

Re: July the 4th

# Re: July the 4th

---

*Source:* <http://unix.derkeiler.com/Newsgroups/comp.os.vms/2007-08/msg00705.html>

---

- *From:* [david20@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:david20@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)
  - *Date:* Thu, 9 Aug 2007 11:18:43 +0000 (UTC)
- 

In article <1186620249.987032.4480@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>, AEF <spamsink2001@xxxxxxxx> writes:

On Aug 8, 11:18 am, davi...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx wrote:

In article <1186442318.376946.4...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>, AEF <spamsink2...@xxxxxxxx> writes:

On Aug 6, 11:12 am, davi...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx wrote:

In article <1186363007.921609.27...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>, AEF <spamsink2...@xxxxxxxx> writes:>On Aug 5, 7:55 pm, davi...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx wrote:

In article <1186334184.382451.138...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>, AEF <spamsink2...@xxxxxxxx> writes:

[...]

[...discussion about the document about Israeli "racism" omitted, but referred to below...]

The document demonstrates its severe

Re: July the 4th

one-sidedness  
with  
this  
comment:

"However,  
by  
means  
of  
the  
1947-48  
war,  
Israel  
took  
over  
even  
greater  
expanses  
of  
land  
and  
forcibly  
expelled  
about  
750,000  
Palestinians.  
This  
travesty  
was  
the  
basis  
for  
the  
official  
founding  
of  
the  
Israeli  
state  
in  
1948."

Hello?  
Israel  
didn't  
start  
this

Re: July the 4th

war.  
And  
it  
is  
by  
no  
means  
a  
settled  
fact  
of  
history  
about  
these  
expulsions.  
Could  
it  
be  
that  
some  
P's  
were  
expelled  
because  
they  
were  
fighting  
against  
the  
Israelis?  
And  
why  
were  
so  
many  
P's  
(or  
Arabs)  
NOT  
expelled?

This  
makes  
me  
doubt  
everything  
else  
in  
the

Re: July the 4th

article.  
It  
is  
only  
one  
person's  
view  
and  
it  
is  
clearly  
not  
a  
neutral  
view.

I  
find  
this  
interesting  
quote  
from  
Wikipedia.  
Yeah,  
it's  
Wikipedia,  
but  
it's  
at  
least  
as  
good  
at  
the  
interview  
you  
referenced:

Israel,  
the  
US  
and  
the  
Soviets  
called  
the  
Arab

Re: July the 4th

states'  
entry  
into  
Palestine  
illegal  
aggression,  
UN  
secretary  
general  
Trygve  
Lie  
characterized  
it  
as  
"the  
first  
armed  
aggression  
which  
the  
world  
had  
seen  
since  
the  
end  
of  
the  
[Second  
World]  
War."  
China  
broadly  
backed  
the  
Arab  
claims.  
Both  
sides  
increased  
their  
manpower  
over  
the  
following  
months,  
but  
the  
Israeli  
advantage  
grew

Re: July the 4th

steadily  
as  
a  
result  
of  
the  
progressive  
mobilization  
of  
Israeli  
society  
and  
the  
influx  
of  
an  
average  
of  
10,300  
immigrants  
each  
month.

Of course  
the Arab  
countries  
going to  
war to  
destroy the  
newly  
created  
Israel  
was an  
agression –  
at least as  
defined by  
the UN  
charter  
(they were  
invading a  
sovereign  
nation).  
As far as  
the Arabs  
were  
concerned  
the very act  
of creating  
Israel was

Re: July the 4th

an  
agression  
that was  
perpetrated  
by the UN.

Well, if the Wikipedia  
article is right, even the  
Soviets (not  
normally Jew-friendly,  
BTW) considered the Arab  
invasion into the  
fledgling Israel to be  
\_illegal\_ aggression.

Can you not read – I agreed that it was an  
agression as defined by the UN  
charter. If you want I'll say it's an illegal  
agression as defined by the UN  
charter. Any invasion of a sovereign nation  
is an illegal aggression as defined  
by the UN charter unless sanctioned by the  
UN.

OK, maybe I missed it. But you seemed to be saying it was  
justified.

Apartheid was legal in South Africa.

My point was that even the Soviets thought it was, in their opinion,  
unjustified. Why else would they claim it was illegal?

