention at the outset of this contribution is the possible overly ideological and political connotation with which this work may appear to some psychologists and academics. Any work, whether it is a theoretical intervention, a quantitative empirical contribution, or a qualitative study, contains an ideological content that contributes to defining and giving meaning to the world, thus supporting a specific ideology (e.g., positivist, constructivist). Every piece of research or contribution in psychology is the result of a scientifically and ethically consistent action that requires the application of a method, and it is the method itself that can make the work appear ideologically connotated. Following the philosopher of science Thomas Kuhn (1962), science is not purely objective as it operates within a specific paradigm-shared methodological framework that guides science through which scholars construct knowledge within a series of accepted theories, methods and values. The very decision to explore a certain topic, even if approached with a claim of neutrality and objectivity, constitutes a political act that has an impact on the world. Consider, for example, the physicists who contributed to the construction of the atomic bomb: the application of a scientifically and ethically consistent and neutral method resulted in the production of the most devastating and dangerous weapon of mass destruction. Every research work is a world-making action that follows a specific ideology.

Lastly, in this paper, terms such as 'genocide' and 'apartheid' are used in accordance with the legal definition adopted by the UN Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (1948) and the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court (1998). The qualifications used here are based on official UN reports (e.g., UN/Human Rights, 2025) and proceedings currently underway at the ICJ and eminent sources from experts on

genocide (IAGS, 2025). This usage aims to ensure terminological accuracy and alignment with international regulatory sources.

Ultimately, we adopt the method of international law studies and follow the rulings of the ICJ, which all UN member states are required to respect. We do so to offer a lens through which psychology communities can view their own positions in relation to the genocide. In line with the contemporary epistemological perspectives of critical psychology (e.g., Teo, 2015), we recognize that no production of knowledge is free from value orientations. The adoption of the ICJ perspective and the human rights-based framework is a methodological choice, consistent with the tradition of psychology.

The Question of Palestine according to the International Court of Justice

The ICJ is the body that deals not so much with the protection of rights in terms of the existence of states, but rather with the existence of peoples, their self-determination, and non-discrimination. Every member state of the United Nations (UN) has obligations towards the ICJ. Reports, recommendations, prohibitions, and warnings from the ICJ regarding violations of the rights to existence of individuals, groups, or peoples should inform the various member states on how to proceed in the face of a given crime. These obligations are reflected in the various States and non-state actors (e.g., international organizations, corporations, and non-governmental organizations), and other entities such as specialized organizations (e.g., scientific societies and associations). Single individuals who can wield political influence are also included since every single individual holds rights and responsibilities under international law, particularly regarding human rights and accountability for crimes (Zarei & Safari, 2016).

Türkelli et al. (2024) explain this logic based on the concept of *jus cogens*. Jus cogens norms, also known as mandatory norms of international law, are norms recognized by the international community as norms to which no derogation is permissible. In essence, these rules are binding on all UN member states, even where there are no contractual obligations, and no exceptions or objections are permitted with regard to the obligations arising from jus cogens (*erga omnes*). In this respect, it should be noted that derogation cannot even be invoked on the grounds of ‘self-defence’ or ‘force majeure’. On August 12, 2022, these norms were redefined in an attempt to decree their possible development to guarantee global health and human rights, the first of which are: prohibition of aggression, prohibition of genocide, prohibition of crimes against humanity, general laws on international humanitarian law, prohibition of racial discrimination and apartheid, prohibition of slavery, prohibition of torture, and the right to self-determination (ILC, 2022). The violation of one or more of the above norms by a state or individual entails: (a) the obligation of states to cooperate to put an end, by legitimate means, to any serious violation by a state of an obligation arising from a peremptory norm of general international law; (b) no State may recognize as lawful a situation created by a serious violation by a State of an obligation arising from a peremptory norm of general international law, nor may it render aid or assistance in the maintenance of such a situation; (c) a breach of an obligation arising from a peremptory norm of general international law is serious if it involves a grave or systematic impediment by the State responsible for that obligation; (d) this is without prejudice to the other consequences that any breach by a State of an obligation arising from a peremptory norm of general international law may entail under international law.

Hence, States and non-state actors, including universities and scientific societies that can wield political influence, are bound by a ‘negative’ or ‘positive’ obligation in the event of a violation of *jus cogens* norms. On the negative side, this includes refraining from providing material, logistical, military, and economic support that could be used to commit violations or that could be used to ‘legalize’ violations by normalizing the context in which they occurred. Added to this is the prohibition of aid and assistance to internationally wrongful acts, such as genocide, violation of the right to self-determination, apartheid, torture, and violations of humanitarian law, and the prohibition of complicity. On the positive side, the obligation is to take all effective measures available to respond to violations of the *jus cogens* norms of international law and may include the adoption of diplomatic measures ranging from the downgrading of diplomatic representation, the recall of diplomats or the severance of diplomatic relations, and the imposition of targeted economic, military, or other sanctions. For States signatories to the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights (UN, 2011), these obligations also apply to states and to every state and non-state actors. They are considered entities with a social responsibility towards human rights.

