

**The Sylvans – main debate
4th October 2025**

Ye Olde Cock Tavern
Detailed summary powered by AI

The motion:

This house supports Trump's peace plan for Gaza.

Proposed by: Giovanni Patricelli

Opposed by: Stan Billington

The motion before us this evening is that this House supports Trump's peace plan for Gaza. This House supports Trump's peace plan for Gaza. It will be proposed by the speaker on my right and it will be opposed by the speaker on my left. So without any more from me, I will ask the speaker to propose the motion.

Well, thank you, the chair and it's a pleasure being here. I hope it's going to be a very emotional debate in many instances and I hope we're going to learn a lot of things today. As you may imagine, I had to prepare for today at least a bit and I learned to use ChatGPT a bit better as of lately. So I went in search. I thought it was a good idea to start with some form of a quote. I went in search for quotes on ChatGPT and the core of my search was trying to find a quote about peace as a compromise. I was given a few and I read two or three. One is: peace is not the absence of conflict, it is the ability to handle conflict by peaceful means. I was like, okay. Second one was: the most durable peace is through reconciliation, not domination. Okay, sounds good as well. If we are to live together in peace, we must come to know each other better. I was like, okay, it's probably three valid ones to use. Now, the only problem with these three quotes is that the first is from Reagan, the second is from Nixon and the third one is from Lyndon Johnson. Literally, if you Google right now the top 10 presidents that waged most wars in the history of the United States of America, these guys are probably top three out of five, with George Bush Jr probably being there and his father probably as well, but still, I learned a bit through the exercise because peace as a compromise has always been, I figured out, a bit of a hypocritical exercise by decision makers. It's very hard to find any movement in history where decision makers really acted out of pure empathy towards everyone else. There was always an element of opportunism. There was always an element of hypocrisy. And the second thing that I thought about is that although that is true, if it achieves its ends, then probably we should focus on the message, not on the messenger. This is the first thing that I want you to remember tonight. We should try and focus on the message, not on the messenger. On that note, there's another thing that I will kindly request you and myself. It's going to be a difficult task for both of us. Whether you hear me speak or anyone else speak tonight, I would like you to try and listen with an unbiased mindset. Some of the bias I have and probably I share with you, include liking or disliking some of the people you're going to hear about: Trump, Netanyahu, Hamas. The peace proposal that we have is what we have. There's no other thing to discuss. So these are the cards that we have been dealt. Some may say it would be better if other players were on the

table, but they're not. These are the three we have. These are the three we're going to play with. Just don't let your possible hate to any of these people influence your judgement. The second one is you need to also try and be unbiased. If you have read the 20 points, Trump is mentioned by surname three times in 20 points. The guy is really keen on winning a Nobel Prize out of this and is clearly invested into it. Still, whether you like his motives or not, please don't focus on that. Focus on the message and the quality of writing. You're probably going to hear tonight that the peace proposal is imperfect. We're going to talk about that in a while, but in general, it's probably vague on purpose. Again, try not to focus on the perfection of the proposal. That's what we have; that's what is here; that's what we're going to vote upon. Let's try to focus on what this proposal can achieve and how. In doing that, there's a few things I would like not to convince you about. One of the things I will try not to convince you about is whether this peace is just or whether this peace is a good compromise. The reason I will not try to do that is because I don't think this peace proposal is just, because for me, for it to be just, it would have to be morally sensible for both points of view. When one side has lost 65,000 people and the other side 1,200, I'm not too sure about that. Equally, I'm not sure it's a good compromise, because for it to be a good compromise, both parties should leave something on the table. If you read the 20 points, it seems to me there's one party which is asked to do lots and the other party goes back to some previous arrangement but is still asked to do less. One party throws their weapons in. The other party does not. One party renounces many things. The other party does not necessarily. For many things I will not convince you this peace proposal is right. Then, if you think about history in general, any peace that was ever signed had probably never been either just or a good compromise on those terms. World War One, World War Two. If there's a war, there's most likely a defeated party and it's very hard for the defeated party to come to the negotiating table and impose its own terms. History has taught us that it's effectively people that win by any means—I'm not arguing that they should have won or not—but clearly they achieved a military victory there, fair or unfair, just or unjust, to impose their own terms. It's how history has always been done. This case is not going to change things. The second thing I'm not going to try to convince you about is that I don't think this is a movie with good people on one side, bad people on the other. I do not believe in characterising either party generically in order to assign a label of good or bad. What I believe we are looking at here is a war, and a war is irrational, unreasonable, inhuman by its very definition. Let's not pretend it's something different. For many people that committed many atrocities, I'm sure there's many other people that believe a peace is still attainable, as many other people believe it's not, maybe because they are blinded by their personal ego, propaganda or their own beliefs, which I fully respect. In general, I believe nothing good ever comes from labelling people generically, especially in cases like this that have many grey areas. What I will try to do is to get you to look forward and not backward. Don't concentrate on labelling. Don't concentrate on what has happened. Try to look forward. The third thing I will not try to convince you on is that this peace proposal is perfect. I mentioned it at the beginning because I don't believe it is. One interesting thing is that I believe it's imperfect by design. If you think about it being imperfect by design, it does potentially achieve certain things because it does not corner either party to decide now on everything. You may see it as building blocks or a starting point for further discussions to take place and therefore, by being not perfect, it may be at least attainable now, which is something we should not entirely disregard. What I will instead try to convince you about is to support this peace deal

