

Tonge Descends Further

The author H. G. Wells was a passionate socialist – a failing that caused some amusing inaccuracies in his science-fiction visions of the future, and more seriously, caused him forever to besmirch his reputation as a decent human being when he sided wholeheartedly with one of the greatest and cruellest evils of all time: He visited Stalin in 1934 and delivered **this verdict**:

“I have never met a man more candid, fair and honest, and to these qualities it is, and nothing occult and sinister, that he owes his tremendous undisputed ascendancy in Russia. I had thought before I saw him that he might be where he was because men were afraid of him but I realize that he owes his position to the fact that no one is afraid of him and everybody trusts him.”

The fact that this sort of betrayal of civilised values was common among Wells’ fellow intellectuals was one of the great catastrophes of the twentieth century. But few of them descended as deeply into the moral gutter as today’s Jenny Tonge, the Liberal Democrat Member of Parliament for Richmond Park.

We commented on Tonge recently, after she said that she might become **a suicide bomber** if she were Palestinian. Now she has gone further, displaying such fatuous trust in vicious killers that Wells would seem perceptive and honourable by comparison. On a recent **visit** to the West Bank, she met some terrorists who were proud of her. She claims to be ashamed of this (why? are they not doing what she said she would do in their position?) but then reports:

More re-assuring was the statement that they now accepted that Israel had a right to exist and their campaign would stop when Israel withdrew to its 1967 borders, removed settlements and returned Jerusalem to the Palestinians.

Should one weep in sorrow or laughter at the sheer naivety of this statement? The mass-murdering terrorists tell her they don’t want to wipe Israel from the map and kill all its inhabitants, so obviously it must be true! But it is **not true**. She continues:

We visited the family of a suicide bomber. The stories of

indoctrination of little children right through their schooldays didn't seem to apply here.

Perhaps she never bothered to visit a school or pick up a **textbook** or **watch television** during her visit. Her willingness to take a cynically sanitised propaganda tour at face value is disgusting abrogation of the values of openness and criticism. Shame on her.

So desperate is she to to rescue the sacred premises of the leftist drivel that consitutes her world-view that she will swallow any argument, no matter how ridiculous or counter-factual. Thus she argues that suicide bombing is a result of poverty:

I would challenge anyone to spend a few days here and see the contrasts between modern Israel and its affluent citizens and the third world of Palestine.

She will not let the fact that most Islamists are **well off** and educated and come from wealthy countries get in the way of her "righteous indignation".

She churns out every myth exculpating Palestinian terrorists as if it were Gospel, including the wicked remark that got her fired from her shadow-ministerial position in her party:

It is certainly true that suicide bombers are regarded as national heroes here, but what else do they have - born out of despair and the desire to resist occupation, laced with religious belief.

What else do they have? The Palestinians could choose as their heroes those trying to resist the terrorists. They could fight against terrorists rather than praise them. That is what every civilised person is urging them to do.

Footnote: Jerusalem cannot be "returned" to the Palestinians because they have never held sovereignty over the city. Arabs have not held it since 1250, and Jews have been the majority there since about 1850 – Editor.

Sat, 02/21/2004 - 19:25 | [digg](#) | [del.icio.us](#) | [permalink](#)

Israel and terrorists

"They could fight against terrorists rather than praise them. That is what every civilised person is urging them to do."
or they could elect terrorists as PM, Israel having been ruled by terrorists Menachem Begin and Yitzhak Shamir only 20 and 10 years ago

Begin bus bombing innocent civilians - 1 of many incidents

http://www.cdiss.org/terror_1940s.htm

Twenty Arabs, five Jews and two British soldiers killed and thirty wounded in Jewish terrorist bomb attacks on buses in Haifa and

Ramleh, Palestine. British mandate to rule Palestine ends on 15 May

1948; state of Israel established.

December 29

Jewish Irgun terrorists throw grenades from passing taxi into cafe near the Damascus gate, Jerusalem, Palestine, killing eleven Arabs and two British policemen.