Far from this article assuming possible legal consequences where such obligations are not respected, as indicated by the 2022 review, and therefore hypothesising that states, bodies and actors may be subject to investigation by the ICJ, it is interesting to look at the juridical recommendations in this regard. Türkelli et al. (2024) specify that the primary responsibility lies with the UN member state, but that bodies and actors also have their own margin of autonomy. This implies that where a state fails to comply with *jus cogens*, a body (e.g., universities, psychological associations) may choose to remedy that failure.

About the question of Palestine, the ICJ is currently involved in the case of genocide charges brought by South Africa (ICJ, 2023). The case is still ongoing, and it could take a long time for the ICJ to reach a final decision. However, since the indictment, the ICJ has ruled that the Palestinian population is currently at risk, “whose intentional destruction by Israel will have consequences for all of humanity” (ICJ, 2024a). The ICJ has decreed the right of Palestinians in Gaza to be protected from acts of genocide and other actions prohibited by the ICJ (e.g., violation of the right to self-determination, torture). Linked to this is the decree to employ preventive measures, with the ICJ ordering Israel to take all possible measures to prevent genocide and allow the provision of basic services and humanitarian aid. In subsequent provisional measures, the ICJ ordered Israel to ensure immediate access to food supplies and to halt its military offensive in Rafah, as well as any other action that could result in the total or partial physical destruction of the Palestinian population in Gaza. These ICJ orders indicate that there is a growing risk of genocide against the Palestinian population in Gaza. About a year after these decrees, UN agencies began to speak of famine in northern Gaza, with a population suffering from widespread hunger and newborns dying from low birth weight. Added to this are two further indications from the ICJ. First, the ICJ has defined Israel’s occupation of Gaza, East Jerusalem, and the West Bank as an illegal occupation. Israel’s occupation practices have been defined as forms of “systematic discrimination based, *inter alia*, on race, religion, and ethnicity” as well as a violation of the Palestinian people’s right to self-determination (ICJ, 2024a, b, c). This led to the UN’s request to suspend any form of economic, market, and academic cooperation that could contribute to the illegal occupation of Palestinian territories (ICJ, 2025). Second, the International Criminal Court (ICC) issued arrest warrants for the current Israeli Prime Minister

Benjamin Netanyahu and former Minister of War Yoav Gallant for war crimes and crimes against humanity perpetrated in Gaza (ICC, 2024).

Following the above guidelines on *jus cogens*, pursuant to the Geneva Convention and in response to the ICJ ruling, every state is required to take the necessary measures to stop Israel's violation of the human rights of the Palestinian people. According to the ICJ, to avoid any risk of complicity in these violations of peremptory norms of international law, as well as other norms of international humanitarian law and international human rights law, institutional cooperation with Israeli bodies and actors should not be initiated, and all existing institutional cooperation should be discontinued. This is particularly important given the evidence of clear collaboration by Israeli state bodies and actors (such as universities, research centres, and scholars) in the violation of international law (Hajir & Qato, 2025; UN, 2025).

Discussing the logic, nature, and validity of the ICJ's decrees, particularly concerning human rights, requires an authority that is unmatched by that of the ICJ, since the ICJ is the only body in the world responsible for such protections. The ICJ has stated that "cooperation with institutions in Israel that operate within a legal and political context that entails and has for a long period of time entailed violations of *jus cogens* norms present an extremely high risk of complicity and may amount to aid or assistance in maintaining the situation created by Israel's illegal presence in the Occupied Palestinian Territory" (Türkelli et al., 2024, p. 22). Beyond this, statements by UN members regarding the authority of the ICJ are cause for concern. The fact that most UN member states, related bodies, and actors have not complied with the positive and negative obligations set forth by the ICJ calls into question the validity and very existence of an international order for the protection of human rights (UN Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights).

Psychology and Human Rights

Beyond the position of individual UN member states, bodies, and actors from various states, the discipline of psychology may assess the risk of its complicity in the violation of *jus cogens* norms, as well as violations of international humanitarian and international human rights laws, including (a) the illegal occupation of Palestinian territories, and (b) the risk defined as plausible by the ICJ of genocide and war crimes.

Adopting this juridical approach to the position of psychology in front of the genocide, we may find it useful to look at the literature of psychology and the research efforts against human rights violations. Such a narrative review of the existing perspectives on psychology and human rights can help to identify potential ways through which psychology can situate the question of Palestine.

