



## **LDFP Position Paper on Palestine and Israel**

### **Introduction**

The Liberal Democrat Friends of Palestine exist to fight for the rights of the Palestinian People through the medium of the Liberal Democrat Party. The party's core values of liberalism, internationalism and support for the indivisibility of human rights and the rule of law make it the natural home in mainstream British politics for those determined to support the Palestinian call for justice and their entitlements under international law.

We currently support the 'two state solution' for an independent and viable Palestinian state, and security for both parties. We therefore call on Israel to renounce all claims to occupied land and to halt all illegal settlement building. If Israel is unwilling to do this, there will come a point at which 'the one state solution', under which Israel will need to offer all Palestinians citizenship in a single, secular State, will become the only possible way forward. This may be very soon.

We reject accusations of anti-Semitism against party members, organisations or other individuals within and outside the Liberal Democrat Party because they criticize Israeli government policies. We categorically reject all forms of violence against civilians (including the disproportionate use of force) no matter who the perpetrators and the victims may be. We oppose all forms of racism including anti-Arab racism, Islamophobia and anti-Semitism.

### **The Creation of Israel**

Zionism, the movement to create a Jewish national homeland in Palestine, became a growing force among European Jews in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century and early 20<sup>th</sup> century. At its core was a deep-rooted affection for the land of the Bible, the historical homeland of the Jews. But it was also inspired by an uneasy feeling that the 10 million Jews of Europe (especially those in Eastern Europe) were a vulnerable group for whom pogroms and persecution could easily happen again as they had in previous centuries, and in many different European countries. The Dreyfus affair showed that such fears were also all too justified in Western Europe.

The Balfour Declaration of 1917 by the British Government promised Jews that Britain would use its best endeavours to facilitate the establishment of a "national home" in Palestine "for the Jewish people", subject to the protection of the rights of the other inhabitants (i.e. the overwhelmingly Arabic speaking majority). From 1923, Britain ruled Palestine under a mandate from the League of Nations that was predicated on the promise in the Balfour Declaration and included a clear obligation to "secure" the establishment of that homeland. However, it was also predicated on an obligation towards the Arabic speaking Muslim and Christian majority in Palestine, since the "well-

being and development” of the people inhabiting the area of the mandate “form[ed] a sacred trust of civilisation” which Britain was responsible to fulfil. The existence of Palestine as an independent nation could therefore be “provisionally recognised subject to the tendering of administrative advice and assistance” by Britain “until such time as [its people] are able to stand alone”<sup>1</sup>

During the mandate, tensions between Jewish immigrants (largely Ashkenazis from Europe) and the Palestinian Arab majority steadily mounted. Although all the other former Ottoman territories which were put under mandates (Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon and Syria) were granted their own elected parliaments in the 1920s, and eventually proceeded to full independence, Britain refused to allow a parliament in Palestine because it would have reflected the wishes of the Arab majority, and in all likelihood ended the immigration necessary to establish the Jewish national home. During the 1930’s, a Palestinian revolt aimed at forcing Britain to end the mandate and grant Palestine independence was crushed. In 1939, Britain committed itself to making Palestine independent as a unitary state after ten years.

After World War Two, hostilities deepened between Arabs and Jews and Britain found its occupying forces were increasingly attacked by Jewish militias. Immediately after the war the USA and other countries were reluctant to accept Jewish refugees from Europe, and British troops under the then Labour Government had the shameful task of sending boat loads of emaciated refugees back to Europe as they tried to enter Palestine illegally. Britain unilaterally relinquished its mandate in 1947 and its forces left Palestine in 1948 in some haste, although law and order were breaking down. The United Nations approved a partition plan for Palestine in 1947 that proposed intertwined Jewish and Arab states. The Arab states and those who claimed to speak on behalf of the Palestinian Arabs rejected it, although they were prepared to give the Jewish community in Palestine specific minority rights. The partition resolution was not legally binding (save for its termination of the British mandate), and the procedures envisaged for the establishment of the Jewish and Arab states in the partition plan were not followed. The State of Israel was proclaimed at the moment the mandate terminated by the leader of the Zionist Jews in Palestine, David Ben Gurion, who became its first Prime Minister.

