

# PARDES

An etude in Cabbala

**By Israel Shamir**

## **The Road To Suez**

In 1973, my dashing unit of the Red Berets was ferried by chopper into the yellow East Desert of Egypt and landed some 101 km from Cairo. We were given orders to block the Cairo-Suez road, and for two decisive days we held a few small hills opposite the mighty crags of Jabal Attaka, shooting off every advance by the Egyptian tanks and commandos. We were just a hundred men poorly equipped with outdated anti-tank weapons, but the Egyptians thought we had at least division strength. We dug into the hills finding protection in their yellow soil from the powerful salvos of enemy fire; and emerged again when the cannons ceased fire to enable their infantry to flush us out. Eastward-roaring Egyptian tanks came under our fire and stopped to renew the bombardment. We clung to our hill, though we had no water, no time to bury dead comrades. It was hard enough to keep the hungry and scraggy desert dogs from feasting on their swollen purple bodies.

Not one of us, with the possible exception of our commander, understood the logic behind our actions. 'Theirs was not to reason why', soldiers do not fight on need-to know basis. We tried to do our job and survive. Only two days later, when the armoured columns of General Brenn reached us, did we learn of the General Staff plans to cut off the Egyptian Third Army on the East bank of Suez Canal, and to snatch victory from the jaws of defeat. Much later we learned of the man who made it possible – Henry Kissinger, the Jewish U.S. Secretary of State who gave the green light and spread the nuclear umbrella of protection over the Israeli troops<sup>1</sup>. He had told a hesitant Golda Meir to break the Security Council-ordered cease-fire and to complete the encirclement. Only then did our modest action began to fit into a strategy.

In a similar way, a Jew rarely knows or understands what the Jews want from themselves and from bewildered mankind. This lack of understanding causes many fine men and women to proclaim their support (or opposition) to the body politic called 'the Jews'. Being born and raised a Jew does not help at all, just as belonging to the elite troops does not provide you with an understanding of the General Staff plans.

---

<sup>1</sup> US let Israel stretch 1973 truce - documents WASHINGTON, Oct 7 (Reuters) - The United States gave Israel the green light to keep fighting Egypt and Syria after the official time for a cease-fire in the war of October 1973 and even encouraged it to do so, according to U.S. government documents released on Tuesday. "You won't get violent protests from Washington if something happens during the night, while I'm flying," U.S. Secretary of State Henry Kissinger told Israeli Prime Minister Golda Meir at a meeting in Israel on the afternoon of Oct. 22, 1973, a few hours before the deadline for a U.N. cease-fire.

A person of little knowledge is described in the Jewish lore as a ‘tinok shenishba’, ‘a kidnapped child’. A kidnapped Jewish child has no knowledge of Jewish customs, beyond knowing that he belongs to the Jews. Recently, Israeli President Moshe Katzav described non-religious Jews as ‘kidnapped children’, and even religious Jews have a very limited understanding of the Jewish world-organising plans. Many Israelis vented their anger at Katzav’s words, but he was right. Your average ‘Jew’ has very little knowledge and understanding of the subjects we shall be dealing with; it is highly probable he (or she) considers himself a Jew just because his grandparents were Jewish.

Our goal is to understand and explain what ‘the Jews’ want. This task is a hard one, for the Jews have no obvious leaders who create a single strategy, no headquarters or central command. It is hard to swallow that the Jews can have a strategy but no strategist; and the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion* are popular precisely because they posit such a supreme (if obscure) strategist. However, ‘the locusts have no king, yet but they attack in formation’ (Proverbs 30:27) and devastate whole countries as if by plan.

It is possible there are no (or almost no) Jews who fully understand what the Jews want. The term ‘The Jews’, as used in this article, is meant to denote a spiritual persona of higher rank, relating to individual Jews like the Catholic Church is related to an individual Catholic, or a beehive to a bee. Thus, there is no subjective personal guilt associated with individual Jews, unless their specific actions or inaction are criminal or sinful per se. 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.

## **To Be Or Not To Be**

It is my deep conviction that to be or not to be a Jew is an act of free will. A French Jew can be just French, a Russian Jew – just a Russian, a Palestinian Jew – just a Palestinian. No one has to be a Jew, and the magnificent icon of Simone Weil, the little Communist Christian saint of Hitler’s days, is the best proof. She stayed with the workers of Renault, supported Resistance of Charles de Gaulle, and dreamed of defeating not just Nazis, but the whole paradigm of modernity with its fake education, religious indifference and uprooting. She was born into a Jewish family, came to Christ, but avoided full communion with the Church for she felt the Church to be too pro-Jewish<sup>2</sup>. For her, not only the Hebrew prophets, but the Greeks and Galls, Indians and Chinese, Germans and Slavs knew of Christ before He was born.

---

<sup>2</sup> Lettre a un religieux, Gallimard

She rejected the assertion of Christianity's 'Jewish roots', saying that indiscriminate adoption of the Old Testament was rather a 'birth defect' of the Church. Her Christ was close to Dionysus and Attis, while Demeter and Isis were prefigurations of Our Lady. The dreadful deed of Crucifixion could occur only in a place where the Evil dominated over the Good, in her words.

Nor was Simone Weil alone. From St Paul to St Teresa of Avila, from Karl Marx to Leo Trotsky, there were people born into Jewish families who broke with the fold and joined the people they lived amongst. And these people were not just a few, but a vast majority. Out of seven million Jews in the days of St Paul, only a few thousand remained Jewish by the Eighth century; the rest became Palestinians and Italians, French and Egyptians, Christians and Muslims. Millions of 20<sup>th</sup> century Jews and their descendants were also successfully assimilated. Some were received into the Catholic Church like Edith Stein, some into the Orthodox Church like Father Alexander Men, some into Islam like my fellow Israeli, the wonderful Neta Golan; others married outside of the Jewish fold and broke with the Jews.

Marriage outside the community is the ultimate sign of 'crossing the lines'. 'Intermarriage is worse than holocaust', said the Prime Minister of Israel, Golda Meir; while Elliott Abrams, President Bush's director of Middle Eastern affairs at the White House, and Deborah Lipstadt, a professor of Jewish studies at Emory, have argued against marrying with gentiles in order to keep 'the Jewish race' pure. "Deborah Lipstadt, who has written and lectured widely on Holocaust denial, has exhorted Jewish parents to just say no to intermarriage [with non-Jews], much the way they expect their children not to take drugs<sup>3</sup>" Elliott Abrams wrote a book, "Faith or Fear: How Jews Can Survive in Christian America," which criticizes intermarriage as a danger to Jewish survival in America<sup>4</sup>.

Meir and Lipstadt have followed the traditional line of the Jews: the Old Testament glorifies Phineas who killed a Jewish man for having intercourse with a Gentile woman; Ezra banned all Jewish priests who intermarried with native Palestinians; the Talmud compared intermarriage with bestiality, 'for the Gentiles are closer to beasts than to Jews'. In Jewish tradition, a Jewish family is supposed to perform full mourning rites if their son or daughter marries a goy.

Despite these condemnations, men and women of Jewish origin intermarry and consciously break with Jewry. This act is an important test of their readiness to give up particularism and join the people they live amongst. It is, in a way, as conclusive a way out as

---

<sup>3</sup> Embracing the Stranger: Intermarriage and the Future of the American Jewish Community (Basic Books, 1995, p.18), by the Jewish author and educator Ellen Jaffe McClain

<sup>4</sup> <http://www.nytimes.com/2002/12/07/politics/07ABRA.html?ex=1040321027&ei=1&en=67a11e479feac48e>

baptism. Forced conversion of the Spanish Jews in 1492 was perceived by the Spaniards as an act of hypocrisy for the Conversos married only within their own community. The Spaniards were often right: many Marranos (another name for Conversos) went back into Jewry when they left the Spanish domains. And they were accepted, for the Jews knew: the Marranos married only among themselves. Their Christian faith was just a protective colour, a part of Jewish crypsis. Those that married outside, on the other hand, proved the sincerity of their baptism.

The Donme, the Sabbatai Zevi's followers in Turkey, outwardly accepted Islam, but still married only within their community. This peculiar sect played an important role in the tragic developments in Turkey of the early 20<sup>th</sup> century; some Turkish historians connect them with the genocidal expulsion of Armenians, massacres of Greeks in Anatolia and with the anti-traditional policies of Kemal Ataturk. Bearing this cryptic tradition in mind, we understand that intermarriage is an important step, a real break calling for a lot of character, for independence of mind, something for their children to be proud of. For a marriage is akin to communion; intermarriage is always an act of rebellion against Jewry, a break to freedom, a covenant with the native people.

Under normal circumstances, this blessed process would evaporate the Jews in hundred years; but it was stopped and even reversed recently. With the Jews now an elite group, the 'top dog', the children of intermarriage drift back. Others 'discover their Jewish ancestors' just as the Brits 'discovered their Norman origin'. Major candidates for the American Presidency 2004 compete in finding their 'Jewish roots'. General Wesley Clark said he "comes from A long line of rabbis in Minsk"<sup>5</sup>; Hillary Clinton's grandmother married someone named Max Rosenberg, and John Kerry 'learned that both of his paternal grandparents were Jewish' (Kerry was originally Kohn). The children of Howard Dean and a Christian woman of Jewish origin were raised as Jews. Thus all efforts of the previous generation are being undone in our time.

Children of intermarriage often do not understand the iconoclastic action of their parents, and the parents are often hesitant to explain the sacral importance of their deed to their children, who instead of being proud of it, try to reverse it and 'to come back' into the Jewish fold. Their attempt to 'return' is doomed to failure, for such a child can never become a 'full Jew' by the Jewish law. He or she won't be able to marry a Cohen, or actually any 'proper' Jewish family. His position is practically the same as of *mamzer*, a bastard, 'a whore's son'. He will be entitled to support the Jews, to die for the Jews, but not to be buried in a Jewish cemetery. But do not regret it, our part-Jewish and all-human children, for it is not only impossible for you to join the Jews, it is also not to be desired, for Jewry is not a good setup, as we shall try to show in this essay.