First, it is worth noting that discourse around ethical principles and human rights is not generally present in psychology (Teo, 2015). Despite recent attempts for invigorating discourse on ethics in psychology (e.g., APA Policy Statement on Reaffirming APA's Commitment to Justice, Human Rights, Fairness and Dignity; APA, 2025) especially after the cases of the involvement of psychologists in torture (see, Pope, 2011; Teo, 2015), psychology as a discipline remains diligently defined as neutral, objective, and depoliticized. However, adhering to this neutral and depoliticized approach without questioning it, runs the risk of objectifying, normalizing, and silencing human rights violations (Abdelnour & Abu Moghli, 2021; Said, 1978; Said & Hitchens, 2001; Tommasi, 2025). First, there is the

reduction of human rights violations to mere objects of analysis (i.e., objectification). This only serves to maintain the status of immutability, legitimacy, and normality of phenomena, events, and ideologies that determine human rights violations (i.e., normalization). At the same time, no attention or voice is given to human rights violations or to those who promote and protect them (i.e., silencing). Such a (non-)approach to violence, through objectification, normalization, and silencing, can only be complicit in that it does not contribute to the documentation of rights violations (because it objectifies them), does not produce possible solutions and remedies (but rather normalizes them), and does not open up possible further interpretations, positions, and solutions (because it silences the actors involved) (Baum & McGahan, 2013; de Rond & Lok, 2016). Furthermore, this supposed scientific neutrality has been widely problematized in critical literature, which has highlighted its ideological roots and political implications. Bal & Doci (2018), for example, have pointed out how organizational psychology often implicitly reproduces neoliberal ideology, naturalizing forms of competitive individualism and the depoliticization of hardship. Historically, the collusion between eugenic pseudoscience and the racial policies of the Nazi regime also serves as a warning about the risks of a science that is apparently neutral but permeated by logics of power and exclusion. In this sense, recognizing the ideological matrices of science becomes a necessary step towards a psychology that is truly ethical and committed to the protection of human rights.

Nevertheless, although sporadic, there exist attempts by psychologists to oppose and resist armed conflicts and conditions of human rights violations (Lykes, 2001; Smith, 2009). In these works, we note that human rights are taken as the founding principles of academic and professional practice, i.e., for a psychology that deals with people's rights to existence. These examples follow the effort to answer the ethical question, 'What should I do as a psychologist to do the right thing?'. That is, scholars have highlighted how, beyond the code of ethics, psychology is a discipline for people, and it has its own value in the face of structural and systemic conditions of human rights violations (Twose & Cohrs, 2015; Doise, 1998; Lykes, 2000, 2001; Patel, 2019). The best known and most emblematic case is certainly that of Martin-Baro's *Psychology of Liberation* (1996). Starting from the idea that mental health and psychosocial risks in Latin America were closely linked to repressive policies, the author emphasized how people's health was closely linked to the violation of their rights as human beings due to conditions of structural and institutionalized violence. Psychic phenomena and mental health are therefore not to be understood as something exclusively intra-psychic, but rather as linked to the social sphere and the environment. In these terms, liberation psychology presents itself as an attempt to broaden the perspective of psychology, as ethically based on the protection of human rights (Lykes, 2001; Martin-Baro, 1996). In line with the perspective of Liberation Psychology, another important theoretical reference is Peace Psychology (Balvin et al., 2025). This discipline aims to understand and transform the psychological, social, and structural conditions that generate direct and indirect violence, promoting the construction of sustainable peace at the individual, institutional, and collective levels. Peace Psychology conceives human beings as part of interconnected systems, in which peace does not simply coincide with the absence of conflict, but implies overcoming structural inequalities and promoting social justice. In this view, psychology is called upon not only to mitigate the effects of violence, but also to develop preventive and transformative strategies that promote social cohesion, reconciliation, and the recognition of human rights as the foundation of peace itself. Peace Psychology, therefore, broadens the

ethical mandate of the discipline, orienting it toward global responsibility and the sustainability of peaceful coexistence processes. Similarly, Lykes (2001) explains how constructivism and cultural psychology have also been involved in integrating human rights into psychology through an understanding of the structural conditions that characterize the individual's experience and affect their mental health. We find the same approach in the work of Jabr (Jabr & Berger, 2017; Jabr et al., 2013; Helbich & Jabr, 2022), which revises the psychiatric approach through the lens of liberation psychology, decolonizing Western thought to address physical and mental health in the occupied Palestinian territories. The result is a decolonial psychology approach which shows that human rights should not be assumed to be universal characteristics of the individual, but rather that they are attributable to culture, environment, and history. In essence, both the constructivist approach, cultural psychology, and liberation psychology inform us that psychology and human rights violations refer to a psychology concerned with violations and abuses of individual and collective rights because of external and systematic structural forces. Looking at the Italian context, Basaglia's work was an attempt to renew and revise psychiatry with a view to protecting human rights (Contestabile, 2024; Colucci & Di Vittorio, 2001). Similar attempts in the Italian context are represented by the work of Fornari and Pagliarani and their research on war, human destructiveness and conflict which led to fund the group of anti-H (i.e., anti-atomic bomb) and the Institute of Polemology in the mid-1960s (Fornari, 1970; Pagliarani, 1968).

This work shows that there can be no distinction between theory and practice, as they enter a reciprocal relationship in an attempt to resist and liberate from human rights violations (Hooks, 1991). In this regard, it is also worth recalling the open letter "Break the selective silence on the genocide in Gaza" promoted on change.org and subsequently published in *The Lancet* (De Vogli et al., 2025). This can be considered an illustration of psychology committed to the protection of human rights and opposed to their violation. The letter is addressed to international scientific associations and societies dealing with health, among which those of interest to psychology stand out (European Federation of Psychologists' Associations, American Psychological Association, International Society of Political Psychology, European Health Psychology Society).