Shamir murdered the UN peace negotiator

<http://www.us-israel.org/jsource/History/folke.html>

The terrorists, wearing khaki shorts and peaked caps, left their jeep, found Bernadotte in the second car of the convoy and one man, later discovered to be Yehoshua Cohen, fired a Schmeisser automatic pistol into the car, spraying the interior with bullets and killing Seraut and then Bernadotte. The other LEHI members shot the tires of the rest of the convoy and all the terrorists escaped to the religious community of Sha'arei Pina where they hid with haredi (ultra-religious) LEHI sympathizers for a few days ... Yitzhak Shamir reputedly played a role in planning the assassination; however, he was never tried and went on to become Prime Minister of Israel.

by a reader on Thu, 02/26/2004 - 16:13 | [reply](#)

Israeli Terrorism

Jewish terrorism had an objective that was not lunatic, genocidal, racist nonsense, unlike the atrocities committed by Palestinian terrorists

<http://www.settingtheworldtorights.com/node.php?id=84>

by [Alan Forrester](#) on Fri, 02/27/2004 - 02:23 | [reply](#)

terror is terror

that is rubbish, terrorism is terrorism and you seem to be close to condoning it there.

what was the purpose of Begin's killers bombing a cafe full of civilians if not to murder innocents ? too much mayo in the bagels ?

the ultimate purpose was an Israeli annexation of land whose inhabitants were still 2/3 Pal arab even in 1947, if anything the Pal rationale for terror: to end illegal (under international law an dUN res 446) Israeli annexation of the remaining 22% of their homeland is MORE justifiable.

by a reader on Fri, 02/27/2004 - 09:14 | [reply](#)

Jewish Terrorism

Couple of points:

(1) Terrorism was only ever a minority thing among the Jews.

(2) The Irgun and the Stern Gang were deliberately dissolved and

suppressed by the IDF very shortly after the War of Independence.

<http://www.settingtheworldtorights.com/node.php?id=86>

'When the United Nations envoy Count Folke Bernadotte proposed a new partition plan which, among other things, again did not assign Jerusalem to Israel, he was assassinated by Lehi. Ben-Gurion ordered: "Arrest all Stern Gang [Lehi] leaders. Surround all Stern bases. Confiscate all arms. Kill any who resist." Virtually all Lehi members were indeed arrested and Lehi ceased to exist.

'Ben-Gurion then demanded that the Irgun be dissolved. Any members of the Irgun who unconditionally handed over their weapons and joined the IDF, would receive amnesty for their previous crimes. Otherwise they would be treated as criminals. The Irgun, in a bitter statement in which they said that they evidently valued the lives of IDF soldiers more than the Israeli government did, complied, and its members joined the IDF.'

For more details see Martin Gilbert's book Israel.

by **Alan Forrester** on Sun, 02/29/2004 - 02:30 | [reply](#)

Alan, terrorism was such a "...

Alan,
terrorism was such a "minority thing" about Israelis that they elected 2 of the terror chiefs as Prime Minister.
exactly - Israelis only ceased terrorism once they got a state - maybe there's a clue to "solving" Palestinian terrorism. Or maybe it would have been better if the world hadn't given in to Israeli terror in the first place.

"virtually all Lehi members were arrested" - and none served any extensive time in jail - the terror chief Yitzhak Shamir never faced justice for his crimes. the killer who pulled the trigger on Bernadotte, Yehoshua Cohen, later became Ben-Gurion's personal bodyguard.

<http://www.adelaideinstitute.org/Beauty/bernadotte.htm>

by a reader on Mon, 03/01/2004 - 14:00 | [reply](#)

what should we do about it?

wow, now i see how awful the jews are. but as a new member of the anti-semite clique, i don't yet know all the pieces. specifically, you've convinced me how horrible the jews are, but have yet to tell me what we should do with them. could you please fill me in?