as a starting point. Think of it as building blocks. We're not seeking perfection here. We're seeking a starting point. There's plenty of things it does not achieve, but there's one immediate and certain result: it stops the killing. It stops the killing, which is a major achievement in my view. It's a low-hanging fruit that we should look at. Take it as a way to marginally improve the current situation, not perfect it, marginally improve it. This is not the best deal in absolute terms, but it still achieves something better than what we have. It stops the killing and it establishes some form—just or unjust, fair or unfair—some form of neutral ground for the international community to keep debating this point. There's plenty of countries that are already going towards recognising Palestine as a state and giving them some fuel to keep pursuing diplomatic actions may potentially yield better results than not. If you don't trust any of the people that are proposing it, if you don't trust that eventually this is going to work, if you don't trust that there's going to be plenty of opportunity to mess it all up again eventually down the road once you've accepted it, the possibility of something to happen is still better than nothing. It is effectively a no-worse option. The possibility of something to happen is still better than nothing. It is no assumption. If you are concerned that signing this deal means that, whatever you believe, perpetrators of crimes will not be pursued or crimes will not be punished, then again, do not focus on that. Nowhere in these 20 points does it say that Netanyahu will stop being prosecuted by the International Court of Justice. Nowhere does it say that one party has achieved moral ground and the other party has not. There's plenty of room to keep pursuing whatever you believe is just or fair by any other means. They should not prevent you from still supporting this peace proposal. Responsibilities can still be prosecuted by international courts. We're not turning any wrong points right. Are you looking for the timer? So I'll take probably less than that, so we can leave room for some space. Let me recap some of the points and then we'll see each other at the end of it. First, let's try to bury our ego in taking a decision. Let's focus on what we can achieve now, not what we should achieve tomorrow, maybe what we can achieve now. Second, let's support this deal as a building block, not perfect, not necessarily just, as a building block to something more meaningful to potentially come tomorrow that's better than nothing today. Third, if you're still bound by any sense of making wrongs right, making sure that whoever committed criminalities will still be prosecuted, making sure that some sides' narrative can still be told in a certain way and the other side's as well, that shouldn't prevent you from still supporting this peace proposal, because that doesn't stop with these parties signing this deal. I'll give back the room three minutes now. I hope we'll have a fruitful discussion tonight. Thanks very much for listening.

Well, thank you, the speaker, for proposing the motion. I will now call on another speaker to oppose.

An earlier speaker talked about this being a good building block, setting us off in a good direction. I have to fundamentally disagree with that. I think this sets us off in totally the wrong direction again. It doesn't solve the problem. Who here thinks that the situation, the plan, the status quo as regards Western support for Israel's actions has worked so far over the past 70, 80 years? Do you think the plan has worked so far? No, the plan has not worked so far. You've got Israel on a war front with about seven countries. You've got Israel accused in the ICJ of genocide. You've got its leaders accused by the ICC of war crimes and crimes against humanity.

that change in his direction is possible. Hence, this plan is insufficient, but I'll get through that more later. I'm going to break down the plan, because an earlier speaker didn't mention the plan. I think we should go through it more thoroughly. I'm not going to go through every point. We don't have time.

Number one: Gaza will be a de-radicalised territory zone that does not pose a threat to its neighbours. Now, an earlier speaker mentioned that World War One is not a just compromise. I was taught by my father that the conventional wisdom is that World War One was an example of punishing Germany, making that population pay for having World War One and also constraining them, constraining the military, putting sanctions on them. Who thinks that was a good idea? Did that work out well? It did not, and that's part of why we're here today. Ironically, the lesson in World War Two was to not take it out on the Germans. This plan is taking it out on the Palestinians, maintaining the status quo, denying them their rights, fuelling bodies like Hamas and being responsible for the bloodshed of beautiful Israelis like Shani Louk, who died. Her blood is on the hands, fundamentally, of nut bag American Zionists who fuelled this. This is a continuation of that.

Number two: Gaza will be redeveloped for the benefit of the people of Gaza who have suffered more than enough. This is a good point. It's better that these people are phrasing things nicely. They might not mean it, but it's better than if they're explicitly saying fascistic and genocidal things like the Israeli cabinet does and like nut bag Zionists like Steve Witkoff, the US envoy for Middle Eastern affairs, who calls the West Bank Judea and Samaria, a crazy messianic thing to say. Things could be worse. This plan is not all bad in every way, all the time.

Skipping to number four: within 72 hours of Israel publicly accepting this agreement, all hostages alive and deceased will be returned. This is a worse plan than earlier plans, where these hostage exchanges were done simultaneously. That's usually more efficacious.

Number five: once all hostages are released, Israel will release 250 life-sentence prisoners, plus 1,700 Gazans who were detained after the seventh of October 2023, including all women and children detained in that context. For every Israeli hostage whose remains are released, Israel will release the remains of 15 deceased Gazans. I think this is a deeply sinister point to make. Basically it says Israel has plenty of hostages of its own. The world has been highly sympathetic to Israel because of its hostages kept, while Israel has, for decades, according to human rights organisations, been keeping under what is called administrative detention thousands of Gazan hostages. High ratio. This is a vast hypocrisy. This is the stupidity that is maintaining this obvious system of resistance and the slaughter and the general hypocrisy that Israel exhibits. I just thought I'd throw it in there: raping detainees, using human shields, slaughtering children—all of this stuff which it accuses Hamas of, it does in far greater measure.

Number six: once all hostages are returned, Hamas members who commit to peaceful coexistence and to decommission their weapons will be given amnesty. Members of Hamas who wish to leave Gaza will be provided safe passage to receiving countries. What is Israel's modus operandi? Is it to show lenience, or is it to enact vengeance? Will it intensify its bombing

once it doesn't have the hostages in the way? I think probably yes. Will this stop the killing, as an earlier speaker said? I think most likely not.

Number seven: upon acceptance of this agreement, full aid will be sent into Gaza at a minimum. Aid must be provided. Article 54 of the 1977 Additional Protocols to the Geneva Convention says that aid must be provided. This is not a concession by Israel. This shouldn't be viewed as a concession by Israel. This is a stain on international law. I should go back. This whole thing—rewind the clock 12 months—this plan, this provisional authority, would have been done in the UN route, maintaining at least a nominal commitment to international law, as was the Coalition Provisional Authority in Iraq in 2003 to 2005. I think that was done under UN Convention. This one is not. Apparently that doesn't matter anymore. Instead of casually disregarding international law as Israel and its supporters have done, we're outright ignoring international law. This is a bad thing, another reason why this plan is flawed.

