

The Children of Palestine are Categorized by Netanyahu as “the Children of Darkness”. Gaza is Becoming ‘A Graveyard for Children’. UNSG Guterres

By [Media Lens](#)
Global Research, November 09, 2023
[Media Lens](#) 8 November 2023

Region: [Middle East & North Africa](#)
Theme: [Law and Justice](#), [Media Disinformation](#)
In-depth Report: [PALESTINE](#)

All Global Research articles can be read in 51 languages by activating the Translate Website button below the author’s name.

To receive Global Research’s Daily Newsletter (selected articles), [click here](#).

Click the share button above to email/forward this article to your friends and colleagues. Follow us on [Instagram](#) and [Twitter](#) and subscribe to our [Telegram Channel](#). Feel free to repost and share widely Global Research articles.

An authentic democracy cannot be psychopathic because most people are not psychopaths.

Most people would not vote to kill, wound and displace hundreds of thousands of innocent civilians for power, profit or territorial gain. Most people do not accept the great lie of ‘pragmatism’: that [‘the anarchical society’](#) of international relations mandates psychopathic violence: If ‘we’ don’t behave as psychopaths, somebody else will.

Most people don’t believe the world can be divided between Israeli prime minister [Benjamin Netanyahu’s](#) ‘children of light’ and ‘children of darkness’.

You don’t need to be a mystic to know that love, kindness, compassion – ‘light’ – arise naturally in *all* human beings allowed to live in freedom and peace.

So, the Children of Light have now killed 10,022 of the Children of Darkness ... including 4,104 literal Children of Darkness, and 2,641 Women of Darkness.

* Persons of Darkness still buried under the rubble not included. <https://t.co/RbRbazxKUw> pic.twitter.com/dbAv984mfp

— CJ Hopkins (@CJHopkins_Z23) [November 6, 2023](#)

We know from our own experience that we are wonderfully happy when overflowing with

love and desperately miserable when overflowing with hate.

We know, therefore, that love is suited to human nature and well-being in a way that hatred is certainly not. We know that when hate arises in large numbers of people it is born of suffering, not of some 'evil' disposition. We know that the real answer to hate is not violence but justice that alleviates suffering and hate.

Because we are not psychopathic, it is deeply important for us to believe that we are *not* living in a psychopathic society. When this human need clashes with political reality, examples of cognitive dissonance abound – psychopathic circles have to be squared, 2 + 2 must make 5. This is the task of the propaganda system comprised of the 'respectable' political, media and religious institutions of our society.

In an [interview](#) with Channel 4 News, the Most Reverend and Right Honourable Justin Welby, the Archbishop of Canterbury, supplied a particularly stark example. Welby began by affecting a transcendent spiritual impartiality, as one might expect:

'I'm not pointing fingers', he said.

The Archbishop of Canterbury tells [@mattfrei](#) he is "pointing fingers at Hamas" but says "let's not run to judgement" when asked about those pointing fingers at the Israeli government. pic.twitter.com/TzOm6PwK1D

— Channel 4 News (@Channel4News) [October 22, 2023](#)

Alas, Welby came back to earth with a bump:

'I *do* point fingers at Hamas and say this is terrorism at its most extreme and most evil.'

Okay, but then was he also pointing fingers at the Israeli government raining hellfire on Gaza? Welby fell silent, hesitated:

'It's not... You can do the... You can say something which in different circumstances might be useful at a time that just makes everything worse... Let's not run to judgement and blame straight away.'

The archbishop's power-friendly ethical dissonance becomes even clearer when we recall that, last December, Welby [told](#) the BBC that 'justice demands that there is defeat' of 'an evil invasion' in Ukraine. It was right, he said, for the West to send billions of dollars of weaponry to support a 'victim nation' that is 'being overrun by aggression'. After all, the international community had a 'duty of care' to protect weaker nations.

Welby's failure to condemn any 'evil' committed by Israel came long after it had become clear that Israel had been criminally targeting Gaza's civilian population with collective punishment cutting off water, food and electricity. And of course, by razing whole apartment blocks, indeed whole residential areas, to the ground.

From satellite imagery, The Economist [estimated](#) (30 October) that 'over a tenth of Gaza's housing stock has been destroyed, leaving more than 280,000 people without homes to which they can return'. The magazine noted:

‘Even Russia, during its siege of Mariupol in Ukraine between February and May 2022, negotiated humanitarian pauses in which some civilians were permitted to leave. Israel has thus far rejected calls, by the European Union and others, for such pauses.’