---

<sup>5</sup> <http://www.jta.org/story.asp?id=030917-clar>

Indeed, in the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, a child of intermarriage would almost always identify with the native people of his land. But this tendency was counteracted by the narrative of Holocaust, an ideological construct impressing on descendents of Jews a fatalist feeling of ‘no escape’. “It does not matter whether you are a full-blooded Jew or have just a few drops of Jewish blood, whether you are baptised or not – you would still be killed by Hitler’s Nazis. Therefore, stick to Jews and support the Jews” – this is, in brief, the idea promoted by the Jews in order to keep its periphery, the descendents of Jews.

Thus the Jews, as represented by Holocaust ideologists, turned Adolf Hitler and his Nazis into their best ally. It is not a mere coincidence that Lipstadt, obsessed by ‘Jewish purity’, protests critical historical study of the tragic events of the WWII, for the official Holocaust narrative aims to keep Jews as obedient servants of the Jews. It was probably for this same reason that the Jewish bankers provided early support to Hitler and his party on their way to power.

The reality was somewhat different from the fatalist narrative of holocaust ideologists: over 150,000 men of Jewish descent served in Hitler’s army, as documented by a professor of history at American Military University Bryan Mark Rigg<sup>6</sup>; among them there were Admiral Bernhard Rogge who received his Ritterkreuz (Knighthood Cross Award) from Hitler personally, General Johannes Zukertort, Luftwaffe General Helmut Wilberg, Field-marshal Erhard Milch and many others.

Hitler’s ideas of opposing Aryan and Jewish archetypes were drawn to a certain extent on the theories of a brilliant Viennese philosopher, Otto Weininger, who repudiated Jewry and was received into the Lutheran Church. For Otto Weininger, Jewishness was ‘neither a race nor a people nor a recognised creed, but a tendency of the mind’. He wrote: “I am dealing with Judaism, in the platonic sense, as an idea. There is no more an absolute Jew than an absolute Christian. To defeat Judaism, a Jew must first understand himself and war against himself. Only steady resolution, united to the highest self-respect, can free the Jew from Jewishness. Therefore the Jewish question can only be solved individually; every single Jew must try to solve it in his proper person” – by discovering God’s presence in the world, that is Christ.

The man Hitler called his ‘fatherly friend’, a Bavarian poet Dietrich Eckart combined an anti-Judaic line with anti-capitalist thought. He believed the Jewish element is present in all people and nations; it has to be overcome but can’t be totally annihilated<sup>7</sup>. Jewish and Aryan correspond to Ying and Yang opposites, in his view, and some ‘Jewishness’ (egoism) is needed

---

<sup>6</sup> Bryan Mark Rigg, Hitler’s Jewish Soldiers. The Untold Story of Nazi Racial Laws and Men of Jewish Descent in the German Military, <http://www.kansaspress.ku.edu/rightit.html>

<sup>7</sup> Albert Lindemann, Esau’s Tears p 498

for a nation in order to survive. He had great respect for Jews who came to Christ. Hitler dedicated the second volume of *Mein Kampf* to him.

Despite his admiration for Weininger and love of Eckhart, pragmatically minded Hitler preferred, rather than fighting the Judaic approach, to *imitate* it by making 'his own people, the Germans' – the Chosen Folk. This racist attitude caused a sea of suffering to all nations of Europe and ruined the old continent for years to come. Still it is important to remember that a negative reading of Judaism (or Jewishness) is not inherently racist, but can be sublimely ideological and theological.

Anti-Judaic thought lies at the foundation of Christianity and Communism, to mention just two of most important ideologies. The Jews try to present the anti-Judaic line as racism. Though anti-Judaic thought has existed for hundreds of years, the Jews insist on using the name of 'antisemitism', a rather short-lived racial theory of the late 19<sup>th</sup> century. For the antisemite, a Jew has inherent and unchangeable inborn qualities; while *anti-Jewish* thought analyses and fights the Judaic tendency – in art, in theology, in political sciences. But the Jews can't face a reasoned, rational objection to their ideas, and stick to the mantra "It is because of what we are, not of what we do", recently appropriated by President Bush. So it has to be racism.

David Mamet, the Jewish American playwright, noticed a Volvo with a bumper sticker *Israel Out of the Settlements*, a slogan which in his words "could best be translated as *Hook-nosed Jews Die*". Graham Barrett wrote in the Jewish-managed newspaper *The Age*<sup>8</sup>: "the retiring Malaysian Prime Minister takes a parting snipe at the "hook-nosed" Jews who 'rule the world by proxy", a sentiment echoed in other Islamic capitals". Barrett lies: Dr Mahathir did not make the racist remark Barrett attributed to him. Mamet lied, too: the person driving the Volvo with the sticker could just as easily be a man or woman of Jewish origin.

I received an email from a 'Sam Jones' who wrote: "your valiant efforts and writings are appreciated throughout this nation. I deeply share your contempt for the hook-nosed Zionist vermin. Every dirty Jew should be put back into the ovens. Thanks once again for your help in conveying this vital message". His email address was traced to a certain Zionist provocateur, but this information was not needed: 'hook-nosed' is a clear sign of the Jewish effort to turn antizionist or anti-Judaic polemics into racist ones. Indeed, 'Sam Jones' also sent similar emails to other friends of Palestine. Jeff Blankfort, a staunch antizionist of Jewish origin, saw through his game; however, others, like our Gentile friend Harry Clark, got cold feet and disengaged from the discourse.

Indeed, people of Jewish origin are immune to this sort of psychological attack. That is why in the first years of the Soviets, the devoted communists of Jewish origin (Evsekcia, the

---

<sup>8</sup> Melbourne, January 10, 2004 <http://www.theage.com.au/text/articles/2004/01/09/1073437469530.html>

Jewish section) undid Jewry, while kind-hearted Gentiles (Kalinin and Lunacharsky) erred on the philosemitic side. Otto Weininger noted: “The Aryan of good social standing always feels the need to respect the Jew; he is displeased when Jews make revelations about the Jews, and he who does so may expect as few thanks from that quarter as from over-sensitive Jews”. His words are even more relevant now: with the Rise of the Jews, it is the burden of people with Jewish roots to undo Jewry.

For years, there has been an ongoing discussion where “antizionism is antisemitism!” quickly alternates with: “Don't confuse Zionism with Judaism! How dare you, you antisemite!”, - in the words of the witty Michael Neumann. Critics of Israel swear daily that they are not antisemites. While rejecting practically non-existent biological racial antisemitism, that aberrant 19<sup>th</sup> century theory, we may fully embrace the great anti-Judaic tradition of St Paul, Marx, Simone Weil. Antizionism may be anti-Judaic or not, but the Gospel certainly is. Only God is benevolent, while the Jews are perfectly able to act destructively and malevolently towards the world we live in, towards nature and towards non-Jews.

This clear disengagement of anti-Judaic thought from unnatural connection with biological antisemitism is long overdue, for it will return our world to normality. Under attack, Mel Gibson would be able to answer proudly to Foxman and other beasts from ADL: “No, I am not an antisemite, I do not think that Jewishness is an innate quality; otherwise I won't make a film about Jesus Christ. But I am anti-Judaic, just like Christ.” Antizionists will have the luxury of choice, whether to be against Zionism, regarding it an aberrant phenomenon (the view of Rabbi Arik Asherman), or to do the full Monty and reject Zionism as an inherent part of the Judaic paradigm (my view).

Eventually this will revive efforts to counteract and contain the Judaic tendency, first of all by encouraging people of Jewish origin to give it no support. But what is the Judaic tendency and why should it be undone? Jewish exegesis offers four escalating levels of penetrating into the deep meaning of Biblical verses. The four levels are abbreviated as ‘PaRDeS’ (Paradise, or orchard), for *peshat*, or plain reading, and ‘*raz*’, ‘*derash*’ and ‘*sod*’ – the deepest mystic content. We shall follow this scheme to expound the designs of the Jews: while *peshat* deals with money, *raz* attends to discourse, *derash* is the political level and *sod* is the theological plane.

## **The Man Higher Up**

### **(peshat)**

Three thieves, lucky enough to escape their pursuers but broke and despondent, find their ways crossed in a small Midwest town - opens a droll short story *The Man Higher Up* by the American virtuoso of the genre, O.Henry. These men represent three kinds of graft: Bill is a

burglar, Jeff is a cheat, while Alfred sells junk shares. Eventually, Bill robbed a bank and opened a poker room. Jeff spiked cards and cleaned out Bill, 'leaving him a black cat and wanderlust'. But Jeff's joy was short-lived: he invested the profits of his 'business' operations in gold mine shares, only to discover too late that the shares are signed by the CEO A.L. Fredericks, who is nobody but his fellow felon Alfred E. Ricks. Thus, the profits of the burglary went to a businessman and ended up with a speculator, at which point Jeff the cheat exclaimed: Wall Street speculation and burglary ought to be wiped out by law!

This story could be read as a parable of the American fortunes. Bill the Burglar symbolizes the primary acquisition (or 'primitive accumulation, in Marx's terms). The original pioneers killed off the natives and robbed the new continent. They dug for gold and oil, turned prairies into corn fields and remained on the Marlboro billboards as intrepid cowboys. Jeff the Yankee, a typical American businessman, skinned Bill, opened shops and banks, marketed Coca Cola, created oil companies, carpet-bagged the South, turned Latin America into his banana-producing backyard, only to find his money invested with A.L. Fredericks a.k.a. Goldman Sachs, Marc Rich, Michael Milken, Andrew Fastow et al.