-- Elliot Temple

<http://www.curi.us/>

by **Elliot Temple** on Mon, 03/01/2004 - 20:56 | [reply](#)

Elliot, don't be so juvenil

Elliot,

don't be so juvenile !
did I say I thought Jews were horrible ?
I condemn terrorism, Palestinian and Israeli.
strange how condemning Israeli terrorism and the election of Israeli
terrorists gets you all excited yet you seemed perfectly happy at the
claim that Palestinians "praise" terrorists.
that speaks volumes about you.

by a reader on Thu, 03/04/2004 - 12:27 | [reply](#)

Palestinians, Jews, and a recent poster

The Palestinians have two major national aims. They want to establish a state, and they want their state to replace Israel. Israel's national objective is to continue to exist as a free and democratic Jewish State. The first Palestinian national objective is in no conflict with the Zionist mission, but the second one is, as it calls for the destruction of the Jewish state. Israel is, understandably, only willing to cooperate with the creation of a Palestinian state if the state is not a step in a Palestinian attempt to destroy Israel.

Unfortunately, the Palestinians are only willing to cooperate with a two-state plan if it seems to allow them to continue moving towards their goal of Palestinian sovereignty in all of Israel's territory, including the section inside the green line. They are currently seeking, not peace, but favorable diplomatic agreements that facilitate both their legitimate and illegitimate national agenda. As Israel and her allies are now unwilling to cooperate with this, there have been no new agreements lately. The Palestinians have been fighting the war with their suicide bombers rather than trying to negotiate their way to victory.

It's certainly the case that a just peace will involve a two state solution -- but that is not possible until both sides genuinely want it. As such, Palestinian terrorists are undermining the legitimate effort to get the Palestinians a viable state, and should properly be regarded as traitors to the legitimate Palestinian cause. And yet, they are widely supported by the Palestinian people. This fact is worth mentioning, and it ought to tell us something about which national objective the Palestinians value more.

The pre-state Zionists were dealing with a completely different situation than the modern day Palestinian Arabs. They were dealing with Arabs who wanted them dead and gone, and a British authority that wanted to appease the Arabs more than it wanted to save the Jews from genocide. This was not a situation they could improve by agreeing to be peaceful and negotiate sovereignty. It was necessary to raise an army that could fight a war and win, in the face of an occupier that tried to prevent this. In these circumstances, everyone faced impossible choices, and some of the Zionists formed terrorist organizations and used unjust tactics for just causes. The mainstream Zionists did not approve of terror and tried to suppress it to some extent, but they were really not in a position to put down the terrorist organizations and win the war at the same time. They

rightfully considered preserving their existence to be more

important, and they later suppressed the terrorist organizations. Former members of these organizations joined the legitimate army and renounced terror at that point. They had the right aims all along, and they have now renounced the unjust means they once used. As such, there is no dishonor in electing them.

It is now no longer reasonable to describe surviving pre-state Zionist members of terrorist organizations as terrorists at all, as they now neither advocate nor practice terrorism. It is also quite unreasonable to draw parallels between modern Palestinian Arab terrorists and pre-state Zionist terrorists, as the former are acting to promote manifestly unjust aims and the latter were using unjust means in the cause of morally vital aims.

A recent poster has been arguing that Zionism and Palestinian nationalism are essentially morally equivalent, while suggesting that Zionism is perhaps a bit worse. This poster has argued on this thread that Israel's election of some former members of defunct pre-state Zionist terrorist organizations to political office is somehow morally equivalent to the Palestinians' current pursuit of terrorism as a means of destroying Israel. This person has made similarly ill-reasoned anti-Zionist claims on other threads, and has yet to offer any substantive reasonable criticisms of Israel. It seems reasonable to conclude that this poster believes that there is something inherently unjust about Zionism that makes it immoral regardless of the means it adopts. As the poster seems somewhat supportive of Palestinian nationalism, objecting only to some of their means, I am assuming the objection is not to national movements in general. So, given that the poster claims not to find Jews horrible, I'm left wondering what non-antisemitic objection this person has to the Zionist movement.

~Woty
<http://woty.davidsj.com>

by **Woty** on Thu, 03/04/2004 - 19:42 | [reply](#)

thanks for your post, woty.

thanks for your post, woty.

I'll believe that in fact many Palestinians do genuinely support a 2 state solution - whereas a large number of Israelis trot out their refusal to countenance a Pal state at, denying Palestine's right to exist with lines such as "there's never been a Pal state before", "Gaza and the WB are disputed not occupied", "Jordan is really the Pal state" etc etc.