More recently, the health ministry of the Palestinian Authority has [estimated](#) that more than 50% of Gaza’s housing units have been destroyed, nearly 70% of its population has been displaced, 16 out of 35 hospitals that can take in-patients have stopped functioning, 42 UN Relief Agency buildings have been damaged, along with at least seven churches and 55 mosques. According to the World Health Organisation, there have [been](#) more than 100 strikes on health facilities. Since 7 October, more than 200 [schools](#) have been damaged in Gaza – around 40% of the total number – about forty of them very seriously, according to UNICEF data.

By any standards, this is an awesome level of destruction. In its first 563 days, Russia’s war on Ukraine [killed](#) 9,614 Ukrainian civilians, 554 of them children. In its first 25 days, Israel’s war on Gaza killed 8,796 Palestinian civilians, 3,648 of them children. Since the 7 October attacks by Hamas, [at least](#) 1,400 Israelis have been killed, including 1,033 civilians and 31 children.

The UN Secretary General Antonio Guterres [puts](#) the immensity of Israel’s violence in perspective:

‘Gaza is becoming a graveyard for children. Hundreds of girls and boys are reportedly being killed or injured *every day*. More journalists are reportedly being killed over a four-week period than in *any* conflict in at least three decades. More United Nations aid workers have been killed than in *any* comparable period in the history of our organisation.’

On 28 October, Craig Mokhiber, one of the world’s leading international lawyers, director of the UN’s New York Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, resigned to protest the organisation’s handling of what he called a ‘textbook case of genocide.’ In his resignation letter, Mokhiber [wrote](#):

‘As a human rights lawyer with more than three decades of experience in the field, I know well that the concept of genocide has often been subject to political abuse. But the current wholesale slaughter of the Palestinian people, rooted in an ethno-nationalist settler colonial ideology, in continuation of decades of their systematic persecution and purging, based entirely upon their status as Arabs, and coupled with explicit statements of intent by leaders in the Israeli government and military, leaves no room for doubt or debate. In Gaza, civilian homes, schools, churches, mosques, and medical institutions are wantonly attacked as thousands of civilians are massacred. In the West Bank, including occupied Jerusalem, homes are seized and reassigned based entirely on race, and violent settler pogroms are accompanied by Israeli military units.

‘Across the land, Apartheid rules.

‘This is a text-book case of genocide. The European, ethno-nationalist, settler colonial project in Palestine has entered its final phase, toward the expedited destruction of the last remnants of indigenous Palestinian life in Palestine. What’s more, the governments of the United States, the United Kingdom, and much of Europe, are wholly complicit in the horrific assault. Not only are these governments refusing to meet their treaty

obligations “to ensure respect” for the Geneva Conventions, but they are in fact actively arming the assault, providing economic and intelligence support, and giving political and diplomatic cover for Israel’s atrocities.’

In an [interview](#) with Al Jazeera English, Mokhiber made a further key point:

‘Usually, the most difficult part in proving genocide is intent, because there has to be an intention to destroy, in whole or in part, a particular group. In this case, the intent by Israel’s leaders has been so explicitly stated, and publicly stated, by the prime minister, by the president, by senior cabinet ministers, by military leaders, that that is an easy case to make. It’s on the public record.’

Our ProQuest media database search for ‘Craig Mokhiber’ and ‘Gaza’ delivered four mentions, all in the Guardian. One of these was a [smear](#), another was a single-sentence [mention](#) in passing buried in a news piece, a third [substantial piece](#) of 667 words, and an additional mention yesterday [buried](#) in the penultimate paragraph of an opinion piece. There were no mentions found in any other newspaper and there are none on the BBC website.

On Channel 4 News, Matt Frei [asked](#) Welby:

‘What do you say to those demonstrators on the streets of London who are saying this is Israeli genocide against the Palestinians?’

Welby’s sage reply:

‘I say you’ve no understanding of what you’re saying.’

When asked if Israel was acting within international law, Labour’s chivalrous knight, Sir Keir Starmer, [said](#):

‘As to whether each and every act is in accordance with the law, well that will have to be adjudicated in due course. Um, I think it’s unwise for politicians to stand on stages like this, or to sit in television studios, and pronounce day by day which acts may or may not be in accordance with international law.

‘I think it’s not the role of politicians. I don’t think it’s wise to do it. I come with the benefit of a lawyer of having litigated about issues like this in the past. And in my experience, it’d often take weeks or months to assimilate the evidence and to then work out whether there may or may not have been a breach of international law.