In real life as in the short story, A.L. Fredericks had cheated Jeff the Cheat. He took his real dollar and turned it into 'funny money', 'unredeemable, non-interest-bearing promissory notes of the Fed, that are not backed by anything other than the confidence of the credulous', in the words of one Internet wit. For 650 billion dollars issued, the Fed has just 17 billion dollars worth of equity, 'the real cover'. The US has now \$38 trillion of aggregate debt incurred by Alfred in relation to a GDP of \$10 trillion produced by Bill and Jeff. The greatest pyramid of all is built on the same principles as the Albanian pyramid that ruined this small Balkan country a few years ago. Sooner rather than later, Jeff, the American middle class, will feel the pinch of AN approaching crisis that threatens to dwarf 1929. Bill, the American worker, feels it already. The ruination of the American working class and even its middle class is unavoidable, for the incredible riches of the US have disappeared into Alfred's black hole.

Can we try and identify 'Alfred', the Man Higher Up, with greater precision than as simply a 'bad rich man'? Who are the net gainers of the pyramid? A new national study<sup>9</sup> by Lisa Keister, associate professor of sociology at Ohio State University, says that 'the wealth (or median net worth) of Jewish people in the US is \$150,890, more than three times the average wealth of Americans (\$48,200). (In comparison, in 1956 the median net worth of a Jew was just below average). The wealth of conservative Protestants (Bill of the story) is \$26,200, or about half the overall average. The wealth of mainstream Protestants and Catholics (Jeff in the story) is about the average for the whole sample. Thus, the Jew has three times more wealth than the

---

<sup>9</sup> (<http://www.osu.edu/researchnews/archive/rejgw1th.htm>)

much-maligned Jeff the WASP, and six times more wealth than even more despised Bill the Redneck.

‘What parcels out the world is the fact of belonging or not belonging to a given species. The cause is the consequence; you are rich because you are a Jew, you are a Jew because you are rich’, in the ringing words of a prominent Marxist scholar of colonialism, Frantz Fanon (*mutatis mutandis*: he spoke of ‘whites’ in the colonial reality of Africa).

Lenni Brenner, the Trotskyite author of the book *Jews in America*<sup>10</sup> wrote recently: “Why then is the Zionist lobby so powerful when their own scholars write endlessly about the alienation of their youth from the movement? The answer is simple: the Jews are the richest ethnic or religious stratum in the US. Because their standard of living is so high, they are the most educated. Because they are the most educated, they are the most scientifically oriented, hence most inclined towards atheism or religious scepticism. But the true believer minority still has an unbelievable amount of money to throw at the politicians.”

Keister found that full “one-third of the Jews invest in high-risk, high-return assets such as stocks and bonds, compared with none of the conservative Protestants, and 4 percent of Catholics.” While the Jews have no monopoly on Wall Street speculation, they do constitute the hard core of the collective A.L. Fredericks. It is a part of their tradition: Jay Gould and Joseph Seligman caused the "Black Friday" stock market crash in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century, while Jacob Schiff caused the notorious 'Black Thursday' panic that led to a nationwide economic depression<sup>11</sup>. Seligman was also the mover behind the Panama affair, a stock market swindle that became proverbial in France.

“During Prohibition, - notes Robert Rockaway, the author of an apologetic book on Jewish gangsters, - fifty per cent of the leading bootleggers were Jewish, and Jewish criminals financed and directed much of the nation's narcotics traffic ... These mobsters defended and assisted the Jewish community.”<sup>12</sup> Murder Inc., the Jewish-led gang of Chicago, provided Zionists with weapons; Jewish mobster Mickey Cohen was raising money for the Jewish terrorists of Irgun gang<sup>13</sup>. The Mafia capo Meyer Lansky killed an arms exporter who was selling to Arab countries, and contributed his ill-gotten fortune to the United Jewish Appeal. The present leadership of American Jewry are to a large extent the sons of Jewish gangsters, killers, smugglers and fraudsters; for instance, the Bronfmans, sons of Bronfman the Bootlegger, or Michael Steinhardt, the son of a mafioso “Red Steinhardt”, one of Democratic presidential hopeful Joseph Lieberman's key backers.

---

<sup>10</sup> Saki Books, London 1985

<sup>11</sup> Benjamin Ginsberg, *The Fatal Embrace: Jews and the State*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago 1993, p 73

<sup>12</sup> Rockaway, p. 215 quoted from JTR

<sup>13</sup> Birmingham, p. 281 quoted from JTR

Dr. William Pierce wrote an interesting piece on Jewish crooks<sup>14</sup>. Oh yes, Dr Pierce is a far-right racist, but this does not invalidate his observations. Half of the antizionist discourse was build upon books of Benny Morris, an Israeli Nazi, who extolled ethnic cleansing of Palestinians and regretted that Palestine is not Goy-free. If we use the works of Morris, we have no reason to disregard Dr Pierce, who wrote:

“Remember Michael Milken, Ivan Boesky, Marty Siegel, Dennis Levine, and the insider-trading scandal that nearly wrecked Wall Street a dozen years ago--and incidentally bankrupted tens of thousands of ordinary Americans who lost their investments as a result of the artificial manipulation of stock prices? Every major actor in that scandal was a Jew.

“Remember the enormous savings-and-loan catastrophe during the 1980s that ended up costing American taxpayers 500 billion dollars? A big part of the reason for the collapse of the savings-and-loan industry in the 1980s was the huge investments in so-called "junk bonds" by so many savings-and-loan institutions. And the man behind the junk bonds --the financial genius persuading the savings-and-loans to buy them--was none other than Michael Milken.

“Do you remember Martin Frankel, who stole more than \$200 million dollars from insurance companies in five states and then fled the country in 1999 as police were closing in? Probably you don't remember Frankel, because, despite the magnitude of his theft, there was very little publicity about him in the media.

“Do you remember Sholam Weiss, the ultra-Orthodox New York rabbi who plundered \$450 million from the National Heritage Life Insurance Company in Florida, in the largest case of insurance theft in U.S. history? He stole the life savings of more than 25,000 mostly elderly Americans who had all of their retirement money invested in the insurance company.

“Do you remember the New Square Four, the four Orthodox Jews in the all-Jewish town of New Square, New York, who set up a phoney Jewish school, a yeshiva, that existed only on paper, and then collected more than \$40 million dollars in government grants for their non-existent school? They are Chaim Berger, Kalmen Stern, David Goldstein, and Jacob Elbaum. Hours before leaving the White House, Bill Clinton commuted the sentences of the four Jewish swindlers. They were ordered by the court to repay the stolen \$40 million, but to date not a cent has been recovered from them.

“Certainly you remember Marc Rich and his partner Pincus Green. They're the two Jewish criminals who got the most attention last year when they received last-minute pardons from Bill Clinton. They are international commodities speculators who broke a great many laws in their wheeling and dealing and stashed away a few billion dollars for themselves while doing it. When they were indicted for racketeering, wire fraud, and a number of other felonies, they

---

<sup>14</sup> <http://globalfire.tv/nj/03en/globalism/rabbisandglobalism.htm>

fled the country with their money. Rich has given an estimated \$200 million to Israel and an unknown amount to Bill Clinton to buy his pardon.

“It's not that Jews are the only crooks who steal from the American people. George Bush is a crook, and he's not a Jew. Bill and Hillary Clinton are crooks, and they're not Jews either. There probably are more Gentile swindlers in America than Jewish swindlers, simply because Gentiles outnumber Jews 40 to one in the overall population.

“No, Jews aren't the only crooks, but they're certainly the biggest crooks. If you hear about a 100-thousand-dollar swindle, it could be anybody. If you hear about a 100-million-dollar swindle, then you know that it has to be a Jew.”

It would be a mistake to see these data as ‘racist’. The ideologists of Jewry indignantly deny any connection between the ‘religion’ or ‘ethnicity’ or ‘origins’ of the crooks, and their crooked deeds. This is to be expected – that is what they are paid for. But as a matter of fact, A.L. Fredericks is devoted to the Jews, **whether he is a Jew or not**. Enron's chief financial officer was Andrew Fastow, described by the rabbi of his synagogue as ‘a mensch, a very committed member of the community. He's active in supporting Jewish causes, is a devoted supporter of Israel’<sup>15</sup>, while his wife Lea (now plea bargaining<sup>16</sup>) Weingarten, who ‘hails from a prominent and well-respected philanthropic family’, did not miss a lesson in the synagogue.

But Kenneth Lay, the Goy top man in the Enron scandal, was equally devoted to the Jewish cause. He and his equally Gentile wife Linda chipped in \$850,000 at a fund-raising event last year for the Holocaust Museum in Houston, Texas, informed the Jerusalem Report<sup>17</sup>, and concluded: “in all, Enron was connected with about a third of the \$3.5 million raised at the event, which honoured former Texas senator Lloyd Bentsen and Holocaust chronicler Ruth Gruber.»

We see again this uncanny, mind-boggling, closely-knit connection of crooks and – not Jews, but Jewish *causes*, be it the Holocaust cult or the Zionist cause. Lay and Fastow stole billions of dollars from Jeff the Investor; they stole even more from Bill the Worker while Lea Fastow-Weingarten siphoned their money into tax shelters on the Cayman Islands. But when it came to charity, they did not care for poor Americans, or starving Africans. They gave their tithe to the Jewish cause.

Kenneth Lay is not alone. ‘Sir’ Conrad Black, a Goy media baron, (admittedly married to a nasty Jewish supremacist) is totally devoted to the Jewish and Zionist cause. He owns the Jerusalem Post, an extreme Zionist paper which criticizes Sharon for his lack of fervour. Expectedly, he turned out to be a crook. He stripped the assets of companies he chaired and stole

---

<sup>15</sup> The Forward, February 22, 2002

<sup>16</sup> New York Times, January 9, 2004

<sup>17</sup> <http://www.jrep.com/Business/Article-5.html> March 25, 2002

hundreds millions of dollars<sup>18</sup>. But a wealthy man who likes the Jews and spends so much on the Jewish causes is invariably a crook, whether he is a Jew like Fastow or a Goy like Lay.