Taken together, these works help us to (re)think psychology from the perspective of regeneration and (re)signification of the discipline and its socio-political value, in which the violation of human rights, understood as the violation of the rights of individuals and communities has to be addressed by psychology itself (Contestabile, 2024; Prilleltensky & Stead, 2013; Tommasi, 2025). What is more, these works inform that a psychology for human rights can reflect alliances with non-governmental organizations or local activists, with institutions on a larger scale to remedy structural conditions (Gómez, 2023; Gómez et al., 2023).

Psychologists for Palestine The perspective of human rights psychology described above certainly offers an opportunity to understand how psychology could align with the ICJ. But this alignment should not be the only rationale for advocating the question of Palestine. Whether it is liberation psychology, constructivist or cultural approaches, or other perspectives, psychology can revolve around the issue of human rights violations and be rethought and re-signified in this light, demonstrating its socio-political value. As a discipline for people, psychology has a valid and reliable authority through which to mark its position by considering the question of Palestine as relevant in every area of psychology (i.e., research

and practice, in societies and associations, in public and private structures, in degree courses and academic departments). In this perspective, we are not reducing psychology to a moral or political discourse, but rather we reaffirm its disciplinary core: the study of the subjective, relational, and institutional processes that determine psychological health and social cohesion. The analysis of conditions of oppression and inequality as in the case of Palestine falls squarely within the scope of psychology and human rights, as it concerns the construction of a sense of justice, intergroup recognition, and professional responsibility in the prevention of collective trauma. Talking about Palestine, therefore, is not a deviation from the field of psychology, but a consistent application of its ethical principles. Doing so, it is not only in line with current juridical international norms and the *jus cogens*, but also demonstrates an interest in supporting a socially responsible discipline that is aware of its contribution to social justice and respect for human rights.

Emphasizing what has been said so far, taking a position on the question of Palestine is not only a juridical but also a moral duty. As a discipline that deals with/for people, we, psychologists, have a series of responsibilities in our practice as researchers, teachers, and professionals, just as we have towards ourselves as individuals. We have a responsibility to pursue and uphold ideals of social justice, to confront social inequalities and the diverse communities with which we come into contact. We have a responsibility to the bodies of which we are part and to protect freedom of thought and expression, just as we have a responsibility to the users of our work, including students, collaborators, and other professional and institutional bodies. We have a responsibility to society, which asks us to prioritize ideals for a more just and equitable world that leaves no one behind, countering power structures and forms of systemic violence. What psychology can do is take a clear stand, declaring its opposition to what is happening to the Palestinian people and advocating for the causes of human rights violations against genocide and apartheid.

Our desired stance on psychology for Palestine is not limited to a generic act of solidarity but implies an ethical and professional alignment with the principles of *jus cogens* and the founding values of psychology. This means recognizing the responsibility of the scientific community to end all forms of complicity with systems or institutions that violate human rights, while at the same time safeguarding the possibility of collaborating with individual scholars who actively oppose such violations. The position proposed, therefore, is that of a psychology that openly opposes all forms of apartheid and state violence but maintains a space for dialogue and critical cooperation with those who, even within oppressive contexts, work for justice and human dignity.

We must acknowledge that our intellectual work can be subject to criticism. First, the juridical and moral perspective we have presented can be easily and systematically disregarded, as the examples of the UN states demonstrate in the current immobility toward Gaza and in other cases of persistent gaps between normative knowledge and political practice (Bar-Tal & Magal, 2026). As argued by De Vogli (2026), there is a double standard, a selective empathy by UN states in contrasting human rights violations, with stark differences between the language, moral framing, and interventionist approaches whereby solidarity varies according to different national, ethnic, and geopolitical alignment (De Vogli et al., 2026). As demonstrated by the report of the UN special Rapporteur Francesca Albanese on the genocide, there is a “corporate machinery sustaining Israel’s settler-colonial project of displacement and replacement of the Palestinians in the occupied territory” (Albanese,

2025). Then, we might wonder whether the UN's legal approach can serve human rights protection concretely, given the various intertwined geopolitical and economic interests. Considering the history of the question of Palestine, we must acknowledge that the UN has failed mainly in pursuing the mandate for human rights protection. Nevertheless, this is not the time for blaming errors, but rather it is the time for action, cooperation and solidarity by putting all the necessary energies to stop the never ending violent and deadly campaigns against the Palestinian people.

