



Aizenberg ✓
@Aizenberg55



10 Questions 'Genocide in Gaza' Accusers Cannot Answer

Only days after October 7, a chorus of so-called “[genocide scholars](#),” [NGOs](#), and [activists](#) began hurling the charge of genocide at Israel. In reality, this accusation functions as a deliberate inversion of 10/7 itself. Hamas carried out mass killings with openly genocidal intent, yet the charge has been flipped onto Israel to whitewash those crimes and blame their victim. In the months since, the charge has only accelerated, turning into a kind of groupthink repeated through recycled slogans (“Israel is targeting healthcare”), canned storylines (“intentional starvation”), and misrepresented quote snippets (“remember Amalek”). These claims are delivered with an air of authority, but they collapse under even basic scrutiny. If Israel truly had a national policy to exterminate the Palestinian people, the evidence would be overwhelming and undeniable. The ten questions that follow cut through that haze. They cannot be answered honestly without exposing the genocide accusation as false, which is precisely why the accusers never confront them directly.

1. If extermination of the Palestinian people is Israel's goal, why hasn't it

happened?

If Israel wanted to kill 100,000 or more Gazans in a single day it easily could, for example by carpet bombing the [Al-Mawasi](#) humanitarian area. You claim Israel's leaders are pursuing a policy of extermination, directed from the highest levels of government and the IDF, against Palestinians solely for their identity. Some point to Hamas's claim of 60,000 deaths as proof, but that only sharpens the question: if extermination of the Palestinian people were truly the goal, why stop at tens of thousands when Israel has the capacity to kill millions in days? Why, after 22 months, has no such attack ever been carried out? Do not evade by pointing out that genocide does not require mass killings; address why a state supposedly bent on extermination of the Palestinian people has not taken the obvious steps to achieve it.

2. Why are millions of Palestinians safe under full Israeli control?

Arab-Israelis, about 2 million people, are ethnically the same people as the Palestinians in Gaza and are often called Palestinian citizens of Israel. They live under full Israeli authority, yet not a single one has been exterminated. History shows that when genocidal regimes have unimpeded access to the very population they seek to destroy, that population is in [immediate and mortal danger](#). Can you cite a single genocide where millions of the supposed victims lived safely under the perpetrator's rule, even serving in its government and institutions? If Israel is pursuing extermination of the Palestinian people, how do you reconcile this reality?

3. Why are Palestinians in the West Bank untouched?

Three million Palestinians live in the West Bank, the same people as in Gaza. Israel could kill many thousands there in a matter of hours if extermination were truly the policy, but this has not happened in 22 months. Why would a state bent on destroying the Palestinian people leave millions unharmed while supposedly carrying out a genocide next door? If extermination of Palestinians *as such* were the policy, there would be no reason to differentiate by geography or governance. And do not fall back on the claim that the West Bank is different because the war is against Hamas, since your own accusation insists that the **only** reasonable inference from Israel's actions in Gaza is exterminating Palestinians as such.

4. How does the legal standard for proving genocidal intent fit here?

The ICJ has held that genocidal intent must be the **only** reasonable inference from a state's conduct ([Bosnia v. Serbia](#), para. 373; [Croatia v. Serbia](#), para. 148). Israel's declared **goal** has been to destroy Hamas and recover its hostages. In pursuit of that goal, IDF soldiers have suffered over **3,000 casualties** including 450 killed, evidence of an actual war against an armed adversary. Genocidal regimes do not send soldiers to die in door-to-door combat when they can exterminate entire populations wholesale. How, then, can genocide be the **only** reasonable inference from Israel's actions in Gaza?

5. How does "intentional starvation" fit the actual food data?

You claim Israel's extermination policy against Palestinians is also being carried out through deliberate starvation. Yet Israel has allowed over **1.4 million tons of food** into Gaza since 10/7, exceeding prewar daily averages and, by standard calorie estimates, sufficient for the population over this period. [UN reporting](#) for much of the war shows daily truck entries matching or exceeding prewar levels. Do you dispute these figures? If so, provide your numbers and methodology, and explain how they square with a state policy to starve Palestinians to death. If your answer is distribution problems inside Gaza, that is not evidence of an intent to withhold food by policy. And if extermination were truly the goal, why allow any food in at all?

