

Will the Palestinian Authority rely upon UN Resolution 377 -- also known as the "Uniting for Peace" resolution -- to achieve Palestinian statehood at the 66th session of the United Nations General Assembly in September of this year?

Copyright 1994 - 2011 Endtime Prophecy Net

Published On : March 9, 2011

Last Updated : March 9, 2011

Palestinian Quest For Statehood At United Nations, Potential Repercussions From The Establishment Of A Palestinian State, UN Resolution 377, Uniting For Peace, A Present Danger - What Israelis Fear Most, Israelis Claim Resolution 377 Is Illegal, Is 377 Contrary To The Intent Of UN Charter?, Does 377 Nullify Security Council Veto Power?, Jews Pressure USA To Use Its UN Veto, Limited Powers Of UN General Assembly, Weak Nature Of Non-Binding Resolutions, Security Council: Powerful Minority, UN Charter Article 27, Fifteen Votes Or Five?, Power Of Veto, Great Power Unanimity, UN Resolution 1973 And Libyan No-Fly Zone, UN Security Council Abstentions, Will USA Be Linchpin In The Palestinian Statehood UN Vote?, Negroponte Doctrine, A Palestinian UN Bluff Or The End Of The Line For Israel?, Obama's Middle East Fence-Mending, USA's Three Muslim Wars, Obama Is A Disappointment To Muslim World, Obama Wins Points With Israelis By Vetoing Resolution That Criticizes Israel, Obama's Options If Palestinian Statehood Comes To A UN Vote, Israelis And Palestinians Need Own National Homeland, Staunch Pro-Israel American Christians, Blinded By Jewish Propaganda, Israelis Milk American Christians For Their Tourist Dollars, Unholy Holy Land, Historical Backslidden Condition Of Israel, Israel Was And Still Is A Land Defiled By Rebellion And Sin

As you may have heard, due to their failure to achieve their aspirations of a bona fide, legally-recognized Palestinian State over the past few decades, which in large part can be attributed to the belligerence of the Jewish leadership, as well as to the violence of Hamas operatives, which have both contributed to the dismal failure of the Middle East peace process in recent years, for some time now, officials of the Palestinian National Authority, led by Mahmoud Abbas and his Fatah party, have been publicly stating that they will seek recognition of a Palestinian State, directly from the United Nations General Assembly -- or UNGA -- during the upcoming 66th session of the General Assembly in September of this year.

If the Palestinians were to achieve statehood, and acquire membership in the United Nations General Assembly, it would likewise result in their gaining certain advantages in their dealings with Israel, being as it would place them on equal status as an official member of the UN body. There are some things which member states are simply not allowed to do to each other, such as occupy each other's territory. In a word, Israel could easily find itself in a legal predicament, and accused of engaging in acts of aggression against a fellow United Nations member. Not only that, but the establishment of a Palestinian State will no doubt have profound effects on the entire region of the Middle East, just as the youth revolutions in that region are doing at this current time.

For example, the corrupt, entrenched leaders of repressive, dictatorial regimes in the region would no longer be able to point to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict in order to deflect criticism from their own governments, and radical elements in the region -- such as al-Qaeda, Hezbollah and Hamas -- would no longer be able to use the Israeli-Palestinian conflict as a means to inflame the passions of their followers. That is not all. A Palestinian victory at the United Nations could inspire other ethnic groups in the region -- for example, the Kurds of eastern Turkey, Syria, Iraq and Iran, the Berbers of North Africa, etc. -- to seek their own path to independence and statehood. So again, the Palestinian quest for statehood at the United Nations merits our close attention.

The Palestinians place their hope in United Nations General Assembly Resolution 377 A (V) -- also known as the "Uniting for Peace" Resolution -- which was adopted by the United Nations General Assembly in November of 1950. The "Uniting for Peace" resolution -- which has since been incorporated into the "Rules of Procedure" of the General Assembly -- states the following in Section A Clause 1:

----- Begin Quote -----

"Resolves that if the Security Council, because of lack of unanimity of the permanent members, fails to exercise its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security in any case where there appears to be a threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression, the General Assembly shall consider the matter immediately with a view to making appropriate recommendations to Members for collective measures, including in the case of a breach of the peace or act of aggression the use of armed force when necessary, to maintain or restore international peace and security. If not in session at the time, the General Assembly may meet in emergency special session within twenty-four hours of the request therefor. Such emergency special session shall be called if requested by the Security Council on the vote of any seven members, or by a majority of the Members of the United Nations;"

----- End Quote -----

Currently, the United Nations Security Council is comprised of five veto-wielding permanent members -- that is, China, France, Russia, the United Kingdom, and the United States -- as well as ten non-permanent members which are elected by the United Nations General Assembly for two-year terms. Because the United Nations Security Council has failed to take any concrete steps to resolve the Israeli-Palestinian feud, the Palestinian Authority has decided to go directly to the UNGA -- that is, the General Assembly -- to obtain recognition of a Palestinian State.

Please note that Resolution 377 -- or "Uniting for Peace" -- specifically states "or by a majority of the Members of the United Nations." In other words, if the UN Security Council is not willing to call an Emergency Special Session in order to discuss a particular issue, the members of the UN General Assembly have the right to call for such a session, if they represent a majority of the body's members; and that is what the Palestinians are counting on. At this current time, over one hundred nations which form a part of the one hundred and ninety-two member United Nations General Assembly recognize and support the legitimacy of a Palestinian State, and this

number continues to grow on a regular basis. It is possible then that they will be able to call such an Emergency Special Session come September, in order to discuss the issues which have plagued the Israelis and the Palestinians for so long.

Please also notice that Resolution 377 specifically includes the phrase "threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression". That's precisely what the Israelis fear most. That phrase could very well be their noose -- and they know it -- if the Palestinians are victorious in September, and obtain UN recognition, and statehood. Resolution 377, along with that specific phrase, could force them entirely out of the Occupied Territories, whether they like it or not, and they most certainly wouldn't be allowed back in if that were to happen.

If you think that I am over-exaggerating this point, allow me to share something with you. While I was conducting research for this article, I visited a number of Jewish websites that discussed Resolution 377, and in each case, the author of the site expressed fear, worry or even went so far as to question the legality of UN Resolution 377. One site referred to it as "a present danger" and stated "The significance of the ruling cannot be overstated: It challenges the power of the veto. The UN Charter Does Not Support GA Resolution 377." In other words, because of the way that "Uniting For Peace", that is, UN Resolution 377, has been used to apply pressure to Israel, the Jews have adopted the legal position that it is illegal, and that it bestows upon the UN General Assembly powers to which it is not entitled. Most notably, it allows the General Assembly to bypass the UN Security Council when it fails to act, and to both legislate and adopt binding resolutions on its own. Incidentally, this same Jewish author accused the UN International Court of Justice of using UN Resolution 377 inappropriately as well.

It seems clear then that the Israelis are seriously afraid of how the Palestinians may use UN Resolution 377 to achieve their goal of statehood and UN recognition. If they weren't afraid, they would not be fighting so hard against 377. One way in which they're doing this is by pressuring the American government and impressing upon it that UN Resolution 377 is a threat to the American veto on the Security Council. In other words, they are claiming that contrary to the intent of the UN Charter, "Uniting for Peace" is being used by the UN General Assembly to override a Security Council veto, thus making a UNGA resolution binding and enforceable. As far as I can tell, the Jews are simply using legal jargon as a mechanism to try to save their own skins, and they want to use the USA as their big stick in the UN, as they've doing all along.

As we have already seen, whether or not the Palestinians have enough support in the UN General Assembly in order for an ESS, or Emergency Special Session, to be called is not the problem. The real question is this: Can the UN General Assembly really admit the Palestinian State to the United Nations as a regular member? Based upon my research -- and setting aside the debate regarding what is actually intended by UN Resolution 377 -- it seems to me -- keep in mind that I am no legal scholar -- that the answer is probably "no"; and therein lies the technical problem that the Palestinians must face; that is, if we accept the Israelis' argument that UN Resolution 377 cannot be used to legally circumvent the Security Council vote.