If the attachment of Jewish criminals to the Jewish cause can be explained by ethnic feelings, what makes the Jewish cause so attractive to the Gentile crooks? In order to answer this fundamental question, we shall start from the psychological motives of Jewish crooks. Dr Pierce offers an interesting insight:

“Perhaps the biggest advantage a Jewish crook has is that he is an outsider. A Gentile swindler if caught becomes an outcast among his own people. A Jewish swindler is nearly always stealing from Gentiles, and that is something condoned by his religion and by long-established custom among his people. He may be punished by the Gentiles if he is caught, but he does not become an outcast in the eyes of his own people, and so he is not held back by moral scruples. His tendency is to reach further than a Gentile crook in his place would.”

It is not the only advantage of a Jewish crook. His society-enforced feeling of victimhood is an even better one, for as perennial victim, the Jew feels the need to correct ‘injustice’ by some extra-legal action. Israelis explain their theft of Jordanian lands in Arava Valley by their desire to correct the ‘injustice’ of Nature: for geological reasons, better alluvial soils accumulate on the Jordanian East Bank of Arava. Theft of Palestinian lands was explained (by Rabbi Lerner, among others) by the need to correct the ‘injustice’ of the Roman occupation of Palestine 2000 years ago. Establishment of the Jewish state is explained by the ‘injustice’ of Arabs having 22 states, while the Jews had none. Daylight robbery of Swiss banks corrected the ‘injustice’ of Nazi confiscations, though the banks never held Jewish deposits. In a way, the Holocaust museums are an important factor in the growth of Jewish criminality, for they enforce the feeling of Jewish victimhood.

“This pseudo victimhood that justifies all manner of evil is the engine of Jewish criminality”, wrote Ken Freeland, a Texan religious thinker. Extreme combativeness, the state of war with [Gentile] society, a constant feature of the Jewish tendency, provides another explanation of Jewish criminality. The state of war which allowed the Jews to charge interest, collect exorbitant taxes, deal with slums accommodation and stolen property, has become to an extent the norm of neo-liberal ‘open society’, where everyone is at war with everybody else.

In the view of Freeland, “just as the Jewish criminals feel that their criminality is exonerated, redeemed or justified by their ultimate financial contribution to Jewish causes, so do these gentile criminal-types feel a similar sense of atonement because of their contributions. The Jews (as a Church) are “providing salvation,” but while Christian Church would demand

---

<sup>18</sup> <http://www.globeandmail.ca/servlet/story/RTGAM.20040117.wblack17/BNStory/Bus>

repentance as a precondition, the Jews do not discriminate between legitimate and illegitimate wealth when accepting donations”.

Freeland is convincing, but what makes the gentile crooks to choose the Jewish causes is not only the availability of ‘salvation without repentance’, but an appeal of the Jewish setup to certain non-Jews whom we call ‘Mammonites’; they prefer the somewhat Luciferian paradigm of an outsider, at war with the society, free from the moral constraints imposed by the majority, and yet still chosen by a higher entity.

These ‘copycat Jews’ rightly feel that they will prosper in the Jewish-arranged world. That is why they support the Jewish cause and admire the State of Israel, the country of no moral restraints, a wholesale assassin and nature destroyer, black money launderer, mass killer, and a leading exporter of weapons and torture equipment.

Jacob Ben Efrat<sup>19</sup>, an Israeli pro-democracy activist, calls us to “look at Tel Aviv, a fourth of whose population now consists of migrant workers from East Asia, Eastern Europe and Africa. Capitalist globalisers want a flexible labour force, which they can transport at will from country to country. As a result, the gap between haves and have-nots increases. Israel is a shining example. Here the topmost fifth of the population earn 21 times more than the bottommost fifth (compared with 11 times more in the US)”. This quality makes Israel much loved by the Gentile Mammonites.

Thus, for an American, European or Russian the conclusion is clear: their pro-Israel, pro-Jewish politicians are the worst for the people and the best for the crooks. A potential investor in Enron, equipped with this essay, could just check Enron’s contributions to the Holocaust museum and he would know enough to carry his money elsewhere, unless he wants to lose it for tax purposes. A California voter could just ask for Diane Feinstein’s opinion about the Jewish state, and vote for her, if he likes the Iraqi War, expensive privatised electricity and a flood of illegal workers.

Indeed, Diane Feinstein, a nominal Democrat, contributed to the Iraqi War more than the average Republican: “Within minutes of Powell's war speech, leading Senate Democrats such as Joseph Biden of Delaware and Diane Feinstein of California were proclaiming it an unanswerable indictment of Iraq, preparing the way for their party to line up behind the war that is now only days or weeks away”, noted The World Socialist Web Site in February 2003<sup>20</sup>. The present competition for the Jewish and Mammonite vote in the US Presidency elections is a bad sign for Bill and Jeff, for they are competing who will skin them better.

---

<sup>19</sup> From a talk by Yacov Ben Efrat, General Secretary of the Organization for Democratic Action (ODA), at Bamat Etgar in Jaffa on December 11, 2003

<sup>20</sup> Powell's UN speech triggers countdown to war against Iraq, World Socialist Web Site [www.wsws.org](http://www.wsws.org), By the Editorial Board 6 February 2003

In Sweden, their unique welfare state once entrenched by the antizionist Prime Minister Olof Palme is now being undone by Göran Persson, their present Prime Minister, perennial organiser of holocaust conferences.

When voting or investing, a prudent American, European or Russian should pick the company or the candidate that does not support the Jewish or the Zionist cause. For sure, it can be a vote for a politician of Jewish origin, like Minnesota Senator Paul Wellstone, who was killed in a well-timed plane crash in October 2002. Wellstone was the strongest voice against the war in Iraq, and supported Palestinian struggle. Michael Howard, the new leader of the Conservative Party, is another good example. A leading British far racist right ideologue Martin Webster characterised him as “a public opponent of oppressive Jewish ‘anti-hate’ laws”; who has told Israel a few home truths about what it must do to achieve a just peace; who "married out"; and who has a son about to take on Christian Holy Orders. Obviously I would much prefer to have a gentile white Anglo-Saxon-Celtic Briton as Prime Minister of Britain every time. But when we look at the cravenly pro-Jewish, pro-Zionist, America's-poodle performance of the present holder of that office (Blair) who has all of the ethnic qualifications I mentioned, we may all have cause to reflect”.

Indeed, a non-Jew who likes the Jewish cause – like Tony Blair or Condoleezza Rice, Bill Clinton or George Bush – is much more dangerous than a Jew who keeps clear of the Jewish causes.

As we saw above, the Jews and their Mammonite allies have been the net gainers during the last three decades, when, in the words of the prominent American philosopher Immanuel Wallerstein, some people have made a lot of money, and others have lost their shirts. “The point is, most of the profit has been made from financial manipulations”<sup>21</sup>, or in our terms, A.L. Fredericks made his profits at the expense of Bill and Jeff.

Immanuel Wallerstein compares the events of 1968 to a ‘ship-wreck’, in aftermath of which the talented A.L. Fredericks scrambled to shore, ‘undeterred by the thought of drowning companions’, but (to continue Wallerstein’s parable in our terms) the drowning Bill and Jeff came to interpret the ability of the talented to swim to shore as evidence of hope for them. Wallerstein missed the point: this interpretation was not made by Bill and Jeff, but by the wholly-owned subsidiary of A.L. Fredericks, the Jewish-owned media with its Jewish pundits. Without this tool, Fredericks would have been tarred and feathered, if not lynched in the best American tradition.

A similar process has taken place in many other countries. Russia provides a fresh example where a group of predominantly Jewish swindlers have ended up owning the whole lot

---

<sup>21</sup> Immanuel Wallenstein, CODA, the so-called Asian Crisis, p 52

of Russian communal property, from gas and oil (Hodorkovsky and Abramovitch) to aluminium (Chernoy). It is less well known that Russia also had its Jeff who swindled Bill before Alfred swindled him. The Russian Jeff was a party apparatchik or business executive, a top man in the Soviet days. He managed the oil and gas industry; he created a space programme second to none; he ran the huge railroad and air network. However, Jeff the Goy was only a manager, not the owner of these assets, and he succumbed to the temptation of 'privatising' (read – stealing) public property. He dismantled the Soviet system, only to find himself swindled by Alfred. In Russia, too, Bill is the ultimate loser: if under Jeff he had his modest flat and salary guaranteed, Alfred objects to such anti-market luxuries. As far as Alfred is concerned, Bill may die tomorrow if he can't compete with cheap Chinese or Mexican labour.

The financial capital of speculators and banks exceeded the industrial and agricultural capacities and created the giant dollar bubble soon to burst. This explains the hysterical campaign against 'antisemites': A.L. Fredericks does not want his name and address to be known to Bill and Jeff; he prefers to hide behind an anonymous 'rich white man' front. To be on the safe side, 'antisemites' are always lumped with 'racists' and Jews - with Blacks or other immigrant minorities, as if struggle against Alfred has anything to do with the racial or other qualities of Jim, the Black half-brother of Bill, or Ahmed, a powerless outsider.

Why should we care who pocketed Bill's cash – whether an all-American Jeff the Cheat, or a cosmopolitan Alfred the Swindler? Indeed, if the Jewish money would remain just money, it would be of legitimate concern only to the middle class. That is why the socialists of the early 20<sup>th</sup> century and the later Frankfurt school considered antisemitism a 'petit bourgeois defence against financial capital', a defence of Jeff against Alfred. From this point of view, a middle class American has a bona fide cause to care, for it is his livelihood at stake. But for the rest, and for ordinary working-class Americans, is there any reason to worry? If one worries about Jewish capital, should not one worry about the capital of Muslims (the richest man on earth is the Muslim Sultan of Brunei) or Armenians and East Asians (other wealthy overseas communities)?