In closing, we wish to note that the present paper results from our decision to stop being silent while witnessing the genocide in Palestine. In this paper, we have expressed our dissent and presented arguments for upholding psychology's social responsibility. As noted, this is not an alternative to psychology's scientific nature, but rather a necessary extension of it. Knowledge that ignores its political and moral implications is no longer neutral, but unknowingly complicit. Certainly, however emphatic, idealistic, and empty such statements may seem, it is necessary to remind psychology that it is a discipline that is part of the world and, as such, gives meaning to it. In this paper, we have decided not to include possible practices that we, as psychologists, could make. We did so because we believe that the juridical perspective offers indications of possible actions we can take in psychology. Moreover, in the literature of psychology, there are various examples of what we can do in terms of research and practice (Veronese et al., 2010, 2025), and networking (The Palestine Mental Health Networks-PMHN, 2026). We believe that our paper thus provides a space to speak and to create a community of solidarity in which to think about potential actions. Breaking the silence with our collective voices, we hope that our contribution will resonate with the institutions that organize and determine our discipline. In the meantime, we continue our scream and humble form of resistance against the violation of human rights, the genocide, and apartheid in Palestine.

Acknowledgements Not applicable.

Author contributions F.T. conceived of the presented idea, developed the theory and wrote the manuscript. D.G. contributed in revising the first draft. All authors discussed the manuscript and contributed to the final version.

Funding Open access funding provided by Università degli Studi di Milano within the CRUI-CARE Agreement. Not applicable.

Data Availability Not applicable.

Declarations

Ethical approval Not applicable.

Competing interests The authors declare no competing interests.

Open Access This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>.

References

- Abdelnour, S., & Abu Moghli, M. (2021). Researching violent contexts: A call for political reflexivity. *Organization*, 0(0). <https://doi.org/10.1177/13505084211030646>
- Abuward, O. H., Fiscione, C., Abulibda, N. M., Mustafa, A., & Veronese, G. (2025). Do you think all of us are mentally sick because of this horror? Mental health under genocide in Gaza. *International Journal of Human Rights in Healthcare*, 18(4), 225–243. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ijhrh-10-2024-0073>
- Albanese, F. (2025). From economy of occupation to economy of genocide: Report of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Palestinian territories occupied since 1967. *United Nations*. <https://www.un.org/unispal/document/a-hrc-59-23-from-economy-of-occupation-to-economy-of-genocid-e-report-special-rapporteur-francesca-albanese-palestine-2025/>
- American Psychological Association (2025). APA Policy Statement on Reaffirming APA's Commitment to Justice, Human Rights, Fairness and Dignity. Available at: <https://www.apa.org/about/policy/statement-t-justice-human-rights.pdf>
- Associazione Italiana di Psicologia (AIP) (2025). Dichiarazione dell'Associazione Italiana di Psicologia sulla crisi umanitaria a Gaza. Available at: <https://aipass.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/09/Dichiarazione-dellAssociazione-Italiana-di-Psicologia-sulla-crisi-umanitaria-a-Gaza.pdf>
- Bal, P. M., & Dóci, E. (2018). Neoliberal ideology in work and organizational psychology. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 27(5), 536–548. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2018.1449108>
- Balvin, N., Haji, R., & McKeown, S. (2025). Peace psychology and global challenges. *Peace and Conflict, Journal of Peace Psychology*, 31(2), 127–131. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pac0000800>
- Bar-Tal, D., & Magal, T. (2026). The unbearable practice of politicians: The gap between knowledge about DEI and their actions in reality. In V. Esses, J. Dovidio, J. Jetten, D. Sekaquaptewa, & K. West (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of psychological perspectives on diversity, equity, and inclusion* (pp. 621–637). Sage.
- Baum, J. A. C., & McGahan, A. M. (2013). The reorganization of legitimate violence: The contested terrain of the private military and security industry during the post-cold war era. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 33, 3–37. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.riob.2013.10.004>
- Cavazzoni, F., Mustafa, A., Sousa, C., Abuward, O. H., Nofal, M. A., & Veronese, G. (2025). Anyone else struggling with work-genocide balance? Exploring the psychological and social impact of collective annihilation in Gaza. *Culture Medicine and Psychiatry*, 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11013-025-09953-0>
- Colucci, M., & Di Vittorio, P. (2001). *Franco Basaglia*. Pearson Italia Spa.
- Contestabile (2024). *Psicologia della Resistenza*. Effequ.
- de Rond, M., & Lok, J. (2016). Some things can never be unseen: The role of context in psychological injury at war. *Academy of Management Journal*, 59(6), 1965–93. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2015.0681>
- De Vogli, R. (2026). *Selective empathy: the West through the gaze of Gaza* (Vol. 348). Brill.
- De Vogli, R., Montomoli, J., Abu-Sittah, G., & Pappé, I. (2025). Break the selective silence on the genocide in Gaza. *Lancet*, 406(10504), 688–689. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0140-6736\(25\)01541-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0140-6736(25)01541-7)
- De Vogli, R., Montomoli, J., Wilkinson, R., & Pickett, K. (2026). Selective empathy and the genocide in Gaza: The silence of health and academic associations. *Globalization and Health*, 22(1), 12. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12992-025-01168-7>
- Division 48 of the American Psychological Association, Society for the Study of Peace, Conflict, and Violence (2025). Psychologists Call for Justice and Accountability: Confronting the Atrocities Against Palestinian Lives <https://static1.squarespace.com/static/6792b25d99228129eae5d6e/t/6851c5d527e3eb4ca1d8c4da/1750189525814/Psychologists%2BCall%2Bfor%2BJustice%2BAnd%2BAccountability--Confronting%2Bthe%2BATrocities%2BAgainst%2BPalestinian%2BLives.pdf>
- Doise, W. (1998). Social psychology and human rights. *European Review*, 6(3), 341–347. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1062798700003380>
- ECPA (2025). ECPA statement on the genocidal war in Gaza. <https://www.ecpa-online.com/ecpa-statement-on-the-war-in-gaza/>
- Fornari, F. (1970/1974). *The psychoanalysis of war*. Anchor. Alenka Pfeifer, Trans.
- Gómez, J. M. (2023). Institutional courage to change the world. In J. M. Gómez, *The cultural betrayal of Black women and girls: A Black feminist approach to healing from sexual abuse* (pp. 133–168). American Psychological Association <https://doi.org/10.1037/0000362-007>
- Gómez, J. M., Freyd, J. J., Delva, J., Tracy, B., Mackenzie, L. N., Ray, V., & Weathington, B. (2023). Institutional courage in action: Racism, sexual violence, & concrete institutional change. *Journal of Trauma & Dissociation*, 24(2), 157–170. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15299732.2023.2168245>

