

This Free E-Book is brought to you by Natural-Aging.com.

100% Effective Natural Hormone Treatment
Menopause, Andropause And Other Hormone Imbalances
Impair Healthy Healing In People Over The Age Of 30!

The Middle East: Prior Claims?

By The Indignant Bystander / Francis Shimandle

The Middle East: Prior Claims? by The Indignant Bystander / Francis Shimandle

A Lebanese-American named Sharon Nader Sloan recently published his thoughts on the Palestinian claims that "Palestine is their land, and that Jerusalem is their capital, and that Israel is occupying their land." He further notes that Palestinians believe that since the West Bank is theirs, that "to resist occupation they have the right to send suicide bombers into crowded bus stations, pizza parlors, etc., and kill innocent men, women and children. And all Arab and Muslim countries support them in their claims and actions against Israel."

This Lebanese-American also concludes that although the idea that the West Bank is occupied Palestinian land has been accepted by almost everyone, it is, in fact, "the greatest lie ever perpetrated". And he proceeds to refute both the claim, its justifying of terrorist acts on Israel, and the supposed support for it by other Arab and Muslim nations, with some convincing historical information.

First of all, where was the Arab support for Palestinian statehood before the Jewish state came into existence? For 19 years before Israel was formed, Jordan occupied the entire West Bank, including Jerusalem. There was no Arab demand for the Kingdom of Jordan to stop ruling the occupied territory, no clamor for the formation of a Palestinian state, or Jerusalem being its rightful capital.

So, if all the Arab hatred for Israel is based on love and support for their Palestinian brethren, and wanting them to reclaim their own state, where was that support before Israel's formation?

Truth is, there never was a Palestinian state. And in recorded history, Jerusalem has never been the capital of any country other than ancient Israel and modern Israel. How, then, can there be a claim that Jerusalem is the capital of a state which never existed? One of the problems is that so few of us in Europe and the U.S. remember enough world history to see how events can distort reality and lies, repeated often enough, become accepted as facts.

The Middle East: Prior Claims?

Many, including some Arab and Muslim journalists and scholars, question even the notion of a Palestinian people. Four elements distinguish a people – language, religion, culture and cuisine. As an example, Chinese, Japanese and Koreans are all Oriental. Yet, they are different people, because they each have distinct language, different religions, different cultures and distinctly differing cuisines. People called Palestinians speak the same language, follow the same religion, exhibit the same culture and eat the same cuisine as other Arabs. They are, in fact, Arabs who happen to live in the region called Palestine.

Palestine is not, and never has been historically, the name of a nation, nor the name of a people. It is a region. Siberia is a region, too. There is, however, no country named Siberia, no people named Siberians. The Sahara is a region, as well, not a country. Arabs living in that region are Libyans and Moroccans.

Because Palestine is a region and not a nation, Britain was able to partition it and gave half to Arabs living on one side of the Jordan River, which became the Kingdom of Jordan. Because it is a region, the United Nations was able to divide the rest of it between the Jews and the Arabs living there. Had the Arabs accepted that U.N. resolution, there would have been a newly created Arab state called Palestine. They rejected the compromise, however, and went to war to destroy Israel. They lost. There is no Palestinian state.

David built the city called Jerusalem. His son, Solomon, built the holy temple within it. The commonwealth called Israel lasted about 1,000 years, with one break, 400 years after David. The invaders from Babylon occupied Israel for 70 years, until Cyrus the Great, of Persia (!), helped the people of Israel regain their land, rebuild the temple and rule for 600 more years. The Romans invaded and ruled Israel, then the Crusaders reigned. The Ottoman Empire ruled next, then the British Empire, and finally, Israel returned to its homeland and built the modern Jewish state.

In all that time, it was never, ever, a Palestinian state. Whence, then, all the discussion and controversy about an occupied Palestinian land?