Meanwhile the Israelis continue to seize more and more of the remaining 22% of Palestine in defiance of international law, UN res 446 and the road map - Israel rejected the road maps settlement freeze and when the Pals accepted it and went as far as getting a ceasefire which Sharon sabotaged by assassinating a string of Hamas/IJ leaders (on Aug 8 and 14th prior to the bus bomb on Aug 19th).

SO yes I think the Pals do have a just cause - their survival in any sort of Pal homeland.

meanwhile you argue that the Arabs in the 1940s wanted the Jews dead - there had been attacks of Pals on Jews of course though historical Arabs and Jews have got on better than say Jews and Europeans. Atrocities like the Hebron massacre against indigenous Jews were certainly not justified but they were provoked not by gut hate but by anger at the prospect of their land - in which Pals were still a 2/3 majority in 1948 - being annexed for an Israeli state against their wishes - the "just" cause you refer to. Israel is far the regional superpower, there is no threat to their existence from the Pals - while the US continues to unconditionally support an Israeli state bent on hoovering up the remains of the Pal land there will be no peace.

by a reader on Thu, 03/04/2004 - 21:05 | [reply](#)

just read some of your post i

just read some of your post in a bit more detail
"that Israel's election of some former members of defunct pre-state Zionist terrorist organizations to political office "
ahh - I like that ! you mean : Israel's election as *prime minister* of former terror *chiefs* - not just any old "members" or any old "political office"
I see from your website that you're not too bothered about Sharon sabotaging the ceasefire as Israel wasn't on ceasefire - no "supportive action" or withdrawal then as the road map calls it, no settlement freeze. no wonder I wonder if SHaron wants peace.

by a reader on Thu, 03/04/2004 - 21:16 | [reply](#)

Rethink your picture

If I am understanding "a reader" correctly, events in the Middle East need to be understood in the context of an expansionist state that is permeated with aggressive ideology. This state marches forth with its superior weaponry to crush its hapless neighbors. These neighbors, who lack any good options, find themselves in a war of survival and resistance against the iron grip of the martial state.

But this picture is problematic.

There does not exist any philosophical or ideological tradition among Jews and Zionists that would make these actions on this scale palatable to a majority of Israeli Jews. On the contrary, many Israeli Jews left such states in order to seek a socialistic utopia in peaceful co-existence with arab neighbors. Even rudimentary knowledge of Jewish and Zionist traditions renders it hugely implausible that the idea of territorial gain, at the expense of innocent civilians both Israeli and Palestinian, was ever on the ethnic or national agenda.

Israel is a Capitalist Democracy. Therefore, it would take a conspiracy theory of incredible intricacy in order to explain how

Israel continuously elected "terrorists" who ripped apart the

economy with their expansionist wars, killed scores of young Israelis, and caused constant disruptions in the daily life of a largely professional populace. On the other hand, if only a fringe group supports the government, how are they gaining such amazingly disproportionate power?

by [Paco](#) on Fri, 03/05/2004 - 07:08 | [reply](#)

well that Israel is progressi

well that Israel is progressively annexing the remaining Palestinian land in the West Bank and Gaza is a matter of fact not a matter of speculation given the philosophical nature of the Jewish people. As it happens I'm a big admirer of Jews: particularly their steadfast loyalty to their cultural roots over millenia and their academic and entrepreneurial achievements in the face of oppression. I welcome your remarks as more evidence that the Israeli state and its actions are not supported by large numbers of Jewish people.

by a reader on Fri, 03/05/2004 - 08:49 | [reply](#)

The occupation

Countries that fight defensive wars are generally considered justified in annexing or occupying some enemy territory for the sake of avoiding having to fight the same war again.

The West Bank and Gaza were both captured in a defensive war. The West Bank is territory captured from Jordan. The Gaza Strip is territory captured from Egypt. Neither these nor any other territories have ever been part of a Palestinian state.

The closest thing to a State of Palestine that's existed in modern times is the British Mandate of Palestine. The largest portion of this territory is now Jordan.

Does the recent poster object to the existence and policies of the states of Jordan and Egypt, or just Israel? And does the recent poster want Israel to return the occupied West Bank to Jordan?