More specifically, in Chapter II, Article 4, Clause 2, the UN Charter states the following concerning membership in the

United Nations:

----- Begin Quote -----

"The admission of any such state to membership in the United Nations will be effected by a decision of the General Assembly upon the recommendation of the Security Council."

----- End Quote -----

Please notice the last seven words: "upon the recommendation of the Security Council". If I understand this correctly, it means that while the United Nations General Assembly can, in either a regular session, or in an Emergency Special Session, recognize and endorse a declaration of independence, such as the Palestinian Authority intends to do in September, it does not possess the legal power to actually admit the Palestinian State as a regular member of the United Nations, without a prior recommendation -- or resolution -- being adopted by the United Nations Security Council itself.

In other words, even if a majority of the members of the UN General Assembly call for an Emergency Special Session, and adopt a resolution in which they recognize Palestine, with East Jerusalem as its capital, such recognition really has no legal teeth, insofar as United Nations laws and procedures are concerned, unless it is "blessed" by the United Nations Security Council first. It is precisely for this reason that so many United Nations resolutions that one reads about in the daily news are weak and to some degree meaningless. They are in reality symbolic gestures of support for a particular cause which do not carry any legal weight. In legal terms, they are not binding; they are not law; they amount to mere suggestions and recommendations. Furthermore, only those resolutions which are actually adopted by the UN Security Council under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter are binding and enforceable.

So the real problem for the Palestinians as they follow their quest for statehood and recognition by the United Nations is not the General Assembly, it is in fact the Security Council; because when all is said and done, the UN Security Council is a powerful minority which controls the majority in the United Nations General Assembly. While all one hundred and ninety-two members of the United Nations have the right to a single vote, it is actually fifteen votes -- and as we'll see in a moment, actually less -- which determines the outcome of every binding decision, and those are the only UN resolutions that actually matter, and which are recognized as international law.

Regardless of how much international support a particular issue or cause may garner in the UN General Assembly -- keep in mind the upcoming Palestinian quest for statehood -- it is made plain in Article 27 of the United Nations Charter that UN Security Council decisions on all major issues require an affirmative vote by at least nine of its fifteen members in order for a resolution to be adopted. Article 27 states as follows:

----- Begin Quote -----

- 1) Each member of the Security Council shall have one vote.
- 2) Decisions of the Security Council on procedural matters shall be made by an affirmative vote of nine members.

3) Decisions of the Security Council on all other matters shall be made by an affirmative vote of nine members including the concurring votes of the permanent members; provided that, in decisions under Chapter VI, and under paragraph 3 of Article 52, a party to a dispute shall abstain from voting.

----- End Quote -----

At first glance, one may possibly assume that acquiring nine of the possible fifteen United Nations Security Council votes may not be such an insurmountable obstacle for the Palestinian leadership; however, there is more. What is somewhat hidden in Article 27 is the implied "power of veto". In other words, while decisions regarding procedural matters can be determined by any nine of the fifteen UNSC members, please take notice of the fact that concerning "all other matters" -- meaning all of the important matters that really count, the substantive ones which pertain to essential legal principles and rules of right -- the nine votes must include "the concurring votes of the permanent members". Said another way, those nine votes must include all five permanent Security Council members. In other words, the five permanent members must be unanimous in their vote, along with four other members of the fifteen-member UN Security Council.

In plain English, even if a particular resolution -- such as the Palestinian quest for statehood -- receives the required nine affirmative votes in the Security Council, it can still be defeated by any one of the five veto-wielding permanent members of the Security Council. This special privilege that is possessed by China, France, Russia, the United Kingdom and the United States is referred to as the rule of "great power unanimity". To reiterate, if one or more of the five permanent members votes against a proposed resolution, that is the end of it. It is dead in the water, regardless of what the UN General Assembly thinks, or how the UNGA votes.

Of course, a permanent member of the UN Security Council does not necessarily have to veto a resolution if it doesn't agree with it. As a matter of strategy; a member may also decide to simply abstain from a vote if it so chooses. This is exactly what occurred recently with UN Resolution 1973 regarding the no-fly zone that's now being enforced in Libya. Brazil, China, Germany, India and Russia abstained from the vote. However, because the remaining three permanent members were unanimous in their vote, the resolution was adopted. If either China or Russia had vetoed the resolution, instead of abstaining from the vote, I believe that it would not have passed -- the rule of great power unanimity -- and the current no-fly zone over Libya would now be illegal. This was no doubt a very shrewd move on the part of the Russians and the Chinese, as it will obviously win them points with certain Arab nations.

So, assuming that the Palestinians are determined to press forward with their quest for UN recognition of a Palestinian State this coming September, what can we expect to happen?

While I am not a professional political analyst, and while I do not claim to be an expert when it comes to the affairs of the Middle East, from reading the news for many years now, as well as watching how the governments of certain nations have chosen to operate, and conducting a fair amount of research on the Internet, my personal inclination is to believe that the linchpin in any such United Nations resolution which may arise this coming September, will be President Barack Obama

and the United States. Obviously, it doesn't take a genius to figure this out. As some of you will already know, the United States has a long history of supporting UN resolutions which assist Israel in some way, while at the same time, it has been quite consistent in vetoing those UN resolutions which criticize Israel, or which in some way may harm Israel.

This American pattern goes back to the early 1970's. Prior to that time, Russia -- then known as the USSR -- was by far the most frequent user of the veto as a member of the United Nations Security Council. However, as the situation between the Israelis and the Palestinians has worsened over the last four decades, one American administration after another has relied more and more upon the power of the UN veto to protect Israel from her critics and enemies. With the implementation of the so-called Negroponte Doctrine during the George W. Bush administration, and the rise of the so-called Christian Right, the pro-Israel position became even more entrenched in both American politics, and in American society in general.

Exactly what is the Negroponte Doctrine? According to online sources, during a closed session of the UN Security Council that occurred on July 26, 2002, then US ambassador to the United Nations, John Negroponte, disclosed the position of the United States regarding any UN resolution which sought to condemn the nation of Israel. In particular, Negroponte stated that the government of the United States would oppose any resolution which criticized Israel, but which did not also condemn known Palestinian terrorist organizations. Even though no official transcript of Negroponte's exact remarks has ever been made public, it is generally believed that he revealed that the following four stipulations must be met before the United States would support a UN resolution which condemns Israel:

1. A strong and explicit condemnation of all terrorism and incitement to terrorism;
2. A condemnation by name of the al-Aqsa Martyrs' Brigade, Islamic Jihad and Hamas, groups that have claimed responsibility for suicide attacks on Israel;
3. An appeal to all parties for a political settlement of the crisis;
4. A demand for improvement of the security situation as a condition for any call for a withdrawal of Israeli armed forces to positions they held before the September 2000 start of the Second intifada Palestinian uprising.

As was to be expected, the staunch pro-Israel position which has been embraced by the American government has resulted in frequent friction between the UN Security Council and the UN General Assembly. Might this be a foreshadow of coming events in September, if and when the Palestinian National Authority declares Palestinian statehood? Of course, the Palestinians could be bluffing, and may simply be using the threat of a UN declaration to pressure the Israeli leadership, although I don't think so this time. They have endured literally decades of Israeli double-talk, procrastination, oppression, violence and land-grabbing. From what I have read, they are thoroughly fed up with the so-called "peace process". They want to see real movement and change on the ground, and that is precisely what September is all about.

What makes this upcoming situation difficult to call, is the

fact that US President Obama is in need of some major image repair in the Middle East on both sides of the fence. On one hand, Israel does not perceive Barack Obama as a friend. It is common knowledge that Mr. Obama and Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu are not exactly bosom buddies. Of course, it didn't help that Netanyahu symbolically slapped American Vice President Biden in the face months ago. Yet at the same time, on the other hand, after a widely-publicized trip to Cairo, Egypt -- during which he called for a new beginning between the United States and the Arab/Muslim world following the disastrous Bush years -- Mr. Obama is now bombing Libya, albeit, supposedly with tacit approval from the Arab League.

Add to this the fact that American troops are still fighting in both Iraq and Afghanistan, as well as in the border areas of Pakistan, and it is safe to say that Obama has his share of critics amongst the Arab world as well. It is difficult to see the difference between George W. Bush and Obama, insofar as American foreign policy is concerned. While George W. Bush was more of a unilateralist who snubbed his nose at Europe, the UN and the rest of the world, the world will not easily forget that contrary to his promises, Mr. Obama has not only continued the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, but he has also engaged in a new war in Libya as well. Three American-led wars in three Muslim lands still looks bad, regardless of whether or not they have United Nations -- and even Arab League -- approval.

