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Part One
The Wall

We watched Pink Floyd’s The Wall in a small, bare and shabby cinema called Semadar, The Vine Blossom in the quaint German Colony of Jerusalem. Emptied of ethnic Germans by the Jews in 1948, it still preserves its old stone houses roofed with red tiles, gables with immured plaques quoting Psalms inscribed in Gothic script, ivy creeping up its masonry and the mysterious Templar Cemetery beyond heavy gate.

Semadar, named after an expression in the Song of the Songs, was a favourite talkies’ spot in our Paradise Lost, nostalgia-bewitched pre-war Palestine, when it was frequented by British officers, and the young cosmopolitan gang of the Holy City’s best and brightest: Armenians, Greeks, Jews, Germans and native Palestinians. Many marriages crossing borders, religious affiliations and political passions were formed in its romantic small yard: a Sephardi Rabbi’s daughter found herself a Scots flier, and a scion of noble Muslim Arab family met a perky Left-Zionist girl. Semadar has not changed; it survived our Fall, the Partition, to become a fixture of Amos Oz Jerusalem-based novels like fossil ice survives global warming.

Semadar remained a decent if rundown place for family outing in 1980s, the blessed days before video, TV and computers took over our free time, and we often went with the kids to the movies. However, the Wall was a flop. In the middle of the film,
there is a horrifying shot of a mouth gaping to devour you, the spectator.

This scary boneless but teeth-filled mouth covered the whole screen towering above our heads. It was too much for our seven-year old son, and he rushed out with a piercing yell. But outside, the foyer was plastered by posters with the same gaping mouth! It took a few hours to calm him down, and this symbol of the Wall, the dreadful devouring mouth, remained buried deep in my memory.

It returned with a vengeance like a released spring today, when I ran into the Wall after a beautiful walk. For many hours we had driven and walked the soft Biblical hills of the Highlands, waded high green grass, picked purple lupines, crossed a brook still full of water, and of friendly full-faced and fully-dressed girls and boys who splashed each other and us with youthful abandon, and passed by their parents in the nearby village of Anata who were preparing a picnic repast and called their cordial salaams. We greeted a monk going down from his cliff hermitage of St Chariton and received his blessing; chased away a flock of four or five shy gazelles with white-spotted crupper; lit a candle at a Byzantine image of the Madonna in Taybeh village church, where according to carefully preserved local lore Christ spent his last days before the Passion. We drunk their famous Taybeh draft beer in the Stones, an airy two-tiered café in urbane Ramallah, with a tweed-clad professor of philosophy from Bir Zeit university, a wryly-smiling architect, a lapsed Jew from England with an uncanny resemblance to the younger Noam Chomsky, and a ravishing dark beauty of a French-speaking Palestinian girl brought up in Tunisian exile and schooled in Paris.

As we drew towards the Shepherds’ Fields, we run into the Wall. It cut into the tender Bethlehem countryside like a colossal devouring maw, and nature disappeared, marshmallow-like. Dozens of Caterpillars were tearing at the hills, uprooting fig trees and vines, crushing rocks for some monstrous Margarita. They demolished old peasant houses and medieval towers, and denuded the slopes walked by the Virgin. The Wall was built like a wide four-lane highway, flanked by 20-feet-high double steel mesh fences, topped with high tension wire, interspaced with cameras, sharpshooters’ positions and a few gates. It was the most formidable prison camp perimeter fencing I have ever seen, and it
skirted the village houses tightly, like a tipsy tango dancer holds his partner.

The peasants looked through the mesh on their olive trees, still there, still in full modest bloom, but already separated, removed, unavailable. The peasants were locked in, as secure as in any jail, beyond this Wall. Their fields, their pastures, their springs of water were locked out. A gate was guarded by an Israeli soldier; it connected them to their livelihood, to their land, to their freedom — to be opened or closed by army decision. Always looking for a profitable angle, the army instituted a two-dollar fee per person per time for opening the gate. If these Palestinians wish to dally with their olive trees, let them pay for the pleasure.

In some places the Wall was huge concrete construction, stealing away the landscape, the view, locking the villagers in an extended prison court. But the mesh wall was even worse by affording a tantalising sight of the land they once called theirs. The Wall runs for hundreds and hundreds of miles, surrounding villages, separating them from their land, and devouring the beautiful nature of Palestine.

This Wall was not a new invention. I have seen it before. Not far from the sacred Mount Carmel there was an Armenian village. It was settled by Armenian refugees fleeing the Kurds’ fury in 1915. The always hospitable Palestinians helped them build their houses and leased them the land, for these Armenians were peasants from the shores of the Lake Van. In 1948 their village became part of the Jewish state. The Jews did not kill them, did not expel them, they just surrounded the village with a Wall, and strangulated it. The living village lost its lands and was turned into a prison with one always guarded — by the Jewish army — gate. The Armenians lasted ten years. In 1950s the last Armenian sold his house for a song to the Jews and fled.

The Wall had a precursor: the system of ‘for-Jews-only’ highways. While even Haifa or Afula has no bypass road, every Arab village has a bypass: a broad highway encircling and limiting its development. Hundreds of Palestinian houses were demolished, thousands of acres devastated while building the bypass grid by recipe borrowed from the Hitchhiker’s Guide to Galaxy. It was done for no visible reason, as tiny Jewish settlements did not need this multi-billion investment for ‘security purpose’. Moreover, newly-built roads were usually blocked by the army. Now, with the
Wall rising higher and higher, the bypass network begins to make sense: it was Stage One of devastation and imprisonment.

The Wall will leave the olive groves in the hands of settlers, wrote ever-so-rational Uri Avnery. But the settlers do not need olives and do not intend to till the land. They prefer to torch the trees. The settlers are not the cause, but a rationalisation of the cause: desire to depopulate Palestine and kill its nature.

Could it be different? The presently implemented programme of victorious Zionism was portrayed in a 1930s essay, The Iron Wall by Vladimir Zhabotinsky. But the roots are deeper, for the Wall is the utmost manifestation of the Jewish spirit and it fits the Jewish state. There are dozens of words for ‘wall’ in Jewish tongues, probably as many as Eskimo have for ‘snow’. Jews’ sacred symbol is the Wailing Wall; their favourite street is Wall Street. The Egyptians, Babylonians, Christians and Muslims build vertical pyramids, towers, cathedrals to connect Heaven and Earth; but the self-deifying Jews need no Heaven or Earth, and the first thing they build – from London to Minnesota – is eruv, a symbolic Wall to separate them from non-Jews. The only extant inscription from the Jewish Temple (destroyed forty years after Christ was tried in its Walls) is not the Decalogue, or Ten Commandments, or moral teachings, but a piece of a Wall with warning: “Goy, if you cross this Wall, you will have to blame yourself for your painful death”.

The most important part of Jewish teaching is the maxim, “build a Wall around the Torah”. It enhances every prohibition of the Law by a dozen of additional prohibitions. A Jew is forbidden to gather fruits on Sabbath, but ‘the Wall’ forbids also climbing a tree, lest one be tempted to gather its fruits. Well, what about fruitless birch or fir? It is banned for the same reason: this Saturday you will climb a birch, next Sabbath you will climb an apple tree, and in a month’s time, you will pick an apple and commit a real transgression.

Sharon’s Wall is a Wall around the Torah, for if you let a goy wander freely he will sooner or later be able to kill a Jew. Sharon’s Wall is a Temple Wall, for a goy who crosses it will have to blame himself for the bullet of a sharpshooter. Sharon’s Wall is a Wailing Wall for Palestinians, and it is the Wall Street for the Jewish building contractors. The commanding voice is that of Jacob, but the hands are the hands of Esau: the Wall is built by the sweat of
impoverished Palestinian workers, guarded by Russians, paid for by Americans to jail their brothers.

The contractors are into a Bonanza, a remake of their previous endeavour, the fifty-feet-high Bar Lev Wall, constructed on the shores of Suez Canal in 1970s and demolished by the Soviet-made water cannons of the Egyptian Third Army of Marshal Sadat on October 6, 1973. The only part of the Wall that survived the 1973 war was the villas of the contractors.

This Wall is the real Roadmap of the Zionists, for when the Wall is completed, Palestine will be ruined and its happy dwellers turned into refugees. But the fate of Jews will not be enviable, either, for the Wall is everywhere. Every shop, every restaurant, every pub in once jolly Tel Aviv has its living Wall: a Russian or Ukrainian boy imported to guard it. For four dollar per hour they stop the bombers with their bodies and are buried beyond the cemetery Wall. We, Israelis, are frisked ten times a day, as we go to the shop, the office, to work or to have fun. There is no building you can enter without a search. Thus the Holy Land has become a high security prison for all its dwellers, Jews and non-Jews alike.

It could be predicted. The Jews weren’t locked by evil strangers within the ghetto walls, wrote Vladimir Zhabotinsky, they chose it as foreigners in China chose to live in their separate settlements. Fifty years later, Israel Shahak made another valid observation: the walls of ghetto were breached from outside, by the state, while the Jews weren’t keen to leave. The visible walls were breached, but the inner walls remained. The Jewish state is enactment of the paranoid Jewish fear and loathing of stranger, while the Cabal policies of Pentagon are another manifestation of the same fear and loathing on global scale.

Not only individuals, whole societies and cultures can be insane. This important discovery was made by an American social scientist Ruth Benedict, a close and admired friend of Margaret Mead and Franz Boas. Her *Patterns of Culture* (1934) remains one of the most widely read books in the social sciences ever written. In this work, Ruth Benedict described different Native American cultures and characterized the Pueblo Indians as “placid and harmonious”. She wrote of “the self-aggrandizing, megalomaniac character of the Kwakiutl”, and proved that the Dobu Islanders were “paranoiac and mean spirited”. 

The Wall
This last definition fits the Jews as culture to a boot. What was this Cabal-instigated obsessive search for WMD in Iraq if not a fit of paranoia, fear of a cheated goy with an axe? The State of Israel, the country of perennial body search, is the ultimate of paranoid societies, according to Ruth Benedict. The US is succumbing to the same disease under her present ruling clique of Leo Strauss’ followers: it builds walls and disarms far away lands, as well as their own citizens, for the Jewish paranoia is extremely contagious.

It is useless to fight the Wall, as it was useless to fight the illegal settlements, as long you ignore the cause. ‘The Wall is in the heart’, ubeliba homa, sung the Jews as they conquered Jerusalem in 1967. The Wall is at the heart of the problem, and this is the Jewish state in Palestine. Young and not-so-young peace activists at the hilltops along the Wall still wave the slogan “Two States” at the bulldozers, though the bulldozers implement the dream of Two States, my nightmare: a Jewish state and a chain of reservations for the Goyim, the “Palestinian State”. Whoever says, “an Independent Palestinian State aside the Jewish state”, turns a blind eye to the Wall. The Wall is an operation of separating the Siamese twins, and only the strongest one will survive it. Discussions of the Wall run into sand in Israel: vast majority of Israelis, from Labour to Likud, support it, while “peace-loving” Israelis are the strongest supporters of the Devouring Maw.

The Wall mocks the innocent souls inflamed by the Roadmap, another doomed plan to separate the Twins. Sharon is not worried for it provides enough delays to complete the Wall, it puts the onus of peacekeeping on the Palestinian side, it gives him full freedom of action in exchange for some empty promises.

The peace activists hope to alter the course of the Wall a bit here and there. But it won’t help, for the Wall will always separate people and their land. Wherever you put it, it will separate the refugees in Deheishe refugee camp from their houses ten miles away in Deir a-Sheik. It will separate the Christians of Taybeh from the Holy Sepulchre and the Muslims of Yassouf from al-Aqsa. It will separate the Jews from the holy sites. It will separate the Highlands peasants from their working places in Tel Aviv and Haifa.

Sharon’s Wall, this unmitigated disaster, provides a rare opportunity to observe the true nature of the Jewish State, and to call for its dismantling. Not the Wall, silly! The Jewish State.
The Road Map of Marquis de Sade or Speaking Dirty for Palestine
(a talk given in Paris on 18 June 2003)

The Road Map is not a compromise between Palestinians and Jews, but between Jews and Jews, none of whom lives in the Middle East, namely, between Jewish liberals of New York and Jewish neo-cons of Washington. Both groups are devoted to preservation and prosperity of the Jewish State, but they disagree on strategy: while neo-cons such as Perle would exterminate and evaporate its enemies à la Joshua bin Nun, Tom Friedman and other liberals think the goyim could be safely jailed in security of Gaza strip guarded by NATO soldiers. Now, these two groups reached a compromise for following reasons. The active stage of the American conquest of Iraq is over, but the US army bleeds in Iraq and Afghanistan. Before replacing American soldiers in the conquered lands by French, Indian and other conscripts, in order to free them for the next stage, the assault on Iran, it needs to show the world that the war was not just an ugly imperial enterprise done in the interests of the Zionists. Whence the Road Map was ushered in.

The two Jewish schools of the US are wonderful in providing drama. Though the real difference between the twain is tiny, they
obscure it by boisterous philippics. Like seasoned shopkeeper bemoans ill luck that forces him to part with a treasured item at a rock-bottom price, and encourages an innocent buyer to enter the deal, the hard-core Zionists bewailed “the Auschwitz borders” of the Road Map. Some friends of Palestine, mainly the believers in two-states’ solution saw the distraught Jews and took the bait. They hastily concluded that the Road Map is good and fair for Palestinians.

“The Zionists are hysterically frightened of this unflinching Texan cowboy”, – wrote Jack Graham, the lawyer, “He will show us the independence of the American mindset! Peace is nigh!” Always ready to jump the gun, Ali Abunimah proclaimed (in a piece called Who’s afraid of the Road Map?) “Israel’s supporters are in full panic by even the appearance of minimal fairness and reciprocity contained in the plan’.

Alas, nobody was afraid of the Road Map. Abunimah et al repeated the error of the youthful bride of prince de Bauffremont, a notorious sodomite in a delightful if risqué story by Marquis de Sade. The Prince was to be married to the chaste and innocent girl, whose mother was well aware of her future son-in-law preferences.

– My daughter, she said, reject the first proposition of your husband. Tell him firmly, any other way but that one! (Ma fille, méfiez-vous des premières propositions que vous fera votre mari, et dites-lui fermement: Non, monsieur, ce n’est point par là qu’une honnête femme se prend, partout ailleurs autant qu’il vous plaira, mais pour là, non certainement...)

However, the Prince has decided to kick the anal habit and to approach his young bride in the conventional fashion. He was quite astonished and pleasantly so, when the lady rejected his initial advance and steered him towards the valleys he preferred anyway, tells us the Marquis in the story aptly entitled L’ÉPOUX COMPLAISANT.

Probably the President Bush was equally surprised by the unexpected support of the Road Map coming from supporters of Palestinian cause. They were supposed to reject it out of hand for it was indeed the plan fit for Marquis de Sade. Like the young bride, they were conditioned to approve whatever is disproved by the

1 http://electronicintifada.net/v2/article1428.shtml
unwelcome partner, and thus fell into the trap. The two-staters among them are so hell-bent for action like public school boys on their first cross-Channel trip, that they are ripe for any trap.

Indeed, the Road Map would be awful if it ever worked, and the conditions imposed by Sharon’s government made it pathetic. It was aptly described and justly condemned by our colleagues Jeff Blankfort, Ran HaCohen and Kathleen Christison in Counterpunch, by Edward Said, Uri Avnery and Jennifer Loewenstein and others. The 14 conditions of Israeli government nixed whatever positive element the Road Map may contain. At best, the process would produce a few fenced reservations for natives called ‘Palestinian State’.

Does this mean that we, the advocates of humanity, should fight the Road Map, as some friends suggest? Well, like Don Quixote, we could of course charge forth and fight windmills. But another risqué joke tells of a man in an advanced stage of venereal disease whose physician informs him that his member has to be cut off. In panic and despair, he rushes from one specialist to the next, until the most eminent of them all reassures him that no surgery is needed: his diseased member has already fallen off.

In other words, there is no reason to fight this fictitious peace plan, for it will naturally disappear the way of Jaring, Zinni, Saudi and other Plans all by itself. Sharon’s missile attacks on defenceless Gaza, the farcical ‘dismantling’ of settlements before the final decision to beef them up prove that Israeli leaders had no slightest intention to honour even its modest framework. Ahmed Bouzid, this fine analyst of Philadelphia, correctly sums it up: “Anyone who has followed this conflict and has a minimum sense of history can only view the latest declarations from the Israeli government as nothing more than a stalling tactic.”

Indeed, why should Zionists accept the plan, or any peace plan? They are “King-of-the-Mountain”; the only other regional power of importance, Iraq, was reduced by brave Jessica Lynch and her fellows-in-arms; while Teheran waits for its turn. It is rumoured that General Garner gave up his position in Baghdad for

---

1 http://www.counterpunch.org/blankfort05272003.html
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he was promised the vice-regency of France when it will be taken over. President Bush again looks a willing plaything responding to Zionist remote control.

There is no slightest chance for any solution in Palestine, but the solution of equality, of unified citizenship and full integration of all dwellers of Palestine. The two-states’ supporters fool nobody but themselves. To make matters worse, there is no chance for this solution until some degree of equality will come into the American discourse. Why, indeed, the media discusses this non-existent Road Map? It is further evidence of the malady called the misbalance of discourse. The recent acts of terror in Gaza and Jerusalem served a reminder to doubters. While death of innocent civilians in Gaza was hardly mentioned in what American papers had described as ‘violence’, it was stressed next day when ‘violence’ visited West Jerusalem. This anomaly joined other numerous anomalies, from unbelievably high 80 per cent of all American foreign aid going to Israel, to the disproportionate space media devotes to Jewish issues from the holocaust to Cabala. Altogether it amounts to a unique phenomenon.

We grieve over the Palestinian tragedy, but we should also regret the American tragedy, for these sturdy people, once renowned for their free speech and rugged individualism, would probably lose out to geese in a contest for independent thinking. Just recently the Americans were extremely angry at President Clinton. It was not because he had an extramarital affair, the Americans said, but for lying. We can forgive everything but a lie. Not only the newspapers attacked him for his rather innocent lie, but the Congress tried to impeach him for this reason.

Twenty years ago, President Nixon was practically skinned and lynched for the same offence: he lied, called the media, he lied, repeated the Americans, and he had to resign. But now, President Bush lied — and his lie was not a small and sordid thing, but the huge lie of Iraqi WMD. Well, who cares, says nonchalant Wolfowitz, and Tom Friedman repeats, yes, who gives a damn indeed, is not “the real story we should be concerned with.” “Amen, said the Americans, we've already forgotten he ever mentioned WMD.” It appears the American Jews decide not only who

---

1 NYT, June 4, 2003
is an antisemite (one who calls for equality of a Jew and non-Jew) but who is a liar, too.

I do not fret over American moral principles, but their total unquestioning submission to manipulation, their readiness to sincerely repeat whatever they are told, amounts to demonic possession. Like in Haitian lore, they were turned into a Zombie by a sinister Warlock, the Masters of Discourse. Our few wonderful friends in the US look more and more like Soviet dissidents of old, with one major difference. The dissidents had full support of the West, while the American dissidents of the present day stand alone.

Now, we all tend to play the game, and even Cassandra found it difficult to grieve the introduction of the wooden horse into the walls of Troy when everybody else rejoiced at the Danaian splendid gift. But in America, conformism exceeds all bounds of reason. What is worse, this imbalance does not want to stay overseas but it is spilling over into Europe. The American totalitarian media lords are buying into European communications. The billionaire Haim Saban, an Israeli-American Jew, is buying KirchMedia, Germany’s largest TV broadcaster. He is also the largest single contributor to the US political parties, and a great supporter of Israel — to such an extent that University of California denied him security clearance\(^1\). One can imagine what sort of programs his TV will broadcast. This attempt to hijack the mindset of Europe should be checked, and the spoiled goods of America — from genetically engineered meat to soap operas to ‘news’ — stopped from entering Europe.

France is the key bulwark of the dam that stems the American tide. If President Jacques Chirac had not stuck to his principled position, Germany’s Erhard Schroeder and Russia’s Vladimir Putin would not dared raise objections to the American attack on defenceless Iraq. You may be proud of your leaders, and give them your support. France needs unity, and no issue unites opponents of the Empire like the issue of Palestine. Let it be the bond of unity between native and adoptive French people.

France is the shining star in the constellation of Europe. Let this wonderful country of small winding roads, vineyards and

---

\(^1\) AP, 15 May 2003
farms, great cathedrals and parish churches, but also of modern industry and communications, of friendly and thoughtful people, be its guiding star as well. France is important to Eastern Europe, for the EU membership should bring its people respite from their present pro-American and pro-Zionist Soros-trained leadership. France is important for Russia, its traditional ally, so the Russians would shake off the vestiges of the CIA-installed Yeltsin’s regime.

France is important for the Middle East, but she is even more important to the US. This country can’t stand up alone against the Empire, nor should we push for confrontation. Let France set an example for the good Americans to emulate, like it did in the early days of the Republic. The more privileged Americans realise this. In a small Champenois village I ran across a frequent visitor, a Mr Cohen of the New York Times. Weekdays he stays in Manhattan, eats freedom fries with gefilte fish, and calls to punish treacherous France, but on weekends he flies here to enjoy a taste of true civilisation. At heart, he knows: the American Empire under its Texan executives and Jewish media barons is an extremely uncomfortable affair even for its adepts; almost as uncomfortable as the Middle Eastern Jewish state.

For after all, in civilised France Marquis de Sade was sent to a psychiatric asylum, and was not asked to draw up Road Maps.
Five to Midnight

To the north of prosperous Hertzliya, the capital of the Israeli high-tech industry with its plentiful sushi-bars, there is a pleasant beach below a steep, almost Pacific bank. It is an unattended shore, without lifeguards, and it is frequented by nature-loving foreigners and Palestinian families on their outings to the nearby sanctuary of Sidna (Our Master) Ali. If you walk even further north, beyond the signs forbidding your advance for the very real danger of avalanche, you will find yourself in a secluded cove, a rarity on the straight line of the Palestinian shore. It is a beautiful place for a swim in the transparent waters of the Mediterranean. Big earth-coloured boulders guard the cove; on a second careful look you will understand that they are not a natural formation. They are bastions of the Crusader castle of Arsur, whose ruins rise on the plateau well above the beach. The bastions were overturned and dropped into the blue-green sea by Baibars, a great Arab commander, the vanquisher of the Mongols and Crusaders in 13th century.

Some 150 years earlier, the Crusaders easily conquered the Holy Land, and easily settled down. They built their castles and farmsteads, married local Christian Orthodox and Armenian women, and could live happily ever after. But they used to invite foreign adventurers and serve as the beachhead for their landings, and proved their inability to fit in as good neighbours. They were
given many chances, but they blew them all and remained a potential ally to any foreign aggressor.

Then, the ‘weak and feminine’ Levant brought forth Baibars. It is not enough to expel the Crusaders, he ruled, for that was tried by Saladin; but the Franks came back. The only way to get rid of them is to destroy the shore of Palestine so they will never be able to snatch it again. Castle after castle, settlement after settlement, city after city, Baibars ruined the seaside of the Holy Land: Caesarea, Askalon, Jaffa, Arsur. He regretted it, but the alternative was an eternal warfare in the region.

It seems that history is about to repeat itself. Unless some unexpected turn of events will occur, the sweet land of Palestine is doomed to perdition. The German-built, US-equipped nuclear submarines of the Jewish state, poised to wreak havoc in Iran, Syria, and Saudi Arabia, make it abundantly clear — there is no way Israel will become a decent neighbour in the Levant.

The Jews were given a good chance to strike root in the land of Palestine and make peace with the native population. But they blew it.

The recent unprovoked Israeli air strike into the depth of Syria reminded those who has forgotten that the Jewish state is an aggressive entity dangerous for the region. Thirty years of calm between Syria and Israel were dismissed by Sharon’s generals as of no consequence. Nobody was fooled by their clumsy attempt to connect Syria to the bloody act of personal vengeance meted out by the young woman from al-Halil whose brother and fiancé were murdered and whose father was refused medical help by the Israeli military. The insightful Malaysian Prime Minister, Dr. Mahathir Mohamad, interpreted that well: “Israel has been urging America to invade Syria, but Americans seemed to be reluctant, so in order to force the US hand, Israel carried out the air strike”1.

The problem of Israel is not the problem of Palestinian suffering anymore; it is the problem of the entire region from India to Ethiopia (Esther, 1) and beyond. Indeed, the fifth column of Israel-supporters instigates wars all over the world, from Chechnya to the Philippines, from North Korea to Cuba. They push the world straight into Armageddon. John Bolton calls for the takeover of

1 http://www.ndtv.com/template/template.asp?template=Palestine&slug=Malaysian%
Iran, Murawiec demands to beat Saudi Arabia. The rabidly Zionist New York Post lifts its sights to France, “one of America’s ugliest enemies” led by Chirac, “a moral pygmy whose lack of scruples is, fortunately, balanced by a lack of courage and power.” “France should be made to suffer, strategically and financially. The French stabbed us in the back. In response, we should skin them alive”, continues the newspaper, and judging by the Zionist record, it is not just a figure of speech.

The Jewish state is an extremely dangerous bundle of goods. It is part of Israeli military doctrine: act crazy, and people will be scared of you. The bogus threat of nuclear Iraq was modelled on the real threat of nuclear Israel. Its scientists practice chemical and biological warfare, as well. They actually tried nerve gas on demonstrators in Gaza, and water poisoning at the siege of Acre, as reported by Abu Sitta in Al-Ahram.

Israel is involved in a long line of kidnapping and assassinations carried out on foreign soil. There is no immunity from the long arm of Israel: they killed in Norway (the notorious Lillehammer affair), they kidnapped in Rome (the Vanunu affair), they bombed the British library and American consulate (Lavon affair), they sunk the USS Liberty, they tried to assassinate Joseph Mugabe, they probably assassinated the anti-Zionist US Secretary of State James Forrestol, they were involved in the assassination of President Kennedy, as Michael Collins Piper in the Final Judgment makes clear, for the American president insisted on the nuclear disarmament of Israel. The recent assassination of Anna Lindh, the Swedish Foreign Minister, who supported a boycott of Israel, still remains a mystery.

They are not particularly secretive: today we know who assassinated Count Bernadotte in 1948, and who committed the mass murder of German POWs in 1946, and who murdered the Egyptian POWs in 1956, for their perpetrators boast about it. Tomorrow we shall know who did other atrocities. But our knowledge won’t help, for Israel is a safe haven for criminals. Whenever caught red-handed, Israel brushed away the world public opinion, for as Ben Gurion, our first Prime Minister, said, “what the goyim say is of no importance, only what the Jews do is of importance.”

This sad record, refreshed by the air strike on Syria and the preparation for a nuclear strike on Iran, proves there is no way to
make Israel a suitable member of the community of nations. It also answers the question whether the peace efforts and attempts to roll Israel back to its old borders are still relevant. They are not. Within the borders of ‘67, ‘48 or ‘73, Israel remains a bridgehead of aggression, a threat to world peace and a physical threat to world leaders. Like the bloodthirsty sect of Assassins, who once plagued the region, Israel-supporters undermine or murder better rulers, and support weaklings who are prepared to act on their orders. Israel’s withdrawal from the West Bank will not change its nature. The leopard can’t change his spots, as Jeremiah the prophet said (13:23).

Israel’s behaviour is partly connected to the Jewish superiority complex, and its consequence, the apartheid structure. South Africa before Mandela also was involved in the destruction of its neighbours, Mozambique and Namibia, and in many plots elsewhere in Africa. This superiority complex should be treated by dismantling the apartheid state. The events of last year proved it beyond reasonable doubt. Dismantlement by the peaceful means of democratisation is the only viable alternative to Israel’s otherwise inevitable ruination. While bringing the brinkmanship policy to the level of ‘calculated madness’, Israeli leaders failed to predict they will bring to life a whole generation that does not care whether they are dead or alive.

Until recently, fear of Israeli retaliation kept its adversaries at bay. In 1991, the Iraqi president Saddam Hussein had powerful WMD, but he did not use them against Israel, for he did not feel desperate. He believed the Israel’s threat to destroy Iraq if he uses WMD. He thought that he could survive the defeat. He did not understand that the Israeli idea of war draws on the Jewish religious tradition that knows no mercy. If Saddam had known that bodies of his tortured sons would lie in a Baghdad morgue, that he would be turned into a homeless refugee, that his country would be ruined by ten years of sanctions and afterwards become prey to the Zionist invader, he might well have been tempted to do the Samson solution, and take the Jewish state with him into the nether regions in 1991.

Saddam Hussein is gone, but by now, every leader in the world knows what he should expect if Israel asks its American Golem for his head. Paradoxically, the very cruelty of Israel turned its threat
into an empty sound, for if they will do their worst anyway, it makes no sense to surrender to their demands.

The Jews of Israel repeated the folly of Napoleon in Jaffa. In 1799, the young Corsican general crossed the Sinai desert and marched north into Palestine. Rafah and Ramleh surrendered to his troops, for the Palestinian soldiers saw no reason to fight the passing European force. Napoleon proceeded to the port of Jaffa, where the six thousand strong garrison of the city also preferred to surrender. They thought they will be disarmed and sent home, to their villages, but Napoleon was reluctant to leave so many enemy soldiers behind his lines and ordered the killing of them all. It took the French three days to kill such a mass of people. They were brought in groups from the Armenian St Nicolas’ Convent to the shore and bayonetted.

After this massacre, all Palestine took to weapons. Napoleon’s troops were ambushed at every orange grove, and when he came to the walls of Acre, there was no talk of surrender. People understood that it just makes no sense. They could as well die fighting. After a few months of fruitless efforts, Napoleon turned back, leaving his wounded soldiers to be slaughtered by the advancing enemy. In the gentrified centre of Jaffa, there is a squat papier–mache figure of le petit caporal in his triangular hat reminding the tourists and the locals of the backfiring nature of cruelty, but probably the Israeli leaders did not pay it sufficient attention when their policies brought the country to the brink of destruction.

The heavy feeling of looming disaster is one of the unmentioned reasons behind the ‘One State Solution’ we proposed and advocated. True, ‘one state’ would be good for the Palestinians; it would be good for Israelis. But a new partition, the Two States’ solution, could also alleviate Palestinian suffering, as Prof. Neumann and many moderate peace activists rightly noted. It could even be preferred by the Israeli and Palestinian elites, though an independent state in the West Bank and Gaza won’t solve the problem of refugees. However, in no way would the partition alleviate the threat to world peace poised by the rogue Jewish state, and it won’t prevent the imminent disaster in the Holy Land.

Even a smaller Jewish state would be the seat of Mossad and its assassination unit, Kidon. Even a smaller Jewish state would pos-
scess nuclear weapons. Even a smaller Jewish state would be poio-
soned by its deeply rooted and extremely xenophobic ideology, and
would remain a source of ideological contamination. Even a small-
er Jewish state would be heavily involved in the politics of subver-
sion from Moscow to Washington, DC. And then, it is just a ques-
tion of time, when a pushed-too-far leader of a state — be it North
Korea, Iran, Egypt, or Russia — will remember the bodies of
Saddams’ sons and decide to follow the path of Baibars and of the
Mongol sultans who removed the Assassins from their eagle nests.
For without Israel, the US forces would hang around their bases in
Georgia and Texas instead of seeking the Jew-haters in the five
continents. The demise of Israel is inevitable; the only question is
whether it will be forcibly removed and the land destroyed, or it
will be peacefully absorbed in the region.

Equality in the Holy Land — it is not only a moral demand; it
is the only way to save the country from approaching destruction.
Not us, not the do-gooders or peace-lovers, but the inevitable
course of events leads us to the choice: equality or death.

Israeli cruelty, vengefulness and the inability to respect others
called hundreds of Palestinians to horrible martyrdom. If, or rather
when, a potential martyr will be equipped with a miniaturised
nuclear device instead of home-made dynamite, the sad story of the
Jewish state will be over.

The Jewish belt of Israel is quite small, and just two well-
placed half-megaton nuclear devices can wipe it off the face of the
Earth. It is possible that in its last throes, it will make true its threat
vocalised by Prof. van Crevel of Hebrew University and ‘go down
by taking the world along’, for Israeli nuclear weapons are trained,
according to van Crevel, at European capitals, as well as on its
neighbours. But no amount of security measures will be able to
stop a nuclear suicide bomber, and she may disregard the fate of
people who failed to protect her and her family.

And then, some years later, the ruins of Tel Aviv will blend
smoothly with the ruins of Arsur.
The Return of Vanunu

Ashkelon is a peaceful small town to the south of Tel Aviv and to the north of Gaza, rebuilt after 1948 on the ruins of the old Palestinian town. White houses and white sand give it its clean look. Its high-security jail is also painted white, though it is a far from idyllic place. Today the Mossad-operated jail returned Ashkelon into the news for the first time since Richard Coeur-de-Leon took it from Saladin.

For 18 long years until today Mordechai Vanunu was buried alive in its super-secret Agaf Seven, ever since he was kidnapped in Europe by Mossad spies and illegally brought to be tried and imprisoned here. Vanunu committed a double crime for he defied the Jewish state by disclosing the secret of its evil nuclear might and by embracing Christ. For this he was kept in solitary confinement; hour upon hour, day upon day, year after year under the lidless eyes of Mossad watchers. This would be enough to break spirit of an ordinary man, to drive him into the release of insanity, as his tormentors wished. But they failed for he was not an ordinary man.

Brought up in a working-class Moroccan Jewish family in the arid Negev, Vanunu witnessed persecution of the native Palestinians, and he felt compassion for them. This brotherly compassion for goyim, frowned upon in the Jewish tradition, brought
him to Christ. He could not continue working at Dimona, the place where Israel makes weapons of mass destruction. He openly broke with Jewish omerta, denounced evil, and made his fellow citizens and the world aware of the huge nuclear arsenal accumulated in the underground storages to threaten world peace.

A Christian has some qualities of Christ, and the witness of Vanunu has made him a Christian martyr. Jews are not a forgiving lot, and they are not likely to forgive a man who broke free. In order to make this religious meaning of his trial clear to all, the judges sentenced Vanunu for 18 years, ‘to be immured alive’, for ‘18’ means ‘alive’ in Hebrew. Many Jews wear the sign of 18, or ‘Chai’ on their necks, where Christians wear cross. “Do you know what this sign means?” – Daniel McGowan of Deir Yassin Remembered was asked by a policeman, and he replied: “it is the sentence you gave Vanunu”.

But 18 years passed, and today Vanunu came back to life. It was a moment of supreme elation reminiscent of Resurrection Sunday, when the white doves flew over the white prison, and crowds chanted in front of the gate of heavy iron bars guarding the entrance to Ashkelon jail. He approached the gate, grasped its bars as if wishing to break free, pulled his strong body up and looked at us, at his friends who came to see him coming out alive, and at his enemies who called for his blood. There was no Hollywood smile of a released prisoner. Not a timid lamb anymore, but the Son of Man who saw death and came back. His face was stern and grim in the blue frame of the iron bars, like that of Christ breaking the Gates of Hell on an old icon.

He turned to the TV crews and spoke to them, at first in his heavily accented Sephardic Hebrew, then in English:

“I want to tell you something very important. I suffered here 18 years because I am a Christian, because I was baptised into Christianity. If I was a Jew I wouldn’t have all this suffering here in isolation for 18 years. Only because I was a Christian... Vanunu Mordechai says we don’t need a Jewish state. Vanunu Mordechai doesn’t want to live in Israel and doesn’t need a Jewish state. I am a symbol of the will of freedom. You cannot break the human spirit.”

“Kill him!” – yelled the Jewish crowd, braying for blood, like in Mel Gibson’s film. They raised their signs declaring “Kill the traitor”. But the prey escaped them: in a minute, his car took him...
into the safe sanctuary of St George cathedral, the Anglican Neo-Gothic building in East Jerusalem, where kind Bishop Riah expected him.

Thus Vanunu confirmed in his own words and deeds: Christ is the symbol of compassion to our fellow men and thus of rebellion against the Jewish rule, the symbol of the unvanquished human spirit that is akin to God. Probably the bravest man alive, he reminded me that ‘God became Man so that Man can become God’ (in words of St Athanasius). I thought of my friend Gilad Atzmon in London and of other good people who rebelled against the archaic spirit of dominance; of endless arguments about whether Christ is relevant for our struggle in Palestine, arguments Vanunu answered so eloquently.

In 1986, when Vanunu was arrested, I wrote in the socialist newspaper Al Hamishmar, “Vanunu was my spy, for he spied out for me the dark secrets of the Zionist establishment.” But he returned with an even more important message, that of spirit. Years ago, he revealed to us the weapons of our enemies; now he revealed our secret weapon in the battle for Palestine, that of Christ. And this battle goes on: while white doves flew over the prison, the Jewish tanks bombarded the towns of Gaza, a few miles away, killing innocent civilians.

He also revealed the complicity of the American and European pseudo-Christians in the plot. Vanunu told us he was trapped not by Mossad but by a CIA agent, for his revelations were mightily embarrassing for the US, for the country that forced the world to disarm while turning its blind eye to the Dimona nuclear facility. Even now the US authorities promised ‘to keep an eye on Vanunu’ so he won’t embarrass them even more. Italy’s Berlusconi, this great friend of Sharon and Bush, did not move a finger to save the man kidnapped on Italian soil. This question should be discussed in the election campaign in the US: it is not too late for Americans to reject the accomplices of the Zionist warmongers.

Yes, Vanunu is right: “The time has come to end this silence and secret cooperation by the West, the United States, Canada and all Europe helping Israel and co-operating with Israel’s secrets...”

It is not too late for us, the Israelis, to listen to this man and to agree with him: we do not need a Jewish state; we need a state of compassion.
“The Palestinian Intifada is over, and the Palestinians have lost” – thus proclaimed the Jewish American columnist Charles Krauthammer in the Washington Post (June 18, 2004). Armed resistance has dwindled; there are no attacks on Israeli civilians; the Palestinians have been brought to their knees, thanks to the assassination of Palestinian leadership and to the Wall that has locked the unruly natives in their ghettos, wrote the Zionist stalwart. Is it true? Is the resistance over, and has the Holy Land been surrendered to the victor? Well, up to a point:

Palestine can’t be separated from the larger context: the battle for Palestine began in Jerusalem and Gaza, but now it rages in Falujah and Kerbala, notwithstanding the appointment of a CIA agent as a ruler of ‘independent Iraq’; before coming back to Jerusalem, the war against Judeo-American domination probably will spread to Teheran, Damascus and even European capitals. But the Intifada in Palestine unsurprisingly ran out of steam.

The military might of the Jewish state knows no rivals in the Middle East and beyond. Armed to the teeth, equipped with the latest American weaponry and nuclear, chemical and biological weapons of mass destruction, it is probably able to take on any army on earth. Every Israeli man and woman serves in the Army, and his

---

or her military exploits are the necessary requirement for any career, from minister to hairdresser. This militarised settler society easily overpowered the thoroughly disarmed native population.

The usual weapon of a Palestinian is a stone picked up on his hillside; their famed ‘suicide-bombers’ were rather manifestation of their indomitable spirit than a threat to Israel; hardly more than a nuisance from military point of view. Ordinary road accidents kill more Israelis than the Palestinians. None had military training; cordonned off from the outer world, a Palestinian could not obtain arms save those bootlegged by the renegade settlers; no wonder he could not defeat the steely rows of tanks and air-to-ground laser-guided missiles.

Moreover, the Jews have a powerful secret weapon at their disposal — their readiness to ruin the land. Their well-planned artesian wells killed the springs of water and turned the Holy Land into parched desert. This week I walked along the watercourse of Ghor (Arugot, in Hebrew), formerly a perennial stream. Home to mountain goat and leopard, this spring dried up, as the nearby kibbutz of Ein Gedi bored a shaft, laid a pipe and caught the water to bottle and sell in Tel Aviv. The gentle slopes of Samaria are disfigured by new roads to new Jewish suburbs. In the North of Gaza strip, a green land of fragrant orchards is turned into black wilderness of Mordor with smouldering stubs of burned trees. In the ruined land, the settlers prevail over the natives.

And still Krauthammer’s declaration of victory is premature. This immigrants-versus-natives confrontation over the sweet land of Palestine reminds me the *Knight’s Tale*, this first fruit of Chaucer, that tells of two brothers, Arcite and Palamon, madly in love with King’s daughter Emely, “fresh as May with blossoms born anew, all mild and reverent, her body washed with water from a well”.

In order to win her hand, Arcite appealed to the God of War, and Palamon pled to the Goddess of Love. In the decisive tournament, Mars-inspired Arcite defeated the love-stricken Palamon, but he was not destined to wed the fair maiden: after his military victory, he collapsed and suddenly died. The God of War could deliver victory, but only the Goddess of Love could deliver the maiden. The gentle King gave his daughter to the defeated Knight, and “with all bliss and joyous melody this Palamon hath wedded

Is the Intifada over?
Emely”, concludes Chaucer. Thus the English bard prophesied an event unexpected by the hard-nosed Krauthammer: people who love their land will have her, even if military victory will be had by their adversaries.

For the land should be loved as Emely was loved by Palamon, as woman is loved by man; and such a love is beyond the abilities of most Jews. Some of them see in Palestine a symbol of God’s promise to the people of Israel or a pledge of Messianic days, but such symbolic love is doomed to fail. Likewise, my French socialist friend married a Russian girl, for she symbolised Communism and Dostoyevsky, but their marriage broke down under the heavy load of symbolism.

My English politician friend has married to obscure his sexual preferences; he was tired to explain the voters why he did not marry. Likewise, many Jews were tempted to embrace Zionism as they were tired of explaining why they have no land of their own. But tiredness is a poor basis for marriage, and a real woman and a real land weren’t made to provide an excuse.

The worst of all are Krauthammers, the American Jews who believe that a land they did not plough and did not seed can belong to them for they have the deed, like a summer cottage they rarely visit – they know no love, but an impotent sultan’s jealousy to his bought-and-paid-for slave girl.

The settlers proved their lack of true love at their withdrawal from Sinai in 1980s. Leaving these places after a short sojourn, they smashed everything they could lay their hands on, dynamited every house and bulldozed every garden and vineyard planted by native and imported hands. And now, discussing withdrawal from Gaza, the settlers swear they will obliterate all signs of life on their lands before surrendering them to the hated natives. This is not the way to deal with a loved land: a poet spread his tenderness towards his beloved like a carpet under her feet as she forsook him, and wished her to be happy with her new man, “loved as much as he loved her”.

Indeed, Palestinians never damaged their homes and gardens they were forced to leave, and beautiful old Arab houses and gardens in Talbieh and Ain Karim bear witness to their masters’ love to the end. Not only their faith in eventual return kept them back from torching their trees and burning their houses down before
fleeing to the refugee camps of Lebanon and Gaza — but their selfless love for the land and trees.

The Holy Land is a common project by Our Lord God and by her people. He created her, and they attended to her, built her terraces, dug around olives, and worshipped her Lord on her high places. Just as the defeated Palamon won his fair Emely, the vanquished will inherit the land; while victorious in battle will perish unless they surrender to the Goddess of Love, love to the land and her people.
The City of the Beloved

Their names bear a touch of medieval morality plays, but instead of Hope, Penance and Mercy, the three sisters are called Amal, Taura, Tahrir, or Hope, Revolution, and Liberation. Dressed like ordinary college girls they are — they would not stick out at Yale or Tel Aviv University. Their books and CDs are the same ones I saw this morning on my son’s shelf. But their smiles, their wonderful happy smiles and high spirits, are quite out of the ordinary, considering their circumstances.

Fifty years ago their parents were expelled from their ancestral home in the South together with 750,000 Palestinians, and the sisters were born into a family of refugees in Halil. They were born one after another, to make up for the many years of their father’s jail term. He was with them but a short while, as his heart gave up when a settler flung a gas grenade into his sitting room. The youngest sister, Amal, is at high school, while Tahrir is already a sophomore at university, studying architecture, the fine art of dressing thoughts in stone and building homes. Their own home, a modest, three-bedroom stone house with wide windows, set deep in the vineyards of the valley, is doomed.

The messengers of doom stood outside staring at the ruins of the neighbouring house, at its flat roof broken at the centre, and at a grey-haired woman with bright blue eyes who was searching in the vestiges of what was her home until yesterday.
“Yalla, ufi kvar”, screeched a tall Jewish girl, Barbra-or-something, at the old woman. Get lost!

An accompanying army officer was ready to oblige. He repeated the order in Arabic, and, while the woman climbed up from the crater, told Barbra-or-something about what the old woman had told him: “Her new leg”, he said. “Five thousand shekels’ worth. Over one thousand dollars, bought just a month ago. She used it for her better occasions, and yesterday, when we demolished her home, she had on her older limb”.

“No, she lost her leg as a child in 1948, when the Old city of Jerusalem was shelled”, the officer answered the unheard question of a tall, imposing man in an elegant grey suit and a small, head-covering kippa. Meanwhile, two bulldozers pulled away the remainder of the old lady’s home, neatly grabbed the remains of the vineyard and crushed its purple-red leaves into the mud.

At this time of the year, purple-red covers the hills in Halil Country. It is the land of vine, separated by Bethlehem to the north from the land of olive. It is the land of broad terraces, reddish-dry soil, abundant sheep, rare springs, strong faith, and of vine. Though a few hundred years ago the local folk gave up their Orthodox Christian religion and embraced Islam, they still press wine in the millennia-old stone wine presses. In the autumn, the women of Halil sell their heavy, yellow, sweet grapes, still covered by field dust, at Damascus Gate, wearing their long black dresses with exquisite embroidery. When my wife gave birth to our first son, I presented her with just such a black and purple-red dress sewn over many weeks in a village near Halil.

Much as I like the vine land and the people of Halil, it is not a place one visits gladly. As in a Greek tragedy, dreadful doom befalls the city. The sea monster consumed the virgins of Jaffa in the story of Perseus, the Doom of Halil slowly eats up the city and its folk. Day after day, a house is confiscated, a shop torched, a man killed. Now, Halil is the semi-digested object fishermen used to find in the stomachs of decked sharks. It still preserves some features of the ancient, proud city of men, but it is half-eaten. If you ever visited a beautiful, terminally-ill young girl, you know the feeling.

In normal times, Halil country would be much admired, for it is very much the Land of the Bible: its people’s life-style has not changed much. They are the same shepherds and wine-growers,
and the names of their villages are replete with memory. The great Palestinian brigand Daud, later King David, charged protection-money in Maan; the prophet Amos grew up in Tukua; Gad is buried in Halhul. Halil was called Hebron, later St Abraham, later Halil, or the Beloved, for it is a stock epithet of Abraham, the great culture hero of the Middle East. That is the original Judea of kings and prophets: Judean but (despite some similarity of sound) not Jewish, even quite unconnected to the Jews of old, who never ventured into this arid province so far south. The Jewish historian Josephus Flavius did not know of those places; the Jewish books, Talmud and Mishna, hardly mentioned Hebron and Bethlehem. The Jews called the land, ‘Idumea’, and its Judean folk, ‘Idumeans’. (In similar vein, the Jews called the land of Israel ‘Samaria’, and its Israelites ‘Samaritans’, as they wanted to keep the heritage of the Bible for themselves.) The native Judeans, the people of Halil, did not care: they still worked the same fields and worshipped at the same shrines as did their ancestors, the heroes of the Bible.

Most of all, they cherish their Ibrahimiye Mosque, commemorating the Beloved of God, Ibrahim (or Abraham), the spiritual pathfinder for mankind. This massive edifice of rusticated stones was built in the uncharted past. The Crusaders erected a beautiful basilica on the old foundations, and the benevolent rulers of Cairo and Damascus, Istanbul and Baghdad adorned its walls with Islamic verses. The Mosque of Halil exudes holiness and grace as the font of spirit that broke out in the Judean Hills. Yes, that is uniqueness of the Holy Land: while the Almighty gave oil to our neighbours, He gave the Halilis bottomless deposits of divine spirit. While oil runs out, the more spirit is given away, the more of it remains. Probably that is why the enemy made it so hard to get there.

The Old city of Halil is a dense swarm of medieval houses around the Ibrahimiye Mosque. The closely built houses leave but few entrances into the maze. These have been blocked by iron gates and barbed wire, leaving just two openings for access. The openings are controlled by massive checkpoints. The soldiers checked our documents again, searched us and let us into the city of the Beloved- turned-into-the-worst-jail in the Gulag archipelago of Palestine.

My Virgil in this descent to Hell was an unusual man, Jerry Levin from Alabama. An ex-CNN bureau Chief in Lebanon, he spent almost a year in Hezbollah captivity, and since then, he has
lived in the Old City of Halil with a small team of Christian Peacemakers. CPT people bring food to the besieged, try to protect the city’s folk and suffer the abuses and violence of the settlers and the military. Born a Jew, he embraced Christ and cast his lot with the downtrodden of the Earth.

“Do not make too much of my Lebanese prison”, he warned me with a wry smile. “Every man here can tell you of much longer and harsher jail terms”.

Children’s eyes watched us from behind iron bars. The streets were empty: for many months, the natives have not been allowed to tread the paved footpaths of their city. Eternal curfew was imposed here years ago. The shops were broken into and torched by looting settlers; the walls bear graffiti in cursive Hebrew script: “Kill the Goyim; it is good for the Jews”, “Kahane was right”, “Bless your soul, Dr Goldstein”.

We knocked on the iron door of a house and heard sounds of heavy locks being removed. The door opened a crack to let us in. We climbed up the narrow staircase to the roof. The grandiose edifice of the Mosque rises high just two hundred yards away, but the inhabitants rarely venture out that far. Narrow planks connect the roofs of the city and allow the besieged Halilis to visit their neighbours. Their children, like birds, run from roof to roof on planks, or stare through bars at the street below. The streets were privatised by the settlers, so they can walk there in complete peace, undisturbed by Gentile presence. Regularly, the settlers break doors down and attack the citizens, throw their bedding and chairs through windows and beat them up. That is why their doors are barred by heavy wooden beams and locks. They can’t even go out and buy food: it has to be brought in by European and American volunteers. Many escape this unbearable life, leave their homes, vineyards and properties behind and go into exile. In this half-eaten city, only the strongest remain.

Once, my American friend Michael asked me whether the Palestinians are engaged in non-violent struggle. In Halil, every day, every hour, every minute of a Palestinian’s life is a non-violent struggle for existence. T’is pity it is not very successful. Apparently, the monsters need a Perseus to do the persuading.

We walked out into the open. A settler called to us, peering into the dusk under the arches above the narrow lane:
“Arabs! Scram!”
A soldier on the corner calmed him: “They aren’t Arabs. They are internationals”.
“They are even worse”, said the settler, an elderly East European Jew. And he called out in his heavy, accented English: “Go away! You are not wanted here”.
“Neither are you”, we responded, and came out to the Mosque. It was surrounded by three chains of soldiers, mainly recent imports from Ethiopia and Ukraine. We were checked once and once again, asked where from and why, walked through metal-finders and thought-controllers, soldiers’ watchful eyes upon us, full of habitual tireless hate, to the huge cenotaph of Abraham. And yet, I was swept by the aura of holiness coming out of the place, as if my spirit were uplifted on the great tsunami wave. High. Very high. I do not know whether a holy place is holy due to the holy man buried there, or, other way around, they bury holy men in holy places, but certainly it was a holy site.
As I turned around, I saw the settlers who had privatised the spiritual spring. They wore white prayer shawls with black stripes on their shoulders. They saw me.
“That is an Arab!” said one.
“No, he is a German”.
“No, he is an Arab with an Israeli passport; that is why he looks so arrogant”, said the first.
“You Arab?” asked the second.
“Sure”, said I.
“Get out of here, you vermin!” they shouted.
Actually, the settlers do not care much for the Tomb of the Beloved. They have another grave to worship, that of the mass murderer from Brooklyn, Dr Goldstein. He achieved glory in the Purim of 1994. Purim is the only merry feast of the Jewish calendar, the anniversary of a jolly good massacre committed by their ancestors in Persia some twenty-four hundred years ago, when 75,000 men, women and children, were massacred by the avenging Jews.
In the Purim of 1994, Dr Baruch Goldstein came into the Mosque with two machine guns and a lot of spare clips. The watchful soldiers would not let us bring in a nail-file, but they did not stop him. He entered the prayer hall, called ‘Merry Purim!’ and opened fire. He slaughtered some thirty unarmed worshippers, until the
survivors succeeded in killing the rampaging beast. When they carried their wounded and dead out of the mosque, the soldiers opened fire and killed an additional twenty worshippers, calling out ‘Merry Purim!’ When the news of the massacre reached the Knesset, the Israeli Parliament, Hanan Porat, a leader of the Jewish Nationalist Religious Party, blessed the parliamentarians with “Merry Purim”.

Dr Goldstein was buried with much respect and love; his grave became a place of mass pilgrimage for the settlers and their admirers from Israel, America and all over the world. Young, plump Jewish maidens come there, lay flowers and light candles on his tomb. Young Jewish soldiers put their American-made M-16 rifles on his tombstone and ask for the holy man’s assistance and guidance. Young couples exchange vows, old men say Kaddish for his soul.

After the murder, there were voices in Israel calling to remove the settlers from Halil. But the Israeli government used it to punish the victims: half of the Mosque was taken over by the Jews; local worshippers were banned from venerating the Tomb of Abraham the Beloved of God; the entrances of the Old City were sealed; dozens of Palestinian homes were confiscated and erased; the main street of the city was forbidden for Palestinian traffic. There is but little difference in outcome: whether a Jew kills or is killed, the Jewish state always uses it as a pretext to steal more land and punish Palestinians.

Still, on Fridays the settlers would go to the Tomb of Abraham, whom they venerate as Christians and Muslims do, but for a different reason. While for us, Abraham is the spiritual father, a man who found the way to commune with God and showed it to mankind; they claim him for a biological ancestor and justification for the privatisation of the holy place. (Adams, the American of Mark Twain’s short story would beat them by claiming direct descent from Adam.) If they could claim George Washington was a Jew, they would surely privatise the White House. (On second thoughts, they have done that anyway.) This perverse reading sits deep in the Jewish psyche, and Natalie, a nice Israeli journalist who accompanied us, asked me:

“Do local Arabs consider Abraham their ancestor as well?”

“The entire world considers him our spiritual ancestor”, I tried to explain to her the non-biological, spiritual and universal faith
of Abraham. I reminded her that Abraham rejected his father, Muhammad rejected his tribe, and Christ rejected his brothers’ call and said that his brothers-in-spirit are more important than his brothers-in-flesh, but my words could not make a dent on the vision she was imbued with.

On Fridays, the settlers rule supreme in the city. The army imposes especially heavy curfew and does not let a single goy out of his house to blacken the path of a Jew. The soldiers shoot at kids who dare to play outside. The city can’t breathe until the last Jew disappears into the barbed-wire fenced, for-Jews-only compound. Halil is a good place to learn of the real Jewish intentions about how the world is to be run – much better than reading their hypocritical, saccharine-sweet editorials.

But last Friday was different. After the heavy guard accompanied the settlers into their compound and was on the way to barracks, they came under guerrilla fire. The guerrilla fighters did not want to copy the Jewish mass murderer; they let the worshippers pass in peace to their homes, and only after that did they opened fire. A Perseus dropped by to visit the monster.

Israeli soldiers are brainwashed to believe in their racial superiority, in the superiority of their weapons, in the protection of their Supreme Commander Most High, in the natives’ meekness. They were sure the spirit of Halilis was irredeemably crushed. Arrogant and reckless, they rushed into hot pursuit. The fighters retreated into a lane between vineyards, and as the enemy soldiers entered there, they sprung their deadly trap.

The Jihad fighters used the old ruse of weak against strong, first described by Roman historians, later made into a play, *The Horatians and the Curiatians*, by the great German playwright Bertolt Brecht. The two warring Roman clans of Horatians and Curiatians met on the battlefield. The weaker Horatians feigned flight, and when their heavily-armed enemies followed them and spread sparse along the route, they turned back and killed their pursuers, one after another.

The result was nothing short of a miracle: three Jihad warriors with their carbines killed twelve heavily armed Jews, among them the chief tormentor of Halil, Colonel Gauleiter of the city, the Hebron Division Commander. The fighters could not escape: when they made their noble decision to attack only soldiers and let the
settlers pass in peace, they sealed their own fate. Still, they proved their spirit is strong, as strong as foundations of their great shrine.

Often one hears that the Palestinians should act in this or other way. They should not kill the enemy if the enemy takes off his military uniform and goes for a holiday. They should be choosy with their targets, as otherwise it is ‘counter-productive’. The Halil ambush proved this to be but pious nonsense. The attack on the soldiers was the fairest one ever launched against the oppressor. And yet, the US President described it ‘a heinous crime’; the UN Secretary General called it ‘a horrible, bloody deed’ and the misled Pope referred to a ‘massacre of worshippers’. Even the Israeli Chief of Staff laughed at this description and refused to call it a ‘massacre’. Our soldiers died in the battle, he said. But anyway, he ordered the demolition of homes in the ambush lane.

Thus, it does not matter what the Palestinians do, whether they kill Israeli children or fight Israeli soldiers, or even if they are being killed by settlers, they are found guilty anyway, for they did not surrender to the Jews. Those who surrendered without fight won’t forgive them. But the Palestinians of Halil, these most abused people on earth, know the truth. And that is why broad, happy smiles stayed on the innocent faces of the three sisters, Hope, Revolution and Liberation.

The nice Israeli journalist Natalie felt she had to balance her story to make it acceptable to her editors.

“But what would you say about terrorist acts in Tel Aviv against Israeli civilians?” she demanded from the girls whose home was to be demolished. I wonder what my grandfather in the ghetto of Stanislaw would have answered to the question of a German journalist about his feelings for the German victims of Allied air raids. He would probably have answered as the Canadian Jewish columnist Mordecai Richler did: “I’m glad Dresden was bombed for no useful military purpose”.

We stood near the place of the ambush on the broad veranda of the three sisters. Probably our looks betrayed our feelings, for the group of settlers and their entourage turned on us. A settler, a sleek Jew, told us:

1 Quoted by The Vancouver Sun | September 13, 1966, p. 5 ‘Lest We Forget... I Hate the Germans’, Mordecai Richler from The Spectator, Excerpts for an article in the book section of a British Weekly Review.
“You should be on our side”, he said. “You are Jews, aren’t you? It is us or them. Listen to the voice of your blood; support your people against their enemies”.

“Was it necessary to demolish the houses of innocent people just because somebody shot at your soldiers in the vicinity?” asked Jerry.

The imposing, tall man in the grey suit looked at us sternly.

“How do you dare to speak of houses, when human life was extinguished here?” He was an American from New York, a Rabbi Wise.