Those who refer to themselves as Palestinians certainly have the right to live there, freely and in peace. But does the right to declare it a Palestinian state come from the mere fact that they are occupying the region? Imagine California and its Mexican–American population. If this community, greater in number than the Palestinians in the West Bank, were to claim that the U.S. is occupying their land since they live there, and demanded other citizens leave so they could form their own country, how would our government respond? What if Washington said they could live there, but not claim independent sovereignty, and they began sending suicide bombers, snipers, mortar fire, and so on, into the rest of the country?

Again, there has never been a Palestinian state. Not under the reign of Israel, of Babylon, the Romans, nor the Crusaders, the Turks nor the English, and not under the rule of the Arab Kingdom of Jordan. Evidence shows that it was never even brought up until after Israel again was established in its

homeland.

Michael Kelly made several points in his May 8, 2002 Washington Post article "Israel's Phony Partner" which look at Yasser Arafat's role in the "peace process". On the second day of 1967's Six Day War, Foreign Minister Abba Eban met with the U.N. Security Council to make Israel's case for preemptive strikes in a war forced by Arab nations. Looking at each ambassador he faced, Eban said, "Look around this table and imagine a foreign power forcibly closing New York or Montreal, Boston or Marseille, Toulon or Copenhagen, Rio or Tokyo or Bombay Harbor. How would your government react? What would you do? How long would you wait?"

The questions remain, and how – or whether – to recognize Arafat as a "partner for peace" becomes the current quandary. Officially, the U.S. still holds the position that Israeli Prime Minister Ariel Sharon ought to "recognize who the Palestinian people look to as their leader," no matter "how disappointed we've been with him over time."

Disappointed? Let's recap. He was given the Nobel Peace Prize. Awarded much of the land he demanded, plus a \$90 million monthly(!) budget, allowed to build an armed force on Israeli territory. Finally, (as America's former top negotiator, Dennis Ross, revealed recently on Fox News), he got both

President Bush and Prime Minister Sharon to promise him all of Gaza and most of the West Bank as an independent and joined Palestinian state, including a right of Palestinian return to that state, plus a multibillion-dollar reparations fund – and what does he do? Goes to war, and proveably orchestrates terrorist attacks against Israel. Yes, disappointed.

Some U.S. media, and even Secretary of State Colin Powell, may still believe Arafat is a peace partner, though Powell noted "we all may disagree with what Mr. Arafat had done over time." We sure may. Take the murder of 6 people and wounding of 30 more at an Israeli girl's Jan. 17 bat mitzvah in Hadera, just one of many terrorist acts directly linked to Arafat's control in documents found by Israeli forces in Palestinian Authority offices. These documents were revealed in a 103-page report released by Israel's government in support of Sharon's position that they cannot pursue peace with Arafat as a "partner".

Mr. Kelly's article states, "The New York Times buried its coverage of the report on A10 and sniffed that the evidence did not appear to show definitively that the Palestinian leader ordered terror attacks.' The Post gave it front-page play but was even more dismissive, treating the Israeli evidence with open disdain. The first 'objective' characterization of the material, third paragraph, does not address the documentary evidence at all but in a contrary slant notes that the report contains 'a great many assertions and allegations for which no documentary proof is offered.' In paragraph 12, after three paragraphs of Palestinian officials and lawyers dismissing the evidence as propaganda, The Post's reporter offers the first and only judgment supporting the Israeli side: 'Nevertheless, some of the material in the report appears potentially damaging to the Palestinians, and could hurt their standing in international public opinion.'"

In light of the spurious claims of Palestinian sovereignty to begin with, and growing evidence of Arafat's ongoing commitment to the destruction of Israel and her people through any and all means, this cannot be viewed as balanced reporting.

The Middle East: Prior Claims?

If the U.S. had credible evidence to believe that a certain rogue Islamic leader was responsible for a terrorist campaign of murder and destruction against America and her people, what would we do? How long would we wait? We've already begun to live this. And we did exactly the right thing. Without delay. We mounted an army, with support from many free world governments, against that leader and his followers. We bombed them, shot them, chased and arrested them and shipped them to Guantanamo Bay. And if we had their leader trapped in his compound, we would not even consider letting him out and setting him up as a "partner for peace".