Taking into consideration my previous statements, I can only conclude that if, come September, the Obama administration chooses to instruct the American ambassador to the United Nations to veto any resolution which supports Palestinian statehood, it will be another step backward for the United States, insofar as the Arab world is concerned. In Arab eyes, such action will only serve to confirm that President Barack Obama is no different than his predecessors, despite the high hopes that the Arab world placed in him during the beginning of his term over two years ago.

In contrast, if his administration should choose to reject a vote supporting Palestinian statehood, Obama may win a few points with the Israelis. In fact, Obama probably garnered a few points with the Israelis on February 18th of this year when his administration vetoed a resolution which condemns ongoing Israeli settlements in the West Bank. I couldn't help but roll my eyes when I first read about it, because it was typical American behavior. Of the fifteen UN Security Council votes, the USA was the only nation to vote against it. Not only that, but the resolution had a total of one hundred and thirty co-sponsors. Despite that fact, the USA just had to go it alone and support Israel. One can only conclude that Obama considers winning points with the Jews more important than worrying about the ire of the United Nations General Assembly. Might this be a strong indication of which way Obama will turn when September arrives?

There is one other available option, and that is that Obama could engage in a compromise move by instructing the American ambassador to the UN to abstain from a UN Security Council vote concerning Palestine, assuming that there is one. Such an abstention would no doubt anger Israel, and the Israelis would feel betrayed; but what about the Palestinians? Well, an American abstention would no doubt be to their favor, and here's why: According to the UN Charter, an abstention by a UN Security Council permanent member doesn't count as a veto. Stated another way, if the remaining four permanent members

of the UN Security Council, along with five of the rotating Security Council members -- they need nine votes -- were to vote in favor of Palestinian statehood, the resolution would in fact be adopted, and the Palestinians will have won.

As I explained a moment ago, this is precisely what happened with the resolution regarding a no-fly zone over Libya. Two of the UN Security Council permanent members -- Russia and China -- abstained from the vote. Their abstentions did not result in the resolution failing to be adopted; rather, the action of these two members did the exact opposite; that is, it allowed the no-fly zone resolution to be adopted, simply without their support or approval. In short, Barack Obama could possibly use the very same strategy. He could allow a resolution supporting Palestinian statehood to pass, just by abstaining from the vote.

By adopting this position, Obama wouldn't be directly voting against Israel, yet at the same time, he wouldn't be voting in favor of the Palestinians either. That is why I stated that it would be a compromise move. It would be a lukewarm position in the middle. The Israelis couldn't accuse him of directly voting against them, and the Palestinians couldn't claim he directly voted in their favor either. Now, some of you -- such as staunch pro-Israel supporters -- may wonder why Obama would even consider this option. My thoughts are the following:

Despite all of the violence and atrocities that some radical elements of Palestinian society have committed against the Israelis, and despite the equally violent, out-of-proportion retaliatory actions which have been taken by the Israelis against the Palestinians during the past six decades, if we brush aside all of the political rhetoric and propaganda, there remains a central, basic truth; and that is that -- as with everyone else in the world -- both peoples need to have a globally-recognized, national homeland. Obama knows this in his heart. The world knows this as well. Please notice that I said "need" and not "deserve". Considering how much violence both sides have committed against each other, I simply do not believe that using the word "deserve" is justified.

Now, even if you happen to be a staunch, Israel-supporting, American Christian, as some of my readers no doubt are, you know in your heart that what I have stated is true. I hope that you have not been so brainwashed by American-Jewish, Christian Right political propaganda, that you believe that Israel can absolutely do no wrong. If you are of that frame of mind, then I suggest that you compare the Israeli body count with the Palestinian body count over the years, and see who comes out the winner. Furthermore, if you believe that every single Palestinian wears an explosive vest under their coat and is just screaming for Jewish blood, then you might as well believe that every Israeli is a Mossad agent as well, who is just waiting to kill Palestinians. Both notions are equally ridiculous and the fabrication of propagandists.

If you fit into the previous category and are offended by my words, well, I'm sorry, but I can offer you no apologies. I am simply sick and tired of so many American Christians who have been drugged into a mindless stupor, so that all they seem to know how to do is parrot their political puppeteers, as well as their propaganda masters who promote Israel. All that some of you American Christians do is talk, talk, talk about Israel and the Jews, as if that is the most important thing in your lives. Maybe if some of you Israel-promoting

Christians were to take the time to visit a number of the Jewish-run, anti-Christian missionary websites, and see what hardcore Jews really think, feel and say about our Christian faith, and how they viciously mock Jesus, you would finally wake up out of your Israel-supporting stupor.

The next time you take the bait and choose to spend hundreds or thousands of dollars on a tour to the "Holy Land", just remember one thing: Israel is simply another secular nation which has for the most part rejected Jesus Christ, just like so many Gentile nations of the world which embrace a variety of false religions, or no religion at all. There's really no difference. All the Israelis are doing is cashing in on their Biblical history at your expense, while at the same time, the vast majority of them mock and despise the very One who came to save them. In fact, as Jesus Himself stated, the Jews are even more guilty than the Gentile nations, because they were the first to receive the Light and the Truth, and they chose to reject it, as most of them continue to do to this very day.

If one takes some time to really study the Bible, and stops and thinks about it, he or she will realize that for most of its history, Israel has in fact been a very unholy land. As I explain in articles such as "The Fruits Of Disobedience", as far back as thousands of years ago, even during the time of the Patriarch Abraham, God warned that He would judge the Israelites because of their sins of unbelief and rebellion against Him. Tell me; what is the bulk of the Old Testament about? It's about the Lord's almost continuous chastisements against the Israelites through their enemies. It's about one Prophet of God after another who warned those hard-hearted, backslidden people to repent of their sins, and to return to the Lord. If you don't believe what I am saying, then you really don't know your Bible.

While the Jews today constantly promote Israel as being the "Holy Land" so that they can milk naive Christians of their tourist dollars, the truth of the matter is that even back then, according to God's own Word, they had defiled the land, and turned it into an abomination, due to their idolatry, and other perverse sins, including sacrificing their children to the false god Molech. Consider this example that is found in the Book of the Prophet Jeremiah:

"And I brought you into a plentiful country, to eat the fruit thereof and the goodness thereof; but when ye entered, ye defiled my land, and made mine heritage an abomination."
Jeremiah 2:7, KJV

Is that the "Holy Land" that everyone is talking about? So the truth of the matter is that Israel was, and still is, a land that has been defiled by rebellion and sin, because to this day, most of the Jews continue to reject their Savior, Jesus Christ, and the Salvation that He offers them.

Please go to part two for the continuation of this series.

Written by the WordWeaver

webmaster@endtimeprophecy.net
<http://www.endtimeprophecy.net>

Will the Palestinian Authority rely upon UN Resolution 377 -- also known as the "Uniting for Peace" resolution -- to achieve Palestinian statehood at the 66th session of the United Nations General Assembly in September of this year?