The war between Jews and Arabs that was necessary to secure the state of Israel was, in the words of Benny Morris, “the almost inevitable result of more than half a century of Arab-Jewish friction and conflict that began with the arrival...of the first Jewish immigrants from Eastern Europe in the 1880s.”<sup>2</sup> At least forty per cent of the population of the proposed area for the Jewish state in the partition plan were Muslim and Christian Arabs. Ben Gurion’s state could not be viable unless it used force to establish control over this area as well as significant other areas which were overwhelmingly Arab. This inevitably led to what we would now call ethnic cleansing on a wide scale. Much of this was carried out in the final months of the mandate (e.g. Jaffa, the villages in the Jerusalem corridor, West Jerusalem). This process continued after the proclamation of the state, and in spite of the last minute and ineffectual intervention by the armies of neighbouring Arab states in support of the Palestinian Arabs (e.g. Ramle, Lydda, the countryside around Majdal (Ashkelon)).

---

<sup>1</sup> Covenant of the League of Nations, Article 22.

<sup>2</sup> Benny Morris, 1948: *A History of the First Arab Israeli War* (2008), p.1.

The war left a terrible legacy of mistrust on both sides. The Arabs maintained that the establishment of the state of Israel was both unjust and wrong in principle. It was not a member of the United Nations and the Arab states were under no obligation to recognise it. The views of the Egyptian government at the time that Israel was not a sovereign state on which it could declare war - and that the Zionist militias were therefore no more than armed gangs terrorising the local population - were perfectly reasonable. Nor did the British government recognise the state of Israel at the time, while the over-hasty US recognition of Israel has been described as "premature" by Crawford.<sup>3</sup> Nevertheless, as Arab anger led to bellicose promises to crush the emerging state so as to restore the rights of the Palestinian Arabs, the myth of the Israeli David against the Arab Goliath was born. Most historians today do not accept that this myth corresponded to the military reality on the ground, but the Jewish population of Palestine at the time were terrified they would be massacred. As Avi Shlaim has written, "it is precisely because this version [of history] corresponds so closely to the personal experience and perceptions of the Israelis who lived through the 1948 war that it has proved so resistant to revision and change."<sup>4</sup>

Since 1967, Israel has been the Occupying power over what is now known as the West Bank of the Jordan (which includes East Jerusalem) and the Gaza Strip. In spite of numerous UN resolutions, it has declined to withdraw from the West Bank, although it has pulled its forces out of Gaza. In defiance of international law, Israel has persisted in taking Palestinian land and moving its own citizens into the Occupied Territories and then giving them special privileges with regard to access and water. It interferes in criminal justice in the West Bank and generally subjects the Palestinian population to routine harassment. Although Israeli soldiers are no longer stationed in Gaza, it is still occupied territory for the purposes of the Fourth Geneva Convention and Israel retains its obligations towards its people under international humanitarian law. Gaza is subject to more or less permanent blockade which prevents Palestinians living there from travelling and deprives them of essential food, medical and other supplies. Families are often divided and forced to live separately in the West Bank and Gaza and travel between the two territories is virtually impossible.

### **Consequences for World Jewry**

The creation of Israel, and the way in which Israel forced many native Palestinians off their land or from their towns and villages and turned many of them into refugees in other countries, enraged many in the rest of the Arab world. The Jewish communities that had lived for thousands of years in, for instance, Iraq, Syria and Egypt were harassed. At various times (e.g. in the late 1940s/early 1950s in the case of Iraq and Libya; after the Suez Crisis in the case of Egypt; after independence in 1962 in the case of Algeria), the overwhelming majority were in practice forced to leave. Many settled in Israel, which opened its doors to them.

In the early decades there was great support for Israel in Western countries, in substantial part in reaction to the horrors of the Holocaust, but opinion polls show that Israel's colonisation of Palestinian territories, repeated pulverisations of Lebanon, general defiance of international law and scant regard for the human rights of non-Jews has turned the tide of sympathy towards the Palestinians. The same applies to Israel's refusal today to recognise its moral and legal responsibility

---

<sup>3</sup> *The Creation of States in International Law*, 2nd edition, Oxford, 2006, p. 433.

<sup>4</sup> Avi Shlaim, *The Iron Wall*, (2000), p.222.

to those Palestinian Arabs adversely affected by its creation. This has had consequences including the spread of anti-Semitism in Arab countries.