One of life's strangest ironies is that people of two of the world's three major monotheistic religions, sharing the teachings of Abraham, continue this history of bloodshed. They are brother tribes, both Semites, descendants of Shem. (Despite the consistent misuse of the term, "anti-semitic" refers to hatred of Arab and Jew alike.) Brothers and sisters, whose bickering has gone obscenely far beyond sibling rivalry.

Marketing and Promotion veteran of 30+ years, Mr. Shimandle writes on a variety of current events, mystery fiction and childrens' stories. He partners a website, Dontforget911.com and operates a marketing consulting business in the Chicago area.

Forehead Jewelry is Not Anti American

By Henrietta Jacobson

March 10, 2003 ---- No the Intuitive Eye (patent pending) is not Anti American. It is forehead jewelry and was inspired by Henrietta Jacobson's practice of Kundalini yoga, which has nothing to do with Islam or the Middle East.

The word Yoga comes from the Sanskrit root "Yug" meaning to join. Yoga literally means yoke or union and speaks of the union of the individual spirit with the universal consciousness. The basic techniques evolved in the monasteries of India & Tibet over a period of thousands of years. Even though Kundalini yoga originates out of India, it was brought to America in the 60's with Yogi BhaJan. Kundalini Yoga, the Yoga of Awareness, consists of simple yogic techniques that can be enjoyed by everyone, no matter his or her age or physical ability. It is a complete science that includes breath(pranayam), yoga postures (asanas), sound, chanting (mantra) and meditation.

It is designed to provide you with the experience of your highest consciousness through the raising of your Kundalini energy. It is like counseling through the body instead of the mind.

Americans may think if someone is wearing something on their forehead they are from the Middle East. Sikhs wear turbans but are not Islamic, Muslim or from the Middle East either. The confusion seems to come from the practice of Middle Eastern Dance or belly dancing. The title "Belly Dance" is a direct translation of Arabic "raks el-batn". Raks is to dance and batn means belly.

Most belly dancers wear headpieces and Indian & Egyptian women wear forehead jewelry. This of course has not stopped American's from wearing belly chains and armbands or even belly rings.

The Middle East: Prior Claims?

So why be afraid to wear your Intuitive Eye. Teens are wearing them, brides are wearing them and women that meditate are wearing them.

Henrietta Jacobson

The Intuitive Eye (Patent Pending) has become a meditation tool for some and a unique piece of jewelry for others. As a single mother Henrietta, a psychiatric nurse and pharmaceutical consultant spent 10 years raising two boys. With previous training and experience in sewing and fashion design, she had always had a passion to design jewelry. It seemed only natural once the children were grown to return to that passion. She enrolled in a jewelry design course finally ready to follow that dream.

Kundalini yoga and meditation provided the inspiration for the design of the Intuitive Eye. Kundalini

yoga is a wonderful tool for enriching a woman's life and has become an important part of Henrietta's life in many ways. It is a type of yoga for women of all ages; it is like counseling through the body and cells instead of the thought processes to heal the mind, body and spirit.

Henrietta is currently working on a unique and full Chakra Jewelry line!

Forehead Jewelry is Not Anti American
Car Insurance No Claims Bonus Explained
Middle Eastern Cuisine
Budapest And The Hungarians
Vacationers... Did you know?

30-Day Low Carb Diet 'Ketosis Plan'
Web Biz for Beginners
Profitable Puppets
COCKTAILS - How to Make and Enjoy them
Hitting the Search Engines



This Free E-Book has been brought to you by Natural-Aging.com.

[100% Effective Natural Hormone Treatment](#)
Menopause, Andropause And Other Hormone Imbalances
Impair Healthy Healing In People Over The Age Of 30!