All ethno-religious minority capital causes trouble, for minority capitalists usually do not care for the native workers. They are not connected with them by ties of marriage or faith, and can be much crueller than native entrepreneurs. Capitalist ethnic minorities – Armenians and Greeks in the Ottoman Empire, Overseas Chinese in the Far East, Indians in East Africa - provide an easy parallel to the Jewish position within the Christian world. The Chinese Philippine scholar Amy Chua<sup>22</sup> called such minorities 'market-dominant'. She wrote:

---

<sup>22</sup> World on Fire: How Exporting Free Market Democracy Breeds Ethnic Hatred and Global Instability by Amy Chua, 2003

“Market-dominant minorities can be found in every corner of the world. My family is part of the Philippines' tiny but entrepreneurial, economically powerful Chinese minority. Just 1 percent of the population, Chinese Filipinos control as much as 60 percent of the private economy, including the country's four major airlines and almost all of the country's banks, hotels, shopping malls, and major conglomerates. The Chinese are a market-dominant minority not just in the Philippines but throughout Southeast Asia. In 1998, Chinese Indonesians, only 3 percent of the population, controlled roughly 70 percent of Indonesia's private economy, including all of the country's largest conglomerates. More recently, in Burma, entrepreneurial Chinese have literally taken over the economies of Mandalay and Rangoon. Lebanese are a market-dominant minority in West Africa. Ibo are a market-dominant minority in Nigeria. And Jews are almost certainly a market-dominant minority in post-Communist Russia.”

However, Alfred the Jew is in a class by himself, and not because of his cruelty. The Sultan of Brunei builds a palace and gives a Boeing to his daughter. Paul Getty locks himself up in a far away place. Wealthy Jews buy media, and media is a mind-altering tool. Thus, their influence goes way beyond market dominance into previously uncharted waters of mind control.

This pattern is seen all over the world. Sulzberger and Zuckerman own a string of newspapers in the US from the NY Times to the USA Today, while their brethren have monopolised editorial and other prominent positions in the discourse. The list of Jews in high position in the media is too long for inclusion here, and can be found elsewhere (for instance, in Kevin Macdonald's new Preface<sup>23</sup> to *the Culture of Critique*). Connecting wealth and media influence, Benjamin Ginsberg, Professor of Political Science at John Hopkins University wrote in 1993:

“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 most influential newspaper, the *New York Times*.”<sup>24</sup>

This makes supreme sense, for otherwise, the free media would point its accusing finger in the culprits' direction. The people of America would demand from Alfred that he pull out his pockets and fully refund the stolen goods. However, such a remedy does not even occur to Joe Public. The reason is the Jewish involvement in the discourse. Thus, we can complete the first level of our analysis on a purely materialistic note, so dear to the hearts of vulgar Marxists. The rich Jews buy media so it will cover up their (and their brethren's) misdeeds. The Jews in the media are giving protection to the rich Jews: in the right-wing media, they protect all rich and

---

<sup>23</sup> <http://www.csulb.edu/~kmacd/Preface.htm>

<sup>24</sup> *The Fatal Embrace: Jews and the State*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago 1993, p.1

powerful men; in the left-wing media, they blur the distinction between Jeff and Alfred. Is that what the Jews want?

## **Two Ladies of Strasbourg**

**(raz)**

But let us look a bit deeper. The Jewish position in the discourse is much stronger than what is needed for the mere protection of rich Jews. In the US, even in Western Europe no view can be proposed to the general public unless approved (after being vetted and corrected) by a Jewish group. This centrality of the Jews to the Western system of power was well expressed by the ex-CIA boss, James Woolsey, who said recently: “Jews are history's great champions of the rule of law, so much so that they have come to embody it. Anti-Semitism threatens the rule of law and intolerance of Jews is a first step toward dictatorial rule”<sup>25</sup>. The CIA is not famous for its love of the rule of law, rather of the rule of elites. That is why the conjecture of Woolsey can be read: “The Jews have come to embody the rule of the elites”.

Similar opinions are expressed by President George W. Bush, Condoleezza Rice, and all contenders to the US Presidency who promptly find their Jewish roots, or at least Jewish roots of their wives and mistresses. Actually, as it was correctly observed in the Israeli weekly *Vesty*, four out of five major contenders are entitled to Israeli citizenship.

The same phenomenon is observed in yesteryear's Evil Empire. In post-WWII Communist Eastern Europe, the Jews embodied the rule of the Kremlin, and formed governments, security forces and an ideological apparatus of many independent and Soviet republics. Their influence was strongest in 1945 – 1956, when they formed the part of national elites most loyal to Moscow. After 1956, as these countries gained more independence, their influence in power structures waned, but their share in the dissident movement waxed accordingly. If formerly the Jewish-led regimes of Hungary, Poland and Czechoslovakia were hard-line Communist, now the Rise of Jews has occurred under the Stars and Stripes.

After the revolutions of the 1990's, the (far from numerous) Jews became the embodiment of the Western way, of the American unipolar world. It is felt in Poland and Hungary, Bulgaria and Rumania; the new post-Communist rulers established close relations with the Jewish state, opened Holocaust museums, preached war on antisemitism, which is identified with anti-Americanism as once it was identified with anti-Sovietism. In the post-Communist

---

<sup>25</sup> [http://www.worldnetdaily.com/news/article.asp?ARTICLE\\_ID=35857](http://www.worldnetdaily.com/news/article.asp?ARTICLE_ID=35857)

world, the Jews are often perceived as the Fifth Column of the US-led globalisation<sup>26</sup>. Nowadays, the pro-American forces (described as pro-Democracy or pro-Market in Western publications) usually contain disproportionate numbers of Jews and Gentile philosemites, though the real Jewish share in the populace is quite small.

The last Parliamentary elections in Russia supply the proof. While in Russia proper, the extreme pro-Market and pro-USA party, The Union of Right-wing Forces (SPS by its Russian acronym) received 4% of vote, the Russian Jews in Israel gave it 41% of their vote.

Professor Alexander Panarin, a Russian socialist philosopher wrote: “The Jews are madly in love with the US. In the countries that still resist the American global ambitions, they are often seen by the native population as the Fifth Column of the US. A conversation with a Jewish intellectual almost always ends with his glorification of the American mission in the world, and with dismissive remarks about the archaic patriots who do not understand this mission and the demands of our time. The Jews prefer to assign to the US the mission of control over the majority of mankind; and the US global presence is perceived as a guarantee for Jews. That is why national sovereignty should be undermined, while American control should become total.”

A somewhat similar position is taken by the communist historian Sergey Kara-Murza and the nationalist thinker Alexander Dugin. Neither is ready to give up on Jews; au contraire, they are united in their attempt to get Jews on the side of natives in the world confrontation. They remember the days of old when the Jews supported the Soviet Russia, when the Rosenberg couple was executed for their help to the Soviet Union; when every right-wing conspirologist from Winston Churchill to Douglas Reed viewed communism as a Jewish plot.

Thus they also accept (without any attempt to clarify the reason) the concept of the Jewish importance to the world. However, this importance is not (or not only) due to the Jewish wealth: in Soviet Russia the Jews were not rich, but their influence was an important factor in the creation and in the collapse of the Soviet Union.

The ordinary run-of-the mill view of Jewish influence as a by-product of money fails to explain the phenomenon, unless we introduce the Toynbeeian category of the Church. In the traditional society, the function of discourse, the national Superego, was kept by the priests. The Church was responsible for the conscience of the nation, while the rulers were responsible for the material well-being of the people. In an ideal situation, the Church and the State represent two independent (and mutually dependent) authorities, (though this equilibrium was frequently undermined by strong Papal or Royal power), the Church stressing the spiritual welfare and the

---

<sup>26</sup> It is not a totally new phenomenon, for already in 1960s, the pro-American tendencies of the Russian Jews were noticed by the Marxist scholar of Jewish origin, Isaac Deutscher, who justified certain doubts regarding loyalty of Russian Jews to their Russian Motherland.

need for solidarity of the People with the King. Thus the Church endorses as well as limits the absolute power of the ruler.

Let us travel to the capital of Alsace, a small land sandwiched between Germany and France, and the home of an old Jewish community, the first Ashkenazi Jewish community in France by virtue of Alsace's integration into that country. On the jambs of the imposing Strasbourg Cathedral, there are two female figures. One is stately and crowned; another is crooked and leans on a broken lance. They represent the Church and the Synagogue. These two ladies compete for attention of the King, not only the Celestial but the Earthly king as well.

Now it appears that the vision of Strasbourg Cathedral artists was somewhat premature. Lance broken and crown removed, the older lady still has some tricks up her sleeve. She is more accommodating to the King, to start with. The powerful Church puts a lot of demands to the King, but the alternative Jewish establishment offers support and puts no demands. The Synagogue behaves towards the Gentile King like Jezebel the Sidonite to Ahab the King of Israel: she considers him all-powerful, beyond moral law and reproach. In her eyes, he may rob and kill. As long as he loves her, he is forgiven and given full support. She does not try to unseat him, for she can't rule alone in the foreign land. For the Christian church, the King must be good to the people, but the Jewish church, a foreigner, makes no such demand; she is merciless to the Gentile commoners. Even better, she is a sworn enemy of the demanding and independent True Queen, the Church.

Indeed, the West was torn for hundreds of years by the conflict between the Papal and Royal power, until the French Revolution completed the undoing of the Church. The moving force behind the French Revolution's fight against the Church wasn't atheist: the people who desecrated Notre Dame and other beautiful and great cathedrals of France offered an alternative worship of Supreme Reason. Most of them were ex-ecclesiastics, often connected to the 'Gallic tendency', to attempts to establish an autocephalous (independent) church of France. Tragically, this desire was rejected by the Catholic Church, and the would-be reformers turned into rebels. However, they failed to establish a new church, for a Church is to provide the mystique of life and the supreme authority; something that Reason could not do. What they did was to undermine the Catholic Church in France.