‘So, I think the call for politicians to look at half a picture on the screen without the full information and form an instant judgement as to whether it’s this side of the line or the other side of the line is extremely unwise. I’m not going to get involved with that kind of exercise.’

If this sounds like an in-depth, heartfelt response, last year, Starmer was [asked](#):

‘Is Vladimir Putin a war criminal?’

Today Starmer explained he can't say whether a country has committed war crimes because thats not the role of politicians, ok?

pic.twitter.com/Dke117LW6E

— Saul Staniforth (@SaulStaniforth) [October 31, 2023](#)

Starmer's reply:

'Yes.'

On 8 February, Starmer [told](#) the House of Commons:

'Before I entered this House, I had responsibility for fighting for justice in the Hague for victims of Serbian aggression. Does the Prime Minister agree with me that when the war in Ukraine is over, Putin and all his cronies must stand at the Hague and face justice?'

Again, completely contradicting everything he is now saying, Starmer [said](#) on 7 March:

'Vladimir Putin and his criminal cronies must be held to account for their illegal invasion of Ukraine. The UK government must do all it can to ensure the creation of a special tribunal to investigate the crime of aggression.'

'The Ukrainian people deserve justice as well as our continued military, economic, diplomatic, and humanitarian assistance.'

Notice, Starmer was not calling for a 'no-fly zone' or a ceasefire – completely unthinkable in relation to Gaza – he was endorsing continued intervention in the form of massive military support for the Ukrainian war effort.

On 17 March, Starmer [said](#):

'I welcome the International Criminal Court's decision to open war crime cases against Vladimir Putin and other senior Russian figures for their barbaric actions in Ukraine.'

I welcome the International Criminal Court's decision to open war crime cases against Vladimir Putin and other senior Russian figures for their barbaric actions in Ukraine. pic.twitter.com/gm6owNZ98h

— Keir Starmer (@Keir_Starmer) [March 17, 2023](#)

There is nothing random, or naïve, about Labour's hypocrisy and servility to power. Declassified UK [reports](#):

'Some 13 of the 31 members of Labour's shadow cabinet have received donations from a prominent pro-Israel lobby group or individual funder, it can be revealed.'

'The list of recipients includes party leader Keir Starmer, his deputy Angela Rayner, shadow foreign secretary David Lammy, and even the former vice-chair of Labour Friends of Palestine, Lisa Nandy, who is now shadow international development minister.'

Britain's veteran warmongers have been queuing up to persuade the public of the rightness

of Starmer's complicity in genocide. Arch-Blairite former Labour MP Peter Mandelson [said](#):

'As for Keir Starmer, I would just say this – I think what he's doing is demonstrating to the British people the sort of toughness and mettle that he would display, if he were to become prime minister of this country. He has been very tough, very realistic...'

In a separate interview, as if reading from the same script, former Tory MP and Thatcherite Michael Portillo [opined](#):

'I'm amongst those who think that Keir Starmer has done *exactly* the right thing and has shown a great deal of mettle, which I think will be quite widely admired. And that's important, I think, for a domestic audience that wonders whether he's up to being prime minister.'

Dissidents are viewed and treated quite differently. Responding to home secretary Suella Braverman's suggestion on X (formerly Twitter) that, 'It is entirely unacceptable to desecrate Armistice Day with a hate march through London', BBC sports commentator Gary Lineker [posted](#):

'Marching and calling for a ceasefire and peace so that more innocent children don't get killed is not really the definition of a hate march.'

Marching and calling for a ceasefire and peace so that more innocent children don't get killed is not really the definition of a hate march.
<https://t.co/qLyIqZKhwt>

— Gary Lineker (@GaryLineker) [November 3, 2023](#)

Nile Gardiner, a foreign policy analyst, former aide to Margaret Thatcher and contributor to the Telegraph, [responded](#):

'Gary Lineker's knowledge of foreign and national security policy is practically zero. His vast narcissism and ego as a BBC football pundit is matched only by his sheer ignorance.'

In reality, of course, narcissism would mean Lineker keeping his head down, banking his huge salary, avoiding the inevitable torrent of abuse, and thus keeping his reputation safe and sound, like so many people do.

The West's Vanishing 'Responsibility to Protect'

It is quite astonishing to reflect that, in 2011, NATO [deployed](#) 260 aircraft and 21 ships, launching 26,500 sorties destroying 'over 5,900 military targets including over 400 artillery or rocket launchers and over 600 tanks or armored vehicles' in response, not to the mass murder of civilians, but to a merely alleged *threat* of mass murder posed by Libya's Muammar Gaddafi.

