

JUSTICE AGAINST ISRAEL, **UN STYLE**

Jack Kinsella - www.omegaletter.com

The World Court has concluded its hearings during which a formal panel of 15 judges in black robes and wigs listened to lawyers testify that Israel's security fence was a violation of humanitarian law. It was a bizarre scene.

Israel is fighting a terrorist war. There is no common ground with regard to nearly every parameter traditionally applied to warfare. Israel's enemy is a non-state whose "military" activities are wrapped around ideologies that legitimize acts of terror against civilian populations. The principles of Islam.

The Israelis are not fighting organized armed forces, but rather a loose, cellular structure of terrorist groups that blend among civilian populations. Their flexibility gives them the ability to materialize unexpectedly and use the Israelis' own democratic systems against them.

This week's deliberation at The Hague is an example of how far our world has come in accepting terrorist blackmail and giving it legitimacy.

Forty-four countries filed briefs with the court opposing the Israeli barrier fence. The Palestinian Authority, received as "Palestine" by the court, and two other non-states, the Arab League and the Islamic Conference, were also permitted to present their cases.

Other countries also argued their positions against Israel's right to install the barrier. These included Cuba, Indonesia, Madagascar, Malaysia, South Africa, and Senegal. It is clear that these countries don't object to a barrier fence so much as they object to an Israeli existence on one side of it.

Neither Israel, nor any Western country presented briefs. Not one Security Council member spoke nor was any Western country represented.

Assessment:

This is what passed for international 'justice'. There were two scenes that simultaneously opened this week's news cycles. The first was the specter of Yasser Arafat, appearing on TV to 'condemn' a suicide bombing for which his own people were taking credit.

The second was the World Court holding 'hearings' to decide if Israel's

decision to fence out Palestinian terrorists was a violation of international law.

The general consensus of the court is that Israel's fence will hinder peace efforts with Yasser Arafat's Palestinian Authority. It is as if the two events took place on different planets.

The latest bomber slipped into Israel from Bethlehem, where the security fence hasn't yet been completed. While the World Court heard that the fence 'wasn't necessary' and an 'obstacle to peace.'

In places where the security fence has been completed, not a single suicide bombing attack has taken place since. The World Court heard instead that Israel's fence makes 'peace impossible'.

Note from pastor Kevin: We must realize that "peace" to the Arab means all the Jews have been killed or otherwise removed from the world. The wall is an obstacle against this goal, and therefore it makes their "peace" impossible.

The fifteen-judge panel listened to one representative after another railing against Israel's security fence. Among those making anti-Israel oral presentations were such bastions of democracy and human rights as Algeria, Saudi Arabia, Bangladesh, Belize, Cuba, Indonesia, Jordan, Madagascar, Malaysia, Senegal, and Sudan. (Osama couldn't make it and the Taliban sent regrets)

Among the JUDGES were representatives of such champions of the rule of law like, China, Madagascar, Sierra Leone, Russia, Venezuela, Brazil, Jordan, and Egypt. (It should be noted the Egyptian judge pronounced Israel guilty before the court had even convened.)

Could it GET more bizarre? The logical argument wasn't made before the court, but one would assume that argument wouldn't be necessary, anyway. Indeed, following the logic, one would assume the TRIAL wouldn't be necessary.

That line of logic goes like this: If it weren't for the onslaught of Palestinian suicide bombings, there would be NO NEED for a barrier fence. Stop attacking and the fence will come down. Case closed?

Hardly. What is 'justice' before the UN for Jews is an entirely different standard of 'justice' than is applied to Arabs.

According to the UN's own rules, international justice demands the

following: the right to life, the right not to be subjected to torture, inhuman or degrading treatment, the right to equality and freedom from persecution, security of the person, the right to health and well-being, the right to safe working conditions, the right to work, freedom from incitement to violence or war, freedom of religion, the right to the protection of the family, the right to the protection of the child, the right to education, freedom of movement, the right to vote, freedom of association, the right to an adequate standard of living and the right of self-determination.

Not ONE of these rights have ever been fully enjoyed by Israeli Jews who have been in a constant state of war with the surrounding Arabs since 1948. The violation of human rights by suicide bombing, starting with the right to life, falls within the category of the gravest human rights violations in international law: crimes against humanity, specifically genocide.

The UN recently passed a resolution against Israel affirming the rights of Palestinian children and accusing Israel of violating them. The same UN, at the same time, refused to pass a resolution sponsored by Israel that affirmed the rights of Israeli children.

The World Court is supposed to PROTECT against genocide. It is also supposed to prevent ethnic cleansing, which it classifies as a lesser included offense within the definition of genocide.

Ethnic cleansing is defined as the systematic removal of a group of people identified by ethnicity from a certain area through killing or forced migration. Both suicide bombings and the dismantling of Jewish settlements are aimed at that same goal. The ethnic cleansing of Jews from the areas the Palestinians claim as theirs.

The World Court didn't consider these issues. The World Court is wrestling with the difficult question of whether or not Jews should be allowed to defend themselves.

It isn't the first time that question has bedeviled world leaders. The Book of Esther is about that exact question. The Feast of Purim is the celebration of the Persian decree that Jews WOULD be allowed to defend themselves that eventually resulted in the Jewish defeat of Haman and his forces.

It was a question that confounded world leaders during the 1930's, and has been debated at the UN General Assembly following the wars of 1948, 1956, 1967 and 1973.

In each instance, the General Assembly's ruling was effectively that Jews do NOT have a right to defend themselves.

In each of those wars, begun by Arabs, Israel captured territory that would have made its borders more defensible; with each cease-fire, the UN demanded Israel give it back, guaranteeing a new war.

Of all the nations in all the world, Israel is unique among its peers at the UN as the only nation with no inherent right to nationhood, and consequently, no inherent national rights.

The non-existent 'nation' of 'Palestine', run by, for, and at the pleasure of, an openly terrorist organization, is afforded greater access to the General Assembly than Israel.

That is the global status quo and the whole world knows it. Israel refused to even attend the hearing, having learned its lesson about UN impartiality and justice at the UN Conference on Racism in Durban, South Africa.

The United States and even some members of the European Union argued the Court has no jurisdiction, but when the target is Israel, the UN gets tunnel vision.

Global anti-Semitism is completely out of the closet, openly and joyfully discriminating against Israel in favor of the Arab side, dismissing claims of bias BY ACKNOWLEDGING THE BIAS EXISTS, but promising to form a commission of some sort to 'look into it.'

The stage is almost set for the final war in history. The war between the forces of the world against Israel and Israel's God during the coming 'Time of Jacob's Trouble'.

Jesus said to him, "I am the way, the truth, and the life. No one comes to the Father except through Me"
John 14:6