- Gómez-Ugarte, A. C., Chen, I., Acosta, E., Basellini, U., & Alburez-Gutierrez, D. (2025). Accounting for uncertainty in conflict mortality estimation: An application to the Gaza War in 2023–2024. *Population Health Metrics*, 23(1), Article 55. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12963-025-00422-9>
- Hajir, B., & Qato, M. (2025). Academia in a time of genocide: Scholasticidal tendencies and continuities. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 23(5), 1163–1171. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14767724.2024.2445855>
- Hall, R. (2025). ‘I am physically here, but mentally in Gaza’ says lecturer now living in UK. *The Guardian*.
- Helbich, M., & Jabr, S. (2022). A call for social justice and for a human rights approach with regard to mental health in the occupied Palestinian territories. *Health and Human Rights*, 24(2), 305–318.
- Hooks, B. (1991). Theory as liberatory practice. *Yale Journal of Law and Feminism*, 4(1), 1–12.
- International Association of Genocide Scholars IAGS Resolution on the Situation in Gaza <https://genocidescholars.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/08/IAGS-Resolution-on-Gaza-FINAL.pdf>
- International Court of Justice (ICJ) (2023). The Republic of South Africa institutes proceedings against the State of Israel and requests the Court to indicate provisional, *Press Release*, 29 December 2023, measures <https://www.icj-cij.org/sites/default/files/case-related/192/192-20231229-pre-01-00-en.pdf>
- International Court of Justice (ICJ) (2024a). Application of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide in the Gaza Strip (South Africa v. Israel), Provisional Measures, Order of 26 January 2024. International Court of Justice. <https://www.icj-cij.org/sites/default/files/case-related/192/192-20240126-ord-01-00-en.pdf>
- International Court of Justice (ICJ) (2024b). Summary of the Advisory Opinion of 19 July 2024.
- International Court of Justice (ICJ) (2024c). Order of the 26 January 2024 - Application of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide in the Gaza Strip (South Africa v. Israel), Document Number 192-20240126-ORD-01-00-EN, 26 January 2024, paragraph 44, <https://www.icj-cij.org/node/203447>
- International Court of Justice (ICJ) (2025). Verbatim Record, *Public sitting held on Monday February 19, 2024, at 10 am, at the Peace Palace, President Salam presiding, on the Legal Consequences arising from the Policies and Practices of Israel in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem*, 19 February 2024, paragraph 27. <https://www.icj-cij.org/node/203>
- International Criminal Court (2024). Situation in the State of Palestine: ICC Pre-Trial Chamber I rejects the State of Israel’s challenges to jurisdiction and issues warrants of arrest for Benjamin Netanyahu and Yoav Gallant, *Press Release*, 21 November 2024. <https://www.icc-cpi.int/news/situation-state-palestine-icc-pre-trial-chamber-i-rejects-state-israels-challenges>
- International Law Commission (ILC) (2022). Draft conclusions on identification and legal consequences of peremptory norms of general international law (jus cogens), 2022. https://legal.un.org/ilc/texts/instruments/english/draft_articles/1_14_2022.pdf
- Jabr, S., & Berger, E. (2017). Trauma in Palestine. *The Editorial Assistants–Jordan*, 28(2), 154–159.
- Jabr, S., Morse, M., El Sarraj, W., & Awidi, B. (2013). Mental health in Palestine: Country report. *The Arab Journal of Psychiatry*, 24(2), 174–178. <https://doi.org/10.12816/0001376>
- Kuhn, T. (1962). *The nature and necessity of scientific revolutions*. University of Chicago Press.
- Lykes, M. B. (2000). Possible contributions of a psychology of liberation: Whither health and human rights? *Journal of Health Psychology*, 5(3), 383–397. <https://doi.org/10.1177/135910530000500312>
- Lykes, M. B. (2001). Human rights violations as structural violence. In D. Christie, R. V. Wagner, & D. Winter (Eds.), *Peace, conflict, and violence: Peace psychology for the 21st century* (pp. 158–67). Prentice-Hall.
- Martín-Baró, I. (1996). *Writings for a liberation psychology*. Harvard University Press.
- NBC News. (2025). *The IDF is supposed to protect aid workers*. Aid agencies say the Israeli military has been attacking them for months.
- Pagliarini, L. (1968). *Si può organizzare la speranza? (L’esperimento del Gruppo Anti H)*, in Fornari F. *Dis-sacrazione della Guerra. Dal pacifismo alla scienza dei conflitti*, Milano, Feltrinelli.
- Patel, N. (2019). Human rights-based approach to applied psychology. *European Psychologist*, 24(2), 113–124. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1016-9040/a000371>
- PMHN - The Palestine Mental Health Networks (2026). <https://www.pmhn-international.org/>
- Pope, K. S. (2011). Are the American Psychological Association’s detainee interrogation policies ethical and effective? Key claims, documents, and results. *Zeitschrift für Psychologie/Journal of Psychology*, 219, 150–158. <https://doi.org/10.1027/2151-2604/a000062>