(You may say that OK Apartheid was legal in South Africa but South Africa  
was  
just one country whereas the legal status of Israel was defined by the "  
world community" via the UN. However imagine for a minute that Hitler had  
won  
the second world war and along with Japan and Italy and a few others had  
setup his own new league of nations. Would you then be arguing that the  
Jews  
outside his immediate control should meekly submit to rulings against them  
because those rules were passed legally by that world community ?)

Re: July the 4th

Re: July the 4th

Of course not.

This is patently absurd. First of all, if Hitler had won WWII he wouldn't have let the Jews live long enough to fight back. And exactly how would they have fought back? They'd probably all be dead before the conquest was finished.

There were many in the British cabinet calling for a peace deal with Hitler in 1940. Only Winston Churchill's determination to continue to fight kept Britain in the war. If such a peace deal had occurred Hitler would have had a free hand on the continent and in his war against Russia later on. That would probably have satisfied Hitler – He would have had his lebensraum. However that would have still left Britain's Jews, America's Jews etc out of his direct control.

You're drawing a parallel between Hitler and the world of 1947?

OK, maybe you're saying that just because "the world" gave a small piece of land to the Zionists doesn't automatically make it right.

Yes I am saying that in the viewpoint of the Arabs it wasn't right and that their action in response was based upon that viewpoint. I am further saying that the viewpoint of the Arabs on this issue is the viewpoint I would expect any people who have lived in an area for generations to have in the circumstances.

I'm frankly amazed that your anti-palestinian bias is so strong that you cannot see that as a valid viewpoint.

Well, if that's the case, just say so. In fact, I don't think I ever made that claim. I only claimed it was very wrong for the Arabs to attack Israel in 1948 (not to forgive all the other attacks!). OK, I suppose there's some implication there. But your point doesn't automatically make it wrong, either.

The fact that some party decides something is legal doesn't change the viewpoint of the other party if it seems grossly unfair to them.

Re: July the 4th

Re: July the 4th

Disputes are based upon viewpoints and justice as perceived by the parties involved.

(I'm certainly happy to accept that the UN created Israel legally – even if not being an international lawyer it's assumption of the imperial colonial powers necessary for such an act seems to sit rather uncomfortably with its commitments in it's charter to self-determination.

)

As I said before both parties have valid arguments in favour of their viewpoint – the legality of Israels establishment and the illegality of the aggression against it by the surrounding Arab nations are part of the Israeli viewpoint.

I can just as easily argue the Israeli viewpoint but that would hardly be much of a discussion since you are propounding that viewpoint. (I say just as easily – but since one part of the Israeli viewpoint is based on God having given them this land, as an atheist, I have problems supporting that view but can understand it as a powerful part of their viewpoint.)

Just to be clear, I don't make the God argument. Also, the religious Jews strongly fought the creation of Israel. "We have to wait for the Messiah" they cried. It was secular Jews who pushed for the creation of the state. (Of course it is the religious right wing who wants to build more and more settlements in the WB and wanted to stay in Gaza, etc. Ironic, huh?)

That doesn't alter the Arabs view that the UN action in creating Israel was also an aggression.

Why? It was under British rule at the time. That didn't bother them.

ALL of it was under British rule. But if half of it is under Jewish rule, suddenly it's a problem.

As I said  
before how  
would you  
react if an  
outside  
power such  
as the UN  
suddenly

Re: July the 4th

gave your  
home to  
foreign  
refugees ?

Again a gross oversimplification. The US now has millions of illegal immigrants and many in our gov't want to give them amnesty which will only encourage millions more to come. But I certainly don't advocate killing any of them.

First of all, this is a gross oversimplification of what happened. I don't know all of what happened, but I know there is a lot more to it than you mention in your question.

The only simplification is that I did not mention – as I have in another post – the mass migration of Jewish refugees which started, in relatively few numbers and peacefully , in the 1880s under the ottoman empire. This then continued but turned into a flood under the British Mandate – particularly in the 30s and illegally during the second world war – which severely upset the local arab population.

So for your benefit I will rephrase the question :-

How would you react if your government allowed in tons of refugees to your home state and then when their numbers had grown sufficiently high the UN decided

Re: July the 4th

that your home state should now be split in two with half being given as a homeland for these refugees and any of their distant relatives who wished to come in the future ?

It wasn't their home state. It was under British rule. And if I were an Arab or Palestinian under such a situation I'd be thrilled just to have a state. Remember, the P's NEVER had their own state. If they would have accepted the partition, then they would have had their "home state".