“Would you demolish a house in New York if one of your people were killed next to it?” asked I.

“Oh yes, we should!” said Rabbi Wise, and a carnivorous, predatory smile disclosed his feelings. He would. He would erase Harlem if a Black were to kill a Jew. For the Rabbis Wise of this world, the life and property of a goy is of no consideration, just a wasps’ nest to be removed. In Halil, or Khevron, as they call it, they enact their dreams free of limitations.

In this city of nasty settlers and brutal soldiers, there was no man as vile as this Rabbi Wise. The settlers turned life of local people into hell, and the soldiers protected them, but they did his will, and he brought them billions of dollars taken from the Americans, and covered for them in corridors of the Congress. I felt great pity for the Americans, the industrious and generous folk, sold down the river by their politicians and turned into slaves of Mordor.

“You are Jews, aren’t you, – insisted the sleek settler.

“If you are, we certainly are not”, I replied.

I felt it was impossible to remain a Jew in Halil. Indeed, the Jews who feel that demonstrating against their government’s policies is not enough, are now doing the unthinkable with greater ease. In the most unexpected way, the vicious Zionist [anti-] Christian cultists’ dream of the Jews coming to Christ on the ruins of Palestine may yet come true, as ever more Jews who face real, victorious Judaism in the inferno of Hebron turn away in disgust. The cultists were right but for the wrong reason: the gathering of Jews in the Holy Land will bring the good people to light, as they will see this total darkness undisguised and reject it.

That is why the Intifada is so important: it could be the beginning of universal world-wide Intifada. It should not stop at the borders of the Holy Land. I know this thought is foreign to
Palestinians. They fight for their villages and towns, for their equality and freedom to live and worship at their shrines. For them, if the settlers were to lose their privilege, the problem will be over. But for Rabbi Wise and his ilk, their slavery and possession of Palestine is the necessary worldly proof of their achievement, and they won’t let it off lightly. It all comes back to the morality play: Hope of Halil is but a sister of Liberation of Discourse and of the World Intifada.
A dreadful monster assaults the city, kills its brave defenders, and advances to devour the citizens. At the last moment, a young maiden demurely walks forward to meet the monster. Her very sight, the sight of feminine innocence, vulnerability, spirituality, certainty of the right cause, stops the ogre in its tracks. The beast suffers her to tie her belt to his mighty neck and walks away, tamed. It is the story of St Genevieve and of other beautiful and virtuous saints; a part and parcel of human heritage, and the subject of many gorgeous tapestries and paintings.

Courageous and noble maidens are still with us. They stopped the US Army trains with soldiers during Vietnam War, and they stopped Russian tanks in Prague 1968 and in Moscow 1991. Drivers of French, Russian, American and German tanks and trains knew: even a monster stops when a girl placidly places herself on his way. It is a biological law that we all are subject to.

Rachel Corrie was murdered by a monster from another tale. This young American girl, an ISM activist, tried to stop with her fragile body a Zionist bulldozer from ruining Palestinian homes. She could not imagine that the driver will look at her and calmly ride his sixty-five-ton steel machine over her body, and back. Nothing in her life prepared her to the encounter with a monster born and bred in the Zionist labs, a monster that is totally alien and hostile to humans. She wrote to her parents: “no amount of reading, attendance at conferences, documentary viewing and
word of mouth could have prepared me for the reality of the situation here. You just can’t imagine it unless you see it, tank-shell holes in the walls of their homes and the towers of an occupying army surveying the [Palestinian children] constantly from the near horizons”.

Though she saw dead bodies of Palestinian children with their heads split by the Jewish sharp-shooters, she still had some illusions of “the difficulties the Israeli Army would face if they shot an unarmed US citizen”. She was mistaken. Her country’s President is about to send the US Army to destroy Iraq and turn the killers of Rachel into the undisputed supreme power of the Middle East. If Bush would be guided by America’s interests, he would demand extradition of Rachel’s killer. But the driver is not exclusion. The people behind the bullet-proof windshields of Caterpillars are the final product of Zionism. At the beginning of Zionist movement, its eugenic task was expressed in a poem:

“Mi dam umi eza Nakim lanu geza” — “out of blood and sweat we shall breed a new victorious and cruel race”, sang the Zionists. With murder of Rachel Corrie the experiment came to its fruition. The “cruel race” is not a dream anymore, it is a new geopolitical reality. A few months ago, a Jewish bulldozer driver shared with the world his experiences\(^1\) of razing Jenin:

“I had no mercy for anybody. I would erase anyone with the D-9, and I have demolished plenty. I wanted to destroy everything. I begged the officers, over the radio, to let me knock it all down; from top to bottom. To level everything. When I was told to bring down a house, I took the opportunity to bring down some more houses. For three days, I just destroyed and destroyed. The whole area. I wanted to get to the other houses. To get as many as possible. I didn’t see, with my own eyes, people dying under the blade of the D-9. But if there were any, I wouldn’t care at all. If you knocked down a house, you buried 40 or 50 people. If I am sorry for anything, it is for not tearing the whole camp down. I had lots of satisfaction in Jenin, lots of satisfaction. No one expressed any reservations against doing it. Who would dare speak? If anyone would as much as open his mouth, I would have buried him under the D-9”.

\(^1\) [http://www.voicesofpalestine.org/outrageous/Jenindozer.asp](http://www.voicesofpalestine.org/outrageous/Jenindozer.asp)
Rachel’s dreadful death should open America’s eyes to the real danger to the world that grew in the Middle East. Her killers possess nuclear weapons, not only bulldozers. If Bush is so keen on a Middle East intervention and on removal of WMD, his troops could land here, on the shores of ar-Rafah, where is a real threat to the world’s peace, and forcibly remove all the weapons of mass destruction.
Tsunami in Gaza

While the whole world had sent aid to the tsunami-hit South East Asia, Israel forwarded a team entrusted with unique task. Not many Israeli tourists were swept away by the giant waves – official death toll stands at three, with some twenty missing; not many comparing with hundred thousand Indonesians or even with three hundred Swedes. Still the Israeli teams were very active on the ground. The highly trained experts led by Rabbi Meshi Zahav did not go to save trapped survivors or alleviate suffering of millions; their job was to save dead Jews from fate worse than death – that is to be buried with the goyim in the same grave. The *Haaretz* daily¹ reported: “The Israeli rescue teams in Thailand split up Thursday: one team worked on identifying bodies in Krabi, while another worked on the same task in Phuket. The Israeli crews – from the police and Zaka (a non-profit group that specializes in identifying victims of disasters) – are trying to locate dead Israelis before they are buried”.

They pressed upon the Thai government to postpone the mass entombment, though it was necessary to prevent spread of epidemics; and Bangkok gave in. Every dead Jewish body should be taken to Israel, or at least buried separately from impure non-Jews. Witty Gilad Atzmon remarked: “the ‘altruistic’ Jews ... are in a state of panic, as we all know, dead Jews are precious, they deserve a spe-

¹ http://www.haaretz.com/hasen/spages/521450.html
cial burial. The fact that 5-10 Jews might be lost forever among some other 125,000 gentiles is pretty horrifying, I am sure you can see it.”

This is a part and parcel of Jewish faith, the pinnacle of “The Nation Shall Dwell Alone” commandment — Jews are not supposed to live or to die with non-Jews. Their separate burial is necessary to guarantee their bodily resurrection when Messiah comes. A Jewish body defiled by gentile proximity won’t be resurrected, according to the Jews. Even irreligious Jews follow this separation rule without giving it a second thought.

This squeamish attitude is particularly unpleasant: whenever the Jews discover that a person of doubtful Jewishness is buried among their lot they remove the body and dump it elsewhere. It happened to an Israeli citizen Teresa Angelowitz. She was buried in the Jewish cemetery; later on the religious authorities discovered that she was a wife of a Jew, but not a Jew. They exhumed her body at the dark of the night and re-buried on the dumping ground. It happened to many Russian soldiers who died defending the Jewish character of Israel and were refused the burial. Now, in face of the huge tragedy in South East Asia, this insistence of “not being counted among the goyim” is especially offensive, bordering on denial of our common humanity. What is so bad about Thais, French, Chinese and other people who found their death in the catastrophe that you can’t leave your dead lying next to them?

This nasty exclusiveness has to be taken into account while trying to comprehend the long-running show of Israeli redeployment in Gaza. Sharon’s government wants to withdraw its troops from within the strip to its perimeter. Fine and good: this is a reasonable (from his point of view) decision: it is cheaper to keep Gaza under lock and key, surrounded by Israeli troops. The redeployment is not good neither bad for the Palestinians — the Jews will be able to kill whoever they wish from their bases outside the narrow strip, but this act is presented as an important step on the way to creation of a Palestinian state.

Now, instead of redeployment, Israelis discuss the fate of some (probably two thousand) Jewish settlers in Gaza strip. Sharon wants to evacuate them and pay them hefty compensation; they object to evacuation. The whole Israeli society discuss-
es whether they can be removed; how much force should be applied; whether “Jews may remove Jews”; whether the ruling of the Rabbis forbidding the evacuation takes precedence over the government decision.

Nobody, but absolutely nobody is ready to consider an obvious (for a non-Jew) solution: remove the army and leave the settlers where they are. If they want to stay in Gaza, let them. Do not pay a penny for their removal: they are free men and women; they knew what they did when they accepted the lands and houses in Gaza. There are hundreds of American Jews who want to buy their houses, there are Palestinians who will be willing to buy – so there is no problem, whoever wants stays, whoever wants to leave sells his house and leaves. If they will be nasty to their neighbours, they will flee; if they will be good neighbours, they will flourish.

Indeed, when the British Empire left Palestine, or India, or Africa, they did not evacuate their citizens by force. Whoever felt that he caused too much grief to the natives, left for England; whoever preferred to stay – stayed.

Kenya is a good case to consider. The country had a sizeable English settler community; there was also very active Mau-Mau native resistance, much more violent than the Palestinian; still, when Kenya was granted independence, the settlers stayed. I have met them in the Highlands near Lake Rudolf: prosperous farmers, strong and sunburned, similar to old-style Israelis, they speak local language, are involved in local life. Many of them have their small airplanes and pop into Nairobi for an evening drink whenever they get tired from watching pink flamingos at the lakeside. The settlers try to be good neighbours to the native people – after all, the political power in hands of native Kikuyu; and RAF is not likely to defend them.

This is the example for the Israeli settlers to emulate, while the Israeli government should not tell them what to do and where to live. Their settlements won’t be “for Jews only”. They will have native neighbours, not only farm hands, but native officials, native police and native judges – but this consideration did not stop thousands of Brits and French, Portuguese and Spaniards, Russians and Germans to remain in the newly independent countries. The evacuation discourse that brought Israel to the verge of civil war
can’t be comprehended outside of the general nasty picture of Jewish exclusiveness.

Only people, who can’t bear the thought of being buried in one grave with a goy, can’t imagine the possibility of staying as equals without the army and colonial administration to enforce their superiority. Azmi Bishara, our MP from Nazareth, was right when he refused to support Sharon’s initiative; while the Labour party of Peres and Barak added another shameful deed to its long roll of shame when they joined Sharon’s government to carry on the ‘disengagement’. The case of the Gaza settlers may be used to undermine and destroy the “Jewish character of the state”. There is no reason to play into the game of Jewish exclusivity, whether in Thailand or in Gaza.
St Barbara of Aboud

Aboud is one of the prettiest Palestinian villages, strongly reminiscent of Tuscany. Its time-mellowed stone houses grow on the gentle hills. Vine climbs up their balconies, leafy fig trees provide shadow to its streets. The prosperity of this well-established village is seen in the spaciousness of the mansions, in the meticulously clean roads. The old men sit in a small and shady, walled enclosure, on the stone benches, like the aldermen of Ithaca gathered by young Telemachus. That is the biblical “gate of the city”, or a diwan. Kids bring them coffee and fresh fruits. Local people are not the refugees of Gaza and Deheishe; here, as in a time warp, one can see the Holy Land as it should and could be.

Three millennia old Aboud received the faith of Christ from Christ himself, says the local tradition, and there is the church ready to prove it, one of the oldest on earth, built in the days of Constantine in the 4th century, or maybe even older, as some archaeologists say. The church is a dainty thing, carefully restored and well taken care of. The Byzantine capitals of its columns bear the image of cross and palm branches. They recently discovered a plaque in old Aramaic script immured in the southern wall of the church.

There are other churches as well: a Catholic, a Greek Orthodox and an American-built Church of God. There is also a new mosque, as Christians and Muslims of the Holy Land live together in great
harmony. On December 17th the Muslims and the Christians go together to the old Byzantine church of St Barbara, a local girl and the village patron saint. It is one of these bitter-sweet semi-ruined churches that still attract worshippers, along with St Anne of Safurie and Emmaus of Latrun, and it stands on a hill a mile away from the village. It would be called St Barbara-without-the-walls if it were in England. At the foothill, at the saint's burial cave, the peasants lit candles and ask for her intercession. In the misty post-Vatican-II days the Catholic Church decided to exclude the Palestinian martyr St Barbara from the list of recognised saints, but she remained a favourite one for the Eastern Churches. There are beautiful new edifices of St Barbara in Florida and Washington, while her breathtaking image by Vasnetsov, a great Russian painter of fin-de-ciccle, shines at the believers in St Vladimir Cathedral in Kiev, Ukraine. A few years ago, the community of Aboud restored the shrine to some extent and renewed Sunday worship.

On the thirty-first of May 2002 the Israeli army dynamited St Barbara, the living relic of the Christian past of the Holy Land. I do not know whether the sappers said the benediction prescribed for such occasions by the Jewish religious codex, Shulkhan Aruch: “Blessed you are, Our Lord, Who destroys the Assemblies of Proud”. The destruction followed the Bethlehem siege; when for the proverbial forty days and forty nights, from the Catholic Good Friday to the Orthodox Easter Sunday, the Jews besieged the Church of Nativity. The destruction passed so quietly, attracting so little attention, that it will probably be continued.

Christianity is the traditional adversary of the Jews. “Against Christians, the Jews rage with an insatiable fury”, witnessed Origen \(^1\) in 2nd century, and in 19th century, Freud confirmed, “Our worst enemy is the Church”, and Graetz the historian seconded: “We must beyond all work to shutter Christianity”. In the election campaign of 2003, the churches starred as the threatening symbol of hate in the Israeli TV prime time.

My friend Miriam from New York, a nice person and a friend of Palestine, learned of the sacrilege and wrote to me: “It is not only churches; they destroy everything meaningful”.

---

\(^1\) commentary to Ps 36  
\(^2\) H. Graetz, Tagbuch und Briefe, Tubingen 1977 p 287
Well, she is right saying they destroy not only churches. In nearby Nablus, they drove a tank into the Green Mosque, the oldest extant structure built above the cave where Jacob lamented his lost son Joseph. One of the great shrines of Palestine, contemporary with St Barbara, it was a Byzantine church, and later served as a Samaritan synagogue, the centre of worship for local Israelites-not-Jews. Samaritan priests pointed it out to me. A holy place is always attended in the Holy Land, and it again was converted to a church and beautified by Queen Melisende, the pious flirt and the builder of the Holy Sepulchre. It reverted to a mosque eight hundred years ago, when the cathedrals of Chartres and Köln were erected. The mosque was celebrating its fifteen-hundredth anniversary when an Israeli tank broke its wall. Just to show their impartiality, they also bombed the St Philip Episcopal church in Nablus and put St Luke Hospital under curfew.

Miriam is right saying they destroy everything of spirit. It includes nature, as nature is the great source of inspiration. In Jerusalem there was a great spring, the biggest spring of the Highlands. It gave birth to Jerusalem, and it is the reason for the city’s existence. It has a plethora of names: Gihon, Shiloah (in the Bible), Ein Sittna Miriam, after the Virgin, Ein Silwan, after the nearby village. Many events are connected with this living spring. King David’s soldiers climbed up its shaft, Jesus healed blind men at its pool, King Hezekiah bored a half-kilometre-long tunnel to keep its waters within the walls, away from the reach of the Assyrian army. It is forever venerated, and an old mosque stands at its lower exit. Many times in the hot days of July I waded breast-deep the tunnel’s cool length, drinking its sweet water and biding time to emerge at the fig tree above broken Roman columns of the pool.

Then, over a year ago, Ehud Olmert, self-styled ‘Mayor’ of Jerusalem, the great destroyer of Palestinian homes, seized the spring. He locked the entrance, set a Russian guard and a few soldiers, then transferred it lock, stock and barrel to settlers. The Palestinians were not allowed to approach it anymore. Nowadays, the spring is dead. Instead of pure water, the city sewage flows through its tall tunnel. It suffered the fate of many other springs of Palestine. Some have been fenced, others covered with concrete, eliminated by pumping stations or poisoned by sewage. All were killed by the Jews.
I hear a voice. “Oh no! Say ‘Zionists!’” I would, but it seems unfair to the Jewish people abroad. They work so hard; they demonstrate in support of Israel everywhere from Brussels to San Francisco; they collect funds for Israeli soldiers; they sue everybody who supports Palestine; they keep news about blown-up Byzantine churches out of your newspapers. Don’t you think they deserve to be considered as full-blown partners in the Zionist enterprise?

“They make life so miserable that the Palestinians will leave”, wrote ever-so-rational Miriam. Here I tend to disagree. Recently I saw just outside the village of Aboud two giant American-built Caterpillar bulldozers, huge, armour plated, moving fortresses. They towered above the landscape as the mechanical monsters of the Evil Empire and slowly devoured the olive trees. That is their purpose. To destroy. Not just churches, not only mosques, but everything that reminds of Spirit, from olives of anointment to springs of blessing. It is their service to the Faceless Destroyer and their curse.

For they destroy even things they intend to save. A beautiful ancient domed shrine at the Tomb of Rachel was one of the sweetest memorials of the Holy Land. It was not exclusively Jewish, but Jews always had an access to it, together with the Palestinian women who came to ask for her intercession before childbirth. In order to make it exclusively their own, the Jews surrounded the shrine by high wall and for all reasons destroyed it. They are doomed to create a lifeless, spiritless ghetto wherever they are.

The Belgian 19th century writer Charles de Coster1 concludes his description of horrible deeds of Phillip II who burned and tortured devout Dutch Protestants with the words: “He found no pleasure in torture”. That is the Jewish fate in the Holy Land: to destroy the vestiges of Spirit and to have no pleasure out of it.

P.S. As an anticlimax, I propose to my readers that they calculate the ratio of Jewish influence in their newspaper in the following way: divide the coverage of a synagogue wall dirtied with graffiti (in square inches of print) by the coverage of the venerable Byzantine church of St Barbara destruction (in square inches of print). Just to remind you: a ratio with the denominator ‘zero’ equals ‘infinity’.

---

1 La Légende et les aventures héroïques, joyeuses, et glorieuses d’Ulenspiegel et de Lamme Goedzak au pays de Flandres et ailleurs (1867)
In the Upper church of Annunciation in Nazareth, there is a striking collection of images, the homage of artists to Mary: in a setting of blue-and-golden flowers, a dainty Virgin in a colourful kimono holds her child in ceremonial Japanese royal robes; a naive Gothic face of Madonna, transferred from French Cluniac illuminations; a Chinese Queen of Heaven carved of precious wood by Formosa devotees; a richly inlaid Cuban statue of Virgen del Cobre; a Polish Black Madonna; a tender face of the Byzantine Mother of God, and a modernist, steely Madonna from the United States all look from the walls of the church and unite us in one human family. There is hardly an image in the world as universal and poignant as that of the Virgin and the Child.

Wherever you go, from Santiago de Compostella in the far west of Spain to the golden domes of Russia, from frozen Uppsala in Sweden to Hagia Sophia in Constantinople, you will find this adorable face. The best artists depicted her compassionate features, her love for her child and her sorrow. Botticelli painted her with a pomegranate and among the Kings of the East; Michelangelo and Rafael, Cimabue and Titian, van der Weyden and Fra Filippo Lippi were inspired by her image. This unique mix of a young girl and mother, of vulnerability and protection, of admiration and love, formed the spiritual and inspirational base of our civilisation.
She appeared to a Mexican peasant, and her flower-covered image arrested the strife and united Native Americans and Spaniards in one nation. She gave her rosary to Saint Dominic and a letter to Portuguese kids in Fatima. Prophet Muhammad saved and cherished her icon found in the Mecca shrine, writes Maxim Rodinson. She appeared to a wealthy Jewish banker Alphonse Ratisbonne, and he took orders and built the convent of the Sisters of Zion in En Karim. A Palestinian Muslim in a refugee camp of Lebanon preserved the image he took from his native Galilee, tells Elias Khoury in his novel Bab Al-Shams (recently translated into Hebrew by Moshe Hakham and edited by Anton Shammas). Syrian astronauts asked for her protection in the shrine of Seidnaya before their flight on the Soviet space shuttle.

In medieval legends, the Jews were often perceived as enemies of the Virgin. The Talmud refers to her in most blasphemous and hostile way. A certain column-stump on Jerusalem’s Via Dolorosa marks the place of a legendary attack of Jews on her person, while in Antioch in 592, Jews were found despoiling her image. These are old tales. And now some new facts. This week in Bethlehem, a Jew shelled the Virgin. A Jewish soldier in the formidable tank Merkava-3, constructed according to US technology at US taxpayer’s expense fired a shell from a distance of fifty yards at the statue of the Madonna atop the Holy Family church in the Nativity town.

The Virgin lost an arm, and her pretty face was disfigured. She became one of a hundred Palestinian women shot by the Jews in the present outburst of war. This seemingly unnecessary act of vandalism could not have been an accidental shot. No terrorist hid behind her gentle figure on the pinnacle of the hospital church. At fifty yards, you make no mistake. It could have been orders; it could have been a spontaneous expression of feelings by a Jewish fanatic. Our worldrewinds full speed back into the Dark Ages, and as Israel rekindled traditional Jewish hostile rejection of Christianity, it cannot be excluded.

Whatever it was meant to be, that shrapnel-shot became the most recent check of the mind-control system: will this sacrilege become widely known? And will it stir the hearts of Christendom? It remained unknown, for Christendom did not respond to the

---

1 W. Dalrymple, From the Holy Mountain
The siege of the Nativity as much as Muslims did at the Jewish fundamentalists’ sacrilege at Haram a-Sharif. The doubly-negative result of the check probably confirmed the greatest hopes of its initiators. The world mass media, from New York to Moscow via Paris and London, has been secured in the grip of philosemites; not a squeak gets out unless authorised. The current Israeli invasion of Ramallah and Bethlehem was covered under the heading “Sharon looks for peace”. The UN resolution equalized the aggressors and their victims, sotto voce. The Western mainstream media dropped a blanket of silence on the cries from the Holy Land. Alexander Cockburn writes this week:

“\textit{It\’s supposedly the third rail in journalism even to have a discussion of how much Jews control the media. Jude Wanniski remarked last week in his daily \textit{Memo on the Margin} in his Web newsletter \textit{Supply Side Investor} that it was certainly true to say that the Jews control discussion of Israel in the media here}”.\footnote{http://www.nypress.com/ Billy Graham: War Criminal}

Indeed, the story was reported by Reuters and this dreadful picture was taken by an AP photographer. It was available to the world media. Still, no important newspaper or magazine printed it. Instead, they published stories of Christian anti-Semitism.

The conscience of the West suffers a mirror vision of the Middle East. Terrorist actions have been perpetrated by Jews against Palestinians, but the very name ‘Palestinians’ came to epitomise terrorism. Palestinians are facing holocaust; Jewish soldiers are printing numbers on their foreheads and forearms, separating men from women and sending them into concentration camps, but Jewish holocaust-memorials spread like mushrooms. Israel and the US disregard the international law, but their adversaries are branded ‘rogue nations’.\footnote{See Francis Boyle in CounterPunch 14.3.02}. While Palestinian towns are invaded by Israeli tanks, the \textit{Wall Street Journal} publishes an article \textit{Israel under Siege} by the illegal ‘Mayor’ of Jerusalem Ehud Olmert. Churches are shelled, Gospel books burnt, Christians persecuted by the Jews in Palestine, but it is Christian anti-Semitism that worries news editors and churchmen.

The accusation of anti-Semitism became the blood libel of our days. Or was it always? In the \textit{Merchant of Venice}, Shylock com-
plained of Gentile hatred, though it is he who hated, and the others disproved of his loan-sharking practices. Instead of cutting the loan rate, he preferred to cut Antonio’s flesh, and hide behind his claims of discrimination. If Shakespeare’s Portia had our modern attitude, she would rather let Shylock have his pound of flesh than stop him and be accused of anti-Semitism.

Probably in such a spirit, the guardians of the public conscience decided to spike or play down the sacrilege in Bethlehem. The quietude of the West should frighten us well beyond the Middle Eastern context, as it possibly means our civilisation is dead.

Civilisation can’t survive if its sacral heart ceased to beat. When faith loses its relevance, civilisation dies, historian-philosopher Arnold Toynbee wrote in explanation of ancient Egypt’s collapse. There is no life without sacral, seconded the philosophy-of-religion scholar, Mircea Eliade. Whether we accept philosophy of history, or mystic reading, or pragmatic sociological studies; whether we follow Durkheim or Heidegger, the conclusion is the same: indifference to the fate of the Virgin of Bethlehem bodes ill for the Western Christian civilisation. It implies that the Europeans and Americans have lost the sacral core, and our profaned civilisation is doomed to extinction, unless we’ll turn away from the edge of the abyss.
Part Two
The Jews and Palestinians: First Encounter

I

The Palestinian Highlands, the heart of the Middle East, a beautiful land of hills and deep valleys, has had a quite stable and permanent population since seven thousand years ago. This modest land had no great resources, and trading routes bypassed it. The Palestinians of old cultivated the olive tree and the vine, walked with their flocks, and worshipped God, perceived as a sacral couple, as Ying and Yang principles, on the hilltops, in the sacred groves, near springs and at great old venerable trees. The male Deity was the Spirit, the female Deity was the Earth, and together they created the world as we know it. Man is feminine in comparison with Heaven, and masculine in relation to Earth. This faith still reverberates in our veneration of Our Lady, Her Son and the local saints, this link to the beautiful earth-bound and spirit-related tradition.

The Palestinians of old had an epic cycle of stories of the tribes of Bne Israel, their legendary ancestors. Their cultural heroes, Abraham and David, star in many stories, like their contemporaries Prometheus and Achilles. Those were stories about ‘good old days’, like stories of King Arthur of Britain, but more than that. These stories described Man’s way to God as it was discovered by Abraham the spiritual path-finder. Thus, the Palestinians created the narrative of the Bible, and some parts of it were written down. They never established a powerful state, and stories of David and Solomon were just that: attractive stories. Their small states were subdued by Assyria and Babylon, and since then they were well
integrated in the Bilad as-Sham, or the Fertile Crescent, still preserving their identity as a mountain folk.

The Jews, a religious fraternity, or a mystery religion community, came into being between the 5th and the 3rd centuries BC, in the big cities of the Middle East – from Susa of Persia and Ctesiphon of Babylonia to Antioch of Syria and Alexandria of Egypt. In those years, the old world collapsed and a new world came into being. Tremendous upheavals of Babylonian, Persian and Macedonian conquests ruined villages and small towns. Uprooted peasants, priests of destroyed temples, nobility without estates were drawn into the first big cosmopolitan cities. They had to do without traditional support, without their local gods and shrines. They responded by forming supportive fraternities, related to the cults of Isis and Mithra, or Orphic, Eleusinian and Dionysian mysteries. The *Encyclopaedia Britannica* writes:

The different mystery religions were not exclusive of one another, but they appealed to different sociological groups. The middle class of the Greek and Roman cities preferred the Dionysiac societies, the festivals of which were a cult of beauty and merriment. Isis was worshipped by lower middle class people in the seaports and trading towns. The followers of the Great Mother in Italy were principally craftsmen. Mithra was the god of soldiers and of imperial officials and freedmen.

Thus, it was not ethnic origin, but affinity of temperament that caused people to choose their mystery religion. One of the fraternities chose the Unseen God, Who chose them. They called their God by the name of the ancient deity of desert and thunder, Yahw, and themselves, the adepts of Yahw, Yahwids. (Though the name of the deity was Semitic, the ending was a Greek one, as the cities spoke Greek. The word also reminded of the tribe of Yehwda, Judah) That is the origin of the self-appellation of Jews, ‘YeHWDim’. While describing the contemporary cult of Isis, *Encyclopaedia Britannica* writes:

The higher grades of the Isis Mysteries were reserved to persons born of the priest caste of Egypt. To be born into this caste was more important than talent or skill. This limited the quality of the priests and was
a serious disadvantage in the community’s competition with other religions. But a second way of advancement within the religious group was devised for men of Greek or Roman origin. In Egypt, there was a group of elevated laymen — the porters of the holy shrine (pastophori). They were inferior in rank to everyone of the priest caste; but in Greek and Roman countries the rank of the pastophori became a surrogate for the native priest caste of Egypt. The pastophori were, in fact, the religious leaders of the communities.

In a similar way, the priesthood of the Jews was that of the priest caste of Jerusalem temple, and Pharisees were the equivalent of Pastophori of Isis cult. The fraternity members were not mainly people of the small principality of Judah, a tiny place on the map of Middle East, which had lost its short-lived statehood many years before. The people of Judah did not call themselves ‘Jews’, nor ‘Yehudim’, but later, this proximity of names created a myth of the Judean origin of the Jews. Such puns are commonplace in historical folklore: Modern Russian nationalists derive the Russian self-appellation, ‘Russki’, from the old Italic tribe of Etruscans. Israelis derive the name of Jerusalem, Yerushalem, from shalom, peace, instead of Salem, the Semitic god of sunsets. Visitors to troubled Jerusalem would be the first to admit: the city has more wonderful sunsets than peaceful days.

Paradoxically, the leaders of the Jews — Jerusalem priests and non-Palestinian Pharisees — identified themselves with Israel, the big neighbour and eternal adversary of Judah. They adopted a cycle of Palestinian Bne Israel stories and traditions, compiled the old texts, edited them, connected, deleted, added and created the Old Testament as we know it. They used the stories and traditions of Bne Israel as the Dorian bard of 8th century BC, Homer, used ‘the court epic of Mycenaean Greece’ (words of Robert Graves in The Anger of Achilles) while composing Iliad and Odyssey, or, as did Peisistratus, the tyrant of Athens in 6th c BC, who published the texts of Homer.

The new Bible preached monotheism, or the denial of local spirits and manifestations of God. Traditional Palestinian faith, and the faith of other ‘territorial’ nations, filled the Earth with signs of the Divine presence. The new ‘extra-territorial’ Jewish approach to God may remind us of the museum curators’ attitude
to art: the Jews ‘removed all traces of God’ from small shrines of Palestine to their great Temple in Jerusalem. For this reason they destroyed temples and shrines in Shechem and elsewhere. As Le Louvre concentrated the masterpieces of art and left the towns and cities of France bereaved, the Temple of Jerusalem was a giant Hoover that concentrated Spirit in one place and left the rest of the land spirit-less.

Metaphysically it corresponded to the great concentration of spirit in One God, and it left the world of their perceptions devoid of spirit. The Israeli archaeologist Israel Finkelstein of Tel Aviv University noticed in his popular The Bible Unearthed¹ that the Deuteronomic source of the Bible elevated King Josiah to the highest place in its hierarchy, for he destroyed all sanctuaries of the land save one in Jerusalem. It is not all that clear to what extent the description of Josiah’s deeds corresponds to the real historical facts, and one may prefer the careful position of Thomas Thompson of Copenhagen University who views all ancient ‘history’ of Israel and Judea as an after-construction of much later days. It does not matter, for us, whether the Jewish leaders and theologians received some tradition from the old days of Josiah, or invented it, for it became the foundation of their anti-territorial faith.

Christianity undid this metaphysical knot. Every Christian Church is the Temple. Every priest is the High Priest. Toulouse and Minsk are as sacred as Jerusalem. The faith of Christ and the Virgin was universal and local, at once. Veneration of local saints fully restored the fabric broken by the editors of the Hebrew Bible. Christ reversed the action of the Jewish Hoover, emptied Jerusalem of the excessive burden and filled the earth again with spirit. The Jewish temple was destroyed — it was the end of the spiritual dotcom bubble.

But the Jews still wish to reverse the process. There are dreams of destruction of all churches, crystallised in a special blessing of the Lord who overturns the shrines of the ungodly. A Jew is supposed to say it whenever he sees a deserted or ruined church. There are dreams of restoration of the Jewish temple in Jerusalem on the site of the al-Aqsa mosque, expressed in a public campaign and in erection of the cornerstone of the Temple. Even Shimon Peres, a

¹ co-authored with Neil Asher Silberman.
‘secular’ Jew, called for creating the world capital in Jerusalem and to fulfil the eternal dream of Jews. However, their dreams are others’ nightmares. The world needs no capital, no central temple, for all the Earth is His Temple.

The new Bible contained other troubling ideas. The original theological thought of Man usually contained the memory of the loving union of Heaven and Earth, mirrored in the love of Man and Woman. Interpreting the old myths of creation, the Gnostics taught of the primeval union of Gaia the Earth and the Spirit of God. The soul of Adam was consubstantial to Christ, and St Luke counts generations from Adam to Jesus. The Gospels spoke of the Union of the Virgin Mother with the Spirit of God that begets Christ. The union of Man and Woman is to remind us of the cosmic embrace that gave birth to Man, and that was the central part of the mysteries performed in the temples of old.

The new Bible undermined the position of woman: an all-male God created an all-male Man, while Woman brought God’s Anger upon him. In the later Talmudic stories Adam did not touch Eve for a hundred and thirty years after the Exile from Paradise. Denial of Earth is connected (identical to) Rejection of Woman. In Palestine before the Jews Woman was as sacral as Man, and their union was sacral, too. Priestesses of love were called ‘kedesha’, ‘holy women’, in the ancient Biblical texts. (Modern translations offer the rather misleading term, ‘temple prostitute’).

Christianity undid this knot, too. The New Eve washed off the sin of the old one. The cult of Our Lady overturned the Judaic scheme. Once again, Woman – Virgin, Mother, Earth, Nature – was venerated by Man.

As much as She is venerated by Man, She is hated by adepts of the Jewish values. ‘Blessed is the Lord for he did not create me a woman’, a Jewish man is supposed to say daily. Their fight against veneration of Our Lady manifests in their involvement with pornography. The Jewish publishers of Playboy and Penthouse, these flagmen of porn, contributed hugely to the effort to profane love and degrade Woman. The first fruit of the Cabal-promoted US victory in Afghanistan over ‘fundamentalists’ was fresh delivery of smut to the local market.

Marx noticed that pornography de-contextualised Woman’s body and commodified it. But it also undermined the worship of
the Virgin. A person whose eye is constantly bombarded by images of naked women is not likely to stand and behold in ecstasy the tender face of the Madonna.

Sigmund Freud, in the vein of Friedrich Engels and Marcus Aurelius, offered his interpretation of Heavenly Love as a substitute (sublimation) of earthly sex drive. If a man has enough sex, he won’t be interested in Divine love, said Freud. He was mistaken, but the two feelings are indeed connected. Why do Jews move their bodies at prayer, a Tsadik was asked, and he replied as a Sufi could reply: we copulate with the female face of God, Shechina. This connection of sex and worship found its sublime (not sublimated!) form in the worship of the Virgin. Freud’s thought could come only to a man who never experienced Grace or the love of a woman, to a spiritual and sensual impotent, but the idea fitted with the vulgar materialism of his time.

Still, Love remained the subject of the Bible; love of the Fraternity (they called it ‘Israel’) and its God. Thus the Fraternity became a Deity. Eventually it became the only Deity, for God Almighty was removed from this world. Marx wrote: “the jealous God of Israel is money”. But actually, the true God of Israel is Israel. The Jews worship Israel, i.e. themselves.

Christianity and Islam undid this knot in two ways. Christianity created the idea of the New Israel, the Church, an all-embracing community (the Ummah of Islam), and returned to the original idea of the Covenant of Man and God, as it was perceived by Abraham and Moses. ‘Abraham was not a Jew, he was a Haneef, i.e., a man who sought God, in the words of the Prophet Muhammad. Love of Man and God took the place of the Love of the Community and its God.

The Jews retained their narcissistic self-deification. (The late Israeli playwright Hanoch Levin, parodied it in his early play, the Bathroom Queen1). The self-deification of the Jews created the

---

1 In a short novella The Courting, an Israeli girl called Hulda Dever (Plague Rat) ‘sits on a park bench, entrapped by her inner charm’. A young officer Boaz stops by.

HULDA. I sit ergo I exist.

BOAZ. I am not one of those who sit down.

HULDA. My name is Hulda. Hulda Dever. I was born in Tel Aviv, in the respectable family of my father the architect and my mother the newspaper columnist. I grew as the sound of flute does. At 17, when I was still rollicking with the boys in high school, I was nominated the Paratroops Delight of Gaza and North Sinai for the financial
chasm between the divine Israel and other nations. The Chief Rabbi of Israel, the greatest modern proponent of Judaism, Rabbi Kook, wrote: “The difference between a Jewish soul and souls of non-Jews is greater and deeper than the difference between a human soul and the souls of cattle”, because a Jewish soul is an integral part of the deity called Israel. Many authors have accused the Jews of clannishness, of mutual support and disregard for an outsider. They rarely understood its religious component. The Jews have a higher purpose: to make all people on earth recognise the divinity of Israel.

Modern Jews rarely comprehend their feeling towards the Jewish People. They are aware of their deep sense of belonging, but the element of deification remains outside of consciousness. Still, it defines a very important feature of Jewish behaviour. Jews respond immediately and strongly at any perceived negative judgement about Jews as a whole or about Jews as separate beings. The strength and persistence of the Jewish response caused Charles Dickens to regret the depiction of Fagin (rhymes with Begin) in Oliver Twist.

1967/1968 year thanks to my boobs, elastic but firm. Now I am doing my master in the Military Law and prepare myself to peaceful and bright life for the sake of the state and the people of Israel.

BOAZ. I am Lieutenant Boaz, the CFO. My friends, ministers and foreign correspondents call me “daring CFO Boaz”, but I do not like it as I consider myself an ordinary soldier who is doing his military duty. Everyone would do the same in my famous tank raid that gave me the Hero Star from the hands of the Pope, not that I know why he gave it to me, as everyone would do the same. My dashing forelock and dashing eyes I retained from my cheerful childhood spent with my father the newspaper columnist and my mother the orthopedist. Now I am a brilliant commander and strategist, daily proving my abilities for the sake of the state and the people of Israel.

HULDA. Autumn.

BOAZ. I am not one of those who notices whether it is autumn or not.

HULDA. I do not express myself in such a way, as a rule, and my acquaintances usually perceive me as a jolly and superficial young girl. But as the matter of fact I am a Daughter of Autumn, and existential sorrow is the fate of my soul. Destiny of Judaism worries me, and my thoughts ponder the meaning of Holocaust.

BOAZ. I am familiar with this feeling though I hesitate to admit it. God alone knows that I am thinking and sophisticated man, and on the battlefield, among wounded and dead, I bit my lip and feel the unbroken link with Cabbala. After this dialogue, Hulda embraces herself in the fit of passion, and Boaz caresses himself:

HULDA: Wonderful Hulda...
BOAZ: Dashing Boaz...

1 Israel Shahak and Norton Mezvinsky, Jewish Fundamentalism in Israel, p 9
Since then, a rare author dares to introduce a negative Jewish character in his book. Le Carre managed to write a book, *Single and Single*, about the dismantling of the Soviet Union and the mass theft of Russian communal property without a single Jew in it. This is like describing the Mafia without mentioning Italians. He has a sinister character, a lawyer operating from behind the scenes, but the author stresses repeatedly that this Lidsky or Slutsky is a Pole. Well, Le Carre is a careful guy, and Poles, or indeed Italians or Brits, do not mind. Nobody minds but the Jews, because they feel it a sacrilegious attack on their deity, the Jewish People.

Alexander Solzhenitsyn encountered this problem¹, as in his books there are complex Jewish figures. They are KGB officers, informers, the top of the prison administration. None is demonised, but none is made a saint, either. He was immediately attacked and offered a way out: to introduce a main character, a "noble, strong and daring Jew". He ignored the advice, and received a letter from Mme. Pomerantz, a leading Russian Jewish intellectual, quoth: "The Nation is the very foundation of life, it is sacred and consubstantial to God. One who speaks against the whole Nation speaks against God." Solzhenitsyn doubted her sincerity: "Surely we would be allowed to refer to the qualities of "whole nations" if we would promise to condemn ourselves and glorify the Jews." But the remark of Mme. Pomerantz was partly sincere. She expressed in a clear and unambiguous way the feelings of Jews towards the Jewish People: it is a Deity, as only Deity is "sacred and consubstantial to God", and one who speaks against Deity, naturally speaks against God.

The original faith of Jews established in the 5th to 3rd centuries BC was hugely successful. By the 2nd century BC, millions of Jews lived in the big cities. They were fraternity members of heterogeneous ethnic origin, judging by their names and letters. The communities of Jews came to control the commerce and politics of the Middle East.

The Jews lived least of all in Palestine, the land of the Biblical narrative, as Palestine had no large cities. In 450 BC, the indefatigable Herodotus walked through Palestine (and called it ‘Palestine’), though Jewish apologetics attribute the name to

---

Romans of the 2nd century AD). He did not see a Jew; he never heard of them; even Jerusalem was too small to be mentioned. The Return to Zion as narrated in the Book of Ezra, was just a story.

The biological descendents of the Bible characters, the Palestinians of Shechem and Hebron, probably did not pay much attention to the editorial job done in Antioch and Ctesiphon. They lived in their villages, and still live there now, and worship Christ and the Virgin, or Allah, on the same sites where their ancestors of old prayed to El and Anath, Yahwe and his Ashera. They still cultivate olive trees and throw stones at bulldozers, as their ancestors did at Goliath. Farmers of Cornwallis do not give much thought to the latest editions of the Mort d’Arthur, nor do they sit around the Round Table either.

But later the Jews came to Palestine and turned the ruined fortress of Jerusalem into their headquarters and place of refuge. It is an established pattern of fraternities. The Knights of St John had their headquarters on Rhodes and, later, on Malta. The Assassins or Nuzairis chose the impregnable castle of Alamut for their Old Man of the Mountain. The Jews also needed a centre for their policies. Rich and industrious, they built up Jerusalem and went out to conquer the natives. At that time the anti-native narratives of the Bible were composed. Only conquering immigrants could compose these violent calls to kill every native.

In the bloody Maccabean wars (168-110 BC), the Jews subdued the Palestinians and forced some of them to accept a new faith. They did not make the converts equal, though. The Palestinians, the biological descendents of Abraham and David, remained second-class citizens (‘am ha-aretz’), in the Jewish Commonwealth. Even native descendents of priests (‘cohen am ha-aretz’) were a way below salt.

The relations between the Jews and the Palestinians were as bad then, as they are now. The Jews had a great propensity to genocide, and modern archaeologists find the horrible relics of mass destruction everywhere from Maresha to Shechem. The conquered cities were given to the sword, temples burnt, survivors taxed to death. When in 63 BC the Roman general Pompey came to Palestine, he was met as a liberator by the native population. Jewish rule in Palestine lasted less than 80 years and collapsed, as they proved themselves rulers too cruel even for that illiberal epoch.
Still, even after the loss of the bigger part of Palestine, the Jews retained Jerusalem and its vicinity for another 130 years, and from this base, the fraternity tried to influence the known world. The first half of the first century had been a time of great ascendancy for the Jews. There were millions of Jews in Rome and the Parthian Empire, but even more sympathisers, ‘God-fearers’, upper-class Gentiles who inclined to the synagogue.

(Why the upper classes and not the ordinary people? Because the Judaic approach of the huge gap between ‘our’ and ‘their’, or ‘outgroup’ and ‘ingroup’ is particularly suitable for the upper classes. It allows them to enjoy supreme luxury while disregarding the wishes and needs of the lower classes. Neo-Liberalism is the Judaic approach stated in general terms, and we know it is good for upper classes and bad for lower classes whose right to life is denied).

Every second matron of Rome observed the Sabbath. In those days the Jews formed a big part of the imperial elite, and Seneca wrote in his proverbial Latin, ‘victi victoribus leges dederunt’ (‘the defeated lay law to victors’). The complaints of Tacit could be written by Pat Buchanan. The acme of Jewish influence was achieved when this great pyromaniac, Emperor Nero, converted to Judaism, according to Jewish sources.

The similarity with our time is even more staggering, bearing in mind that in both cases, this rise of Jews took place within a historically short time, just over a hundred years. The Romans of Sulla (d. 78 BC) knew of Jews as little as the Americans of President Monroe (1824 AD), while Nero (d. 68 AD) was as aware of Jews as President Clinton.

II

The Jews of Christ’s day were a heterogeneous lot of millions of adepts, spread from Babylon to Rome to Alexandria. They spoke a variety of languages, and had various ethnic origins, but shared the affinity of temperament and character. In Palestine, the majority of ‘Jews’ were the natives of Palestine, forcibly converted into Judaism by the Hasmonean kings in 168-110 BC. The Palestinians remained second-class natives (‘am ha-aretz’), who had to provide and to be prepared to give their life for the first-class Jews.
The Talmud contains numerous references to the natives: “It is better to feed one’s daughter to lions than to let her marry a native.” (This maxim was repeated last year by Avrum Burg, a Labour leader and speaker of the Israeli parliament. He said: “Palestinians are not the people you would like to marry your daughter to”). Rabbi Yohanan said, “It is permitted to tear a native like one tears fish.” Rabbi Eliezer the Great said, “It is good to pierce and stab a native even on Yom Kippur coinciding with Sabbath.” His shocked disciples tried to correct him, “why don’t you say ‘slaughter’ a native, dear Master?” and he replied, “Slaughter demands a benediction while piercing does not demand a benediction.” An animal should not be slaughtered without a benediction, to pacify his soul, but R. Eliezer did not want to waste a benediction on a native (i.e. he was not even willing to deal with natives as with animals). 1

The leaders of the Judaic mystery religion wished to make their faith a world-embracing one. They did not want to turn the whole of mankind into Jews, as even in their Palestinian fief they were not willing to allow for the equality of converts and the ‘real Jews’. They wished for mankind to worship Jews, to adore Israel, to participate in veneration of their Deity, as “the God of Israel” in their eyes was but the spirit of the People of Israel. That is the true meaning of “Jewish world domination designs”.

But 2000 years ago their domination plan misfired. The second-class citizens, new converts of Galilee, were tied to their soil. They loved their land, their terraces and olive trees, vineyards and springs. People of soil cannot understand the need to be a master, nor do they wish to be slaves. The Palestinians considered themselves the descendants of Abraham, the hospitable friend of God, of David, the Palestinian king of old. They corrected the mistake of self-adoration by a ruse: they expanded the Fraternity and made it a universal Church, thus returning the Jewish faith to its Palestinian origins of Abraham and Moses. (That is why the result

---

1 These sayings were censored out of printed versions of Talmud and reprinted in full only now in Israel. Until recently, they were printed separately for the scholars as ‘Hesronot Shas’. The quotes are from Pesahim mem tet 13 bet, in hesronot p 8: “Omar R Eliezer, am haaretz mutar lenochro byom kipurim shehal lihot beshabat. Omru lo talmidav, Rabbi, emor “leshohto”! Omar lahen ze taun bracha, uze ein taun bracha. Omar R Yohanan, am haaretz mutar lekor’o kedag etc.
is called “the fulfilment of the Mosaic faith”). They turned every church into a temple. They repudiated usury, authorised by the Bible editors. They venerated Mary, the spouse of God, a woman of Sepphoris in Galilee. Their veneration of local saints restored holiness to the whole land. They made images reminding that Man was created in the likeness of God.

Mystics and spiritualists would say that the force of good made a wondrous supposition, and instead of the Enslaver of Nations, the Spirit of Brotherhood was embodied in a man of a small Palestinian village of Nazareth. It was manifested in the wild countryside of the Judean desert, where the ruddy colour of soil gave it the name of the Ascent of blood. Nowadays there is a small building called the Good Samaritan Inn, of the parable told by Jesus about a man wounded by robbers and left to die in the desert. The Jewish priest avoided him, a Levite passed by, but a Samaritan treated the man as his brother and saved him. The Jews hated Samaritans like the modern Israelis hate Palestinians, and for a similar reason: Samaritans were the true descendants of Israel, whose name the Jews adopted. By elevating the Samaritan, Jesus broke with the tradition of denying other people’s humanity. That is why the Pharisees and the Priests sentenced him to death.

The Divine punishment was swift. The Roman Empire, almost suborned and taken over by the Jews, reasserted itself and destroyed the Temple of Jerusalem, removing the territorial base of the Judaic creed. It took another hundred of years of rebellions and wars to subdue and break down Jewry. With Divine assistance, Mankind corrected its errors, rejected supreme egoism and continued its normal troublesome life. On the broken ruins of Jewry, Christianity sprung, as a butterfly from the discarded caterpillar shell.

The majority of Jews in Palestine embraced Christ and became an integral and indistinguishable part of the Palestinian people. It was a long process, while some were received in the Church, and others converted to Islam, a Middle Eastern native form of Christianity with strong Judaic elements, a prefiguration of Protestantism.

Millions of Jews in the Roman Empire did the same, and became assimilated in Egypt and Italy, Spain and Greece. Old Judaism was perceived as too archaic even before its demise, as in
Christ’s days, the old religion of animal sacrifices was outdated, and people looked for new forms and new meaning. Christianity contained all the good elements of the Judaism of old: Christ was the new all-embracing transfiguration of the God of Israel, while the Church provided a community and the joint service of God; but it never became an object of self-adoration, as the Holy Virgin, the Mother of God, took the place of the female Deity in people’s minds. (Centuries later, Calvin’s destruction of the Marian cult was connected with rise of self-adoration, or ‘Jewish-ness’ in the terminology of young Marx, and eventually with the Rise of the Jews).

Still, the powerful fraternity of the Jews did not disappear. Small groups of adepts in other countries carried out their Counter-Reformation and created a new faith, strongly anti-Christian and anti-Gentile. Its credo contains the Birkat Ha-minim, the Curse of the heretics. In the original form that survived in Geniza of Cairo, it was directly aimed against Christians, but later it was altered and its original meaning obscured. At its beginning, it was a religion of sheer hatred toward a goy.

Shmuel Hugo Bergman, a German Jewish philosopher, later the President of Hebrew University, wrote: “Two factions forever struggle within Judaism. The separatist faction hates Gentiles. Their slogan is “Remember Amalek” (i.e. “Kill the Goy”). But there is a faction of love and forgiveness, the Judaism of “Love thy Neighbour.”

Bergman was mistaken. The Judaism of “Love Thy Neighbour” is called Christianity. But Christian influence on Judaism could transform the Hate of Amalek into Love of Neighbour within the souls of individual Jews. Some of them would become Christians, others would — in harmless vanity — claim like Bergman, “we were always like that”. But often the spirit of hate would pull them back into the abyss. Thus Bergman, a supporter of one democratic state in Palestine, eventually condoned Zionist crimes.¹

The most horrible adjectives and laws against Gentiles were formulated by the new faith. (For instance, Rabbinic Judaism permitted the killing of a Gentile by a ruse: a Gentile may be enticed to descend into a well, and then a Jew may remove the ladder and

¹ See Shahak, 3000 years
leave the goy to his death. In order to avoid sin, he should just ‘remember’ that he needs the ladder for some purpose).

Critics of Judaism (“antisemites”) published many books full of dreadful quotations from the Talmud and later scriptures of Jews. The younger generation of Jews doesn’t believe these books, because of their combative nature. The older generation of learned Jews knows these things but hesitates to admit these quotes are correct. Still, they are confirmed by the modern discussion of the anti-Gentile tendency in Judaism, as carried out by a few Israeli and American Jewish scholars, notably by Israel Shahak and Norton Mezvinsky, Israel Yuval, and Abraham Shafir, whose dissertation¹ is still one of the best and waits for a publisher. On the other hand, nowadays some Rabbis in Israel freely repeat the most awful things against Gentiles, orally and in writing. Such is a treatise by Rabbi Alba purporting to prove that a Jew is entitled to take life of a Gentile. It was published in the volume dedicated to the mass murderer Baruch Goldstein.

Eventually this hatred calmed down, but it never was admitted and exorcised. That is why it came back with a flourish in the moment it was encouraged by the Jewish leadership.

1 Dropsie University, Phila. 1976
Take Two

[This short private message to friends sent on Easter 2001 caused a considerable controversy.]

Easter Sunday is a beautiful day, a day of new hope and new promise. Two thousand years ago, the first joust of two spirits, the spirit of the brotherhood of Man and the spirit of Master-Slave domination, was over. Jesus taught: love your neighbour as yourself, even if he is a traditional enemy of Jews, a Samaritan. That is why he was hated by the Jewish supremacists of his time. He said: you cannot worship God and Mammon, the god of greed, you have to choose. That is why he was hated by the supply-side economists and bankers of his day. They sentenced him to death and the Empire obliged and carried out the execution, in order to keep peace with these important forces. Our fathers did not dare to speak against their leaders. The spirit of domination scored a victory, but the spirit of brotherhood did not vanish.

I received the Easter message of Naim Ateek, a priest from Jerusalem. He writes, “Here in Palestine, Jesus is again walking the Via Dolorosa. It only takes people of insight to see the hundreds of thousands of crosses throughout the land, Palestinian men, women, and children being crucified. Palestine has become one huge Golgotha, the place of the skull”.

The forces of supremacy and the greed worshippers united again to crucify Christ. The US, this New Rome, again lends a hand and agrees to become the executioner. Now it is our turn to decide.

History gave us an incredible luxury, Take Two, as they say in movie production. We can now repeat the mistake of our fathers
and silently connive with the plans of our self-appointed leaders. We can correct this mistake now, and stop the crucifixion.

In the Jewish Passover narration, we say, each one of us has to see himself as if he personally was liberated from bondage. I say to you, each one of us, Jew and Gentile, has to see himself as if he personally stands on Via Dolorosa, and to decide, whether the execution will be carried out. Two thousand years ago, only people of Jerusalem were present while Christ was rushed to Golgotha. Now, in the global village of the 21st century, the whole of mankind has become a witness of this tragic and lasting event. We all stand on the sidewalk of Via Dolorosa. The fateful question, “whether this man should be crucified”, applies to all of us. If we keep our mouth shut, we deserve to be called “Christ killers”. If we stop it, we shall change history. The scarlet-as-blood sins of the past will become white as snow.

Two thousand years ago, the spirit of brotherhood rose again, to give hope for the second joust. If he is defeated again, we all shall become forever slaves to our faceless masters. They will destroy the Mother Earth herself; turn her into the waste land of Mordor. They need this victory to bind us together by the dark forces of domination. Let us deny them, this time.

Share with me the wine and bread of Palestine, my brothers and sisters, as the sign of the new covenant of the Brotherhood of Man, as an oath of our decision: this time, Christ will not die on the cross.
[Easter Greetings Take Two triggered an orchestrated campaign against Shamir, started by two Arab activists, Ali Abunimah and Hussein Ibish. Both were richly rewarded by their Jewish partners; Abunimah received access to mainstream media, tax-exempt status and other perks.]

Ali Abunimah and Hussein Ibish spoke against what they feared might be my anti-Semitism. I am certainly pleased with their principled stand. As a Jew and a man, I salute them. Any irrational aversion to Jews should certainly be eradicated and condemned. While saluting their good intentions, I consider their judgment to be somewhat premature. It is based on my Take Two, which they failed to understand. Christopher Bollyn of *The Spotlight* stated it well. He wrote:

“I realize that neither of you are probably deeply immersed in Christianity, but you must understand that Shamir ...compares the Israelis, Jews, and Americans to spectators of an execution that they can do something to prevent.

“I say to you, each one of us has to see oneself as is he personally stands on Via Dolorosa, and decides, whether the execution will be carried out. If we keep our mouth shut, we deserve to be called “Christ killers”. If we stop it, we shall change history. The sins of the past, scarlet as blood, will become white as snow’, Shamir wrote.

“He is demanding that Jews, Israelis, and Americans do something to prevent the bloodbath that is occurring in Palestine as we speak.”
Indeed, while the Jews of old provide the background to the Passion, all of us are the background of the present suffering of the Palestinians, which was the theology behind my *Take Two*. In other words, all of us, Jews and Gentiles alike, are ‘the Jews’ of the Palestinian Passion.

I perceive that the excitement of Mr Abunimah and Mr Ibish could be generously explained away by their relative innocence of theology and history. They even put the exclamation mark of ‘sic’ after my words, failing to recognize the quotation from the prophets (scarlet sins and white snow) which is a part of the Yom Kippur liturgy. They are not attuned to read what I wrote.

Anyway, Ali Abunimah and Hussein Ibish are entitled to their opinions. Their concern for the purity of the Palestinian banner meets my approval. However, my appreciation of their position is slightly diminished by some additional facts. The present accusatory letter is not the first, nor the second that they have composed in connection with my humble self. In their previous letters, the accusation of anti-Semitism was absent, but they called me alternatively a Mossad agent, a pursuer of Arab money, and even a false pretender to the high rank of an Israeli Russian journalist and a *Vesti* columnist. Such insistence combined with inconsistence makes one wonder if their goals were limited to fighting anti-Jewish prejudice. If I were a suspicious man, I would probably suspect their motives.

But I am ready to give Ali Abunimah and Hussein Ibish the full benefit of any doubt. It is probable that they were motivated not by spite and envy, not by a fear of competition or of ‘rocking the boat’, not by working in cahoots with the Jewish lobby, but by nobler feelings. They remind me of the young police officer in this period piece movie, *LA Confidential*, who tries to arrest a blond Lana Turner look-alike, and proclaims: “a hooker who looks like Lana Turner is still a hooker, not Lana Turner.” His colleague stops him: “she IS Lana Turner!” The kid made a silly mistake.

In plain words, I do not pretend to be a friend of Palestine: I am a Palestinian. I am quite used to this sort of accusation; they are the professional hazard for whoever is engaged in the struggle. A fainthearted man should fight for the well-being of whales, as it is a noble cause that brings no flak.
Now I shall refer to other concerns raised by Ali Abunimah and Hussein Ibish. As for my alleged comparison of the Jews with a ‘virus’, I quote the lines of Ellen Cantarow, who was present at the talk.

“I do want to stress that the comment about “viruses” cited by Ali in his letter was taken out of context. I was there; I heard the talk. This is NOT what Shamir said. Which makes me feel that The Jerusalem Post reference should be looked up in context. I do not feel it wise, when one has not read the entirety of a text, especially in a controversy like this one, to fan the flames by circulating partial statements. In the Tufts talk Shamir referred to the movie Matrix, with its references to ‘organic’ ‘mammals’ and to predatory viruses. He then said that the original Palestinian population had an ‘organic’ relation to the land in Palestine, whereas the European-Jewish immigrants and colonists did not, and in their consequent actions, expelling the original inhabitants, destroying villages with beautiful architecture, etc., could be compared to the ‘viruses’ in Matrix. I find this in perfect keeping with his Dulcinea essay and other pieces.”

I would add to it that in my opinion every man, Jew or Gentile, can choose whether to behave like a virus or like a mammal, or even as a vulture. It is actually an idea deeply rooted in the Zionist discourse of Herzl and Borochov, who wished to reconnect Jews and soil as the means of rejuvenation of the Jewish people. In my opinion, it failed because the settlers did not connect to the native inhabitants of the land.

(The ‘virus comparison’ is present in the discourse on Palestine. But it was made by the Prime Minister Barak, who called the Palestinians ‘a virus’. However, his comparison created no ripple).

Let us move on to the blood-libel accusation in the Jerusalem Post, repeated by Ali Abunimah and Hussein Ibish. This Conrad Black newspaper wrote:

“One of NIF’s beneficiaries is the Israel-Palestine Friendship Centre in Tel Aviv. The centre promotes the Palestinians’ ‘right of return’ to their pre-1948 homes. Two weeks ago, Russian-language journalist Israel Shamir told a largely Jewish audience: ‘Jews only
exist to drip the blood of Palestinian children into their matzas.’ No one protested”.

It is obvious rubbish. I certainly did not say the words they attribute to me. Have no doubt, the nice middle-class Jewish audience in Tel Aviv, where the misquoted talk was given, would protest such silly stuff instead of pouring their love on the speaker. The purpose of the JP allegation was to smear these wonderful people, who work very hard on charity lines to feed the hungry and clothe the needy in the besieged villages. It is to be regretted that Ali Abunimah and Hussein Ibish were deceived by the right-wingers’ blood libel against Israeli supporters of Palestinian rights.

[My full discussion of Blood Libel is available in this volume].

As for me, I can repeat the words of an unjustly punished Russian poet, “The insult hurts, but it is not the issue: let my destiny befalls me, it is the destiny of mankind I am worried about”.

Lana Turner
Psychologists like to offer their patients to play a game of allusions in order to free the imagination. They drop you a word and you should reply with the first word that comes to your mind: “bed” – “sex”, “husband” – “pay”, or “drink” – “police”. These replies help the shrink to understand the working of your mind. But sit a Jew on the couch, whisper one word, “Christ”, and you will get one response: “you call us Christ killers”.

I compared the killing of Palestinians, who are the beloved children of Christ, with the killing of Christ, and immediately two hired boys voiced this Jewish complaint, “he called the Jews Christ killers”. I was rather vexed, as I know I did not say it, since I do not think it. But they would not take “no” for an answer.

When Pope John Paul II visited the old capital of the Umayyad Caliphate, Damascus, the young Syrian ruler reminded his audience of the transcendental meaning of the battle for Palestine. The Palestinians fight the enemy of Christ and the enemy of the Prophet, he said.

The words of Bashar Assad caused consternation among Jews. A Conrad Black newspaper, always supporting the Israeli ‘extra-judicial killings’ (read: murders), wrote indignantly: “this was anti-Semitism of the worst order. Down the centuries, the charge of dei-cide has been a pretext for persecuting Jews, who stood accused of ‘killing Christ’.”

Please re-read again. Bashar Assad did not say, nor did he imply that Jews killed Christ. Neither did I: there is no collective guilt over many generations. But the Masters of Discourse know better what people are supposed to say. In the same way they know
better who should represent Palestinians instead of the ‘irrelevant’ Arafat, they know better who should rule Iraq, they know better who attacked America and whom America should attack, and even whom Blacks should elect instead of Cynthia McKinney: in the same way they know better: we should say, “Jews killed Christ”. They wait for it like a passionate lover for consummation of his desires, like a brave soldier for the battle call, as they know how to reply. They will insist on it until we say it, like in the joke.


This accusation is false; it is but an anti-Christian libel. None of the Church Fathers, none of the “right wing religious fanatics” of old, and none of the Crusaders would or did condemn the present day Jews for killing Christ just because some of their ancestors killed Christ. They were not that silly; nobody is. This accusation is but a figment of Jewish imagination. The eminent scholar, professor David Flusser, was right: “the Jews should not be blamed for killing Christ anymore than French blamed for sending Joan of Arc to the stake, or Greeks for sentencing Socrates to death.”

Why, then, do the Jews insist on the false accusation? They do it in order to obscure the real one: of hostility to Christ, Christianity and Christians. My dear late teacher David Flusser was a very fluent and skilful Jewish apologist, who could and would justify anything done by Jews. His reasoning is correct, but it lacks sincerity. Why, indeed, are the French not blamed for the fiery death of the Maid nor considered “enemies of the Maid”? For the simple reason that though the situation appears similar (foreign occupation and corrupt local judges), the French people condemned the French judges who sentenced Joan, and made her their beloved saint. The Jews of old, on the other hand, were defiantly proud of the deed of their ancestors. They were quite happy to concur in it, and busily copied The Gospel according to the Jews, a manuscript that could be called “How we killed Christ.”
Who killed Christ?

T. R. Reid of the Washington Post, a staunch supporter of Israel, declared: “it’s time for Christians to never repeat the complete distortion of history, that Jews were largely responsible for Jesus’ crucifixion. The church should re-write the Passion” – he demanded, and his call was seconded by Black’s Boston Globe. As the US Congress usually follows the orders of AIPAC, probably the Gospel will be soon outlawed in the US. And not only in the US: American Jews are fighting hard to ban the centuries-old medieval production of the Passion play in Oberammergau.

The Gospel says that Jesus was sentenced to death by the High Priest of the Jews and his comrades, then the sentence was confirmed by the Sanhedrin, the Jewish High Court, and afterwards the prisoner was given to the Roman chief commander in the land to be executed. While the old Jewish theologians and scholars happily concurred with the story, the modern Jewish historians and religious scholars say that anti-Semites invented the story, to spread hatred of the Jews.

Hayim Cohen, an Israeli High court judge, wrote that Jews would never sentence an innocent person to death. Hyam Maccobi, an English Jewish scholar, (alas, a fanatical nationalist), claimed that Jesus led the fight for the Jews and against the Gentile rule, and that he was killed by the Romans as a result. David Flusser, an Israeli scholar of Qumran texts, thought the Passion narrative was written many years after the event as part of the Church’s anti-Jewish polemics. Others denied the Jews practised crucifixion or applied death penalty at all.

However, a reading of the Jewish sources disproves these arguments. A Jewish sage of pre-Christian days crucified eighty witches in
one day, says the Talmud. If Jesus were a fighter for the Jews, he would be venerated as the brigands of Masada were. In such a case his claim to the title of Messiah would not be a hindrance: Simeon Bar Kochba, the last Jewish ruler in Palestine, was proclaimed the Messiah by Rabbi Akiba, the highest Jewish spiritual authority of his days, and he is still highly esteemed. Even better proof to the contrary is supplied by the numerous devotees of the late Lubawitscher Rebbe. Posters of this bearded old Jew cover many walls in Israel bearing a legend ‘Messiah the King’. Thus, even the death of the Messiah is no obstacle for Jewish veneration, while rejection of Jewish exclusivity certainly is.

Christian historians and scholars, from Origenes of Alexandria and Eusebius of Caesarea to Chesterton, thought the Gospel description of the Jewish leaders actually condemning Jesus to death was perfectly realistic. The traditional Jewish sources, from the Midrash to later medieval writings, also accepted the story, and added that it was a good thing to do. Moreover, the adepts of Judaism kept fighting Christ and Christians. Soldiers of the last Jewish king, Bar Kochba, massacred Christians in 135. In Yemen, a Jewish ruler, Yusuf Zu Nawas, burned churches and killed thousands of Christians in 519. Palestinian Christians were slaughtered in 529 and 614.

Afterwards, the warfare switched to ideology. The Middle Ages are full of rather crude Jewish anti-Christian propaganda. Examples of this could be found in Jesus through Jewish Eyes¹, a recently published compendium of Jewish writings about Jesus, and they include the infamous Toledot Yeshu and Nestor Hakomer, written in Arabic in the 9th century. Even today, leaflets in Jerusalem describe Judas as “the Redeemer of Israel”. That is why, as a shorthand, the Jews were described as “enemies of Christ”.

Christians fought back, and slaughtered quite a lot of Jews as well. It is a peculiarity of modern convoluted discourse, that Christian persecutions of Jews are well known, while persecutions of Christians by Jews are consigned to oblivion. There is “post-Auschwitz Christian theology”, but there is no “post-Mamilla Pool, or post-Deir Yassin Judaism”. This distortion of history is used by the Jewish leadership in order to induce into Christians a destructive guilt feeling. That is why it is important to explain that the relations of Jews and Christians weren’t as one-sided as depicted by the Jewish apologists.

¹ Publisher: Yediyot Aharonot, Tel Aviv, 1999, ISBN 965-448-527-3
Jews versus Christ

The millennia-old ideological warfare against Christ became the most important element of Jewishness, and it is still with us. “T’is better to serve Hitler than Christ”, — words to such effect said a well known Israeli Rabbi. Acceptance of Christ is the worst possible crime for a Jew, and it is felt by the vast majority of the community. Jews aren’t just ‘non-Christians’, like we are ‘non-Buddhist’, they are anti-Christian. Even now, when the majority of Jews have ceased to practice the rules of faith, this anti-Christian streak is not gone. For instance, a baptised Jew is banned from receiving Israeli citizenship by the Law of Return. Recently, a few good Jews in America wrote to the State of Israel renouncing their right to Israeli citizenship. There is just one way to do it: accept Christ and you would lose this ‘right’.

There are, for sure, many Jews who feel differently. No group is so monolithic as to exclude dissent. Even in the leadership of the German Nazi Party, there were people who conspired against Hitler. But it does not mean there was no Nazi ideology. Among millions of Russian Communists one could find people of every possible opinion, but the Party had its structure and ideology. That is why one should not hate a man for being a Jew, or a member of the Nazi Party etc, but one may reject their doctrine.

For many years I, a son of enlightened parents, could not force myself to enter a church. I did not spit at seeing a church, as my great-grandfather would, but I was taught to despise Christianity, “a silly prejudice”. The Jewish faith was never considered to be a prejudice in our circles. Still, a young Jewish man could toy with Buddhism or pray in an ashram, or dance with Sufis, but Christianity was beyond the pale, a totally forbidden thing. That is
why many young Jews of J. D. Salinger’s days were looking for spirituality in foreign Buddhism: they really did not dare to embrace Christ. One could eat pork, even marry a *shiksa*, a slightly smaller sin, but we had imbibed hostile rejection of Christianity with our mothers’ milk.

The opinion of the Jews about Christianity would be quite irrelevant if the Jews lived on the Moon. It would be bearable if the Jews were shoe-shiners or cotton-pickers. It was survivable while Jews were visibly separated by dress and manners, as in the Middle Ages. But since the Jews became an important part of the American elites, their massive presence undermined the delicate social and spiritual fabric.

It is particularly deadly, as the spirituality of our tripartite ecumene (Western Christendom, the Eastern Orthodox world, and Dar al-Islam) has been built on Christ. The cathedrals of Rome, Assisi, Chartres, Kёln and Canterbury; the mosques of Damascus, Baghdad and Jerusalem; the paintings of Botticelli, Andrei Rublev and Blake; the great poetry of Rumi and Elliott, Block and Brodsky flow from this rock. It is as basic as water and earth for our civilisation. Even books arguing with Christianity – Rabelais and Voltaire, Mayakovsky and Marx – still are based on it. The removal of Christ kills Western civilisation as certainly as poisoning its air does. Human beings will not die, but the civilization will collapse after its sacred unity is gone.

The scary present of the US is the result of this collapse. This neo-fascist state of billionaires and hungry children that scraps human rights, tortures prisoners in Guantanamo, rejects all norms of international law and plans aggression against sovereign Iraq just after the devastation visited upon Afghanistan is the moral perversion built upon Christianity undermined. My friend and an important American Islamic scholar of religion, Maria Hussain, wrote: “Christianity has been very weak in the US. In Ann Arbor where I was raised it was understood that you do NOT mention the name of Jesus unless it is to make fun, and you do NOT publicly admit to believing in Christianity, unless you want to be avoided by your peers”.
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Christian Zionists as a social neurosis

The strange, uniquely American phenomenon of Jew-worshipping Christian Zionists is but a result of social neurosis, caused by strong guilt feelings induced by the Jewish elites. These simple Christian souls try to combine their love to Christ with the society-induced adoration of Jews. They look for Jewish approval, while sticking to the church. These opposing forces misshape their psyche like the bodies of children were misshapen by the medieval freak-makers. They should be helped to reassert their love of Christ and freed from emotional dependency on the Jews.

The appearance of the Christian Zionists was predicted in long gone 1902 by a Viennese Jew, Solomon Ehrmann. He spoke of the future when “all of mankind will have been jewified (verjudet) and joined in union with the [Judeo-Masonic] Bnai Brith”. Now when the Bnai Brith are strong supporters of Sharon and Foxman, one understands that these Christian Zionists have been thoroughly jewified.

Their pitiful spiritual condition should remind us: Christianity and Judaism are NOT mirror images of each other. While the Church wants to bring every Jew to salvation, to make him equal to the rest of believers, to turn him or her into a dear brother or sister, the Jews want to turn the Christians into jewified Christian Zionists, emotional and spiritual slaves of the Jews. It means that the struggle is not over yet. It is an ideological, not a racial struggle; and the Christians of Jewish origin were always an important element, a beacon for their hesitating brethren, as it is the battle for the souls of Jews as well. But as precious as they are,

1 Beller, Vienna, quoted by Lindemann, Esau's Tears
they are not a bit more precious than the souls of other folks. If the spiritual and ideological struggle with the Jewish influence won’t be vigorously resumed, I am afraid the Christian Zionists will become the biggest and most powerful denomination in the US, and then seep over into Europe.

Professor David Perlmutter wrote to me:

Sure, maybe 20 years ago the “Israeli lobby” was made up mostly of Jews. And campaign donations were important. But now it’s the Evangelical Christians who are dominant, and most politicians are nominally pro-Israel not because they want Jewish money but because they either believe in the “holy” cause or listen to their huge number of evangelical voters. Bush did not go easy on Sharon because of Jews, but because his own constituency rebelled. This is something that most Arabs and Israelis don’t understand — but you see it here in the Churches and in DC. Every major US evangelical Christian leader is farther to the right on Israel than most Jews I know, and after 9/11 they consider it their own personal crusade. The traditional Israeli Lobby (AIPAC etc.) has become almost irrelevant.

The Jews are often described as ‘yeast’ — because of their ability to judaize people, to transfer some Jewish qualities; an ability rather enhanced by their positions in the discourse, media and universities. If the preachers did not feel the support of media lords, probably they would not become as pro-Israeli as they are now. If the cause of Christ were not so completely undermined, their flock would not feel obliged to support the Israeli genocidal apartheid state.
The Second Coming
(a positive view of fundamentalism)

I

They walk in big and jolly crowds on Jerusalem streets, waving blue-and-white flags and smiling at passers-by; the Christian friends of Israel often arrive in the autumn, during the Tabernacles Feast. This year, too, they came by thousands; cheered up the despondent shopkeepers of Ben Yehuda Street, promised to stand by us, in weather fair or foul; met with the representatives of the settlers and with Sharon’s ministers. Their leader, Pat Robertson, proclaimed: “I see the rise of Islam to destroy Israel and take the land from the Jews and give East Jerusalem to Yasser Arafat. I see that as Satan’s plan to prevent the return of Jesus Christ the Lord,” - and the crowds applauded him, even ram horns blew.

The Israeli Jews are less than happy with them. Religious Jews hate their crosses and visibly restrain themselves from spitting in their direction as is their wont. Ministers of the Jewish Nationalist Right hoodwink their supporters promising them to use and manipulate the silly visitors. In the educated and liberal circles of Jerusalem (as well as in Boston, Washington and Paris) it is usual to pour scorn on the fundamentalist Evangelical Christians, to despise these ‘country hicks’, ‘homophobes’ and ‘warmongers’. But I like these simple and sincere men and women; though their love of Christ was misused by their cynical leaders as the first love of a young country girl is misused by a cynical urbanite.

What is, indeed, the proper Christian attitude to the Jewish state? Nowadays it varies from “warm support” to “indifferent”, i.e.
from support of Israel on the grounds of an apocalyptic belief to the view that the Jews and the state of Israel have no more meaning for Christians than Inuit. Archbishop of Canterbury Rowan Williams offered a compromise affirming the need for a Jewish state and the state’s duty to be good to its neighbours. A Palestinian Christian, Jonathan Kuttab of Sabeel wrote him an open letter bitterly complaining that he “ignored the Palestinian people on whose land the Jewish state was created” but “was satisfied that the Archbishop did not support eschatological or prophecy-driven interpretations”. However this discourse is missing the fourth leg: the rejection of the Jewish state on the ground of an apocalyptic tradition; and so we shall supply this leg.

Indeed, the “eschatological or prophecy-driven interpretations” are unavoidable; millions of Americans express them openly and millions of Europeans feel them acutely. No amount of empathy with the Palestinians has been able to change the widespread feeling that was well expressed by Lord Balfour: “The fate of the world, the millennia-old plan of Redemption and the Second Coming, is more important than the immediate concerns of local inhabitants”. Balfour, probably the Archbishop of Canterbury, other shepherds of the Catholic and Protestant Churches, and many, many ordinary folks feel about the fate of Palestine as [Egyptian President Gamal Abdel] Nasser felt about the fate of Nubian villages when he built the Aswan Dam: ‘tis pity but they’ll have to suffer for the greater good of the land and its people.

Let us follow this simile a bit farther. If the Aswan Dam were to flood the Nubian villages, Pharaonic temples and Coptic monasteries, but will provide Egypt with water and food — fine and good; we shall just compensate the poor Nubians and relocate the monks. If the Dam were to create zillions of mosquitoes and bilharzia man-eating worm, arrest the inflow of fertilising Nile ooze and disrupt harvests, we shall regret the folly of building the Dam but stick with it hoping for the better. But were we to recognise the Dam as a new Damocles sword hanging over Egypt, allowing its neighbours to blackmail the country by the threat of nuclear targeting the Dam and turning the Lake of Nasser into the Sea of Doom for this ancient country — we would change our view about the setup rather radically and begin gradually dismantling the project.
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In other words, we (as opposed to many friends and enemies of Palestine) may agree that prophecies are coming true, but which prophecies? There are two competing mutually exclusive versions of Apocalypse, a Judaic and a Christian. According to the Jews, after Jewish sufferings, God’s rage will be awaken and he will avenge the shed Jewish blood and restore their good fortunes: the outcasts will become the leaders. Theirs will be the only spiritual centre of the world in Jerusalem, they will outlaw or kill believers in Christ and other idolaters, demolish churches, de-spiritualise and disarm the nations, will get seven gentile slaves to a person, collect all material and spiritual riches, and will live happily ever after shepherding the happy gentile flock.

In the Christian narrative of forthcoming events, before the new spiritual awakening of Christendom (described as the Second Coming), the Christian world is to sink slowly into the abyss of de-spiritualisation and Mammon worship; its nadir is described as “the Antichrist rule”, the end of Kali Yuga, as they say in India. The prophets connected this dramatic development with the return of the Jews and with re-establishment of Judaic cult in Jerusalem. This was supposed to be the lowest point of spiritual descent, the darkest hour before the sunrise, for Judaism is based on rejection of Christ. This mass apostasy will cause a horrible war; in its aftermath, the survivors will return to Christ.

The prophets and fathers of the Church did not determine whether the Antichrist was to be a Jew (or even a person), but the intricate connection between the Jews, restoration of their cult and the Doom of Christendom was a universally accepted dogma, East or West. In the West, as long ago as the seventh century, Isidor, the bishop of Seville, knew of the “Antichrist who will take Jerusalem and re-establish the Jewish temple and the Jewish kingdom” before taking over the Church and the world. In the East, St John the Damascene prophesied that the Antichrist will come to Jews and for Jews, against Christ and Christians. The Church Fathers considered the Rise of the Antichrist as the rise and temporary triumph of Judaism. In the Tenth Century, St Andrew prophesied that the kingdom of Israel will be restored, and that it will be the launching-pad of the Antichrist.

The secret of this confluence of two narratives is hidden in the idea of de-spiritualisation: the Church fathers were aware that the
Jews seek to remain the only sacral unity within profane mankind, while they wished the world to overflow with sacrality like a jar with good wine.

When a Christian observes the US Army and its auxiliaries being sent to subdue the Middle East and establish a Judaic ruler on the throne of Solomon; when the Jewish state declares its supreme sovereignty upon earth by assuming right to judge and doom anyone, anywhere; when prime ministers and presidents gather to deliberate whether they are doing everything they can for the Jews; when the superpower rates its allies by their attitude to the Jews; when princes of the church are begging forgiveness of the Jews, and when practical steps are being taken to renew the sacrifices in Jerusalem — one can’t but recognise that prophecies are being fulfilled. One also can’t but recognise that whoever supports this prophesied “rise of Jews” sides with the Antichrist. One may also find comfort in knowing that the dark night of the Antichrist will eventually bring the great spiritual awakening, or “the Second Coming”, but may one then hasten the darkness of the night while wishing for sunrise?

In the Bolshevik tradition, this is called “the worse, the better”; i.e. the worse is the situation, the better are chances to bring forward the desired revolution. It is a legitimate view; many good people feel that Bush the Worse is also Bush the Better, as he is so obviously evil that he antagonises even groups liable to support an equally bad but cunning politician. In Israel, a Jewish Ultra-Orthodox authoress wittily explained her antizionist community’s support for Benjamin Netanyahu the Zionist: The Ultra-Orthodox realize that Netanyahu will surely destroy the Zionist state.

This attitude ceases to be legitimate when it is transformed into a positive action of supporting evil. One may passively find comfort in knowing that a nasty situation will be soon over, but one may not actively provoke the nasty situation “to have it done with”, by, say, campaigning for Bush or Netanyahu. Such a Machiavellian action is perilous for the soul.

The rise of the Antichrist as the last stage before the Second Coming may be compared with the betrayal and the Crucifixion before the Resurrection. Thus actively aiding and abetting the Antichrist, in order to speed up the Second Coming, is tantamount to playing the role of Judas betraying Christ — if he betrayed
Christ in order to quicken the Redemption. A mad theologian Nils Runeberg, a character in a Jorge Luis Borges story, admired Judas for his deed, as without him, the divine plan would not be fulfilled. Such an approach is called “antinomian”, and Christ foresaw it when he said: “the Son of Man will go as it has been decreed, but woe to that man by whom the Son of Man is betrayed” (Mat 26:24). Indeed, for Christians, Judas is the symbol of the worst in human nature; Dante planted him in the Ninth Circle of his Inferno, while a Jewish author made him a national hero in the Toledoth Yeshu.

Lurian Cabbala is decidedly antinomian; Sabbatai Zevi, a post-Lurian Cabbalist messiah of 17th century, believed that sins lead to redemption. His adversaries claimed he would sodomise a boy while wearing phylacteries and singing hymns. The spiritual leader of the Israeli Cabbalist school, Rabbi Kook, also believed that mass murder, rivers of blood and a sinful life are the harbingers of salvation, though he never called for direct antinomian action – this was a later addition by his disciples.

So-called Christian Zionists are antinomians as they side with the Antichrist in order to quicken the Second Coming, but woe to that man who helps Antichrist to destroy the world. Whether they believe in the Second Coming of Christ or not, people who knowingly implement antichristian plans are better called “the Antichrist Zionists”. Rise of the Antichrist Zionists is a part of the prophesied Apostasy of the Church. But our feeling towards them are like that towards misled brothers. They were ensnared by their spiritual longing for Christ. We do not mind that they are fundamentalists – we regret that they are not sufficiently fundamentalist.

II

A fundamentalist is one who follows the traditional teaching of the Church. There are no stricter fundamentalists than the monastic community of Mt Athos in Northern Greece, where I write these words. Athos is a great reservoir of spirit, and many people come to partake of its waters. (Charles, the Prince of Wales stays here in an abbey, too.) The monks keep the fire of Christian
faith as it was kindled by Christ and his apostles. They do not expect their salvation will come from Jews, as it already came in the person of Christ. They feel no need to seek Rapture for they were given a plan of their own: to try and achieve the Second Coming by means of prayer and spiritual enlightenment. For them, the Second Coming is the individual mystic experience of seeing Christ in his glory, and it is attainable by divine grace. Thus, the Second Coming happened many times, and will happen again and again.

The roots of the Greek Church go beyond the first mission of St Paul to Athens, for he recognised the religious zeal of the Hellenes. They did not have to be converted, but enlightened. Even today, Greeks are devoted to Christ, to His Mother Our Lady Mary and to her earthly manifestation, their own Mother Church established by SS John and Paul.

Their church stays out of politics, but exercises moral influence. Guided by her church, Greece does not participate in the Iraqi war, her sons do not die on the streets of Baghdad; and this most religious, most Christian nation shares the view of good Muslims and ours, that the world including Greece is threatened not by Islamic terrorism, but by the US fight against terrorism. Their Archbishop Christodoulos correctly stated that terrorism is caused by the “injustice and inequality that pervades the world.”

In The Wall Street Journal, a Zionist Greek Takis Michas, in a piece called Is Greece a Western Nation? writes with horror: “Such views seem to have more in common with public opinion in Cairo or Damascus than in Berlin or Rome.” Indeed, such views are common among Christians of Jerusalem and Damascus, Madrid and Montevideo, in short, in all lands where Christians are united in Apostolic Churches. So much for the silly concept of conflict between Christendom and Islam promoted by these guardians of the Christian faith, the Wall Street Journal and the New York Times!

As opposed to the West, the Greeks knew neither hatred nor fear of Jews. As they had their own national church, they did not transfer their spiritual values to Jews for safekeeping; and thus had no reason to bewail the loss of them. Where there is no guilt, there is no fear, either. Where there is no fear of Jews, there is no automatic support for the US, either, and Theodorakis’ view that “the root of evil today is the policy of President Bush” rather than the Muslim world is shared by many Greeks.
Greeks know Muslims not from books — they lived in close quarters with them for a millennium. They are aware that their long and troubled relationship with their Turk neighbours reached its nadir under the anti-Islamic rule of Kemal Ataturk, while Islamic Sultan Selim the Grim spent a fortune restoring the monasteries of Athos.

Now, both the Greek Left and the Greek Right are united in their rejection of the American drive to conquer the East, to enforce multiculturalism and to separate Church and State. They support the Palestinians and wish the Jews to come to their senses. They are a good example for US fundamentalists. Indeed, Greece is the proof that fundamentalist Christianity is not that of George Bush, and that the alternative to him is not monopolised by the First Lesbian Synagogue of New York.

Mt Athos, this green wooded island stretching into Aegean Sea, an independent Christian nation under Greek protectorate and home to twenty massive abbeys, a place where hundreds of monks and thousands of lay pilgrims pray to Lord, work the land, grow heavy olives and red apples, is a good place to recognise an unacknowledged victim of the Iraqi war: Christianity. Its reputation has been besmirched by people who take the name of Christ — and of fundamentalism — in vain. From the *New York Times* to *FrontPage magazine*, various Judaic publications provide an outlet for anti-Muslim rant, for calls to war in the name of Conflict of Civilisations. As a result, some Muslims began to answer by counter-attacking Christianity; and European and American youth learn to think of their faith as a danger to mankind. However, this victim is innocent: true Orthodox Christendom, as fundamentalist as it can be, firmly rejects the creed of Mammon and the US war on Islam.

Why were the Greeks better than the Western intellectuals at recognising these media lies for what they were? The reason, in my view, is the national character of the Greek Apostolic Orthodox Church. Separation of Church and State, this much vaunted accomplishment of the French revolution and even more of the US founding fathers, cut off the anchors of the Western society and it drifted straight towards the rocks. While in France the national Catholic church still occupies an important and exclusive place, the US, the country without a state church, became a victim and a
servant of Mammon. The small, independent churches of the US had no ability to form the mind of the nation; they competed for an outlet in the Jewish-owned media; they were forever threatened by tax authorities; they broke with tradition and became prey for the wolves.

This absence of one church further undermines the underlying concept of unity-in-God, elaborated by T S Elliot in *The Christian Idea of Society* (1939). People live together united by an idea; this idea may (or indeed should) be their common worship and uniting communion, thus the need for one national church that unites its people by a single communion.

The US was a first experiment on a large scale of what will happen to a society that is built on the quicksand of profit, instead of the rock of faith. Given this background, one can understand the US churches’ vulnerability to the Judaic influence and their readiness to support the Judaic Doomsday script. But this should be called heresy – not fundamentalism!

III

Fundamentally, the church always believed that the Jews will be eventually saved by coming to Christ. This important event will accompany the defeat of the Antichrist, as part of the Great Reawakening (metaphorically called the Second Coming). Then the sheep will be separated from goats, and those who accept Christ will continue into future life. As the Rise of Antichrist occurs in our days, we witness the first fruits of this sifting.

Our brother Mordechai Vanunu is one of the first swallows. This holy man, a scion of a learned Sephardi Jewish family, was horrified by the Jewish persecution of the native Palestinians and came to Christ. As a Christian, he denounced the Armageddon weapons of Antichrist, manufactured in Dimona, in the South of the Holy Land, within sight of Sodom. He was severely punished by the Antichrist and suffered 18 years in jail; but by God’s will he survived it like Daniel survived the Lions’ Pit.

There are many others: Neil and Gilad, Daniel and Menachem, Jews by birth who denounced the Judaic cult of Death and accepted the Living Christ. In every case, relationship to the Palestinian
suffering was the sieve: whoever disregarded it followed Antichrist; whoever denounced it, began his way to Christ.

Though modesty precludes me from referring to myself, I have a duty to witness. A vain and suffering man, I was granted the grace of Christ and was reborn in his glory. Though the ways of God are mysterious, I believe that it was my compassion and love for the native people of the Holy Land that made me worthy of His Theophany. A poem by the Greek Alexandrian poet Cavafy helped me to recognise my way:

For some people the day comes
When they must say the great Yes
Or the great No. He who has the Yes
Ready within him, says it
And goes by the path of honour, strong in his conviction.
He who refuses does not repent. Asked again,
He’d still say no. Yet that No – the right No –
Drags him down all his life.

I do not regret my Yes, and the attacks of enemies do not break my spirit. I am daily grateful to Christ who saved me from the Judaic paranoia of hating and being hated, and brought me into the world of loving and being loved. And every Jew who has come to Christ by the way of rejecting the Judaic ideas, by upholding love for the nations, is a portent of Salvation.

Now I have received good news, great news from a great man, Alfred Lilienthal, an American Jewish author of many books including famous *What Price Israel?* published in 1953 and republished last year. Alfred Lilienthal was one of the first Jews who renounced Zionist separation and mistreatment of Palestinians.

Now Suzanne Nicole, his webmaster, secretary and assistant wrote to me:

“At age 90, Alfred is quite frail and too blind to read, his short-term memory is severely impaired, so he has to be asked short questions (in a loud voice since he is also growing deaf), or he forgets what he is being asked. His long-term memory is still quite good, so he is also able to discuss concepts such as the difference between Judaism and Zionism. He understands current events when he first hears about
them but quickly forgets the details. I did paraphrase one of your statements from *The Pardes* to him:

“Thus, this discourse should help an individual to decide whether he wants to be a Jew, or not, in the same way one may choose whether one wants to be a communist or a Quaker, for it is my deep conviction that to be or not to be a Jew is an act of free will.”

He replied, “And that is what I have finally done.” He was baptised sometime shortly before last Thanksgiving. Even in *What Price Israel?* in 1953, he had referred to Jesus as a prophet of Israel. One day a couple of ministers had come by to see him at the urging of a Christian friend, and he made the decision in what seemed to some perhaps as a senile moment. But Friday afternoon, he said, “What is today? Is Ned coming to take me to church today?” So, it has stuck. He may not remember what day it is, but he does remember each day that he has chosen to become a follower of Christ like you.”

This conversion of Alfred Lilienthal is an important event, for it tells us that Christ’s grace is available to Jews and not only in the physical Holy Land: It is enough to renounce the separation of a Jew and a Gentile, to give up hate and to accept the love that is Christ.

Christian faith is not compatible with Jewish exclusivity. The mission among Jews can be successful only if the whole complex of Jewish separatism is removed, when their hearts are circumcised and they are brought into full communion with the people they live amongst. I have met in Israel with some ‘messianic Jews’, who were full of hate to the native people of the Holy Land. Not surprisingly, they thought Jesus Christ came just for Jews, and the Holy Land was theirs, too; they worshipped the Israeli Army and the flag of Israel. For them, the pivotal moment of history was not the Resurrection, but the Destruction of the Jewish Temple. In other words, they only pretended to be Christians, or not even that, as they preferred to be called ‘messianic Jews’.

Indeed, the plans of Almighty include the Jews; like the plans of the Ring included the hobbits; but some will play the role of Frodo, while others will take the part of Gollum, some will support Antichrist, and some will stay with Christ.

The ‘Antichrist Christians’ may revert to true fundamentalism, reject Antichrist and his drive to destroy the last enclaves of spirit
still hidden in the high mountains of Asia. Then they will be called ‘Christ’s Christians’. They may campaign for strengthening and uniting the American churches and eventually bringing them into full communion with the Apostolic Churches of the East and the West. They may campaign and undo the extreme separation of church and state in their country; for sacred and profane must be reunited. They may reintroduce worship of Our Lady, as the way to connect to nature. She performed a miracle in the neighbouring Mexico, and healed the wounds of the native people; she can repeat it in the US. Then you will be blessed by all those who damn you today; and the Americans will be met as friends by friends wherever they go. The plans of the Antichrist will be ruined, as happened before; and mankind will resume its noble path of striving to discover its divine qualities. For the main message of the Orthodox Christianity is that God became Man so Man can become God; this is the true meaning of the Second Coming.
The Spectator, a venerable British institution, recently purchased by the great supporter of Israel, ex-Canadian media mogul Conrad Black, published a long article by a Miss Melanie Phillips, a heady brew of theology and actuality called ‘Christians who hate the Jews’

Despite the punchy title, it deals with Christians who dare to profess Christ, rather than a form of Judaism adapted for Gentiles. Miss Phillips writes as a young girl straight out of convent school while encountering “the facts of life”. Apparently, she never knew that Christians have a New Testament. Why should these strange Gentiles replace a perfectly good Old Testament with a New One? Her insufficient grasp of ideas calls it ‘replacement theology invented by a revisionist Palestinian theologian’.

Needless to say, this term is but her invention, while the correct term is ‘supercessionism’. A genuine article is ‘replaced’ with a substitute, while an outdated idea is ‘superceded’ by a newer one. It was indeed invented by a “revisionist Palestinian theologian”, but his name was not Canon Ateek, as she claims, but Prophet Isaiah. He spoke of the New Covenant that will supersede the Old one. Afterwards, this idea became the cornerstone of Christianity, as the New Covenant between God and the Church (Israel of spirit) superseded the Old Covenant between God and Israel of flesh.

Ignorant Jews present it as an act of “hatred to Jews”, but it was just an opposite: the act of eradicating hatred between Jews and non-Jews. St Paul speaks about Christ as of “our peace who has

---

1 Christians who hate the Jews, opposition to Israel is motivated by anti-Semitism rooted deep in Christian theology
2 Epistle to Ephesians (2.14)
made us (i.e. Jews and non-Jews) one and has broken down the dividing wall of enmity”. “In Christ, this enmity was abolished, because through Christ, the Jewish faith was fulfilled. Christianity was not established as some new religion; it was accepted by chosen Jews who were the first Christians precisely because their belief in Christ as Messiah was for them nothing else but the fulfilment of the Jewish faith that is the faith of their forefathers from Abraham down to the time of Christ”.

In modern terms, Christianity was an upgrade of the old Judaism, or alternatively, return to its Palestinian roots and sources. Miss Phillips mistakenly identifies modern Jews with Biblical Israel. However, this identification is an act of faith, as arbitrary as any. No person in his right mind thinks that the victor of Agincourt is the same man who killed Anne Boleyn, though the name is identical, King Henry of England. Still, it is a common error to think that Judaism of our contemporaries is the Judaism of the days of Jesus.

The brilliant Israeli scholar, Prof. Israel Yuval of Hebrew University in his book, *Two Nations in Your Womb*, proved that Judaism we know of (Rabbinic Judaism) came to existence in the end of the first century after Christ. It came out of ruins of the old Temple-centred Biblical Judaism, practically at the same time as Christianity. It is a full answer to the notion of “superseding faith”. Christianity actually superseded Biblical Judaism (by return to its sources) and became the faith of millions. Still, a small band of men challenged its advent, and offered an alternative, Rabbinic Judaism. In the eyes of its followers, Rabbinic Judaism superseded Biblical Judaism.

Rabbinic Judaism has as little in common with Biblical Judaism as Christianity. It produced its own holy books, the Mishna and Talmud, as Christianity produced the New Testament. Prof. Yuval wrote: The Biblical Judaism died, and two religions claimed to be the legitimate heir, Christianity and Rabbinic Judaism. They had a good reason, as old Biblical Judaism contained elements of both. In a similar way, National Socialism and Communism are heirs to Hegel’s philosophy.
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Thus, Judaism we know of is a jealous sister, not a mother faith to Christianity. Its adepts are not the people who remained faithful to the “old religion”, as the Biblical Judaism with its sacrifices, Jerusalem Temple, ritual purity, tithes and priests disappeared two thousand years ago. It is a new faith explicitly made to fight Christianity.

As for Miss Phillips’ specific remarks, they express unmitigated ignorance of Christian faith and traditions coupled with a strong streak of Jewish supremacy.

Miss Phillips found the words of the Bishop Riah “an astounding interpretation of the Old Testament”. The Bishop Riah said of Palestinian Christians, “We are the true Israel”. There is no doubt that the Palestinians, Christians and Muslims are true descendants of the Twelve Tribes, of Prophets and Apostles. But the “true Israel” appellation denotes the basic tenet of Christian faith: the Church is the True Israel. In other words, it is not an “astounding interpretation of Old Testament”, but an orthodox reading of the New Testament.

She thinks Canon Ateek tries to “sever the special link between God and the Jews”. She apparently believes God feels more for a Jew than for an Englishman, or a Palestinian. Well, she is mistaken.

She chastises David Ison, canon of Exeter cathedral, who took a Palestinian guide. That is right, for a Jewish supremacist, only Jewish guides are kosher. As I guide pilgrims myself, I heartily concur with this idea. But I also ascribe to the notion that “genocide is now being waged in a long, slow way by Zionists against the Palestinians.”

Stephen Sizer, vicar of Christ Church, Virginia Water says that Israel is “an apartheid state”. She objects as “Israeli Arabs have the vote, are members of the Knesset and one is even a Supreme Court judge”. Well, the good vicar is right: two thirds of Palestinians have no vote, send no members to Knesset. “Israeli Arabs”, in Zionist parlance, are Palestinians with the right of vote. “Even one supreme court judge” sounds a bit too paternalistic for 45% of non-Jewish population of Palestine. Presence of one Jewish Government minister in Brezhnev’s USSR did not stop the kin of Miss Phillips to fight “Russian anti-Semitism”.

Anyway, what it has to do with “Christians who hate Jews”? Many good Israeli Jews share the hope of Vicar Sizer that “Israel will go the same way as South Africa” – into equality.
She quotes with horror Rev. Sizer: “The covenant between Jews and God,” he states, “was conditional on their respect for human rights”. Again, this thought was expressed by St John the Baptist, who said: if you do not observe human rights, God will turn these stones into new children of Abraham.

She does not mind generalisations and victimisation per se, as long as it is Muslims and Christians are stereotyped and blamed for. “Dr Patrick Sookhdeo, the director of the Institute for the Study of Islam and Christianity, has been addressing Christian groups up and down the country on the implications of 11 September. When he suggests that there is a problem with aspects of Islam, he provokes uproar”. Well, if he would suggest there is a problem with aspects of Judaism, would she quote him with such an empathy?

The Protestant Churches in the Holy Land hold a variety of opinions. On one end, there is a preacher of equality and liberty, Canon Ateek. On another end, there is a priest of the Church of Christ at Jaffa Gate, who supports Zeevi’s plans to expel all Gentiles from Palestine. Rather, he would like the Palestinian Christians to leave by their free will, while the Muslims will be ‘transferred’.

The Church of England did not make up her mind yet. The article in Spectator could be conceived as an attempt to scare some equality-minded clerics and suborn the Church. It is also a promotion paper for Rowan Williams, the Archbishop of Wales and a contender for the see of Canterbury. He is presented as a great friend of Israeli apartheid. Williams told her, “When I hear “the Jews” used as a term, my blood runs cold”. Probably it is meant to be a compliment, but it sounds like an anti-Semitic jibe: what is wrong with us Jews that our name chills a hot-blooded Welshman? (He became the Primate of the Church of England, and the C of E duly blessed the war on Iraq. But the day is not over yet!)

Christendom made a grave mistake by unilaterally abandoning ideological struggle against the Jewish paradigm. One should make a clear distinction between Jews as persons, and the Jewish paradigm as ideology. Jews are just human, and deserve to be treated and accepted as human. The Jewish paradigm should be confronted and counteracted. Two important issues were confused: the question of external relations, human and civil rights, human dignity on one side and ideological difference and variance, on the other side. They can, and should be treated separately.
Two Sisters

The two sisters, the Church and the Synagogue, forever struggle for the title of legitimate heir of the Covenant of Abraham and Moses. It is not an abstract theoretical question for theologians: victory of the Jewish idea would complete neo-liberalist and globalist takeover of Europe and America. The question of relationship between Judaism and Christianity turns around the axis of Supercession. However, the Catholic Church developed recently a dangerous doctrine of “supercession and co-existence”, saying that, while the Old Covenant was superceded it was not voided. If it is correct, there are two Israels, one of the Old and one of the New Covenant, and that is a logical and theological nonsense. If one accepts this doctrine, one accepts Judaic approach: Christ was the founder of the religion for Goyim.

For the last year, painful as it was for the inhabitants of the Holy Land, nothing caused me more sorrow than a single document called “the Reflections on Covenant by the US Conference of Bishops Committee”. Some innocent folks probably expect the end of the world to come in the polychrome version of Revelation, with live dragons and beasts galore. But each generation has its own signs, and ours chose bureaucracy. Drab and bureaucratic language of the Reflections could not obscure its nearness to what could be described as the Apostasy of Church and Denial of Christ.

The Reflections state, inter alia:
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1 On August 12, 2002, members of the Bishops’ Committee on Ecumenical and Interreligious Affairs (BCEIA), an arm of the National Council of Catholic Bishops (NCCB), along with the National Council of Synagogues (NCS), released the document called Reflections on Covenant and Mission. The full document is available on the website of the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops.
While the Catholic Church regards the saving act of Christ as central to the process of human salvation for all, it also acknowledges that Jews already dwell in a saving covenant with God. However, it now recognizes that Jews are also called by God to prepare the world for God’s kingdom. Their witness to the kingdom, which did not originate with the Church’s experience of Christ crucified and raised, must not be curtailed by seeking the conversion of the Jewish people to Christianity. The distinctive Jewish witness must be sustained if Catholics and Jews are truly to be, as Pope John Paul II has envisioned, “a blessing to one another”. This is in accord with the divine promise expressed in the New Testament that Jews are called to “serve God without fear, in holiness and righteousness before God all [their] days” (“Luke 1:74-75”).

In plain words, the Reflections deny the Mission of Christ and of St Paul and reduce Christianity to the second-tier-faith for goyim. Jews are already saved and need no Saviour —Caiaphas would repeat this line without hesitation. If the Gentiles wish to imitate Jews, while recognising Jewish inborn superiority, it is their business. For the Committee, Christ died in vain, and St Paul fought in vain. In the fateful Antioch confrontation, the emissaries of Jerusalem Church were right, while St Paul and St Peter were mistaken. Two-thousand-year-old struggle of the Church and the Synagogue was capped by this Capitulation Treaty.

It is my deep conviction that the Reflections are wrong, on many various and contradictory levels:

1. It is an act of cruelty to Jews. The Jews do suffer as they have no grace, while grace comes through Christ. Jewish Messianic movements, political involvement, troublemaking, Zionism, lust for power and money are caused by their subconscious desire for grace and communion with Christ. Yes, unbeknownst for themselves, the Jews desire Christ. Being told they do not need Christ would surely reinforce their blind and stubborn rejection of the only saving remedy.

2. It is an act of discrimination against our Muslim brothers who love Jesus Christ and His Holy Mother as much as we do.

3. It affirms the Zionist ideology of the Jewish “eternal covenantal right to the Holy land”, the ideology causing so much of bloodshed and uprooting of memory of Christ from His land.
4. It is an act of betrayal of the Christians of Jewish origin, of Apostles and Martyrs, who died professing Christ. If the holy Martyrs were to repeat the words of the Reflections, none of them would be martyred, not even Jesus Christ and certainly not St Paul and St Peter.

5. It is an act of betrayal of the Christians of Gentile origin, as it places them at the eternal second-class position of people who have to work hard in order to become almost equal to the Jews.

6. It is a rejection of Mission of Christ. Rabbinic Judaism and Christianity parted ways on the relation of the Chosen people to the rest of mankind. Jesus turned all his followers, Gentile and Jewish, into the Chosen people, into the people of God. He erased the chasm between a Jew and a Gentile. Jesus, like Prometheus, brought the Divine Fire of Grace to mankind, while his adversaries had wished to keep it to themselves. He acted like a prince who ennobled all his people, while the old nobility has revolted against Him and had denied His sovereign right to ennable whomever He wishes. In the Vineyard Parable, He proclaims His right to give the same reward to the first-called and later-called servants. The Committee denied Him this right.

7. It is a denial of Christ's Divinity. By agreeing with the false Jewish claim that Christ is the Messiah expected by the Jews, the Bishops rejected Godhead, for the Jews do not expect a Divine Saviour. Christ is the Messiah of the Old Testament, yes, but the Jews did not and do not understand it.

8. It is a denial of the Mission of St John the Baptist. If a modern Jew does not have to be baptised, even more so the ancient Jews did not have to be baptised, nor did Jesus Christ.

9. It is the end of the Mission to the Jews, as if the Church rules they do not have to be baptised, they won't. Not in the Catholic Church, anyway.

10. It will have severe repercussions for the social fabric of Christendom. Christ eliminated the privilege of Divine Election by giving it to everyone who wants to take it. In most general way, Judaism and Christianity struggled as two paradigms, that of supremacy, and that of brotherhood. Now the Committee had accepted the paradigm of supremacy.

11. A similar process took place in India, where the equality-based Buddhism was defeated by the older, caste-based Hinduism
despite many successes. Since then caste-bound India declined spiritually and materially. Christendom will inevitably follow the same road.

12. The Church has to re-assess its attitude to the Jews. Its present conciliatory attitude is due to the Rise of the Jews, a unique and unprecedented phenomenon expressed in the mantra of “Three Great Monotheistic Faiths”. Theologically, it is meaningless, as the Jewish concept of Tribal God of Israel connects rather with Zoroastrianism than with the universal faiths. It is meaningless historically, as Jews were a constellation of small social groups in other civilizations. It is meaningless numbers-wise, as there are less Jews than Jamaicans. It is meaningless cultural contribution-wise, as probably the Jews are on a par with Welsh or Czech, not with the spiritual might of Christendom or Dar ul-Islam. It has just one meaning. Tiny Jewish community has as much money and power as a billion of Christians or a billion of Muslims.

13. For Christians, (as opposed to the Jews and Calvinists), wealth and power are not the proofs of Divine Blessing. The wealth and power can be provided by the Christ’s adversary, the Prince of the World, who can give his servants everything but grace. In the millennia-long argument, the Prince of the World tries to prove people prefer him and wealth without grace, to God and grace without wealth. Once chosen by God, the Jews have become the chosen tool of the Prince of the World, as we witness daily in Palestine. That is the source and meaning of their Rise.

14. Now the Jews do to Christianity what the US did to the Soviet Union. Despite the sweet talk of rapprochement and co-existence, they try to undermine its foundations. It is not a chance coincidence that the Reflections were written in the city of the sex scandal, Boston. Continuing the simile, the Reflections usher in the Perestroika, and unless their authors will be stopped, the collapse of the Church is inevitable.

15. While there is no place for violence in the inter-communal relations, the ideological struggle should not stop. The Church should audibly and strongly reject the ideas of the Reflections. The relations between the Jews and Christians are those of competitors, and the Jews did not give up their old dream to reduce the rival. It is the right time for the Church to cease its apologies and to counteract the adversary in strength.
The Orthodox Church avoided the problem by skipping the idea of supercession altogether. The New Covenant is absolutely identical to the Old one of Abraham and Moses; Christ admitted Gentiles to the Covenant but it remained the same Covenant. “The Covenant, established by God with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob is the same Covenant which afterwards was established with the whole Jewish nation, and the same Covenant was established through Christ with those both Jews and non-Jews who believe in Him. As there is only one God, there is only one Covenant1”.

The Jews, who rejected Christ and rejected the Covenant, are OUTSIDE of the one and only Covenant. “Since God through Christ has opened his Covenant to the Gentiles, those, from the Jews, who do not consider themselves to be in one beloved Israel of God with righteous Christians from all other nations do not belong to Israel either and do not participate in the Covenant of God. There is only one way to participate in the Covenant — to believe that there is one Israel, one Covenant, one faith, since there is only one God. There cannot be two Israels, two or more different Covenants of God or two or more Gods2”.

While terminology is different, the Apostolic Churches were of one mind: the Jews, who do not wish to be in the same Covenant with God as non-Jews, reject God. The word ‘Israel’ has two meanings. The first is ‘People of God’, and the Jews (like the Apostles) who chose to be in the same Covenant with Gentiles are part of it. The second meaning of ‘Israel’ is ‘Rebel against God’, and the Jews who, out of hubris, refused to be in the same Covenant, entered the state of rebellion against God.

Consider a city where is just one hotel which admits everybody. A person who insists to stay in segregated hotel will sleep on the bench in the park; that is the good logic of Christian theology. However, there is a competing establishment, and it is run by the professional Rebel, the Prince of the World. Sooner or later, the proud vagabond will find his way to the Prince.

We can come back to our previous interpretation. God wants to unite with Man as much as Man wants to unite with God. God chose Abraham and taught him the union. God chose Moses and tried to
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teach a whole tribe. He gave to Israel many precious gifts, including
the gift of persuasion, for them to spread the knowledge among men.
But Israel became intoxicated by the gifts and God’s choice, and
instead of worshipping God, turned to self-worship. As Israel rejected
God, he became a powerful tool of the Prince of the World.

(We can conceive it as a game between God and Satan, described in the book of Job: who of the two will win in free con-
test over the soul of Man). Then, God incarnated within Israel as
Man. It was a Divine attempt to take over the tool of Satan, just as
Satan took over this tool from God. The Jews rejected God again
and killed him, as slaves kill the son of the vineyard owner in one
of his parables, but mankind received the knowledge of God.

The Jews rejected God and God punished the Jews by with-
drawing His grace. Man without Grace is but a nuisance to himself
and to others. He can not settle but doomed to wander on earth, as
a reminding to others: it is bad to be without grace. But the Prince
of the World can give everything but grace, and he made a new
deal with graceless rebels. They will do his will, and he will help
them to succeed in earthly matters. That is the scaring explanation
of earthly successes of George Soros and Marc Rich, of the Jewish
state and of the American Neo-Cons, of Russian Jewish oligarchs
and neo-liberals, of Freud and Milton Friedman, of Madeline
Albright and Henry Kissinger. It feels that whatever they wish they
succeed: they ruin countries and pauperise nations, they cause
wars and justify oppression, deny spiritual and upheld destructive
carnal desires.

It was particularly manifest during the 1991 Russian neo-lib-
eral revolution, when suddenly the wealth of Russian people was
snatched by a few predominantly Jewish businessmen. Seven out of
eight greatest Russian oligarchs were Jews, and they owned bigger
part of Russian media and resources. I could not believe my own
eyes, but was forced to admit: the Jews were a major partner in this
turn of events. The Protocols became reality for many Russians in
these days. It was so shocking for people brought up on rejection of
this thought, that a Russian thinker proposed as the only way out,
the concept of great anti-Jewish conspiracy aimed to ‘frame’ the
Jews. But the idea of anti-Semitic conspirators happily pushing bil-
lions of dollars to the Jewish pockets is at least as odd as the idea of
Jewish conspiracy.
Could it be that the Rise of Jews, or, say, the Jewish success is but a mirage concocted by our imagination? In order to remove doubts, one can read the Preface\(^1\) by Kevin McDonald. Another comprehensive summary is given by Benjamin Ginsberg’s *The Fatal Embrace: Jews and the State*.\(^2\) Recently, the daring American philosopher Michael Neumann\(^3\) tried to show this power is not all that great, as “the Jews do not own the sinews of America”, but its media. But it reminds the famous bon-mot of Stalin, “How many divisions has the Pope?” Neumann notes, quite correctly, that the Anglo-Saxon Americans own “sinews” of America, from its oil to its steel, while the Jews’ share of ownership is not that grand. Then, implicitly applying the Marx postulate on the primacy of means of production he concludes that the ‘Gentiles’ of America could do whatever they want and if they pay attention to the Jewish wishes, it is only because they wish so.

However, this idea of Marx is somewhat dated, for two reasons. One, a new phenomenon of financial capital, which exceeds real value of ‘sinews’ by factor of ten. A broker company, like the Soros fund, has more paper money at its disposal than any oil or steel corporation. This is the financial ‘pyramid’ of last ten-fifteen years. Second reason is more fundamental: the Jews, in my opinion, form an alternative church of America and the West. The Christian church was never as rich as big feudal lords, but it was the guiding light and the supreme organiser for centuries. Now, in the new church, the Jews form the Nation of Priests, an equivalent of Brahmins in Hindu civilisation. After long struggle, the Brahmins of India managed to undo the achievements of Buddhists, and a similar process takes now place in the West. That is the reason of Gentile America’s compliance with the Jewish wishes. Neumann correctly says that the Americans rebelling against ‘the Jewish power’ are not likely to be shot at dawn. But that is the difference between a church and state authorities. As opposed to revolution against the state order, rebellions against the church are less frequent and rarely succeed, for the church is the most basic element of civilisation, in Toynbeean sense. Full refutation of Neumann
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\(^2\) see a summary on www.thornwalker.com/ditch/deadlyenemy.htm incl. some critique.

\(^3\) http://www.counterpunch.com/neumann01072003.html
was done by Jeffrey Blankfort, and his essay leaves no doubt to the extent of the Jewish power in the US. Similar research was done for other countries, and came to similar conclusions.

One really can not explain it by ‘Jewish smartness’, as Kevin MacDonald tried. Indeed, “the latest developments in human history can not be plausibly explained by rational material causes. Beyond all-too-human figures of big corporations, beyond capitalised Greed, beyond the paradigm of Domination, the faceless Destroyer has made his appearance on Earth as Lord Darth Vader on the captive planet!”. Indeed, these successes were an additional proof of the mystical nature of the Jewish People, as was noted by Fr Sergei Bulgakov, a great friend of Jews. He wrote:

“Israel (in the meaning: The Jewish People) rejected Christ and was doomed to wander like Agasfer and fight Christ. It is a frightening and fateful image: on one hand, Israel is persecuted by Christian nations; on the other hand, Israel is an overt or hidden persecutor of Christ and Christianity. But it is not the worst element of his fate. The worst is that Christ-rejecting Israel is armed by the tools of the Prince of the World, and takes his place. Power of money, Mammon is the world-embracing Jewish power, notwithstanding the fact that big part of Jewry lives in poverty... The spiritual state of Israel is ambiguous: on one side, the belligerent adversary of Christianity, Israel is the laboratory of spiritual poisons targeting Christendom and the world. On the other hand, the religious passion of Israel does not vane. Israel is Christianity without Christ, even against Christ, but it seeks and aspires to Him only”.

This explanation was commonly accepted for hundreds of years and denied only by thorough materialists of 19th century. We were brought up on this denial and accepted it as a dogma. Like a child in a Zoo who looks at giraffe and repeats, “such animal can't exist”, I repeated our materialistic explanations. And only when they failed, I agreed with what the Rabbis and Priests told: the story of Israel is a manifestation of God’s design.

For the troubles of Israel we described can be translated into the language of the Prophets: “Israel forgot God”.

1 Apocalypse Now
Yuletide Message

It is not a coincidence Christ was born in Judea, a day after the winter solstice, the darkest time of the year. It is not a coincidence that he was born in the family of Palestinian refugees from Galilee, hunted by the army to the caves at the edge of the desert.

Son of Man could be born anywhere on earth, and would be received with great glory. Instead, he chose the darkest time and the darkest place, and the lowest position there is. He came as light comes, where and when it is most needed.

His birth in Palestine is sometimes understood as a sign of special election of the people he was born amongst. The Jews were chosen worthy to give birth to Christ, preach Evangelical Zionists in their drive to support Israel. Another Zionist outlet, Jews for Jesus, try and appropriate Christ as their coreligionist and a fellow Jew, a Saviour for the Jews. A whole PR industry promotes an idea of Jesus as a Jewish Rabbi, and of necessity for Christians to give tribute to Jews.

But it is possible to read the text in the different light: Jesus chose to be born in the darkest time, in the darkest place, among people possessed by their dark idea. The Jewish paradigm of that time was a system of double morals, of mutual support combined with disregard to an outsider, of inward love and outward enmity. Christ chose to be born here as he felt: this idea is the most dangerous one the mankind faces, and it has to be taken on.

The tradition tells, after his death, he descended to the netherworld and saved the souls of just. It is called Harrowing the Hell, and a visual presentation of this deed can be found in many churches, for instance, in the small apse of St Saviour monastery of Chora in Constantinople/Istanbul. His birth in Herodian Judea
under Pharisee control was a prefiguration of his descent to Hell. He came to the worst place and saved the souls of just, of Peter and Paul, of John and Jacob and of other good men. Short three hundred years after his birth, and his idea of brotherhood of man won the day. Alas, the forces of darkness were not defeated.

This idea of supremacy, of inequality, of being good to your kin and awful to the rest, is again the biggest danger mankind faces now, two thousand years later, when the world made a complete circle and came back to the same place. Bethlehem again bewails its innocents; a newer, better equipped version of King Herod rules in Jerusalem; the doctrine of double morality again spans the earth and captures the great empires.

Still, one finds hope today: the darkest time is already behind us. Be merry!
Yuletide Controversy

Christmas greetings are supposed to be a pretty non-controversial stuff, but not anymore. The date of Nativity caused a heated polemics among my friends and readers. Lane, from Miami wrote, “it was my understanding that the actual time of Christ’s birth was in September”. Shanaz from Saudi Arabia was of different mind: “Jesus was born in April, check it out”. Prof. John Williams from Virginia explained: “You may be aware that most historians believe that Jesus must have been born in September, under the sign of the Virgin. The Church moved his “official birthday” to just after the shortest day of the year in order to emphasize that he was the Light of the World”. And Bryce from Atlanta offered another date: “most scholars will agree that Jesus was born in mid-late October (a kindred Libran)

● ● ●

Such variety of proposed dates, and all of them “actual”, and agreed by “most experts”! Is it a meaningful controversy? Well, up to a point. There isn’t and can’t be any new historical knowledge about the Nativity that was not available to, say, St Jerome of Bethlehem or Eusebius of Caesarea. As centuries and millennia pass by, we do not learn more about these times, we just forget. People of Bethlehem are not likely to remember the fact of birth of a humble refugee from Galilee. The church decided on the date on the basis of the best data available at the time. The persons who decided were men of great faith, curiosity, desire to establish true facts, and I see no reason to doubt their decision.

Could the Church move his birthday in order to emphasize that he was the Light of the World? Before replying to this ques-
tion, I shall quote an amusing booklet published in the second half of 19th century under the title “Napoleon as a Solar Myth”. The author “proves”, tongue-in-cheek, that Napoleon never existed, but he was just a new version of the Solar Myth, and his 12 marshals were, yes, you guessed it, twelve months or signs of Zodiac. In the same vein, one could argue that Sabbatai Zevi, the great Jewish prophet of 17th century, was an invention, as he was born and died on 9th of Ab, the day of Destruction of the Temple. Many other important men were born on auspicious dates. Why would not Christ be born on such a day?

Doubt of Nativity date hides a greater doubt, the doubt of divinity, doubt of predestination, doubt of God’s existence. If God exists, and if He arranged for the Star to announce the coming of Christ, is it strange that Christ would be born on the day of great importance to all mankind? No, it would be logical. The birth of Son of Man was a cosmic event, and it would be expected to happen on a special day. As he was the Light of the World, he was born after the winter solstice. Even more important, the darkest time of the year hints to the darkest place on earth. Jerusalem was the focal point of the system of double morals, of inward love and outward enmity. Christ chose to be born here as he felt: this idea is the most dangerous one the mankind faces, and it has to be taken on.

This connection is overlooked by the evangelical Zionists, who misunderstand his birth in Palestine as a sign of special election of the people he was born amongst. The Jews were chosen worthy to give birth to Christ, they preach. One could think Christ was born in purple. The date is especially relevant as it confirms what we know: he was born in the Heart of the Darkness.

If you doubt Christ, then it makes sense to doubt the cosmically significant date of Nativity. And then you can find yourself on a wrong side of the frontline that goes through New York and Bethlehem, as the struggle is far from over.

The Washington Times (28.11.01) published an interesting article called “Calendars for Advent appear more secularised”. Newspaper reporter visited a few bookshops in the US, from Barnes and Noble to Borders, and found that the Advent calendars dropped Nativity. There are mice, bunnies, Santa Claus, bears, ‘Nutcracker’, but no Bethlehem, no Nativity. ‘The stores do not
want to offend any non-Christian shoppers’, offers an explanation an interviewee.

Who are those “non-Christians”? Surely not Muslims, who commemorate the Nativity of Christ as much as anybody, and who are anyway disregarded in the US. There are not too many Neo-Pagans, either. So, why could not they write in less oblique way, “the shop owners feel the Jews do not want to see anything connected to Christ”? Probably because it would be a painful truth. The Orthodox Jews have even a special routine for Christmas. The preferred occupations are cutting toilet paper for the forthcoming month and suchlike, reported the local Jerusalem newspaper *Kol Ha-Ir*: Non-religious Jews forgot the reason why, but still keep fighting Christ and Christianity.

*Forward*, the most progressive Jewish American newspaper, dedicated a long article to Jewish Christmas customs. It refers to “the traditional Eastern European Jewish custom of playing cards on Christmas Eve” and explains it: “The most precious commandment for religious Jews is learning Torah… The only time Jews would not learn was at times of personal or communal mourning — and on Nitlnacht. There would be no learning to bring honour and merit to the one that was born on that night (i.e. to Jesus Christ”).

Jews would not say “Christmas”. “Punning derogatorily in different languages on Christian words for this holiday, it turns out, was indeed a time-honoured (!) Jewish practice. For instance, Nitlnacht (a pun on nit, nothing, or on Hebrew nitleh, “the hanged one”), Kratzmakh, (a made-up Yiddish word that sounds like “Scratch-me”), Taluy-nakht, “the night of the hanged man”, blinde nakht, “Blind Night” (a pun based on the Ukrainian, in which sviatyi vechir, “sacred evening,” was turned by Jews into slipyi vechir, “blind evening”), Khvoristvo (a pun on Ukrainian rizdvo, “Christmas”, and Belorussian khvori, “sick.”). “Some Yiddish speakers in Western Poland called Christmas beyzgeboyrenish, “Badly Born”, playing on Polish Boze Narodzenie, “Divine Birth.”

*Forward* concludes: “It’s clear, I think, why Christmas should have inspired so many Jewish puns. It was a day that Jews had an
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instinctive distaste for, it being the holiday on which Christians celebrated the incarnation of God in human form of all Christian beliefs, the one to strike the Jewish mind as the most absurd and repugnant.” Repugnant, no less!

The Washington Times quotes Patrick Scully of the Catholic League: “We witness neutering of Christmas ... Christmas suffered a direct hit from this secularisation. One is allowed to see symbolism in Kwanzaa, while a Nativity scene may mean a battle with the (heavily Jewish) ACLU”. As the Christians of the US prefer to avoid battle with ACLU, Israelis can battle the besieged Bethlehem with greater ease, but who knows, which front of this battle is the most important one?

The American Jewish Committee, the ADL and other major Jewish supremacist organizations have worked relentlessly to forbid the singing of Christmas carols in schools and public institutions. They have made sure that Nativity scenes and Christian symbols are removed from community property, but they have worked for and even received court approval for Jewish Menorahs on public property.


Q. What is excessive when it comes to Christmas decorations on handouts and in the classroom?

A. First, it is important to note that while Christmas trees, Santas, wreaths, wrapped gifts, and reindeer are commonly used as Christmas decorations or symbols, the courts have decided that they are secular symbols of the season. Nevertheless, their inordinate usage is inappropriate. Talk to the teacher about the plethora of Christmas decorations on the homework assignments. Explain that while you understand that displaying such graphics on workbook assignments is legal, such excessive use makes you and your child feel uncomfortable. Suggest alternative winter decorations, including snowflakes, gingerbread houses, and mittens that may be more inclusive.

Q. Is it appropriate for teachers to hold Christmas parties and to allow those who don’t observe to be excused?
A. The students are being told, in effect, “Come to a fun party with gifts, food, and games, or go to the library for the afternoon”. While legal, this party is insensitive to those students who do not celebrate Christmas. With a few adjustments, this party can be a positive experience for all of the students. Instead of celebrating Christmas, the party can celebrate the winter season or a variety of holidays. Finally, since receiving gifts from Santa Claus is a Christian tradition, it is inappropriate in the public school classroom.¹

The attempts to sow doubts about Christ are regularly done by some Jewish scholars, who usually try to downgrade Him. If he existed, they claim, he surely was just an ordinary bloke, a vagrant teacher from Galilee, who was born anywhere but in Bethlehem, anytime but on an auspicious date, and grew up anywhere but in Nazareth. If he existed he surely did not care about Goyim, non-Jews, they say. Why indeed a good Jewish Rabbi would care about the rest of mankind? (This is the underlying idea of the book of Hiyam Maccobi, for instance, where the Jewish nationalist writer claims Christ was a Jewish extreme nationalist, a Rabbi Kahane of his days). For Jewish scholars, media-owners, opinion-makers the fight against Christ was and still remains an important part of the agenda, and denial of Nativity is a weapon in this struggle. It is not the only weapon, and I shall give you an example.

The Washington Post printed in its last Easter edition on the first page (not far from its usual glorification of Israel) a feature called “The Face of Christ”, containing a police-style e-fit. It showed a rather crude and brutish face of a man, with low forehead, darkish skin, eyes expressive of cunning, a type of lowly menial worker. It bore a caption, “Face of Christ”. Bold headlines advised the reader that now the latest tools of science were used in order to find out how Jesus Christ looked, on basis of some sculls found in Jerusalem. Well, 90 p.c. of the readership does not go beyond the bold headlines, into petite letters, and they would remain with a feeling that after all, a scull of Jesus was discovered, and he turned out to be quite an unpleasant fellow.

Only careful perusal of the feature article shows the face being a reconstruction of a Jewish contemporary of Christ, based on a

¹ quoted by David Duke in his radio sermon, available on his website.
few sculls found in Palestine. The authors could call the brutish e-fit, “The High Priest of Jews”. They could remain neutral and unbiased and call the e-fit “a face of a Jewish (?) contemporary of Christ”, but they preferred the misleading legend “Face of Christ”, with its implication that Christ actually looked like a low criminal.

With absolutely the same license, they could make a composite photo of a few women from the local old folks house and publish it as “a face of Marilyn Monroe”. But then, this newspaper has its own agenda. On this agenda, fighting Christ has higher priority, than debunking Marilyn Monroe. And this newspaper does not stand alone, but it liaises with other media outlets all over the US, Canada, England. The picture of “the face of Christ” appeared in all of them, and afterwards, probably, in every major newspaper, as who would give away such a scoop?

Struggle against Christianity and Christ is the raison d’être of Judaism, as Christ symbolises the end of Jewish chosenness. We are truly blessed that nowadays, the Jewish war against Christ is expressed just in the siege of Bethlehem and a ban on Christ in ‘Christmas’.
Easter Offensive

The prevailing theological American idea could be called “Judeo-American” approach, but its adepts prefer a rather misleading title of “Judeo-Christianity”. According to the teaching of Judeo-Christianity, there is not much difference between two rival religions. Christianity teaches that He came and will come again, while Judaism considers the Messiah who is Christ did not come yet, c’est tout. But reality is quite different. Christ is God, Messiah of Rabbinic Judaism is Man. Christ is God for all, Messiah is for Jews only. Judaism and Christianity are two diametrically opposing religious systems. A nominal Jew and a nominal Christian can be best friends, indeed, father and son, husband and wife, but ideologically they differ more than a Neo-Con and a Trot.

Christianity and Judaism offer two different, indeed opposing approaches. Their struggle is a natural competition. At first sight, the two sister-faiths are similar; both celebrate at Easter/Pesach their accepted sacrifice by a narration, the liturgy of Passion for Christians and the family narrative of Haggadah for Jews. But actually they could not differ more. The Jewish Passover narrative came as the response to the Passion story. In the Biblical Judaism, Passover sacrifice was carried out in the Temple. After Resurrection of Christ and destruction of the Temple, the old custom died, and the Christian Passion story came to be told and performed. The Rabbis created a brand new counter-Christian liturgy, the Passover Haggadah, a family recital of exegetic interpretations of the Exodus. Professor Yuval demonstrates that Haggadah was not told before the advent of Christianity; moreover, it was created as response to the mysteries of the Passion.
Passion is a story of supreme self-sacrifice of the Chosen one for the sake of universal salvation, the Haggadah is a story of sacrificing the enemies and celebrating salvation of the Chosen ones. At Easter, Christians celebrate resurrection of one who sacrificed himself for us. It is affirmation of altruism to the highest degree. Jewish Passover has an opposite idea: it is our salvation and their death. Egyptians and the people of Canaan should be sacrificed, so we would live better, that is the Passover idea, the affirmation of national egoism.

This difference is not a pure scholastic one, but a question of praxis as well. Since the rise of the Jewish paradigm, the prosperous nations sacrifice the poor nations so they would live even better. The growing poverty of the Third World is the proof of it. Look at the figures. Between 1960 and 1980 per capita income in Latin America grew 73%, and in Africa, 34%. During the period of ‘economic liberalization’, or the rise of Jewish paradigm, 1980 to 2000, that growth plummeted to 7% in Latin America and in Africa it went into reverse — minus 23%.

— Is it “work of Jews?” — asks the reader. Surely not. The Jews and the Christians influence each other. When Christian influence prevails, Jews turn to more merciful interpretations, and become “a blessing to all”. When Judaic influence prevails, Christians behave like the worst of Jews. For we do not speak about ‘Jews’, but about “the Jewish paradigm”, which can exist without Jews as well. A person of Jewish descent is not necessarily a bearer of the Jewish ideas. There is no need to fight ‘the Jews’, but “the Jewish paradigm” in all its manifestations.

This paradigm does not stop at the border; it works in the “core country”, in the US, as well. There, the rich sacrifice the less affluent so they would live even better. A new study, *Divergent Paths*, proved that ninety percent of young workers in the US now doing worse than they would have 20 years ago. Since 1980, only a small percentage of Americans improved their lot, while for the rest, the per-
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2 Co-authors of the book are Martina Morris, a University of Washington professor of sociology and statistics, Annette Bernhardt, senior research associate at the Center on Wisconsin Strategy at the University of Wisconsin, Madison; Mark Handcock, professor of statistics and sociology at the University of Washington; and Marc Scott, assistant professor of educational statistics at New York University. The research was funded by the Russell Sage Foundation and the Rockefeller Foundation.
spectives of “upward mobility” are gloomy. In the best ally of the US, in Britain, the figures are even worse. Both these countries have now poorly educated youth and inefficient health care. In the same period of time, rich people became richer by far, tells the study; while the Jewish community’s average income became twice that of Gentile American. The result would be even more convincing if we would compare ordinary Americans with Neo-Jews, i.e. ideological supporters of the Jewish paradigm, i.e. neo-liberal ideas and Zionism.

In Israel, an average Jew has eight times the income of a Gentile, while the gap between rich Neo-Jews and ordinary Jews is vast, as well. Nowhere the praxis of Easter/Passover dispute is obvious as much as in Palestine. When the Jews came to Palestine, they were quite poor. The British administration enacted a local statute allowing building only of stone in Jerusalem. Stone was expensive, Jews were poor, and the statute was described as ‘anti-Semitic’. In 1948, the Gentiles’ stone mansions of Jerusalem were confiscated and given to Jews, while the legal owners were pushed into refugee camps. They languish in poverty so we can live better.

In the bare hills around al Halil/Hebron, Palestinian villagers have no water, and their flocks die near dried-up spring. The spring water goes by a pipe into the swimming pool of a Jewish settlement. It is also a realisation of the maxim, “let them die, if we can live better”. Using the Passover idea, the Talmud rules\(^1\) on priority for drawing water at a well, “need of a Jew to do his laundry takes precedence over the lives of Gentiles”. It is implemented in real life, in real time, in Israel.

Theology is ideology, and there is no place for ideological compromise between these opposing paradigms. The perceived difference between the twain was stated by the sides as follows. A prominent modern Jewish scholar and editor of Talmud, Rabbi Adin Steinzaltz described Christianity as “simplified Judaism, adapted to the childish minds of Gentiles”. On the other hand, a grandson of a Rabbi, Karl Marx, wrote: “Christianity is the sublime Judaist thought, while Judaism is a sordid utilitarian application of Christianity”.

Now, in these days, we should decide what to celebrate — the altruism of Easter or egoism of Passover. I would conclude with the

\(^1\) Tosefta Baba Metzia 11:33-36
marvellous words of Robert Leverant, “What the Jews are doing to the Palestinians is abominable. To participate in a service where the Jews are going to say “we are victims” is beyond my ability to stomach”.

The war in Palestine became a part of the global war between followers and deniers of Christ. It is not an accident that at the same time, the Virgin in Bethlehem was shelled¹ by a Jewish tank; in the US and elsewhere, the Jewish-dominated media² began a vicious smear campaign against Catholic clergy; while in France, a film *Amen* denigrating the late Pope Pius came to cinemas. Suggestively, the Cross on the movie's posters turns into Nazi swastika.

Wait, – a reader proclaims. The Virgin was indeed shelled at fifty yards, but do not get carried away. The media just reported real or alleged sexual transgressions committed recently by Catholic priests in a few countries. That is the duty of the press.

While report of every single misdeed may be true or not, their grouping lies in the eye of the beholder, i.e. the media. The media grouped the events into a single tendency, by picking separate events and creating a world-wide conspiracy of the priests to abuse children, a par with the blood libel of old. While they did it to priests, they carefully avoid doing it to the Nation of Priests. We read of “the wave of priests’ rapes”, but we never read of “Jewish financial machinations”. In such a case, there are “separate misdeeds of separate persons who happened to be Jews”. For instance, a small item in *New York Times* reported on alleged conspiracy between Goldman, Saks investment bankers and Robert Maxwell. These Jewish tycoons joined forces and swindled thousand English employees of Maxwell’s media empire. The workers lost their pension funds; Goldman and Maxwell pocketed the cash and shipped a share of it to Israel. While giving the facts, the *New York Times* avoided a reference to the perpetrators’ Jewishness. This praiseworthy political correctness is dropped when it comes to the Church.

The present crisis in Zimbabwe provides another example. The media reported at length about the attempted framing of the
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¹ See my article *Our Lady of Sorrows*
² See http://www.csulb.edu/~kmacd/Preface.htm
opposition leader into an assassination plot against the president Mr Robert Mugabe, but the personality standing behind the plot and/or the frame-up remained unknown. Very few papers, among them a British weekly, the Economist, told its readers that it was an Israeli officer who claimed expertise on political assassinations. But the Economist avoided bringing up a long line of politicians who were kidnapped and/or assassinated by Jews and Israelis. Among them we would find not only old cases of a German ambassador in Paris in 1938, or attempt at Lenin’s life in 1918, or assassination of Lord Moyne in Cairo in 1944, and the UN Swedish envoy Count Folke Bernadotte in 1948, but fresh cases of kidnapping and assassination of the Moroccan opposition leader Ben Barka and a failed kidnapping attempt of a Nigerian minister in 1970s. The list of assassinated Palestinians would be too long for the article. Still, the newspapers did not write “Jews again at assassination games”, rightly avoiding generalisations. It is just for the clergy the generalising headline implying that “priests are paedophiles” was found suitable. Thus, the Jewish-dominated media continues its struggle against the church, by applying double standard to misbehaving priests and misbehaving Jews.
Pope Pius

I

The factual side of Pope Pius controversy was described many times: accusations of Mad Goldhagen, reduction of Goldhagen’s arguments by Norman Finkelstein, many articles pro and contra, make it unnecessary to enter the subject. It is enough to say that during WWII, the New York Times praised Pius for being the only major figure in Europe who was not silent about racial persecution: “a lonely voice crying out in the silence of a continent”.

The attack on the Pope fits too neatly into general anti-Christian rant of the Jewish Hollywood, where Christianity is typically portrayed as evil. For example, in the film Monsignor (1982), a Catholic priest commits every imaginable sin, including the seduction of a glamorous nun and then is involved in her death. In Agnes of God (1985), a disturbed young nun gives birth in a convent, murders her baby, and then flushes the tiny, bloody corpse down the toilet. There are also many subtle anti-Christian scenes in Hollywood films, such as when the director Rob Reiner repeatedly focuses on the tiny gold crosses worn by Kathy Bates, the sadistic villain in Misery.

“Hollywood has portrayed Christians as sexually rigid, devil worshipping cultists, disturbed, hypocritical, fanatical, psychotic, dishonest, murder suspects, Bible quoting Nazis, slick hucksters, deranged preachers etc”, wrote J. W. Cones, while Joe Sobran rightly concluded, “Pius XII isn’t Goldhagen’s ultimate target; Christianity is”.

Here again, one is rather worried by lack of response. Instead of discussing whether the Pope spoke loud enough about the Jewish holocaust, why we do not discuss and do not see movies about active involvement of leading Rabbis with the current Palestinian holocaust? Lubawitscher Rebbe did not keep quiet, but called to genocide, and his call was supported by dozens of Rabbis in an ad in Haaretz. Why a poster with the Star of David and Swastika would be condemned by the US senate, while Cross and Swastika poster is displayed on the streets? Why Vatican lawyers do not activate ‘hate legislation’ of Europe against its creators?

II

The Church’s desire for peace was misinterpreted by the supporters of the Jewish idea. After the Pope, while in the Holy Land, said the Catholic Church “is deeply saddened by the hatred, acts of persecution and displays of anti-Semitism directed against the Jews by Christians at any time and in any place”, the Washington Post’s London correspondent T. R. Reid called the Church to scrap the Passion narrative, or re-write it totally. This call was repeated by a Conrad Black newspaper, Boston Globe columnist. But the media just repeats what some Christian clergy say. Richard Harries, the Anglican Bishop of Oxford and chairman of the Council of Christians and Jews, told The Times, “I would far rather people come to belief in the living God through Judaism than have no spiritual home at all”.

I am not too surprised. The councils and other dialog groups between Jews and Christians became an arena of fierce competition: who is more pro-Jewish of the two.1 There is no reciprocity. While the Bishop practically calls his flock to renounce Christ, Israeli Parliament (Knesset) debates the Zvili & Gafni Bill proposing up to a year of jail for quoting the New Testament or even referring to Christ and Christianity in a positive way, let alone joining the Church. Gafni was awarded with the desirable post of
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Israel Ambassador in France, and not even one man in the Favoured Daughter of the Church protested this affront. The Christian clergy, who gave up Christ and preferred the Jewish paradigm, should contemplate the words of Christ: “You are the salt of the world, but if salt loses its saltiness, it is thrown away”. They are not needed, as Rabbis would manage without them as well.

III

Nothing attracts as much as success, and these are years of spectacular success for the Jewish paradigm. More Holocaust museums were built, stronger became the US support for Israel. In 1956, a Jew in the US earned as much as a Christian, and the US could order Israeli troops to leave Sinai. Now the average income of a Jewish community member became twice that of a WASP, and the US administration obediently jumps the loop for Sharon.

“Is it good for the Jews?” was the standard question of my grandmother. A radical Jewish kid, I rejected this question, saying, “What is good for everybody is good for Jews as well”. My grandmother was not so sure. Now I am not so sure myself. It seems the trends and interests of the people and of the corporate Jews diverge again, after a hundred year long interlude. After all, traditionally ‘the Jews’ sided with the king against the people.

While ‘the Jews’ made this U-turn, there are many Jews who remained with the people, against corporate Jewry. They are our wonderful comrades in arms. Finkelstein and Chomsky, to name just a few, supplied excellent weapons for the people in the war of ideas. Our situation is not unique. Many Whites in South Africa choose to be for the people, not just for Whites. Many aristocrats choose to be for the people, not just for their class. Many Americans struggled against America during the Vietnam War. Now it is our turn to be “against our own people”, with the people and for the people.
The religious teachings of the Talmud imbued many Jews with a cavalier approach to Gentile property and life. Even non-religious Jews carry this psychological burden from past. If we compare the Jewish faith to an exhilarating drink containing various resins and spirits, the post-religious Jew is left with poisonous brown sediment. That is why non-religious Jews in the governments of post-war Poland and Czechoslovakia supported the transfer of ethnic Germans in 1945, and why in 1919 the heavily Jewish government of revolutionary Hungary in 1919 massacred its opponents on a huge scale. Zionists exceeded all by coupling massacres and transfers.

The Jews are not unique; many nations and states did the same. However, there is remarkably little remorse among Jews for the transfers and massacres. The strange behaviour of Benny Morris, the Israeli “New Historian”, bewildered many friends. How could the historian of al-Nakbah become a spokesman of the Israeli right-wing? A few days ago Israeli TV carried out a lively discussion on the advantages of transfer. Not everybody supported the notion, but the transfer-supporters were not ostracised. They sat with smug smiles and called for mass murder and expulsion, citing the previous transfers as proof of legitimacy. On Israeli TV news the leading item announced the death of an Israeli sergeant, and followed with a casual reference to the fifty Palestinians killed.

This ruthless and shameless behaviour is born of the chasm artificially cleft in the Jewish mind, between Jew and non-Jew. In the chain of “Jew – Gentile – Animal” the difference between the first two items is much bigger than the difference between the sec-
ond and third, postulated the Taniya, a compendium of Cabalistic teaching. This notion sits in the subconscious of many Jews, religious or not.

While the evil supporters of Sharon slaughter Gentiles without the slightest remorse, many good Jews object to Sharon’s actions as they would object to the cruel treatment of animals. Actually, on the walls of Tel Aviv houses there are more posters protesting the inhumane feeding of geese than deploring the mass murder of Palestinians.

The Talmud preaches compassion for animals, as we learn from the following fable. A sheep on the way to the butcher tried to find refuge with Rabbi Judah the Prince, who pushed the animal away and said that it is normal for a sheep to be slaughtered. As he had shown no mercy to sheep, God withdrew His mercy from him, and the holy Rabbi suffered for many years of kidney disease. Years later he prevented the killing of wasps, and this sign of compassion made God reverse His judgment.

But there is a profound lack of compassion towards non-Jews. They are frequently compared to animals, but while there is a duty to save an endangered animal, there is no obligation to save a Goy. This paradox of compassion for animals and lack of feeling towards Gentiles causes many abnormalities in the Jewish outlook.

Despite good feeling towards animals, people do not hesitate to sell them, slaughter them, separate them and move them whenever it is deemed necessary. We do not consider it a sin or an objectionable behaviour. Lady Macbeth lost sleep because of bloodshed, but a person with a traditional Jewish outlook would not have felt badly at all. He would remain his cheerful self after killing Palestinian peasants in Kafr Kassem in 1956, or Egyptian POWs in 1967, and indeed, Russian and Hungarian gentry in 1920, Germans and Poles in 1945, Iraqis and Afghans in 2002.

Such a person would not be marked by an impression of homicidal mania because he would consider himself a perfectly sound man. I have met many professional killers and torturers in Israel, and none of them have experienced pangs of conscience. An old judge of the High Court, Moshe Landoi, permitted ‘moderate’ torture of detained Goyim, but their cries did not disturb his sleep. He is still honoured by his colleagues and the media. In an interview, a Shabak official Ehud Yatom boasted that he had smashed a
Palestinian prisoner’s head with a stone\textsuperscript{1}. He could not comprehend why anybody would find that objectionable. When his career suffered a minor setback, he was supported by many MPs and by the Israeli public. Eventually he became an MP.

This deep conviction in our own righteousness makes us Jews so unusual. It also makes the job of good Jews more difficult. We do not cause enough annoyance. Jewish Nazis are quite tolerant towards Jewish liberals: the parties have a strained but comfortable relationship of hunter and vegetarian, not of hunter and the hunted. Rare Jewish radicals of al-Awdah and such-like groups break the complacent mould when they reject the very idea of a Jewish state and of the eternal People of Israel.

The peculiar feeling towards a non-Jew is manifest in the Jewish endogamy, the tradition of marriage within the creed. In the Talmud, copulation with a Gentile equals bestiality. Even in Twentieth Century, the Jewish writer Sholom Aleichem describes his good Jew, Tevie the Milkman (the Fiddler on the Roof), doing full mourning rites for his daughter who had been married a Gentile. Just last year, Mortimer Zuckerman, the owner of many American newspapers, divorced his Gentile wife in order to be elevated to the top of the US Jewish community, reported \textit{Haaretz}.

Furthermore, marriage outside the creed is considered a rejection of Jewry. A good man, the late Professor Yeshayahu Leibowitz, an avowed enemy of Israeli occupation, nevertheless considered such a marriage a “betrayal of the Jews” and the Jews married outside the flock as ‘deserters’.

Children of mixed marriages are often misled as to their status vis-à-vis the Jewish community. Whatever they are being told by their well-meaning parents, they are often considered as impure bastards and unfit for important positions in the community. The community will use them, abuse them and discard them. This pattern is seen in Israel, where the children of mixed marriages serve in the army but are buried outside the fence if they die for the Jewish state. It would be better for them, while having a moderate interest in their origin, to throw their lot with the folk who accept them fully.

\textsuperscript{1} Shin Bet Murders JOHN DANISZEWSKI, Confession of a Killing in Cold Blood Chills Israel; Los Angeles Times, 07-27-1996, pp A-1
The present rise of the Jewish idea is not the first one. It is similar to Freddy of the Elm Street Horror movie: whenever this concept materializes, it causes genocide. The Biblical story of Joshua’s total genocide served as a model for genocidal Hasmoneans; the mass murders of Bar Kochba led to the slaughter of gentiles in Yemen and Palestine, Cyprus and Alexandria. They were exceeded by the large scale genocide practiced by the Jewish rulers of Khazaria. The genocide of Palestinians will not be forgotten, either. That is why I believe the bloodthirsty spectre of a Jewish state should be laid to rest.

We can offer a different idea, that of equality. After all, the real chasm is not between Arab and Jew; it is between enemies of equality and the rest of us. Long time ago, St Paul said that Christ brought peace between Jews and Gentiles. His words are valid, despite attempts of Goldhagen and Judeo-Christian apologists to rewrite history. The present Israeli leaders committed horrible war crimes and lost the last vestige of their legitimacy. There is an urgent need to establish a new legitimate leadership for the whole of Palestine, following the example of the South African ANC, a leadership that represents all the religious and ethnic communities of Palestine.
The Bloodcurdling Libel
(a Summer Story)

I

Summer heat presents a great challenge to the non-air-conditioned world. When thermometers soar into the roaring forties (or into triple digits for Fahrenheit adepts), mankind slows down and seeks salvation in watery and shady places. Families with children depart for seashore, and elegant couples perambulate to the mountains. But the most sophisticated defence against sticky sweat and discomfort was discovered by the inventive Japanese. On the hottest summer nights, they gather around and tell bloodcurdling horror stories, chilling spines and sending goose pimples to their sily smooth skin. In July, all Tokyo cinemas screen favourite horror movies, from Kwaidan with its host of ghosts to Godzilla meting out vengeance on New York. After such films, the Japanese bravely face the suffocating heat.

This summer, the Japanese example was emulated by David Aaronovitch in the British weekly, The Observer. In order to chill blood of his English readers, he turned to “Blood Libel”, recurring story of Jews kidnapping Christian children, killing them and “using their blood in arcane rituals. We had a spate of these tales in England in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, and many Jews lost their lives as a result”, he wrote. “So what on earth is the blood libel doing in a column in the respected Egyptian mass daily paper Al-Ahram, in a book by the Syrian defence minister and in broadcast sermons from various Palestinian mosques?” asks Aaronovitch. He explains that “the libel in question is the 1840 Damascus case, in which several Jews (including a David Harari) ‘confessed’ to the
The priest murdered in Damascus was hardly a child, but it does not stop Aaronovitch. He knows nothing of the case, but it does not stop him either. He just KNOWS a Jew has to be innocent. Aaronovitch is not alone. Jackie Jacobowski in Sweden and a plethora of his brethren from New York to Moscow remind their readers the sins of Damascus. If you ran an internet search, you would find this expression used extensively whenever a Jewish scribe is unhappy with an accusation levelled at a Jew: be it Marc Rich escaping with his billions from the tax authorities, George Soros impoverishing Malaysia, Ariel Sharon accused of mass murder before a Belgian court, or Muhammad ad-Durra shot in the eyesight of millions of TV spectators, it is always a case of Blood Libel. It does not have to be connected to children and blood anymore. Whatever Jews do not like is ‘antisemitism’. But if a truly unpleasant accusation is aired, the best defence is to roll your eyes to heaven and proclaim, “It is Blood Libel”. Thus, when Israel was universally condemned for the Jenin Massacre, Shimon Peres had no words to justify or obscure the deed; he just called the very accusation, “a blood libel”.

“Blood Libel” is the Jewish battle cry, on a par with the ‘Montjoie St Denis’ of the French chevaliers and ‘St. George for merry England’, of the English knights. And whenever it is used, Jews are mobilised into action, and Gentiles are horrified by the accusation and silenced. When the toll of murdered Palestinian children rose into the hundreds and began to attract attention of international organisations, the spirit of the blood libel was promptly ushered forth as the ultimate defence for the killers. It helped, even though the head of Shabak, the Israeli Secret Service, wondered in a prime-time TV interview why so many children were being gratuitously murdered by Israeli soldiers.

The scaring expression can be used against disobedient Jews as well. When Edward Herman, the author of *Manufacturing Consent*, wrote of “the powerful pro-Israel lobby in the United States, which advances Israeli interests by pushing for U.S. aid and protection to Israel, and, currently, by pressing for a war against

---

1 Co-authored with Noam Chomsky
Iraq, which again will serve Israeli interests. This lobby has not only helped control media debate and made congress into 'Israeli occupied territory', it has seen to it that numerous officials with 'dual loyalties' occupy strategic decision-making positions in the Bush administration…", a Jewish American filmmaker David Rubinson wrote to me and called Herman's words "the ultimate blood libel". My own reference to murdered Palestinian children was described as "blood libel" by The Jerusalem Post, the far-right daily published by Conrad Black.

The frequent and tendentious use of the horrifying label (together with 'antisemitism' and "protocols of the Elders of Zion") brought a certain depreciation of its value, but it is still going strong. You can't ever-ever consider that there might be some truth to the Blood Libel, the accusation of ritual murder of children. Or can you? The Blood Libel was recently aired by the Observer, the weekly that published Aaronovitch, and nothing happened. Here is the press clipping:

---

The Bloodcurdling Libel

---

A boy whose mutilated torso was discovered floating in the Thames in London was brought to Britain as a slave and sacrificed in an African "religious" ritual intended to bring good luck to his killers. Genetic tests on the boy – found last September with his head and limbs removed and weighing only a stone – point to a West African origin.

Further analysis of stomach contents and bone chemistry shows the child, aged between four and seven, whom police have named Adam, could not have been brought up in London. Detectives are now working on the theory that he was bought as a slave in West Africa and smuggled to Britain solely to be killed.

Experts on African religion consulted by police believe Adam may have been sacrificed to one of the 4,000 "Orisha" or ancestor gods of the Yoruba people, Nigeria's second largest ethnic group. Oshun, a Yoruba river goddess, is associated with fertility, the colour of the shorts that were put on Adam's body 24 hours after he was killed in a bizarre addition to the ritual.

The cultural clash fits neatly with the forensic evidence, as the Yoruba are found in Nigeria and nearby Benin, Cape and Ghana. Thousands of Yoruba slaves were taken to the Caribbean, where elements of their religion formed the basis of voodoo rituals.

A close examination of the cuts where the head and limbs were removed from the body shows that they were made by an expert using extremely sharp, specially prepared knives. Police believe the level of expertise involved could show the perpetrators are not a group, a magician or priest to carry out the ritual. They also think the amputated body parts have been kept as powerful magical trophies.

According to Richard Hodkins, an expert at Bath Spa University who has studied ritual killings across Africa: "This looks like a deviant variety of a West African religion. Someone would have done it to gain power."

From analysis of his clothing police believe Adam may have arrived in London from Germany. His face has shocked the West African community in Britain. The vice-chair of the African Caribbean Development Association, Yemi Oluwasegun, said: "This crime cannot be tolerated in African religious murder. "The Observer"
‘Torso boy’ was sacrificed
by Martin Bright and Paul Harris

A boy whose mutilated torso was discovered floating in the Thames in London was brought to Britain as a slave and sacrificed in an African ‘religious’ ritual intended to bring good luck to his killers.

Genetic tests on the boy — found last September with his head and limbs removed and wearing orange shorts — point to West African origin.

Further analysis of stomach contents and bone chemistry show the child, aged between four and seven, whom police have named Adam, could not have been brought up in London. Detectives are now working on the theory that he was bought as a slave in West Africa and smuggled to Britain solely to be killed.

Experts of African religion consulted by police believe Adam may have been sacrificed to one of 400 “Orisha” or ancestor gods of the Yoruba people, Nigeria’s second largest ethnic group. Oshun, a Yoruba river goddess, is associated with orange, the colour of the shorts that were put on Adam’s body 24 hours after he was killed in a bizarre addition to the ritual.

From analysis of his clothing police believe Adam may have arrived in London from Germany. His fate shocked the West African community in Britain. The vice-chairman of the African Caribbean Development association, Temi Olusanya, said: “This crime cannot be tolerated in African religions. Murder is murder”. The Observer.

Now you have recovered your breath. Now you are relaxed. It’s Blacks who commit ritual murders, not Jews. Who cares? In Raymond Chandler’s Farewell, My Lovely, a news-hawk enters the scene of a crime literally awash in blood, learns from a policeman that the carve-up was done by Harlem dwellers, exclaims: ‘aw, hell, shines’, and drives away. For some reason an accusation of ritual murder by Blacks is not called ‘Blood Libel’, just as genocide of Blacks or Armenians is no ‘Holocaust’.

“If Palestinians were black, Israel would be a pariah state subject to economic sanctions led by the United States,” The Observer
editorialized after the outbreak of the Second Intifada. Oh no, if Palestinians were black (and only some are), slavery would be re-established in the United States, and the great Jewish sage Maimonides’ maxim “Blacks are less than human” would be embossed in gold on the US dollar. Indeed, Afro-American ‘Israel’, Liberia, for 160 years of its existence received less US aid than the Jewish ‘Liberia’, Israel, in a month.

Why accusation of Blacks in ritual murder is taken so easily, while accusation of a Jew creates waves in the conscience? Can we deal with the accusation of Jews in the same straightforward, unattached and businesslike manner The Observer and the Scotland Yard dealt with similar accusation of Blacks? **For if not, our self-declared anti-racism is not worth a penny.**

Jews do not mind some blood-libelling. Palestinian parents are habitually blamed by Jewish scribes of ritually sacrificing their own children by exposing them to the justifiable fury of Israeli soldiers. In an article called *Child Sacrifice, Palestinian Style* a Reuven Koret (Capitalism Magazine, November 13, 2002) marks: “the Palestinians started sacrificing their own sons and daughters as a matter of policy, as a sacred ritual”

The Jerusalem Post wrote of Palestinian “parents and leaders who proudly send children to die in attacks against Israel and resort to targeting Israeli children as well”, while the singularly malicious Cynthia Ozick wrote: “But the most ingeniously barbarous Palestinian societal invention, surpassing any other in imaginative novelty, is the recruiting of children to blow themselves up with the aim of destroying as many Jews as possible in the most crowded sites accessible”.

For some reasons, practically none of the Jewish readers wrote to these publications and protested ‘blood libel’ or “wholesale accusation of the entire community nefariously used to spread hatred and inflame racial animosity to the point of murder and massacre”, as David Rubinson protested both Herman’s essays and mine. Apparently it is OK to accuse a whole community as long as

---

1 More Nevochim, or Guide to Perplexed, 3:51 “Chinese and Blacks are less than human but above monkeys”.
4 Here and elsewhere we shall bear in mind an important exclusion of our wonderful comrades, Jews supporting the cause of equality in Palestine.
it is not a Jewish community. Blood Libel is also OK as long as Jews are the accusers, not the accused.

However, it is the belief in Jewish (not Palestinian) ritual child murders that was widespread and persistent. The old *Jewish Encyclopaedia*, Vol. III, 266, lists the following cases, beginning with William of Norwich: 5 other cases given for the twelfth century, 15 for the thirteenth, 10 for the fourteenth, 16 for the fifteenth, 13 for the sixteenth, 8 for the seventeenth, 15 for the eighteenth, and 39 for the nineteenth, going right up to the year 1900 (total 113). There have been more cases in the 20th century1. What is the reason for this belief? Was there a world-wide and centuries-spanning conspiracy to implicate innocent Jews in heinous crime or is there a crime behind accusations?

II

This question was tackled by fearless Professor Israel Yuval of Hebrew University in Jerusalem in his seminal book2, available in Hebrew. Its English translation was supposed to appear a few years ago in California University Press, but for variety of reasons this has not happened yet. It is certainly sheer coincidence that some American Jewish scholars objected to this book being published and called to “erase it from public conscience”.

Yuval discovered actual irrefutable child murder beyond the Blood Libel. During the First Crusade, impatient folk tried to forcibly baptise Jews of Rein Valley in order to save their souls from the satanic cult of hate, as they saw it. Their refusal to be baptised was seen as stubborn adherence to Satan: for the pre-modern people, our present religious indifference was unacceptable. They saw a direct connection between faith and behaviour, and felt the need for communal worship, for unifying communion. A Jew permanently residing in a

---

1 See Medieval Sourcebook [http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/sbook.html](http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/sbook.html) for details. It offers the following list of saints and martyrs: William of Norwich, d. 1144, Richard of Pontoise or of Paris, d. 1179, Herbert of Huntingdon, d. 1180, Dominic of Val, 1250, Hugh of Lincoln, d. 1255, Werner of Oberwesel, d. 1287, Rudolf of Berne, d. 1294, Conrad of Weissee, d. 1303, Louis or Ludwig of Ravensburg d. 1429, Anderl of Rinn, d. 1462, Simon of Trent, d. 1475, Lorenzino Sossio, d. 1485

2 Two Nations in Thy Womb, or Perceptions of Jews and Christians, Tel Aviv, Am Oved 2000
Christian land created a complicated situation: he was free from duty of brotherly love and could (and often did) act in anti-social way, for instance he practiced usury and sorcery. The Christians were particularly worried by the well-attended Jewish custom of cursing Gentiles. Every day Jews asked God to kill, destroy, humiliate, exterminate, defame, starve, impale Christians, to usher in Divine Vengeance and to cover God’s mantle with blood of goyim. Israel Yuval’s book offers its reader a good selection of bloodcurdling curses.

The Crusaders were non-racists. They did not think the Jews were irredeemably evil, but they rejected the ideology of hate and vengeance expressed in the curses. They also feared the curses, as much as Jews did. (In modern Israel, cursing is a criminal offence punishable by prison). Indeed, for Jews and for Christians of that time the curses were not just silly offensive words, but potent magic weapon. They offered Jews expulsion or conversion, this old-style equivalent of our modern psychological treatment meted out to adepts of totalitarian sects. At that time, the Slavs and the Scandinavians were also forcibly baptised, and it made eminent sense to baptise the Jews living in the Christian lands as well.

However, the Jews did not take the attempt to bring them into New Israel lightly. Whenever the ‘danger’ of baptism became imminent, many of them murdered their own children and committed suicide. It is not deniable: Jewish and Christian chroniclers of the period describe these events at length, with Jews glorifying this Waco-like behaviour, and Christians condemning it. Did they murder the children in order to save them from Christ? Well, not exactly. That would be bad, but the reality was worse. The murder was performed as ritual slaughter followed by victim’s blood libation, for the Ashkenazi Jews believed that spilled Jewish blood has a magic effect of calling down Divine Vengeance on the heads of the Gentiles. Others used the victim’s blood for atonement. In Mainz, Yitzhak b. David, the community leader, brought his small children into the synagogue, slaughtered them and poured their blood on the Arc, proclaiming “Let this blood of innocent lamb be my atonement for my sins”. It happened two days after the confrontation with Christians, when the danger passed by.

The picture of Jews slaughtering children for cultic reasons exerted huge impact on the Christian peoples of Europe. This behaviour was not comparable to Christian martyrdom. While
Christian martyrs allowed others to kill them for their faith, they never committed suicide, and certainly never murdered their (or anybody else’s) children for such purpose. It enforced an image of Jewish cruelty and ruthlessness. Over the years, the actual circumstances of the child murders were forgotten, but the picture of a Jew slaughtering children remained imprinted in the European matrix. (Yuval uses the thesis of Robert Graves, who explained many traditions of the Church by its misreading of old images.) This was the source of the idea that Jews murder Christian children, while in fact, Jews murdered their own children, writes Professor Yuval.

Indeed, Blood Libel accusations appeared soon after the murder of children in Germany. Yuval speaks with horror about these accusations, completely missing the point: a ritual murder of a child is a ritual murder of a child. If some Jews committed this heinous crime in Mainz and Worms, and other Jews exalted this crime as exemplary behaviour even in Israeli historical books written in 1950s, is there any place left for indignation and horror concerning similar accusations in Norwich or Blois, or indeed in Damascus or Kiev? If Yuval thinks that a Jew can use only Jewish blood for libation to wake up af Adonai (the fury of Yahweh), in some cases, the kidnapped child was circumcised before being murdered, i.e. “made a Jewish child”. And for atonement, even lamb’s blood will do.

Numerous medieval stories about Jews killing their children for visiting a church or for considering baptism do not surprise. Parents and relatives of converts went into full mourning for converts. Even in the 20th century, gentle Tevie the Milkman, an ideal hero of Sholem Aleichem’s Fiddler on the Roof, mourned his baptised daughter. The mourning rite for a person alive is a traditional magic means to kill the person. Greater believers in the power of magic probably died of it, as Frazer tells us in his enormous collection of lore. If you try to kill somebody by magic means why restrain yourself from more mundane killing?

Over a period of eight hundred years Jews were convicted in more than hundred cases of ritual murder and blood sacrifice Jews were found guilty of. It is a reasonable amount if we think in terms of religious maniacs. Probably any religious community of similar size would produce similar amount of deviants like [the 15th-century marshal of France] Gilles de Rais or Comorre the Cursed [a 6th-century Breton chief] It would be strange if all the cases were ‘libel’. The
concept of the magic powers of blood was embedded in the Jewish thinking. Blood was used for atonement libation. Yes, it was lamb’s blood, but in the Mainz case, it was children’s blood that served in its place. In the Christian world, there were people who practiced black magic and human sacrifices in a perverted ‘Christian’ ritual. They would substitute human blood for wine of communion that is the blood of Christ that is the blood of Paschal Lamb. Is it reasonable to think that the Jews never ever produced magicians and sorcerers who would use human blood to wash off sins or to hasten Salvation?

III

On the other hand, it is possible that the connection of blood sacrifices and matzo of Passover or homentash of Purim is but a popular belief. The mystic idea of libation could be misunderstood by simple people. Yuval explains it by a combination of different traditions and their misinterpretation.

Jews hated Christianity with all their hearts and had many magic ceremonies at the time of Easter, Purim and Passover, directed against Christ and Christianity. They made dolls attached to a cross and burned them or defamed them in various ways; they desecrated host and parodied communion. The custom of ‘leaven eradication’ on the Passover morning was also meant to symbolise and to lead magically to the eradication of goyim, writes Yuval. Occasionally they killed priests and nuns. Prayers of Passover were full of anti-Christian references, some of which have survived to the present day, namely ShePOCH Hamatha, a prayer demanding God’s vengeance upon goyim, and ALEINU LESHABEYACH, a prayer describing Christ and His Mother in most blasphemous terms.

The Christians mentally bridged these phenomena, writes Yuval. If Jews hate Christ and Christians, desecrate host and were seen murdering their own children in a ritual way, probably they murder others’ children in connection with Easter or Passover, as well, thought the Christians according to Yuval. But in his opinion, though the basic facts were right, the conclusion was not. Jews did not use blood for matzo, he writes.

However, the belief of Jewish usage of blood for matzo can be explained better than by general hatred to Christians. In Jewish
Passover rites, a small piece of unleavened bread, called *afikoman* was the symbol of the Paschal Lamb. It was hidden at the beginning of the Passover Seder. One can imagine a mystic who would give a direct literal meaning to the metaphor of Afikoman as the Paschal Lamb. It was claimed by many Jews who left the fold and joined the Church, and they also noted that *afikoman* was baked secretly and separately. Some of them explained that blood was not added directly into dough, but burned and its ashes are used in a ritual reminiscent of the Red Heifer purification.

For Israel Yuval, a believing Jew, any evidence given by a convert is ‘suspicious’ and ‘doubtful’, but it is part of longstanding Jewish tradition to discredit non-Jewish evidence. Likewise, the Israeli ‘New Historians’ have just confirmed the data obtained by their Palestinian colleagues, but their confirmation of 1948’ horrors made a big impact in the West, as non-Jewish research was considered ‘suspicious’ and ‘doubtful’ in the Jewish-dominated discourse. For non-racists, there is no reason to doubt evidence given by non-Jews or ex-Jews. For if the objection to converts is based on rejection of renegades per se, one should object to evidence of the authors of Darkness at Noon (Arthur Koestler) and Homage to Catalonia (George Orwell), or even David Aaronovitch, for they gave up their communist faith for another one.

The converts knew what they said, and Yuval confirms it. For instance, a convert in Norwich explained that ‘Jews believe that without human blood shed they can’t regain their land and their freedom’. It is, according to Yuval, a correct interpretation of the Ashkenazi idea of Vengeance as the path to Salvation. “Jews actually believed that their Salvation depends on Extermination of Gentiles”, he writes. Yes, they hoped God and/or their Messiah will do the work, but does this caveat amounts to an alibi?

If I hope and pray that John will kill my enemy Harry, and Harry is indeed found dead, don’t my hopes and prayers serve as a strong reason for suspicion against me, rather than a full alibi? “Oh no, he hoped John would do it, so surely he could not have done it himself?”

This recalls an immortal line by Raymond Chandler¹. His private eye Marlowe discovers a handkerchief with fitting initials on

---

¹ *The Lady in the Lake*
the scene of murder. The suspect, a well-bred young lady on inti-
mate terms with the victim, indignantly rejects his suspicion. 
Marlowe ironically calls out: “This hanky bears your initials, and it 
was found under victim’s pillow, but this rag stinks of cheap syn-
thetic sandalwood, and you wouldn’t use a cheap scent. And you 
just never keep your hankies under a man’s pillow. Therefore this 
has nothing to do with you! Isn’t it too elaborate?”

IV

The last public discussion of blood sacrifice took place less than 
a hundred years ago. In 1911, in Kiev (now the capital of Ukraine, 
then a major city of the Russian Empire) Andrew, a 12-year old stu-
dent of a church school was brutally and unusually murdered. 
There were 47 wounds on his body; his blood was drained off while 
his mouth was gagged. It appears the murder had a ritual character, 
as did the murder of the Torso boy in England of our days. It could 
have been done by a Satanist, by a fanatic, or another obsessed per-
son. Could such a person be of Jewish origin? Yes. Could the mur-
derer have been driven by some peculiar misconceptions of the 
Jewish faith? We have seen that the answer is ‘yes’.

However, 400 Rabbis wrote a letter to the authorities and to 
the court denying the very possibility of such a miscreant. In a mass 
paroxysm of hysteria, Russia was divided between believers and 
disbelievers in the ritual murders. The Liberal media accepted 
philosemitic thesis: Jews can’t kill. Certainly not in a ritual way. 
The Tsar wisely enquired how somebody can be as sure as the 400 
Rabbis. He touched the most important point.

There is no crime that Russians, English, Americans, French or 
Chinese, or alternatively, Christians, Muslims, or Buddhists would 
say that their fellow countrymen or co-religionists were unable to 
commit. We know that humans are capable of both to highest 
inspiration and to basest cruelty. Human sacrifices were known to 
all nations, even to the Greeks (Iphigenia) and Hebrews (Jephtah). 
However, the Jews, whose religion contains the religious duty of 
genocide (Amalek), the religious duty to curse Gentiles, who actu-
ally practiced ritual murder of children (albeit their own), were 
ready to vouch for co-members of Israel: Jews could not do it. This
extraordinary degree of tribal solidarity positioned Jews in a separate category. Not a nation, not a religion, but a mutual protection syndicate.

“It is an accusation of the entire Jewish people”, the Rabbis wrote. It was a lie: only one man was accused, and later found innocent. But their approach was tactically useful: masses of Jews from New York to Moscow were mobilised to defend Beyliss. Liberal public opinion in Russia, Europe and America supported them.

Only one man of note, Vasili Rosanov\(^1\), a brilliant maverick, poet, writer and religious thinker, once forgotten but now rather popular in post-Soviet Russia, was convinced that Andrew was martyred by Jews, though not necessarily by Beyliss. (The Russian intelligentsia ostracised him) Previously an extreme philosemite (he had planned to convert into Judaism) he was touched by dreadful fate of young Andrew and upset that none of Beyliss defenders cared about the cruelly murdered child. He wrote an interesting memoir\(^2\), trying to prove that Jews actually practiced human sacrifices.

He dabbed with Cabbala, drew diagrams of Andrew’s wounds worthy of his contemporary Alistair Crawley, and quoted many verses from the Old Testament, Talmud and even New Testament dealing with blood. In his conclusions he referred to the Jewish custom of sucking the blood of a circumcised member, and to rather cruel Jewish [animal] slaughter rules (now banned in some European countries). His most interesting insight was quite surprising even for a lapsed Christian he was: he considered that Old Biblical Judaism, the forerunner of Christianity, knew and practiced human sacrifices; as otherwise, (he reasoned) Christ would not offer Himself as a supreme sacrifice. Rosanov saw in Isaiah, 53 (he was pierced for our transgressions etc) — not a prophecy of Christ’s Passion, but description of actual human sacrifice at the Jerusalem Temple. The worship in the Jerusalem temple of Yahweh was extremely bloody indeed, and Mishna tells of rivers of blood pouring forth from under its altar. It was condemned by prophets and made the Temple a living anachronism by the time of its destruction. It was probably a reason why the temple was not

\(^{1}\) http://www.reec.uiuc.edu/srl/Rozanov/rozanov_program.htm

\(^{2}\) Jewish attitude to smell and touch of blood, reprinted Moscow 1998
rebuilt, but Rosanov’s insights, whether true or false, have no direct bearing on the question of human sacrifices in 20th century.

Have no doubt: one can find many quotes in the Bible, Talmud and later Cabbalistic books in support of human sacrifices. Dahl, the 19th century Danish author of a short treatise on the murders, referred to Numbers 23:24 (“drinks the blood of his victims”) and to many other verses. We are better equipped for such research than the contemporaries of William of Norwich or Andrew of Kiev, for we have better texts. For instance, in 1913 the experts would not have been able to find such a quote from Talmud¹: “It is good to pierce a goy even on Yom Kippur if it falls on Sabbath day. Why ‘pierce’, instead of ‘slaughter’? Because slaughter demands blessing, while one can pierce without blessing.” Now we have it in print in new editions published in Israel. It is usual to view such quotes as a sign of the exaggerated hatred of Talmudic sages towards ordinary people. But there could appear a mystic, a black magician, who would see it as the instruction for Yom Kippur sacrifice, kaparoth.

However this is not a proof that such cases were numerous, or that this tradition was widely spread. Moreover, the scholars who have studied the phenomenon and came to accept it for a fact, concluded that such cases were rare, and remained unknown to vast majority of Jews.

Rosanov was as wrong as the Rabbis. They had no business to deny a priori a possibility of the crime being committed by a Jew. They were wrong in claiming that ‘all Jews’ were accused. Rosanov could not be as sure as they were, either. He did not have to turn blood sacrifices into the cornerstone of Judaism. However, while facing the united philosemitic front, he allowed his pugilist nature to take over his better self. **We shall reject his attitude as unfair and prejudiced.** Indeed, the idea of human sacrifice and of blood as atonement is well known to Christians and Jews; thus the ritual murder of Andrew could have been done by persons of Jewish or non-Jewish background. At best, Rosanov’s book might convince a Jewish mystic to try his hand at ritual murder and blood libation.

¹ Hesronot Shas, Pesahim mem tet 13 bet, Omar R Eliezer, am haaretz mutar lenochro byom kipurim shehal lihiot beshabat. Omru lo talmidav, Rabbi, emor “leshohto”? Omar lahen ze taun bracha, uze ein taun bracha.
But the Jews took up the case as the case against all Jews. The Beyliss defence team tried to frame one of the key trial witnesses, Vera Cheberiak. She was offered a huge bribe by an advocate who admitted that he had met her at his initiative in dubious circumstances. Her own children were killed “by persons unknown”. In 1919, after the Bolshevik victory, she was arrested and roughly mistreated by the Jewish commissars of Kiev Cheka. She refused to retract her statements, insisted that she had spoken the truth and was executed after a 40-minute ‘trial’.

In the same year 1919, the Soviet Department of Education convened a commission to find the final truth about the blood sacrifices. It consisted of four Jews and four Christians. Simon Dubnov, a Jewish historian, participated in the commission, and in his memoirs he wrote: “the Russian members did not exclude possibility that there could be a secret Jewish sect practising ritual violence. The Jewish members of the commission were certain it could not happen at all.”

Alexander Etkind, our contemporary, a Russian Jewish scholar of religions, and an author of authoritative book on Russian sects, wrote in his review: “We can be more open nowadays. I do not consider it is impossible that among Jews there were a cruel and secretive sect. I studied the Russian sects, some of them can be described as bloody, vicious, murderous. I am not aware of similar Jewish sects, but I can not exclude their existence a priori. Apparently, my feelings are more close to that of the Russian members of the commission than to the Jewish ones”.

In the long history of Blood Libel studies, this was the wisest remark ever made. Alexander Etkind was right, while David Aaronovitch was wrong. A well known Jewish cabbalist and mystic Yitzhak Ginzburg, the head of an Israeli Yeshiva Od Yosef Hai, actually confirmed it when he recently told the American newspapers, “a Jew is entitled to extract liver from a goy if he needs it, for life of a Jew is more valuable than the life of a goy, likewise life of a goy is more valuable than the life of an animal”. Such people won’t see a difference between animal and human sacrifice.

---

1 Memoirs of Chekist, Prague 1925, quoted from Solzhenitsyn, 200 years I451 M 2002
2 Kololol Nr 1, London — Moscow 2002
The question of ritual murders divides mankind, but it is not a division of Jews versus Gentiles. The real division is equally sharp: on one side, philosemites, Jews and Gentiles who a priori exclude a possibility of a Jewish guilt. If they find a dead body and a Jew with knife next to it, they would exclaim, “Not another blood libel!” On the other hand, normal people, Jews and Gentiles who are ready to consider all circumstances of each case, without prejudice, as proposed by Alexander Etkind. A philosemite a priori excludes a possibility that a cruel or ritual murder was committed by a Jew; he is a naive racist, at best. Mr Aaronovitch has no knowledge of the Damascus case. The murder occurred in 1840, a long time ago. He just presumes a Jew can’t be guilty, full stop.

The Damascus suspects were tortured, and therefore their confession is invalid, writes Aaronovitch. Torture is evil, but in Israel, suspects of ‘terrorist crimes’ are invariably tortured. According to Amnesty International and other Human Rights Watch bodies, tens of thousands of Palestinians, including children, have been tortured in the cellars of Shabak. However, Aaronovitch never tried to doubt any Israeli conclusions achieved by torture.

The murder victim was a priest, and it pushes Aaronovitch to classify the case as “antisemitic blood libel”. But priests, nuns and monks were killed by Jews. Hundreds were slaughtered in Antioch in 610, and thousands in Jerusalem in 614. Monks and priests are being killed even now in Israel. For instance, a few years ago, a settler Asher Rabo killed a few monks with an axe and splashed their blood on the walls. He was apprehended by a monk from the Jacob’s Well monastery, and was found insane by an Israeli court. Later, two Russian nuns were murdered with an axe in the St John the Baptist monastery. Practically all murderers of priests and desecrators of churches and mosques were found insane by Israeli judges, but there was a system to their insanity.

Aaronovitch presents the Damascus case as “libel against all Jews”. But it was just one person who was accused of the murder. At the same time, Farhi, a Jew of Damascus, had “more money than the Bank of England”, (wrote a travelling Englishman) and managed the treasury of St Jean d’Acre. If an accusation against one Jew
is an accusation against all Jews, there is no way to correct small errors by small measures.

Indeed, the philosemites of Aaronovitch ilk brought incredible calamities to mankind and to Jews. They excluded a priori the possible guilt of Captain Dreyfus or Beyliss. Instead of standing aside and allowing the justice to take its due course, they created mass hysteria in France and Russia, thus obtaining acquittals but also undermining popular belief in the judicial system. After Dreyfus and Beyliss trials, Jews rose above the law. This caused the backlash of the 1930s, and the back-backlash of our days, and will probably cause a back-back-backlash of tomorrow.

In a better world, Dreyfusards and Beylissists would be sentenced for contempt of court; for their unspoken axiom was “a Gentile may not judge a Jew”. One should not believe or disbelieve ritual murders. The ability of men to commit crimes is well known, and there can be monsters like Dr Hannibal Lector of The Silence of the Lambs. Some of them are led by their peculiar interpretation of the Holy Bible. In our days the president of a superpower sent his shock troops to attack a small and weak country and killed thousands of men, women and children for he believed God wants it. (Yes, this God was Mammon, as the witty Polish philosopher noted.) He would have done better to quietly sip the blood of babies.

Jews of our days rarely know they are supposed to eat matzo on Passover, let alone afikoman. They are blissfully unaware of the troublesome legacy of medieval Jewry. But a few things have survived from those times.

The thought to write this essay came to me as I watched the body count of massacred Palestinian children grow daily. Since the start of the Second Intifada on September 29, 2000, 2,237 Palestinians have lost their lives. This total includes 430 children who were killed; 228 kids were under age 15, and 202 others between 15 and 17 years old. This is more than all the children that Jews were accused of murdering since William of Norwich. Why should one think of the old accusations, when there is a fresh new and incontrovertible crime?

Because the new murderers enjoyed the traditional cover-up. The system of cover-up was not created yesterday, it was inherited from the Middle Ages, when the Jewish communities were ruled by
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1 Marek Glogoczowski
the omerta code of loyalty. A criminal is not supposed ever to surrender a fellow criminal to justice. This approach was integrated into the inner life of Jewish communities. They even adopted a criminal label ‘moser’ (an informer), one who informs non-Jewish authorities of crimes perpetrated by Jews against non-Jews. Such a moser is ‘ben mavet’: he may be and should be killed by any Jew¹, preferably on Purim or Passover, but Yom Kippur is also a suitable day. For instance, a Jew who learnt of a raving fanatic who committed ritual murders was not allowed under pain of death to inform the Gentile authorities of the crime. This medieval attitude is still with us, as it found its new life in the philosemitic concept of a priori innocence of Jews.

In other words, a philosemite who rejects the very idea of a crime committed by a Jew is a potential accessory to murder. Let us look again at the cutting from the Observer. Why did it cause no spurts of indignation? Does it mean “we can’t compare Jews and Schwartzes”? Or does it mean the Blacks have no sick and depraved need to stand up for every other Black² regardless of the gravity of the crime?

And now it is the time to disclose the real crime behind the allegations, for this crime is still with us. Hundreds of Jews knew of the satanic plan by the ‘Avengers’ led by Abba Kovner to poison millions of innocent German civilians, men, women and children – and not even one reported it to the police, let alone tried to stop it. On a minor note, just today the leader of the German Jewish community expressed his ‘wholehearted support’ for repulsive Michael Friedman, “the man who turned his Jewishness into useful tool”, in the words of Haaretz’ Benny Zipper³ and was found sniffing coke in the company of Ukrainian whores. This inner quasi-criminal solidarity of Jews – standing up for Sharon, standing up for Mark Rich, standing up for Michael Friedman, and harbouring every evildoer if he happens to be a Jew or to be good for Jews, – that is the real crime behind the Blood Libel, for it has caused the murder of hundreds of Palestinian children, with the silent approval of philosemites.

¹ See extensive study in Israel Shahak and Norton Medvinsky book, Jewish Fundamentalism in Israel. Hastily written and under-edited (for instance it refers to the Arc as ‘holy cupboard’!), it still provides much of valuable material.
² Save OJ
³ Haaretz, 11 July 2003
Paradoxically, Jews tend to harbour criminals because their world view is so different from the Christian one. The deepest chasm between Christianity and Judaism is not located in the murky area of sacrifices. Jews believe in collective salvation, guilt and innocence, Christians — in individual salvation, guilt and innocence. That is why a sin committed by a Christian has no bearing for the rest of Christians. A Christian is free of guilt by virtue of Christ’s incarnation, death and resurrection, by virtue of his own baptism and communion. But Jews also bear no collective guilt in Christian eyes.

For a Jew, the admitted guilt of one Jew would turn all Jews into guilty ones. That is why for Jews, all Christians (or all Germans, all Palestinians etc) are guilty for an offence committed by some of them. That is why non-Jews are always guilty in Jewish eyes. Americans are guilty because their fathers did not collect all the Jews to their bosom in 1930s. Christians are guilty because their ancestors did not like to be cursed and occasionally mistreated the cursers. Germans and Palestinians, Russians and French — everybody is guilty towards Jews in Jewish eyes.

This Jewish idea of collective responsibility spreads nowadays into Christendom. The Germans are obsessed by their feeling of guilt, and in masochistic apotheosis buy the Goldhagen’s spew. The Catholic Church even asked forgiveness of the Jews. It is good for a wrongdoer to ask forgiveness from a wronged person. But acceptance of the Jewish paradigm of collective guilt is an error of judgement, as well as a theological error. We are free from guilt. The Church is free from guilt. And Jews — modern Jews — are free from guilt for whatever their ancestors did. Even if medieval Jews harboured a murderous child-killing sect, Jews — our contemporaries — are free of guilt.

Now, when the talk of the Blood Libel is used to induce guilt feelings in modern Europeans, one has to admit: the Christians were rather wonderful to this hateful group of my ancestors: they were always ready to receive them as equals, as beloved brothers and sisters. Just think of it: the Jews daily wished the Christians to drop dead, while the Christians wanted the Jews to join them and be saved. The generosity of the Church was fabulous — even Jews who committed cruel murder could save themselves through baptism.
I think of it when I read Goldhagen’s attacks on the Church, or other Jewish writing condemning the Church for its “anti-semitism leading to the holocaust”. Gratitude is not a strong point within the system of Jewish moral values. In 1916 Weitzman promised to the British the eternal gratitude of the Jews, and they sent their soldiers to die in Gaza, Beersheba, Jerusalem and Megiddo for the Jewish national home. By 1940 the eternity was over, and Jews began to hunt and kill British soldiers. In the World War Two, the Russians took in all Jewish refugees, lost millions of their soldiers and saved the Jews. Instead of gratitude, they compared Stalin to Hitler, spoke of Russian pogroms, and demanded (successfully) to introduce sanctions against Russia. Lebanese Maronites allied themselves with Israel, only to be dropped like a hot brick at the time of withdrawal. But ingratitude to the Church was the most extreme case.

Christians perceived the Jews as people possessed by a demon, and they were indeed possessed by a demon of hate. It was not racial, but an ideological and theological group, and by giving up the ideas of hate a Jew could join mankind. The Jews were treated like Neo-Nazis in modern society: repulsive and hateful creatures to be kept at arm’s length but to be fully forgiven if they forsook their errors. Many Jews were received in the Church, and some became saints, like St Teresa, and some became bishops, and some became nobles, and some became teachers and scholars. But the most important thing they received from the Church was full release from the spirit of hate. They were released from doubt that people love them and they went on to love people — not only the chosen ones, but everybody.

VII

However, we can offer another and more important reading of the “blood libel”. The pre-modern people were naturally Jungian: they used myth in order to convey their thoughts. Medieval Jews were harbingers of capitalism and globalisation, the tendencies that were to prove perilous for children and for the future of ordinary men. They were usurers, and usurers “suck the lifeblood” of their debtors even in modern usage. Thus, an accusation of blood
sacrifice was a powerful ‘scarecrow’, a metaphoric warning to potential borrowers to stay away from the usurers, and to be suspicious of burgeoning capitalism.

We use metaphoric scarecrows now, too. The government could say “do not use marijuana, for we are heavily invested in wine and liquors, and besides, we want you to relax by shopping and not by smoking pot”. But they scare the public with pictures of heroin addiction: destitute families, health hazards and social consequences. Marijuana is not heroin, but without frighteners people won’t heed the warning, the campaigners think.

Poor people of the pre-modern days had no teachings of Marx, and they used the language of myth. Indeed, all victims of ritual murder belonged to the working classes, and belief in the Jewish ritual murder was widespread among the poor who were the first to suffer from the advent of capitalism. On the other hand, the royalty and upper classes were usually supportive of Jews and punished those who complained of ritual murders. In some countries, the complainers were punished by death, while in Russia, the Tsar forbade even considering the possibility of ritual murder by a Statute of 1817.

Indeed, the ruling classes were not afraid of capitalism and usury. However, this warning scheme worked until Christians succumbed to the temptation of usury in the age of religious tolerance and ‘blood-sucking’ stopped being an exclusively Jewish occupation. Mme Bovary, this charming and all-too-human character of Flaubert, was ruined by a French usurer who trapped her by allaying her fears with soothing “I am not a Jew”. Then, the old frightening myth was put in abeyance for it ceased to be relevant.

The world became civilised, whole communities and countries became indebted, while citizens have gotten trapped into mortgage repayments and consumer credit. With the victory of capitalism and spread of globalisation, the chances for ordinary children of growing up, finding good satisfying work and living peacefully in their own home and community as their parents did, took a nosedive. The great danger to our children is not a marginal Jew on the fringes of society, but the very structure of society; and it calls for an altogether different cautioning myth.

1 Beyliss case took place after reforms of 1905 which voided the old statutes and made the trial possible
The Elders of Zion and the Masters of Discourse

“The latest controversy to involve the Arab World concerns a TV program, *A Rider without a Horse*, that started airing on several Arab satellite channels on Wednesday, Nov. 5, the first day of the holy month of Ramadan. The source of the controversy is that the program is partly based on *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*, the old forgery originating in Tsarist Russia,” writes Qais S. Saleh, a business consultant from Ramallah on the excellent website, CounterPunch.¹ Expectedly, Saleh condemns the broadcast and warns the Palestinians and Arabs to stay away from the bad old wolf of anti-Semitism, or, as he put it, “the trend of importation of anti-Semitic bigotry.”

Saleh’s view coincides with that of Michael Hoffman, on whose site the *Protocols* can be found. Hoffman thinks Arabs have no need to import anti-Semitic arguments from the old and far-away sources, provided they have a fresh round-the-clock local source: actual behaviour of the Jewish state and its Jewish citizens. It is much more convincing than old tales.

However, the *Protocols* are still with us and still entertain minds. Recently, the leading Italian novelist and thinker Umberto Eco contributed his opinion on the subject to the *Guardian:*² Eco “explains” the popular feelings towards the Jews: “They . . . engaged
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in trade and lent money — hence the resentment towards them as "intellectuals." In my limited knowledge, it is not the intellectuals who lend money, but bankers and loan sharks, while true intellectuals find their behaviour repulsive. Probably Eco has a different definition of ‘intellectual’ up his sleeve. “The ill-famed Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion were a rehash of serialised fictional material, and prove their own unreliability, since it is hardly credible that ‘the baddies’ would reveal their fell purposes so blatantly,” concludes Eco.

One can forgive a business consultant from Ramallah, but Umberto Eco could notice that his definition would fit some other books, for instance, Gargantua and Pantagruel, an even older forgery, pretending to be a real chronicle of the Giants family, and built on ‘serialised fictional material’. Don Quixote, Pickwick’s Club, 1984 of Orwell — all these books “pretend” to describe real events to the same extent. They are ‘forgeries’, as they are ascribed to somebody else: Don Quixote to Sid Ahmed Benengeli,1 and Gargantua to Maitre Alcofridas Nasier.2

The Protocols of the Elders of Zion are best described as ‘pseu-
do-epigrapha’, rather than ‘fake’. They belong to the same category as Thomas Friedman’s “Letter of President Clinton to Mubarak.” After all, pseudo-epigraphic genre is an old and venerable one. It is even better to consider the Protocols ‘a political pamphlet’.

In this essay, we shall attempt to find out why the Protocols refuse to lie down and die. We shall stay clear from the usual question, “who wrote it.” Its real author remains unknown, and it is difficult to imagine this person, for the Protocols are a literary palimpsest. In the days of yore, a scribe would write his composition on a piece of old parchment, previously removing an older text. The erasure was rarely total, and a reader was treated to an integrated version of the Golden Ass and Fioretti of St. Francis. In the Protocols, there are layers of old and even older stories, and it precludes a meaningful quest for the ultimate creator. Every text should be treated on its own merits, disregarding the question of authorship. Although, Jorge Luis Borges wrote that the author is an important part of a text. Indeed, if we would know the Protocols

---

1 Cide Hamete Benengeli, in Cervantes’ spelling.
2 Nom de plume of FranHois Rabelais.
contain a real blueprint of some Jewish elites, we would have our answer ready in minutes. But *Protocols* were published in the end of the 19th-beginning of the 20th century “as found” — as apocrypha. They became a great bestseller and still stay there, though in some countries (notably the Soviet Union), mere possession of the text was punishable by death.

The Anonymous author of the *Protocols* describes a master-plan for vast restructuring of society, creation of a new oligarchy and subjugation of millions. The final product is not too different from the one described in a contemporary piece of writing, *The Iron Heel* by Jack London, the great radical from Oakland, California. However, London expected a harsh crack-down, while Anonym’s way to subjugation leads through Machiavellian manipulations and mind control à la Orwell’s *1984*. (Orwell’s homage to the *Protocols* is even more striking as it is rarely noticed).

“The difficulty of the *Protocols* is in an uncanny dissonance between its uncouth language and deep social and religious thought. It is a rude parody-like rendering of a satanic, subtle and well-thought out plan,” wrote the Nobel Prize winning novelist Alexander Solzhenitsyn1 in his (written in 1966 and published in 2001) analysis of the *Protocols*:

The *Protocols* . . . show a blueprint of a social system. Its design is well above abilities of an ordinary mind, including that of its publisher. It is a dynamic process of two stages, of destabilization, increasing freedom and liberalism, which is terminated in social cataclysm, and on the second stage, new hierarchical restructuring of society takes place. It is more complicated than a nuclear bomb. It could be a stolen and distorted plan designed by a mind of genius. Its putrid style of an anti-Semitic grubby brochure [intentionally] obscures the great strength of thought and insight.

Solzhenitsyn is aware of the faults of the *Protocols*: “Its style is that of a filthy leaflet, the powerful line of thought is broken and fragmented, mixed up with ill-smelling incantations and psychological blunders. The system described is not necessarily connected with the Jews; it could be purely Masonic or whatever; while its

1 Alexander Solzhenitsyn, Evrei v SSSR i v budushei Rossii, 2001 (in Russian).
strongly anti-Semitic current is not an organic part of the design.”

Solzhenitsyn makes a textual experiment, removes the words ‘Jews’, ‘Goyim’ and ‘conspiracy’ and finds many disturbing ideas. He concludes: “The text demonstrates impressive foresight on the two systems of society, the Western and the Soviet one. While a powerful thinker could possibly predict the development of the West in 1901, how could he grasp the Soviet future?”

Solzhenitsyn braved the Soviet regime, dared to write and publish the mammoth *Archipelago Gulag*, an indictment of the Soviet repression, but even he stalled and did not publish his research on the *Protocols*. He asked that it be published after his death only, and it was printed against his will in a very small number of copies in 2001. Let us follow Solzhenitsyn’s line of thought and gaze into the crystal ball of the *Protocols*, while temporarily discounting its “Jewish line” and paying heed to the idea of creating a new system, not necessarily a Jewish-dominated one. The master-plan begins with the reshaping of the human mind:

People’s minds should be diverted (away from contemplation) towards industry and trade, and then they will have no time to think. The people will be consumed by the pursuit of gain. It will be a vain pursuit, for we shall put industry on a speculative basis: what is withdrawn from the land by industry will slip through the hands of workers and industrialists and pass into the hands of financiers.

The intensified struggle for survival and superiority, accompanied by crises and shocks will create cold and heartless communities with strong aversion towards religion. Their only guide is gain that is Mammon, which they will erect into a veritable cult.

Foresight of Anonym is amazing: in the days of the *Protocols’* publication, Man was still the measure of things, and a full eighty years would pass until Milton Friedman and the Chicago School would proclaim Market and Profit as the only guiding light.

The tool for enslavement of minds is the media, writes Anonym. “There is a great force that creates the movement of thought in the people, and that is the media. It is in the media that the triumph of freedom of speech finds its incarnation. Through
the Press we have gained the power to influence minds while remaining unobserved. We shall erase from the memory of men the historical facts we do not want them to know, and leave only those we wish [to have them remember]."

Years were to pass after the time of the publication of the Protocols until a small group of people, the media lords, who control our discourse while remaining unobserved, would arise. The open discussion of the media barons, Berlusconi and Black, Maxwell and Sulzberger, Gusinsky and Zuckerman is banned from the media they own, while their cooperative affinity remains impressive. Freedom of discourse survives wherever independent (from media barons) media still exists. Hundred years ago, this force was much weaker than it is now; it is amazing that Anonym recognised its potential.

A century before the rise of the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund, the Protocols noticed that the foreign loans are the best tools to rob countries of their wealth. “While the loans were internal, money remained in the land, but with externalisation of loans, all nations pay tribute of their subjects to the oligarchy.” Indeed, the bigger loans poor countries get, the poorer they become.

Concentration of capital in the hands of financiers, concentration of media in few hands, extra-judicial killings of unyielding leaders, and the stock market with its derivatives, suck out wealth. It accumulates in the hands of the priesthood of Mammon, gain (or “market forces”) as the only measure of successful strategy. Yes, the interest to the Protocols does not disappear because the described plan of creating oligarchic (not necessarily Jewish) rule is being implemented in real time and it is called the New World Order.

Sometimes, the Protocols are described as an extreme-right-wing anti-utopian piece of writing. However, it spans both left and right-wing discourse. A right-wing writer would bless the strengthening of Law and Order, but the following prediction of Anonym could be written today by a leftist libertarian, say, Noam Chomsky, witnessing the present transition to the New World Order: “The race of armaments and the increase of a police force will bring forth society where there are only the masses of the proletariat, a few millionaires, police and soldiers.”

However, the deepest thought of Anonym remains in the spiritual sphere:
Freedom might be harmless and have its place in the State economy without injury to the well-being of the people if it rested upon the foundation of faith in God, upon the Brotherhood of humanity. This is the reason why it is indispensable for us to undermine all faith, to tear out of the people’s mind the very principle of God and the Spirit, and to put in its place arithmetical calculations and material needs.

Anonym connects Faith and the idea of the Brotherhood of humanity. The undermining of Faith ruins the Brotherhood. Freedom, instead of a desirable and beautiful state of mind, turns into a destructive drive when unhinged from the Faith. Instead of Faith, the Enemy offers the pursuit of Mammon.

While reading in today’s (16.11.02) International Herald Tribune philippics against gay priests and nuns, one notes the following lines in the Protocols: “We have taken care to discredit the Christian priesthood and ruin their mission which might still hinder our plans. Day by day, their influence on the people is falling lower. Collapse of Christianity is nigh.”

We witness implementation of this plan: religion is removed from consideration, neo-liberalism or Mammon worship takes its place, while with disestablishment of socialism, this brave attempt of a non-faith-based brotherhood collapses, leaving an ideological vacuum.

This observation caused some reviewers to exclaim, “The true designer of the Master-plan is our old foe, the Prince of the World, whose ultimate aim is the elimination of the Divine Presence and ruination of Man.” True, but the Prince of the World can’t act directly. He needs free agents that choose to accept his plan. These chief agents and possible allies, according to the pamphlet, are financial capitalists and Masters of Discourse, ‘the Mind’.

They promote to the highest positions “politicians who, in case of disobedience to our instructions, must face criminal charges or disappear. We shall arrange elections in favour of candidates with some dark, undiscovered stain in their past. They will be our trustworthy agents out of fear of revelations.” For us, contemporaries of Watergate and Lewinsky, it sounds familiar.

The shift from Stage One (liberalism and freedom) to Stage Two (tyranny) took place in our lifetime. If in 1968 the New York Times promoted the Freedom Riders; in 2002 it supports the Patriot Act. An important American lawyer, Alan Dershowitz of
Harvard made a U-turn from Human rights to the Right to Torture. This U-turn was predicted by the Protocols, as the purpose beyond the struggle against the old elites.

“The aristocracy enjoyed the labour of the workers, and it was interested in seeing that the workers were well fed, healthy, and strong. The people have annihilated the aristocracy, and have fallen into the grip of merciless money-grinding scoundrels.”

In less emotional terms, the new bourgeoisie removed the old elites with the support of people, while promising freedom and objecting to their privilege. After its victory, it took the privilege for itself, and turned out to be as bad (or worse) as the feudal lord. Marx referred to this complaint of aristocracy in one of the numerous additions to the Communist Manifesto, and considered it futile if partly justified. However, he did not live to witness a similar process which took place in the last days of the Soviet Union. The rising new bourgeoisie took control over the discourse and convinced the people to fight the privilege of Nomenclature for the sake of equality and freedom. After their victory, it assumed and multiplied the privilege, and rejected equality and freedom.

The Protocols predict the rise of the New Bourgeoisie, globalist Mammon-worshippers who are inherently hostile to Old Elites, to spirit, to religion, and to the ordinary people. For a long while, they were the engine of the left, democracy-seeking movements, until their purpose was completed, and then they made the U-turn towards oligarchy.

This U-turn can be quantified by the inheritance and land tax rate in England: while the financial bourgeoisie and Masters of Discourse fought against the old ruling classes, the rates were high and eventually dismantled their power base. After their victory, the rate decreased allowing consolidation of the new ruling classes. It is possible that the Old Order had had some advantages. It is almost certain that a transition from the Old Order could be different if the people understood the intentions of the enemy. But history can’t be reversed, and it is futile to dream of return of the good lords and benevolent Party bosses.

Thus, the Protocols (purified of references to the Jews and conspiracies) are useful as they describe a blueprint of the New World Order, and help its adversaries to form a defensive strategy against the designs of the Enemy. But the references to the Jews constitute a large and important part of the text.
The Jews and the Protocols

The Protocols identify the moving force of the New World Order as a powerful group of extremely chauvinistic, manipulative and domination-obsessed Jewish leaders. The leaders, according to the Protocols, despise ordinary community members; they utilise and support anti-Semitism as the means to keep their ‘lesser brethren’, innocent ordinary folk of Jewish origin, in thrall to their rule. The leaders are described as pathological goy haters, bent on destroying culture and traditions of other nations while preserving their own. Their goal is to create world government and rule the homogenised and globalised world.

Their aims and intentions are stated in an extremely contrarian and obnoxious way. Solzhenitsyn concluded that no sane person would deliver his favourite ideas in such a self-demeaning and self-defeating way. "We extract gold from their blood and tears," “our power is based on workers’ hunger,” “revolutionaries are our human tools,” “brutish minds of Goyim,” are, in his opinion, words ascribed to the Jews by their enemies. A Jew would rather put such ideas in an oblique way, he felt.

It is not a water-tight argument. Some people speak in an oblique way; others prefer a direct one. An Armenian from the Azeri capital, Baku told me in long gone 1988, “The Azeris are our cattle. Without our Armenian mind their country would collapse in a course of days, as they are silly donkeys.” (A few months later, an explosion of native violence expelled the clever Armenians from Azerbaijan, and since then the Azeris manage their own land quite all right.)

David Ben-Gurion, the first ruler of the Jewish state, coined an equally arrogant maxim: “Who cares what Goyim say? What mat-
ters is what the Jews do!” This sentence is an almost direct quote from the Protocols.

The Protocols ascribe to the Elders a saying, “Each Jewish victim is worth in the sight of God a thousand goyim.” This line, a pinnacle of arrogance, is not a vain invention of an anti-Semite. Two ministers of Sharon’s government, Uri Landau and Ivet Lieberman demanded to kill one thousand Palestinian goyim for each Jewish victim. A Jewish extremist at a demo for the Jewish Temple Mount (18.11.02) called each Jew to kill one thousand Palestinian goyim. Apparently, some ideas of the Protocols are not foreign to some Jews.

The late Israeli scholar Israel Shahak and an American Jewish writer Norton Mezvinsky present in their book, Jewish Fundamentalism in Israel\(^1\) a plethora of sayings by Jewish Rabbis that wouldn’t be out of place in the Protocols. “The difference between a Jewish soul and souls of non-Jews is greater and deeper than the difference between a human soul and the souls of cattle” (p. ix). Shahak and Mezvinsky proved that the rage of the Jewish chauvinists does not differentiate between Palestinians, Arabs and Goyim in general. In other words, whatever happened to Palestinians could happen to any Gentile community standing in the way of the Jews.

Indeed, if the Protocols had no relation to reality, they probably wouldn’t be as popular as they are. The Jews are sufficiently powerful to dream of domination, and some do. Apparently some Jewish ideas found their way into the text. Other thoughts are ascribed to the Jews on the basis of qui bono [who benefits].

The least acceptable idea of the Protocols is the presumption of an extremely ancient conspiracy of the Jews aiming to take over the world. The extreme philo-Semitic view denies the Jews their ability to act together and presents them as separate individuals united by prayer only. This view is not accepted by the Jews, and it does not agree with the common sense.

Solzhenitsyn does not believe in the existence of the Elders of Zion, though “the togetherness and coordination of Jewish activity for the sake of their advancement caused many writers (beginning from Cicero) to imagine there is a single commanding centre for directing their attacks. Without such a world centre, without

\(^1\) Pluto Press, 1999.
conspiring, the Jews understand each other and are able to coordinate their actions.”

The Jews are perfectly able to coordinate their actions, but I doubt that human beings, Jews or English, Russians or Chinese are able to form long-standing plans spanning centuries and continents. Nobody was able to prove such a plot exists. Usually, ‘anti-Semites’ (the people who doubt or deny inherent benevolence of the Jews to Gentile society) argue for its authenticity as Henry Ford did. The car king said:1 “The only statement I care to make about the Protocols is that they fit in with what is going on.” Indeed they do, exclaims Victor Marsden, the English translator of the Protocols.

However, it is not proof of a Jewish plot. We can reach similar results rejecting the conspiracy line altogether, by applying the concept of self-interest to the real Jewish community as it was aptly described by Shahak-Mezvinsky. We shall prove that the troublesome concept of the Hidden Hand or the Elders of Zion is superfluous and unnecessary.

The traditional Jewish community had a structure of the ‘upturned pyramid’. In the words of Zionist theoreticians, it contained many persons of wealth, learning and management, and very few workers. It appears an odd thing, until one understands that the Zionists artificially view the Jews in divorce of the society they live in. The Jewish ‘upturned pyramid’ couldn’t exist without a real down-turned pyramid of Gentile low classes. The Jews compete with the native elites of the Gentile society for the right to exploit the Gentile worker and peasant. The modus operandi of the two competitors differs. Although native elites shared some values with their lower classes and usually provided for some upward mobility, the Jewish community had its own structure and values.

Economically it stood for capitalist or quasi-capitalist exploitation of the natives, while ideologically the community declared loyalty to its leaders, rejection of common humanity with the natives, extreme ethnocentrism and feelings of racial and religious superiority towards the natives. It was a marginal community which formed no bonds of marriage and friendship with the natives. As a marginal community, it was free of long-standing considerations the native elites had had.

1 In an interview published in the New York World, February 17th, 1921.
For instance, the Jewish community of 17th century Ukraine had been a collective tax-farmer and leaseholder, extracting from the natives SIX times more taxes and dues per person than a gentile landlord did, wrote a prominent Jewish Ukrainian historian, Saul Borovoy in a book recently published in Jerusalem. The Jewish communities of Maghreb supported the colonial power against their gentile neighbours, etc. Their traditions forbade normal relations with the natives.

Let us presume that such a community acts on its egoistic interests. Forget conspiracy; forget the Elders of Zion, learned or otherwise. The community’s only aim is to promote its own well-being. For a marginal group it means to make the social gap between its members and the native population as broad as possible, while minimising the backlash potential.

The group would naturally, for its own self-interest, support every movement against native elites, whether initiated by the King (as the Jews did before the French Revolution) or by the rebelling low classes. It would not be done for the Jewish love of democracy or rebellious nature, but for the improvement of their own positions. An ideal situation would be created by massacre or expulsion of the native elites, as the group members would be able to appropriate their positions. Indeed, it happened in Soviet Russia of Cheka and Soviet Hungary of Bela Kun in the aftermath of World War One. Massacre and exile of the native elites made the positions of power and influence available to the competing Jews.

Self-interest explains the Jewish involvement with the dreaded Cheka, the Soviet security services. Until 1937, the Jews occupied the top echelon of the KGB predecessor body, while millions of Russians lost their life or liberty. Objectively, these executioners made jobs and houses available for their fellow Jews. After the massacre and exile of Russian elites, the Jews were ready for equality, as a son of a Rabbi could easily compete with a son of a Russian worker or peasant, though he wouldn’t be able to compete with a son of a Russian noble.

In a similar way, the Jews in Israel granted limited equality to the Palestinians in 1966, after confiscation of 90% of native lands and expulsion of 90% of the natives. Now, the settlers promise to extend equality to the rest of Palestinians, after they expel the majority of them elsewhere. In light of the great Jewish support for Israel,
there is no reason to presume that the Jewish *modus operandi* in
Palestine is intrinsically different from the Jewish intentions abroad.
Solzhenitsyn writes:

Executed [during the revolution] army officers were Russians, the
noblemen, priests, monks, deputies were Russians . . . In 1920s, the
pre-revolutionary engineers and scientists were exiled or killed.
They were Russians, while their place was taken by Jews. The best
Russian Psychiatric institute in Moscow, its Russian members were
arrested or exiled, while their place was taken by the Jews. Important
Jewish doctors blocked the advancement of Russian medical scient-
ists... The best intellectual and artistic elites of Russian people were
killed, while the Jews grew and flourished in these (deadly for
Russians) years.

The new Jewish elite did not fully identify with Russia but car-
rried out a separate policy. It had a fateful effect in 1991, when over
50 % of the Jews (as opposed to 13 % of the Russians) supported
the pro-Western coup of President Yeltsin. In 1995, 81% of the
Jews voted for pro-Western parties, and only 3% for the
Communists (as opposed to 46% of Russians), according to the
publication by the Jewish sociologist Dr. Ryvkina in her book, *Jews

In ever-expanding America, the Jews did not have to kill or
remove the native elites; they became its important part, control-
ling discourse and wielding considerable financial clout. They still
do not identify with the goyish America: every year, they force the
Congress and the Administration to send five billion dollars to
their Israeli offshoot and now they are trying to let America fight
their war in Iraq. They do discriminate against other Americans;
otherwise 60% of the leading positions in the media would not
become Jewish.¹

Jews of France do not identify with France, either. “Their iden-
tification with Israel is so strong, it overshadows their ties to the
country they live in,” writes Daniel Ben Simon in *Haaretz*. This
dual loyalty was made very clear to me by a Jewish doctor in Nice.
“If the choice is between Israel and France, there's no question I

¹ The data provided by Kevin MacDonald of California University.
feel closer to Israel,” he said, without a moment’s hesitation. He was born and bred in France; he went to medical school in France; his patients are French; he speaks French with his wife and children. But in the depths of his heart, he feels a greater affinity with the Jewish state.

In Palestine, the Jews have no compassion for the natives. They travel by segregated roads, study in segregated schools, while a Jew consumes ten times more water resources than a goy, and has an income seven times higher. Thus, the Jewish separateness remains a fact of life for many Jewish communities.

For their own well-being the Jews have to obscure their unique position, wealth and power by the following means:

- Holocaust discourse helps to fight envy.
- In a mono-ethnic society, the Jews as the only foreign body do stick out and attract attention, while in multicultural society they are hardly visible. For this purpose, the Jews support immigration from non-European countries, as their presence would remove the stamp of Jewish exclusiveness.
- The Political Correctness is another device forbidding the discussion of Jewish influence.
- Fight against Christianity and the Church makes sense for a non-Christian community: if the Church would be strong, the Christians would prefer their own, Christian elite.
- Globalisation is a natural development for the people spread all over the globe, if they attach but little importance to the local ways.
- Impoverishment of the natives is but another side of growing wealth of the Jewish community.

Summing it up, a big share (though not all) of the ideas ascribed to the Jews by the Protocols are indeed the ideas useful or necessary for the Jewish communal well-being, without any need for great hatred towards Gentiles and/or the guidance of mythic Elders of Zion. That is the reason for the Protocols’ long life. Paradoxically, without Israeli apartheid these facts would remain invisible for the host communities.
Gibson’s Passion

Three incredible days passed in Jerusalem. On Friday night, burial processions carried out the shroud of the Lord from the small ancient church of St James into the parvis of the Holy Sepulchre. Yesterday, tens of thousands of native Christians and pilgrims flocked into the great edifice of the Holy Sepulchre to celebrate the annual but always new and surprising miracle of Holy Fire coming of the Tomb of Christ. It is a beautiful and colourful feast, when processions of various denominations march in and out, while young Syrian and Armenian boys throw wild and inspiring dances full of manly power. After hours of chants and prayers, Holy Fire burst out of the empty Tomb to encourage us at this most frightening Saturday of the year, the Saturday when the Lord was dead. During this godless Saturday Christ fought the gates of Hell, and its outcome was far from obvious. The Holy Fire was a sign of life from the Tomb. And with sunrise on Easter Sunday came a beautiful day, a day of new hope and new promise.

This year, the Old City of Jerusalem was full of CDs and videos of the great modern Passion Play by Mel Gibson. It was also screened in semi-privacy of hotels and clubs, for no cinema in Jewish-controlled Palestine wished to show it. There was no clear reason as reason goes. The Passion of Gibson is quite similar to his Braveheart; both films contain long and heart-tearing scenes of torture, flogging and agony. But no Englishman objected to the Braveheart being screened claiming it will inspire anti-English sentiment. The Passion reminds in a way even The First Blood, but no policeman tried to block Rambo saying it inflames hatred to cops. If the Jews were an ethnic group, they would be able to watch the Passion as easily as the English watch the Braveheart. Indeed,
our friend Gilad Atzmon was right: Jews are not killers of Christ, but those who identify with killers of Christ.

For Palestinians, this story of a kind Palestinian man tortured and killed by the brutal lookalikes of Israel’s Border Police at the shouts of ‘Yiztaley’, ‘Crucify Him’, is a story of their daily life brought to the level of Faith. And they can find respite and hope in its message of Resurrection. For the immigrant ‘Jewish’ population of Palestine, there is a plain message: identify with Christ, not with his killers.
Take your kids to the movie

The film of Mel Gibson, The Passion, grows into an important, maybe the important event of the year. Even before screening, it caused violent reactions of the American Jewish ‘thought police’, ADL led by obnoxious Foxman. There are unpleasant rumours (in the *New York Times*) that Mr Gibson gave in and decided to censor the Gospel. I hope it is not true, for a man who can give in and cut the Gospel is not worthy to make a film about Golgotha. ‘To change even one letter in the Bible is like to destroy the world’, says the Jewish wisdom, and I concur: if the Gospel, the most important part of the Bible, tells us of the High Priest of Jews that he accepted his responsibility for the verdict, Mr Gibson is not entitled to change it, even he were to be crucified himself.

Naturally, the High Priest of antisemitism fighters, Abe Foxman, the guy who took bribe from Marc Rich the thief, is not worried about placid American Goyim attacking the innocent Jews. First, it is not bloody likely. Even if the Jews were to crucify Christ today in prime time on CNN, the Americans won’t dare to object. Secondly, every attack on a Jew brings cash to Abe Foxman; he thrives on strife. He is worried about something else.

Foxman and other enemies of Gibson’s film are worried that the young American kids of some Jewish background, like kids of Vermont Governor Dean, or many of our readers, will see the movie and never again will call themselves ‘Jews’ anymore. Foxman, Bronfman et al are worried that these kids — and grown ups — will take themselves to the church, while these leaders will remain with assorted retired folk in Florida. Their worries are our hopes.

There many good people who by mistake or by ignorance consider themselves ‘Jews’. For this mistake they pay dearly: they are
forced to fight against ‘the Jews’ while supporting the setup. I saw something similar in Russia, where many good people called themselves ‘communists’ in the days of Brezhnev. They had to justify or condemn invasion of Afghanistan from extremely uncomfortable position. But they had no choice in the USSR of those days. But now, there is no need for any good person to call him/herself a Jew anymore.

The Church always welcomed these good people of Jewish origin to her bosom. They are welcome, and the film of Gibson hopefully will bring them — away from Foxman and Caiaphas to Christ. But this beautiful plan can’t be implemented by way of ideological and theological compromise. The Church is open for the good people, and the separation of lambs from goats is promised beginning of the Last Judgement. Now, appearance of the Mel Gibson’s film provides us with opportunity to separate lambs from goats. The Washington columnist Joe Sobran wrote to me:

‘The Mel Gibson’s movie is being accused of “antisemitism” just for presenting the Gospel story. Have you noticed that Christianity, the Catholic Church, the popes, Martin Luther, many of the most eminent Christian authors, and the Gospels themselves are constantly called antisemitic? But not Jesus himself! Why not? Obviously someone is trying to tell us something with all these charges of antisemitism. Here is a man who antagonized the Jewish authorities of his day, incurring all their fury, and who has inspired TWO THOUSAND YEARS of antisemitism! Why does He get off the hook? Why don’t they just come out and accuse Him? That’s plainly what they’re driving at. So let them say it. Remember, when they talk about “antisemitism” they’re really talking about Jesus Christ. If they won’t say it, we should’.

Indeed, this film can wake up the American Christians to the supreme sacrifice and glory of Christ. It will bring American ‘Jews’ to the crown of their long assimilation process — to the Church. It will set them free — for Christianity is freedom, first of all. And then the Holy Land will remain the socle of the Cross, not the base of Antichrist.
The Stumbling Block

I

In the *Return of the King*, the Oscar-studded film based on the Tolkien’s fantasy, there is a touching and inspiring moment: at the lowest ebb of struggle, when the Sauron hordes pour in through the breached gates of Gondor, horns announce the arrival of the relieving force. Rohan is coming, and the looting Orks retreat from the City in disarray.

Such a rescue force came to the embattled people of the Middle East in the unexpected form of a film. This inspired creation of Mel Gibson broke the dangerous and immoral alliance between devout American Christians and their Jewish shepherds. Mel Gibson and his *Passion of Christ* may well have advanced the cause of justice and peace in Palestine more than we could possibly dream of. Incidentally, he succeeded in undermining the most dangerous heresy in the long history of Christianity: the right-wing Evangelicals’ infatuation with Jews and Zionism. Now it is the time to recognise this victory and enjoy its fruits.

The Jewish establishment and its willing subjects carried out a perilous policy of encouraging the Clash of Civilisations, embodied in ideological and US military warfare against the Third World. For this reason, they promoted the concept of a ‘Judaeo-Christian’ Civilisation at war with the Muslims, with the ‘Red-Brown’ Russians, with the French and with traditional societies and forces. Mel Gibson and his powerful film opened the Second Front of this great struggle within the powerbase of the enemy — in the US — by exposing the lie at the very foundation of the Judaeo-Christian myth.
As St Paul prophesied, Christ turned out to be the “stumbling block” for the Jewish advance. The Jewish leaders thought they secured the US, and that they could safely proceed with this war elsewhere. Their second target was Islam, the Middle East — their battleground, and the trophy was to be the holiest shrine of Islam in Jerusalem: the Dome of the Rock, with the blazing golden letters inscribed by the Umayyad Caliphs that proclaim “Blessed is Jesus Christ, Blessed is the Day of His Nativity, and Blessed is the Day of His Resurrection.”

Zionists formed an alliance with the misled Christian Conservatives, and the US troops took over Iraq and Afghanistan, while supporting the Israeli offensive against the native Palestinians in the Holy Land. Then came Mel Gibson, and their alliance fell apart. Thus, Christ indeed was our secret weapon against the Zionist takeover. I felt it for long time; ever since on Easter 2001 I referred to His Passion in context of Palestinian suffering, just to be immediately frozen out by mainstream Jewish pro-peace groups. Let us raise the banner of Christ, for it causes split amongst our adversaries.

Professor Patrick McNally wrote that the Judeo-Nazis repeated the error of German Nazis; they became over-extended by opening the Second Front. They could not help: they attacked Gibson and the American Christians, though their support was necessary for the Middle East takeover.

Sidney Blumenthal, an American Zionist Jew and a former senior adviser to President Clinton, wrote in the Guardian: ‘The neo-cons and the theocons (conservative Christians) were bound together for different reasons: the neocons by foreign policy (read: support of Israel), the theocons by their continuing fundamentalist revolt against modernity (for modernity read: neo-liberalism). Enter Mel Gibson, sprinkling holy gasoline on the fires and blowing up the cultural contradictions of American conservatism.” It frightened Jews, concludes Blumenthal, and therefore Bush must go.

In Israel, this understanding came first. Gershom Gorenberg wrote in the Jerusalem Report:²

---

¹ Guardian, March 4, 2004
² FUNDAMENTALISM ON FILM Jerusalem Report (Israel) March 8, 2004 Issue
“Post-9/11, the “conflict of civilizations” is often taken for granted; it supposedly pits the “Judeo-Christian” world against Muslims. That mood, along with the Intifada, has fertilized an alliance twinning Israeli right-wingers and some U.S. Jewish leaders with conservative Christians. The Passion should sober people up.

“By attacking The Passion, Jewish groups such as the Anti-Defamation League helped to publicize it. I don’t think they had a better option. To ignore a film in which Pilate is a softy and the Jews cry for Jesus’ blood would be equivalent to pleading “no contest” to the West’s oldest calumny. But the Passion affair underlines the absurdity of the romance between Jewish groups (including the ADL) and the Christian Right.”

Gershom Gorenberg is right. This alliance of Christ-loving American Conservatives and Christ-hating Jewish leadership was absurd from the beginning. The Christians in the US, as elsewhere, belong to the traditional all-embracing faith of love to the poor and downtrodden. The Jewish establishment subscribes to the faith which is good for the rich and powerful Chosen People, whether Jews or godless Mammon worshippers. Their alliance was a peculiar quirk of history that brought mankind to the edge of the abyss.

As a last, bizarre stroke of this alliance, on March 5th, 2004, the Arab-bashing Pat Robertson appealed on his blasphemously-named ‘Christian Broadcasting Network (CBN)’ to the American Christians to join with Jews this year to celebrate the Festival of Purim. Those who answer his call will celebrate together with hundreds of followers and admirers of a fundamentalist American Jew, Baruch Goldstein, who slaughtered dozens of worshippers in the city of Abraham, Hebron on Purim in 1994. His burial place in Kiriyat Arba is the location for Purim celebrations for many Israeli Jews, reported a Jerusalem weekly Kol HaIr on March 5, 2004. It is probably the least-likely festival for a Christian to celebrate together with Jews. By his call, Robertson plainly presented his anti-Christian credentials. His enmity is not reserved for the Muslims only: Robertson also attacked Russia and accused this Christian nation of plotting the “gassing of Jews and Jewish children” – which is a horrible blood libel against a country that has a Jewish Prime Minister. But his support for Zionist atrocities in Palestine would suffice for the viewers of Gibson’s film to reject Robertson and his preaching of hate.
God knows, there are other Christian forces, and the enthusiastic welcome received by Gibson’s film proves that they are the real majority. The Reverend Charles Carlson of www.whtt.org runs Project Straight Gate, which speaks against the war in Iraq and Palestine. On a recent pro-life demonstration they called upon their fellow-Americans to care about lives of Iraqi and Palestinian children as much as for the unborn children of America. Their signs read “Innocent Blood on Our Hands, Iraq – Gaza”, and “Choose Peace, not War”. They called upon “fellow Christ-followers to oppose successive slaughter in the Middle East. Americans are now among the victims of the war almost every day. But even when none of ‘ours’ are killed, they are being fashioned into assassins and brutal occupiers, which is not what most Christ-followers should desire for their children.”

II

Gibson’s film expresses forebodings of the Second Coming. It brings greater awakening into Christian hearts in the Lent; it restores the almost-forgotten tradition of Passion Plays; it separates the lambs from the goats. Not only have Abe Foxman of ADL and Mervin Hier of Wiesenthal Centre exposed their hostility to Christ, but crypto-Zionist Michael Lerner of Tikkun sent his disciples to give away anti-Christian leaflets at the movie theatres. Lerner began as a peace-seeker, but soon turned out to be a Zionist Trojan horse in the peace camp.

On the other side, Mark Bruzonsky of MER, a longtime friend of Palestine, condemned the Jewish establishment’s attempt “to relentlessly crucify Gibson for trying to tell the story as he knows it, or rather as he believes it, [as] in itself a kind of intellectual and political blasphemy. Rather Gibson should be thanked for standing his ground, making his movie, telling his story, and making us all ponder and think and feel... whether Jew, Christian, Muslim, Buddhist, atheist... or just plain human.” Our friend Gilad Atzmon published a strong essay supporting Gibson, while brave Jeff Blankfort of California wrote that it confirms the reality of Jewish control over Hollywood.

1 http://www.whtt.org/whtt.shtml?articles/RighLifeSponshtmFnl.htm
Indeed, this film unveiled the anti-Christian intentions of American Jewry. The New York Times reported that ‘the chairmen of major studios said they would avoid working with Mr. Gibson because of The Passion of the Christ. One of them explained: “It doesn’t matter what I say. It’ll matter what I do. I will do something. I won’t hire him. I won’t support anything he’s part of.”’

Because they run Hollywood it is not strange that America produces anti-Christian films seeping with hatred for the poor, downtrodden, un-Chosen people, be it American rednecks or Arabs, Russians or Latin Americans. The US newspapers, too, gave vast coverage to the hostile positions of Jews on the subject of Passion, showing an incredible bias well known to us friends of Palestine.

Their fear and loathing shows that this film can change America; and therefore it can change the world. American Christians can recognise the urgent need to free their media from the deadly grip of Christ’s enemies. They can attune their policies towards Christ, share their worldly goods with the needy, return their sons from overseas wars, turn their mighty arms industry into ploughshare makers to feed the hungry; reject Mammon; promote spirituality and be a good neighbour to all nations of the Earth.

Let them remember: the Passion of Christ is not a millennia-old event: even today, as I write, it is the funds and weapons sent by the US are helping the Jews to crucify Palestine. They besiege the Nativity town of Bethlehem and plot to destroy the Dome of the Rock with its benedictions of Christ. The horrors of the Passion presented by Mel Gibson are inflicted daily on the captive Palestinians. They are killed by the hundreds, tortured by the thousands and starved by the millions. People who support or ignore this persecution will never be able to wash their hands of their blood.

The nearest few months will show whether the American Conservative Christians care for Christ; whether they are an independent political power at all, or just an alibi-providing Gentile front for the Jewish policies; whether the only political swing possible in the US is that between pro-Likud Bush and pro-Labour Kerry. It is the time for Americans to regain their lost independence. But for that, they will need a miracle.

---

Christmas Greetings to Hellenes

In this season of short days and long nights, the Greeks, like their Palestinian Orthodox Christian brothers, turn their thoughts – not to the neutral ‘shopping season’, like Americans, not to Lapland, like the West Europeans, but to the small town of Bethlehem in Palestine, where the most profound miracle took place and the Eternal Logos was born as the Son of Man; where the great Church of the Nativity still stands, and the Greek and Palestinian priests sing their beautiful akathists to Our Lady Theotokos and to Her Blessed Son, for Greece is forever united with the Holy Land. The Hellenes and the Palestinians together formed the first Mother Church, they were among the first apostles, and while Our Lady was a Palestinian, the words of the Gospel were written in immortal Greek. For two thousand years the Greeks and the Palestinians belonged to one state, whether it was called the Eastern Roman Empire, Byzantium or the Ottoman Empire. The blood of Greeks still flows in the veins of Palestinians together with the blood of Jews and Arabs, and we are united by the common faith.

I write to you as a member of your Sister Church, a member of the Greek Orthodox Church of Jerusalem, for though born a Jew, by the Grace of Christ I was baptised this year in its wonderful ancient cathedral of Mar Yakoub, the old see of St James, the brother of our Lord and the first Bishop of Jerusalem. It is adjacent to Golgotha and to the great Church of the Resurrection, and it is the home church of the local Arab-speaking Palestinian Orthodox community. I was baptized in the old deep octagonal Byzantine font that so many saints and bishops of the Holy City were baptized in. My skin still feels the touch of
olive oil and myrrh, soft, supple, fragrant, though it was more than a year ago.

I was anointed before the full immersion, and the water in the font also felt like precious olive oil, this main substance of the Holy Land. I was brought into the church by the Archimandrite Attalla Hanna, Father Theodosius, the highest-ranking native Palestinian priest of the Mother Church, who was released from his captivity. Instead of Israel, the father of Jews, I was given the name of Adam, the father of all men. It was midday when I stepped out into the atrium, feeling like a groom in his wedding day, and was met by the bells of the Holy Redeemer. It reminded me of this dream of Theodore Herzl, to bring the Jews into Church on midday with all bells a-ringing. The monks and parish folk blessed me ‘mabruk’ and indeed I feel myself much blessed to join my Palestinian brothers and sisters in their church.

I share my witness with you, and make it known to my brothers the Jews: there is no joy greater than to be in communion with God and with the people of the land. Now, I can repeat after John, “for the Law was given through Moses, grace and truth came through Jesus Christ”.

Since then, I celebrate with you and with all Orthodox Christians our marvellous feasts; Epiphany on the shores of the Jordan River, Annunciation in Nazareth, Easter in the Holy Sepulchre, Ascension on the Mount of Olives, Transfiguration on Mt Thabor, Dormition in Kedron Valley, and Nativity in Bethlehem.

The Holy Land is still Christian – in the Judean Desert, the Great Laura of St Sabas guards the steep ravine of Wadi al-Nar, the Valley of Fire. Not far away, in St Theodosius Monastery, the tomb of the great Greek Palestinian writer and monk John Moschos, creator of The Spiritual Meadow, is still venerated. Greek monks worship in St George Laura built at the cave where Joachim fasted forty days and Elijah was fed by ravens. The memory of Origen and Eusebius still lingers in Caesarea.

Despite all hardship, worshippers do not desert the churches of the Holy Land. Bethlehem and Nazareth, Taybeh and Rami, Kana of Galilee, Jaffa and Lydda, Jifna and Bir Zeit, and many other villages and towns remain staunchly Christian. They withstand the relentless pressure of the Jewish State, the sieges, persecutions and
discrimination. Native Palestinian Christians, sons of the Apostles, are the backbone of the community, and recently they were joined by thousands of Russians who immigrated into the Holy Land and now flock into churches.

However, not everything is fine in the Orthodox Church: while the Catholics have a Palestinian bishop (“Patriarch”) and a new bishop for the converts from the Jews, in the Greek Orthodox Church there is but one Palestinian out of twenty members of the Synod. While the laity is Palestinian, the clergy is solidly Greek. As there is no Palestinian neither Hellene in Christ, such a situation is not healthy and not realistic. Indeed, in the 19th century all Palestinian Christians were Orthodox, but since then the numbers of Catholics and Protestants grew at the expense of the Orthodox Church. The Palestinian Christians feel that they have no chance for ministry in their Mother Church. Even worse, the Orthodox clergy feels its vulnerability and hardly participates in joint actions with other churches on behalf of the besieged Palestinians. These actions are often led by Catholics and smaller churches, while the deserved place of the largest Christian denomination, the Orthodox one, remains vacant.

The Orthodox Church does not try to serve the growing Christian Hebrew-speaking community, either. Many Israeli Jews experience the abundant Grace of Christ in His Land and turn to the Church while rejecting the Synagogue. They go to the Catholics, or even to the plentiful Evangelical churches, for they do not know of the Greek Orthodox Church. It is a source of great regret, for a few reasons. The Jews are forever fighting Christ and the Church; there is no chance for peace in the Holy Land unless the position of the Synagogue is undermined and the Jews saved by the Church.

The Orthodox Church is the only Church that still keeps the fire of the Apostles; thanks to the labours of St Basil, St Gregory and St John Chrysostom, she possesses theology able to undo the Jewish paradigm as no one else. Other churches, even the Catholic Church after Vatican II, accepted the unacceptable demands of the Jews and agreed to the conditions once rejected by St Paul. They agreed to the idea of Two Covenants, as if the Old Covenant is not the same as the New Covenant. Thus they came to the weird idea of Two Chosen Peoples — Israel of the flesh and the Church. The
Orthodox Church is still safe from this dangerous heresy. Only the Orthodox Church can offer true salvation to the Jews escaping their supremacist creed. And now, when thousands of Jews try to come to Christ, the Orthodox Church of Jerusalem does not make a sufficient effort to bring them in.

The Laws of the Jewish state forbid evangelising, but so did the laws of Tiberius, Nero and Domitian, and it did not stop the first messengers of the Good News. There should be an effort to help the Israeli Jews to reach salvation. It can’t be separated from the question of Palestinian clergy, for the Palestinian clergy can show the Israelis that the way of the Church is also the true path to peace.

The Greek leadership probably will be needed for a time in the Greek Orthodox Church of the Holy Land, but if we want this most important church to survive it should promote the Native Palestinian Christians to high positions. Otherwise, sooner or later a schism in this Church is inevitable; and it can end like it did in Antioch, where the Greek clergy was summarily expelled. In order to sustain the very important and needed positions of the Greek scholars and divines, they must be induced to share. Whoever wants to have everything, will have nothing; one who shares will see his share growing.

It is not a theoretical question. Father Theodosius Attalla Hanna, the dean of St James Cathedral in Jerusalem, is a much venerated Palestinian Orthodox priest, a man of great learning and eloquence, a native of Rami in Galilee. He enjoys the great love and support of the Orthodox Palestinians. He should be elevated as a Bishop and a member of the Synod, if we want the Church to flourish. There is an urgent need for a seminary for native Palestinian Christians, as well as for Russian and Israeli Orthodox communities.

The war in the Holy Land has a theological dimension, and it reaches the ends of the world. Indeed, the dangerous and evil creed of ‘Christian Zionism’ is a Judaising tendency and a result of theological ignorance. The Hellenes can’t wash off their hands: you must make a consistent effort to correct the faults of the Greek Church in the Holy Land.

I write it with great love to you, our Greek brothers and sisters. Please let this neophyte remind you that the Orthodox faith is not
a small parochial creed but the main road of Christendom. It is now embraced by millions of Russians; thousands of Catholics in France and in the US, disappointed by the Judaising heresy of Vatican II, also look up to the Orthodox Church. While Judaisers support the New World Order, the Orthodox Church remains steadfast in following the creed of the Apostles with its promise to the poor and downtrodden. In Russia, the strongest voices against American hegemony are those of the Orthodox philosophers Alexander Dugin and Alexander Panarin. For a new flourishing of the Church, we have to attend to its Palestinian roots, for a church without worshippers is just an empty building.

The Greeks have an important mission in the Holy Land, and it can be fulfilled by providing a place for the native Christians in its hierarchy. Let it happen soonest!
Success and Failure
(An Interview given to Mr Kostas Karaiskos, editor of the Greek weekly Antifonitis)

Q: Mr. Shamir, after working for so many years as a writer and journalist, a day came and you surprised all people by your daring, heretic point of view. What had really happened? How can an established Jewish writer speak openly about Israeli racism, the right of the Palestinians to resist and return to their homes, the American crimes in Iraq?

A: It is not strange that in the critical moment I stood by my adoptive country, the Holy Land, this delightful and charming sister of Hellas, so similar to Peloponnesus or Crete, the living temple of God, for it was destroyed before our eyes by the mad forces of Sharon. It is strange I kept quiet until recently. But the instinct of self-preservation makes cowards of us all, and besides, Man is optimistic by nature. As long as the child does not cry, we do not pay much attention to his discomfort. As long as the native Palestinians were quiet, one thought: “Well, probably they can manage, and the country can manage”.

But the Intifada was a sign that these extremely peaceful and patient people are being pushed into a slow death, and with them Palestine is going for good. I felt that every bullet shot by the Israeli Army kills my brothers, and every torched olive tree, every razed house, every demolished Church, damages the very fabric of our existence. It does not make sense to live if our earth is destroyed, and that is true everywhere. Just objections or critique were not sufficient anymore.
If I were younger, maybe I would join the fighters of Jenin standing fast at assault of the armoured monsters. But writing is also a form of warfare. A writer can emulate a fighter by disregarding mortal danger, by putting his goal above self-preservation. Later I discovered that this war of words is good not only for Palestine, but for my soul as well. Thus, the struggle for Palestine became a spiritual quest for me and for many others.

Q: Your thesis about the Israeli-Palestinian conflict is that it can be ended only by the construction of a unified state, with equality for all its citizens. Do you believe that this is more realistic than the two states framework? What could be the steps toward the solution you propose?

A: Judging by your question, there are a separate Israel and Palestine, while Shamir wishes to unite them. But this is not the case. We have 'one state' and practically always had it. Palestine was partitioned for a very short time, from 1948 to 1967, but before and after this break we – the different communities of Palestine – live together in one beautiful country between the Jordan River and the Mediterranean Sea. It can’t be divided, for it is too small and people live in close quarters with each other. Moreover, without Palestinians, Palestine dies.

Like Cyprus before 1974, we are still one country, and the idea of the partition of Palestine is as wrong as that the partition of Cyprus. Now, when the communities of Cyprus are trying to reconcile, we should not be promoting the partition of Palestine. We must learn from others’ errors: the partition of Cyprus brought no blessing to the Cypriots, and we should not try it here. The enormous tragedy of Greek – Turkish partition and transfers is a living proof that it was a wrong way to solve the problem.

Whenever I travel in the Eastern Mediterranean, I deeply regret that there are no Greeks in Smyrna, no Turks in Thessalonica. In Constantinople, Hagia Sophia and Hagia Irini still remember their Orthodox Past, and the mosques in Rhodes bewail their glory. This tragedy is still with us, for the Greeks were an important and leading element in the Ottoman Empire, this successor of the Byzantines. The Turks were soldiers and shepherds, the Greeks represented state and trade. There is a coin minted in
1455 in Constantinople; its one side is inscribed with the legend “Mehmet, Sultan of the Faithful” in Arabic, and the reverse side is inscribed in Greek, “Mehmet, the Emperor of the Orthodox”. The Ottoman Empire was like this coin, and under the Turkish warriors and Greek ministers it kept the peace and prosperity of the Mediterranean. The West envied its successes and undermined it.

From the Sack of Constantinople in 1204 to Smyrna in 1921, the imperialist West tried to disintegrate our beautiful Eastern Mediterranean and eventually they made it. Out of Greek-Turkish partition, came Mustafa Ataturk, and his policies (for a while) broke the spirit of the Turks, turned them into an American tool, forbade them to worship God and even wear national dress. Greece was subjugated by the British forces for many years. Greeks were the real force in the Empire, while in their independent state they serve Western tourists.

Looking back, one understands that the partition of the Empire was a costly mistake that we all still pay for. The partition of Cyprus, the partition of Ireland, the partition of India – so many partitions promoted by the imperialist West, and all of them lead to perdition. It is enough. In my view, the partition of Palestine should be avoided, while the real problems should be attended to by promoting equality, democracy, love of our country and its spirit. Maybe the non-partition of Palestine will be the turning point for mankind.

**Q:** Vladimir Guzinski, the Russian media baron, was arrested in Athens and is expected to be deported to Russia. Other fabulously rich members of the Jewish community are also prosecuted (Berezovsky, Khodorkovsky) and others continue to keep good relations with Putin and authorities (Abramovich, Chubais). You were born and you have worked in Russia, you know the country and its culture. How do you explain the unrestricted power which was gathered in Jewish hands after 1989? Do you believe that Putin is trying to put some limits to their power or he is just rearranging the scene?

**A:** The rise of the Jews in post-Soviet Russia is one of the most bewildering phenomena. Six out of seven of the wealthiest men of Russia are Jews, and they are influential in media, banking, and in control over natural resources. It is not easy to explain why a
Jewish accountant from Tashkent, Chernoy, with a monthly salary of one hundred roubles, became the owner of the Russian aluminium industry.

One explanation lies in the religious sphere. The Orthodox Christians are ashamed of being rich. They remember the comparative size of a needle and a camel. They understand that riches rarely come to honest men. They are ashamed of power, for they were told: the last ones here will be among the first there. This quality of Orthodox Christianity was partly inherited by Communism, and that is why Communism was successful in Russia. (It would have succeeded in Greece, too, but England crushed the Communists in post-war Greece).

The unreconstructed Jews and the Calvinists have no such misgivings. They seek power, for the Old Testament says, “be a master to your brothers, and they will bow to you”. They believe wealth is a sign of being blessed. That is why they are ready to grasp all there is. On a less religious note, I shall quote Victor Pelevin, a modern Russian writer:

“In tumultuous times, an unscrupulous and cunning man manages better than an honest one for he quickly adapts to the changes. At a certain level of dishonesty and cunning, the man foresees the oncoming changes well in advance, and thus he adapts even faster. The worst rogues adapt themselves to the changes before these changes actually occur. These worst rogues are the engine of change, for they do not foresee the future, but they form it. These unscrupulous, shameless, pushy rogues convince the rest that their forecast is correct, and thus the change occurs”.

In other words, the ‘success’ of a group at the expense of others is a sign of their lack of scruples. But in a more pragmatic way, the Russian Jews owe their success to their close relations with the American Jews. When the US Jews entered the big game of sharing the spoils of Russia, they needed local allies, and the Russian Jews were available for this role. Thus, this prominence of Russian Jews is even worse than it appears, for the prominent ones are extremely pro-American and pro-capitalist. They support Western domination, fight the Russian Orthodox Church, and promote ‘modernity’, this poisonous mix of CNN, MTV and the IMF.

They enjoy the support of the important American Jews. Khodorkovsky is defended by such differing and mutually hostile
Jewish players as Richard Perle and George Soros. The NY Times (July 23, 2003) reported from Moscow: “When key Washington policy advisor Richard Perle sat down this week for a meeting with leading Russian political analysts, he had an unsolicited word of advice: Lay off Yukos Oil Co., the Russian energy giant locked in a showdown with criminal prosecutors.” (Yukos is Khodorkovsky). Charles Grant, a Soros man, wrote: “today, in strict utilitarian terms, Khodorkovsky is a force for good in Russia. He gives direct and indirect support to a range of organisations and individuals that are trying to raise the standards of Russian capitalism, civil society and democracy. He wants to make Russia more western, which in my view is exactly what it needs”.

When Putin moved against Gusinsky, the NY Times of Sulzberger called to “defend the freedom of independent press”, another code-word for the Jewish-owned one, as the NY Times did not defend Zavtra and other opposition media.

But ordinary Jews, or Russians of Jewish origin — and there are millions of such people — are a different story. I meet them, music teachers, journalists, economists; they are normal people, and they reject the New World Order and regret the fall of the Soviet Union. Even oligarchs are only human: Berezovsky was received in the Russian Orthodox Church, married a Russian woman, supports the national opposition, and who knows? Maybe he has changed his ways. The Manichaeian approach should be rejected — reality is more complicated than any scheme.
An Island of Faith

I write on a balcony overlooking the azure sea and a fresh red rose shares my company with a few cats.

Mt Athos, this green wooded island stretching into Aegean Sea, an independent Christian nation under Greek protectorate, home to twenty massive abbeys is a tranquil paradise; the place where hundreds of monks and thousands of lay pilgrims pray to Lord, work the land, grow heavy olives and red apples. Esoteric Orthodox Christianity is a well hidden secret of Greece – people are aware of Zorba the Greek and of sunny islands, but if they would know they would come here with their spiritual search, not to Sufis or Zen Buddhists; as besides being wonderful this faith is easier accessible for a Westerner. The monks are learned men; some hail from Australia and Russia, France and Palestine. The abbot Vasileios studied in Lyon; he appreciates Pindar and Dostoyevsky.

This is a good place to recognise an unknown victim of the Iraqi war: Christianity. Its reputation is besmirched by people who take the name of Christ – and of fundamentalism – in vain. From the New York Times to the FrontPage magazine, various Judaic publications provide an outlet for anti-Muslim rant, for calls to war in the name of Conflict of Civilisations. As the result, some Muslims began to answer by counter-attacking Christianity; and the European and American youth learns to think of their faith as of danger to mankind. However, this victim is innocent: true
Orthodox Christendom, as fundamentalist as it can be, firmly rejects the creed of Mammon and the US war on Islam.

Fundamentalist is one who follows the traditional teaching of the Church. The sacred texts have no meaning outside of tradition. The adversaries try to appeal to the texts by taking them out of tradition, but the tradition is alive and it can't be deconstructed into composite elements, de-contextualised and used at will; the elements can be understood in context only, being fully contextualised by Church tradition.

There are no stricter fundamentalists than the monastic community of Mt Athos in Northern Greece, where I write these words. Athos is a great reservoir of spirit, and many people come to partake of its waters. (Charles, the Prince of Wales stays in an abbey, too.) The monks keep the fire of Christian faith as it was kindled by Christ and his apostles. They do not expect their salvation will come from Jews, as it already came in the person of Christ. They feel no need to seek Rupture for they were given a plan of their own: to try and bring the Second Coming by means of prayer and spiritual enlightenment. For them, the Second Coming is the mystic experience of seeing Christ in his glory, and it is attainable by divine grace. The church is a device that helps believers to see Him. She also guards the believer from being misled by cunning sophisms and subterfuge.

The roots of the Greek Church go beyond the first mission of St Paul to Athens, for he recognised the religious zeal of the Hellenes. They did not need to be converted, but enlightened. Simone Weil wrote of Hellenic premonitions of Christ so apparent in the Iliad. In her view, the Greeks were Christians before Christ; and their influence on Christianity was paramount. Even today, Greeks are devoted to Christ, to His Mother and to their own Mother Church, the ancient Orthodox Church established by SS John and Paul.

Their church stays out of politics, but exercises moral influence. Guided by her church, Greece does not participate in the Iraqi war, her sons do not die on the streets of Baghdad; and this most religious, most Christian nation shares the view of good Muslims and ours, that the world including Greece is threatened – not by Islamic terrorism, but by the US fight against terrorism. Greece is a rare place where a Western dissident feels spiritually at
home, as your average Greek thinks the thoughts known to rare Western intellectuals, readers of Chomsky and Baudrillard. Their immensely popular Archbishop Christodoulos correctly stated that terrorism is caused by the “injustice and inequality that pervades the world.”

In The Wall Street Journal, a Zionist Greek Takis Michas, in a piece called Is Greece a Western Nation?, complains that only 10% of Greeks think that Greece should give military support to the US in its attack “against states harbouring terrorism”; majority thinks that Osama bin Laden is a creation of CIA propaganda. The Zionist concludes with horror: “Such views seem to have more in common with public opinion in Cairo or Damascus than in Berlin or Rome.” So much for the silly concept of conflict between Christendom and Islam promoted by these guardians of the Christian faith, the Wall Street Journal and the New York Times!

As opposed to the West, the Greeks knew neither hatred nor fear of Jews. They saved many of their Jews during the German occupation, and treated them fairly. As they had their own national church, they did not transfer their spiritual values to Jews for safekeeping; and thus had no reason to bewail the loss of them. Where is no guilt, there is no fear, either. The renowned Greek composer Mikis Theodorakis was sarcastically asked by his Israeli interrogator whether, in his view, the Jews pull the strings from behind George Bush. He dashingly answered: “No. They are in the front.” “America, the great superpower, is actually controlled today by the Jews?” – asked the inquisitor before pronouncing his verdict. “Yes”, replied Mikis, the man who has more Jewish friends than an average American.

Where is no fear of Jews, there is no automatic support for the US, either, and Theodorakis’ view that “the root of evil today is the policy of President Bush” rather than the Muslim world is shared by many Greeks. Greeks know Muslims not from books — they lived in close quarters with them for a millennium. They are aware that their long and troubled relationship with their Turk neighbours reached its nadir under the anti-Islamic rule of Mustafa Kemal Ataturk, while Islamic Sultan Selim the Grim spent a fortune restoring the monasteries of Athos. Muslim communities are well integrated in Greece, as the national church is quite tolerant to religious minorities and to its big non-religious population.
Now, both the Greek Left and the Greek Right are united in their rejection of the Judeo-American drive to conquer the East, to enforce multiculturalism and to separate the Church and the State. They support the Palestinians and wish the Jews to come to their senses. They are a good example for US fundamentalists. Indeed, Greece is the proof that fundamentalist Christianity is not that of George Bush, and that the alternative to him is not monopolised by the First Lesbian Synagogue of New York.

In his ‘thought police’ report in the Wall Street Journal, Takis Michas describes the sins of the Greeks: “in the 1980s, they harboured organizations perceived as terrorist in the West, and opposed the Reagan administration’s deployment of Cruise and Pershing missiles in Europe. Following the collapse of communism in Eastern Europe, the anti-American narrative came to be adopted by the political Right. American policies in Bosnia and Kosovo were widely seen as aiming to destroy the church, while the overthrow of Slobodan Milosevic – celebrated all over the world – was seen as a CIA plot.”

Michas’ report on Greeks appeared soon after the much-anticipated book by Diana Johnstone, Fools’ Crusade: Yugoslavia, NATO and Western Delusions which demolished the faked “evidence” of Serb atrocities in Kosovo. Today we know that the world had no reason to celebrate the overthrow of Milosevic – or indeed, of Saddam Hussein. But the Greeks understood this earlier, when it was the opinion of only a small enlightened minority in the West. How come – why were the Greeks better than the Western intellectuals at recognising these media lies for what they were?

The reason, in my view, is the traditional character of the Greek Orthodox Church and of its connection to the people and to their state. Separation of Church and state, this much vaunted accomplishment of the French revolution and even more of the US founding fathers, cut off the anchors of the Western society and it drifted straight towards the rocks. While in France the national Catholic Church still occupies an important and exclusive place, the US, the country without a state church, became a victim and a servant of Mammon. The small, independent churches of the US had no ability to form the mind of the nation; they competed for an outlet in the Jewish-owned media; they were forever threatened...
by tax authorities; they broke with tradition and became prey for the wolves.

This absence of one church further undermines the underlying concept of unity-in-God, elaborated by T S Eliot in *The Christian Idea of Society* (1939). People live together united by an idea; this idea may (or indeed should) be their common worship and uniting communion. This need for one national church that unites its people by a single communion was manifested in Eliot’s decision to remain a member of the national Anglican Church while adhering to the Catholic dogma. In Palestinian context, Eliot would prefer an ‘Islamic state’ to a secular one.

The US was a first experiment of a large scale: what will happen to a society that is built on the pursuit of profit, instead of on the rock of faith. The fathers-founders could read the story of the Chinese sage Mencius (372-289 BC). He went to see the King Hui who said: “Old man, since you dared the distance of 1000 li to come here, you may know of a way to profit my state.” Mencius replied: “why should you ever mention the word ‘profit’? What counts is benevolence and righteousness. If the King says “How can I profit my country?” the high officials will say, “how can we profit our fiefs?”, and the intellectuals and the commoners will say: “How can we profit ourselves?” If the upper and lower classes strive to snatch profit one from another, the state will be endangered.”

Indeed, this is what happened in the US, and under its influence it increasingly happens elsewhere. Whether nationalist or socialist constructs were far from perfect, they offered some semblance of solidarity, denied by profit-seekers. But Greece convinced me: none could improve on the national church, which is fully national and fully integrated in the ring of churches.
Sunday in Gondor

While the world was treated to another sham performance of peace process in Palestine, and just before the next stage of Middle East war, I paid a visit to the Ethiopians, much loved by Poseidon, the Sea God – probably because these landlocked people do not disturb the seas but inhabit high plateau which also gives birth to Nile. “The farthest outposts of the Race of Man”, as Homer called them, Ethiops, poor as they are, preserved many things we have lost. There, one can see women reaping high stalks of wheat with the sharp sickle, and four ferocious black bulls tearing along and thumping shoulder-to-shoulder threshing wheat in a narrow circle of hay, and a man with a spade winnowing the chaff off corn, girls filling jars at the side of a spring, and the result of their labours, the vast congregation of men and women clothed in white who sit like seagulls in the church yard on Sunday morning listening to the preacher, receiving blessings from their priests and sharing the blessed bread. For in the world we lost, seeding and reaping and winnowing and baking bread are completed in this blessing and sharing.

The Ethiopians have much of their ancient tradition intact as they received the Light of Christ from St Anastasias the Great in Byzantine Alexandria in 4th century. Their dogma is at variance with ours, but they venerate the Virgin as the Mother of God, as the apostolic churches do. Never colonised, and not for lack of trying, they were not ushered by Western missionaries towards a
Protestant sect like other Africans. The Jesuits equally failed to subjugate them to Rome. Thus the church unites, not divides them. If this ancient and authentic church were to evangelise the Black Continent, its fate could be different. It is still valid for those seeking an African Christian identity, more than its Rastafarian offshoot. Like other Eastern Churches, the Ethiopian Christians prefer Muslims to Westerners and live with the large Muslim community (some 30%) in perfect amity.

In their holy city of Gondor (not far from Shire, to utter delight of Tolkien lovers) a pilgrim finds Orthodox Christianity, as African as their black skin and as rooted as the enormous banyan tree in the main square.

On Sunday I prayed with them in their 17th century Trinity Church of Gondor, built along the lines of the Temple of Solomon. Waist-high drums broke the dead quiet of an African night, accompanied by ringing silver of rattle-boxes; hundreds of angel faces looked at us from the high beams. The church was illuminated like an ancient manuscript; every inch of a wall covered with exquisite paintings explained by the Ge'ez captions: a Saint rides on lion back, climbs by a snake as by a rope to his hermitage or stands on one foot being fed by birds; a swarm of angry bees defends the church from the invader; a cannibal King repents and receives pardon through the Mediatrix; and pictures that require no caption, such as The Holy Trinity presented by three almost identical grey-bearded men, the story of Passion of Christ suspended on ropes from, rather than nailed to his cross, or the Coronation of the big-eyed dark-skinned Queen of Heaven. She did not look strange to my eyes, though, for we are familiar with her sisters, Black Virgins of Loreto in Italy, Czestochowa in Poland, Montserrat in Catalonia. “I am black and beautiful” – this line is not from the Negritude poet Sengor, but from the Song of Songs.

And the people were beautiful, with chiselled features, smooth skin, warm and compassionate eyes; their looks exuded brotherly love to each other and to this pilgrim from Jerusalem. We clapped hands together in the rhythm of the drums under constant stare of the angels. It was quite different from your ordinary Sunday service, but essentially the same: unity of people in God. It is great to be a Christian for one can feel this unifying brotherhood-in-God with the native people in so many lands and places, be it among pros-
perous English folk of Reverend Stephen Sizer in the low church of Virginia Waters, or with the monks of Mount Athos in their candle-lit medieval chambers, with Jerusalemites in the small Palestinian Arab church of Father Attalla Hanna, or among throngs of jolly Italians in the vastness of St Peter in Rome, or among the unique mixture of Russian writers and peasants in the village church of Peredelkino near Moscow, – and among the Ethiopians in far-away Gondor.

It is quite dissimilar from the Jewish experience which, though equally globe-embracing, – there are synagogues in Venice and Cochin, New York and Curacao, – is basically the experience of expatriates meeting together wherever they go – the people are quite the same, like in different British Officers Clubs in various corners of the Empire, from Hong Kong to Vancouver. It is not a question of race but of doctrine – there was in Ethiopia a long-established Judaic community, whose members were not distinguishable from the rest of Ethiopians by their looks, blood, language or customs; but they received the call from Jerusalem and went there, to guard Tel Aviv cafes and man checkpoints in Palestine, humbly accepting their third-rate status in the new land. Thus they joined the members of other once-well-rooted communities from Germany and Russia, from Yemen and Morocco, for Jewishness unavoidably leads to separation from the native population and to exile. But let us return to the Gondor church.

A wall with two open arched doors separated the commoners’ part from the priestly inner sanctum which, in its turn, led to the Holy of Holies where a replica of the Arc of Covenant was resting obscured from our sight. The Trinity Cathedral of Gondor was built for the real thing, brought from troubled Jerusalem to remote Axum by Menelik, son of Queen of Sheba and King Solomon, according to their tradition. However, the Arc refused to be moved and has remained to this very day in St Mary of Zion in dusty and deserted Axum. A strange obstinacy: Gondor is much more attractive with its vast black basalt castle built by Ethiopian Emperors with the advice of their Portuguese masons and bombed, centuries later, by the ubiquitous British Air Force. If you, my reader, know of a country that has never been bombed by the Anglo-Americans, please share this knowledge with us.
While we looked at the pictures, the drums gave place to the beautiful singing of the Psalms and the priests came out and blessed the devout. By this time it was already eight o’clock, and ordinary folk had begun to congregate outside. By local custom one can’t enter or leave the church during the long service, so the vast majority of worshippers stay outside at ease, walking around the church, kissing its posts and stones. People who have not observed the strict fasting rules (which prohibit not only meat but sexual union as well) also have to remain outside. The doors were opened, and we sat in the yard in pleasant morning chill, while children went around with baskets of freshly baked bread, the dark bread of Ethiopia.

The church is a peaceful oasis in this troubled land. Outside, tanks roamed — the new conflict between Ethiopia and its breakaway province of Eritrea was about to flare up. Paupers and homeless children swarmed the streets. Though Ethiopia is not dead as I learnt that night, it is seriously ill. Since 1950, its population has grown six-fold, and such an increase has overstretched its meagre recourses. In the same period of time, the US and its allies have supplied weapons to all parties in the region, promoting strife and dissent, and supporting every separatist movement. They undermined the hugely popular socialist government of Mengistu who is still remembered with nostalgia by many Ethiopians. His fall was caused by the US support of separatists — people got tired of endless war. Now Ethiopians have ‘democracy’, though this word means mainly ‘corruption’ in this huge country of 60 million people, dozens of tribes, nationalities and languages, social gaps and dreadful poverty.

Noam Chomsky wrote about this American strategy: they do not have to win; they need just to undermine, destroy and push the rebellious nations back into the Stone Age. Afterwards, they will blame it on socialism, like in Vietnam or Ethiopia, on Islam like in Palestine or Afghanistan, on nationalism like in Serbia, and never on their own intervention. “The US never provide aid for people, but are always ready to give arms for us to kill each other”, Ethiopians told me.

The role of the Church is also steadily diminishing. Its lands were confiscated and redistributed by the government and it has lost its ability to protect the people. The rural communities get
uprooted by ceaseless fighting and a lack of water, its members drift into towns where they are reduced to begging. The younger generation of city dwellers does not go to church any more. The onslaught of Modernity is relentless everywhere, even in far-away Ethiopia. Not much is left; who knows maybe the Ethiopian priests count years better than we do: according to their calendar it is now AD 1997, with only three years to the millennium and the end of days.
Part Three
The Origin of modern Jews

Many modern scholars reject the idea of biological continuity between the Jews of the Talmud and the Jews of our days. Arthur Koestler in *The Thirteenth Tribe*, using the theory of Prof. Pollak, came to the conclusion that European Jews are descendents of Khazars. Prof. Paul Wexler of Tel Aviv University corrected his theory in his groundbreaking book, *Ashkenazi Jews*, and demonstrated that we are mainly descendents of various Slav and Turkish tribes, converted into Judaism a thousand years ago. He based his findings on study of Yiddish, the Jewish language of Eastern Europe.

Another concept of modern Jewry’s genesis was offered by a bright young Jewish man from Warsaw, Abram Leon, who died in 1944 in Auschwitz. Just before his capture by the Gestapo, this ex-Zionist-turned-Trotskyite completed his only book, the short and brilliant *The Jewish Question: A Marxist Interpretation*. This book defines Jews as a ‘people-class’, as a social strata with some quasi-national qualities. According to Leon, medieval Jewry was a motley collection of outlaws who wished to deal with usury and similar occupations.

A descendent of Jews who would rather work the land would leave Jewry. A Christian who desired to become a usurer or tax farmer would become a Jew, wrote Leon. He quotes in his book some documented examples of Polish nobles who decided to become Jews in order to engage in banking. Poor Jews gave up their Jewishness, as the Jews of Sicily; rich and proper Jews who wished to join the civil society of their lands, embraced Christianity and were ennobled. The remainder were those who chose anti-social occupations: usury, smuggling, sales of alcohol and drugs, the slave
trade and the white slave trade. In other words, it was a semi-criminal group, akin to the Guild of Thieves and to Gypsies — another ‘people-class’ of the Middle Ages.

In G. K. Chesterton’s short story, *The Purple Wig*, there is a Duke of Exmoor, who hides his ear under an unusual purple wig. Folks tell of the deformed ear he inherited from his accursed ancestors, like a sign of the devil, and they pity him. Whoever sees the horrible ear, will certainly lose his mind, goes the legend. Only the modest Catholic priest, Fr. Brown, was not afraid. He took the wig off the Duke, and everybody saw his ordinary ears. The Duke turned out to be a rich Jewish financier, a Mark Rich or Conrad Black of his days, who bought the title of Exmoor complete with the legend of the Curse.

Whether you accept the reading of Leon or Koestler, of Boaz Evron or Paul Wexler, there is no “guilt of deicide”, no “racial qualities”, no “predestination”. But also, there is no great antiquity, so pleasing to our vanity, no basis for the claim to the land of Palestine. The position of Leon became the accepted line of American Trotskyite groups.

However, it is not the only possible reading of history. Lev Gumilev denied the theory of the mass conversion of the Khazars. This expert on the Khazars thought that the Jews ruled in Khazaria, like their brethren ruled in post-Revolutionary Russia and in the modern US, over non-converted Gentiles. Then there were no great masses of converts.

Perhaps modern science will be able to answer this question. The genetic labs of Tel Aviv University try to prove that the Jews are of one stock. Meanwhile they publish a few inconclusive results, which do not exclude some Mediterranean origin of modern Jews. Apparently, some Jews are of Palestinian origin, while some are descendents of converts. The similarity of some Jewish genes and that of Palestinians could become a bridge for racially minded people into the happy future of integration. But this integration needs a religious component in order to transform Jewish immigrants in Palestine into another Palestinian tribe. How can it be done?
Messiah Now!

The rise of anti-Christian Jewry is a symptom of the despotic world of right-wing fantasies. Christ stands for the great idea of the fellowship of Man, of our commonality, of us being joined in spirit. Noam Chomsky expressed it in this way: “the US carries war against the Catholic church, as the church chose to stand by the poor and oppressed people in Latin America”. Looking deeper we understand that this choice was not a question of chance, but it was caused by the communal idea of Christ. It is difficult to rob and skin people you share communion with.

The spirit of commonality found a response to the removal of Christ, by bringing forth Communism, a new messianic faith, a new incarnation of Christianity. The Left’s purpose was a daring attempt to regain the Kingdom of Heaven upon Earth, to bring Christ back. It was not only about food and housing, but it was the great human desire for a single communion, for a uniting spirit, that moved Communists. The prominence of Jews within the Left made the Jewish rejection of Christ its vulnerable spot and caused a severe distortion in the history and ideology of the Left. The Russian Revolution would have passed without bloody excesses if the revolutionaries had not fought church and faith. This fight broke the spine of Russian history, it created a schism between the Russian people and Communist ideas; it was unnecessary and hurtful. Socialist revolution is not a picnic, but in China and Vietnam it passed with much less bloodshed, as there were no elements dedicated to demolishing faith.

The Jewish revolutionaries of Russia gave up their dead Jewish faith and induced the Russians in return to give up their living one. It was not a fair deal: Jews retained their particularity, while
churchless Russians were de-ethnicised. There were the attempts of Obnovlentsy, a Russian church movement, to reconcile Christ and communism. On the level of art, it was expressed by Alexander Blok in his glorious poem, *The Twelve*, this crown of the revolutionary subconscious. Through darkness and snowstorm, Block’s Twelve Russian revolutionary soldiers, unruly and godless, follow the unseen figure of Jesus Christ. If this move had been met by the communists, if Trotsky and Zinoviev, Kaganovitch and Sverdlov had dared to enter the communion of the Russian church, the messianic communist upheaval would have swept Russia and we would live today in a different world. They did not dare, and Communism failed.

Similar processes took place in the West. Though the Jewish revolutionaries were sincere men and women, they failed to rid themselves of the supremacy tradition, and their achievements were used to the full extent by their less scrupulous brethren. The latter saw in the Left movement just a means of group advancement, and eventually turned their back on socialism when it fulfilled its role and removed the old elites. That is why the Jews en masse deserted the Left after 1968 revolution, and the cause of the Left has failed.

In a similar way, Zionism failed, as it was another Jewish attempt to bring the Messiah forth. The father of Zionism, Theodor Herzl, tried to save Israel by taking them to Palestine, but a few years before that, he dreamed of leading his people into the faith of the Messiah with the bells a-tolling and folks calling Halleluiah. But then he saw the hardness of their hearts and preferred an easy way of conquering Palestine, getting rid of the native population, terrorising the Middle East and building a Jewish state. He thought it was easier than to deliver the Jews. It was easier, but quite useless: the lofty ideals of messianic Zionism could not be achieved without recognising the Messiah.

Why, actually? Consider a small band of chosen soldiers sent to deliver a secret message to a remote city. They have to cross unknown and hostile territories, encounter unexpected dangers and deliver the secret. It stands to reason that they would be instructed to trust nothing and nobody, to remain aloof, to use and misuse strangers in order to fulfil their all-important mission. It is a long way, and the soldiers get used to the idea. The right to use
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and misuse is quite a convenient right, and they manage not too badly. By the time they get to their goal, they remain a close-knit group, utterly hostile to their surroundings, devoted to keeping their message secret, and they are unable to deliver it. Eventually the message gets to the city by other means, it becomes a part of daily life for everybody, but this group of old soldiers still feels besieged in hostile territory, still preserves its message, which has been known to the world for a long time. It is time to tell them: you were fine, you did your best, and you delivered the message, now you are free men in the city of the free. Disband, mix freely, and enjoy the world saved thanks to your message.

Those who refuse to join mankind should be treated as Japanese soldiers in the jungle of New Guinea still fighting and hiding fifty years after the war was over – with strict compassion and psychological help. From this point of view, the present philosemitic wave can provide a good support to these misled persons.

Zionism became poison without the Messiah: not in vain did the Jewish religious scriptures (“the instructions to the soldiers”) forbid the gathering of the Jews in the Holy Land before the days of the Messiah. The “instructors” knew what we have forgotten: such a gathering, unless by means of accepting the Messiah, would be used by the Antichrist and would poison the earth.

Indeed, we came into this sweet Land and devoured it like locusts. We uprooted olive trees. We caused the springs to dry up and trees to wither. We expelled and imprisoned its people. We wasted the limpid waters of the underground caverns. We sliced strategic roads through the mountain meadows. Now we are locking ourselves in a high-rise ghetto surrounded by the double ring of barbed wire and endless hostility. Inevitably we re-create the way of life of our much-hated ancestors in a Polish schtetl. One cannot escape oneself. We carry Exile in our hearts and that is why we create Exile.

Why would the Messiah change Zionism into a marvellous thing? In the days of the Messiah, all restrictions will be lifted, teaches the Talmud. Commandments and prohibitions will be cancelled. By accepting the Messiah, the Jews become free from the tenets of the Law, and join mankind. This was known to Sabbatai Zevi, the 17th century Messiah: in Jerusalem, he blessed the Lord Who releases from Prohibitions, over prohibited food.
(He went a long way, became a Muslim while keeping a crypto-Jewish identity, but did not dare to do the full Monty.) It was known to Rabbi Nachman of Bratzlav, a 19th century Messiah, who “fulfilled the Law”, much like Jesus, in the course of one night spent in the Holy Land, and became free from prohibitions and commandments. It was hinted at by Nachmanides, saying that a touch of the Holy Land is more important than the prohibitions and commandments.

It is felt by the Zionist settlers, and Rabbi Ariel, one of the more radical settler Rabbis lamented, “we believed that by encountering the Holy Land, Jewish hearts will be united with the heart of the land. But for the majority of Jews our settlements failed to restore that sacred linkage”. Rabbi Ariel did not understand why the scriptures connected the miracle of ‘sacred linkage’ with the miracle of the Messiah. That is why he did not understand the reason for the failure. There is no way around it: the only way leads via accepting the faith of Palestine, and via total integration with the main mass of the descendents of the holy people of Israel, the Palestinians.

Mystics would say that those who can accept the Messiah and join the Palestinians, are the true sons of Israel coming back after a long exile; while those that fail to accept their Palestinian brothers are descendents of Leon’s profit seekers attracted by the privileges of the chosen people. That is why Israeli Jews’ turn to the Messiah and to their Palestinian brothers, an acceptance of one communion, would separate grain from waste, and complete the redemption.

A Jewish joke tells of an American Jew who complained to God: “I have sent my son to Jerusalem, and he became a Christian!” — “It happened to me as well”, replied God. This joke still can become true, as the ‘Jews’ of Israel are looking for their spiritual meaning. They can’t find it without the Messiah.

The long history of the Jews is a proof of unavoidability: the Jews had become rich and powerful, and had got the Holy Land, but instead of reuniting with it, only ruined it. A folk tale tells of a thief who was caught stealing cucumbers. The judge offered him a choice of three punishments: to have the cucumbers pushed up his arse, to be flogged, or to pay triple. The thief chose the first punishment, but by the third cucumber regretted it and asked to be
flogged instead. By the twentieth lash he regretted it as well, and agreed to pay triple. Thus, for his stubbornness he got all three punishments instead of one, and was forced to do the thing he tried to avoid, namely, to pay for the cucumbers. Such a thing happened to us Jews: despite all the trouble we went through, we still have to do the thing we did not want to do in the beginning.

Now for Jews the denial of Christ has had the same dire consequences as for others, namely it arrested their spiritual development. There were hundreds of minor Jewish poets and writers, but none of them reached spiritual or creative heights. Wealthy Jewish men and organizations spent huge sums on promoting their meagre achievements, and some became widely known and read, but none could be described as “a great artist”. Many Jews oversee the arts, support artists, own galleries, and write art reviews, and it creates the illusion of artistic involvement and of an “immense Jewish contribution”. But in fact, the position of Jews in the arts is similar to that of eunuchs in the seraglio: much activity but little result.

It was well expressed by a brilliant thinker of the Viennese fin-de-siècle, Otto Weininger. A man of Jewish origin, he was a harsh critic of Jewishness and committed suicide at 22, leaving behind his compelling, if dated, bestseller, *Sex and Character*. He wrote: “The Jew rejects the transcendent; he wishes to make the world as ordinary and insipid as possible. The Jew prefers such understanding of human history that eliminates Spirit from it. The Jew is unable to reach religious or spiritual ecstasy”. These qualities are necessary for a poet or painter of genius, and as they are absent, Jewish art remains imitative at best.

It is not a question of race or inherited abilities. There were brilliant poets of Jewish origin — Brodsky, Pasternak, Mandelstam, Tuwim, Heine — but all of them accepted Christ. The Nobel laureate S. Y. Agnon also wrote a short story full of love for Christ, and Rabbis demanded that this story be destroyed. In the Middle Ages, the only important spiritual figures of Jewish origin were those who rejected Judaism and accepted Christ, like St Teresa of Avila and St John of God.

The second tier is formed by those who did not quite make it; they rejected Jewishness but did not find Christ. Isaac Deutscher calls them “non-Jewish Jews”, those who “transcended Judaism, as
they found Jewry too narrow, too archaic, and too constricting”: Spinoza, Trotsky, Freud.

This lack of real Jewish creativity is based in the Jewish tradition, which encouraged learning and discouraged originality. On a deeper level, Judaism proclaimed the principle of Divine Non-interference, which is the denial of Spirit. The Talmud contains an archetypical story of an argument between an inspired man, Rabbi Eliezer b. Horkenos the Great, known as the author of *Pirkei Rabbi Eliezer*, and the collegium of Rabbis. R. Eliezer asked God for a sign to prove he is right: “if my interpretation is right, let the walls of the House of study prove it,” and the walls began to cave in. “The walls have nothing to do with it,” the Rabbis replied. “Let God be my witness,” he said, and the Divine Voice witnessed that Rabbi Eliezer was right. But the Rabbis said: “the keys are given to us, and the Torah is with us, not in Heaven”. They rejected God’s mercy and involvement, closed the doors and remained in this world, supplanting the Lord Most High with the Prince of this World. Such rejection of Divine intervention is good for study, but deadly for Spirit. This dispute was followed by two thousand barren years in Jewish spiritual life.

The spiritual reason for this bareness was well expressed by Rabbi Isaac Mayer Wise, a champion of liberal Reform Judaism and “the most active and renowned rabbi in the United States” in the nineteenth century. His words were engraved on a memorial tablet in the Memorial Hall of Temple Emanu-El, the great synagogue of Reform Judaism in New York City: “American Judaism. A religion without mystics or miracles. Rational and self-evident, eminently human, universal, liberal and progressive. In perfect harmony with modern science, criticism, and philosophy, and in full sympathy with universal liberty, justice and charity.” But a rational religion without mystics or miracles is not a faith in God, as it slams the doors of Creation in the face of Creator. In other words, it is worship of the Prince of this World.

There are two ways of solving the ideological confrontation in Palestine from the theological point of view. One of them, preferred by liberal forces, leads through the separation of Synagogue and State, the creation of a secular state and a “normal” Western development. This would be possible in a separate Jewish state, if it were created on a lone island in the ocean, or less likely, if the
Jewish settlers in 1948 had stayed on the seaboard of Palestine. But as they annexed Jerusalem and brought in masses of semi-religious Jews from North Africa, this possibility became non-existent.

There is a second, incredible but more plausible solution: by going through the darkest levels of the Jewish subconscious, to arrive into the Messianic age. It is eagerly expected by thousands of Jews. This expectation is so strong that Messiahs galore appear, the latest being the late Lubawitscher Rebbe. His portraits bearing the legend “Messiah” cover the walls of Israeli homes. These Messianic movements are xenophobic and violent, supremacist and destructive. They are also not sufficiently antinomistic. As opposed to the Messiahs of old, the current Messiahs do not promise release from restrictions and commandments. This could be changed by embracing Jesus as the Messiah. There is no need for a new Messiah appearing on a white donkey. There is no need for a man to deliver us, as it was done by God Himself. It is enough to say, the Messiah is God, God is the Messiah, and we live in the days of the Messiah.

Then the restrictions will be gone, and nothing would stop the Jews from joining the Palestinians, or indeed any other nation. The long mission of Jews will be over.
Yom Kippur Blessings to My Brothers in Zion

Our teachers of blessed memory forbade us to enter the Land of Israel until we shall see the light of the Messiah. We thought we were wiser and rejected this commandment with contempt. But they knew what they meant and they knew the hardness of our hearts. We came into this sweet Land and we are locking ourselves in a high-rise ghetto surrounded by the double ring of barbed wire and endless hostility. Inevitably we re-create the way of life of our ancestors in a Polish shtetl. One cannot escape oneself. We carry Exile in our hearts and that is why we create Exile.

But do not despair! This curse confirms the validity of the divine plan of our Exile from the Holy Land. Not blind chance, not the might of Rome, but the sins of our fathers brought the curse of Exile. We were cursed to cause pain to the nations and to suffer at their hands, to be a stranger to Mother Earth, to wander from land to land. We can't escape this curse until we see the Messiah. Whoever does not believe in the divine plan of Exile rejects Divine providence and the teachings of our masters.

Here is salvation, for it is said, “until we SEE the Messiah”, not “until the Messiah cometh”? Why, we can see Him now! Messiah is here! Whoever sees and recognises Him is saved from the curse of exile and he can remain forever in the sweet land in which he lives. Whoever sees Him will become like a loving brother to his neighbours, and they will bless him, and be blessed by him. Whoever sees Him will become a bountiful spring in the dry land. See Him, my brothers, witness the Messiah! The secret is that the Messiah is not a man anymore but the Glory of God. His soul is with us, and
when we turn to Him, we shall recognise Him. It is within our reach to escape the curse and turn it into grace.

The power of Israel is great, but it goes into destruction and hatred. But the moment Israel will see the Messiah, this great force will become the force for good. We shall turn our land into paradise, slay the terrible twins of need and greed, and, every day and every hour, we shall witness Glory and Shechina, together with our Palestinian brothers who call them Christ and the Virgin, or Mesih and Sitt.

This is the faith of the Holy Land, love of the Spirit and of Mother Earth, embodied in the boy from Nazareth and the girl from nearby Saffurie, love for the green hills of our beloved Land of Israel, Land of Palestine. We came to this land and we did not recognise it; we met our long forgotten Palestinian brothers and sisters and we did not recognise them. Like soldiers in the dark, we fought against our own brothers. But as the Sun of Messiah is rising, we recognise their familiar faces and lower our weapons.

Zionism has become a poison without the Messiah, since unless we gather in the name of God, we gather in the name of his adversary. Why would the Messiah change Zionism into a marvellous thing? In the days of the Messiah all restrictions will be lifted, teaches the Talmud. The separating commandments and prohibitions will be cancelled. By receiving the Spirit of God, the Israelites will become free from the tenets of the Law, and join mankind.

This is felt by the settlers, and Rabbi Ariel, one of the more radical settler Rabbis, lamented, “we believed that by encountering the Holy Land, Jewish hearts will be united with the heart of the land. But for the majority of Jews our settlements failed to restore that sacred linkage”. Rabbi Ariel did not understand why the scriptures connected the miracle of ‘sacred linkage’ with the miracle of the Messiah. That is why he did not understand the reason for the failure. There is no way around it: the only way to God leads by the union of our hearts with the hearts of the people of the Holy Land.

This is the sieve: those who feel the spirit of the Messiah and join the Palestinians, are the true remnant of Israel coming back home after long exile; while those who reject it are the sons of the multitude who joined us attracted by the privileges of the chosen people. Our turn to the Messiah and to our Palestinian brothers
and sisters in one communion would separate grain from waste, and complete the redemption.

Do not fast this Day of Atonement, my brothers. Instead, share bread and wine with your Palestinian brothers and sisters. Do not observe the strict rules of Sabbath, but go out and remove the fences. Seek the Spirit of God in your souls and you will find it. The Messiah is here. It is not a man you should look to for deliverance, but God.

If the Messiah is here, the Third Temple is here, as well; it is the temple of all people of the Holy Land. The Third Temple is the people of the Holy Land praying together to one God in the Divine Presence of Shechina. The wish of the Prophet Muhammad, peace be upon him, will become true: the Jews shall worship Allah together with Muslims. The wish of Jews will become true – all the nations will worship God in Jerusalem. The prophecy of St Paul will become true – the remnant of Israel shall come to Christ. The first commandment of Torah will be fulfilled: instead of waiting for man, Israel will turn to God.

Then the sons of Abraham shall pray together on the Temple Mount, eat at one table, drink together the wine of al-Halil and celebrate Easter, Passover and Adha in one day. Jews name themselves by referring to their father: Isaac son of Abraham; Palestinians refer to their sons: Isaac father of Jacob. Then, we shall refer to ourselves as grandfathers of our grandchildren, sons of the covenant of the free communes of Palestine. The wars will be over, the exiles of Suba and Vilna, Kakun and Cordoba will return home, and in the feast of pilgrims the people of the Holy Land will gather at the foot of Kubbat as-Sahra to listen to the New Covenant of the Divine Presence and the Spirit of God.
The Days Of Awe
(The New Year Blessings to my Jewish readers)

In Jerusalem, faith is always the most important preoccupa-
tion, even more so in these days, when the Jews observe the New
Year, or Rosh Hashana, and the native Christians, members of the
Orthodox Church, celebrate the Invention of the Holy Cross.
Churches and synagogues are full, holy sites well attended, and
chants flow in the mountain air, slightly touched by early autumn,
of the Holy City. The chants are profoundly similar, and you can’t
distinguish the Jewish hymns from the Gregorian chant retelling
the miraculous discovery of the Holy Cross by Queen Helen. “For
what merit the uncircumcised may sing every day the chant that
the holy people of Israel intone only once a year?” – wonders a
Hassid character in S. Y. Agnon’s story In the Heart of the Seas. The
answer can be found in the common fountainhead of our faith, for
in the words of Mircea Eliade, the Orthodoxy of Christianity is the
theology of the Old Testament. The Orthodox Church even cele-
brates its New Year at practically the same time as Jews, in
September. The faces of worshippers in my church of St James are
quite the same faces you will see in the synagogue next door; even
men sit separately from their womenfolk in both houses of wor-
ship. There is so much similarity, and still so much of difference.

I write to you with much love, my brothers and sisters in the
Palestine-loving web community. I know your noble hearts and
steadfast support of the difficult but sublime cause. You are the
best; you are as good as your non-Jewish brothers and sisters. You
rejected the temptation of exclusivity, you have embraced your
Palestinian friends, and through them you have been united with
mankind. And now some of you have a problem.
The Days of Awe (as these ten days from New Year to the Day of Atonement are called in the Jewish calendar) are the days of great spiritual awakening in the Jewish community. Your Jewish friends will stand for many hours in the synagogues and sing beautiful psalms and the touching liturgy of the soul’s quest for redemption. For this is the inner meaning of these days: repentance and hope for salvation. The unity of worshippers is the reason why people pray together instead of doing it alone. But you will find it difficult to obtain the great unity, for the synagogue will be plastered with posters calling to “Support Israel. Now if ever”, while the worshippers will compete who gives more money to the very cause you fight against. On a deeper level, you will be asked to pray for Divine vengeance and to send curses on the heads of your very brothers. Indeed the political difference is but a direct consequence of theological difference.

Many of you will skip the synagogue altogether, others will find their way to some non-Zionist Rabbis. And some are anyway atheists, and do not believe that there is a spiritual reality beyond the material one. The choice is hard.

An archetype of a non-Zionist Rabbi was the late Rabbi Isaac Mayer Wise, a champion of liberal Reform Judaism and “the most active and renowned rabbi in the United States” in the nineteenth – early twentieth century. He was acclaimed recently by our friend Miriam Reik of New York in a pro-Palestinian email group, Universalist. She wrote:

Rabbi Isaac Meyer Wise, one of its most important and progressive leaders who was passionately anti-Zionist and thought that Herzl’s ideas were so dangerous that “it becomes the duty of every true Jew to take an active part in efforts to destroy it.”

This is surely very nice. But Rabbi Wise and his brand of rationalistic Judaism are tremendously uninspiring for the Days of Awe. His words were engraved on a tablet in the Memorial Hall of the Emanu-El Reform synagogue in New York: “American Judaism. A religion without mystics or miracles. Rational and self-evident, eminently human, universal, liberal and progressive. In perfect harmony with modern science, criticism, and philosophy and in full sympathy with universal liberty, justice and charity.” But a
rational religion without mystics or miracles is a Pharisee creed of self-righteousness, for we greatly need the miracle of Divine charity in view of our faults that we confess in the Days of Awe. Moreover, the present-day Reform Jews are rabid Zionists anyway, for Zionism is the only substitute for spirituality available in the Synagogue.

In such a spirit I replied to Miriam and she wrote back:

You mean you prefer a mystical attachment to the Holy Land that allows Jews to drive out the Palestinians? You will not settle for a rational respect for other human beings as a God-given obligation?

But surely there is another possibility, that of a mystical attachment that allows Jews to embrace Palestinians? This thought did not occur to Dr Reik for a good reason. She — and all of us — understand full well that the Jewish mystic religious alternative to rationalist anti-Zionist Rabbi Wise is Rabbi Ginzburg the goy hater. There is no alternative mystic Jewish religiosity of universal non-discriminatory love, for this good mystic side of Judaism is not Jewish anymore. By becoming universal it turns into Christianity, its sister.

That is why there are good rationalist non-mystic religious Jews like Wise, good rationalist atheist Jews like Dr Reik or Lenni Brenner, and there are bad rationalist Jews like Leo Strauss or Allan Bloom of The Closing of the American Mind, the neo-cons’ Bible, and his disciple Paul Wolfowitz of the Iraqi War, and there are bad spiritual Jews like the settlers rabbis clamouring for the Goıyım’s land, but for a strange reason there are no good spiritual mystic Jews. A good spiritual mystic Jew is not a Jew at all.

Do not confuse religion and its deeper, inner, esoteric and exoteric levels. There are many good religious and pious Jews. Rabbi Milgrom went into besieged Bethlehem, Rabbi Arik Asherman of Rabbis for Human Rights picked olives in the teeth of the armed settlers, Rabbi Hirsch of Neturei Karta stayed in Ramallah with Arafat. With all the vast difference between reformist Asherman and ultra-orthodox Hirsch they both follow the rational line of the Vilna Gaon and Maimonides. The late Professor Yeshayahu Leibowitz, this Urim and Tummim of the Israeli progressive camp, admired Maimonides this side of idol worship. While calling for
“the end of occupation” he eagerly supported the Jewish state, was a convinced Zionist and a hater of Christ. He described the inter-marriage of Jews and non-Jews as ‘betrayal’, just like Golda Meier, whom he disliked so much.

I had recently a long and friendly conversation with an extreme Orthodox Jew, a member of Eda Haredit, an organisation (“church”) close to the anti-Zionist Neturei Karta. He believed in the divinity of Jews as much as a settler rabbi, though he thought that a Jewish state is not needed.

As we enter deeper into the more mystical levels of Judaism, we experience more of the negative tendency. Rabbi Kook, the Lubawitscher Rebbe, and the settler rabbis are certainly mystics, as is Rabbi Yitzhak Ginzburg, and their teaching is full of hate, vengefulness and exclusivity. The Jewish mystics deny the equal humanity of Jew and non-Jew, even the common origin from Adam and Eve. That is one of the reasons why so many Jews are rationalists: they are rightly revolted by the abyss, but are unable to find and embrace positive spirituality.

There are no wonderful and inspiring mystic Rabbis as there are Christian saints and priests or Muslim Sufis. Sieve through centuries and you will not find a Jewish Francis of Assisi. The great sage Rabbi Shimon bar Yohai, credited with the founding of the Cabbala, the Jewish mysticism, was so full of hate that his very looks set trees on fire, the Talmud says. Martin Buber tried to find some inspiring Jewish saints in the Hassidic lore, but failed profoundly. He tells a story of the Besht, an 18th century Jewish Hassidic Rabbi, a story that apparently contradicts this grim assessment, but actually confirms it.

The saintly Besht used to go out of his home almost every night, and his Hassid followers were at loss for the purpose of his disappearances. “Probably he flies to heaven and converses with God and angels”, — they reckoned; and decided to sneak and watch their Rabbi’s doings. In the deep night, the Rabbi took an axe and went out, while his disciples followed him unnoticed. They saw him chopping wood and delivering it to the door of a lonely Gentile widow. He knocked and called out: this is Vassili [a Gentile name], who has brought you some wood; and walked away. “This is an even greater miracle than flying to heaven,” said the disciples.
It was also a transgression according to Jewish ideas, for a Jew is allowed to help a Gentile only if his good deed will promote the well-being of the Jews. Not only was the widow a person of no importance, Besht even failed, nay, refused to provide the Jews with the benefit of his good deed, as he assumed a Gentile name. He came dangerously close to Him who taught: “Do not do charity before men, when you give to the needy do not announce it with trumpets, but do not let your left hand know what your right hand is doing” (Matthew 6)

The good deed of giving the fruits of one’s labour to a needy stranger would not amaze a Christian or a Muslim. They would consider it a proper and natural behaviour, certainly a very good one but unexceptional. St Martin gave his cloak to a needy pauper in a winter night, and remained in a shirt, while St Bernard gave all his vast property to the needy. They did not enquire whether the poor belong to the church. Indeed, the Christian charities of the Holy Land, schools and hospitals, famously support needy Muslims and Jews as well as local Christians. But for Jews the Besht’s most natural behaviour was a supreme miracle and an antinomian deed.

Recognition of this fault keeps many good Jews out of spiritual search altogether. They see the only choice, between the “We won. Let’s eat” of rationalists and the dark mystics of Jewish chauvinism — and stay away. It is tragic, for though people go into the substitutes of politics, sex, and power struggle, the real thing one needs is spirituality. It gives you more kick than heroin. It would be even more tragic if you, the best and the most spiritual people, will stay in the desert of rationalism. The desert is a dangerous place, for Mammon loves places of dead spirit. That is why God is needed, but the way to God is not with Rabbis, it is not with their obedient servants who call themselves ‘Evangelical Christians’ but are not.

It is perfectly possible to have the best of both worlds: to support the brotherhood of men, to reject the evil brood of neo-cons and neo-liberals, and to be with God. That is exactly what the Pope preaches, that is what my local Orthodox priest Fr Attalla Hanna preaches, and what so many Muslim clerics preach. There are no such Rabbis, but you do not have to get stuck with them. The Synagogue has become a rich men’s club, a great supporter of AIPAC and the ADL. St John’s Synagogue of Satan has become the
Synagogue of Sharon. But the gates of the Church are open for you. Instead of trying to create some dubious but exclusively Jewish sects, you can follow the footsteps of the first apostles and join with your neighbours in one community of believers, for Christ is what the Jews call ‘Israel’.

Even the fundamentalist Jewish settlers are not inherently bad. They are not Mammon worshippers. Mistakenly they seek for the mystic meaning of life with phylacteries and machineguns, but they can come to the light if they follow just two commandments of Torah: “Love God with all your heart”, that is “love God instead of Jewish self-adoration” and “Love thy neighbour” where the ‘neighbour’ is everyone, even Samaritan or Palestinian. They can consider the return of the Palestinian refugees, these certain descendants of ancient Israel, into their ancestral homes to be a necessary precondition to messianic awakening, as the return of the dispersed tribes. For it is said, “aliens will join them and unite with the House of Jacob”. It will turn their dark pessimistic mysticism into one of hope and salvation, for a Jew may descend into the dark depth of Jewish mysticism, to find the fountainhead of all grace and cross the lines into the luminous all-embracing spirituality of Christ. This outcome was glimpsed at by Rabbi Akiba, the Besht and Rabbi Nahman. It was achieved by St Paul and Rabbi Zolli of Rome.

The late disciple of Sigmund Freud, Dr Theodore Reik, (incidentally, the father of Dr Miriam Reik) wrote that the Jews are always making the same mistakes by following the archetypal model of the Bible, and always find themselves in the same trouble. It is an all-too-human feature, for criminals are likely to return to jail and a raped woman is likely to be raped again. By constantly blaming others and mitigating themselves, the Jews make this repetitious routine likely to come back. It should worry the US Jews, for their leadership follows the perilous path of Joseph who helped the Pharaoh to enslave the Egyptians like modern neo-cons and neo-liberals are actively enslaving America and the world. It should worry the Jews in Israel, for they treat their neighbours
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harshly and trample upon their poor. It should worry the Jews elsewhere as their support for Israel and the US will cause their neighbours to think, “if the war breaks out, they will join our enemy” (Exodus 1:10). The Jews have their mode of behaviour, and it can not be changed by a simple expedient of changing countries.

What is worse, we see this contemptible mode of behaviour with our own eyes, and we can not blame it on somebody else. That is why we find no place in the synagogue, as it is preserved for Dershowitz and his kin, the people who can exonerate the guilty and blame the innocent. Stand not at the doorstep of a synagogue for you are holy and just. Leave the Sharon-loving throngs of the Wailing Wall, and come over to the great Church of the Resurrection. Today, like two thousand years ago, it is the right time for you, the remnant of Israel, to find your way to Christ.
Trotsky and the Church

The accusation of trying to destroy Christianity was an important part of the Protocols of the Elders of Zion. But the reality is more complicated: in my opinion, Jews are not consciously aware of the damage they cause through their rejection of Christianity. In the same way, Europeans were not aware that they were bringing various diseases to the native people of Polynesia, as they were immune to the malady. Still, the natives died in droves.

It is intuited by Orthodox Jews, who try to minimise their interaction with the Gentile world. It is intuited by anti-Semites, who prefer a traditional Orthodox Jew in his shtreiml and peyoth to an assimilated Jew. Few of them understand, however, why assimilated Jews unwillingly cause so much damage to the national fabric.

A tragic example is provided by Leon Trotsky, a Jew by birth, who thoroughly rejected Judaism and described himself as a ‘non-Jewish Jew’, but was involved in massive destruction of Russian churches. He did not dream of destroying the church in order to raise up the banner of George Soros or Ariel Sharon. He was not a philosemite. He liked goyim and didn’t like Jews. He believed that Jews handled money for so long that their souls were almost irre- mediably warped. They retained, he said, a petty-bourgeois consciousness, while Jewish intellectuals were “fickle untrustworthy semi-foreigners.” He spoke Russian and apparently lost his command of Yiddish. He was proud of being considered a real Russian, not a Jew.

---

1 Nedava, Trotsky and the Jews, quoted by Lindemann
Why, then, did he become the soul of the campaign against the Russian church? For the best of reasons. He did it instinctively, as he felt, and quite rightly, that Christ stood in the way of his full integration within the Russian people. He did not rise to accept Christ, but tried to remove the obstacle. Thousands of churches were destroyed, and the future of Russian communism was undermined. Eventually, this schism of communism and church caused the great successes of George Soros and Mark Rich in Russia after 1991.

Many good people of Jewish origin in Europe and America repeat the same error. They fight the Church as they feel it stands between them and the rest of the population. Alas, the example of Trotsky proves there is no short-cut. They have to submit, or cause irremediable damage to the souls of people they care about.
Part Four
The Trefoil and the Cross

I

On the many-coloured Hans Buenting Map (1581), our world looks like a flower; its three petals present the three continents of Europe, West Asia, Africa, united by the Holy Land. The map allows for a different reading, too: the flower is the faith of Christ and Our Lady, and the three petals are Islam, Catholicism and Orthodoxy. While the Westerners preferred to view Islam as an antithesis of Christianity, Eastern Christians, notably St John the Damascene, considered Islam as another Christian Church, on a par with the Western Catholic Church. Indeed, Islam with its veneration of Christ and Sitt Maryam is not farther away from Orthodoxy than icon-less priest-less anti-Marian Calvinists. The three churches offer different readings of the same concept: the Orthodox stress Christ Resurrected, the Catholics concentrate on Christ Crucified, and the Muslims follow the Holy Spirit. The Orthodox rejection of filioque is their additional link with Islam; theological proximity grounded in geographical proximity.

This vision of Islam as of the third great church of our oikoumène is basic to our understanding of the Middle East war. Indeed, there are many ways to interpret the conflict: political economy, demography, geopolitics and race theory offer their con-
flicting interpretations. The problem is, none work very well. A strong feeling that the problem calls for a religion-derived explanation found its expression in Huntington’s “Clash of Civilisations” doctrine positioning “Islam vs Christianity” as a repeat of the mediaeval Crusades. Its vulgar, down-to-earth application can be found in every mainstream Western newspaper from the NY Times to Berlusconi’s empire, brought to its extreme by Oriana Fallaci and Ann Coulter.

But the conflict between the three great churches is over – for better or for worse, chivalrous knights in red pelerines over shiny armour won’t ride again in the hills of Palestine and the fields of Poitou exclaiming *Lumen Coeli* towards the equally noble and valiant Saracens with their green banner. Their areas of influence are well established, and small border skirmishes and soul poaching are just for keeping the braves awake. There is no “Islamic threat to Catholicism” or “Catholic threat to Orthodoxy”, though many people would bet otherwise.

The Orthodox Christians of Greece and Russia, of Palestine and Syria fully share the views of Muslims and are equally hostile to the American invasion. The attempts to instil pro-American sentiment in Moscow and Athens invariably fail. “Their [the Orthodox] views seem to have more in common with public opinion in Cairo or Damascus than in Berlin or Rome”, admitted The Wall Street Journal. So much for the silly concept of conflict between Christendom and Islam. In my view, and in this article, ‘Christianity’ includes Islam and the great Apostolic Churches of East and West.

Huntington’s theory, albeit erroneous, is based on the deep foundations of *theopolitics*, a word unknown to the *Microsoft Word* dictionary but introduced by Carl Schmitt. This great thinker is hard to position, for he is claimed as their own by Nazis and Neo-cons, Deconstructionists and Anti-globalists, thinkers as different as Leo Strauss and Giorgio Agamben, Huntington and Derrida. In Schmitt’s view, “all of the most pregnant concepts of modern doctrine are secularized theological concepts.”

The “liberal democracy and human rights” doctrine carried by the US marines even across Tigris and Oxus is a crypto-religion, an extreme heretical form of Judaised Christianity. Alexander Panarin, a modern (deceased) Russian political philosopher, noticed the anti-Christian character of the American doctrine:
“The new American vision of de-contextualised Goods and their
de-socialised Consumers is a heathen myth”; in his view the US
doctrine represents a lapse into heathendom.

In my view, this new religion may be called Neo-Judaism; its
adepts imitate classic Jewish attitudes; Jews often act as priests of
the new faith and they are considered sacred by its adepts. Indeed,
while mosques burn in Netherlands and churches are ruined in
Israel, no emotions are stirred in comparison to those set in motion
when graffiti is written on a synagogue wall. The US grades its
allies by their attitude towards Jews. The Holocaust Temple
[“Museum”] stands next to the White House. Support of the Jewish
state is a *sine qua non* for American politicians.

Everybody can aspire to “Chosenness” of the new faith — the
choice is yours; the Newest Covenant admits both Gentiles and
Jews; worship Mammon, disregard Nature, Spirit, Beauty, Love; feel
you’re belonging to a race apart, prove it by some this-worldly suc-
cess — and you can enter it. On the other hand, every Jew can opt
out of it; there is no biological guilt or virtue.

Still, there is a strong feeling of continuity between Palaeo-
Judaism and the newer version. The Jewish state is the enactment
of the paranoid Jewish fear and loathing of the stranger, while the
Cabal policies of Pentagon are another manifestation of this same
fear and loathing on global scale. The ideas for Neo-Judaism were
formed by Jewish nationalist Leo Strauss, and promoted by Jewish
writers of the New York Times. There is a project of supplying
Neo-Judaism with exoteric rites by constructing a new Jerusalem
Temple on the site of al Aqsa Mosque.

Neo-Judaism is the unofficial faith of the American Empire,
and the war in the Middle East is indeed the Neo-Judaic Jihad. It is
intuited by millions: Tom Friedman of the NY Times wrote that
the Iraqis call the American invaders “Jews”. Neo-Judaism is the
cult of globalism, neo-liberalism, destruction of family and nature,
anti-spiritual and anti-Christian.

This is also an anti-social cult of commodification, alienation
and uprooting; fighting cohesive society, solidarity, tradition — in
short, fighting the values upheld by the three great churches. As
the church has lost its position in the West, the adepts of Neo-
Judaism consider Western Christendom almost dead and fight it
by bloodless means through their ADL, ACLU and other anti-

But Islam is the last great reservoir of spirit, tradition and solidarity, and the Neo-Jews fight it with all firepower at their disposal. Islam has to be crushed if the Neo-Jewish Temple is to be erected on the site of al Aqsa. Islam is the dominant faith of Israel’s neighbours and enemies. Islam has a historical role of defending Palestine, the centrepiece of the three-petal flower, the depository of the united pre-tradition divined by Guénon. Carl Schmitt has observed “the great historical parallel” between our days and the days of Christ. Indeed the war on Palestinians is often interpreted as a new attempt of (Neo-)Jews and Mammon-worshippers to crucify Christ in His land. Guénon considered that modernity (representing the kali yuga or final age) would conclude in the appearance of the Antichrist and the end of the world. Thus the war on Islam is a stage of the last war, the War on Christ.

On a deeper, metaphysical level, there is a struggle between two tendencies: a power that draws Heaven and Earth together and re-sacralises the world; and a power that tries to separate Heaven and Earth — to profane the world. The uniting power is represented as Christ in the arms of Our Lady. The dividing power, the Great Profaner, is greater than the Jews; but they eagerly support him for in their view the world outside Israel (Persona Divina, not the state) should be profane and godless. Thus the actions of the Neo-Jews eventually lead to the profanation of the world, and, on another level, to liberation from the limitations imposed by the society and God, to the victory of individualism.

II

Now, once we have diagnosed the disease (Neo-Judaism as a new religion and the Middle East as its jihad) we may attempt a cure. The centrepiece of this warfare is not the battlefield of Falluja, but the battle over minds carried on by ideas: will Christ or Antichrist win? This question is not decided by force of arms, but by our ability to defeat the enemy in discourse. You, my readers
and comrades, are an elite fighting unit of the spiritual army; expose the enemy and beat him.

It is possible to fight a religion, especially Neo-Judaism, an extreme form of heresy. We should show its religious roots, profane its sacral heirloom, ridicule its concepts and highlight its crimes. When the predecessors of Neo-Judaism began their fight against the Church, they made fun of its tenets. From this point of view, the French stand-up actor Dieudonné did as much as anybody to stop the Jihad.

Guenon considered the Reformation as the Fall, as the beginning of Kali Yuga; Neo-Judaism should then be seen as its completion, as the extreme of Reform where the reformed body becomes a total opposite to the pre-reform one. In a way, our task is Counter-Reformation, and our banner is Our Lady, who is ‘majestic as troops with banners’ (SS 6:4). Schmitt also considered Our Lady Mary as the most important cultural and religious symbol, though he was not aware of her connection to Islam.

The Judaic tendency which first appeared in Christendom with the Reformation (or, according to Dugin, with the Roman church’s deviation from the Nicene creed) has now blossomed into Neo-Judaism. This religion is vulnerable because it is not a universal faith. Like its predecessor, [Palaeo-] Judaism, it is a religion for the Chosen; this time for those Chosen by Mammon, and beyond Mammon we see that Great Profaner, Anti-Christ. The Chosen are but a few; the rest follow this heresy against their own best interests.

Californian Professor Kevin McDonald wrote with some astonishment: “Wealthy, powerful European elites are often unaware of or do not value their own ethnic interests. They have acted to subvert the ethnic interests of their own people... One reason may be that these elite Westerners are able to live in gated communities insulated from the rest of the world, completely ignoring their ethnic kin.” He failed to comprehend that the modern “powerful European elites” emulate traditional Jewish attitudes: they live in ‘gated communities’ as the Jews lived in ghetto; [historically, a Jewish ghetto was a privileged ‘gated community’ just like a European settlement in pre-Communist Shanghai, wrote Jabotinsky] and they do not regard ordinary people as their kin. This is the Neo-Jewish way to success, for Neo-Jews have neither ethnic kin, nor homeland.
An emulation is rarely as successful as the original. The Sufi poet Rumi tells the bizarre story of a maid who was happily copulating with a donkey; she used an aubergine to make his enormous size suitable for her human dimensions. Her mistress noticed her doings and decided to emulate her; but she did not apply the magic of aubergine and was torn to death at first attempt. Likewise, the Neo-Jews failed to notice the family-like support real Jews provide to their own; they paid attention only to the external features of Jewish behaviour, i.e. of their disregard for native society. That is why they are liable to suffer as did the silly mistress of the wily maid: indeed, they will decline and destroy their society, having nothing to fall back to.

The observation of McDonald can be interpreted as recognition of people’s betrayal by the elites. This is correct: while the USSR collapsed as the result of the elites’ betrayal, a similar process now is taking place in the West. The War on Islam goes as badly as it does for the US and Israel because local native elites mobilised by their Church do not go for full betrayal. Such betrayal is not comme il faut in Dar al Islam.

We may separate the Chosen from the misled, but first we have to break through a few defence rings of the enemy. The outer defence ring of Neo-Judaism is its blank denial of its being a religion. This device was used by Communism and eventually became its undoing. The second defence ring is the presentation of religion as “a private matter, of no concern to others”. Their Jihad differs from the noble Jihad of the Prophet Muhammad; instead of proclaiming their faith, Neo-Jews try to impose it by stealth. The false flag of Bushite “Christianity” adorns the third ring.

Until now, Neo-Judaism has won by defeating its enemies one after the other; now we must unite them together. In Cabbalistic terms, we should collect the divine sparks that were dispersed when the Vessels were broken by excess of Divine light (Shevirath Keilim). In this process we shall recognise the positive [for Christ and Our Lady] forces and tendencies of our oikouménê and unite them, while deconstructing the enemy devices.

The left-right schism was imposed by the enemy; we should overcome it. The Left and the Right refer to one-dimensional universe; while our world for sure has more dimensions than one. Analysis of Judaic political practices shows that the Jews do not over-estimate the Left-Right distinction: the leader of a left-wing
Meretz party, Yossi Sarid, eulogised the assassinated leader of extreme-right Judaeo-Nazi Party Rahavam Zeevi. Israel is not an exception to the rule: the most militant Republican Jews, Neo-Cons, expressed their willingness to change their colours and become Neo-Liberals in case of Kerry’s victory:

**Going Back Where They Came From**, by Patrick J. Buchanan [http://www.antiwar.com/pat/?articleid=2371](http://www.antiwar.com/pat/?articleid=2371)

"If we have to make common cause with the more hawkish liberals and fight the conservatives, that is fine with me," William Kristol has told the New York Times. The Weekly Standard editor added that the neoconservatives may just abandon the Right altogether and convert to neo-liberalism. Ranking his political preferences, Kristol added, "I will take Bush over Kerry, but Kerry over Buchanan...If you read the last few issues of The Weekly Standard, it has as much or more in common with the liberal hawks than with traditional conservatives."

Yes, it does. But as John Kerry backs partial birth abortion, quotas, raising taxes, homosexual unions, liberals on the Supreme Court and has a voting record to the left of Teddy Kennedy, how can Kristol prefer him to other conservatives? Answer: War and Israel.

Our answer is more complicated. The Left and the Right are only positions on the social axis, important as they are. But there are two other axes, the Axis of Spirit and the Axis of Earth, or the Axis of Christ and the Axis of Our Lady. Together they form the three-dimensional cross described by Guenon in his *Symbolism of the Cross*. Our enemies are able to form unions over the Left-and-Right divide for they are united in their negation of Christ and rejection of the Virgin. Likewise we should be able to unite with other people of Spirit and of Earth despite differing social views.

If we refer to the **Axis of Spirit**, there is a dichotomy between the all-embracing faiths of the Three Great Churches; and the exclusivist cults. "Religion is not a private affair of spiritually inclined individuals," wrote Panarin; "The Church is the guarantor of values, an alternative and higher authority standing above the money-changers. It has to have power to exclude female beauty and love, convictions, land from the market place." That is why our enemy
fights the Three Churches so remorselessly. In modern society, one may say anything he likes about the Three Churches, but must say nothing but good about the Judaism, the prototype of Neo-Judaism. “The Sacred Jewish Practice of Child Murder” – you won't find an article with such title anywhere in our “antisemitism-ridden” world, despite hundreds of Palestinian children slaughtered by Jews in last few years. But you will find in a prominent Jewish magazine:

The Sacred Muslim Practice of Beheading
By Andrew G. Bostom
FrontPageMagazine.com | May 13, 2004

Reactions to the grotesque jihadist decapitation of yet another "infidel Jew," Mr. Berg, make clear that our intelligentsia are either dangerously uninformed, or simply unwilling to come to terms with this ugly reality: such murders are consistent with sacred jihad practices, as well as Islamic attitudes towards all non-Muslim infidels, in particular, Jews, which date back to the 7th century, and the Prophet Muhammad’s own example.

Every attack of the Churches and their sacral icons is permitted, even such an evil one as was used by the French Jewish Student body called UEJF. They published a poster: the face of the Virgin undersigned “Dirty Jewess”. In France, the courts accept Jewish demands to silence church bells; the hijab is another well-known example of it. In Palestine, last week police raided the Anglican Cathedral and removed Christian asylum seeker Mordecai Vanunu. We should mobilise the churches and defend their spirit.

Communism was an attempt to create a new all-embracing Christianity, but without Christ. Though some Right-wing thinkers stress the ‘Judaic origin’ of Communism, it was an anti-Judaic, all-embracing ideology. Alas, they applied the Ockham razor too vigorously by far, and died of haemorrhage. We should accept the survivors of the collapse and give them a place in our ranks.

If we refer to the Axis of Earth, there is difference between autochthons and wanderers. Yuri Slezkine¹ proposed to call them

¹ The Jewish Century, Princeton University Press, 2004
http://www.alumni.berkeley.edu/Alumni/Cal_Monthly/November_2004/QA_A_conversation_with_Yuri_Slezkine.asp
Apollonian and Mercurian, where “Apollonian society consists of peasants, warriors and priests; while Mercurians are messengers, interpreters, craftsmen, guides, healers, and other border-crossers”. He compares this distinction with the Jew-Gentile dichotomy and notices: “Jews are Mercurian, while Gentiles are Apollonian. In the modern world, all of us became more Mercurian – more Jewish, if you will, and traditional Mercurians – Jews – are better at being Mercurian than anyone else.”

Naturally, the ‘all of us’ of Professor Slezkine are his colleagues in Berkeley and Moscow, hardly peons of California or Russian peasants. With this correction, his thesis should be rephrased: in order to succeed in the Kali Yuga period, one has to adopt Jewish qualities and become a Neo-Jew. These ‘Jewish qualities’, according to Slezkine, are “mobility, restlessness, rootlessness, ability to remain strangers by staying aloof, not fighting, not sharing meals – just making, exchanging, selling, and possibly stealing, things and concepts”. “Staying aloof” implies lack of compassion; “not sharing meals” implies not sharing the faith, “not fighting” implies benefiting from other men’s war, “rootlessness” leads to their tendency to uproot others.

Indeed, Neo-Jews have no compassion, they benefit from wars other men fight, and they are rootless and ruthless; an ideal described by Jacques Attali who seeks the world made out of modern nomads unconnected to roots or soil. We should return the Mercurians to their modest position at the margins of the society.

These qualities are not “racial”; indeed, Karl Marx and Simone Weil, Ludwig Wittgenstein and Otto Weininger are good examples of our comrades-in-arms who provided tools for modern anti-Judaic discourse. They proved that the ‘Judaic tendency’ is an ideological and theological, not a racial trend. Immense publicity for, and almost promotion of Hitler’s crimes by the Judaic media is a tool to obscure this distinction: mean-spirited biological anti-Semitism, a freak development of an age-long struggle against the Judaic spirit, is presented as the rule.

While rejecting racism, we may equally reject anti-racism, for today this is a code word for an extreme anti-autochthonic attitude. In vain did the friends of Palestine try to use this concept in their struggle for equality in Palestine/Israel. Though every idea can be used in more ways than one, anti-racism is attuned and
honed for the neo-Judaic fight against cohesive native societies. They would use it today against Guatémoc or Boadicea, they use it against Mugabe. Anti-racism is a denial of the autochthons’s right to decide his fate; a tool to separate Man from his native landscape. This concept de-legitimises objections to swamping a land with a flood of immigrants and ruining the society’s fabric.

Theophilus d’Obla noted that “Contemporary antiracism as well as human-rights’ concept are not principles of fighting against exclusion and thus protection of the Human Person. Quite to the contrary, it is in the name of inclusion, dilution in the formless Whole, that these concepts are carried to the pinnacle of the dominant culture”.

The [Jewish] Holocaust is a shibboleth of the New Chosen. It has a social function to be used to throw suspicion on native traditionalist majorities: unless disarmed, transformed into “open societies”, their state undermined and their economy privatised and sold to the American companies, they will embark on the next holocaust. Socially-minded Panarin writes: “Whoever accepts the Holocaust as the most important historical event is able to carry out the civil war against the traditionalist majority and becomes a member of in-group for the globalists”. But the Holocaust also has a theological value as this event is offered to supplant the Crucifixion for believers.

The human rights mantra is an important part of Neo-Judaism. It is used to undermine a society’s interests. Neo-Jews inherited from their medieval ideological ancestor a peculiar vision of society as a host society; a society they do not belong to but prey upon. There is a real contradiction between the rights of such an individual and the right of society; Neo-Judaism consistently de-legitimises the rights of [host] society. Thus, the right of a Chodorkovsky or a Berezovsky to sell his oil company to Western interests is more important than the Russian society’s right to provide every its member with heating in winter. The right of a pimp to import pornography or to export women to whorehouses is more important that the right of a society to protect its women or its morals.

---

1 A word that identifies one as a member of an ‘in’ group. The purpose of a shibboleth is exclusionary as much as inclusionary: A person whose way of speaking violates a shibboleth is identified as an outsider and thereby excluded by the group.
Conclusion

The Jewish state of Israel became the banner of the enemy and has to be dismantled. Israeli ‘Jewish’ citizens are torn between two loyalties: loyalty to the land and loyalty to the Jewish People. This second loyalty stops them from becoming Palestinians; thus it has to go. We approve of the Israeli citizens who demanded from their Supreme Court to cease designating them as ‘Jews’: to a basically irreligious people this word has became a designator of loyalty to World Jewry. Their lot is with their native Palestinian brothers who will accept them. A small Ultra-Orthodox pre-Zionist Jewish minority in Palestine proved its adherence to the tradition: they should be protected as the remnant and a witness; their fate should be left to the spiritual powers.

Palestinians are the epitome of autochthonous people who are being uprooted by the immigrant Jews. They are the last katechon, in terms of St Paul’s Second Letter to Thessalonians, the last defence of our sacral heritage, the guardians of the holistic tradition before this was divided into the Three Churches. They are the paradigmatic victims of outsourcing: the working people who are being marginalised and replaced by mercenaries of labour. Thus this war in Palestine is our war by all three axes: this is a war of autochthon against uprooting power, this is a war of all-embracing Churches against Christ’s enemies, this is a war of peasants and workers, warriors and priests against the money changers. This is also a symbolic war: about whether Neo-Judaism will win on a global scale or lose globally. This is the most decisive war of the century, and its outcome will decide the future.
The Spirit of Santiago
(A talk given in Spain at launching of the Spanish translation of my book)

I came from Jerusalem to launch my book in its Spanish translation; but even more so to congratulate and bless you for your decision to pull your soldiers away from the wrong side in what is called the Iraqi War, but what is actually the battle for Palestine. When I wrote so in the series of articles presented in this book over a year ago, this was a wild opinion shared by a selected few; while the majority was fed by stories of a war for the liberation of Iraqis, a war for democracy in Iraq, a war to end terror, a war to stop Saddam’s WMD, or a war for oil. A year passed and all these explanations vanished like smoke in the night. No WMD were found in devastated Iraq; no connections to al-Qaeda were revealed by the tortured prisoners of Abu Ghraib and Guantanamo; the liberation of Iraq turned out to be a brutal occupation regime; as for oil, at the beginning of the war, the price of oil stood at 20 dollars a barrel, while now it is about 40 dollars. The oil companies that were blamed for pushing for the war are pulling out of Iraq, and oil production is well below its pre-war levels. On the 29th of April, 2004, the Guardian reported that BP decided to leave Iraq, saying that the oil company has no future there.

This leaves us with exactly one reason for the war, the reason we stated over a year ago. Sometimes it is called ‘the war for Israel’, but this definition misses the point: the state of Israel does not need this war for its safety; Israelis do not need this war for their well-being. The Jews can live as equals in Palestine or elsewhere; but they want to dominate the water, land and souls of the others.
For this reason they kill children and ruin the homes of Palestinians in Gaza and Iraqis in Faluja. This is the war for Jewish supremacy waged by the US adepts of this concept, against the principle of equality for all dwellers in the Holy Land. In such a war, Spain has no reason to side with the forces of Jewish supremacy, to provide cover for mass destruction in Palestine and for mass torture in Guantanamo.

Spain had no reason to fight for Jewish racism, as your country has a glorious anti-racist record often distorted in modern Jewish narrative, which became the dominant Anglo-American discourse. You are blamed for the so-called Expulsion of 1492. But the majority of exiled Jews came back, gave up their racist tradition of superiority, agreed to share bread and wine with other Spaniards — for that is the meaning of the Eucharist — and became honourable citizens of Spain. St Teresa of Avila and San Juan de la Cruz are the shining examples of their glory.

On the other hand, England under Cromwell accepted the exiled Jews and received kudos from the Masters of Discourse for this deed. They do not speak of its connection with fencing out the English commoners, with the massacre of Irish peasants and Scots, and with the massive genocide of Native Americans in their colonies, but the regimes that are ‘good for Jews’ are rarely good for anybody else.

The same Masters of Discourse vilify Spain for its treatment of Native Americans. But in the end, Spaniards married natives and brought forward the modern nations of Latin America, while the North American colonists, who were very good to Jews and considered themselves ‘new Jews’, killed off almost all natives and transferred the remainder into reservations.

They vilify Spain for your inquisition, but in the Protestant countries thousands of women were burned at the stake as witches — something that can’t happen in a country that venerated the Mother of God as you do.

Indeed it is a mistake to think that theology is an irrelevant occupation of useless clerics, while only material possessions matter. Theology is the deep foundation course on which the palace of a society is built. Without foundations, the palace will collapse at the blow of a strong wind, let alone an earthquake. This was the reason for the Soviet collapse: quasi-religious communism had no
strong theological foundation and did not survive. In the ‘neo-Jewish’ US, the Judaic paradigm came forth in place of apostolic Christianity, and with it the New World Order of a dwindling middle class, a vast security apparatus, a growing social gap and the impoverishment of spirit. It is not the first time the Judaic paradigm rises in the world; but such societies invariably collapse for they lack a broad social base. Now its adepts have decided to ensure its survival by making it globe-wide; this is the reason for wars and expansion, for their design would not survive on any smaller scale.

Everywhere they promote leaders who accept their theology and ideology. Such leaders can belong to the Right like your Aznar, or to the Left like Tony Blair in Britain, but they invariably support the Judaic idea of superiority and are ready to send their countrymen to fight for it in far-away lands. Maybe they are good for Jews, but they are bad for the rest. Indeed, now the struggle of Left and Right has become obsolete in the face of the new dichotomy, and here in this room I see people whose fathers exchanged fire at Hueska and Tarragona in the 1936-1939 war. My uncle fought in the International Brigade for the Republic, while maybe your father fought on the side of Franco, but now we stand united for spirit, tradition and equality against supporters of spiritless and rootless supremacy.

The old wars remain in the past. You fought the Moors, but now Spain is a good friend to Morocco. You fought Napoleon, but now you are friends and allies with France. In a similar way, the war of Left and Right belongs to the past, like the war of Carlistas and Isabellinas, of York and Lancaster, of Union and Confederacy. The Right and Left tendencies do not disappear, for both are needed for society like two arms and two legs for a man. The Right ensures continuity of tradition and preservation of the roots; the Left promotes equality and the ability to reform. Their Yin-Yang struggle makes society work; while the total victory of one of the two paradigms derails society.

The tragic and destructive confrontation of Left and Right reached its peak in your Civil War and in World War Two, where the two great anti-bourgeois movements, “Left and Right disciples of Hegel” shed their blood *ad majoram US gloriæ*, to the greater glory of the neo-Judaic US, the ultimate winner of the war. I came to this understanding in the Russia of 1990, when the pro-
American neo-liberals called the veterans of Stalingrad, the patriots of Russia, ‘red-brown’, claiming there is no difference between Communism and National Socialism.

Nowadays we have the pseudo-Left and pseudo-Right, for there is no difference between Thatcher and Blair, Bush and Kerry – both equally support Israel in its drive for supremacy. In Spain and France, the Left and the Right-wing newspapers were united in their condemnation of *The Passion of the Christ* by Mel Gibson as “offensive to Jews”. Thus, instead of Left and Right, we have a new dichotomy, a new split, by the attitude toward Judaic supremacy. Today the US fights the Muslims for Israel, but Huntington, the leading theorist of the war, already calls for containing the Hispanics that are in the US, as they are not sufficiently devoted to the Jewish cause.

You can gauge your leaders by their attitude to the plight of Palestinian peasants. If they prefer to hobnob with Sharon, they will be bad to you, as well. All of them will go, as Aznar went, for the people understood the reasons for the war. There can be only one solution in the Holy Land that will bring peace to the world – that of full equality for Jews and non-Jews in the whole of Palestine, of deconstruction of the supremacist Jewish state and its conversion into a true democracy for all. It was called for by the late Edward Said, and now by Mustafa Barghouthi, the most popular Palestinian leader. More and more Israelis also reach the conclusion that there is no other way to stop the bulldozers.

Spain has an important role to play, for Spain is inherently connected with the Land of Christ and St James, your favourite saint whom you call Santiago. This Palestinian fisherman was beheaded by the orders of Sharon’s predecessor, King Herod Antipas, and his head was taken by his disciples to your shores to be interned in Santiago de Compostella, but his heart remained buried in Jerusalem, and the Cathedral of St James rose above his tomb, equally venerated by Palestinian Christians and Muslims, for in our land Christians and Muslims live together in great peace and harmony sharing the same places of veneration and – no less important – the same enemy. Their enemy is not ‘the Jew’, for Jews can live peacefully with Spaniards and Palestinians, but the spirit of Judaic supremacy, which has to be defeated and will be defeated.
In a twist of nomenclature that would seem implausible in fiction, a craft carrying Col. Ilan Ramon of the Israeli Air Force apparently broke up over an East Texas town called Palestine.

NYT, 2/2/03

Omens, good and bad, are sent to us like beacons to facilitate our navigation in the sea of troubles, said the renowned Portuguese writer Paulo Coelho. Wise and successful men constantly watch out for the telling signs and act accordingly. Silly and arrogant folk disregard omens and court disaster. Santiago, the main character of his hugely popular Alchemist, made his decisions by paying close attention to omens, especially those given by birds, and eventually won love, glory, wisdom and riches. With or without the bestseller, we also pay heed to the celestial hints of destiny, but usually we call it ‘a hunch’.

We do not understand the reasoning of an old hunter who observes the birds’ flight and predicts the coming storm, but we trust his hunch. To a great extent, people are guided by premonitions and omens. The Roman armies did not leave their walled city until the augurs would complete the observation of birds. At the other end of the world, the creator of The Art of War gave the same advice: pay heed to omens and ask prophets before the war.

Ulysses asked the supreme god Zeus to grant him a sign about whether he will overcome the suitors, and Zeus sent an approving omen: a clap of thunder from the clear sky. Penelope received a sign in her dream: an eagle ravished her tame fat geese,
and she understood: her husband will return home and punish the suitors.

Whoever ignored the omens often had cause to regret it. The Pharaoh of Exodus did not believe the signs and died in the sea. The Jews ignored the dreadful omens at the Crucifixion and just laughed all the way to their kingdom’s perdition forty years later.

But signs and seers are notoriously ambivalent. It is not frequently we receive a clear and unambiguous sign, like those given to the Pharaoh or to the rebellious Jews. It happened, if ever, a few days ago, when the space shuttle Columbia, this most advanced craft of the American Empire, proudly carrying an Israeli on board, disintegrated over a small Texan city called Palestine. Israelis tried to omit and forget this strange and impossible ‘coincidence’, like their ancestors tried to ignore the torn curtain of the Temple, but in vain.

You do not have to harrow Hades for Tiresias, the blind seer of Thebes, or raise the spirit of Samuel or call for the Sybil to divine the meaning of the steel bird’s crash. It is an omen that the mighty US is likely to suffer terrible calamities while serving the cause of Israel. America’s best men will perish; America’s best technique won’t help. It is an omen that Palestine remains the stumbling block for the Jews; and even the most generous assistance of the US will not help them to overcome Palestine. It is a sign for the American president: if he will carry on doing Israel’s bidding his good ship will perish with all hands.

The Columbia disaster is not the first sign. The steel birds’ attack of 9/11 was an omen that Israel’s influence on Wall Street and the Pentagon will bring America to disaster. For this reason it does not matter ‘who did it’, nor does it matter what caused the Columbia’s crash, as such events have their symbolic meaning. But, instead of pondering the meaning and repenting, Bush and his Administration preferred to persevere in their dangerous ways. They followed the Jewish way of disregarding signs and omens, an approach based on disbelief in Divine providence. The Talmud contains an archetypal story of a dispute where a wise man was supported by God and the signs, but he was defeated by the Rabbis, for ‘the Torah is on Earth, not in Heaven’. This Jewish headstrong and God-denying approach gave its proponents much short-term advantage, and even more long-term calamities.
Now, after the second warning, the US leaders have to choose. They can stick to the Jewish ways, stubbornly deny God’s will and ignore omens, or they can choose the way of Indians and pathfinders, gold-diggers and oil prospectors: pay attention to signs and play the hunch. The clever boy Santiago of Paulo Coelho understood the omens. Will President Bush?
The Divine Wind  
(Homage to Simone Weil)

Walls of cold rain and hail encompassed my Jaffa. Streets turned into ferocious streams and snow touched palm trees and whitened the sidewalks of subtropical Tel Aviv, in violent counterpoint to the violet skies hanging low, just a handbreadth above the belfries and minarets, as the hurricane rushed masses of sand and rain clouds over the deep cleft of the Dead Sea into Palestine. A sandstorm of unheard-of magnitude broke all over the Middle East, stopping American tanks in the desert, blinding the pilots of their planes, covering the crosshairs of their weapons, threatening to capsize the monstrous battleships in the Gulf. A hundred armoured troop carriers were savaged by the sandstorm. Such a Divine Wind had saved Japan from the Mongol landing of Kublai Khan; such a storm had preserved Elizabethan England from Spanish occupation.

Like the Spaniards of the Armada on their way to English shores, the Mammonite force was not prepared for a meeting with this divine intervention. The invaders had planned to enter the soft underbelly of Asia as easily and smoothly as the dagger of Jack the Ripper had torn defenceless women. No opposition was envisaged.

John Wayne or Burt Lancaster handed over their spare guns to the unarmed foe before the fatal shootout. But the Mammonites are not the noble American heroes of the old Westerns. They were not satisfied with their technical superiority and the ten-to-one numerical advantage of the American population over the Iraqi people; they demanded the disarming of their enemy. The cowards landed only after the obedient UN obligingly disarmed the Iraqis and smashed their last rusty missiles.
They did not expect this supernatural intervention of the elements because Mammonite power is based, in Dostoyevsky’s words, on the secret knowledge that there is no God. But the material world is not dead matter. Everything in this world is alive and interconnected: our history, our present and future, our visions and our social structure, sandstorms and hurricanes, earthquakes and revolutions are part and parcel of the tightly connected trinity of Earth, Man and God. The will of the people, of billions of men and women opposing the Anglo-American aggression, was expressed in mammoth demonstrations around the globe and in the solemn halls of the United Nations, but it was scorned by the Mammonites. This will of the people was translated into sandstorms to remind us that our wishes are as powerful as those of the Olympian gods, and that the integrated will of the people is indeed Vox Dei. By disregarding the Will of God and Man, the War Party sowed the seeds of its destruction, for it is intoxicated by its Might.

“The strong are never absolutely strong, nor are the weak absolutely weak. Those who have Might on loan from fate count on it too much and are destroyed. Might is as pitiless to the man who possesses it (or thinks he does) as it is to its victims. The second it crushes, the first it intoxicates”, wrote Simone Weil, the French philosopher and divine who witnessed the great intoxication of Might called World War Two. She referred to the Trojan War when she extracted this sublime lesson from the Iliad: “The human race is not divided up, in the Iliad, into conquered and conquerors. There is no refuge from fate; learn not to admire Might, not to hate the enemy, not to scorn the vanquished”.

This modern saint, who was born into a Jewish family, joined the Communists, fought in Spain, worked with the workers of Renault and followed St Teresa into the Church, Simone Weil, cast the Trojan War as a tragedy for both the Greeks and the Trojans, for they did not stop when they could have. At a certain point, the Greeks could have had 90% of their demands, but they preferred to risk all and to win all. At another point, the Trojans could have had 90% of their wishes met, but they also chose to risk all. The two parties suffered, both lost their best men, and the victorious Achaeans were defeated some fifty years later by the invading Dorian wave.
In a similar way, the Nazis went too far in 1939. The world accommodated some of their demands, for Prague had been under German rule for hundreds of years, and the French control over the Ruhr Valley was not based in law and tradition. The German demand for unhindered access to Danzig and Königsberg was not an unreasonable one. Hitler could have stopped at this and got away with it. ‘Appeasement’ was sound politics and a reasonable course in 1938. But in 1939-1940 the German Reich proved its insatiability. Czechoslovakia, Poland, Yugoslavia, Greece, Denmark — many states were overrun, until the world decided to put an end to Nazi expansion. The dreadful war ruined Europe and Russia, and prepared the ground for the Mammonite accession.

The Zionists went too far. They could have had a decent share in the sweet land of Palestine, willing Palestinian workers and friends, an endless supply of cheap oil and resources from the hinterland to the Haifa refineries, a very good life for themselves and their children. But they wanted to have all, and to leave nothing to the vanquished. That is why their days are numbered.

The Mammonites are repeating the errors of Hitler and Sharon. First, Afghanistan. Nobody could understand why the Mammonites decided to attack this remote kingdom, but they got away with it, with the mass slaughter of prisoners, with the destruction of Afghani livelihood, with unleashing the opium production previously tethered by the Taliban. Now, Iraq. The battle is still undecided, and already Michael A. Ledeen of AEI (the American Enterprise Institute), a Zionist and Mammonite (if these twin ideologies can be separated) reminds us, “Iraq is a battle, not a war. After Baghdad, Tehran, Damascus, Riyadh”. And afterwards, Paris, Berlin, Moscow, Beijing. Today they wish to remove Saddam Hussein; tomorrow they will demand the head of Chirac, Schroeder and Putin.

They are already demanding a full boycott of France, and follow-up action is on the way. Here is one of the Mammonite ads: “Boycott France because American lives and security are at stake. France has every right to disagree with America. But France has moved from simple dissent to active hostility toward America. The

---

1 New York Sun, March 19, 2003:
2 http://www.newsmaxstore.com/a/boycottad
French President Chirac warned East European nations that if they side with America, France will oppose their membership in the European Union. This week, William Safire reported in the *New York Times* that France has secretly been helping to arm Iraq, and has been helping Iraq build long-range missiles. These same missiles may soon be used against American soldiers”. Safire is a leading Zionist Commissar, and his ‘report’ is a Zionist *fatwa* against France and its President. In the report of the warmongers’ get-together, this plan is unveiled: “Kristol urged that we split Germany off from France but noted that such ‘intelligent diplomacy may be too much to hope for from the State Department.’ When Perle declared that “Americans are not vindictive,” Ledeen interrupted to say that, in the case of France, he certainly hoped we would be.”

That is why there is an urgent need to borrow a leaf from the American book. In 1823, the US President James Monroe upheld the Monroe Doctrine in his annual message to Congress. Declaring that the Old World and New World had different systems and must remain distinct spheres, Monroe made four basic points: (1) The United States would not interfere in the internal affairs of or the wars between European powers; (2) the United States recognized and would not interfere with existing colonies and dependencies in the Western Hemisphere; (3) the Western Hemisphere was closed to future colonization; and (4) any attempt by a European power to oppress or control any nation in the Western Hemisphere would be viewed as a hostile act against the United States.

Now is the right time to proclaim the fully symmetric Eurasian Doctrine. Let the US stay away from the Old World of Eurasia, and stop its attempts to oppress or control any nation in Eurasia. Britain should decide whether it intends to act as a Trojan Horse, in the apt words of de Gaulle, or sincerely join Europe. Iraq, or any other country in Eurasia, is not open to American colonisation. The free nations of Eurasia, led by France, Germany, Russia and China, should condemn the Mammonite aggression in the UN and call for sanctions against the aggressors. The US dollar should cease to be the reserve currency, and the US debt of $6.4 trillion

---

should be called in. The US-owned media, the tool of indoctrina-
tion, should be treated as a racist propaganda vehicle for having
sanctified the killing of Arabs. US forces should leave Eurasia and
peace will be restored in the interests of all sides.

The unjust sanctions against the noble people of Iraq should
be lifted immediately. These sanctions caused the deaths of mil-
lions of innocents, including a million Iraqi children. They pre-
pared the ground for the Mammonite aggression. The terrible cam-
paign of demonisation carried out by the Mammonite media
against Saddam Hussein, the Iraqis and Arabs in general, should be
denounced as racist bigotry.

Saddam Hussein is neither a Santa Claus nor St Francis. He is
not a gentle king-philosopher. But President Allende of Chile was
the most liberal and progressive ruler, and still he was overthrown
and assassinated by the CIA-sponsored General Pinochet, this
great friend of Zionist Mammonites Margaret Thatcher, Henry
Kissinger and Conrad Black. The liberal and progressive Prime
Minister of Iran, Mohamed Mossadegh, was overthrown as well,
and replaced by the authoritarian rule of the Shah. Saddam
Hussein was brought into being by the very spirit of the Arab
world as its defender, for a civilisation (in Toynbee’s sense) meet-
ing a lethal challenge produces stern and warlike leaders able to
meet that challenge.

When Russia was about to be attacked by the most cruel and
dangerous enemy of its history, Russia’s spirit brought forth a
steeley and stern, defrocked Georgian priest and made him ruler of
the Soviet Union. A kinder, softer man would not have been able
to sacrifice millions of Russians (including his own son) to defeat
the Third Reich.

The Arab world was mismanaged for centuries by outside pow-
ers: by the Ottoman Turks, by the colonialists, and now by the
Mammonite neo-colonial web. Saddam Hussein is the first strong
independent ruler of Arabs since Saladin; it is not a blind coinci-
dence that he was born in Tikrit, the city that gave birth to the
noble vanquisher of Crusaders. He can unite the Arab world and
restore the Caliphate – like de Gaulle and Adenauer restored the
Carolingian Empire. This has to be done, as the present parcelling
of Arab lands has created blocks of rich sheiks, protected oil wells
and impoverished masses. Saddam is able to confront Mammonites
and Zionists, and that is why he is much loved by the people of the Middle East.

Saddam is vilified by the Mammonite media, but this only proves he is the right man in the right place. For whomever they glorify is surely their collaborator. They loved Mikhail Gorbachev, who demolished the USSR; they love Tony Blair, who turned England into an American colony. John Pilger described it well in his introduction to the new edition of the great classic of Phillip Knightley, *The First Casualty*: “The media could praise the ‘miraculously few casualties’ in the Gulf War (meaning the few British and American casualties), while the horror of up to a quarter-million Iraqis slaughtered by the US-led forces was consigned to oblivion.” Yesterday on Israeli TV the cruel ex-defence minister of Israel, Fuad Ben Eliezer, murderer of hundreds of Palestinian civilians, called Saddam Hussein, “a fearsome man”. For me, and for other people of the Middle East, whoever frightens Ben Eliezer can’t be all that bad.

Saddam has passed with honours a severe test of war: his people remain loyal to him and are fighting the Mammonite aggressor. We should support him in this hour of doom, like Winston Churchill supported Joseph Stalin. Do not worry: when the Arab world regains its independence within the framework of friendly Eurasia, it will produce kind and gentle rulers, lovers of the arts and letters.

American and English soldiers were sent to commit the worst of war crimes, that of aggression against a sovereign state. But they weren’t sent in the interests of Americans and Englishmen. They were sent to extend the Mammonite rule all over the Middle East. We do not identify the Mammonites with the people of America. The Mammonites come and go, while the people remain forever. Nor should the Europeans repeat the American folly and try to ‘liberate’ America. Let Americans free themselves from the Mammonite yoke. It is in their interests, for the Mammonites are not a forgiving lot. They will not forgive anybody who stands in their way. They will try to crush the internal American opposition. They have stored all the photos of participants in the anti-war demos, and they will use them, sooner or later.

---

1 http://evatt.labor.net.au/news/201.html
The Mammonites are blinded by their sheer power, by their coup of having harnessed America to their master plans. Their lack of compassion has manifested in Guantanamo, where they cage their unfortunate prisoners. Their chutzpah was manifest when they demanded the disarming of Iraq and attacked it afterwards, turning all of us into their unwilling henchmen. Their lack of sincerity is proven by their massive campaign of lies and disinformation. Their godless nature is seen in their refusal to obey the pastoral instructions of the Churches. (Only some Zionist TV preachers support their war.)

The Mammonites utilise the Zionist network and mislead the Jews into obedience. The US Senate started the war by presenting the Jewish state with ten billion dollars, and in return, “God Bless America”, a major Israeli newspaper, Yediot Aharonot, headlined today’s edition, and its web edition declared that “the hearts and prayers of Israelis go out to the US armed forces”.

“Much of the ideological justification and political pressure for war against Iraq has come from right-wing American Zionists, many of them Jews closely allied to Israel’s Prime Minister, Ariel Sharon, and occupying influential positions both inside and outside the Bush administration. It is a Bush-Sharon war against Iraq”, wrote Patrick Seale, the British observer and expert on the Middle East. Seale is right — up to a point. The ‘Left-wing’ American Zionists, many of them Jews, are as ridden with Mammonitis as are their Right-wing brethren.

Bob Norman reports from South Florida: “Robert Wexler has made himself one of the nation's loudest critics of President Bush. The liberal congressman attacked Bush on the environment, prescription drugs, corporate scandals, tax cuts for the rich and the President's 2000 election tactics. But Wexler said on TV that war on Iraq is a swell idea. Wexler and several other Jewish Democrats in Congress, led by Connecticut’s Senator Joe Lieberman and a gaggle of representatives from California and New York, are spoiling for that fight. And because these same politicians can usually be counted on to anchor the Democrats’ opposition to Bush, they have helped to destroy any hope of the Party's reining in Dick Cheney's dogs of war”.

The US and UK Zionists do not endanger their power base by supporting the war. While their positions in the media are well known, “there are some 15 Jewish soldiers (0.03% of the British invasion force in Iraq) among the 45,000 British fighters currently in action in the US-led campaign’, reports Haaretz. This disparity explains a lot, including the ‘chicken-hawks’ label. Their mad ideas include restoration of Greater Israel from the Nile to the Euphrates and ‘historic revenge’ upon Babylon for the destruction of the Temple of Solomon in BC 586, as called for by David Ben Gurion, the founder of Israel. Needless to say, these insane plans are not in the true interest of Americans nor of the sane majority of Jews.

While rejecting the Mammonite-Zionist covenant, we do not identify the enemy with a religious or ethnic group. Indeed, many Americans of Jewish origin stand against the war and against the Mammonites. I do not want to mention again their venerable names for there is no need to distinguish between them and other good Americans. The enemy is the Mammonite ideology, ‘a weird crossbreed of Roman and Hebrew attitudes’ in the terminology of Simone Weil. She wrote:

“The Romans and Hebrews were much admired and quoted every time one wanted to justify a crime. For Romans, conquered people were objects of contempt, and they had no epics, no tragedies. For Hebrews, cruelty to the vanquished is permissible, indeed indispensable.”

Simone Weil perceived the Gospels as the last and brilliant manifestation of the Hellene spirit of the Iliad, the spirit of compassion that sees the humanity of both sides in the war. That is the spirit the Americans could invoke.

The compassionate and fiercely independent America of Henry Thoreau and Gore Vidal could and should win its long battle against the Mammonite spirit. Provided both main parties of the US are infiltrated to equal extent, the way out lies in giving more, much more, power to the states, while reducing the Federal Government’s functions to managing the US Mail. The best

---

1 http://www.haaretzdaily.com/hasen/spages/275621.html
American intellectual magazine, *Harpers’ Monthly*, recently drew an idyllic picture of the world, where instead of the monstrous US, some seven or eight states (California, New England, Texas, the Confederacy, etc.) occupy the landmass of the North America between Mexico and Canada. Such smaller and more manageable states (the size of France!) would be able to form meaningful relations between their people and their landscape, create real and not imaginary communities, produce art, and relate to Man and God.

Americans would be able to live a much better, happier and more inspired life. For instance, the $75 billion America is spending on the Iraq war could provide fifty million Americans with free health care, or six million young men with university education. Americans would be able to celebrate the Nativity of Christ, not only ‘seasons’ at Christmas, and His Resurrection at Easter, without fear.

Even the Mammonite spirit of commerce would shake off its destructiveness if confined to the Big Apple. Who knows, maybe independent New York will re-create the glory of Venice, the great trading republic, once disengaged from the huge continent.

Israel, the exclusivist Jewish state, has no place in the free Middle East; but its inhabitants, adoptive Palestinians of Jewish faith or origin, will be welcomed and desired citizens of the Palestinian Commonwealth, on a par with native Palestinians. Their abilities will help them lead their common country to prosperity and equality. Thus, the noble Zionist goal of bringing Jews back to the home of their ancestors will be accomplished, and the descendents of Jews elsewhere would be able to forget separatism and blend peacefully into the nations they live among.
Midas Ears

A new spectre haunts America. It enters the well-protected boardrooms of newspapers and banks, shakes the deep foundations of its towers. It is the spectre of glasnost: the dark secret of Jewish power is out. Just recently it was ‘third rail’, touch-and-die, deadly dangerous to mention, the certain end to a career. Just recently, Joe Public snapped his TV from an eminence with an Israeli passport to a member of a Jewish think-tank, and muttered to himself: Surely it is just a coincidence that so many important and largely unelected people in our country happen to belong to this small minority group. Surely it is just a coincidence that they belong to different parties but reach the same conclusions. Surely it is just a coincidence that ninety per cent of American foreign aid goes to their cousins in prosperous Tel Aviv. Surely it is just a coincidence that they run our newspapers, television, cinema, universities. Anyway, we are not allowed to notice this elephant in our sitting room.

Only rare desperados comment, as Edgar Steele did on Rense.com: “The silence in America concerning Jews is simply deafening, isn’t it? The old adage has it that, when visiting a foreign country, to ascertain who really runs things, one need determine only who is spoken about in whispers, if at all.” Judged by this measure, the Jews rule supreme. Indeed, when I referred to ‘Jewish media lords’ during a UNESCO conference in the summer of 2001, the audience’s hearts missed a beat.

The yet-unfought War on Iraq changed this. The Americans peeped into the bottomless abyss of World War Three and woke up from their generation-long stupor. Thus the first victim of the Iraqi War is not truth, but the strongest taboo in the West. A
Democratic member of Congress, usually a most docile specimen, one James Moran, dared to tell his supporters: “If it were not for the strong support of the Jewish community for this war with Iraq we would not be doing this.”

He was immediately slapped by a Jewish overseer: “It is simply stunning to hear Representative Moran make such accusations,” said National Jewish Democratic Council Executive Director, Ira N. Forman. “First, a number of the current leaders of the anti-war movement are Jewish, and Jewish organizations have clearly not been at the forefront among those groups actively and stridently supporting a war in Iraq”. Forman had spoken, and the media reported and amplified his view, and Moran duly recanted, slapped. But he is not the only one.

The secret is out, and like the secret of King Midas and his long ears, it is being sung now from coast to coast, despite the frantic efforts of the organised Jewish community to clamp the lid back on the boiling cauldron. Kathleen and Bill Christison¹, two ex-CIA experts, exposed the link between right-wing American Jews and the Bush Administration. Edward Said, the most celebrated American thinker of Palestinian origin, stated the case: “An immensely wealthy and powerful republic has been hijacked by a small cabal of individuals, all of them unelected and therefore unresponsive to public pressure.”²

He was seconded by the courageous Herman, Neumann and Blankfort. These Americans of Jewish origin object to the un-elected, anti-democratic Jewish power as they would object to any disproportionate minority power. Their presence, as they were not afraid of the anti-Semitic label, was instrumental in turning the tide and saving the intimidated majority from browbeating.

Edward Herman, the author of Manufacturing Consent (together with Noam Chomsky), wrote of “the powerful pro-Israel lobby in the United States, which advances Israeli interests by pushing for U.S. aid and protection to Israel, and, currently, by pressing for a war against Iraq, which again will serve Israeli interests. This lobby has not only helped control media debate and

² http://weekly.ahram.org.eg/2003/628/op2.htm
made congress into ‘Israeli occupied territory’, it has seen to it that numerous officials with ‘dual loyalties’ occupy strategic decision-making positions in the Bush administration…”

Jeffrey Blankfort, the Californian who defeated the ADL in court and made Foxman pay heaps of dollars for his espionage against activists, took an important next step and rejected the views upheld by Noam Chomsky, Joel Beinin and Stephen Zunes, for these older radicals play down the crucial importance of Jewish power. Jeff Blankfort noticed the roots of the Rapture Evangelicals’ meteoric rise in the US. This obscure sect would never have left its lair in remote Dixie, but for the Jewish media lords. Jeff noticed that when Black Entertainment Television was taken over by Viacom, whose owner, Sumner Redstone (né Murray Rothstein), was recently described in the New York Times as the world’s biggest media owner, he eliminated BET’s news program and began running evangelical Christian infomercials for Israel. Blankfort’s list of ‘Jews in media” enables an understanding of the secret of Jewish

1 Here is sampling:

First of all, Sumner Redstone (né Murray Rothstein) owns $8 billion dollars worth of Viacom, which gives him the controlling interest in CBS, Viacom, MTV worldwide (Brian Graden, president), and most recently he bought Black Entertainment Television and proceeded immediately to cut down its public-affairs programming. The president of CBS is Leslie Moonves, the great nephew of David Ben-Gurion.

Michael Eisner is the major owner of Disney-Capitol Cities, which owns ABC. David Westin is the president of ABC News. Although it has lost viewers, Nightline host Ted Koppel is a strong supporter of Israel. Lloyd Braun is chair of ABC Entertainment. And there is the perennial Barbara Walters.

Neil Shapiro is the president of NBC News. Jeffrey Zucker is the head of NBC Entertainment and Jack Myers has some important post there, as well.

Although Rupert Murdoch of Fox is not Jewish, Mel Karamazin, the president of the corporation is, as is Peter Chernin, the second in command at Murdoch’s News Corps.

Sandy Grushow is chairman of Fox Entertainment, and Gail Berman is president. Murdoch has received numerous awards from various Jewish charities.

Jamie Kellner is chair and CEO of Turner Broadcasting.

Walter Issaason is the News Director of CNN which also has Wolf Blitzer, host of Late Edition, Larry King of Larry King Live, Paula Zahn, and Andrea Koppel, Ted’s daughter.

Jordan Levin is chairman of Warner Bros. Entertainment.

Howard Stringer is chair of Sony Corp. of America.

Robert Sillerman is the founder of Clear Channel Communications.

Ivan Seidenberg is chair of Verizon Communications.

Terry Semel, former co-chair of Warners is CEO of Yahoo.

Barry Diller, former owner of Universal Entertainment, is the chair of USA Interactive.
charm, and it can be compared with a similar extensive list by Prof. Kevin MacDonald of California State University.

The Iraqi War, and even more its linkage with Palestine, became the litmus test of Jewish power. Organised Jewry pushed for war and at the same time denied its involvement. Thus in New York City, the City Council rejected an anti-war resolution, and only 12 of its 51 members were for it. This is not strange for heavily Jewish New York. Indeed, a Democrat, Rep. Robert Jackson, said it in a most straightforward way: “New York City is the home away from home for most Jews; and many members of the Jewish community think [the war is] in the best interests of the state of Israel.” According to Jackson, several of his council colleagues have been intimidated into silence by the pro-Israel crowd: “People are not talking about this.”

Joel Klein is chair and CEO of Bertelsmann’s American operations, the largest publishing conglomerate in the world.

Mort Zuckerman, the Chair of the Conference of Presidents of Major Jewish American Organizations, owns US News and World Report and the NY Daily News.

Arthur Sulzberger, Jr. publishes the NY Times, the Boston Globe and a host of other publications.

Marty Peretz publishes the New Republic, which is unabashedly pro-Israel, as is William Kristol, editor of the Weekly Standard.

Donald Graham, Jr. is the chair and CEO of Newsweek and the Washington Post.

Michael Ledeen, of Iran-Contra fame, edits National Review.

Ron Rosenthal is the Managing Editor of the SF Chronicle and Phil Bronstein is the Executive Editor.

David Schneiderman owns the Village Voice and a number of other “alternative” weeklies.

Columnist William Safire, Tom Freidman, Charles Krauthammer, Richard Cohen, Jeff Jacoby, are among the most widely syndicated columnists.

There are a number of widely syndicated talk show hosts such as Michael Savage (ABC) on more than 100 stations, Michael Medved, 124 stations, and Dennis Prager who has an Israeli flag on his website. Others include Ron Owens, Ben Wattenberg, and former ZOA official Jon Rothman, all in San Francisco on ABC.

In Hollywood, which was founded by Jews, there is of course, Stephen Spielberg, David Geffen, and Jeffrey Kranzberg of Dreamworks, Eisner of Disney, Amy Pascal, chair of Columbia, and many, many more.

For the intellectuals, we have NPR, with pundit Daniel Schorr and weekend hosts Scott Simon and Liane Hansen, Robert Segal, Susan Stanberg, Eric Weiner, Daniel Lev, Linda Gradstein (a well-known speaker at pro-Israel events) covering Jerusalem, Mike Schuster (whose soft-ball interview with Ariel Sharon after Sabra and Shatila should have brought him before the court of Hamarabi). Brook Gladstein.

And that’s just for starters. From the boss to the delivery it’s an impressive list. While they certainly can’t be put in the same box when it comes to Israel, they more or less guarantee that there will be limits to any criticism they may make of Israel.”
Jackson was certainly right, but a Jewish newspaper¹ (surprisingly or not, almost all newspapers in the New York area are Jewish) condemned him for . . . racism: “[He claimed that] not only do the Jews run New York City, but they’ve cowed their opponents into silence. Jackson could as well call New York Hymietown.”

This response is remarkable for its typically Jewish logic. First, the opponent’s rational argument is perverted and distorted, then it is aligned with opprobrium; and at the last stage, the opponent is destroyed forever. That is one of the secrets of Jewish might: the Jews enter a dialogue berserk-like, with great vehemence, quite foreign to the Socratic style. While sane people are satisfied with quoting their opponent and fighting his arguments, madmen (for berserk is a temporarily-mad individual) go for the jugular.

David Mamet, the Jewish American playwright, provides a good example of this vehemence as he notices a “Volvo of old, the vehicle of my brethren, the congenitally liberal. It was festooned, as are its kind, with every sort of correct exhortation: Save James Bay, Honour Diversity, and so on. A most interesting bumper sticker read: Israel Out of the Settlements ... a slogan which could best be translated as Hook-nosed Jews Die.”

I wonder why Mamet stopped at this, for with equal adequacy the slogan can be translated as Torture Babies, Denounce America and Burn Apple Pie. Who cares for the form of the Jewish nose? Mel Brooks noticed long ago that Jewish girls have the cutest noses, made by the best plastic surgeons . . .

It is the racist Jewish policies in occupied Palestine that annoy good, ‘congenitally liberal’ people. But if Mamet were honest, he would not be Mamet.

Now, Bill Keller of the NY Times has read the Riot Act to the Americans. He kindly allows that “most of the big Jewish organizations and many donors are backing the war” but insists that “the idea that Israel’s interests are driving one of the most momentous shifts in America’s foreign policy is simple-minded and offensive.” Well, Keller is certainly being paid for his convictions by a Jewish media lord, and one of the nastiest, Arthur Sulzberger Jr, the owner of the NY Times, the Boston Globe and a host of other publications. This undermines the possible veracity of Keller’s words.

¹ NY Post 22.02.03
Let something similar be written in a thoroughly non-Jewish newspaper! But alas, there are no important media outlets in the US that are not owned or controlled by Jews . . .

Surely a coincidence? Do not bet on it. A few days ago, in the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, an important all-Jewish conference on anti-Semitism took place under the auspicious aegis of the Sasson Centre. The talk given by the French Jewish historian Simcha Epstein dealt with pre-war France but pertained more immediately to America. This is what Epstein said:

“The pre-war anti-Semites said that the Jews of France organized a syndicate secretly bankrolling and subverting the press. And what did the Jews say at that time? They said: “Of course not! No, it's a lie, of course not! We are not engaged in conspiracies!” And what did the historians and the Jewish historiography coming afterwards say? “Of course not! It is anti-Semitic drivel!” But we know now from Jewish sources that before the WWII the Jews of France secretly financed the press.

“Since the end of the 19th century, there was a secret Jewish organization, well financed, which bought and bankrolled newspapers. Sometimes it took over existing newspapers, which suddenly became pro-Dreyfus because they received Jewish subsidies. New papers were created especially by the Jews. Two very important papers of the period, one was called Les Droits de l'Homme, the Rights of Man, was financed by the Jews, and L’Humanité, which was the Socialist and then the Communist newspaper of France, was also financed by Jews. I say this on the authority of Jewish sources of course.

“And this brings us to a dramatic dilemma of historiography. Saying this, saying what I said, is something horrible and unacceptable, because it means that the Jews organized a conspiracy and secretly bought the media, or part of the media. That was precisely what the anti-Semites said at that time, and what they still say today. And we know now from Jewish sources that the allegations were true, that there was a Jewish clandestine activity of bankrolling the press.”

Some people perceive every suggestion that Jews are able to act together as a mad conspiracy theory. Let them read and re-read this report by a Jewish historian made at a Jewish conference. If it is proven now beyond any reasonable doubt that the Jews of France
secretly bought and subverted French media for many years in order to distort the national discourse and eventually push unprepared France into the horrible and unneeded World War Two, is it impossible to consider that the Jews of the US have secretly taken over their national media and are now pushing the US into a horrible and unneeded World War Three?

Actually there is no need for secrecy. One of the chief Zionist ideologists, Zeev Hefetz (ex-spokesman of PM Begin), wrote in an American daily: “Disarming Iraq is only a start in Middle East” as “the Arab and Iranian (sic!) cultures” are “irrational” and that nothing can be done, short of war, to “improve the collective mental health of Arab societies.”1 Certainly this massive ‘disarmament’ will be carried out by American soldiers, though the commands will be given by the Jewish chicken-hawks roosting in the Pentagon. As for reasons for the war, they were eloquently stated by a keynote speaker at a conference on anti-Semitism by Yehuda Bauer, the director of the Holocaust Memorial Institute Yad va-Shem in Jerusalem:

The Jews are not a nation, neither a religion, he said. They are a civilisation, and they have their civilising mission. They cannot tolerate the competing civilisation of Islam, as they could not tolerate Christendom or Communism. That is why the war with Islam is unavoidable.

But the war is avoidable. Even today, at minutes before H-hour, the war is avoidable. And if fire is unavoidable, let the Jewish advisers of President Bush be fired. Let this Purim see the great Exodus of the “Wolfowitz Cabal” from the Pentagon. Excluding the clinical possibility of his actual zombification, G W Bush should be able to understand that he has been misled by this powerful, unelected minority. They cannot deliver what they promised. Moreover, their own days at the helm of the Republic are numbered. They over-estimated their abilities, and pushed too hard. As the frog of La Fontaine, they can blow up. Bush still can do a U-turn, and save himself and his country.

In a way, today’s America reminds one of Russia in 1986, at the beginning of glasnost. After Soviet citizens were allowed to learn who rules them and how, the days of the Soviet regime were num-
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bered. Glasnost gave place to perestroika. Now, for the first time in a generation, Americans are allowed to see the men in power, the toxic combination of the Right-Wing Democrats of Lieberman, the Republican neo-liberals, the Neo-Cons and plain Con-men. The Iraqi War brought them forward and presented them in a clear light. Now is the time to undo their hold.

It can’t be postponed, for the divisive presidency of G W Bush is perceived as the period of ‘White’ Protestant Anglo-Saxon rule, despite the prevalence of his Jewish advisers. All available contenders for the next elections — Lieberman, Kerry and even Kucinich — claim their Jewish connections and declare their undivided loyalty to Jewry and to the state of Israel. In the present political setup of America, there will be no real alternative to Jewish ascendancy. If Bush flops, it will be construed by the media as a WASP flop. If he succeeds, it will be seen as the success of his Jewish advisers.

That is why American patriot forces should not wait for the next elections, or for the end of the war. They must act now, by calling the war off. They have an enemy, but he is not in Iraq. What is called for is a new American revolution, on a par with the New Deal and the abolition of slavery, with de-monopolisation of the discourse; that is, of media and universities, for starters. In the beginning of the Twentieth Century, Americans undid the mighty Standard Oil. They created new anti-monopoly laws and terminated the threat to democracy. This achievement could be repeated now.
The Shadow of Zog
(Exegesis of Besson)

In Luc Besson’s delightful film, The Fifth Element (with the perfect Mila Jovovich and the supreme Bruce Willis), an absolutely evil force, the Shadow, Messenger of Death, comes from Outer Space to destroy human life on our planet. It is impervious to bombs and missiles, and regardless of what people do, it closes in, and darkens the earth. Yet in order to succeed the Shadow needs some human help. Who will, for personal profit, assist the satanic Shadow in his quest to destroy our Mother Earth? In the best tongue-in-cheek tradition of Swift, Besson gave the monstrous volunteer, that servant-of-profit, a scary name: Zog.

The name of the pre-war Albanian King, Zog, is one of a few words that kick the fearsome Thought Police of the ADL into action, activate the FBI like Anthrax, and can send IDF assassins and ARA punks in hot pursuit, for this king – like the Jewish God – does not like his name to be mentioned. This name came back to me with the impending instalment of General Jay Garner as Viceroy of Iraq. Garner received his credentials from the bloody hands of Ariel Sharon: he supported the killing of the Palestinians by signing, in October 2000, a letter that began: “We believe that the Israeli Defence Forces have exercised remarkable restraint in the face of lethal violence orchestrated by the leadership of the Palestinian Authority.”¹ The letter was launched by JINSA², “the major link of the Israel lobby, the Washington-based and Likud-supporting Jewish Institute for National Security Affairs”, as

¹ Michael Lind: New Statesman, April 7, 2003
defined by Michael Lind of the New Statesman, or “another thinly
disguised Israeli espionage and recruiting front”, according to
Washington observer Jeffrey Steinberg of EIR. Signing the letter
was a good move on General Garner’s part: it will give him the rule
of Iraq.

However, he will not have too much money at his disposal. Despite ‘NO WAR FOR OIL’ slogans, Iraqi oil won’t make Americans rich. Iraq has a huge national debt — $70 billion to Russia alone — and the Occupation Regime will have to cough it up. Debt to France is over $30 billion, and it will have to be paid. On top of this, the US Occupation Administration will have to spend considerable amounts of money on repairing the Iraqi infrastructure, destroyed by sanctions and war, before paying one cent of commission to Dick Cheney and his company. No, this war was not fought for the imperial interests of the US or for its mammoth oil companies.

As the head of the Occupation Administration, Jay Garner’s
task is to create a new Iraq, friendly to Israel. The Jerusalem Post, a
hard-line Zionist daily published by Conrad Black, friend of
Pinochet and Sharon, carried an interview with one of his
wannabe Quislings, Ahmad Chalabi’s right hand man, Musawi.

“Musawi talks enthusiastically of his hopes for the closest pos-
sible ties with Israel. There will be no place for Palestinians in the
new Iraq, for the large Palestinian community is regarded by INC
leaders (and presumably by their Zionist instructors) as a loath-
some fifth column. Instead, an ‘arc of peace’ would run from
Turkey, through Iraq and Jordan to Israel, creating a new fulcrum
in the Middle East.”

The Occupation Regime in Iraq was installed by the US army
in the interests of Zionists, and it may be rightly called ZOG,
Zionist Occupation Government, if anything. However, this ZOG
is also a Zog, a servant of Darkness and Annihilation, for its first
step was the destruction of Baghdad’s libraries and museums. A
scholar of Zionism, Joachim Martillo, wrote:
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“Zionism has long taken a position of stripping target populations of their cultural heritage and turning them into clay\(^1\) so that they can be remoulded in conformance with Zionist ideology”.

My learned friend is right. This week I took myself to a lonely hill near Mesecha, a small village in the heart of Biblical Israel, where a few young ISM activists and villagers helplessly watched the Caterpillar machines uprooting olive trees, smashing lupines, devouring this unique Biblical landscape, home and cradle of the people of Palestine. They did not dare step out in front of the machines, for the American volunteer Rachel Corrie was murdered in similar circumstances, to the deafening sound of silence from Washington. Jeffrey Blankfort, the analyst from California, had good reason for calling Washington “the Zionists’ Most Important Occupied Territory”\(^2\).

Thus, the burned manuscripts of Baghdad and uprooted olive trees of Mesecha lead to Zog . . . and to ZOG. This homonymy points to a telling semantic concurrence; as Kuang-Ming Wu said in *The Butterfly as Companion*: “The words of a sound flock together in sense; like sound, like sense.”\(^3\) Thus the witty Luc Besson, who borrowed the idea of the Five Elements from Socrates, gave us a lesson: “ZOG is Zog”.

For a while, the Jewish establishment tried to deny its direct involvement in the Third World War. They furiously rejected references to high and mighty Jews pushing for war as (you guessed it) “antisemitism”. But eventually the denial wall was broken, and in the Israeli newspaper *Haaretz*, the culprits, a “band of 20-30 Jewish intellectuals”, the Neo-Cons, admitted they did it. Afterwards, Michael Lind summarised their powerful positions in the New Statesman, while my countryman Gabriel Ash optimistically predicted: “In a couple of months, when the role of the Zionists in the war will become widely known, *The New York Times* will publish an editorial sheepishly bemoaning the way

---

\(^1\) clay, homer was the term Zionists used to describe Jewish Arabs during the 1950s. The same word, homer, is used in Hebrew liturgy at describing creation of Man

\(^2\) “Occupied Territory” — Congress, the Israel Lobby and Jewish Responsibility by Jeffrey Blankfort, City Lights Review, “War after War”, 1992, City Lights Books

\(^3\) [http://laetusinpraesens.org/docs00s/assmeta.php](http://laetusinpraesens.org/docs00s/assmeta.php)
some Pentagon officials have let their personal views influence U.S. policy.”

The problem is, the people of the US have no way out of the Zionist takeover. While Neo-Cons and Right-wingers are guilty of starting World War Three, of introducing Fascist measures against the American population, of premeditated aggression against sovereign Iraq and of unrestrained support for the racist Jewish State, it would be a mistake to leave the buck resting with them. Michael Moore’s philippics against President Bush are convincing only up to a point, for in his bestselling book, *Stupid White Men*, he regrets that Al Gore was not allowed to enjoy the victory that was his by rights. But if Al Gore and Joseph Lieberman were the White House incumbents now, the US Marines would be in Baghdad nevertheless, the National Library of Iraq and Iraqi museums would still have been looted, and the olive trees of Mesecha uprooted and the flow of American cash to Israel would be continuing unabated.

Every publicist and every internet user in America and Europe knows by now that the ‘only superpower’ was taken over by the Likudniks, the supporters of the Right-wing Likud and its bloody leader General Sharon. The team of Bush and Sharon, or BuSharon, in internet parlance, horrifies the right-minded. But is there an alternative in American politics? Al Gore was a “hand-picked and chosen disciple of Podhoretz” the Zionist, Lieberman is a devoted Zionist. Democratic presidential candidate Howard Dean, “has a Jewish wife, and both his children, 17-year-old Paul and 18-year-old Anne, have chosen to identify as Jews”, we were informed by JTA, the Jewish Telegraphic Assn, called The Global News Service of the Jewish People. Kerry “discovered his Jewish roots”, and Kucinich told the Jewish newspaper *Forward* that he “observes kashrut, has an ex-Israeli girlfriend and knows most of the Haggadah (Passover narrative) by heart”. Apparently, the forthcoming elections in the US (as the previous ones) are the elections for the front figure of Zionist-led America. Left Zionists or Right Zionists – that is the only choice for Americans, and, alas, for the whole world. Why has this come to pass?

---

2 Jewish dietary law
We can find an answer in a short and sincere piece by Eric Alterman, a good Leftist, a journalist with the anti-war Nation. He admits freely: “My own dual loyalties – there, I admitted it – were drilled into me by my parents, my grandparents, my Hebrew school teachers and my rabbis, not to mention Israeli teen-tour leaders and AIPAC college representatives. Whose interests come for me first, America’s or Israel’s? I feel pretty lonely admitting that, every once in a while, I’m going to go with what’s best for Israel.”

Bear in mind: while the Right-wing Jews were always shamelessly chauvinist, the Left kept up a universalist appearance. If that is a voluntary admission of a progressive left-wing journalist, you can easily guess what’s on the mind of the average American Jew. As an Israeli, I should be happy that millions of American Jews stand for me. However, ‘Israel’ in Alterman’s confession stands for ‘the People of Israel’, ‘the Jews’, not for the Middle Eastern State of Israel. If Alterman does not mind robbing his fellow Americans of their hard earned cash in order to sustain the Israeli occupation (as he freely admits), he is probably ready to go much further for the sake of his own community, American Jewry. And this community is managed and represented by – not the ostracised Noam Chomsky, but an extremely unpleasant bunch of billionaires, media lords and warmongers.

If Alterman were the only Jew in the media, one would be able to dismiss his self-admitted bias as the normal influence of an important community. If Jews in the media constituted only 3%, as their share in the general population, Alterman’s position would be affordable. But their share in the top echelon of the media is in double digits; according to some sources it approaches 60%.

Jeff Blankfort writes, “Ardently pro-Israel American Jews are in positions of unprecedented influence within the United States and have assumed or been given decision making positions over virtually every segment of our culture and body politic”. And he quotes Benjamin Ginsberg’s “The Fatal Embrace: Jews and the State”:
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“Jews played a central role in American finance during the 1980s, and they were among the chief beneficiaries of that decade’s corporate mergers and reorganizations. Today, though barely 2% of the nation’s population is Jewish, close to half its billionaires are Jews. The chief executive officers of the three major television networks and the four largest film studios are Jews, as are the owners of the nation’s largest newspaper chain and the most influential single newspaper, the *New York Times*.”

Is it a conspiracy of Jews to steal the Republic? No, no conspiracy is necessary. In Jules Verne’s juvenile novel, *Children of Captain Grant*, a villain leads the captain’s ship astray by placing a magnetic brick beneath the compass. The magnet does not conspire: it constrains the compass. The sheer mass of self-involved Jews in the media acts in a similar way and draws the superpower off its normal course. For the media is the nerve system of a modern state. Modern democracy in practice in a very complicated society can be compared to a sophisticated computer. Its machinery can function successfully on one condition: there is a free flow of information across the system. While every input is instinctively checked and sieved on one criterion, whether it is good for Jews, it is not odd that the machine produces such freak output as ‘revenge on Babylon for its destruction of Jerusalem in BC 586.” Indeed, in long-gone 1948 the first ruler of Israel, David Ben Gurion, promised: “We shall mete historic vengeance to Assyria, Aram and Egypt.” Now it comes to pass, as Iraq, Syria and Egypt are targeted by Zog.

Thus, the concentration of Jews in the media created the distortion. A takeover of every other part of industry or trade would be noticed and reported in the media; but there is no remedy for media takeover. Discussion of this unbearable situation is further stifled by the ‘political correctness’ taboo. PC has its good sides, for it made life easier for a lone outsider. However, this very good and useful device has its limits of application. Otherwise, it could be used to defend South African apartheid, or British colonial rule in India. Isn’t it anti-white racism to notice that the political power in apartheid South Africa belonged to whites? Surely there are poor
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1 quoted by Bar Zohar, in his biography of Ben Gurion.
and good whites? Gandhi could be condemned as ‘racist’, for he ‘noticed’ the privileged position of the British in India. By PC logic, a good American should reply to the Mahatma: yes, there are some rich and powerful Brits in India, but there are also poor Tommy Atkinses, governesses, honest administrators, writers like Kipling and Orwell. On the other hand, there are powerful and rich Rajas, important Brahmins. How do you dare, sir, to demand ‘de-colonisation’? This is sheer anti-English racism!

An old Indian Air Force officer, Joe Thomas, actually reminded us that, “while the population of the US today is approximately the same as the population of India a century ago, the British in India never numbered more than 50,000 and still ruled India. They did not rule India by force but by dominating Indian discourse. Indians fought for the British and put down rebellions. During the two world wars, millions of Indians fought as volunteers for Britain. If such a tiny group could control India, then it is not strange that 100 times that number can influence the United States.”

In no way should we embrace racism. Au contraire, the anti-racist fervour of America should be turned against the Jewish racists — Elliott Abrams, Deborah Lipstadt and others of their ilk — who publish treatises comparing intermarriage with a holocaust. It should be turned against the Wolfowitz Cabal who push for racist war in the Middle East for the sake of the racist Jewish state. It should be turned against media owners who employ disproportionate numbers of Jews and thus discriminate against non-Jewish Americans. It should be turned against the church leaders who agreed to the racist notion that Jews are the only people in the world who do not need to be baptised. It should be turned against the Jewish/non-Jewish discrimination; for the present situation, when the goy killer of Klinghoffer the Jew is hunted by the CIA, but the Jewish killer of Rachel Corrie goes scot-free, is a perversion of natural justice. Jewish racism should be confronted; otherwise America will forever have to choose between Likud and Meretz on its way to Armageddon.

Jewish dominance in the media should be redressed, among other measures, by separating advertising and media. Advertising media shouldn’t carry news or articles, and non-advertising media should be forbidden to carry advertising. Commercial advertising
in the general media was (according to Werner Sombart) an 18th century Jewish invention. Apparently that was ‘good for Jews’, but not for society in general, as it turned the media away from readers towards advertisers. The separation could be enforced by banning all forms of media and business interaction, like we ban all interaction of the police and business. The media are more important than police for the safety of society. It should be free from undue influences. The media are the compass of society. It is necessary to remove the magnet from their vicinity, in order that the good ship of our society may sail smoothly.

Such a concentration of any minority group (be it Korean or Mormon) in the media would be perilous. However, the concentration of Jews has its specifics, for the Jews profess a different, non-Christian, or even anti-Christian faith. Your average Jewish editor or media lord is distinctly unhappy whenever he encounters a reference to Christ or His Blessed Mother, for their very names are subject to strong and explicit taboo in his culture. At best, he will try to balance it with a pro-Judaic piece or reference. If Christian Americans were to refer often to Christ, the frequency of Judaic references would grow also, disproportionately to the Jewish share in the population. In our terms, ‘the magnet brick of Jews-in-discourse has turned the American boat towards forms of worship more palatable for Jews’.

At this moment many enlightened readers’ interest begins to wane. If Goebbels’ hand automatically reached for his [Robert?] Browning at the word ‘culture’, modern Western man is conditioned to seek the Delete button at the name of Christ. However, we shall try your patience with an even more severe test and bring in the rich word ‘Metaphysics’.

Young drivers often disregard manufacturers’ advice and use unsuitable oil for their engines. Others use unsuitable fuel. They say: ‘my car functions anyway, so why I should pay more?’ Terms such as ‘compression’ and ‘ignition’ sound like Mumbo-Jumbo to our young driver: he has never seen them. Only after a few unpleasant experiences is a driver convinced that invisible compression is a perfectly real phenomenon that can manifest itself as a sudden breakdown on the turnpike. Metaphysics is exactly that: a hidden but perfectly real force within the engine of our civilisation. M. Jourdain of Molière’s Le Bourgeois Gentilhomme was
amazed that unbeknownst to himself he had spoken prose all his life. We are equally amazed to learn that we apply some metaphysical categories in our daily life. Indeed, our treatment of our neighbours and our social behaviour depends on such Mumbo Jumbo words as the ‘relationship of Man and God’.

The Jewish concept of the Man-to-God relationship is metaphysically different from the (say) Catholic one, as different as diesel fuel and carburettor fuel. The prominence of Jews in Western discourse causes the same sort of trouble that you would experience if you were to refuel your diesel car with petrol.

The Jewish faith as practiced by observant Jews might contain many positive ideas shared by other religions; it also borrowed a lot from other religious systems: for instance, sayings of Christ were imported into Mishna and ascribed to Hillel the Elder (according to Niebuhr). However, it is based on troublesome metaphysics, and the metaphysical level survives even the present low level of Jewish religiosity. According to its teaching, the One and Only God created this One and Only World, and remained totally separated from the World. It is stressed by the Cabalist term Zimzum, Contracting Divinity; which holds that God’s withdrawal from the meta-world leaves some ‘meta-space’ for the Material World. A Godless World is the necessary partner of the Other-Worldly God. Thus the immanent World is cruel and ruthless, a place of eternal warfare, while God is transcendental and unreachable. ‘There are no prophets’, ‘God can not intervene in our decisions’, ‘the Law is given to us and God can’t change it’ — these maxims effectively create a Godless world. Sure, God exists, but he does not manifest Himself.

In Christian faith, Christ and His Mother bridged the World-God divide by His Incarnation, and brought in Compassion and Mercy. Since then, this World is full of the Light of Christ, which is a Divine Light. People became brothers-in-Christ, His soul unites them, and an offence against a fellow man is also an offence against Christ. (I describe the ideal, paradigmatic metaphysics of Christian faith, as different from reality as the scheme of the engine in your manual differs from the real engine of your five-year-old car).

In the Godless world of Jewish metaphysics there was an island of light, the People of Israel, crowned by the Torah. The ‘Israel’ of the Jews corresponds to the ‘Christ’ of the Christians. The
relationship between the people of Israel and each other is brotherly, for they are one family (descendents of Jacob), and they recognise this spark of light in each other. It is apparently similar to the brotherhood-in-Christ, but metaphysically quite different, for while (in Christian metaphysics) every son of Adam and Eve is entitled to the Light of Christ, in Jewish metaphysics other people, non-Israel, are absolutely God-less, all ‘thinking beast’. In some esoteric Jewish teachings non-Jews are denied even their descent from Adam. There is no way to transform a non-Israel into a member of Israel, for Jewish conversion is but the correction of an error: a certain Israelite was by mistake born into a non-Israelite family, and his conversion is but the public recognition of this error.

(Indeed, there is a good real-life example, provided by two converts, Jennifer and Andrew. Jennifer converted, and moved into Gaza to defend the Palestinian cause. Andrew continued after his conversion to defend Jews and Jewish terror in Palestine on every Internet forum. I have to agree with the Rabbis: Jennifer failed to convert because she was born with a Christian soul, while Andrew was born a Jew, and conversion just authorised it.)

Thus the difference between ‘ours’ and ‘theirs’, ‘insider’ and ‘outsider’, in Judaism is much more rigidly drawn than in other major religions (pace Zoroastrianism, another fossil, in Toynbee’s terminology, that happily remained a sleeping fossil) as non-Jews are absolutely profane while Jews are holy. A non-Jew who describes a world without God is not too wrong, from the Jewish point of view, for the non-Jew has no connection to God. Such a non-Jew is preferable to a Christian, for the Christian claims he is the equal of Jews, and that is sacrilege for a Jew. That is why prominent Jews in the media and universities outwardly support the doctrine of religious indifference or atheistic materialism. “All religions are the same”, or “religion is not important” or “religion is the personal matter of an individual”, or “nobody has seen God” are equal to saying “all fuels are the same”, “fuel makes no difference”, or “nobody has seen compression”.

Alexander Dugin¹, a contemporary Russian Traditionalist philosopher, a follower of Rene Guénon, traced the original fault of Jewish metaphysics to its “extreme Creationism”, the idea of the One

¹ See his works at www.arctogaia.com
and Only God (monotheism) that created a totally separate One and Only World (monocosmism) ex nihilo (out of nothing). One could dismiss Dugin’s view by claiming that Creation is also a part and parcel of Christian dogma. However, in Christian metaphysics the equivalent of Creation is Incarnation, the fruit of the sacral union of the Godhead and a mortal woman, while the pre-history described in the Old Testament is effectively excluded from consideration or is re-interpreted through the concept of Pre-figuration.

The OT could not be accepted or rejected in toto by the Early Christians, for the wonderful codex of the native Ancient Palestinian poetry, liturgy, metaphysics, religion and tradition, was heavily edited by the immigrant Soferim (the spiritual precursors of Pharisees). The memory of this editing was preserved in the Semitic world, and it was referred to by the Prophet Muhammad, peace be upon him. Old Palestinian tradition was much more holistic, and its gods El and his spouse Ashera were integrated into the environment as the rain-sending Heaven of Palestine and the fruit-giving Land of Palestine. Together, they are the equivalent of the ‘God’ of the Old Testament, and the Gospel preserved for us the last words of Jesus on the Cross. He called to El, not to Yahwe.

The Old Palestinian tradition and its younger gods, Baal the Homeless (“Birds have nests, but the Son of Man has no home”), who defied Death, was killed and Resurrected, and Anath the Virgin, were perfect pre-figurations of the Gospel, certainly better ones than those offered by the Pharisees. (A materialist would say that the Palestinian tradition had influenced the Gospel writers and the founders of Christianity.)

Early Christians were aware of the problematic qualities of the OT, but they had no tools to undo the Soferim-Pharisees’ editing and restore the Palestinian text. The Pharisees (for the Pharisee teaching won the day among Jews) took over the Palestinian heritage as surely as King Macbeth took over Scotland.

(The Jewish editing of the Bible has not stopped to this very day: CE Carlson¹ and Steven Sizer² noted that the Scofield Reference Bible, published by Oxford University Press, calls for the
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www.whtt.org/articles/02080.htm
² http://virginiawater.org.uk/christchurch
adoration of Israel in a more explicit way with each new edition being published: “With limitless advertising and promotion, it became the best-selling ‘bible’ in America and has remained so for 90 years. Scofield chose not to change the text of the King James Edition. Instead, he added hundreds of easy-to-read footnotes at the bottom of about half of the pages, and his notes weave parts of the Old and New Testaments together as though they were written at the same time by the same people”. The first edition was arranged and financed by “Samuel Untermeyer, a New York lawyer whose firm still exists today and one of the wealthiest and most powerful Zionists in America”. This Zionist edition of the OT explains a lot of the strange phenomenon of Christian Zionism.

The Early Christians decided to put the OT far away (the Church forbade laymen to read it) but not too far. They relied upon St Paul (and later St Augustine) that there is a way to re-interpret the OT in the Christian spirit. It is true, Mein Kampf can be re-interpreted as a Zionist text, and it was actually done by some Zionist Nazi anti-semites from Adolf Eichmann to Donald Pauly, but I shall be the first to admit that this is a forced interpretation. It would be better to restore the Palestinian reading of the OT, but it could not be done easily in the reality of the ideological struggle for the souls of Jews, against the Pharisee (and their heirs, Tannaim) establishment.

The great Russian historian Leon Gumilev¹ asserted that the OT remained as a latent part of Christian tradition for historic reasons: in the First-to-Fourth-Centuries’ ideological warfare between Orthodoxy and Gnosticism, the OT was used by the Church Fathers as a handy weapon against some esoteric concepts of the Gnostics. The unbridled Gnostics considered the Material world to be evil, and were able to conceptualise the world as a place as hostile to people as was the world of the defeated Jewish paradigm. Indeed, the late resurrections of Gnosticism (Albigensian, Manichaean, and Cathari heresies) proved its social danger. The teaching of an Evil World would effectively extinguish all life on the planet.

However, the sharp sword of the OT did not want to sleep in its sheath. The massive import of Old Testament ideas by Protestants revitalised the submerged Jewish paradigm and

¹ Rf Lev Gumilev, Russia and the Great Steppe
brought in the extermination of Native Americans, “the Canaanites of the New Promised Land of the New Chosen People”, and eventually the Rise of the Jews to their present pre-eminence in American (and through it, in Western) discourse.

(Here is the place to explain that ‘Jew’ for this author is an ideological and metaphysical construct, an abbreviation of “an adept of the Jewish paradigm”. Nobody has to be a Jew, or indeed a Cathar, or a Dialectical Materialist. The term has no racial meaning, despite the deep inherent racism of the bearers of the Jewish paradigm. A racist-nationalist derivation of a ‘Jew’ is Zionist, for Zionists concentrate their attention on the actual historical Jewish People and believe in their unique Chosen-ness. The Universalist derivative of ‘Jew’ is ‘Mammonite’, for Mammonites accept and universalise outwardly aspects of the Jewish paradigm. An ‘absolute Jew’ is a Zionist (for himself and other Jews) and a Mammonite (towards non-Jews). A non-Jew can be (a mistakenly altruistic) Zionist, or (an egoistic) Mammonite, but by embracing both concepts he turns into a ‘neo-Jew’, like Conrad Black, the owner of the bulk of British media. A ‘perfect Christian’ is the antithesis of an ‘absolute Jew’, for he denies both the ‘divine right’ of Jews to suppress non-Jews (in Palestine and elsewhere), and Mammonite egoism towards his neighbour. A ‘perfect Christian’ is anti-Zionist, for actual historical Jews are his dear potential brothers-in-Christ, who should be enlightened, not isolated and locked far away. (That is why racist antisemites are not ‘perfect Christians’) A ‘perfect Christian’ is anti-Mammonite, for he treats everybody as his neighbour. (That is why neo-liberals are not ‘perfect Christians’).

In America, with its predominance of Jews in discourse, ‘perfectly Christian’ ideas are blocked and do not enter the discourse, while ‘partly-Jewish’ ideas pass through the sieve of the Jewish editors and professors. Thus, the ideas of von Hayek, Popper and Soros that conform to the outwardly Jewish paradigm are amplified and made central. Its American counterpart is Objectivism, the philosophy of Ayn Rand, an American best-selling (voluminous novels Atlas Shrugged and The Fountainhead) guru writer, and its religious offshoot, Californian Satanism, as outlined in The Satanic Bible by Anton LaVey, nee Levy, a Zionist-turned-Satanist. Their sites are

1 For instance, http://www.slip.net/~wolf/vad/satan/cos/ayn_rand.txt
full of praise of Israel and Zionism, and, yes, of Satan. Among their adepts was President Ronald Reagan, for this form of Satanism is the religion of Neo-Liberalism: get what you can, do not care for the ‘other’; the Chosen are those that ‘have’, while the have-nots are damned sinners. It explains the Americans’ fear of being a ‘loser’, for a loser is a sinner in the world of predestination.

Thus the Jewish sieve in the media ushers in openly satanic themes. The following excerpt illuminates the point: Madonna’s manager, who was thinking of signing up Marilyn Manson, called Manson’s manager to inquire about whether the rocker had a swastika among his many tattoos. “Of course not,” said Manson’s manager. “One of the guys in the band is Jewish.” “Oh, OK,” said Madonna’s manager. “We don’t have a problem with Satanism, but we can’t deal with any kind of Nazism.”

“Now he insinuates that Jews have a demonic nature!” – fumes my Jewish reader. Well, demonic as in the ‘Maxwell demon’? The Scottish physicist James Clerk Maxwell built a thermodynamic model of a box with a tiny door operated by a demon. The demon lets in fast molecules and lets out slow molecules. Thus the box can be heated to any temperature even in coldest atmosphere. In a similar way, Jews let into discourse “good for Jews” items and try to block the “bad for Jews” items. “It is done by all communities”, objects my reader. Not really. A writer may depict a bad Englishman or American, Arab (any day!) or Muslim, and he will never receive a single letter of objection. A writer may present a

---

1 Leah Garchik, “Oh, the romance of it,” San Francisco Chronicle, November 7, 2002
2 hypothetical intelligent being (or a functionally equivalent device) capable of detecting and reacting to the motions of individual molecules. It was imagined by James Clerk Maxwell in 1871, to illustrate the possibility of violating the second law of thermodynamics. Essentially, this law states that heat does not naturally flow from a cool body to a warmer; work must be expended to make it do so. Maxwell envisioned two vessels containing gas at equal temperatures and joined by a small hole. The hole could be opened or closed at will by “a being” to allow individual molecules of gas to pass through. By passing only fast-moving molecules from vessel A to vessel B and only slow-moving ones from B to A, the demon would bring about an effective flow from A to B of molecular kinetic energy. This excess energy in B would be usable to perform work (e.g., by generating steam), and the system could be a working perpetual motion machine. By allowing all molecules to pass only from A to B, an even more readily useful difference in pressure would be created between the two vessels. About 1950 the French physicist Léon Brillouin exorcised the demon by demonstrating that the decrease in entropy resulting from the demon’s actions would be exceeded by the increase in entropy in choosing between the fast and slow molecules. (EB)
homosexual priest, and he will never receive a letter saying “Not every priest is homosexual” or demanding to “offset the bias” by showing a saintly priest.

But every negative depiction of a Jew will run into a Maxwell demon. Dickens portrayed Fagin, the repulsive gang operator, in his *Oliver Twist*, and came under barrage with letters and questions of the “not every Jew is a Fagin” sort. Dickens never claimed this, but he was forced to apologise to Jews at every lecture he made in America. It taught him a lesson, and he refrained from showing Jews of less than saintly qualities.

Since then, it is a rare author who dares to introduce a negative Jewish character in his book. Le Carre managed to write a book, *Single and Single*, about the dismantling of the Soviet Union and the mass theft of Russian communal property without a single Jew in it. This is like describing the Mafia without mentioning Italians.

Alexander Solzhenitsyn encountered this problem, as in his books there are complex Jewish figures. They are KGB officers, informers, and the top of prison administration. None is demonised, but none is made a saint, either. He was immediately attacked and offered a way out: to introduce a main character, a “noble, strong and daring Jew”. He ignored the advice.

Thus the world we live in was created. Like the box managed by the Maxwell demon, it is “overheated”, for the critique of Jews is removed. There are bad guys of all persuasions in the fiction and in the media, but hardly any Jews. “Jews are like everybody else”, my good Jewish friends would say often. But in the mirror of the discourse, the Jews are usually saints or martyrs. In order to normalise the discourse, to save Palestine and the Middle East, to save the remnants of Christianity in the West, the Maxwell demon should be removed.

The Jews in the media are unable to permit critique of Jews, be it of the media lords or of Israel, or of the evil neo-cons. The sieve they form is about to cause the ‘framing’ of Christ and Christians for Zionists’ crimes. Sacked Baghdad is still reeling after the strike, and already the Left-wing Zionist Saul Landau has published an article subtitled “Shop, Go to Church, Support Bush's War”. Thus

---

2 ‘The Last Days of Born-Again History’ on CounterPunch site
the most anti-Christian regime of Bush and Wolfowitz is misrepresented as a manifestation of Christianity.

Jeffrey Blankfort (a strong and principled anti-Zionist voice, and a good proof that a descendent of Jews does not have to adhere to the Jewish paradigm) noted: “Landau mentions not a word about the role of the Jewish neo-cons or Israel's urging of the US to pursue the war on Iraq, pushing the onus on to the Born-Again Christians.”

This brings us back to the Fifth Element of Luc Besson, for in the movie as in real life, Zog is not an independent force. A slave of Mammon, a servant of the Shadow, he is helping the Dark force fulfil its metaphysical task, to blot out the Light of Christ and to turn our world into a Godless desert. That is why he sends bulldozers to wipe out flowers in Palestine, sends troops to sack Baghdad and Damascus, threatens Paris and Moscow, perverts Christianity.

Is there a remote chance to save the world from the Shadow? One feels that the rule of King Zog is as secure in Washington as it was in pre-war Albania, as secure as the rule of King Macbeth in his Scotland, for no ordinary man can defeat him. But on Palm Sunday I walked down the Mount of Olives from Bethpage, where Our Lord (not an ordinary man) mounted the donkey, to the Lions' Gate of Jerusalem, in the midst of a huge procession of all denominations, for miraculously, the great Churches of the East and the West decided to celebrate Easter in Palestine together.

This had an all-important message, for the Orthodox Church puts emphasis on Christ the God, while the Latin Church emphasizes Christ the Man, as our Muslim brothers praise the Holy Spirit of God, and all of us are united in love for the beautiful Land of Palestine and Her Lady. So we walked, city folk of Jerusalem and Nazareth, Bethlehem and Jaffa, peasants from Taybeh and Abboud, and nuns and monks and priests, waving palm branches and calling Hosanna, and it looked like Birnham Wood coming to Dunsinane . . .

1 Blankfort also mentions: “Israel has always been Landau's weak point as it has to most, but happily not all, Jewish leftists. Twenty years ago he wrote that the two old Palestinian women who were shown (in a documentary) crying for their destroyed homes and the killing of their loved ones in Gaza did not seem genuine. I wonder what he would say if someone wrote that about Jewish survivors of the WW2 Jewish Holocaust?”
The Sword of St Michael

In The Dune, a visionary film that predicted the US invasion of the Middle East, the spiritual leader of the Resistance is asked:

– Will we ever have peace?
– We’ll have victory, – he replied.

Indeed, the invader may relent and seek for peace; an attacked must seek victory until the invader will seek peace. Thus, during the Vietnam War, good Americans demanded ‘peace’, but people of Vietnam and their supporters elsewhere sought to defeat the invader. The rule is often forgotten by modern proponents of pacifism and non-violence. They preach non-violence to the oppressed as the panacea for their troubles. Not surprisingly, non-violence gets very good media coverage and is supplied for downtrodden in great abundance.

The Holy Land received recently a grandson of Mahatma Gandhi who went teaching non-violence to the Palestinians in Ramallah. Good idea, wrong place: non-violence is the daily bread of vast majority of Palestinians, while their ‘violence of the oppressed’ is a rare and precious thing; without it, non-violence has no meaning. The lion’s share of violence is done by the Jewish state, though it is often “suspended violence”, as an Israeli philosopher and a friend of Palestine, Adi Ophir, has called it — violence suspended as the Damocles sword, as a suspended sentence ready to uncoil any moment. Pacifiers leave the suspended violence in place; that is why instead of seeking peace we may seek victory.
What is more annoying is an attempt to establish non-violence as the only acceptable way, as a religiously orthodox norm of dissent. “Nothing justifies violence”, or “Two wrongs do not make a right” – one hears these pseudo-wisdom cracks daily. It is not true from any point of view; even from the highest moral ground: violence is justified and commanded in order to save another person’s life and dignity. A saintly man may follow the Sermon of the Mount advice to the dot and turn his right cheek to be slapped; but he may not pass by a rapist or a murderer at his vile deed and leave him unchecked. He must kill him, if there is no other way to stop the murderer. We are free to give up our life and dignity, but we have a duty to defend others. Equally, justice is “doing wrong” by imprisoning, fining or executing a man for he did “wrong” by murder or rape; in such a way “two wrongs make one right”, indeed.

This simple rule is sometimes forgotten, often intentionally, by non-violence preachers. In an Internet discussion, a pacific Indian-Canadian, Ardeshir Mehta claimed that: “One can be a Christian, or one can advocate violence, but one can’t be both.” He was neither, but words of Christ are often quoted with the same ease Nietzsche quoted Zarathustra. The radical South African, Joh Domingo retorted: “Do I justify Palestinian violence? No, I support it”.

Is violent resistance wrong and non-Christian act? This question brought to my mind a picture I have seen in Medina del Campo, a small Castilian town that hosted an exhibition in memory of Isabella la Catolica, the Queen of Columbus and Granada. The picture by her contemporary El Maestro de Zafra (Alejo Fernandez) was one of the most striking and impressive of the art of his period, of any period, period. In the midst of an Apocalyptic battle, amongst saints and angels, devils and dragons, on the deep blue background, shone a handsome, calm, serene countenance of St Michael with raised sword in one hand and the embossed shield in the other. A visage of supreme beauty, somewhat androgynous as angels are, the serene St Michael knew no hate; fury clouded not his calm blue eyes; anger furrowed not his brow crowned with cross; but his sword was not a toy, and it was raised to smite.

Tucked away in a deep valley lies the Palestinian village of En Karim, where red and purple bunches of bougainvillea embrace its
delightful Visitation Church, which marks the meeting of the two expecting mothers. In its second storey, there is a big painting of the Lepanto maritime battle, with the Virgin as the battle spirit, the Commander of the Celestial Army and the Defender of Faith, akin to the St Michael of Castilians, to Nike of Greeks and to Valkyries of the North; a manifestation of Christ, who said, “I’ve brought you not peace but sword”, the sword of St Michael.

The Christian faith contains seemingly contradictory ideas; this is one of its unique qualities. It includes the example of St Francis of Assisi who considered it his best pleasure to be humiliated and thrown into snow. But it also includes the risen sword of St Michael. These two opposites are harmonised by our love to God and to our fellow human being. This love can cause us to give everything including our life, and it can cause us to take life, as well.

As our friend and philosopher Michael Neumann eloquently stated,

“Christianity is a religion of love, but not of cloying, hippy-dippy love. The repentant sinner is loved. The sinner persisting in sin is abhorred, but receives God’s love if or when he receives the grace to repent. Think of Tertullian: what we learn on Judgement Day is who, in the end, is hated. We must always love our enemies, but not the enemies of God.”

Too often, non-violence grows not out of humility and self-sacrifice, but out of self-preservation and fear; fear of supporting the right side in the war. It is easier to be “against wars and violence” in general than it is to stand against an aggressor and invader, especially if your country happens to be the aggressor and invader.

Thus, in Italy, Communist leader Fausto Bertinotti has proclaimed that he is “against the Iraqi War for he is a pacifist and against wars in general”. After such a statement, he had no reason to demand the return home of Italian soldiers. And he did not. What a change for a party that had once taught the ringing words of that great rebel, Chairman Mao, “Power grows out of the barrel of a gun”!

True, the Italians have found themselves in a tight corner. For the second time in the last sixty years their country has chosen a wrong partner — two times too many! Sixty years ago, young Italian
soldiers went with Hitler to Stalingrad; today, their sons and grandchildren proceed with Bush to Baghdad. Still, then as now, a painful duty of an Italian man of conscience is to wish the speedy victory to the people who shoot at Italian troops, be it Russian soldiers on Volga River or Iraqi resistance fighters on Euphrates.

Some wars are silly; nobody knows why the WWI was fought – there was not even a Helen to be brought home from the banks of Spree River. In such a war, one should not fight. But in this war we have a right and a wrong side, and we are duty bound to support right against wrong.

Regarding the Third World War waged in Palestine, Iraq, Afghanistan and elsewhere, it is not enough to be “against the war” and preach non-violence “to both sides”. One has to give full moral support to the fighters who resist the invader just as the Russians resisted the German and Italian aggression in WWII. In the same way, good Americans supported the Viet Cong against their own army; and good French – like our friends Ginette Scandran and Serge Thion – supported the Algerian resistance. Pacifism offers a coward’s escape from facing moral choice.

The moral record of pacifism is far from perfect. Many readers have heard of a wartime American book by a Dr. Kaufman who proposed to sterilise the Germans to get rid of the war drive. The German propaganda ministry reprinted this book by the millions to steel the spirit of their fighters and to remind them that they were defending not only their Fatherland but their Fatherhood as well. Not many people know that the same Dr. Kaufman proposed to sterilise Americans, too – he was a convinced pacifist and thought there was nothing like mass sterilisation to bring universal peace.

Another great pacifist, Lord Bertrand Russell, advocated nuking Soviet Russia in order to bring peace. Father of non-violence Mahatma Gandhi advised the Jews to commit mass suicide to shame their Nazi oppressors, while his political career ended with one of the biggest massacres in human history. In short, pacifism is a quirky, doubtful and unsuccessful idea.

In the past, the enemies of Christ tried to convince Christians (in my view Muslims are Christians too, for they believe that Jesus is Christ) to accept non-violence and pacifism by various sophisms. The entertaining (if anti-Christian-to-extreme) Judaic best-seller
of the fourth century, *Toledot Yeshu*, tells us of a cunning Jew who came to the first Christians and told them he was sent by Christ. He indoctrinated them (the book says) in the name of Jesus:

“Christ suffered in Jewish hands, but he did not resist. Likewise you should suffer whatever Jews do to you and not cause them any damage just like Jesus. If a Jew demands that you walk a mile, walk even two miles; if a Jew hurts you, do not hurt him back. If a Jew strikes your right cheek, offer him your left cheek out of your love to Jesus and do not cause Jews any trouble, big or small. If a Jew insults you, do not punish him but tell him: ‘It is your arrogance that speaks;’ and let him go freely. If you want to be with Jesus in the Better World, you should suffer all the evil caused to you by Jews and repay them with good deeds and mercy”.

We do not know whether such an indoctrination attempt ever took place in the murky years preceding Constantine’s conversion, but if such an attempt was made, it failed profoundly as many an insolent Jew learned to his peril. It is not that Christians forgot the words of Jesus (his pacific message did not relate to Jews in particular), but the Christian faith is not a collection of his sayings; it is manifested in the living body of the church, in her doctrine and praxis, and it includes the flowers of St Francis and the sword of St Michael.

The society, like everything in the universe, is in the best state when there is a balance between the yin (the passive, female principle) and yang (the active, masculine principle). Christendom was powerful when its yang was strong. Then, the church blessed many warriors and was blessed by them. St George the Dragon Slayer and St Joan of Arc wielded sword. The Western Church knew Knights Templar and St John’s, and the Eastern Church venerates St Alexander Nevsky who defeated the Germans and St Sergius who prayed for victory over the Tartars. For war may have a spiritual meaning; and we may acknowledge that “war is a possible ascetical and immortalising path”, as Julius Evola summed up the medieval Christian tradition. Our Muslim brothers implied it by their double concept of a Minor Jihad (war for faith against the oppressor) and the Major Jihad (war for faith in the soul of man).
Now yin element won over the spirit of the west, while its natural un-subdued yang parted with harmony. The Peace movement is dominated by women, and it is not a coincidence. In his article *Little Old Ladies for Peace*, the reviewer of the *Pardes*, Owen Owens notes the makeup of the Peace Camp crowd as “female, old and short”. For sure they are blessed, but their prevalence is a sign of misbalance. Beside the Yin Peace Movement, there is — or there should be — the Yang Victory Movement. They, the fighters with AK machineguns cautiously treading the narrow streets of Nablus or Faluja, the French farmers of Bove crushing McDonalds with their bulldozers, the demonstrators of Seattle and Genoa, partisans of Che Guevara and rebels of Mishima are the latter day Christ warriors, holding out against the ultimate anti-Christian force in the history of Christendom. Hail the warriors; hang not on their shooting arm. Maybe we won’t have peace; but we’ll have victory.
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*Israel Adam Shamir*
The Shamir Legend
By Ratibor Petrushkin (Zavtra 20/06/2003)

For a few years of Israel Shamir's publications in Zavtra, the newspaper has received over ten kilograms of letters and megabytes of email carefully and convincingly showing in diverse non-contradictory ways and in sundry languages that such a person doesn't and cannot exist. Altogether they produced some 27 reasons against Shamir's existence. There were deconstructions and refutations, subtle sophisms, proofs to the contrary, fact comparison analysis, content deconstruction, oaths and denunciations, exposes and requests to confess the truth.

These tangible letters with stamps and return addresses made us think that their writers are real live persons whose existence can't be doubted. That is why we began to doubt Shamir's existence. The more letters we received, the more our doubts grew. Perhaps it is our Chief Editor Prochanov who writes all these anti-Israeli articles under Shamir's name, as hundreds of our respondents claimed? A Jew can't write like that about the Jews. Or can he?

Some factors only enhanced the confusion. First, the incredibly broad range of interests of the author called 'Israel Shamir'. It was shockingly, overwhelmingly extensive; one had to be enraptured with his learning or otherwise consider a version of a collective using this name. Indeed, Shamir is all over the place: he translates Joyce and Homer, lives in Japan, works at BBC, fights Arabs and Soviet secret services; he is a Zionist and anti-Semite; a socialist and a Talmud scholar: It is too much of erudition for one man!

Time and again, Israel Shamir would appear at the Zavtra office and cause even more disturbing questions by his appearance. Aged, but wiry, feline, but weary, tanned like a black, and curly-
haired in the same way, tenacious and contemplative at once, witty and profound, similar to Prochanov and dissimilar, he drinks his vodka with cucumber, speaks faultless Russian, but with a Jewish intonation; smiles guiltily somewhat for not being sure what is he. When I first saw him I took him for a Cuban. Once I asked him hesitantly 'Are you Shamir?' — 'Yes!' — he replied; but my doubts just increased. To dispel my doubts, I searched out his biography. It can be found at the "First unofficial Russian site of Israel Shamir"; an official site does not exist. Here it is:

"Guide, translator, journalist and writer, Shamir was born in Novosibirsk in 1947. He graduated from the elite High School of Physics and Mathematics in Academgorodok, read math in Novosibirsk University and law at Sverdlovsk Law School. Still a student, he befriended dissidents. While at Law School he wrote a Bill of rights and liberties of man in the USSR, and was expelled from the school for this work. This only strengthened his will to sacrifice his life for a just cause. In the late '60s, Shamir met Zionists in Moscow (who highly valued Shamir's experience in samizdat (free media) and his conspiratorial abilities), and he became active in the Zionist movement. In 1968 he protested against Soviet aggression in Czechoslovakia and soon emigrated to Israel where he served in the elite paratrooper unit and took part in the 1973 war. After the war he continued his studies of law at the Hebrew university of Jerusalem. However, fate meant that his career as a lawyer would be abandoned, but he fully realised his potential as a journalist and writer.

Israel Shamir cut his teeth as a journalist at Israeli radio. Afterwards, as a freelance writer he often went to 'hot spots' such as Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia. In 1975 moved to London and joined the BBC. In 1977-79 he lived in Japan being invited by Japanese radio...

Already in 1970s Israel Shamir grew disillusioned with Zionism because of the discrimination of non-Jews in Israel. The Jewish state reminded him of Stalinist Russia and rekindled the fire of protest. That is why, returning to Israel in 1980, Shamir became active in politics. He worked as press secretary for the Israeli Socialist party (Mapam) and wrote for Ha'aretz. He translated Agnon (Nobel laureate) and Ulysses by Joyce. His best known work is Sosna i Oliva (Pine and Olive), a historical work on Palestine and the Arab-Israeli conflict published in 1988. In this
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book he sharply condemns the Israeli aggressive and criminal policies towards the Palestinians. In 1989-93 he returned to Russia as a Ha'aretz correspondent. At first he was enchanted with perestroika, but the real perestroika foreign policy worried him because of its strong pro-American tendency. At that time he wrote his notorious and controversial articles in Pravda, Nash Sovremennik, Den and Zavtra (under the pen name Robert David), arguing that Soviet foreign policy was the best possible policy for the Soviet Union and for the Third World. He condemned Yeltsin and his circle for shelling the Russian parliament and called this action 'illegitimate and illegal'.

Soon, thanks to recommendations of two extremely different writers, Lev Anninsky (left) and Stanislav Kunyaev (right), Shamir joined the prestigious Russian Writers' union. In 1993 he returned to Israel and settled in Jaffa. In addition to his many articles for Israeli and Russian newspapers, he translated the classic Homer's Odyssey, which was published in 2000 in St Petersburg. His next big project was (is?) a translation of a 15th century Talmudic manuscript into English. In his most recent articles, Israel Shamir criticizes the Israeli left and their "Two States' solution" (the partition of Palestine into an Arab and a Jewish states)."

End of the biography from the unofficial site.

At the beginning of the 20th c, such a fiery Jew could have existed; we can imagine him at that time: his thirst for greatness, dreams of a real life and heroic death; escape from a boring shtetl to the capital city, to the revolutionary circles, into human turmoil; the wind of revolution beat hot on his tempestuous, curly head; calumnies, pursuit, exile; decisive battles and victories; grandiose plans of both heaven on earth and world conflagration; decrees and meetings, wild exertions at work; early frictions, disagreements, resignation; challenge issued and terrible death — or reconciliation and a long peaceful old age somewhere on the shores of the Amur River among hills so beautiful in September... But such a life today? Impossible. This bio just raises more questions.

And it is the writings of this author that create the most confusion. Russians often criticise Russia, and readers explain their position by Russia's wrongs or by non-Russian soul of the Russian critics. But when a Jew steeped in the Bible and Talmud criticises not only the state of Israel but the very concept of 'the Jewish People',
the familiar world around us collapses and the situation requires immediate re-interpretation.

The word "traitor" is the most frequent one in the pile of letters whose authors, using strict rules of logic, simultaneously argued Shamir’s betrayal of the Jewish cause AND the impossibility of his existence as a person. They hated someone who, in their opinion, never existed. But that is the simplest interpretation.

Of course, in history and literature, we know such instances – the blind Borges in his Story of a Warrior and a Captive convincingly argues of "the obscure heart’s desire overriding any reasons" and of stupendous difference between treason and revelation, between a turncoat and a new adept. But in Shamir’s case, it is not treason because it is not clear who is the real traitor – Shamir, the state of Israel or world Jewry.

From philosophy courses, we all know the sophism about the Cretan stating that all Cretans are liars. Not every student could extricate himself from this vicious circle. Shamir’s texts manifest that a Jewish state is a misnomer, while 'the Jewish people' is not a reality, but an imagined idea. Shamir’s presence in the world elevates this hypothesis to the status of proven theorem. If a non-Jew wrote this he would be a liar. But if a Jew writes it, then Israel the State is based on a lie and the Jews as we know them don’t exist. So we have a difficult choice: either Shamir or Israel doesn’t exist, and who knows who will win. If one accepts existence of Israel the Man one has to doubt existence of Israel the State.

Or maybe Shamir is the only really existing Jew nowadays, and Berezovsky, Soros, Wolfowitz and Rabinovich: well, it’s not at all clear WHO they are. Maybe the real state of Israel is trying to manifest itself in the world through such a person as Shamir, and the likes of Sharon are only getting in the way? Maybe Jews do not exist, and Shamir, after proving this, at a given moment, is already dissolving forever into the ringing Palestinian heat. Shamir himself can’t reply whether he is real or not. More likely he’ll agree that he doesn’t exist, and will repeat the words of Joyce: I am not I, since all my molecules have changed.
Reviews of Israel Shamir’s writing:

One of the great writers of our day sets out his record of Palestine as it has been – and may be no more.

Peter Myers, Australia

Shamir takes on the big evils of today: globalization, mammonization, zionization of Christianity. Even after reading the Israel Shahak and Norman Finkelstein, I am often jolted by many of Shamir’s insights. I feel that cataracts are being removed from my eyes. These insights can involve shocking reformulations of conventional wisdom, obscure historical knowledge, current statistics, interesting travel anecdotes, quotes from old texts, or almost anything. Nietzsche said that 100 more years of books and the spirit itself will stink. Very true, but Shamir gives the spirit a good airing out. Unfortunately, one bad effect of reading Shamir is that Nietzsche now seems somehow irrelevant and pale.

Professor Patrick McNally, Tokyo

This outrageous Book will shock you . . . or will change your vision of the world...A Jewish genius, Israel Shamir kicks holes through doors. He is the true refusenik. My favourite anti-Semite, Shamir is a must-read for every Jew.

Paul Eisen, London

Maybe the real state of Israel is trying to manifest itself in the world through such a person as Shamir, and the likes of Sharon are only getting in the way?

Zavtra, Moscow
Israel Shamir: A fearless anti-Zionist with Quixote’s sense of justice and resolve.

Daniel McGowan, Deir Yassin Remembered

Israel Shamir writes with the heart of a poet, and the uncorrupted perception of the child who is able to cry out, ‘The Emperor has no clothes!’ Many writers on current events are worth reading, but I know of none who can be re-read as often as can Israel Shamir, with reawakened admiration each time for his skill, and renewed gratitude for his service to truth.

Lubomyr Prytulak, Ukrainian Archive

A brilliant storyteller with a vast knowledge of history, Shamir discusses current events and their global implications with brutal honesty and tenderness. Israel Shamir’s clarity of insight and lyrical use of language to illustrate social, religious and political complexities make him the Khalil Gibran of our time. His essays portray the peaceful, pastoral landscape of the Holy Land and the humanity of its inhabitants, juxtaposed against the ugliness and inhumanity of Jewish racism. Shamir strives to free Gentiles from both fear and adoration of Jews. He demystifies the threat of “anti-Semitism” as a control mechanism to keep good Jews from confronting the Jewish leaders responsible for promoting war and policies of economic inequality. He dreams of a world where the descendants of Jews and Palestinians will be able to live as equals, intermarry, and create a new race of people. Israel Shamir’s proposal is consistent with Islamic tradition and is the only viable option for a lasting peace in the Middle East.

Karin M. Friedemann, Editor World View News Service
The American Journal of Islamic Social Sciences

Shamir, who does not get much mention in the "respectable" press, seems to me a noble spirit and a penetrating analyst of the world scene today. His love of Christ, of the Holy Land, of the Palestinians, and indeed of his fellow Jews, shines in his writing. I shall be interested to see if my notion of him as a giant of world literature and as a paradigm of virtuous political protest, holds up in the years ahead. My guess is it will. For my part I take heart from the assurance of this Jew, Shamir, that our common enemy is not the Jew, or Jews, but "the spirit of Judaic supremacy."

Tom White, Culture Wars Magazine
Israel Shamir has a wonderful talent as a writer, and I do not mean simply a certain writing skill, but in a much deeper sense, Shamir writes with a real flame; it warms, it shines, it burns. His subject is Palestine, a land that he first saw as an Israeli soldier, and then fell in love with; he shows us the land of Israel, he shows us the land of Palestine, or are they one and the same? Tragic, as what was there was Paradise; a land of gentle streams, olive trees, orange orchards, plots of thyme, managed by a hospitable people whose roots date back to Biblical times. It takes not just genius to describe this, it takes compassion, and Shamir treats his subject as Glenn Gould would treat his piano. We hear pain, we hear beauty, we hear a cry for help; it is not an anodyne work of intellectual description, but a soulful outpouring, with the depth of research adding that dimension to his work that so many zealots lack: credibility. He footnotes his words and chooses them carefully, so that they flow together in a well developed fugue, rising above the crescendo of the mere diatribe that is so common today; this is no mere recital, it is a well-tempered set of short studies, complex in their counterpoint and focused in their harmony.

Kenyon Gibson
Author, Common Sense: A Study of the Bushes

It was only thru the accidental access to the writings of the prophetic and eloquent Jewish dissident Israel Shamir that I learned the deep, true and historically connected story of Palestine. And why in the words of John Pilger: Palestine Is Still the Issue. Why that is so may be summed up in this quote from Shamir: "Israel/Palestine is the model of the world Americans want to achieve. It has peasants and their flocks dying of thirst, and on the hilltop there are villas and swimming pools for the chosen folk. It has a huge army and it has many labourers without any rights. In order to turn all the world into Palestine they began now World War 3 against the Third World."

To the leftist's assignment of Christian ideology as the pervading force behind current aggressive Americans military policy and to the general intellectuals' rejection of religious content as anything but "external" to reality, the wonderful Hebrew Prophet Israel Shamir poses a widely divergent alternative scenario.

Owen Owens, a Ruskin scholar
Make no mistake: were Shamir's articles read only for the qualities that they share with other fine political comment, they would be invaluable. Shamir's capacities for rigorous analysis, for dredging up neglected, uncomfortable facts, for getting to the scene of the action and observing it with clear eyes, take a back seat to none. Some have discovered this to their cost: he is a formidable polemicist as well. Yet these are not the qualities that make Shamir's thinking and writing uniquely precious. It is rather his almost personal relationship to literature, history, and geography that makes one feel, reading his essays, a sense of revelation.

This manifests itself in several ways. First, people are never cardboard cutouts for Shamir: Palestinian, Norwegian, Malaysian, he takes them seriously. They are not idiots; they are not pathetic victims; they are not specimens. Their opinions, and their ways of looking at the world, matter to him. Shamir seems incapable of condescension. Second, Shamir sees beauty in the land of Palestine; he loves it deeply. No one evokes its landscape and history as he does. Through his eyes the stubborn, bitter, resistance of the Palestinians is more than understood; it is felt. Finally, Shamir does not rest with self-satisfied moral condemnation. He is as keen to understand the criminal as the crime: "Sharon and his people are held together by a perverse form of love to the land. It is perverse because they imagine it is possible to love Palestine without Palestinians. But Palestine is not a dead object, it is a live country and Palestinians are her soul." In this and many other passages, we sense almost an informed pity for those whose narrowmindedness complements their cruelty, and this helps prevent us sinking to their level.

Shamir's approach works: you may sometimes come away from his writings unconvinced, but rarely uninspired. Shamir writes, not to glorify himself, but to support us in our best impulses, and even when we disagree, we are pushed to new and better ideas than we had before. Even among his opponents, Shamir sees humanity as well as guilt, in Jew and gentile alike. His real enemy is no race or creed, but mean-spiritedness. It is in this ability to prize humanity, though all the twists and turns of bitter experience and sharp dispute, that Shamir teaches by example his most valuable lesson.

Prof Michael Neumann, Trent
Israel Shamir dares to speak the truth before the modern Leviathan: Monster Mendacity. His essays wound the beast, and rectify the vision of those swimming away from perfidious power and towards the shores of peace, from Haifa to Havana.

Prof. Julio Pino

Israel Shamir is the most incredible man I ever met. Next to Israel Shamir, Norman Finkelstein and his Holocaust Industry is a tale for children. Reading him, one believes for a moment that St Paul was right when he said there is no defence against the truth. The story of David and Goliath would not suffice to illustrate the combat of Israel Shamir — It makes think of an ant tackling the largest monsters having ever traversed the surface of the Earth.

Manfred-Christian Stricker, Strasbourg

Flowers of Galilee was a mental journey through the hills and hearts of Palestine. I was pleasantly surprised to know how eloquently you described how to fall in love with the land and the people. As a Palestinian living in America, it was always hard for me to explain our love for the land that has no similar anywhere in the world! You succeeded in making me laugh, cry and smell the oregano za’tar all at the same time! At the conclusion of the book, I turned to my wife and said, Adam Shamir earned the right of my brotherhood as a Palestinian. Peace will come, not by the two state solution, the one state solution, nor the no state solution, but by people who love the land and the people the way you and I do.

Mohammad A. Ismail, a Palestinian in the US

Not only I was moved by your description of the character of the land, that I’ve experienced myself in many visits to follow, I am in awe, yet again, of your ability to bring the emotional dimension with the political "human" solution in such a simple manner. Thank you for reminding me that I am not insane to think that way myself. You’ll never appreciate how uplifting your writings are.

Sana Dabbagh, a Palestinian in the UK