### **British Foreign Policy**

British Foreign Policy has, since the Suez debacle of 1956 when Britain (and Israel) found themselves on the opposite side to the Americans, largely shadowed US policies. A determination to retain the position of America's closest ally has been one of the main aims of every British government, except possibly that of Edward Heath who tried to lead the country towards a more European foreign policy. This has led Britain into dubious wars in the Middle East, to helping to prop up Arab regimes with appalling human rights records, and also to very mild criticism of Israeli belligerence and human rights abuses. While it is true that Britain has been less slow to criticise Israel than the US, it has always refrained from dissociating itself from American policies and did not vote for Palestinian membership of the General Assembly of the UN when most of the world did. The coalition government has however taken tentative steps to put pressure on Israel by working with European partners to prevent produce from illegal Israeli settlements from enjoying special tariff benefits that Israeli and Palestinian producers enjoy. LDFP hopes the Coalition Government will take this a step further and follow an independent foreign policy towards Israel and in other matters.

### **BICOM**

LDFP is very uncomfortable about the malign influence of the British Israel Communications and Research Centre (BICOM). A recent report by *Spinwatch* has shown convincingly that this PR company exists and is well-funded to promote right-wing Israeli viewpoints and whitewash the abuses of human rights in Israel. Through its support of the Conservative Friends of Israel, it is estimated by Peter Osborne of the *Daily Telegraph* that some 80% of Conservative MP's belong to the Conservative Friends of Israel.<sup>5</sup> Many of that party's MP's and peers have enjoyed expenses paid trips to Israel to encourage their support for the Israeli government in Parliament, and many of those have reportedly then enjoyed support towards their constituency expenses. It should, however, also be noted that many of them have also enjoyed the hospitality of the Conservative Middle East Council which takes a more balanced view of the Palestine/Israel situation, but which appears to be uncomfortably close to the regimes in some of the Gulf states that have poor human rights records. As Liberal Democrats we are uncomfortable that British Parliamentarians are under such pressure from such malign influences.

BICOM, according to the *Spinwatch* report, focusses its attention on the political elites, believing that this is more important than public opinion or even opinion in the Jewish community. Public opinion surveys among the Jewish population in the UK show nearly three quarters of British Jews being uncomfortable with Israeli government policies. Evidence is growing of similar trends in North America, especially among younger Jews. The political lobby for Israel in both countries seems unmoved by this change in attitudes and continues to defend Israel at all costs.

There are of course many Jews and indeed Jewish pressure groups that argue for justice for Palestinians. Disappointingly they seem to have little influence on organisations within the Jewish

---

<sup>5</sup> Peter Osborne: Daily Telegraph article 12 December, 2012

community. We particularly commend Yachad ([www.yachad.org.uk](http://www.yachad.org.uk)) for working within the Jewish community in the UK both to show unashamedly its love for and commitment to Israel while encouraging Jews to realize that much of what the Israeli government does (settlements, military courts etc.) is impeding a peace based on a two-state solution to the conflict. Yachad's values appear to us to be well in tune with Liberal Democratic values. (It is presently asking its supporters to write as Jews to David Cameron ahead of his upcoming visit to Israel to urge for its policies which would comfortably chime with most Liberal Democrats.)

### **Is Israel an Apartheid state?**

Many have accused Israel of being an Apartheid state. This is a very controversial issue. LDFP would argue that Israel discriminates in many ways against its Arab citizens, but does not consider that this amounts to Apartheid for the purposes of international law. However, the contrary is the case with regard to the territories occupied by Israel in 1967. Please see our accompanying paper [[www.ldfp.eu](http://www.ldfp.eu)] which sets out LDFP's considered position on this issue.

Many supporters of Israel feel that it is held to much higher standards than the Palestinian Authority and the de facto Hamas government in Gaza, let alone most other Arab governments. As Liberal Democrats we are always concerned to hear about charges of corruption and arbitrary arrest that are often heard in Ramallah. We are even more concerned to hear about the use of execution and torture, and of discrimination against women and Christians – charges that are often levelled against Hamas. Israel, however, claims to be a beacon of democracy in the Middle East and enjoys special privileges with the European Union and enormous financial aid from the US. There is considerable evidence of double standards in its treatment of its Jewish and its non-Jewish populations in both Israel and the West Bank. It needs to work much harder to earn its privileges and its democratic reputation. As Ari Shavit, a journalist for the Israeli newspaper Haaretz has written in his recent book: "If the Israeli Arabs will be woven into our social and political fabric and given the equality they deserve, they might prefer what democratic Israel has to offer over what is offered by Islamist Arab nations and radical Palestinian political movements."<sup>6</sup>

It might also be observed that the incorporation of the Balfour Declaration into the document establishing the Palestine mandate, the refusal of the mandate authorities to allow the territory to have its own elected assembly, and the proclamation of the state of Israel severely put back the cause of democracy (and secularism) in Palestine.