Copyright 1994 - 2011 Endtime Prophecy Net

Published On : March 9, 2011

Last Updated : March 9, 2011

Israel Murdered Its Prophets And Failed To Hearken To Them,
Jewish History Marked By Sin And Rebellion Against The Lord,
Smiling Unbelieving Robbers Taking American Tourist Dollars,
Antichrist Muslims Take American Christian Tourist Dollars,
There Are No Neutrals: We Are Either For Or Against Christ,
Lying Spirit Of Antichrist, Jewish Antichrists And 144,000,
Unhealthy Infatuation With Israel And Jews, Our Jealous God,
Elevate And Proclaim Name Of Jesus, Let's Talk About Jesus,
Why Mr. Obama May Abstain From UN Vote Regarding Palestine,
Obama A Typical Backpedaling Politician And Promise-Breaker,
2012 American Presidential Campaign And Jewish Voting Bloc,
Legal Debate Concerning Claimed Ambiguity Of Resolution 377,
International Monetary Fund & World Bank Endorse Statehood,
Will The Israeli Strategy Of Procrastination And Years Of
Endless Negotiations Ultimately Not Work In Their Favor?,
Deceptive National Governments Scheming Against Each Other,
Will Israel Try To Jeopardize Palestinian Statehood Quest?,
Biggest Palestinian Vulnerability Is Hamas - Fatah Division,
Hamas Propensity For Violence And Maverick Hamas Operatives,
Israeli Attempt To Stir Up New Wave Of Palestinian Violence,
Israeli Assassination Campaign Against The Leaders Of Hamas,
No Government Can Control Actions Of Every Single Citizen,
Encroaching Big Brother Society, Gaza Is Israeli-Controlled
Pressure Cooker, Israeli Excuses No Longer Being Accepted,
Radicalization Of Palestinian Youth, Threat Of An Intifada

As I explain in the aforementioned series, as well as in a number of other articles, that is why so many of the Old Testament Prophets were slain by their very own brethren; because they didn't want to hear the truth. As Jesus tells us, they chose to kill the very ones that God sent to warn them, including the Son of God Himself. Consider these verses:

"Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! because ye build the tombs of the prophets, and garnish the sepulchres of the righteous, And say, If we had been in the days of our fathers, we would not have been partakers with them in the blood of the prophets. Wherefore ye be witnesses unto yourselves, that ye are the children of them which killed the prophets. Fill ye up then the measure of your fathers. Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of hell? Wherefore, behold, I send unto you prophets, and wise men, and scribes: and some of them ye shall kill and crucify; and some of them shall ye scourge in your synagogues, and persecute them from city to city: That upon you may come all the righteous blood shed upon the earth, from the blood of righteous Abel unto the blood of Zacharias son of Barachias, whom ye slew between the temple and the altar. Verily I say unto you, All these things shall come upon this generation. O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that

kill the prophets, and stone them which are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not! Behold, your house is left unto you desolate. For I say unto you, Ye shall not see me henceforth, till ye shall say, Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord."

Matthew 23:29-39, KJV

Over six hundred years earlier, the Lord said the very same thing through the mouth of the Prophet Jeremiah. Consider the following verses, and how many times the Lord had to say it; and yet, the Israelites still would not repent and turn again to the Lord:

"And now, because ye have done all these works, saith the LORD, and I spake unto you, rising up early and speaking, but ye heard not; and I called you, but ye answered not . . . Since the day that your fathers came forth out of the land of Egypt unto this day I have even sent unto you all my servants the prophets, daily rising up early and sending them:"

Jeremiah 7:13, 25, KJV

"To hearken to the words of my servants the prophets, whom I sent unto you, both rising up early, and sending them, but ye have not hearkened;"

Jeremiah 26:5, KJV

"Because they have not hearkened to my words, saith the LORD, which I sent unto them by my servants the prophets, rising up early and sending them; but ye would not hear, saith the LORD."

Jeremiah 29:19, KJV

"And they have turned unto me the back, and not the face: though I taught them, rising up early and teaching them, yet they have not hearkened to receive instruction."

Jeremiah 32:33, KJV

"I have sent also unto you all my servants the prophets, rising up early and sending them, saying, Return ye now every man from his evil way, and amend your doings, and go not after other gods to serve them, and ye shall dwell in the land which I have given to you and to your fathers: but ye have not inclined your ear, nor hearkened unto me."

Jeremiah 35:15, KJV

While there were a few good, obedient Jewish kings and civil leaders during the Old Testament period who strived to turn the people back to worshipping the Lord, taken as a whole, it seems that the sad history of the Jewish people is one marked by sin, unbelief and almost continuous rebellion against the Lord. As we have seen, the backslidden condition of the Jews didn't end in the Old Testament. In the opening pages of the New Testament, what do we discover? We find John the Baptist, followed by Jesus and His Apostles, again warning the people of Israel to repent of their sins, and to return to the Lord. Tragically, this same sad situation continues to this very day, and most Jews still reject Jesus Christ. So again I ask, is this your "Holy Land", or is it really an unholy land that is marked by rebellion and unbelief, and filled with robbers who smile at you as they take your tourist dollars, and then spit at the name of Jesus once you are gone?

Lest some of you accuse me of being unfair about this, let me also publicly say that the Christ-rejecting Palestinians are guilty of the very same sin. That is, they exploit holy sites

such as Bethlehem in order to attract tourist dollars, while just like the Jews, most Palestinians reject the Messiahship role of Jesus Christ. As you probably already know, Muslims do not even believe that God has a Son. While they believe that Jesus was a great Prophet of God -- although not of the same stature as Muhammad -- they do not believe that He died for the sins of the world, or that He rose from the dead, just like the Jews. For a more detailed look at this topic, please consider reading such articles as "Holy Qur'an And Islam: A Doctrine Of Devils?".

Now, please don't send me your hate mail and accuse me of being anti-semitic -- a favorite manipulative tool that the Jews employ quite often -- or write and warn me that God is going to judge me; or tell me that I don't really understand Israel's place in Endtime prophecy, etc. Your message may be read, but will then end up in the trash without a response. Trust me, I have been seriously studying the Bible for four decades, and I do know whereof I speak and write concerning this issue. Perhaps some of you need to be reminded of what Jesus said in the Gospels of Matthew and John. He said:

"He that is not with me is against me; and he that gathereth not with me scattereth abroad."
Matthew 12:30, KJV

"He that receiveth you receiveth me, and he that receiveth me receiveth him that sent me."
Matthew 10:40, KJV

"Jesus cried and said, He that believeth on me, believeth not on me, but on him that sent me. And he that seeth me seeth him that sent me. I am come a light into the world, that whosoever believeth on me should not abide in darkness. And if any man hear my words, and believe not, I judge him not: for I came not to judge the world, but to save the world. He that rejecteth me, and receiveth not my words, hath one that judgeth him: the word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day. For I have not spoken of myself; but the Father which sent me, he gave me a commandment, what I should say, and what I should speak."
John 12:44-49, KJV

So as you can plainly see, there are simply no neutrals. You are either with Christ -- meaning that you believe He is who He says He is, the Redeemer and Messiah of the world -- or else you are against Christ. If you are against Christ, then you are also against the Father in whom you claim to believe, because the previous verses work both ways. In other words, to accept Jesus Christ is to accept the Father; but to reject Christ is likewise to reject the Father who has sent Him, no matter what you say. As the Apostle John informs us in his Epistles, if you reject Christ, then you are an antichrist, no matter how religious you pretend to be. You are a false religionist, and you are in fact deceived. Furthermore, if you actively speak against Jesus Christ's Divine Mission, then you are an outright liar as well, as the following verses make very clear:

"Little children, it is the last time: and as ye have heard that antichrist shall come, even now are there many antichrists; whereby we know that it is the last time."
1 John 2:18, KJV

"Who is a liar but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ? He is antichrist, that denieth the Father and the Son."

1 John 2:22, KJV

"And every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God: and this is that spirit of antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come; and even now already is it in the world."

1 John 4:3, KJV

"For many deceivers are entered into the world, who confess not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh. This is a deceiver and an antichrist."

2 John 7, KJV

"But evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse, deceiving, and being deceived."

2 Timothy 3:13, KJV

"Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for he is a liar, and the father of it."

John 8:44, KJV

"God forbid: yea, let God be true, but every man a liar; as it is written, That thou mightest be justified in thy sayings, and mightest overcome when thou art judged."

Romans 3:4, KJV

"He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in himself: he that believeth not God hath made him a liar; because he believeth not the record that God gave of his Son."

1 John 5:10, KJV

According to the Scriptures, and as I point out in articles such as "Woman In The Wilderness And The 144,000", the fact of the matter is that most of the Jews are -- and shall in fact remain -- antichrist until the very end. It seems that only a small remnant -- the 144,000 who represent less than two per cent of the current population of Israel, and about one per cent of worldwide Jewry -- will eventually be saved; and we should be thankful for that, as we should be when any person -- whether they are a Jew or a Gentile -- repents and accepts Jesus Christ as their Lord and Savior.