~Woty
<http://woty.davidsj.com>

by [Woty](#) on Fri, 03/05/2004 - 14:39 | [reply](#)

Explanation and fact

Although "a reader" believes his claims are born out by facts alone, I put it to him that his entire understanding of the Middle East situation is governed by *explanations* of those facts, involving theories of culpability, rather than the facts themselves. Therefore "a reader" ought to be compelled by an argument which makes the underpinnings of his/her explanatory structure highly implausible.

by a reader on Fri, 03/05/2004 - 17:56 | [reply](#)

The above post was by me, sor

The above post was by me, sorry.

by [Paco](#) on Fri, 03/05/2004 - 17:58 | [reply](#)

Terrorism is a relatively new concept

I don't think that terrorism by some Jews in 1947 should be excused just because their strategic intentions were good. I think it can be excused because

-6 million Jews had just been murdered, the horror and pain being sharp and raw

-The prospect existed of keeping a grip on a homeland which could offer sanctuary against possible future genocides. However, there was no guarantee, therefore the mood must have been truly desperate. Desperate people don't always think straight.

-The intentional mass killing of ordinary, innocent civilians for political or religious reasons wasn't widely understood to be an absolute and atrocious crime like it is now. (Many of today's crimes weren't crimes if you look far enough back in history. Even murder wasn't murder once if the guy killed was from another tribe.)

Whether this is correct or not, I don't see how hotel bombings in the late-1940s have much bearing on Israel 2004.

These days, there's no way on earth the Israelis would elect a terrorist as their leader. On the other hand, it seems unlikely that the Palestinians could avoid doing so, given the death cult.

by [Tom Robinson](#) on Sun, 03/07/2004 - 03:41 | [reply](#)

woty, "The West Bank and Gaz

woty,

"The West Bank and Gaza were both captured in a defensive war. " no they weren't - they were captured in 1967 as part of the war that started in 1947 when the Israelis seized 78% of Palestine (and Jordan is not part of Palestine, by the way) against the wishes of its 2/3 Pal Arab inhabitants: at the time Ben Gurion made it very clear that Israel wanted ALL of Palestine, hence the annexation of the WB/Gaza.

Tom,

" bombings in the late-1940s have much bearing on Israel 2004" because the terror chiefs became PM of Israel only 10 and 20 years ago - Shamir is still at large having never faced justice for his crimes.

and no, terror against anyone is not justified: maybe the Pals are desperate as the remains of their homeland are hoovered up. you discount the 1940 terror attacks and maybe in 50 years time you'll discount the current suicide bombings as inevitable acts of a people fighting for their homeland against the odds.

by a reader on Mon, 03/08/2004 - 11:26 | [reply](#)

tom,

i don't think jewish terrorism in 1947 should be excused. but it doesn't need to be. it was just a small minority. it didn't have the support of the jewish people in general. and in fact the jewish people put a stop to it.

-- Elliot Temple

<http://www.curi.us/>

by **Elliot Temple** on Mon, 03/08/2004 - 21:11 | [reply](#)

Who's a what now?

'no they weren't - they were captured in 1967 as part of the war that started in 1947 when the Israelis seized 78% of Palestine (and Jordan is not part of Palestine, by the way) against the wishes of its 2/3 Pal Arab inhabitants: at the time Ben Gurion made it very clear that Israel wanted ALL of Palestine, hence the annexation of the WB/Gaza.'

If the Israelis wanted to keep the West Bank and Gaza why did they offer to give it back immediately after the 1967 war in return for peace and recognition from the Arab states?

Also, in 1947, the Palestinian Arabs made no attempt to declare a state in the portion of the former UN mandate that was allotted to them. If they wanted a state back in 1947 why didn't they declare it?

Next, I am unaware of any quote by David Ben-Gurion to the effect that he wanted to annex the whole of the West Bank and Gaza. In fact, I am fairly sure there is no such quote. Could you provide such a quote, preferably with a reference?