### **The Refugees**

66 years after the establishment of Israel, there are still hundreds of thousands of Palestinian refugees and their descendants living in refugee camps in the West Bank and Gaza, Lebanon, Syria and Jordan – who do not all enjoy full citizenship rights in their countries of residence and have not always been treated well by their hosts. The camps are managed at great international expense by the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine (UNRWA). They tend of course to house the poorer refugees – many others have succeeded in joining the Palestinian diaspora around the world and made new homes for themselves. Those refugees from the camps

---

<sup>6</sup> Ari Shavit: My Promised Land – The Triumph and Tragedy of Israel. 2013. P. 415.

and others who wish to return to Palestine should be allowed to do so. Those who cannot return to their lands and properties in Israel should finally be compensated.

### **Israeli Security**

Whenever Israel is criticised its defenders seem to try and justify many of the policies that we criticise as being necessary to protect Israel's security. This concern for security is understandable – nobody wants to have missiles raining down on their homes. However these days the attacks on Israel are from renegade groups in the Palestinian territories and there is no evidence of government organised terror. This is in contrast to the violence used by Israeli government forces in attacking targets in Gaza and in using live ammunition and other potentially lethal weapons against demonstrators in East Jerusalem and other parts of the West Bank. The best prospects for Israelis to live in security will come when it steadily removes the policies that incite legitimate anger among Palestinians, recognises the Nakba ('Catastrophe') that it inflicted on Palestinians when it chased them off their lands in 1948, and makes peace.

### **What needs to be done now?**

Pending a peace agreement, LDFP would like to see:

- An education programme in the UK to make people aware of the history of the Arab-Israeli dispute and why failure to resolve it has had such dreadful consequences in international relations ever since 1947.
- An end to the blockade of Gaza so that its economy and humanitarian situation can improve
- An end to Settlement building in East Jerusalem and the rest of the West Bank, and the initiation of a programme to reverse the settlement project.
- An end to any continued work on the wall separating Israel and Palestine – or at least ensuring that any further work is done on Israeli and not Palestinian land
- A fair distribution of water resources between Israeli and Palestinian communities
- An end to Administrative Detention and in particular of Palestinian parliamentarians
- An end to the use of Military Tribunals for Palestinians and Civilian Courts for Israelis in the occupied territories
- An end to the routine (often daily) humiliations which are meted out to Palestinians whether they live in Israel or the Occupied Territories as they attempt to move around or in and out of their respective countries.
- An end to the harassment of Palestinians living in East Jerusalem in particular over residence and building permits and the separation of families.
- The placing of the territories Israel occupied in 1967 under a form of international trusteeship in order to facilitate all of the above.

We support some, but not all, aspects of the BDS (Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions) movement. Our call for a boycott in 2010 <http://www.ldfp.eu/2010/12/14/ldfp-press-release-ethical-principles-for-boycotting-israel/> (see also Attachment) was based on the Kairos document of the Palestinian Council of Churches, but does not include the academic boycott of Israel (which is contrary to Lib Dem party policy).

We do think that if the peace process is dragged out or if agreement is not reached that the EU should ramp up economic sanctions on Israel. It is already Party policy that the British Government should press for suspension of the EU-Israel Association Agreement until the blockade of Gaza is lifted.<sup>7</sup> LDFP further believes that firms that are helping to support and maintain the illegal occupation of the West Bank or the blockade of Gaza should be banned from doing so. We do not support a universal boycott of Israeli universities as we support freedom of expression and believe that its universities are places in Israeli society where there are many good people who are trying to promote a fair society. A universal boycott would therefore be counterproductive. Nonetheless, it should be acknowledged that some of the research in Israeli universities will inevitably be assisting the Israeli military. EU universities should be banned from collaborating with such research, and put under an obligation to exercise vigilance accordingly.

