

JOHN KERRY'S KNICKERS MUST BE IN A BIT OF A TWIST, IT SEEMS**Perhaps, The First Signs Of Senility ?**

For many years, politicians from a number of countries have tried to settle the many and varied political differences between The State of Israel and Hamas, Hamas, being the fundamentalist, Sunni-Islamic organisation, considered by many governments of the world as being a terrorist organisation.

Since 2006, Hamas has been the ruling, governmental authority in respect of The West Bank and The Gaza Strip.

These two small strips of land are claimed by Hamas as the rightful, sovereignty territory of The State of Palestine.

But The State of Palestine is not recognised as a state, anywhere in the world.

Hamas is the sworn enemy of The State of Israel and refuses to acknowledge even the Jewish State's right to exist along with its Jewish residents.

Hamas is determined to liberate Palestine – which includes The State of Israel – from Israeli occupation.

Hamas is funded, directly and indirectly, by The Islamic Republic of Iran.

The Islamic Republic of Iran, also, has gone on record as stating that it wants to eradicate The State of Israel from the world map, along with all of the Jews, presently living in Israel.

With this short introduction to the political situation that exists, today, in this powder keg of the Middle East, it is somewhat difficult to understand the recent utterances of Mr John Forbes Kerry, Secretary of State for The United States of America.

Secretary of State John Forbes Kerry said, in a public address on Wednesday, December 28, 2016, that the determinations of Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu of Israel were, inter alia, one of the obstacles to a lasting peace in the Middle East.

He said that the Israeli Government's foreign policies had shattered any hope for a two-state solution with regard to the festering conflict between Israel and Hamas, now decades old.

It was just five days earlier, on Friday, December 23, 2016, that, in the United Nations, Israel had been condemned and damned for promoting the construction of settlements in The West Bank and East Jerusalem.

On that Friday, The United States of America abstained from voting on a United Nations' Security Council Resolution to condemn the construction of Israeli settlements.

The United States of America could have vetoed this Resolution, thus, effectively, killing it, but instead, it abstained from voting.

On the assumption that Secretary of State John Forbes Kerry had the express approval for his public tirade from his immediate superior, namely President Barack Hussein Obama – an approval that, logically, one may rightfully presume – and with January 20, 2017, fast approaching on which date, President-Elect Donald John Trump would be sleeping in the White House, it was a shocking speech that this once, American lawyer delivered to the world.

The speech was shocking for a number of reasons, one of which was the inherent contradictions, contained therein.

Secretary of State John Forbes Kerry said, among other things:

‘If the choice is one state, Israel can either be Jewish or democratic. It cannot be both. And it won’t ever really be at peace. The United States did, in fact, vote in accordance with our values, just as previous (US Government) Administrations have done.

‘The vote in the United Nations was about preserving the two-state solution. That’s what we were standing up for.’

Secretary of State John Forbes Kerry, then, went on to state:

‘Separate and unequal is what you (Israel) would have, and nobody can explain how that works.’

That which surprised many right-minded people was the implied vituperation of the speech of this outgoing Secretary of State.

It was, in diplomatic terms, almost unthinkable that one of the most-senior ministers of the largest economy of the world, as well as being, militarily, the strongest nation of the world, would have delivered such a speech, laced as it was, with venom.

For forensic analysts of The Secretary of State’s many invectives, there was a question as to the probability that he may be suffering from an onset of senility: He is, after all, in his 70’s.

For a person, having been awarded a **Juris Doctorate (JD)** from the Boston College Law School in 1976, there appeared to be clear indications of illogicality in his thinking.

He said, inter alia, that the chances of a two-state solution for peace between Israel and the Hamas was, clearly, impossible as long as Israel determined to press ahead with its avowed policy of an expansive construction of Israeli settlements.

Secretary of State John Forbes Kerry, then, in the next breath, stated that future US politicians – obviously referring to President-Elect Donald John Trump and his retinue – could continue to work for a two-state solution along the lines, laid down by the outgoing Secretary of State, during his tenure of office, plastered as it was with his abject failures to procure the prize of the Middle East: The ‘*Golden Fleece*’, if you will.

If, as the outgoing Secretary of State had clearly intimated, that the (incoming) Administration of President Donald John Trump would be unlikely to follow the political footsteps of Secretary of State John Forbes Kerry, then, how could there, ever, be a solution to the decades of distrust between The State of Israel and Hamas?

That which Secretary of State John Forbes Kerry had, obviously, forgotten (perhaps it was convenient so to do?) was that Hamas refuses to accept the legitimacy of the existence of The State of Israel.

This has, always, been the starting point of all peace negotiations between the two (now) warring factions.

And, with funding, continuing to pour into the coffers of Hamas from the Government of The Islamic

Republic of Iran, it is, indeed, difficult for Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu to break bread with the leader of a terrorist organisation by the name of Hamas, an affiliate of The Muslim Brotherhood that has been outlawed in many countries, including Bahrain, Egypt, Russia, Syria, Saudi Arabia and United Arab Emirates.

It is, indeed, rare for a healthy dog to attack, savagely, another healthy dog from the same pack when food is plentiful and there is no reasonable excuse for such antagonism to break out between the healthy dogs, but some dogs are, by their very nature, bellicose.

-- **E N D** --

***While TARGET makes every attempt to ensure accuracy of all data published,
TARGET cannot be held responsible for any errors and/or omissions.***

*If readers feel that they would like to voice their opinions about that which they have read in **TARGET**, please feel free to e-mail your views to editor@targetnewspapers.com. **TARGET** does not guarantee to publish readers' views, but reserves the right so to do subject to the laws of libel.*