Number eight: entry and distribution of aid into the Gaza Strip will proceed without interference from the two parties, with oversight from the UN. So the UN is getting involved in aid. Again, better than Gaza Humanitarian Foundation, which slaughtered people while they tried to eat. This is good and it's good that despite my earlier point, they would bring back the UN, but it's also partly because Israel doesn't pay for this stuff, and this is why, again, the plan is not setting us off in the right direction, because it's not acknowledging Israel's obligations under international law. Under international law, Israel is the occupying power of Gaza. Israel should be treating this like a hostage situation of its own civilians. It is clearly not doing so. Were it its own civilians, it would not turn the area into rubble to save the hostages. That's stupid in every way and immoral in every way. We need to make sure this plan sets us off in a sane direction, a moral direction.

Gaza will be governed under the temporary governance of a technocratic apolitical Palestinian committee. Again, yes, this is like in Iraq, maybe a mission doomed to fail. In Iraq, with far less hatred towards the local community, nonetheless the governing authorities were seen as imperialists and any Iraqi that got involved was seen as a collaborator and despised. Any attempt to either govern externally or to bring in Gazans to be part of the administration will be met with a lot of resistance. This isn't practical.

The Trump economic plan is number 10 or 11. It's good that Trump's pride is on the line. I think that's a good thing. His sense of economic pride being on the line might encourage him to try and keep Israel in check. But the model being used for this is Dubai, its success stories in the Arab world, where there was an attraction to bring in expats, where there was full control of the borders. Gaza will lack those things. It's a doomed mission under this paradigm.

Number 12: no one will be forced to leave Gaza, and those who wish to leave will be free to do so and free to return. We'll encourage people to stay and offer them the opportunity to build a better Gaza. Israel has a pretty bad record of letting back in those it ethnically cleanses. I wonder whether they might have excuses to not allow them back in again. Maybe my cynicism after 70 years is misplaced.

I could keep going on, but I think I have layered the condemnations of this. Actually, I'll skip to the end. Number 20: the United States will establish a dialogue between Israel and Palestinians to agree on a political horizon for peaceful and prosperous coexistence. Israel has been committed all this while—its prime minister now explicitly says so—to undermining the two-state solution. This is because the impunity being given to Israel by the United States has allowed this kind of extremist expansionism to flourish. I realise, of course, that I sound like a huge partisan of Palestine, but I think this is the obvious status quo. I'm willing to be challenged on this. Your time to speak will come soon. Israel's support is diminishing. Its allies are turning against it, increasing even in America. By the tens of percentage points, support for Israel is rapidly dropping, as per Economist polls. A recent poll found that 39 percent of Jews in America believe that in Gaza Israel is committing a genocide. Also, Trumpians who believe in his mission of not giving all American taxpayers' money away: where does the most American taxpayers' money go to foreign sources? Israel, then Egypt, both in support of crazy Zionism. There's a lot of opposition to this crazy support of Israel from Trump's core base. Trump could be pressured to oppose Israel as he should and impose a far tougher line that will have a far more pragmatic capability of working and be far more moral and be far more in line, accidentally, because it's Trump, far more in line with international law. Anyone can be a critic, anyone can poo-poo a suggestion. I've got an alternative suggestion, an alternative way, a far more coherent plan that I think is in reach and one that we should support. It is that Israel should be considered a rogue state by the United States. It should be slapped with sanctions and threats. The United Nations should send in peacekeepers immediately to stop the genocide in Gaza, following which sanctions will intensify against Israel until they commit to one state, one person, one vote. You could make a big push to push back all those horrible settlers, 750,000 of them, from the West Bank. I think the better plan is to push for one state, one person, one vote. You sanction them. Israel is heavily dependent on the West. It couldn't be a bully to the whole region if it weren't supplied to the teeth by the West. If you sanction them, the political calculus changes completely, and they will do anything they're told. They will remove their apartheid, and that will totally get rid of the fundamental issue, which is not being addressed at all in this plan. The fundamental issue is the illegal occupation and apartheid. We should pressure Israel, as we easily can and as Trump easily could, to end that and address the fundamental issue. Then you should have ICC and ICJ investigations on both sides, bringing back international law, looking at the ICC's approach to people on the Hamas side who committed war crimes and then on Israel's side what war crimes they committed. Bring justice back into the fray. Put in UN peacekeepers, because there will be partisan infighting amongst Jews and Arabs in the region. Put UN peacekeepers there. Let them defend the innocent properly, as Israel has failed to do. One person, one vote. Ehud Olmert in 2007 said, if the day comes when a two-state solution collapses, as it has, and we face a South African-style struggle for equal voting rights, the State of Israel is finished. He doesn't mean that the State of Israel will be annihilated. He means that the State of Israel as a Jewish supremacist state, a stupid idea in someone else's land, will be over, and that is the basis for lasting peace. That is not the thrust of this plan. This plan is setting us up in the status quo, which is an abject failure. We need to plan more sanely, in line with international law, with democracy and with human values. So don't support this motion. Thank you.

Thank you very much, the speaker and both of you, for outlining the proposition and the opposition to the motion, which I will repeat once again: this House supports Trump's peace plan for Gaza. That is now open to the floor, anybody who wishes to come up and speak. I saw you first, sir.

Hello everybody. Thank you for coming. Thank you for your time here. A lot of points have been made. I'm going to add to them some notes I made. This plan bypasses the Palestinians. There's no path to statehood. We keep talking about a two-state solution. I'll come on to that. There's a bit of PR really; we're not really talking about that. Donald Trump chairs it. He's not known for changing his mind. How trustworthy is that? This is not the first peace plan. Every US president since Carter has come up with a Middle East peace plan. This is where we are today and what is happening. Just to make clear, it is genocide. It is ethnic cleansing. It is an apartheid state. An earlier speaker mentions the word democracy. The Israelis like to think that they are a democratic state. As he just said and as Olmert said, if it was a truly democratic state and everybody in that country had a vote, including the Arabs, there would be no Jewish state. It's not a democracy. It's an ethno-fascist state. It really is. I was here once and I used the word rogue state, and I was admonished by some people, but it is a rogue state and what an earlier speaker is suggesting, it should be sanctioned. It's not going to happen, because sanctions can only really be implemented effectively by the US, the EU. The EU can't do anything; otherwise Trump will threaten them with tariffs. The 20-point plan is literally 20 bullet points. You could, on your PowerPoint at work, within half an hour, come up with 20 bullet points. There is no reference to any article in the UN. There's no reference to any legal framework. The deadline says accept this within 72 hours; otherwise we're going to carry on bombing the shit out of you. We're going to carry on continuing with this genocide. You've already seen the video footage. It's been reduced to rubble. They're going to carry on doing it. An earlier speaker mentioned Netanyahu as the person who is pushing this because he wants to stay in power. Netanyahu in his UN speech, and this has been fact-checked, said it's not just me, this is what the Israelis want. The Israeli cabinet was asked, do you want a two-state solution, and they voted no. More than 90 percent voted no. Part of the peace plan involves Israel deciding if Hamas has disarmed, but Israel has said, and Israel's polled quite a lot. This comes from Israeli society. We keep saying it's Netanyahu, but actually Israeli society is represented by this. The action they're taking. It's polled quite a bit, and the results of the poll are, do we want a two-state solution? Seventy percent, if you exclude the Israeli Arabs, the Jewish population there, say no, we don't want a two-state solution. Roughly the same percentage say that everybody is Hamas. If every Israeli says Hamas hasn't disarmed, that's their definition. They say that there are no innocents in Gaza. That means every baby, every child. I think 40 percent of the population are under 18 or under 25 or something like that. They are all determined as being not innocent. As has been mentioned, this is supposed to bring about peace. The intention is not to bring about peace. That is not the intention of Israeli society represented by the West. It may delay the killing. That is all it's going to do: delay it because of the pressure put on Netanyahu by Trump for a number of reasons. He wants the Nobel Peace Prize. There's all sorts of things going on there within the US that's forcing his hand. I hope for killing to stop, but it's just a delay to the genocide. My time is up, so I'm generally on an earlier speaker's side. Thank you.

Thank you very much, dear guest and an earlier speaker, for your presentations and dear chair for managing this so well. I've got some information that I believe very few people in this room have any knowledge of. It came to me from a Chinese analyst. She initially did not believe a Chinese dissident when he said that China is interested in keeping four proxy wars going. The first proxy war is the conflict of Xi Jinping encouraging Vladimir Putin to invade Ukraine so as to have a proxy war with Europe and the United States. All these proxy wars are aimed by China to weaken the US military such that China's taking over Taiwan would become a walk in the park. The second proxy war is the conflict between Iran and the United States and Europe. The third proxy war is the support of North Korea against the global West. The fourth proxy war is to provoke a conflict between Israel and the Arab world in order to once again weaken the US military, because the Chinese Communist Party believes that the US military will be drained by four areas of operation, which, of course, China seeks to control from behind the scenes. I learned also from the same analyst that there were Chinese engineers before Netanyahu brought his forces into Gaza. There were Chinese engineers in the Rafah tunnels creating operational capability for Hamas and China was very worried that some of these engineers would be discovered, and they were very interested in getting them out very quickly before the Israeli forces moved in. Those who do not see China's hand in the conflict should note China's hand in seeking to destroy the Abraham Accords, seeking to destroy the peace, because they want a war between Israel and the Arab world as one of the four proxy areas of conflict. Thank you.

War, what is it good for? Marvin Gaye. That song about brother was about his brother who actually fought in the Vietnam War, and I believe Marvin may have been a war veteran as well. I didn't know whether to laugh when I first heard about the peace treaty, and because I've got my own way of looking at things, I hadn't seen that the UN was involved, but even with what an earlier speaker has said, the UN is not really that involved. They have got no peacekeeping thing and Israel's gradual withdrawal. An earlier speaker, you need to spend more time on the content more than the context, because I was hearing a sales pitch. If you're in business and somebody sends you something, you say, no, you don't want this and I've got the solution. This is the best you can get, and I sat here thinking, I've been places. It may not be perfect. It doesn't matter if it's unjust. Do breathe. He's Italian. Palestinians are not white anyway. Remember why World War Two started: Germany felt hard done by the penalties enforced on them after World War One, and so Hitler stirred it up and said this is the reason why we're suffering, it's the Jews, and with everything else that he went on, World War Two happened. After World War Two, because Germany got so bombed and everything else, everybody pulled in to help invest. That's why Germany looks much better than England does at this present moment. One of the things I want to think about, and this is me being taken it too far, but I think I need to think about this: those who think that this is a good idea, it's like a woman who's been kidnapped and raped for two days, then saying to her she's got a choice. She either dies or does what her captors want her to do. That is what's been offered. I'm sorry for it to sound too extreme, but we need to think about the women in war who are raped, tortured, used. Even if they're not tortured and raped, they use them as chattel. It doesn't matter where the war is. Sometimes it's about knowing your history, because I'm going to tell you something about Jews that most Jewish

people do not know. The word ghetto comes from them in Italy. I read a book called Behind the Wall. They had to live in a room like this or an area like this or the size of this block, but as generations went on, they weren't allowed to expand. They had to move up. They weren't allowed to buy new clothes. They could only buy second-hand clothes. That's why they became good tailors, because they made new clothes and then ripped them so they could say it wasn't a new clothes, and they did invisible mending. The word is an Italian word, geto. Don't ask me how it got to American English and got an H in it and another T. We need to think: what is Trump? I was trying to think about the past presidents, and I don't remember much. Ronald Reagan was an actor. He was a sort of okay president. Bush, the second one, his dad, he was sort of famous because his dad was famous. Now we've got this entertainer, and that's what he's doing. There's other conflicts happening in the world, but think about the conflicts happening in Africa, because Israel is actually part of Africa, because it's in the continent, and we've got to think about what is it about the Jewish people that if something is happening, then it's more important than other people. Just think about the Palestinians, who are a bit darker skin but not necessarily dark as me. If they were white, would this still be going on? Would this be allowed?

Mr. Chair, fellow members and guests, my name is the speaker and I'm really pleased about this motion that at last we are talking about peace, something that I often bring up in this very room. Where is the humanity? Peace is possible. Peace is ethical. Peace is right in principle and deep in human consciousness. So it's a peace plan coming from human beings. The issue is, do we trust these human beings or are we going to live for the rest of our lives in fear? That's our choice: trust or fear. If we don't go for peace, and unless we get it right, there are about 70 odd conflicts in the world. I looked up some statistics the other day that in 2023 the world spent \$270 trillion on weapons each day. There are 8 percent of the population hungry. That's 700 million, 123 million displaced people in the world. This is what fear brings. No doubt some of my friends who hear me every week or every three weeks will be their usual cynical selves or sceptical selves. Oh, peace is impossible. Human nature is naturally violent. I don't believe it. As John Lennon said, give peace a chance. You don't know the mentality or the psychology of the negotiators. Let's not get into personalities. Let's talk about principles. Do we want peace in the world? Do you want peace in your lives? I can tell a story. There was a homeless, hungry person in the street, and this entrepreneur who was just about to open a five-star restaurant gave the homeless person the menu. It wasn't open till next week. Along comes a drag queen with a cup of soup. Who did the practical thing? Who helped that person who was starving? Peace. What's the alternative, just to perpetuate like the hamster going round on the wheel? More weapons, not 270 trillion, 570 trillion, more babies, more women, more everybody. All ethnic groups being killed all over the world. Now we've got a chance tonight to send out a message to believe in peace and to give peace a chance. Vote overwhelmingly for the motion tonight and show that you are peaceful people. Thank you.

I would like one more speaker before we have a break. If anybody would like to come up. You, sir.

So just regarding peace talks, the first thing is there was a peace talk for the Vietnam War, 1968 to 1969, I think it was in Paris. It took them 10 weeks just to debate the shape of the table. Peace talks: the journey of 1000 miles starts with a single step. Diplomacy and dialogue in this conflict is the best solution. It may not be easy, but it is the best solution. Donald Trump has been here since January 2025 and he inherited from the Biden administration quite a mess when it came to foreign policy: pullout in Afghanistan with the Taliban in power, Russia invading Ukraine, a Middle Eastern war, not just a war between Israel and Palestine, a wider conflagration. With Donald Trump, for all his ills, he has actually tried to have some kind of dialogue and diplomacy. For example, between Washington and Moscow, they have tried to have some sort of dialogue to try and resolve. I know he didn't solve the war in 24 hours, but there is some dialogue. Regarding the Middle Eastern conflict, the war which started two years from now, on this day tomorrow, war started Israel–Gaza, then it spread towards Lebanon near Hezbollah. The IDF and the Mossad defeated Hezbollah. That ultimately led to regime change in Syria, where there is now an al-Qaeda-backed government in Damascus. Israel is using Syria as a launching pad to go after Iran. This happened all before Trump came into office. I support the concept of the State of Israel. It's the world's only Jewish state. Israel does have the right to defend itself. That doesn't mean the IDF or the Israeli government is not without criticism. Specifically with this war, one question that I actually have is Hamas has 25,000 fighters. Hezbollah has 100,000 fighters with more sophisticated weapons, but Israel took less than a week to defeat Hezbollah with these pager attacks, but they're still fighting Hamas. For me, that doesn't add up. The continuous onslaught going on in Gaza—a lot of it is the fault of the IDF, but it is also the fault of Hamas as well. That's undebatable. The only way to begin to solve this problem and go towards more stability in the region is to start with talks, which is why I agree that this peace plan is the beginning of going towards the right direction. Thank you.

I support this plan, the plan which is 20 points, but I actually think there's only maybe five overarching blocks that you were suggesting. I think the House should support this plan. It brings the stabilisation of the area immediately and stops the killing and allows for a transitional period. That's one aspect of it. The second is the hostage exchange, which is vital and I disagree with an earlier speaker. It is an exchange of hostages. On the Israeli side, wouldn't you say that on the Palestinian side there are prisoners of war? They're at war, and you can't really put them under the same umbrella in my view. Who's being exchanged? It's people after 2023, the start of the war. It's 1,700 people who have been captured since, and then there were other long-term prisoners of 250, I believe. The third aspect is the humanitarian aid, and that needs to happen quickly and be immediate, and that's what two or three points cover. Then there's a transitional period where we bring in the international stabilisation force. Who's going to be that force? Where is it coming from? Who's going to fund it? There are very big questions about this plan, and it's very vague, but surely, on the eve of the start of the war tonight, it's got to be the way forward. Finally, it means—and I don't think that Hamas will accept it—it's the end of Hamas, and it has to be that way. When the end of the Second World War came, you didn't keep a percentage of Nazis in power. You can't in war. Hamas cannot stay in power and they cannot be seen to be influential in that region anymore, and it's not going to be easy. Netanyahu won't get it through his parliament. His party has 61 seats out of 120. He won't be able to sell it to them, and they don't want it. It's not all Netanyahu's fault. Islamic Jihad have said think about

it as a recipe to blow up the region. From that aspect it won't work either. However, surely it is better going forward. It will also fail because not all parties are involved. The Arab world seem to look upon it favourably. That's a positive and even the Europeans do, and all we can hope for is that progress is made.

First time here today. Thank you very much for both sides of the debate. What I was feeling was that I was always confused by this conflict, and after listening to the debates and everyone on the floor, I'm still equally, if not more, confused. I would like the speakers to clarify in their plan or counterplan what they are trying to achieve and what the metrics are, how we're going to judge success. What are the KPIs? Is that stopping killing, stopping more people who are alive today from dying tomorrow? Is it prolonging life expectancy for those people who are alive today but can't get medical care or food and need aid? Is it economic growth for those areas? Is it economic growth for someone else who's selling weapons or fuelling the war? Is it justice, and whatever that means for whom? Is it upholding international law? How do we know when we've got success here? I would really love to hear those thoughts. There are always people winning from running a war and always people winning from the war ending, and so that's why it's always confusing, and we want some yardsticks. On a personal note, I'm from Finland, and we as a country have the longest land border with Russia, over 1000 kilometres. We've conceded; we've won against Russia in war. We've conceded a considerable amount of territory. Even then, people in Finland would still think that was a victory. One of the best countries with highest life expectancy, happiness ratings, living standards. It is possible to concede a war and come out winning. I don't think there's many people in the world who would rather go and live in Russia than Finland. It is possible to have a peace deal where you lose but you win, but also at the same time, it is possible to always continue to live under threat of war. In Finland, everyone's mindset is not if Russia is going to attack but when they will, and so you might always, even after conceding, have to live under that threat. I'll be interested to see where the debate goes. Thank you very much.

Good evening, everyone. It's also my first time speaking, not first time here. Excuse me if I'm a little bit nervous. I'll try my best. I think what I was thinking follows up the previous speaker. I think this plan is a good starting block. When I was asked at the beginning of this war how I see it, a lot of building blocks which are here are what I was thinking should be there. That's a good start. From that start, the questions we should ask are whether we can actually achieve this plan, whether we can follow up all the steps and whether we can sustain it. Achieving this plan relies partially on Trump's involvement in the Middle East with money. He has a lot of investment coming through that. He'll be really keen on getting this through. The Arab world is really interested in getting this plan through. This part hasn't been mentioned here: how much money is involved. That's a good thing for this plan. The questions we need to ask for sustainability are, as much as many people don't think it's fair, making Israelis feel safe. A lot of people in Israel are so susceptible to Netanyahu because they feel threatened. Whether it's fair or not is a separate discussion, but they should feel safe. Palestinians should feel safe and moreover, they should feel prosperous, because radicalism comes from poverty, from people feeling frustrated, feeling betrayed by powers outside their control. This is where the involvement—alleged involvement—of the Arab world is important. For the last three years there was not a lot of

discussion, but never as close as it was recently, of Arab forces' involvement in Gaza, which I think, together with the Abraham Accords and with a lot of negotiation already happening between Trump and the Arab world, can help to make this peace feel more sustainable. If we would see a truly international force like that, Palestinians would be more likely to not see them as a threat. There is a discussion to be made whether they would fully trust those forces. I think it's a better start than anything we had before. Just a random UN force would not have a similar effect. Because of all the ties between Americans and Israel and them being in the middle of that, Israelis might see that as a better option out of what we have. This change, compared to everything that we've heard before, is the crucial bit which makes me really hopeful about this plan. I think we should support this, and I think we should try to get it through.

My voice is hoarse, so I apologise. Israel hasn't won this war. Hamas has won this war. They didn't envisage this situation. They called it a war. It actually should be a campaign. That was a linguistic trick. By calling it a war, you have been licensed to parallel it to previous wars to actually kill the civilians. In the Torah, which Christians call the Old Testament, there is licence from Yahweh, which actually was a tribal God, that the Promised Land was the land of the Canaanites, and that was inhabited by the forebears of existing Palestinians who were Semites. You notice that the Palestinians, Hamas, are never quite seen as Semites. Very interesting, but that's a separate point. This plan is not something they envisaged. They've been reduced to accepting, and it must be accepted. Hamas will accept it, and it's unconscionable not to support it, because if you look at the various provisions, it's not perfect, but consider after two years, after Israel with the backing of America, the military might of America, and their arms to Israel donated and not given, Israel has been successful because it has lived on welfare from America and private welfare from individual and corporate beneficiaries. There's romanticism attached to it because of the way it's been presented. It's now exposed itself morally to be a pariah and feral state in the eyes of the world. If the plan is not accepted, more Palestinians will be killed, and then the finger will be pointed at Hamas. The responsibility will be transferred to them. It will give the Israelis more licence to kill more people and say, well, we put a peace plan forward. I could say more. There isn't much time. The definition of war: it's actually a campaign. A war is between two industrialised military states. They have neighbours, armies, air defence. Hamas is a militia. It's an urban militia force in no way comparable to the advanced weaponry available to Israel and supplied by the US and with the financial support of the US. So it's not the war, it's a campaign. The idea of the war was rhetoric so that civilians can be killed as they have been killed in previous wars. It's the norm in Zionist thinking that you kill civilians. Hamas has to be destroyed. You have to destroy the women who bear children, and the children will become Hamas supporters as they inevitably would do. This is the rationale behind it. To kill only the fighters is not to achieve your objectives. This debases the status of children, women and men, and humanity in general. Israel has not attained its objectives. Hamas has not surrendered. The Germans surrendered, the Japanese surrendered, and in the First World War there was an armistice. Hamas surrendered? No. It's a peace plan. It requires the consent of Hamas. Because the newspapers don't say this doesn't mean it's not true. One must think independently. There is a drive against independent critical thinking. Rise from the embers.

I'm going to stand on an earlier speaker's side. Years of friendship out the window, an earlier speaker, out the window. Some original points from me. I totally disagree with what Israel has done over the last two years. I totally disagree with what Hamas did on October the seventh. There's no justification on either side. We are in a situation where we are at a point where we think, what are we going to do? Are we going to continue? There isn't much more to destroy in Gaza, really. There are a few more people to kill. How far is that going to get us? Do we decide that we're going to have a little bit of, to quote a famous politician, more jaw-jaw rather than war-war, or do we carry on looking at the children and the women and the people starving? There's some dispute about whether or not this 20-point plan is any good. If you look at the reports coming out, they are saying that Hamas actually supports a lot of the plan. Therefore you think, well, if we're against the plan—the motion is the House supports the Trump plan. If Hamas supports the plan, or at least some of the plan, then surely you've got to vote in favour of an earlier speaker, in favour of the proposition. I have some worries about the Second World War. People come up with the Second World War, the First World War, Hitler, the Germans, the Versailles Treaty, and it ended up with the Second World War. The Second World War really ended with Hiroshima. We dropped a nuclear bomb on somebody which destroyed 200,000 plus lives. We can hang around and wait for that, or we can try and say we're going to try and have a negotiated settlement, even though it's being created by Netanyahu and Donald Trump. Donald Trump, who I believe has got no intention of leaving the White House in a couple of years' time. He will hang around. He will create something to ensure that. That's for another debate. I just ask you to think, if you were in Gaza this evening and you were a mother and you had some children sitting at a table, and someone came to you and said, listen, this is what is being proposed, we've got a choice. We can reject that and continue the slaughter and the destruction and the potential death of your children sitting here, or we can give peace a chance, to quote my friend John Lennon, and we say, okay, we'll give it a go. It might not work, but it might work. You might be wrong—people who say this is never going to work. It's easy for us. We're sitting in Fleet Street in London, a couple of beers. The intellectual arguments aren't helping the people who are sitting tonight scared in Gaza. We have a duty to say, yes, we should give this a go. It's got to be better than what's happening at the moment. I would urge you to support the motion. Thank you.

We heard from an earlier speaker the notion that this conflict has no solution. I think that's a pessimistic take on what is a tribalised scenario. We can have tribalism come to an end through justice. It happened in Ireland. In Iraq before 2003 you had the Turkmen, the Kurds, the Sunni and Shia Arabs, all these factions that coexisted without the significant antagonisation that imperialism causes. I think we can bring about the end to the tribalistic nonsense that is the warfare in Israel if we pursue justice. I think that's totally a solution, which I'll get around to again towards the end. There was from an earlier speaker the notion that we must vote for the proposition because we're doing a vote for peace, from the gentleman, the idea that I'm talking about how the world should be rather than how the world is. I want to talk to you guys. You're probably thinking there's a slaughter happening. The priority is to stop that, and I think that's a wise notion. I think that is the starting point, but that this plan is not, is a very important consideration. As a reiteration as to the non-pragmatism of this plan, the first of my three points of analysis: pragmatism, morality and international law will be my framework of analysis. On

pragmatism, the instigator of this, the controller of this, is Netanyahu, someone whose incentive structure is to undermine this plan and make it even worse in the future for Gazans. To intensify the bombing to an even greater level once the hostages are out of there. It's no longer so contentious for Netanyahu to bomb the place to rubble, though he already is. Without the hostages there, he will remove all constraints, as an Israeli minister said the military should do. They haven't done that. They likely would do it once the hostages were gone. Imagine how much worse it could be. Instead of hundreds of thousands who I think have died, millions could die. Why? Because we have to take out Hamas in an area that we have a legal occupation obligation to look after. It's nonsense. It's going to get worse, I think very likely, with this plan. What the Israelis do is they suggest to the Palestinians a non-viable plan and then say they have no partner for peace. People semi-committed to the issue internationally, morons like Keir Starmer, nod along and say they're doing what they can. Their whole MO, the Israeli expansionists, is to think about this issue. That is their goal, to expand Greater Israel. They're doing a great job of it, occupying multiple countries. They will undermine this plan. That is what they're structured to do. They're a tribalistic, expansionistic, common settler colonial force. This is a structure that's happened again and again through history and is happening now, lest we arrest it.

Morality: I think this is going to fuel more genocide. It's going to antagonise the Palestinians further, or it's going to oppress them so much that they can't finally resist like October 7. This is an immoral outcome that we shouldn't put our name to. We're asking the motion to support. We support this plan. Would we support a plan to rape a woman less? Say that was happening a huge amount. Let's do it less. But the plan is flawed such that it's going to bounce and become even worse than the first place. This is something that we wouldn't put our name to. We would put our name to an alternative of hope. You don't have to just choose this. Your support is what you want it to be, and there's a far better plan just waiting.

International law: this is destroying international law root and stem. There's no reference to international law. It's violations of international law. The establishment of this provisional authority has no basis in international law. They're destroying international law. An earlier speaker, you referenced all these conflicts that are going on. It's going to be exacerbated under a Trumpian demolition of international law.

The alternative plan and what we should reserve our nominal support for is a plan to recognise the fundamentals and address the fundamentals of this issue, which is the occupation, the illegal treatment of the Palestinians. Without addressing that, you will not resolve this conflict at all. This is what Trump could do. Trump could oppose Israel's evil expansionism, Israel's occupation. There's a growing support in the American right for cutting ties with Israel and allowing international law to come in. Israel should be treated like a rogue state. Israel should have the UN come in and say, we're going to stand in the way of you in the Gazans. That should be the first step. Then Israel should be sanctioned such that it commits to one person, one vote. This is obvious. This is what we said about South African racists, whites: one person, one vote. They feared the blacks just like the Israelis fear the Gazans. It's nonsense to oppress them and say we have to keep oppressing them because now that we've oppressed them, they hate us.

This is stupid. It's not designed to work. Then you need to bring in international law. You need to bring the ICC and ICJ to analyse both factions and bring justice to this situation. Finally, you need peacekeepers in there to help a thriving, multicultural state which could emerge. Let's not despair to racism. A thriving land could exist there with the application of justice. Support that, not this.