Finally, why didn't the Arabs of whom you speak wish to participate in a democratic state with equal rights for all of its citizens like Israel? What kind of state did these Arabs want?

by **Alan Forrester** on Tue, 03/09/2004 - 03:17 | [reply](#)

Fighting for a homeland?

Elliot,

You're quite right. Rather than excusing the terrorist acts I really wanted to excuse those among the minority who committed them at that early time, and who were later elected to office (having renounced terrorism).

-- Tom

reader on 03/08/2004 - 11:26 GMT,

in 50 years time you'll discount the current suicide bombings as inevitable acts of a people fighting for their homeland against the odds

I doubt that very much. I believe in moral progress. Terrorism can

no longer be confused with freedom fighting under any circumstances. Also, there never has been and never likely will be any kind of Palestinian holocaust. So you can't draw a parallel with my argument above, whether or not you agree with it.

I don't accept that the Palestinians are fighting for a homeland, or any land at all. They're blowing themselves up out of a kind of twisted religious hatred. If they had any sense, they would have seized the opportunity to become Israeli citizens while this was still possible. As Israeli citizens, they would have been more secure and more wealthy. They would have been free to buy and sell land. Furthermore, land would itself have been a relatively trivial issue, as it is within the West today. (If you add up the value of all assets in an advanced economy, land makes only a small percentage of the total).

If you listen to the Jenny Tong interview, you'll discover that Palestinians regularly go to Israeli hospitals for treatment. But if an ordinary Israeli took a walk in the West Bank, he could expect to be killed by a mob within an hour. There is no symmetry here.

The Israeli government is now building a wall. The Pals don't like it. However, they, and in particular, the suicide bombers and the death cult, are responsible for that wall. They could scarcely be more responsible if they mixed the concrete themselves.

Even if I adopted your premise that the Israelis have stolen land from the Palestinians (which I don't), it doesn't justify murder. You don't murder a thief, or murder your children by brainwashing them into suicide-bombing him. OTOH, seizing a murderer's assets, including some of his land, might well be a reasonable way of extracting reparation. It might also shock him and his brethren into turning away from crime and having a change of heart.

by **Tom Robinson** on Tue, 03/09/2004 - 06:59 | [reply](#)

Alan, why didn't the Pals de

Alan,
why didn't the Pals declare a state in 1947 ? because they had a bigger priority - opposing the occupation and ongoing expansion of invading Israelis whose sworn aim was to seize and expel the Palestinians from ALL of Palestine (Ben Gurion: in June 1938: "I support compulsory [Palestinian Arab population] transfer. I do not see in it anything immoral."
in 1947 "We feel we are entitled to Palestine as a whole," replied Ben-Gurion, "but we will be ready to consider the question of a Jewish state in an adequate area of Palestine."
<http://www.jpost.com/com/Archive/04.Dec.1997/Features/Article-2.html>
previously in 1936 BG made it clear he wanted some of Palestine as a first step to getting the lot - in a letter to his son Amos at the time of the Peel plan).
given that I think liberating their homeland was more important than declaring a state.
Now of course : 50 + years later the Palestinians realise there is no

possibility of liberating the 78% of palestine that is now Israel. they accept a 2 state solution. so do I though I still think the 1947/8 ethnic cleansing was wrong.

do you ever disagree with those Israeli propagandists who deny Palestine's right to exist : who claim ther is no such thing as Palestine and claim the WB/Gaza is "disputed" ?

"why didn't the Arabs of whom you speak wish to participate in a democratic state with equal rights for all of its citizens like Israel?" a bi-national state consisting of the current Israel and West Bank/ Gaza is one solution. Or if you mean why didn't the Pals in 1947 "participate" its because they were ethnically cleansed. For exactly the same reason that Israelis today oppose right of return the Israeli in 1947/8 drove out the Pals in a series of bloody massacres to ensure an adequate Jewish majority.

no Tom, "Terrorism can no longer be confused with freedom fighting under any circumstances"

its noe good enough to claim that terrorism was OK in the 1940s but its not now. Nor is it OK to claim that terrorism against Pals was justified by the holocaust given that the Palestinians did not participate in the Holocaust - if it had been Americans bombed by Israelis in reaction to the Holocaust I think you's appreciate the faulty logic.