Hermann Hesse<sup>27</sup> described it well: "In the spiritual life of Europe after the Middle Ages there were two important tendencies: liberation of thought from an authority, i.e. struggle of the mature and sovereign mind against the supremacy of the Roman Church, and on the other hand, the hidden but passionate search for legalisation of this freedom by a new higher authority".

---

<sup>27</sup> Magister Ludi

Thus history has provided us with a confirmation that no society can survive without its Church. “You’re going to have to serve somebody, it may be Devil, it may be the Lord, but you’re going to have to serve somebody”, in the words of Robert Zimmerman (Bob Dylan). The short interregnum of ‘civil society’ built on the ruins of the Bastille came to its end with establishment of the Jews as the new Priestly caste.

The alternative Church of our society, the Jews, survived in abeyance for hundreds of years. As long as the Christian Church attended to the discourse, the Jews plainly had no chance to compete; but when its power was broken by liberty-seekers, the alternative arrangement came forward.

The choice the Church OR the Jews’ was felt by the European intellectuals. In his beautiful and haunting *Fanny and Alexander*, the brilliant Swedish film-maker Ingmar Bergman, counterpoises the grim and stark bishop of the Lutheran Church and the soft and charming Jew. The bishop mistreats his step-children and banishes them to a dark attic; the Jew saves the kids and eventually helps their mother to regain freedom. The bishop dies A horrible death, and the Jew takes his place at the family gathering.

Bergman does not even try to make his fable realistic: his Jew, an Orthodox man in a big black yarmulke, drinks wine with the Swedes at the Christmas table, something no religious Jew would ever do. But for Bergman, the rise of the Jew is a way to show his animosity to the Church. On the other side, anti-Judaic T.S. Elliott, G.K. Chesterton, and Jorgen Graf, an iconoclast researcher of the Holocaust, eventually were received in the Church.

The Rise of the Judaic church is similar to the rise of Eunuchs in the court of the Byzantine, Ottoman and Chinese emperors, noticed (separately) Michael Neumann and Siegfried Tischler: it takes place when the power of the King is weak. If America were to have its own strong leadership, it would not be reduced to its present level of obedience to the Eunuchs of Sulzberger and Foxman, according to this view. But in our opinion, this simile fails: even a strong aristocracy needs the support of a church to legitimise its rule. If the Christian church can’t provide the cover, a default or alternative church will be brought to the fore.

The Jews were well prepared for the takeover by their attitude to discourse. During the ages of Christian rule, the wealthy Jews we discussed in the previous chapter traditionally carried the heavy burden of providing for Jewish scholars and marrying them to their well-endowed daughters. A rich Jew knew it is his duty to provide for the scholars. The rich Jews have some practical reason to buy into media, as we mentioned above, but they had no practical reason to spend money on this vast ideological apparatus, on ‘the alternative church’. Seen the other way around, this alternative church (call it The Jews) was the *raison d’etre* of their labours.

## Messiah's Donkey

### (derash)

These rich Jews are but the Donkey of the Messiah, in Jewish terms. This expression became widely known in Israel a few years ago, when an Israeli writer Seffi Rachelevsky<sup>28</sup> published a hefty volume with this title. In the book he claimed that the Cabbalistic Jewish religious establishment considers ordinary Israeli Jews just 'a Donkey of the Messiah', who are supposed to carry Messiah without actual understanding of their function.

The term is based on the words of Zechariah the Prophet (9:9) "thy king cometh... riding upon a donkey' (xamor). The Wise men said: it is the same donkey Abraham ('he saddled his donkey', Genesis 22:3) and Moses ('set them upon a donkey', Ex 4:20) rode. The creator of Golem, Maharal of Prague, explained it (Gevurot 5:29) by way of a pun: 'xamor' is a donkey, 'xomer' is matter. Messiah (and before him Abraham and Moses) are able to use the material tools ('ride the donkey') without succumbing to the material world. In plain words, spirit always wins over matter; and the way of the Messiah of Spirit is to use the Donkey of Matter.

According to Rachelevsky, the Cabbalistic theology of Rabbi Kook with its heady mixture of Messianic ideas, hatred towards the Goy and the Zionist Socialist Left, desire for revenge and bloodshed became the predominant ideology of the Orthodox Jews. "Pursuit of absolute power is their shaping goal, as they are bent on destroying Israel's democracy, rebuilding the Third Temple (which will herald the age of the Messiah), and perhaps, sparking worldwide apocalypse." The Cabbalists did not mind while the socialist Zionists were building Israel and fighting her wars, "paving the road to the eventual redemption of the Jewish people; but once it has accomplished the necessary objectives, the Left must descend from the stage of history, because its very existence contradicts the concept of national-religious salvation," wrote Eliezer Don-Yehiya in *Haaretz*<sup>29</sup>.

"Some critics have compared this book to the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion*. In point of fact, *The Messiah's Donkey* is far worse, it belongs in the category of virulent anti-Semitic writings" – concluded the Orthodox critic.

The book of Seffi Rachelevsky 'the virulent antisemite' was a great bestseller in Israel, and it was acclaimed by many Israeli intellectuals, from the best living poet of Israel, Nathan Zach to the peace activist Uri Avnery who called it "the most important book published here in recent years. It is a must-read for anyone who cares about the country's future<sup>30</sup>."

---

<sup>28</sup> [http://www.findarticles.com/cf\\_dls/m1181/1999\\_Fall/56750487/p1/article.jhtml](http://www.findarticles.com/cf_dls/m1181/1999_Fall/56750487/p1/article.jhtml)

<sup>29</sup> <http://www.geocities.com/CapitolHill/2527/press35.htm>

<sup>30</sup> <http://www.gush-shalom.org/archives/article38.html>

“Many respectable rabbis take part in a conference for the construction of a temple on the ruins of two of Islam's most holy shrines, knowing full well that this is bound to lead to a war between us and a billion Moslems - and there is not a single rabbi who dares protest in public! We see the Religious Nationalists and the ultra-Orthodox - who until recently were sworn enemies - close ranks under a common flag of hatred of the goyim ” – continued Avnery and asked: how has Judaism turned into such a monster? “Rachelevsky explained the process in detail. He exposed the secret code for the message. He reveals to us a whole world never before shown to us: hundreds of unknown facts, hundreds of quotes from the Talmud, the Book of Zohar, the Rambam, Ha'Ari, the Maharal, Rabbi Kook, and many more.”

But were the facts and quotes really unknown? There is huge literature explaining poisonous ideas of Judaism. Since the 4<sup>th</sup> century, when St John Chrysostom of Antioch had his insights into the new creed of the Talmud, or since the 12<sup>th</sup> century, when the West became aware of the Jewish faith (previously the Western Europeans had thought that Jews adhere to the pre-Christian Biblical Judaism) and even before the recent works like Israel Shahak's *Three Thousand Years of Jewish Tradition* or Michael Hoffman's *Strange Gods of Judaism*, there were literally thousands of books dealing with the subject. For centuries, hundreds of Jews renounced the creed, turned to Christ and revealed the secret of 'hatred of the goyim' and of 'pursuit of absolute power'. But the Jewish community just wrung its hands in response and cried 'antisemitism!' And even Uri Avnery, in his speech in Cologne<sup>31</sup> five years after his praise for Rachelevsky's book, chose to forget 'the unknown facts and hundreds of quotes', and to join the denouncers – not of the 'haters of goyim and pursuers of absolute power', but of 'antisemites' who made the facts and the quotes known.

However, while Rachelevsky made an important step by revealing the true face of Judaism to the 'kidnapped children', modern Israelis, his theory fails the fact check. Even if we accept his premise of a Messianic Cabbalist intoxication of the Orthodox Jews, it does not mean their opinions (awful as they are) can be translated into a coherent policy. The Orthodox Jews are the poorest and discriminated against segment of Israeli society. Even the Religious-Nationalist Jews are far from powerful; and the brutal settlers of Hebron are just a few dozen all told. Whatever they feel about Left Zionists is quite irrelevant.

Moreover, Socialist Zionism is no less godawful than the teaching of Rabbi Kook. Lasse Wilhelmson<sup>32</sup> correctly defined it as Jewish National Socialism; if one wants to hear repelling views, the non-religious Zionist 'left' is a good place to start. Matti Golan, the epitome of a non-religious liberal Zionist, an ex-chief editor of the *Haaretz* newspaper, wrote on New Year's eve:

---

<sup>31</sup> 22/11/03 Gush Shalom

<sup>32</sup> on [www.israelshamir.net](http://www.israelshamir.net)

“Those who say that the same rule should apply to us and to the Muslim countries regarding nuclear weapons are not looking out for our welfare. And if asked how we can be so confident that these weapons will never be used improperly, we must state frankly: Our confidence stems from the fact that we are not them; we are not like them and those that say otherwise are not interested in the truth. To allow Muslim countries to continue to possess nuclear weapons is tantamount to agreeing to global suicide<sup>33</sup>.” Actually, Matti Golan repeated in so many words the Jewish morning prayer words: “Bless you, Lord, for you made us different from Goyim, that our fate is not their fate, that we are not like the nations of the land.”

Thus, Rachelevsky was wrong, and the popularity of his book in Israel was partly caused by the choice of culprit: the religious Jews are not liked by Zionists. He correctly identified the hidden layer of Judaism with ‘hatred of the goyim’ and of ‘pursuit of absolute power’, but he erred when he blamed its activation on the relatively small religious community. He also erred when he made Socialist Zionists (as racist as any) the innocent Messiah’s Donkey. The Socialist Zionists (they are described as ‘Israeli left’ for no reason I can fathom) play no bigger a role than the powerful Jews elsewhere, from Sulzberger to Soros. In a way, all Jews unconsciously act the part of the Messiah’s Donkey, where the Messiah is a spirit, not a man.