Okay, well, I think at the end of the day, after listening to everything, we agree on many points, many of which somehow disobey what I said as personal rules, or I asked the floor as personal rules for tonight. I think we're more biased on who's right and who's wrong in this situation, and I think we're both on the same side of the narrative. We're both biased on labelling someone good and someone bad, both things that I personally asked no one, me first, not to do. We're both biased towards thinking that this plan may not work, it may be a deception, and we're both biased in thinking that an alternative plan to this may be a better plan, that plan including Israel being sanctioned and a lot of pressure for it to come to terms with what has happened. We agree to all these things. Where are we and what do we have here in front of us now remains a pertinent question. We established already the plan is imperfect. We did. But we're basically weighing the possibility of it not going as it says, which is big, against the certainty of it not going as it says by not signing it. Even a small percentage of a possibility for it to actually go anywhere close to what it says is better than nothing, at least that's my point of view. To the point of relieving the pressure that the international community is right now waging on Israel, we're almost there. I think an earlier speaker said an alternative plan is just waiting. We don't know. I hope, but we don't know. Pointing at examples like South Africa, I think it's a bit misleading. It's like saying that when South Africa started to implement some reforms because the international community was pressuring them to do so, then the opposers of the apartheid would have said, we want the status quo, we don't care about reforms, we'd rather keep the pressure of you being bad so that we can wage our arguments against you. I don't think that's the way it works. This is not perfect, this is not just, but it's the starting of something. You mentioned Ireland. To me, Ireland is actually the opposite side. When Michael Collins went to London and they signed the treaty with the English, there were plenty of things—they waged a civil war over it—there were plenty of things that they didn't agree. Thirty-odd years later, Ireland was a free state by maybe other means. Sometimes history works in unpredictable ways. The point is, if you don't start something, you're most definitely not going to have any outcome. That is the question that we should ask ourselves. The choice is between doing nothing and doing something, especially when thinking that doing something does not preclude any of the moral ground that we still want to maintain. That peace plan doesn't say that Netanyahu gets off the hook of the International Criminal Court. The peace plan doesn't say the Israelis all of a sudden are the good guys. The peace plan doesn't say many of these things. You may remember at the beginning I tried to find a quote. I started with three that I utterly disliked, but I did end up with one that I think is apt, from a person that I think is much better than Nixon or Lyndon Johnson or Ronald Reagan. It goes as such: if you want to make peace with your enemy, you have to work with your enemy. Then he becomes your partner. The brave man is not he who does not feel afraid, but he who conquers that fear and reaches out to those who once wished him harm. That's Nelson Mandela. Thanks very much. Vote for the motion.

Very well, ladies and gentlemen, you have now heard both sides of the motion, so we come to a vote, and I will repeat the motion, which is this house supports Trump's peace plan for Gaza. Those who are in favour of the motion, please raise your hands. The motion is carried.

AI analysis of the result:

Why it carried: the decisive drivers

- Humanitarian immediacy over perfection: The proposition successfully framed the plan as an imperfect but immediate mechanism to “stop the killing,” secure a large hostage/prisoner exchange, and flood Gaza with aid. That near-term, concrete yardstick trumped the opposition’s longer-term, justice-first frame.
- “Message, not messenger”: By opening with and returning to the injunction to judge the plan on outcomes rather than on Trump/Netanyahu, the proposition blunted distrust of the sponsors. Several floor speakers echoed this “give peace a chance” pragmatism, aided by emotive appeals (e.g., the Gaza mother thought experiment).
- Starting-point logic: The proposition normalised vagueness as “by design” to enable a stoppage now and deeper talks later. The Irish treaty analogy and Mandela quote reinforced the idea that imperfect beginnings can lead to better settlements, and that accepting the plan does not foreclose accountability in international courts.
- Perceived feasibility vs. the opposition’s maximalism: The opposition’s alternative—UN peacekeepers, sweeping sanctions, and a one-state, one-person-one-vote settlement—read as morally attractive to some but politically implausible in the current balance of power. Voters appeared to discount it as unlikely to materialise quickly enough to save lives.
- Ownership of the centre ground: Multiple floor interventions in support stressed stabilisation, a transitional authority, Arab funding/participation, and the fact that elements of the plan were reportedly acceptable to Hamas and regional actors. That gave the plan a broader, more “coalitional” feel than just “a Trump/Netanyahu scheme.”

How each side performed

- Proposition (opening and closing):
 - Framed the debate around immediate harm reduction, asking the House to suppress bias and judge the text’s likely short-run outcomes.
 - Conceded the plan’s imperfections and asymmetries but argued history shows peace deals are rarely “just”; what matters is starting a process and halting deaths now.
 - Rebutted accountability concerns by noting the plan does not grant impunity, and cautioned against waiting for a “better plan” that may never arrive.
 - Closing skillfully reframed the choice as uncertain progress versus the near-certainty of continued mass casualties if nothing is signed.
- Opposition (second and penultimate):
 - Substantive critique: said the plan entrenches the failed status quo, lacks legal grounding, and empowers Netanyahu—whose incentives are to sabotage it—and could worsen the onslaught once hostages are released.
 - Detailed objections: de-radicalisation framing likened to punitive Versailles; hostage exchange sequencing weaker than prior offers; technocratic governance impractical; economic model (Dubai) inapplicable; right of return and UN legal basis doubtful.

- Proposed alternative: designate Israel a rogue state, impose sanctions, deploy UN peacekeepers, move to one state with equal suffrage, and prosecute crimes via ICC/ICJ.

- Weaknesses: The plan's demolition under international law and the sweeping sanctions/one-state solution sounded normatively strong but operationally distant. Sharp rhetoric (ad hominem swipes, repetition) risked alienating undecided listeners and ceded the "responsible pragmatist" ground to the proposition.

Role of the floor

- In favour:

- Emphasised the urgent need for talks as the least-bad option; prioritised stabilisation, aid corridors, and a transitional authority; noted probable Arab sponsorship/funding and regional buy-in; argued Hamas would accept much of it, shifting blame back to Israel if it refused; insisted that continuing the war offers only more death.

- Against:

- Condemned the plan as bypassing Palestinians and offering no path to statehood; criticised the 72-hour ultimatum and absence of explicit UN legal scaffolding; argued Israeli society largely rejects a two-state horizon and will define "Hamas" so broadly that disarmament certification is meaningless; proposed sanctions and a rights-based end-state.

- Neutral/clarifying:

- One speaker asked for clear KPIs; while not formally answered, the debate implicitly set near-term metrics (ceasefire, hostages returned, aid volume, basic safety), which aligned with the proposition's frame and likely guided votes.

What ultimately swayed the House

- The centre of gravity coalesced around near-term, measurable harm reduction rather than comprehensive justice, with a belief that accountability and further negotiation remain possible after a pause.

- The proposition's sequencing advantage (opening and closing) helped anchor the lens of practicality and immediacy, while the opposition's solution was seen as aspirational and slow-moving in a crisis.

- Reports of regional openness (and even partial Hamas assent) made the plan feel implementable, whereas sanction-led compellence and a one-state horizon felt remote.

Bottom line

- Members judged that accepting an imperfect, vague plan that plausibly halts mass casualties and unlocks aid today is preferable to rejecting it in pursuit of a more just but presently unattainable settlement. Hence, the motion carried.