no, I didn't say that land theft justified murder - or that you could murder a thief (although the right to bear arms/ gun lobby might disagree with us there) - however thats easy for me to say since its not my land being stolen.

anyway isn't it Ariel Sharon who says land is worth innocent lives. He rejected the road map insisting on continuing the land grab and then sabotaged the Pal ceasefire assassinating a string of Hamas/IJ leaders on Aug 9/14th knowing this was bound to get a response and result on the deaths of innocent Israelis: hope that Pal land is worth it.

by a reader on Tue, 03/09/2004 - 08:52 | [reply](#)

Fabricating History

A reader wrote:

'why didn't the Pals declare a state in 1947 ? because they had a bigger priority - opposing the occupation and ongoing expansion of invading Israelis whose sworn aim was to seize and expel the Palestinians from ALL of Palestine (Ben Gurion: in June 1938:

"I support compulsory [Palestinian Arab population] transfer. I do not see in it anything immoral."

This quote is incomplete, the full quote reads:

'I saw in the Peel Plan two positive things: the idea of a state and the idea of comulsory transfer...I support compulsory transfer. I don't see in it anything immoral, but compulsory transfer can only be affected by England and not by the Jews...Not only is it

incocevable for us to carry it out, but it is also inconceivable for us

to propose it.'

So, to summarise, the British government proposed the Peel Plan in 1937 which included the idea of compulsory transfer and also cut down the Jewish state to an even smaller sliver of land than the UN awarded them. It was in the context of this reduction of Israel to a tiny fraction of the Palestine Mandate that the Zionists were reluctantly prepared to agree to such measures being undertaken by the British. Hence Woodhead Commission that consulted the Zionists said of the transfer idea: 'on behalf of the Jews it was made clear to us that Jewish opinion was opposed to the exercise of any degree of compulsion.'

Also, the surrounding Arab states invaded Israel in 1948 with the intention of killing or expelling all of the Jews and even before then sent in irregulars and terrorists to wage a campaign of mass murder against the Jews. Yet, somehow, the Jews managed to find the time to declare a state. So, again, why did the Palestinians not declare a state?

Overall, the content of your comment bears no relation to what actually happened. As Efraim Karsh has shown, many historians such as Benny Morris, Tom Segev and Avi Shlaim have deliberately and systematically distorted the historical record by selectively quoting from the contents of meetings in such a way as to completely change the meaning of the what was actually said. When they have not been able to find a way to distort a quote to say something bad, they have simply made it up.

<http://www.meforum.org/article/302>

'do you ever disagree with those Israeli propagandists who deny Palestine's right to exist : who claim ther is no such thing as Palestine and claim the WB/Gaza is "disputed" ?'

I would support the formation of a Palestinian state in the West Bank and Gaza with a democratic government determined to suppress terrorism. I would not support a Palestinian state run by terrorists and tyrants, I think both the Israelis and the Palestinians deserve better.

by [Alan Forrester](#) on Tue, 03/09/2004 - 19:11 | [reply](#)

Alan, your BG quote apart fr

Alan,
your BG quote apart from stating he regarded ethnic cleansing as positive merely seems to confirm he thought the 1/4 Jewish population at that time unable to drive out the Pals.
in fact BG supported the Peel plan seeing the allocated Jewish state as a bridgehead for taking ALL Of palestine by force
Ben-Gurion was quite explicit, as illustrated in a 1937 letter to his son:
"A partial Jewish State is not the end, but only the beginning. The establishment of such a Jewish state will serve as a means in our historical efforts to redeem the country in its entirety. ...We shall

organize a modern defense force ..and then I am certain that we will not be prevented from settling in other parts of the country, either by mutual agreement with our Arab neighbors or by some other means... We will expel the Arabs and take their places with the force at our disposal."

your claim that the arabs wanted to "kill or expel" all the Jews in 1948 is a common unsubstantiated claim despite the fact that as shown above the Israelis were the aggressors. the pals rejected partition allowing the Israelis a state from which to carry out their sworn intention of overrunning Palestine and expelling the indigenous Pals. the pals then lost the initial war and were in no position therefore to declare a state with 78% of their homeland occupied.

your Karsh link at a glance rejects Morris et al as you'd expect. It seems to mainly cite an old 1990 link by Teveth (BGs biographer) , "The Palestine Arab Refugee Problem and its Origins," Middle Eastern Studies, Vol. 26, No. 2Apr. 1990, pp. 214-49.

