

You have denied nothing, Malcolm. Rule out the Islamic State

Andrew Bolt

–, Friday, November, 20, 2015, (7:45am)

[Malcolm Turnbull's denials deny nothing about his astonishing peace proposal for the Islamic State:](#)

Andrew Bolt wrote he was “staggered” by these comments and that Mr Turnbull had suggested a “ceasefire” with Islamic State, making him Australia’s Neville Chamberlain — a reference to the British prime minister who appeased Hitler...

Mr Turnbull did not name Bolt yesterday, but rejected the criticism. “I might say I read somewhere that someone had suggested a political settlement would mean that Daesh would be at the table,” Mr Turnbull said, speaking in Manila, where he is attending a regional summit. “Nobody is suggesting that, least of all me. Daesh or the so-called Islamic State seeks to establish its own caliphate. It has no interest in any political settlement and I’m not aware of anyone having any interest in raising it with them.”

Note well: Turnbull does not deny he proposed a peace deal that could involve power sharing with supporters or representatives of the Islamic State - and he proposed it not one week after the Islamic State butchered 129 people in Paris. He says only that he expects the Islamic State would not support such a deal.

Here are his original quotes, showing he not only proposed a “ceasefire” but made it perfectly clear that if the Islamic State chose to be part of a power-sharing deal, Turnbull would not object:

JOURNALIST:

... Prime Minister, your call for some power-sharing there, [how open are you to extending that to include some of the Sunni elements that are part of or linked to Daesh?](#)

PRIME MINISTER:

Well, this is, you know, in Australia we are, what you need, what we need there is a political settlement. And it is clear that the principal determinants of, the people that will decide who can be in or out are going to be the people in Syria. You know the dictating terms from foreign capitals is unlikely to be successful...

There needs to be a ceasefire as has been asked for in Vienna, and there needs to then be a power-sharing deal, as I mentioned, you know the example of Lebanon is given, I mean, that obviously has had its imperfections as well. But nonetheless, there needs to be a power-sharing deal...

I repeat: Turnbull is our Neville Chamberlain. If journalists were not judging this purely through some Abbott/Turnbull prism - with Abbott, of course, cast as the blundering war monger - they would see how crazy this is.

Yes, a political settlement with Assad. But no to any with Islamic State. How hard can it be to say so? To repeat those very words?

But contrast: when al Qaeda struck in New York, George Bush and John Howard resolved to destroy it in Afghanistan. When the Islamic State struck in Paris, Barack Obama and Malcolm Turnbull resolved to strike a power sharing deal in Syria that could include it. One duo punished terrorists, the other seems bent on appeasing.