Rabbi Leitman, a leading Israeli Cabbalist, expounded: “There is no Messiah – a person, from the Cabbalistic, or indeed Jewish Orthodox point of view. Cabbalists explained explicitly that Messiah is the Celestial Light, the High Spiritual Force which descends into our world and improves mankind by raising its consciousness to a higher plane. ‘Messiah’ is a derivative of ‘liMshoh’ (a pun, so popular with Cabbalists), ‘to pull’, for he pulls people out of the bog of daily existence to a higher level. This is Messiah. There could appear leading lights of generations, teachers and preachers, but the Messiah is a spiritual force, not a man.”<sup>34</sup>

Sergey Balandin, an interesting Russian spiritual writer living in Jerusalem noticed the similarity of this point of view to the Christian one. But it is the similarity of antipodes. Christ is indeed the Celestial Light, that shines on everyone, Jew and Hellene, who want to accept Him. while the Light of the Jewish Messiah shines on the Jews only, but spreads darkness upon the Christians. If a Jew understands that the Light of Christ is for everyone who accepts it, he becomes a Christian. And when a man accepts Christ, he notices that His Light shines on everyone who accepts it. But darkness spread by the Jewish Messiah cuts man off Christ, away from God. As any light engineer will confirm: if you wish to put a spot light on a man, ensure that it is dark around him.

---

<sup>33</sup> Matti Golan, Jerusalem Post Dec. 31, 2003

<sup>34</sup> ([http://www.kabbalah-web.org/ruskab/index\\_rus.htm](http://www.kabbalah-web.org/ruskab/index_rus.htm)).

## Israel Is Real

(sod)

The Jewish Messiah whom the Jews carry on their backs, donkey-fashion, through their long journey across centuries, is a certain Spirit, that relates to the Jews as Christ to the Church. But the Jews do not consider him – God, and they are right, for “it is not God, but the idol Jews worship, - wrote Simone Weil, - not a figure of metal or wood, but the Nation, an equally this-worldly object. The Jewish faith can’t be separated from this idol worship because of its basic concept of Chosen People.”<sup>35</sup>

Indeed, a Jew considers himself an inseparable part, a single unit of Yisrael, of a great sacral entity, which relates to a separate Jew as the beehive to the bee, as the Church to a Catholic. Yisrael is the central androgynous figure in the Jewish universe, for he is the groom of Torah, and she is the Chosen bride of God. But while in the Christian universe there is the pair Christ – Church, in the Jewish Universe, Yisrael the Church of the Jews is like Christ for the Christians; for the Church of the Jews, or Yisrael, worships Yisrael, or herself. This narcissistic persona of higher rank, a sort of neurotic superego of the collective personality of Jews, has a will of his own; and his will does not coincide with wills and desires of individual Jews. Yisrael does not care about separate Jews – they are expendable if necessary for his mission.

Howard Bloom, the author of a popular new book *The Lucifer Principle*, proposed a scientific-sounding explanation: “In the early 20th century, entomologist William Morton Wheeler was observing the lives of ants. No ant is an island. Viewed from the human perspective, the activities of the individual ants seemed to matter far less than the behaviour of the colony as a whole. In fact, the colony acted as if it were an independent creature, feeding itself, expelling its wastes, defending itself, and looking out for its future. Wheeler was the man who dubbed a group of individuals collectively acting like one beast a super-organism. Like the ants and the sponge cells, you and I are parts of a vast population whose pooled efforts move some larger creature on its path through life. Like the ants, we cannot live in total separation from the human clump. We are components of a super-organism... We do strive as individuals, but we are also part of something larger than ourselves, with a complex physiology and mental life that we carry out but only dimly understand.”

Many Jews were overtly enthusiastic about Bloom’s book (“I have met God and he lives in Brooklyn. Howard Bloom is next to Darwin, Freud, Einstein” wrote Richard Metzger), for he re-told in quasi-scientific terms what they feel. They feel their belonging to ‘the Jews’ is well above their comprehension, but is as real as anything. They feel they do not compete as

---

<sup>35</sup> Lettre a un religieux, Gallimard

individuals, but as a group, against all the rest. They feel the supreme reality of the 'super-organism' (in Bloom's terms) called Yisrael, as opposed to imaginary reality. And they do not feel God above it.

A Christian knows there is God above, and the church is central to the community. But a Jew, as a rule, mistakes his feeling of belonging to the national super-organism for the religious feeling. That is why the synagogue was rather a club than a place of worship. (The noise and chatting of Jews in their synagogues was a great complaint of the Reform Jews in 19<sup>th</sup> century.) Religious Jews believe in God who is the God of Yisrael, the divine protector of the super-organism. Their 'monotheism' is not a tribal religion as their detractors say, but the extreme egocentrism of an ant who does not believe there is life outside his anthill, or a god who is not the God of Ants. And rare pious Jews perceive God the Father of All who is consubstantial with Christ. These last ones are the Sons of Prophets, rejected by the Jews. They are very close to Christ, and the Church always prays for the Divine grace to lead them to Christ.

The crude biological and material model of Bloom ("anthill") corresponds to a deep spiritual concept, helping to fathom the riddle of Jewish existence. The Chosen People were members of Israel, the great super-soul, a spiritual counterpart of the super-organism. Touched by God, forged by His Covenant, Israel was a super-reality in the pre-Christian world. With the coming of Christ, this super-soul experienced catharsis and its bigger and better part was baptised into the super-soul of the Church. But the excreted part did not die. It remained partly in the spiritual world, partly in the material world. It is still real, as opposed to the imaginary reality of de-spiritualised nations; but it is demon-like and disoriented. It vaguely remembers what it was chosen for, and tries to act; but without Christ, its efforts lead in the wrong direction. It became a parody of Israel of old; and while trying to fulfil the prophecies, it (call it Yisrael) creates mischief. From the Christian point of view, Yisrael is in the state of rebellion against God; so he is akin to Lucifer.

He can't live, he can't die; like a rogue elephant, the de-spiritualised remainder of great Israel of old roams the world and causes destruction on its way. He fights Christ, for Christ removed this harsh substance from Israel and stopped him from making his Universe the only one; and he hopes to win, by removing Christ from this world. His plans will come to naught; there will never be the Jerusalem the Jews dream about; they destroy the Promised Land while hoping to build it; the world they build is but a dreadful parody of the Prophetic visions.

But meanwhile the great Super Soul of the Church, this reincarnation of Israel in the baptismal fire of Christ, suffered terrible calamities. With communications broken between the mystic and traditional East and the exoteric and materialist West, these two halves of one

conscience were schizophrenically divided. The West grew physically stronger, but spiritually weaker.

That was the great chance of Yisrael. Sick and misguided, she was a reality while the national churches were disappearing. A Nation without its national church is a dead soulless body, for its Church was its soul. Yisrael dwelt in the dead bodies of the churchless nations creating an imitation of their Superego. But while the Church attracted the most spiritual, Yisrael, the Mocker, attracts the vile lot ready to turn away from Christ, deny spirituality and pursue material possessions.

That is why she is perceived by Gentiles as Mammon, the Deity of material possession. For a servant of Mammon, all other-worldly considerations are forbidden, while profit is elevated to the top of preference scale. The Chicago Neo-Liberal school of Milton Friedman offered a quasi-scientific rendering of the Mammonite tendency, proclaiming the supremacy of the Market forces. Mammon is a potent enemy of Christ, for a Mammonite is locked in material universe and has no spirit.

A modern Russian writer Victor Pelevin proposed to de-mythologize Mammon. He renamed the god-like Mammon into 'Oranus' (Oral +Anus), a mussel, or sea-cucumber, or starfish, a sort of living creature, incapable of sophisticated thought. It has no ears, no nose, no eyes, no mind. It is not a concentration of evil. It has no will of its own. It is a primitive virtual parasite, evolutionarily lower than its cells. Oranus – Mammon consists of cells, while each cell is an economic, money-related projection of man.

Man is a multidimensional creature; he can be projected into a Mammonite-economic space or into the Christ-and-Church sphere, or into a piece of meat for a tiger, into a pint of blood for a vampire, etc. Thus, 'a man as a cell of Mammon' is a projection of Man, devoid of passion for God, Love, and Art. Being an evolutionarily low animal, Mammon-Oranus has no complicated desires; money is its blood, and as it craves more money movement, it develops a kind of nerve system, the 'advertising media'. Mammon is the Gentile-turned face of Yisrael, a by-product of the world's de-spiritualization. The Mammonite attitude is based on the concept of *Homo homini lupus est*, developed by Hobbes and upheld by von Hayek, Popper, Soros, Jacob, Glucksman and other neo-liberals. It is a Judaic attitude for the model relationship outside of the Jewish community, developed for dealing with Goyim who are 'the inherently evil shards', according to Cabbala. In plain words, neo-liberalism is a godless Judaism.

Christ is an enemy of Yisrael, for it is his divine intervention that caused her excretion. However, Yisrael can't admit this without admitting that Jesus is Christ; instead, she created the myth of the Destruction of the Temple as the cathartic event of old. The Jews believe that rebuilding the Temple will fully restore the power of Yisrael, and bring her into communion with

God. but they are mistaken: as the true catastrophe of Yisrael was her rejection of Christ, the rebuilding of the Temple will be the greatest Jewish flop since the Resurrection.

But Mammon is an enemy of Christ in a *peshat* meaning, too, for Christians are traditionally taught to be ashamed of being rich. They are taught about the comparative size of a camel and a needle's eye. They generally 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. The Mammonites have no such misgivings. They seek power, for the Old Testament says "Let people serve you, and nations bow down to you; be lord over your brothers, and let your mother's sons bow down to you"<sup>36</sup>. They believe wealth is a sign of being blessed, while for Christians a sign of being blessed is being a blessing for others.

Jews are supposed to be obedient to Yisrael. Indeed, whoever has conversed at length with Jews is aware of their unlimited apology of Judaic behaviour, of their denial of uncomfortable truths, of their vehemence in argument, of a vast protean variety of ways to defend Yisrael and attack the Gentile society. Their team play is unique: Communists or Capitalists, poor or rich, they carry on one refrain, aiming at one goal. If they don't protect Yisrael, they just aren't Jews, even if *they* think differently.