(actually its Palestinian not Palestine).

he quotes Morris as saying

"what happened in Palestine/Israel over 1947-9 was so complex and varied" as though that debunks the occurrence of ethnic cleansing.

I agree at least with your last para. given Sharon's refusal to even freeze the expansion, never mind remove, of illegal settlements at the heart of the proposed Pal state how do you suggest this will happen ?

by a reader on Wed, 03/10/2004 - 09:18 | [reply](#)

Bored now

Sharon has said many times that he will make concessions in return for peace. The Israelis did in fact disassemble their settlements in Egyptian territory after their 1979 peace treaty, the same would happen in the West Bank and Gaza if the Islamonazis would stop killing Israelis. Your distortions and falsifications are tiresome, read:

<http://www.settingtheworldtorights.com/node.php?id=74>

<http://www.settingtheworldtorights.com/node.php?id=105>

<http://www.meforum.org/article/466>

<http://www.meforum.org/article/207>

Ben-Gurion not only never advocated ethnic cleansing, he explicitly stated he would never do such a thing:

'We do not wish, we do not need to expel Arabs and take their place...All our aspiration is built on the assumption... that there is enough room in the country for ourselves and the Arabs.'

by [Alan Forrester](#) on Fri, 03/12/2004 - 02:50 | [reply](#)

", the same would happen in t

", the same would happen in the West Bank and Gaza if the Islamonazis would stop killing Israelis." well that flies completely in the face of the facts and Sharon's own statements when he rejected the settlement freeze (a freeze mind you, not even dismantlement) proposed in both the Mitchell agreement and the Road Map claiming this would require "a pregnant woman to have an abortion just because she is a settler?" - its not known whether Sharon thought the continuing land grab of Palestinian land was forcing Palestinian women to have abortions or whether he was the slightest bit worried if they were.
http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/middle_east/3020335.stm

Despite your claim that Sharon would support a Pal state and dismantle the settlements but for pal terrorism it is uncontested fact that Israel rejected the road map peace treaty whereas the Pals accepted it without reservation and obtained a ceasefire (despite the fact the RM was slanted towards Israel) Straight away Israel announced 14 reservations <http://www.us-israel.org/jsource/Peace/road1.html> basically refusing to meet any of its commitments. Sharon then rejected the road map on the 31st July announcing he'd continue his land grab of Pal land in defiance of the road map. <http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2003/08/01/world/main566251.shtml> and http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/middle_east/3115325.stm

if Bush has clamped down on Israeli violations like he said he would (he earlier said he'd "ride herd" to ensure Israel and the Pals met their commitments <http://www.jerusalemmites.org/news/english/jun2003/5a.htm>) then many Israelis and Pals would be alive today.

The IDF then assassinated a string of Hamas/IJ leaders on Aug 8 and 14 which provoked, as Sharon must have realised, the August 19 suicide bombing (which I regard as not justifiable but certainly inevitable given Sharon's actions) <http://in.news.yahoo.com/030808/137/26rqn.html> and [http://www.unhchr.ch/Huridocda/Huridoca.nsf/\(Symbol\)/E.CN.4.2004.G.7.En?Opendocument](http://www.unhchr.ch/Huridocda/Huridoca.nsf/(Symbol)/E.CN.4.2004.G.7.En?Opendocument) and <http://www.guardian.co.uk/israel/Story/0,2763,1018928,00.html>

And its ludicrous that you deny BGs support for ethnic cleansing when we have it from his own lips. Its also strange to me that the same people who refuse the Pals right of return on the grounds that it would endanger the demographic majority of Jews in Israel fail to see that the Israelis carried out, indeed needed to carry out in their view, ethnic cleansing in the 1940s on precisely the same grounds.

by a reader on Fri, 03/12/2004 - 10:43 | [reply](#)