So I urge everyone to not get so hung up on Israel and the Jews. Let's abandon this unhealthy infatuation with Israel and the Jews, because God does not like it. The Scriptures make it very plain that our God is a jealous God, and that He refuses to take second place, or play second fiddle, to anyone. The Lord will not allow any false gods or idols -- including infatuation with Israel and the Jews -- stand in front of Him. Consider the following verses:

"Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them: for I the LORD thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me;"

Exodus 20:5, KJV

"For thou shalt worship no other god: for the LORD, whose name is Jealous, is a jealous God:"

Exodus 34:14, KJV

"For the LORD thy God is a consuming fire, even a jealous

God."

Deuteronomy 4:24, KJV

"Thou shalt not bow down thyself unto them, nor serve them: for I the LORD thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me,"

Deuteronomy 5:9, KJV

"(For the LORD thy God is a jealous God among you) lest the anger of the LORD thy God be kindled against thee, and destroy thee from off the face of the earth."

Deuteronomy 6:15, KJV

If there is any name that we should elevate and proclaim, it is the Name of Jesus Christ. If there is any name that we are to preach and promote, it's the Name of Jesus Christ, because Jesus is the one who died for our sins. Jesus is the only one by whom we receive Forgiveness of sins, Redemption, Salvation and Eternal Life. Let's talk about Jesus, because not only is there power in the Name of Jesus, but as the Scriptures tell us plainly, it is at His Name, and only at His Name, that the entire Universe will one day bow, as we see here:

"Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name: That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; And that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father."

Philippians 2:9-11, KJV

"Neither is there salvation in any other: for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved."

Acts 4:12, KJV

"For there is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus;"

1 Timothy 2:5, KJV

At any rate, returning to our main topic of discussion, that is why Barack Obama may possibly choose the latter option of abstaining from a United Nations Security Council vote which concerns the issue of Palestinian statehood, if and when that day arrives. I just don't see how Obama could outright vote against such a resolution, knowing that the Palestinians need a legally-recognized homeland. However, on the other hand, we also need to consider Obama's record, and knowing that record casts a shadow on this very possibility. If there's one thing that we have learned about Barack Obama during the past two years, it is that he is a backpedaler. He has not kept all of his campaign promises. In fact, President Obama has reversed himself substantially regarding a variety of issues. He is a typical politician who promises a lot during campaign season, but then doesn't deliver the full goods once he is elected.

This ties in directly with my next point. Just a few days ago, Obama announced his intentions to seek re-election during the 2012 presidential campaign. This development will undoubtedly affect his decision concerning a possible United Nations vote regarding Palestinian statehood. All presidential contenders strive to obtain the American Jewish vote -- and thus Jewish money to support their expensive campaigns -- and Obama will be no different. So the question is: will Obama sacrifice the Palestinians' aspirations for statehood, by giving a nod to

the Jews and vote against the United Nations resolution? Time will certainly tell.

If Mahmoud Abbas and the Palestinian Authority press forward in September and do win substantial support for Palestinian statehood in the 66th session of the United Nations General Assembly -- again, it seems to be a given -- but are knocked down by an American veto, or possibly even by failure by the Security Council to act altogether, while overwhelming UNGA support may not achieve their ultimate objective of obtaining membership in the United Nations, nevertheless, it will add substantial legitimacy to their goal, while at the same time, applying more pressure to Israel to remove the settlements, and to make serious endeavors at peace with the Palestinians. So no matter how you look at it, it appears that there is at least something to gain for the Palestinians by approaching the United Nations General Assembly.

As we discussed in part one, what adds so much uncertainty to the potential outcome concerning the Palestinians' quest for statehood and membership in the United Nations, is the level of ambiguity which certain parties claim exists in Resolution 377. While the mass media doesn't appear to be dedicating too much time to this issue, online research has left me with the impression that there is an ongoing legal debate surrounding UN Resolution 377 and exactly what is intended and implied by it. That is, if the United Nations Security Council fails to act, exactly how much authority does Resolution 377 give to the UN General Assembly, and how will it affect the drive for Palestinian statehood in September?

The more I research this matter, the more I become convinced that regardless of anything that the Israelis or the American government may do to try to stop the Palestinians, the birth of a Palestinian State may in fact be an eventuality which neither one of them can prevent. The train of support has simply gained too much momentum, and the world won't settle for anything less than recognition of a Palestinian national homeland, regardless of any doubts concerning Resolution 377.

There can be no doubt that substantial support is building for a sovereign, independent Palestinian State. As further proof of this point, consider the fact that just a few days ago, the International Monetary Fund lent its support to just such a proposed state, and stated that it believes that the Palestinian Authority is quite capable of handling the financial affairs of an independent state. But that is not all. Another financial heavy, the World Bank, has also just released a statement in which it likewise recognizes the fiscal responsibility of the Palestinian Authority. It said:

----- Begin Quote -----

"If the Palestinian Authority maintains its performance in institution-building and delivery of public services, it is well positioned for the establishment of a state at any point in the near future,"

----- End Quote -----

The endorsement of these two global financial institutions can be interpreted as nothing less than a green light for the Palestinians. So again, it seems that the handwriting is on the wall, and that it is only a matter of time before a Palestinian State will become a reality, regardless of any opposition from the Israelis or the government of the United

States. The Palestinians obviously realize this, and this is no doubt one of the reasons why recently, they have resisted any overtures from the government of Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu. It would seem then that as a result of their own procrastination and stubbornness, the Israelis may have missed the boat, and may end up being passed right over, whether they like it or not. Their strategy of many years -- decades, in fact -- of negotiations and talk, talk, talk without any real improvement on the ground, has turned into a pit into which they themselves may fall.

Of course, I don't think anyone expects the Israelis to just take this challenge sitting down; and I for one would not be the least bit surprised if they attempt to find devious ways to jeopardize Palestinian intentions long before September arrives. Let's be honest here. Secular governments plot and scheme against each other all the time. They smile and shake hands at the table, while at the same time, they point their daggers at each other underneath the same. I am reminded of the following verse that is found in the Book of Daniel:

"And both these kings' hearts shall be to do mischief, and they shall speak lies at one table; but it shall not prosper: for yet the end shall be at the time appointed."
Daniel 11:27, KJV

So national governments are constantly looking for new ways to obtain political advantage, economic advantage, military advantage, etc. Surely, Israel is no different. So how might the Jews attempt to achieve this objective of confounding Palestinian statehood intentions at the United Nations?

In my opinion, it would be by exploiting the Palestinians' biggest vulnerability, and that is the current division that exists between Fatah in the West Bank and Hamas in the Gaza Strip. Mahmoud Abbas -- the Palestinian Authority president -- and Ismail Haniyeh -- the disputed Prime Minister of the Palestinian National Authority who now heads Hamas in the Gaza Strip -- no doubt recognize this danger; and I suspect that this may be why they have recently made attempts to be reconciled in a national unity government, even though it will come at a very high price for Abbas, insofar as Israel is concerned. In other words, Netanyahu's government has already informed Abbas that he must make a choice. Either he chooses Hamas, or he chooses negotiations with Israel.

Assuming that Abbas continues to work towards some degree of unity with Hamas, not only will a unified government further convince the United Nations that the Palestinians are ready for statehood, and membership in the UN, but it will also help to insulate the Palestinians against any machinations that the Israelis may devise against them.

More specifically, it seems to me that if there is one thing that the Palestinians -- and particularly Hamas -- need to prove to the world, it is that they are capable of achieving their objectives through peaceful means without resorting to violence, such as lobbing rockets and mortars into southern Israel. Regardless of any differences which may now exist between them, it is imperative that Fatah and Hamas present a united, peaceful front to the world body. What they need to watch out for are intentional provocations from Israel, which could result in more retaliation and violence from maverick Hamas operatives who don't follow the party line, especially now as September approaches.

We all know that Hamas has a propensity for violence. They have demonstrated this time and again over the years. What they need to realize is that yielding to violence is their Achilles Heel. Furthermore, it is a vulnerability which the Israelis will most certainly exploit if they possibly can. That is why Hamas needs to rein in the maverick operatives. In other words, if through minor provocations Israel were to succeed in provoking a new wave of Palestinian violence, it would no doubt dampen expectations for September, and quite possibly even make a declaration of Palestinian statehood impossible for the foreseeable future, because the world would not be convinced that the Palestinians are capable of governing themselves in a peaceful, independent state along side Israel.