- Prilleltensky, I., & Stead, G. B. (2013). Critical Psychology, well-being, and work. In D. L. Blustein (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of the psychology of working* (pp. 19–36). Oxford University Press.
- Said, E. W. (1978). *Orientalism*. Pantheon Books.
- Said, E. W. (1979). *The question of Palestine*. Times Books.
- Said, E. W., & Hitchens, C. (2001). *Blaming the Victims: Spurious Scholarship and the Palestinian Question*. Verso.
- Sinan, Y. (2025). *Decades of Israeli Forces Killing Journalists With Impunity*. Sourced.
- Smith, R. K. M. (2009). Human rights in international law. In M. Goodhart (Ed.), *Human rights politics and practice* (pp. 60–76). Oxford University Press.
- Taysir Dabbagh, N., Troupp, C., Freeman, M., & Hollins, K. (2025). *How do we even talk about Palestine and Israel?* TWiG.
- Teo, T. (2015). Critical psychology: A geography of intellectual engagement and resistance. *American Psychologist*, 70(3), 243–254. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0038727>
- Tommasi, F. (2025). Resistere e liberare dalla violenza: Figure di una psicologia responsabile. *Giornale Italiano di Psicologia*, 52(4), 763–782. <https://doi.org/10.1421/118802>
- Türkelli, G. E., De Feyter, K., & Kruger, T. (2024). *Serious breaches of obligations arising from peremptory norms of general International law & consequences for institutional cooperation with universities in Israel*. Available at: <https://medialibrary.uantwerpen.be/files/7154/746c261e-9427-4832-b1d0-9a47f79bdee2.pdf>. Accessed 27 February 2026.
- Twose, G., & Cohrs, J. C. (2015). Psychology and human rights: Introduction to the special issue. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, 21(1), 3–9. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pac0000087>
- UN/Human Rights (2011). Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights. https://www.ohchr.org/sites/default/files/documents/publications/guidingprinciplesbusinesshr_en.pdf
- UN/Human Rights (2024). UN experts warn international order on a knife's edge, urge States to comply with ICJ Advisory Opinion. <https://www.ohchr.org/en/statements-and-speeches/2024/09/un-experts-warn-in-international-order-knives-edge-urge-states-comply>
- UN/Human Rights (2025). From economy of occupation to economy of genocide. Report of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Palestinian territories occupied since 1967. <https://www.un.org/unispal/document/a-hrc-59-23-from-economy-of-occupation-to-economy-of-genocide-report-special-rapporteur-francesca-albanese-palestine-2025/>
- United Nations. (1948). Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide. *United Nations Treaty Series*, 78, 277. https://treaties.un.org/pages/ViewDetails.aspx?src=TREATY&mdsg_no=IV-1&chapter=4.
- United Nations. (1998). Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court. *United Nations Treaty Series*, 2187, 3. <https://www.icc-cpi.int/sites/default/files/RS-Eng.pdf>
- UN/OCHA (2025). Reported impact snapshot | Gaza Strip (27 August 2025) <https://www.ochaopt.org/content/reported-impact-snapshot-gaza-strip-27-august-2025>
- UNRWA (2025). UNRWA Situation Report #182 on the Humanitarian Crisis in the Gaza Strip and the West Bank, including East Jerusalem. *UNRWA*.
- UN/UN News. (2024). Gaza: 'Sickening normalisation' of suffering, amid attacks on people and aid convoys. *UN News*. United Nations. <https://news.un.org/en/story/2024/12/1158176>
- Veronese, G., Castiglioni, M., & Said, M. (2010). The use of narrative-experiential instruments in contexts of military violence: The case of Palestinian children in the West Bank. *Counselling Psychology Quarterly*, 23(4), 411–423.
- Veronese, G., Hamamra, B., Mahamid, F., Bdier, D., & Cavazzoni, F. (2025). Intersectional violence against women in Gaza amidst genocide. *Women's Studies International Forum* (Vol. 110, p. 103081). Pergamon.
- Zarei, M. H., & Safari, A. (2016). The Status of Non-State Actors under the International Rule of Law: A search for global justice. *Rethinking International Law and Justice* (pp. 233–252). Routledge.