### **Peace Negotiations**

LDFP is very pleased at the unexpected new peace negotiations which we attribute to a growing support for a two state solution in the Israeli Knesset, aided both by American pressure and the gently growing squeeze that the EU is applying to the Israeli economy. Israel enters these negotiations as much the stronger participant and the international community must ensure that the outcome is fair. Israel should not be allowed to use the duress inherent in its occupation to wring concessions from Palestinians who are negotiating in good faith on the basis of Palestinian legal rights. We believe that economic pressures on Israel should continue and be tightened to make it clear to the Israeli government that continued intransigence and unfair demands will be punished. We also believe that the world needs to continue to be told about the human rights abuses and other privations that are being inflicted on Palestine and Palestinians and that the Israeli government must be shamed into action, whether by analogies with Apartheid South Africa or with other oppressive regimes.

Whatever the outcome of the peace negotiations, that outcome must be fair and it must be one that Palestinian leaders can sell to the majority of their people. That means that it must broadly reflect the rights of both parties in international law, whatever trade-offs are freely made. It must also be one that provides Israel and Palestine with security. Indeed if Israel would just accept international law and the UN would guarantee its security, a peace agreement shouldn't be too difficult to achieve. The implementation of any peace agreement must be under international supervision to ensure it does not die like the Oslo Accords of 1993. The UK Government, acting alone or together with the US and other major powers, should then press neighbouring countries to recognise Israel and give it a peace dividend. The Saudi Peace Plan which has been adopted by the Arab League suggests that this won't require much pressure.

### **Hamas**

The reluctance of Western governments to recognise Hamas as the winner of the last Palestinian General Election and as the de facto ruler of Gaza is a major mistake. LDFP sees its position as rather similar to that of Sinn Fein in Ireland prior to the peace agreements reached in Ireland – except that Sinn Fein was not part of government. It wasn't until Sinn Fein leaders (ironically with American

---

<sup>7</sup> Emergency Resolution 17A at the Spring Party Conference in 2009.

pressure) were brought into negotiations and then into power sharing, that peace was brought to Northern Ireland. A peace settlement in Palestine without Hamas's agreement (which would of course include Hamas's formal acceptance of Israel's right to exist) is unlikely to survive.

### **And if the peace negotiations fail?**

If the peace negotiations fail, then Lib Dems need to reconsider their support for a two-state solution. We must surely accept that Israel has effectively colonised the West Bank and absorbed it into Israel. If that is the case then Israel must be held to the highest international standards in its treatment of all those living in the country and its democracy must be adapted to ensure fairness for all.

### **Liberal Democrat support in minority and other communities**

We believe that the Liberal Democrats benefitted considerably from support in Muslim communities at the 2010 General Election. This can be attributed both to the Lib Dems being the only party to oppose the invasion of Iraq in 1993, and also to Nick Clegg being the only party leader at the time to consistently criticise Israel for its policies towards Palestinians. This has caused some concern in the party that we may be losing Jewish votes. During the period of the coalition government there has been much more muted criticism of Israel and a fear that criticism of Israel will be construed as anti-Semitic. There is now a danger of the party losing Jewish and Muslim votes, as well as those of many Church-going Christians who often are well apprised of the issues because of pilgrimages to the Holy Land. We are also missing the opportunity to attract the votes of a significant portion of the electorate for whom human rights could be a key factor in helping them to choose between Labour and Liberal Democrat. Instead of listening to those in the Jewish community who largely defend Israel at all costs, the leadership should listen to and engage with those whose love for Israel still enables them to criticise it and advance policies and values which are closer to those of Lib Dems.

### **In conclusion...**

The establishment of Israel as a Jewish national home has provided a safe haven for nearly 40% of the world's Jewish population. 100 years ago less than 10% of Jews lived in the Middle East and in the intervening years over six million perished in the Holocaust. Nonetheless the creation of Israel ignored the rights of indigenous Palestinians and a grave injustice was done to them. Israel exists and must continue to exist, but it must put a halt to its continuing maltreatment of Palestinians, make amends, and come to a just peace with them. Only then can it hope for peace with its neighbours and a safe and secure future.



## **Attachment**

### **Ethical Principles for boycotting Israel**

*"I've been very deeply distressed in my visit to the Holy Land; it reminded me so much of what happened to us black people in South Africa. I have seen the humiliation of Palestinians at checkpoints and roadblocks, suffering like us when young white police officers prevented us from moving about."*

– Archbishop Desmond Tutu

### **Why we are calling for a boycott**

Israel's occupation of East Jerusalem, the West Bank, the Gaza Strip (still Israeli-occupied territory in international law despite Israel's withdrawal in 2005) and the Syrian Golan Heights has now endured for over 42 years. During this period, Israel has transferred part of its civilian population into the occupied territories thereby setting up a form of Apartheid. It has purported to annex parts of these territories, claimed the right to annex other parts, and refused to admit that it is bound by the corpus of international humanitarian law in its behaviour as an occupying power. Official Israeli maps frequently show all or parts of the occupied territories as belonging to Israel, and encourage Israeli citizens and the international community to think accordingly.

Israel has also failed to acknowledge any moral or legal responsibility towards those Palestinians whom it and the Yishuv displaced in the fighting in Palestine which took place between the UN Partition Resolution in November 1947 and the 1949 cease-fires between Israel and the neighbouring Arab states, or at later dates

Throughout its existence, Israel's armed forces have carried out many war crimes with impunity, often with the open encouragement of its political leaders. Israel has encouraged a culture of denial about this in the international community.

Israel has thus wilfully failed to abide by its international obligations and obstructed peace moves. At the same time, it has striven on many occasions to avoid legal scrutiny of its actions, and has conducted a well-financed propaganda campaign to persuade the world that its breaches of international law can be justified (or that they are not breaches at all), and to deny legitimate Palestinian claims.

By contrast, since at least the launch of the Arab League Peace Initiative in 2002, the Arab states have indicated publicly that they are prepared to recognise an Israel which lives in peace and security with its neighbours within its pre-1967 frontiers.

### **Our call for a boycott**

The present situation is a great injustice, in which Western nations (including the UK) have colluded. It is also against the self-interest of the international community for it to continue. We in the Liberal Democrat Friends of Palestine join the call for a boycott and sanctions against Israel, and will fight for this to become official party policy until such time as Israel accepts its legal obligations towards the Palestinian People and Syria and implements them.

Our call for a boycott and sanctions is limited to this precise objective and will cease forthwith once this objective has been met. In campaigning for a boycott and sanctions, we are mindful of many appeals that have been made to the international community, not least the call by the Palestinian churches in their “Kairos Palestine” document entitled “A Word of Faith, Hope and Love from the Heart of Palestinian Suffering”:

“Our word to the international community is to stop the principle of ‘double standards’ and insist on the international resolutions regarding the Palestinian problem with regard to all parties. Selective application of international law threatens to leave us vulnerable to the law of the jungle. It legitimises the claims by certain armed groups and states that the international community only understands the logic of force. Therefore, we call for a response to what the civil and religious institutions have proposed, as mentioned earlier: the beginning of a system of economic sanctions and boycott against Israel. We repeat once again that this is not revenge but rather a serious action in order to reach a just and definitive peace that will put an end to Israeli occupation of Palestinian and other Arab territories and will guarantee security and peace for all.”(paragraph 7).

### **What form should the boycott and sanctions take?**

Boycotts can be crude and ineffective, punish the innocent, and hinder dialogue. These are all risks. At the same time, there are particular issues with regard to boycotting Israel, given the history of anti-Semitism in Europe and America. We therefore do not make the call for boycott and sanctions lightly.

Yet we are convinced that a boycott and sanctions are necessary because of the culture of impunity which Israel enjoys in its dealing with Western governments and in the minds of large sections of Western opinion. Unless an effective form of pressure can be brought to bear on Israel, it will have no incentive to recognise Palestinian and Syrian rights and make peace with its neighbours. Its actions have amply demonstrated this. In addition, Israel sets out to frustrate attempts by the international community to treat goods wholly or partially produced in its illegal settlements – or by settlement labour -differently from goods produced in Israel.

We call on the public to boycott Israeli goods on sale in this country and to carry out a cultural boycott of Israeli performers and artists, unless such performers and artists have stated clearly and publicly that they oppose Israel’s breaches of international law and have called for an end to the occupation. We likewise call on British performers and artists to refuse to perform in Israel.

We also call for a boycott of companies complicit in the occupation, for dis-investment from such companies, and for specifically targeted sanctions by the UN to compel Israel to comply with its obligations. We will fight to make such sanctions official British government policy.

We believe that these forms of boycott and sanctions will not prejudice dialogue but encourage it, since they will draw the attention of Israelis to the consequence which their government’s actions have on the Palestinian and Syrian peoples.