What kind of provocation could Israel possibly attempt which would achieve their goal of stirring up the wrath of Hamas, but without world condemnation raining down upon them? Sadly, I think the answer can be found in one of Israel's current operations. It is a widely-known fact that for some time now, Israel has engaged in a violent campaign of assassinations of Hamas' leaders. Because some of them have been known as being violent men, there has been little, if any, world outcry. The Israelis are going around murdering Hamas leaders with total impunity. When certain United Nations members do protest this Israeli witch hunt, what usually happens? The United States quickly comes to Israel's aid by declaring that the Israelis have a right to defend themselves.

So here's the question: What if the Israelis were to step up their assassination campaign until Hamas finally decides to retaliate? Or what if certain maverick Hamas operatives, that is, loose cannons so-to-speak, decide to retaliate against the Israelis, by defying the better judgment of Hamas leadership?

I think it is important that we all recognize that no matter how big and powerful a national government may be, it simply cannot control the actions of every individual citizen at every minute every single day. If it could, there would be no murders, no rapes, no theft, no violence or dishonesty of any kind. We would need a world that is very similar to the one that is described in George Orwell's "1984" for that to happen. Yes, I know; with RFID chips, closed-circuit TV's, cameras on the street corners in cities all across America, GPS, DNA tests, retinal scans, national identity cards -- driver's licenses and Social Security cards basically serve the very same purpose -- government databases, and related technologies, we are well on our way to arriving at a Big Brother society even now, and I have written all about this topic in some of my 666 or Mark of the Beast articles.

But I hope that you can see my point. Even if the leaders of Hamas and the Palestinian Authority were to arrive at some kind of mutual agreement whereby they would share power, and avoid any form of violence against Israel at all cost, for the sake of achieving their common objective of acquiring a globally-recognized Palestinian State in September, if even one or a few Gaza radicals were to resort to violence as a result of Israeli provocations, it could possibly escalate into a major wave of violence, which would play right into Israel's hand, and totally defeat Palestinian intentions at the United Nations in September. That's why the Palestinians need to be very careful during the next six months.

It has occurred to me that in a way, the Gaza Strip is like a pressure cooker, and Israel expertly controls the pressure

valve according to its own needs and national interests. In other words, whenever the Israelis feel threatened -- such as by the upcoming 66th UN General Assembly -- or when they feel the need to justify their positions or actions before the world, they will simply apply pressure to the Gazans, economically, militarily, or in some other fashion, until the Gazans finally react with violence, such as by lobbing more rockets into Israel. It is a very predictable reaction from the radicals in Gaza, and the Israelis know it, and in fact count on it.

In other words, the pressure valve blows off steam, which is exactly what the Israelis are hoping for; because then they can turn around and exclaim to the world "See; we were right. This is why we can't trust the Palestinians. This is why we can't make peace with them. This is why we are not able to negotiate with them. This is why we are against giving them a Palestinian State. This is why our security needs must come first"; and on and on it goes. It is perfectly choreographed for world consumption; however, what they need to realize is that a lot of countries are no longer willing to accept such excuses, and that is why they have chosen to back Palestine.

Now obviously, I honestly do not know what Israel intends to do concerning the Palestinians' plan to approach the United Nations in September. I do believe that despite their outward demeanor, the Israelis are quite concerned about it, and that they do view this development as a threat to their national security. Because of this fact, I simply do not believe that they will stand idly by and do nothing. They will decide to do something to try to jeopardize Palestinian plans, if they haven't already begun to do so. Assassinating more leaders of Hamas is simply one possibility, and merely a personal theory.

However, I should point out that to continue to assassinate the leadership of Hamas could ultimately prove to be a very dangerous and foolish mistake for the Israelis, as it would no doubt further radicalize the Palestinian youth. If the Israelis don't understand this point, then they really need to take a closer look at what has been happening in the Arab nations around them, and at who has instigated most of those revolutions. In other words, assassinating the old guard leadership of Hamas is not going to solve anything. If they completely kill the head, the arms and the legs could very well become wild and uncontrollable.

In fact, it seems to me that at this point in time, whether the Israelis takes measures to try to jeopardize Palestinian intentions before September, or the United States vetoes a UN resolution that supports Palestinian statehood, either way it could result in a further radicalization of the Palestinian youth, and very bad things may happen as a result of it. I am talking about another bloody intifada which the Palestinians obviously cannot win, as well as more Israeli oppression of, and military action against, the Palestinians. The pattern of violence and retaliation will simply start all over again, with no end in sight, and peace between the two peoples will remain as remote as ever.

Please go to part three for the conclusion of this series.

Written by the WordWeaver

webmaster@endtimeprophecy.net

Palestinian Quest For Statehood And UN Resolution 377 : Pt. 3

Will the Palestinian Authority rely upon UN Resolution 377 -- also known as the "Uniting for Peace" resolution -- to achieve Palestinian statehood at the 66th session of the United Nations General Assembly in September of this year?

Copyright 1994 - 2011 Endtime Prophecy Net

Published On : March 9, 2011

Last Updated : March 9, 2011

Will Ismail Haneya Give Mahmoud Abbas A Final Opportunity?, Barack Obama Needs To Resist Israel And Support Palestine, Jews Aren't Sincere About Attaining Peace With Palestinians, A No Longer Acceptable Status Quo, Israeli Procrastination, Two-State Solution - A Homeland For Jews And Palestinians, Jesus' Prophecy Regarding God's Coming Wrath Against Jews, Temporary Solution, Both Sides Guilty of Blood And Violence, Peacemakers Or Warmongers, A Logical Pragmatic Humanitarian Solution, No Room For A Potential Palestinian About-Face, Stability Civility And Peaceful Coexistence, Ottoman Empire And Division Of Middle East By United Nations And European Powers, A Boiling Pot Waiting To Explode, An Unjust Solution, Follow Peaceful, Legal, Globally-Respected Path To Statehood, United Nations, New World Order, One World Government, Beast, Does United Nations Represent Mob Rule Or Rule By Minority?, Limited Powers Of United Nations General Assembly, Inherent Power Of UN Security Council Is Guaranteed By The UN Charter, Chapter XVIII Articles 108 And 109, Great Power Unanimity, Resolution 377 vs Security Council, God's Will Shall Prevail

While I honestly don't know what is going on between Mahmoud Abbas and Ismail Haneya at this current time, the impression I get is that perhaps Haneya is willing to give Abbas a final chance to prove that his approach -- that is, navigating the diplomatic channels of the world and the United Nations -- is the right way to achieve their objectives. If Mahmoud Abbas fails this time, my sense is that not only will he probably abandon any further attempts at arriving at peace with the Israelis, but Ismail Haneya will become even more convinced that his way is the right way, and that violent warfare is the only means to achieve Palestinian objectives.

So I think that there's an awful lot hanging in the balances right now, and Israel and the United States really need to take note of it before they decide to do anything to impede Palestinian aspirations this coming September. Obama simply needs to put Israel in its place, and stop letting Netanyahu manipulate him. He needs to stop being an Israeli stooge like so many previous American presidents, and support Palestinian statehood; because the alternative -- a violent intifada in which many more Israeli and Palestinian lives will be lost -- is not very nice.

Because of their belligerent actions -- particularly their ongoing expansion of Jewish settlements and enclaves in both East Jerusalem and the West Bank, even contrary to the wishes and the counsel of the USA -- I am also convinced that the

Israelis are not truly desirous of attaining peace with the Palestinians, or sincere about working with them to establish a Palestinian State. Anyone who has been a regular observer of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict for the past few decades, will realize that whenever both parties are getting close to discussing a final status agreement, something suddenly goes wrong; and quite often, it is Israel which throws a monkey wrench into the works. I can only assume that it is because they really don't want peace, and simply want to maintain the status quo, a status quo that the rest of the world no longer views or accepts as being valid or fair.