6. Where is the famine, where are the starvation deaths?

Even by Hamas's count, roughly **200 people** have died of starvation since 10/7. Without food, most people die within about two months. A sustained famine over this period would have produced deaths in the hundreds of thousands. How do you reconcile that with a claim of a deliberate Israeli starvation policy aimed at extermination? If you argue there was severe hunger only recently, you concede there was no famine for the first 20 months while the alleged genocide was supposedly already under way. How is that timeline consistent with an extermination policy by starvation?

7. Why does the IDF risk soldiers' lives in door-to-door combat?

Israel has suffered thousands of casualties in Gaza, much of it from close-quarters fighting against snipers, IEDs, and booby traps. If genocide were the goal, why would Israel choose a combat method that exposes its soldiers to high

risk instead of avoiding casualties by annihilating everyone from the air? If your claim is that the only reasonable inference is genocidal intent, how do you explain these costly ground operations?

8. Why is the civilian-to-combatant casualty ratio lower than in other recent urban wars?

Hamas claims that about 60,000 Gazans have been killed, while Israel says more than 20,000 were combatants. Even taking Hamas's figure at face value, the civilian-to-combatant ratio is roughly 2:1. By comparison, reported ratios in U.S. and allied operations in Iraq and Afghanistan were 3:1 to 5:1. If Israel's intent were the indiscriminate massacre of Palestinians, why are its ratios lower than those of other Western militaries in urban war? If you dispute these numbers, provide your own analysis—and then explain whether they resemble recognized patterns of genocide, or the tragic but typical outcomes of modern urban combat.

9. Why are IDF tactics often consistent with avoiding civilian harm?

Israel has repeatedly used tactics such as advance [evacuation warnings](#), and designated [humanitarian corridors](#) before strikes, measures that slow operations and provide advance warning to enemy fighters. For example, Israel waited weeks to attack Rafah, allowing for an evacuation. Some military experts have called these steps [unprecedented](#) in the history of warfare. These measures are not always perfect or effective, but they are unnecessary if the intent were to slaughter the Palestinian people. In known genocides, perpetrators have never taken active steps to limit casualties among the very group they sought to exterminate. How can such actions be explained if Israel's true objective is genocide?

10. Why facilitate mass medical care if the goal is extermination?

In February 2025, the WHO, with Israel's cooperation, completed a [mass polio vaccination](#) campaign for over 600,000 Gazan children under age 10, about 95 percent of that age group. This was the third round of vaccinations that began in [September 2024](#). Why would a state intent on killing Palestinians for their identity simultaneously help vaccinate nearly all of Gaza's young children against disease? In recognized genocides, do perpetrators ever devote resources to preserving the lives of the very population they are accused of trying to



destroy? How do you explain this contradiction?

Conclusion

These ten questions show that the genocide accusation is not just weak but unsustainable. A charge as serious as genocide requires clear and overwhelming evidence, yet the record is full of contradictions: millions of Palestinians remain

← Post

continued to reach Gaza throughout the conflict; and the supposed statements of "genocidal intent" by Israeli leaders collapse under scrutiny. In reality, the genocide charge is a deliberate inversion of 10/7 itself: Hamas carried out mass killings with genocidal intent, yet the accusation is flipped onto Israel to whitewash those crimes and recast Israel as the villain. When facts so consistently point away from intentional extermination, persisting in the genocide narrative is no longer scholarship. It is propaganda posing as scholarship.

5:02 PM · Aug 18, 2025 · **3M** Views



491



4K



11K



8.2K



Aizenberg @Aizenberg55 · Aug 19, 2025



So far, the two main responses to these ten questions fall into two categories:

(1) "The West Bank is not untouched." Critics point to incidents such as settler violence or isolated clashes. But this misses the point. The claim in the essay is not that nothing had happened [Show more](#)



See all the replies

Open X App



Dror Pipano  @DrorPipano · Aug 18, 2025



Let me add 5 more:

11. Why does Israel maintain electricity, water, and fuel supply lines into Gaza?

Throughout the war, Israel has facilitated electricity transfers, fuel shipments, and water supply into Gaza, even while Hamas has diverted many of these resources for its own [Show more](#)

 28

 90

 644

 23K