Not that there had been a call for a humanitarian 'pause', or a ceasefire, or the introduction of UN peacekeepers – the widespread demand was for massive military intervention. In reality, the NATO 'no-fly zone' that instantly became a bombing campaign obliterating

Gaddafi's army was based on a lie. A 9 September 2016 report into the war from the foreign affairs committee of the House of Commons [commented](#):

'Despite his rhetoric, the proposition that Muammar Gaddafi would have ordered the massacre of civilians in Benghazi was not supported by the available evidence... Muammar Gaddafi's 40-year record of appalling human rights abuses did not include large-scale attacks on Libyan civilians.'

In February 2011, The Times insisted that 'there is incontrovertible evidence' that demonstrators in Benghazi 'are being blown apart by mortar fire'. Even if accurate, this would have been a pin prick compared to Israeli actions now. This was the response to the Libyan government proposed by The Times:

'British officials and private citizens must do all they can to cajole, pressure and exhort it out of power.' (Leading article, 'In bombing its own civilians, Libya stands exposed as an outlaw regime,' The Times, 23 February 2011)

By contrast, on 25 October, The Times [praised](#) Starmer's 'initially assured response to the outbreak of violence that followed Hamas's terror attacks on Israel on October 7', which 'correctly emphasised his party's unconditional support for the Jewish state's right to self-defence'.

This was a reference to Starmer's appalling [declaration](#) that Israel 'does have that right' to inflict collective punishment on Palestinian civilians by cutting off water, food and electricity.

On 22 March 2011, with NATO bombing of Libya underway, the Guardian's Jonathan Freedland published a [piece](#) titled, 'Though the risks are very real, the case for intervention remains strong'. He meant military intervention, of course - war - insisting that 'in a global, interdependent world we have a "responsibility to protect" each other'. Freedland now warns against such 'binary thinking', as he [baulks](#) even at the idea of a ceasefire:

'It seems such a simple, obvious remedy. Until you stop to wonder how exactly, if it is not defeated, Hamas is to be prevented from regrouping and preparing for yet another attack on the teenagers, festivalgoers and kibbutz families of southern Israel.'

Freedland's article was titled: 'The tragedy of the Israel-Palestine conflict is this: underneath all the horror is a clash of two just causes'. In 'Manufacturing Consent', Edward Herman and Noam Chomsky commented on their analysis of media treatment of victims deemed 'worthy' and 'unworthy' by the West:

'While the coverage of the worthy victim was generous with gory details and quoted expressions of outrage and demands for justice, the coverage of the unworthy victims was low-keyed, designed to keep the lid on emotions and evoking regretful and philosophical generalities on the omnipresence of violence and the inherent tragedy of human life.' (Edward Herman and Noam Chomsky, 'Manufacturing Consent', Pantheon Books, 1988, p.39)

The Guardian's Polly Toynbee also [rejected](#) calls for a ceasefire, obfuscating with a tangled web of Welby-style verbiage:

'That word "ceasefire" has become a symbol and a semantic roadblock, as events rush on and words get left behind. "Ceasefire" has become an ideology rather than a

practicality.’

When it comes to Gaza in November 2023, the famous ‘responsibility to protect’ has vanished from thinkable thought. Today, even the responsibility to protest is under legal [threat](#). As for the British government’s response, Peter Osborne [describes](#) the shocking truth:

‘Meanwhile, not one government minister, as far as I can see, has condemned the indiscriminate slaughter of civilians in Gaza, or uttered a word of condemnation of the wave of settler attacks including displacement of Palestinian communities – war crimes – across the West Bank. Nor the genocidal language used by too many Israeli leaders.’

In describing the conflict, the BBC is content to [use](#) the pro-Israel propaganda construct ‘Israel-Hamas War’.

Israel’s murderous bombardment of Gaza was [described](#) by the BBC’s Jeremy Bowen as Israel ‘still pushing forward’. Bowen noted: ‘Palestinians call this genocide’.

It is not just the Palestinians though, as Bowen well knows.

*

Note to readers: Please click the share button above. Follow us on Instagram and Twitter and subscribe to our Telegram Channel. Feel free to repost and share widely Global Research articles.

Featured image is from Media Lens

The original source of this article is [Media Lens](#)
Copyright © [Media Lens](#), [Media Lens](#), 2023

[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Media Lens](#)

Disclaimer: The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: publications@globalresearch.ca

www.globalresearch.ca contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca