

The Church of Sweden has long been an anti-israeli institution, kidnapped by those who wish Israel harm. The Sweden Democrats party secretary submitted this motion to the church meeting in 2006 in defence of Israel and to thwart the anti-israeli position of the Church. Here is a short background on each of the two motions and then Mr Söders motion against them.

<http://www.bjornsoder.net/artiklar.php?action=fullnews&showcomments=1&id=1097836698>

Regarding motion 2006:17 and 2006:41 on the Church meeting

I oppose both motion 2006:17 and motion 2006:41 because they do not reflect an accurate depiction of the historical events and does not take into consideration the never-ending violence directed against Israel.

For starters it is my opinion that the background text is not acceptable. The text does not take into account the fact that Jordan was a part of the Mandate of Palestine and that hinders a further understanding for the events in the region and the responsibility that lies in the first Arabic state in the former Mandate of Palestine.

Furthermore I find it deceitful that it is not clearly expressed that the four "big wars" was initiated by the Arab states in an attempt to wipe out the State of Israel along with its population – a goal that still is sought after today.

Regarding motion 2006:17 it should be clear that the so called "Palestinians-arabs" is not protected by the Geneva Convention as it refers to states. Since it doesn't exist and never has existed a "Palestinian" state those rules are not applicable. The Arabs on the other hand violate all rules of war that exist by, among other things, fighting without a uniform, by hiding in civilian areas, by using children in warfare and the use of terrorism. It is my firm belief that Israel has a clear right of self-defense when faced with this kind of violence according to the principle of self defense.

The "borders" of 1967 isn't borders, merely where the fighting stopped when cease-fire came into effect. The writers of the motions has to ask themselves why they claim that the area that Jordan and Egypt occupied in the war of extermination they started in 1948 should be the base for the second Arab state in the formed Mandate of Palestine. If they really wanted a "Palestinian" state they should have created it in 1948 but instead they tried to destroy Israel. Israel has, again and again, tried to make peace with its neighbors but always got the same reply. In the Israeli declaration of independence it says "WE EXTEND our hand to all neighboring states and their peoples in an offer of peace and good neighborliness". The Arabs invaded shortly thereafter. Why, if the conflict was about Judea and Samaria and Gaza? All logic and all history clearly show that their ambition is not another Arab state but one Jewish state less. Therefore it is pressing to discuss if it is sensible with another Arab state in Judea/Samaria and Gaza.

To treat terrorist, that knowingly and willingly ignore and break all rules of war, in normal courts or even military courts (where prisoners would be treated according to the Geneva Convention) would be very strange. To give the terrorists protection that the West has set up for those who fight in accordance with the rules of war when the terrorist themselves doesn't have any ambition to follow the very same rules would be immoral and hypocrisy. Since the terrorist doesn't follow the rules of war they cannot be protected by them and not be classified as prisoners of war. The US term of "illegal combatants" is therefore a correct description.

[...]

Regarding motion 2006:41 I feel that the Church meeting can make a statement but in that case in support of Israel and its people.

[...]