Until the British carved up the ottoman empire they were citizens of the empire. The Arabs wanted the British out but they probably didn't really want a Palestinian state as such – what they wanted and what lots of Arabs still want is a single united Arab state, of which Palestine would have been a province, comprising pretty much all of the Middle East ie the territory of the ottoman empire. Before the first world war the whole of the Middle East was the Arab's state as you put it. Saying the Palestinians didn't have a state is like saying that Yorkshiremen (those coming from the English county of Yorkshire) don't have a state. It's true in the sense that Yorkshire is not a state but untrue in that it is part of a larger entity – England and the UK. Given the character of Yorkshiremen I can assure you that they would definitely fight if someone gave half their county away.

And at the same time given them the other half all to themselves, and the other non-parallel is that I think Yorkshirites have a lot more in common with Britons than the P's or Arabs do. And why are Yorkshireman supposed to be the gold standard for what to do in this type of situation?

What the hell is

"I think Yorkshirites have a lot more in common with Britons than the P's or Arabs do."

supposed to mean. I was using Yorkshiremen and Britain/UK as an analogy for Arabs and ottoman empire since you have this fixation that the arabs had no state on the land of Palestine.

Re: July the 4th

Re: July the 4th

Regardless, I seriously  
doubt I'd call for an invasion  
if I were in  
that position.

I already told you what I would expect with  
my picture of what Britain and  
the republic of Ireland would have done if  
the UN had planted a refugee  
nation in Northern Ireland. Damn right I  
would have expected them to invade.  
I cannot seriously imagine that the US  
population would allow some  
international body or collection of nations to  
just setup a nation state on  
US mainland territory.

Again, the big difference is that your analogies refer to  
people who  
already had their own sovereign nations. The P's did not. They  
would  
have if they would have accepted the partition. The P's in  
Israel  
proper today are probably far better off than the P's in the  
WB and  
Gaza.

The fact that following the first world war the British and French had carved  
up the Ottoman Empire and the British were ruling as an occupying power had  
little bearing upon how the Arabs viewed their ownership of land they had  
lived  
on for uncounted generations.

But when Palestine was split between the Jews and Arabs, suddenly it  
was a big deal.

In everywhere other than Palestine the same people continued to live on the  
land they have lived on for generations. In Palestine you have a new nation  
created which isn't for the existing people it is for refugees who have been  
coming in ever greater numbers and for all those refugees "relatives" from  
around the world.

Re: July the 4th

Re: July the 4th

And why didn't the Arabs  
invade Palestine to capture  
it back from  
Britain?

Britain was an imperial power still pretty  
much at the height of it's power  
after world war I. The other arab nations  
were themselves newly created by the  
British and French by their carving up of the  
ottoman empire. The new rulers of  
these arab states were handpicked by the  
British and French.

In some cases the populations in these  
countries were beginning to form  
nationalist movements aiming to kick the  
british and french out of their  
countries and topple handpicked rulers but  
achieving those aims was far in the  
future – and by then Britain's imperial power  
would be fading fast.

I think it would have been a net gain for all involved if the  
P's and  
neighboring Arab states had accepted the partition.

So you admit it's an illegal aggression yet you continue to try  
to  
justify it.

You seem to think that somebody laying down a law irrespective of the effect  
of  
that law on particular people means that those people should just meekly  
accept  
it. Laws are man made. The history of civilisation is the fight against what  
groups of people see as unjust laws.

Then what's the point of laws?

Re: July the 4th

Laws evolve. Struggles against unjust laws may overturn those laws.

In the international arena, who is decide how just they are? Yes, people should fight against "unjust" laws. So they thought the creation of Israel was unjust. That's their opinion. Doesn't make it right.

Forget right and wrong. In conflicts all that counts is viewpoints !!!  
You may agree or disagree (as you evidently do) with their viewpoint but to solve the conflict everybody needs to understand the others viewpoint.

If you had setup Israel almost anywhere in the world without the explicit consent of the local population you would have had the same reaction.

Anywhere else in the world would lose the parallel in that the inhabitants in the rest of the world have their own country. And I'm not convinced it would be the same reaction everywhere. Also, I'd like to point out that perhaps you don't give the S. African blacks enough credit for not slaughtering all the S. African whites. Many have been killed "in the spotlight of world attention".

However there were "good" reasons for setting it up in Palestine.

The Jews were being persecuted in Europe and saw settling in Palestine as a way to escape that persecution. From their point of view Palestine was the chosen land given to them by God.

Again, it was the SECULAR Jews who fought for the creation of Israel and the RELIGIOUS ones who fought very hard against it.