In observing the Israelis' track record during the past few decades, I have become convinced that they have been playing a long-term game of procrastination, and that their intentions are to continue to occupy Palestinian territory, to keep the Palestinians divided against each other, and to manipulate the Palestinians through economic means, through military means, and through whatever other means they deem necessary, in order to safeguard their own national identity and security. If what I have just stated is not true, then let them prove it to the world by their actions, by tearing down the wall, by removing all illegal settlements and enclaves from the West Bank and East Jerusalem, by withdrawing all Israeli military personnel from Palestinian territory, by lifting all economic embargos against the Palestinians, and finally, by signing an agreement with the Palestinians that is based upon the 1967 borders with East Jerusalem as the capital of a Palestinian State. Do this, and the world will be convinced that they truly want peace.

Some of you reading this will no doubt assume from my previous remarks that I am standing behind the Palestinians and giving them my full support. I assure you that this is not the case whatsoever. Yes, I am of the opinion that just as the Jews of the Diaspora were given a homeland over sixty years ago, if we are to see any degree of peace in the Middle East, then it seems only logical and necessary that the Palestinians must be given their own homeland as well. Let me also remind you that the land which was given to the Jews over sixty years ago, was in fact occupied by the Arabs and Palestinians at the time, who had eventually taken it over following the earlier Roman occupation, which itself was a judgment from the Lord against the unbelieving Jews of that era. As Jesus Himself prophesied:

"And when ye shall see Jerusalem compassed with armies, then know that the desolation thereof is nigh. Then let them which are in Judaea flee to the mountains; and let them which are in the midst of it depart out; and let not them that are in the countries enter thereinto. For these be the days of vengeance, that all things which are written may be fulfilled. But woe unto them that are with child, and to them that give suck, in those days! for there shall be great distress in the land, and wrath upon this people. And they shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led away captive into all nations: and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled."

Luke 21:20-24, KJV

You will find this topic discussed more at length in some of my other articles.

While I support a two-state solution to the current conflict, because it is obviously impossible for these two peoples to live side-by-side in peace in the same country -- currently, Israeli Arabs do not enjoy the same rights and privileges as

Jews in Israel -- based upon my current understanding of the Scriptures, I'm not certain that such an arrangement will last indefinitely. It will falter sooner or later; but again, this is a topic that I discuss in other articles where I delve into issues related to the Endtime.

While I believe that the Palestinians need to obtain their own homeland in order to resolve their long-standing conflict with the Israelis, this is not to say that I am in agreement with all of the methods that they have employed in order to reach that objective. As I point out in other articles, I am of the opinion that there is plenty of blood, and a lot of guilt, on both sides of the fence, Israeli and Palestinian. As a follower of the peaceful doctrines of Jesus Christ, I am totally opposed to violence, bloodshed and war of every kind, and for every reason. As Jesus clearly taught us, blessed are the peacemakers, and not the warmongers, as we see here:

"Blessed are the peacemakers: for they shall be called the children of God."

Matthew 5:9, KJV

"Then said Jesus unto him, Put up again thy sword into his place: for all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword."

Matthew 26:52, KJV

"Jesus answered, My kingdom is not of this world: if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews: but now is my kingdom not from hence."

John 18:36, KJV

As I amply explained in part two, from a purely religious perspective, I do not agree with the beliefs of either the Israelis or the Palestinians. I believe that they are both seriously misguided, deceived, and in fact quite antichrist, because they both reject Jesus Christ as being the Son of God who died for the sins of the entire world, who was raised from the dead on the Third Day, and who now sits at the Right Hand of the Father. So again, they are both antichrists, and they will both pay for their sins of rebellion and lack of belief, unless they repent. In short, I support neither the politics, nor the tactics, or the religions of the Israelis and the Palestinians. I am discussing this issue purely from a logical, pragmatic, humanitarian point-of-view, as a means of obtaining at least a temporary solution between the two parties.

Let me also clarify, lest someone get the wrong impression, that in making my previous comments regarding the leadership of Hamas and the Palestinian National Authority striving to work together towards a common goal, I'm not suggesting that the Palestinians should play Mister Nice Guy during the next six months until they have finally achieved their national aspirations -- that is, Palestinian statehood -- and then suddenly show their other side again by engaging in violence against Israel. Such an about-face would no doubt shock the entire world, and would quickly undo everything that's been accomplished. Once Palestine is established, the Palestinians must live by their legal commitments and obligations to the United Nations, which I fully expect they intend to do.

Once the Palestinians' demands have been met at the United Nations, there should no longer be any further motivation for violence against Israel. As I said, it would in fact be

quite self-defeating at that point to engage in such violent behavior. What more could they hope to gain from it? No, I'm not saying that both parties should simply kiss and make up and forget their violent past. Such an expectation would be unrealistic considering the harsh feelings that have existed between them, not to mention the many lives which have been lost over the years; but they can at least learn to live with a degree of civility along side each other in peace for the sake of maintaining stability in the region, and because it is simply the right and decent thing to do. As Paul wrote to the Christians of the First Century:

"Recompense to no man evil for evil. Provide things honest in the sight of all men. If it be possible, as much as lieth in you, live peaceably with all men. Dearly beloved, avenge not yourselves, but rather give place unto wrath: for it is written, Vengeance is mine; I will repay, saith the Lord."
Romans 12:17-19, KJV

So again, once a Palestinian State is established, peaceful coexistence should be the order of the day.

While I have pointed the finger at the Palestinians due to their propensity for waging acts of violence against Israeli citizens who may in no way be responsible for the injustices that are being committed by the Israeli government, as well as the Israelis themselves due to their continued obstinacy and their disproportionate retaliatory violence against the Palestinians, it is also only fair to mention the complicity that the European powers -- particularly the British and the French -- as well as the United Nations and its predecessor, the League of Nations, have in the current situation.

The current political problems, ethnic divisions, etc., which plague the Middle East are to some degree a result of actions that these powers took during the first half of the Twentieth Century, when they chose to carve up the lands of the Middle East, based upon their own national interests, following the fracturing of the Ottoman Empire. At that time, as they drew up national boundaries and forced together certain religious and ethnic groups which weren't compatible with each other, they must have known that it was a recipe for disaster, and that someday, the boiling pot would explode.

Thus, today we are witnessing the results of their decisions as problems erupt that involve the Kurds, the Armenians, the Sunnis, the Shi'ites, the Palestinians, the Israelis, etc. Ridding Europe of the Jews may have seemed like a smart move at the time -- not that they were completely expelled from the European continent -- but offering them their own state at the expense of the resident Palestinians was neither fair nor just. Then, of course, too, we must not forget that the Palestinians could have had a lot more by now, if instead of choosing to go to war over sixty years ago, they had accepted the deal that was offered to them at the time.

So to reiterate a point that I made earlier, the Palestinians need to remain focused on one thing, and that is a peaceful, legal, globally-respected path to acquiring statehood. That path is obviously United Nations recognition. They must not allow anything that Israel may attempt to do from now until September to deter them from that track. Furthermore, it is imperative that they keep their own people under control, and not give Israel another reason to attack them, or the United Nations any reason to doubt their readiness to be accepted into the world body of nations.

Before concluding this series, allow me to make a few more comments regarding the United Nations, and how it seems to be perceived by certain individuals. As some of you will know, I have dedicated a fair amount of space in some of my articles to the discussion of an oppressive, intrusive New World Order or One World Government, as it is also known. Occasionally, I have mentioned the United Nations, although usually not in any great detail. If you are a regular web surfer, then you will obviously already know that there appears to be quite a few online Christian writers who are convinced that the United Nations represents the Biblical Beast of the Endtime, or at the very least, a precursor to the same. Personally, I am not fully convinced of this point, although I have considered it.

During the course of reading online news items or conducting research for my articles, I sometimes encounter comments in which an individual will criticize the United Nations, and equate it with mob rule. More often than not, these kinds of criticisms seem to originate with Americans. I have even read comments where someone will say something like "The president should be able to do whatever he thinks is right. We are a sovereign, free nation, so why do we need to receive approval from the United Nations? Why should we need the permission of other countries?". In particular, members of the John Birch Society and other patriot groups are known for holding this particular negative view of the United Nations.