Authors and Affiliations

Francesco Tommasi¹ · Davide Giusino² · Matthijs Bal³ · Sandiso Bazana⁴ · Angelo Benozzo⁵ · Margherita Brondino⁶ · Andreina Bruno⁷ · Daniela Converso⁸ · Chiara Corvino⁹ · Roberto De Vogli¹⁰ · Giuseppina Dell'Aversana¹¹ · Chiara Destefanis¹⁸ · Hilda Du Plooy⁶ · Francesca Esposito¹² · Laura Galuppo¹³ · Sven George¹⁴ · Silvia Gilardi¹ · Mara Gorli¹⁵ · Giada Mignolli⁶ · Ambra Natati⁶ · Margherita Pasini⁶ · Camilla Ponti¹⁹ · Silvio Carlo Ripamonti¹³ · Armando Toscano¹⁷ · Luca P. Vecchio¹¹ · Guido Veronese¹⁶ · Chiara Volpato¹¹ · Milica Vukelić²⁰

✉ Francesco Tommasi
francesco.tommasi@unimi.it

Davide Giusino
davide.giusino@unifg.it

Matthijs Bal
mbal@lincoln.ac.uk

Sandiso Bazana
s.bazana@ru.ac.za

Angelo Benozzo
a.benozzo@univda.it

Margherita Brondino
margherita.brondino@univr.it

Andreina Bruno
andreina.bruno@unige.it

Daniela Converso
daniela.converso@unito.it

Chiara Corvino
chiara.corvino1@unicatt.it

Roberto De Vogli
roberto.devogli@unipd.it

Giuseppina Dell'Aversana
giuseppina.dellaversana@unimib.it

Chiara Destefanis
chiara@destefanis.eu

Hilda Du Plooy
hilda.duplooy@univr.it

Francesca Esposito
francesca.esposito34@unibo.it

Laura Galuppo
Laura.galuppo@unicatt.it

Sven George
sven.george@hu-berlin.de

Silvia Gilardi
silvia.gilardi@unimi.it

Mara Gorli
mara.gorli@unicatt.it

Giada Mignolli
giada.mignolli@univr.it

Ambra Natati
ambra.natati@univr.it

Margherita Pasini
margherita.pasini@univr.it

Camilla Ponti
camilla.ponti.psi@gmail.com

Silvio Carlo Ripamonti
Silvio.ripamonti@unicatt.it

Armando Toscano
Armando.toscano@unibg.it

Luca P. Vecchio
luca.vecchio@unimib.it

Guido Veronese
guido.veronese@unimib.it

Chiara Volpato
chiara.volpato@unimib.it

Milica Vukelić
milicaa.vukelic@gmail.com

- ¹ Dipartimento di Scienze Sociali e Politiche, Università degli Studi di Milano, Milan, Italia
- ² Dipartimento di Studi Umanistici, Lettere, Beni Culturali, Scienze della Formazione, Università degli Studi di Foggia, Foggia, Italia
- ³ Lincoln International Business School, University of Lincoln, Lincoln, UK
- ⁴ Department of Psychology, Rhodes University, Rhodes, South Africa
- ⁵ Department of Human and Social Sciences, Aosta Valley University, Aosta, Italy
- ⁶ Department of Human Sciences, University of Verona, Verona, Italy
- ⁷ Department of Educational Science, Università degli Studi di Genova, Genoa, Italy
- ⁸ Department of Psychology, University of Turin, Turin, Italy
- ⁹ Faculty of Economics, Department of Psychology, Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, Milano, Italy
- ¹⁰ Human Rights Center and Department of Social Psychology and Development, University of Padova, Padova, Italy
- ¹¹ Department of Psychology, University of Milano-Bicocca, Milan, Italy
- ¹² Department of Psychology “Renzo Canestrari”, University of Bologna, Bologna, Italy
- ¹³ Faculty of Psychology, Catholic University of The Sacred Heart, Milano, Italy
- ¹⁴ Humbolt University of Berlin, Berlin, Germany
- ¹⁵ Department of Psychology, Faculty of Economics, Catholic University of the Sacred Heart, Milano, Italy
- ¹⁶ Department of human sciences for education “R. Massa”, University of Milano- Bicocca, Milan, Italy
- ¹⁷ Department of Human Sciences, University of Bergamo, Bergamo, Italy
- ¹⁸ Torino, Italy
- ¹⁹ Milano, Italy
- ²⁰ Belgrad, Serbia