But even the secular Jews based their claim on the biblical history of the Jews in Palestine see the quote below from Weizmann. Otherwise, why as Balfour asked, must the Jewish homeland be in Palestine.

The world Zionist Organisations original strategy was to obtain the permission of the Ottoman Sultan Abd-ul-Hamid II to allow systematic settlement in Palestine. The good offices of the German emperor, Willhelm II, were sought but nothing came of this. Instead the WZO pursued a strategy of building a

Re: July the 4th

Re: July the 4th

homeland  
through small-scale immigration.  
Chaim Weizmann's invention of cordite was critical for the allies during  
world  
war 1 and he gained influence with the British government and as leader of  
the  
Zionist movement was instrumental in getting British government support in  
the form of the Balfour declaration.

From

[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Balfour\\_Declaration%2C\\_1917#Text\\_develop...](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Balfour_Declaration%2C_1917#Text_develop...)

During the first meeting between Weizmann and Balfour in 1906, Balfour  
asked  
what payment Weizmann would accept for use of his process and was told,  
"There  
is only one thing I want: A national home for my people." Balfour asked  
Weizmann why Palestine ? and Palestine alone ? should be the Zionist  
homeland.  
"Anything else would be idolatry", Weizmann protested, adding: "Mr.  
Balfour,  
supposing I was to offer you Paris instead of London, would you take it?"  
"But  
Dr. Weizmann", Balfour retorted, "we have London", to which Weizmann  
rejoined,  
"That is true, but we had Jerusalem when London was a marsh."

Weizmann eventually received both monetary compensation for his  
discovery and  
his place in history as first President of the state of Israel.

[End of Wikipeida quote]

The declaration used the word home rather than state and specified that it's  
establishment must not "prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing  
non-jewish communities in Palestine".

I believe, in Israel, all religions are allowed freedom to worship as  
they wish, as long as it doesn't involve unreasonable things like  
killing all the infidels. This was not the case when Jerusalem was  
under Arab control. Only Islam was allowed.

Reread your history. Jews have lived under Arab rule all over the world with  
much much less persecution from Arabs than they have suffered under Christian  
rule. Small Jewish communities have lived in Jerusalem for centuries under Arab  
rule and were completely free to practise their religion. (Similarly small

Re: July the 4th

Re: July the 4th

Christian communities lived under Arab rule in Jerusalem and were free to practise their religion).

The limited settlement already begun in Palestine under the WZO plus the Balfour declaration thus ensured where any contemplated Jewish homeland would be setup.  
The Nazis during the 1930s and the holocaust during the second world war then made the setting up of such a homeland pretty much inevitable.

(Whether the existence of Israel would really provide much protection to Jews around the world against a future holocaust is somewhat open to debate since just moving all the Jews in the US to Israel would double the size of Israel's population.)

At least there'd be a place for non-Israeli Jews to go if anti-Semitism starts rearing its ugly head and at least there'd be a state Jews could always depend upon for support. No, it doesn't guarantee the protection of each and every Jew in the world, but it's certainly better than not having a state. If Israel existed during WWII it could have joined the Allies.

Hence from the point of view of the Jews a Jewish homeland in Palestine had been promised them both by God and by the British (and through their influence

It was the SECULAR ....

the other main world powers – culminating in promises by the league of Nations and UN). This homeland was from their viewpoint a necessity because of the persecution they had been suffering especially later because of the holocaust. From the Jewish point of view since the UN had promised them a homeland it was setup legally.

However since they did not agree to it but just had this nation forced upon them the Palestinians had a rather different point of view and reacted accordingly.

You conveniently omit the fact that they were offered half for themselves and turned it down. If all of Palestine were given to the Jews, you'd have a better case. But you repeatedly keep ignoring that.

Re: July the 4th

Re: July the 4th

Giving someone half of what they already own and claiming that makes it right for you to take the other half doesn't strike me as a good or equitable deal.

Both points of view are valid points of view. Noone is going to convince the Israelis that their point of view is wrong – neither is anyone going to convince the Palestinians and the surrounding Arab populations. But to solve the problem both sides need to recognise the others point of view and work towards a compromise position.

The 1947 partition plan was such a compromise.

No the 1947 deal was something imposed. A compromise has to be agreed by all parties involved.

I think I'll probably stop now. This discussion seems to be getting nowhere.

David Webb  
Security team leader  
CCSS  
Middlesex University

Re: July the 4th