While I can certainly understand the degree of mistrust that some people have towards the United Nations, ironically, the perception that some Americans have of the UN -- that is, that it amounts to mob rule -- is the exact opposite of the truth, as far as I can tell. As we saw earlier, and contrary to what some people seem to think, because of the way that the United Nations Charter is written, the UN General Assembly -- which represents the majority of nations in the world -- is actually quite limited in its decision-making ability, as well as its ability to actually effectuate its resolutions. Unless UNGA resolutions have been approved by the UN Security Council, as we've already seen, they are symbolic gestures at best. This is particularly true when they deal with international peace and security, and other substantive matters.

You will recall that I stated that the UN Security Council is comprised of five permanent members -- China, France, Russia, the United Kingdom, and the United States -- as well as ten non-permanent members which are elected by the United Nations General Assembly for two-year terms. Furthermore, the five permanent members are the only ones which possess the power of the veto. If any one of them does not like a resolution which has been put forth by the UN General Assembly, it can simply veto that resolution, and it is dead in the water. So contrary to what some American patriots seem to think, what we have here is most certainly not mob rule by the nations of the world, it is in fact a small, powerful monopoly comprised of only five nations; and the United States just so happens to be one of them. Furthermore, all five permanent members are nuclear powers.

Thus we see that the notion of referring to United Nations General Assembly votes as mob rule is quite ludicrous. Even using the word "mob" is inappropriate, because it is used to designate a crowd of people who are disorderly, and who are intent on causing trouble or violence of some kind. The UN General Assembly is anything but that. It is a large group of international leaders who gather in an orderly fashion in

order to discuss different aspects of International Law. It is bound by the chapters, articles and clauses of the United Nations Charter. It follows the rule of law. It does not practice anarchy.

When some people -- such as American patriots -- accuse the United Nations General Assembly of mob rule, it seems to me that what they're really saying is that they are angry just because America didn't get its way; and sadly, this is such a typical American attitude. Look at it this way. If your family decides to take a vote regarding some issue, and your view doesn't gain support, are you going to turn around and accuse your family of mob rule? The very same principle can be applied to a school board, a city council, or the United States Congress. Just because one side doesn't get its way does not mean that the other side is guilty of mob rule. As they say, you win some, and you lose some.

To reiterate, the five permanent members of the UN Security Council control and regulate all of the substantive decisions -- meaning approved resolutions -- that are made by the other almost two hundred nations in the UN General Assembly. This clearly represents a powerful monopoly of which the United States is a part. Furthermore, as I mentioned in part one, in recent years, the United States has relied more upon the use of its power of the veto than any other member country of the United Nations. This is historical fact, and not fiction.

Surprisingly, that is not the end of this matter either. You will recall that in part one, I stated that because the UN Security Council -- and in particular, the five permanent members -- have been assigned so much power, it has often caused friction between the Security Council and the General Assembly. As a result, during the course of its existence, there have been calls for reform of the United Nations for a variety of reasons. So perhaps you are wondering why the UN General Assembly doesn't simply amend the UN Charter so that it is more to their benefit. Well, the crafty architects of the Charter apparently considered that possibility as well. Consider the following:

The United Nations Charter was structured in such a way that it would protect the national interests of the five permanent members. There are certain legal mechanisms built into the Charter which make it virtually impossible for other nations of the world to break the permanent members' hold on power in the UN. The manner in which this has been accomplished is by means of Chapter XVIII, which deals with amendments to the UN Charter. More specifically, as you can see below, Article 108 and Article 109 of the UN Charter grant the permanent members -- or P5 as they are also known -- the power of the veto over any potential amendments to the Charter itself:

----- Begin Quote -----

Article 108

Amendments to the present Charter shall come into force for all Members of the United Nations when they have been adopted by a vote of two thirds of the members of the General Assembly and ratified in accordance with their respective constitutional processes by two thirds of the Members of the United Nations, including all the permanent members of the Security Council.

Article 109

1. A General Conference of the Members of the United Nations for the purpose of reviewing the present Charter may be held at a date and place to be fixed by a two-thirds vote of the members of the General Assembly and by a vote of any nine members of the Security Council. Each Member of the United Nations shall have one vote in the conference.

2. Any alteration of the present Charter recommended by a two-thirds vote of the conference shall take effect when ratified in accordance with their respective constitutional processes by two thirds of the Members of the United Nations including the permanent members of the Security Council.

3. If such a conference has not been held before the tenth annual session of the General Assembly following the coming into force of the present Charter, the proposal to call such a conference shall be placed on the agenda of that session of the General Assembly, and the conference shall be held if so decided by a majority vote of the members of the General Assembly and by a vote of any seven members of the Security Council.

----- End Quote -----

Please notice carefully that we are told that there are two primary conditions which must be met in order for amendments to the UN Charter to come into force. First, according to Article 108, they must be "adopted by a vote of two thirds of the members of the General Assembly"; and second, they must be "ratified . . . by two thirds of the Members of the United Nations, including all the permanent members of the Security Council". Clause 2 of Article 109 likewise states that "Any alteration of the present Charter recommended by a two-thirds vote of the conference shall take effect when ratified . . . by two thirds of the Members of the United Nations including the permanent members of the Security Council".

In other words, if some member nations of the United Nations General Assembly want to make some fundamental change to the Charter which would grant them more power in some way, while at the same time, possibly weakening the position of the five permanent members, they simply cannot do it, because one or more of the P5 would probably veto it, because they obviously are not going to allow anything which works against their own national interests. Chapter XVIII very clearly says that "all the permanent members of the Security Council" must agree; so here again we clearly see an example of the rule of "great power unanimity" coming into effect, which we discussed in part one.

Again, this amounts to rule by a powerful minority -- five nations -- and not mob rule by the majority as some people seem to think. The fact that certain Americans dis the United Nations structure demonstrates that they simply do not fully understand how it works, nor seem to fathom that it's actually working in their favor. As we have clearly seen, America has more power within the United Nations than most other nations of the world, so what's the beef?

Let me emphasize again that "great power unanimity" and the power of the veto primarily apply to what are referred to as substantive resolutions, and not to procedural resolutions. Obviously, amending the United Nations Charter would clearly be recognized as a substantive resolution, as would admitting a new state to the United Nations. Thus again we see that the

Palestinians may have some major hurdles to jump over in the near future. Depending on how one interprets Resolution 377, garnering a two thirds majority vote of the General Assembly may not be sufficient. It's quite possible that the acid test will come with the UN Security Council, and which way they each determine to vote.

As I mentioned earlier, a lot can happen between now and next September when the 66th Session of the United Nations General Assembly convenes. Without a doubt there will be unseen forces at work, trying to control and manipulate the outcome of this crucial vote for the Palestinians. However, regardless of what eventually happens, when all is said and done, I remain firmly convinced that God is in control of this situation, and that the conflict between the Israelis and the Palestinians will play out exactly as He wants it to, according to His Divine Purposes and Will. As His Word tells us:

"I know that, whatsoever God doeth, it shall be for ever: nothing can be put to it, nor any thing taken from it: and God doeth it, that men should fear before him. That which hath been is now; and that which is to be hath already been; and God requireth that which is past."

Ecclesiastes 3:14-15, KJV

"Remember the former things of old: for I am God, and there is none else; I am God, and there is none like me, Declaring the end from the beginning, and from ancient times the things that are not yet done, saying, My counsel shall stand, and I will do all my pleasure:"

Isaiah 46:9-10, KJV

"Lift not up your horn on high: speak not with a stiff neck. For promotion cometh neither from the east, nor from the west, nor from the south. But God is the judge: he putteth down one, and setteth up another."

Psalms 75:5-7, KJV

"Daniel answered and said, Blessed be the name of God for ever and ever: for wisdom and might are his: And he changeth the times and the seasons: he removeth kings, and setteth up kings: he giveth wisdom unto the wise, and knowledge to them that know understanding:"

Daniel 2:20-21, KJV

"This matter is by the decree of the watchers, and the demand by the word of the holy ones: to the intent that the living may know that the most High ruleth in the kingdom of men, and giveth it to whomsoever he will, and setteth up over it the basest of men."

Daniel 4:17, KJV

"The king's heart is in the hand of the LORD, as the rivers of water: he turneth it whithersoever he will."

Proverbs 21:1, KJV

With these verses I will bring another series to a close. I trust that you have found it both informative and instructive.

Written by the WordWeaver

webmaster@endtimeprophecy.net
<http://www.endtimeprophecy.net>