In 1648, during the civil war in Ukraine, the Cossacks tried to disengage poor Jews from their rich brethren. They sent a delegation and offered full protection to the poor Jews, for theirs was a social fight of poor Ukrainian peasants and their warlike Cossack allies against their exploiters, the Polish landlords and Jewish managers and loan sharks. The Cossacks felt no need to fight the poor Jews or poor Poles. But the poor Jews rejected their proposal and evacuated with the rich Jews, writes a critical Jewish Marxist historian Saul Borovoy.

Nowadays, Jews have different ideas and belong to different parties and ideologies. But many of them have the same bottom line: presently they attack Islam, for it is a great reservoir of spirit still unbroken. From the high priest of the Holocaust cult Elie Wiesel to the staunch antizionist Lenni Brenner, from an Israeli leftist Professor Benny Morris to the cabbalistic extreme right of Baruch Marzel, they express their enmity for Islam, though for variety of reasons. People who do not toe the line, who do not feel they belong to the super-organism, who do not wax apologetic for the crimes of Jews – they just aren't Jews, even if they were born into Jewish families. Due to some fault, they did not establish a 'telepathic connection' with Yisrael. (This happens with bees, too, but such bees usually die.)

This beehive feeling of Jews is quite unique; and to the end of their lives they do not understand it. That is why they play what Michael Neumann wittily called "the venerable shell-

---

<sup>36</sup> Gen 27:29

game of Jewish identity: “Look! We're a religion! No! a race! No! a cultural entity! Sorry - a religion!”

An antizionist historian Joachim Martillo tried<sup>37</sup> to get rid of this uniqueness of the Jews by putting Zionism in the historical and geographical context of Eastern and Central Europe. He gave the Jews another name, Ashkenazi. In his opinion, an East European name helps to reduce the question to its normal proportions. He pointed out the similarities between the nationalism and confessionalism of various East and Central European nations and Zionism, and described Zionism as an ‘organic’ movement with ‘primordialist’ ideas, while objecting to the exceptionalism promoted by Jewish scholars.

Alas, this reduction did not work. Much as one dislikes exceptionalism, it is not out of place dealing with this question. If Ashkenazis are an ordinary East European folk full of organic primordial ideas, just like Serbs, according to Martillo, why, then, in the dominant mainstream discourse all East European, and indeed all such organic movements bar Zionism are damned? Why this exclusion? Why are neither Serbs nor Japanese allowed by *the New York Times* to have an organic movement and primordialist drives? If the Jewish movement is so similar to German Nazism, why one is damned and the other blessed by mainstream media? How has this small East European folk succeeded in dominating the discourse of the US and Russia, and to a smaller extent, Europe? How did the biggest and most devastating financial weapon of our days come to be embodied in the person of George Soros? How come the ideas of these ‘almost Serbs’ became the paradigm of the day under the brand name of neo-liberalism? Why is it one can say whatever one wants about Serbs, but the very hint of antisemitism freezes ink in fountain pens?

Martillo’s comparison is very interesting but misleading. Zionism has indeed some features similar to organic European movements (“Nazis” etc), but are these features inherent or superficial? Is Zionism ‘organic’? Surely not, as it is in fact a movement to eradicate all real traditions of Ashkenazi Jews and of all nature in their new habitat – in Palestine. It pretends to be organic in order to appeal to supporters of organic movements. Or rather it pretended as much in 1920s and 30s, when organic movements were on the rise.

Zionism has also some features similar to socialist movements, but are these features basic? The kibbutz appears to be a socialist feature until one looks closely and finds unique, “exceptionalist” quality of total racism, of military order, of brainwashing. Is Zionism socialist? No, it pretended to be socialist in order to appeal to the socialists, and with great success.

Nowadays, the Zionist State appears to be an open society and a democracy. Again, it is appearance only, created to mislead and attract. There is no need for many examples, for the real nature of murderous Israeli apartheid should be well known to the reader.

---

<sup>37</sup> [http://www.telfordtools.com/NAAP\\_Lecture/naaplecture.htm](http://www.telfordtools.com/NAAP_Lecture/naaplecture.htm)

This is my objection to the attractive thesis of Martillo. Zionism, or the Jewish Movement, deserves exceptional treatment because it is exceptional in its ability for mimesis<sup>38</sup> or mimicry<sup>39</sup>. Nazi, Socialist, Democratic, whatever you like, protean if anything, Zionism can't be comprehended in isolation from other Jewish-led movements, from the antizionist Bund to the non-Zionist Neo-Cons. The Jewish activity in Palestine appears to be part and parcel (and not the most important) of a larger framework.

This is felt by leaders of the world who send their best ambassadors to our small and poor land. In Tel Aviv, they search for keys to the hearts of the mighty, to the destroyer of treasuries George Soros, to the darling of Conservatives Conrad Black, via Michael Levy to the chief of the Labour Party Tony Blair, via Richard Perle to George Bush, via a plethora of media lords to the hearts of the American people. Prudence forces me to place a caveat: this activity is perceived as an integrated and interconnected whole, though it is always possible that whenever these important people meet, they merely discuss golf in the Bahamas.

A scientist in his heart, Martillo wants to classify Zionism and pierce it with a needle as part of his collection of East European monsters. But this monster is too big. It is not only an unpleasant form of nationalism. Its danger is in its removal from God: The Prophets of Israel condemned the Israelites for being godless. Martillos needle is simply not sufficient for this creature - it calls for a spike.

## Worlds and Gods

In order to understand the will of Yisrael, we have to deal with two parallel universes, the Jewish and the Christian<sup>40</sup> one.

Let us venture into the Jewish universe. There, the Creation of the World separated the world from God and made it in effect Godless, but in His Mercy the Almighty chose Yisrael and gave him<sup>41</sup> the Torah. The Torah descended into our world like Sophia in the Gnostic vision, but forever, never to leave Earth. She married Yisrael, and together they lit an island of Light in the dark world. Yisrael is the Church of Mankind; it is the only presence of God in the material world, for Yisrael could commune with God, while Gentiles are existentially different from people of Yisrael, and they have no way to worship the God of Yisrael except by serving Yisrael.

---

<sup>38</sup> The word is Greek and means "imitation"

<sup>39</sup> in biology, phenomenon characterized by the superficial resemblance of two or more organisms that are not closely related taxonomically. This resemblance confers an advantage—such as protection from predation—upon one or both organisms through some form of "information flow" that passes between the organisms and the animate agent of selection.

<sup>40</sup> as some ideas of Christology differ in various churches, we shall follow the Orthodox view as established by the Synods of the united Church

<sup>41</sup> Israel is masculine towards Torah and feminine towards God, in Cabbala.

Yisrael is the Light unto Nations, and the Nations are illuminated by this Light, like a tree is illuminated by the sun but remains a tree.

In the Jewish universe, all communications between Man and God are broken. Even a direct intervention by God is repulsed by the Jewish Sages in a Talmudic story with the words: since the Torah was given to Israel, all decisions are made by us, on Earth. After the Destruction of the Temple, even Yisrael can't commune with God. Thus, the Jewish Universe remains Godless for all practical purposes.

In the Christian universe, there is no impassable, existential gap between God and the World, for God Himself descended into the world and was incarnated in it. There never was an existential gap between Jews and Gentiles, either. We all are sons of Adam. Before the incarnation of Christ, the Jews worshipped God, but they had no monopoly: Melchizedek, the Priest of God Most High, was a contemporary of Abraham and superior to Abraham. Melchizedek was a priest of the original Church of Mankind, bearer of Christian tradition before the Incarnation of Jesus Christ. Christ is not only the Messiah of Israel, but the High Priest of the Church of Melchizedek, of the Church of Mankind. Christ opened Israel to everybody. The Light that was with Israel turned the Nations into Light, like fire spreads in the forest.

It was possible because Christian ideas were present among the nations of the world no less than within Israel of old. Simone Weil<sup>42</sup> wrote of the pre-Christian intuitions of Greeks and stressed non-Jewish sources of Christian faith. She rejected the concept of Gentile idolatry as 'invention of Jewish fanaticism, as all nations at all times knew of One God'.

The massive inclusion of Gentiles by power and grace of Christ did not change the election of Israel: it was and remained Elected. Israel after Christ, or True Israel, is the Christian Church, and it includes Jews and Gentiles who accepted Christ. The Jews that rejected Christ ceased to belong to this True and only Israel, and remained outside of the Covenant with God. Thus the Jews that rejected Christ broke with God, in the Christian view. For Simone Weil, the Jewish faith after Christ became a form of idolatry, for the Jewish worship of their nation or race (a mundane, this-Worldly object) is present in the very term of the Chosen People. Thus, the Jewish Yisrael is the excreted remainder of real Israel of old, a nonentity at best, but an ally of Satan at worst.

Back to the Jewish universe. Here, the election of Yisrael is the eternal election of a certain bloodline. Even acceptance of converts does not change this principle, for a true convert is born with a Jewish soul, but by Divine providence, in a Gentile body. For him, conversion is just the way to correct this error of birth. A true Gentile can't convert, for there is no way to provide him with a Jewish soul. For some modern Cabbalists, the difference between a Jew and a

---

<sup>42</sup> Lettre a un Religieux, Gallimard

Gentile is a difference on the genetic level of DNA. A Gentile, like every living creature, has a duty to worship the God of Yisrael; but in no way should he try to join Israel. A goy who attempts to follow the precepts of the Torah given to Yisrael should be killed, like a commoner who attempts to put a crown (of King or Priest) on his head. Even a goy who studies the Torah should be killed, though there is a learned argument as to whether he should be killed as a thief for stealing the patrimony of Yisrael or as an adulterer for trying to be with the lawful spouse of Israel<sup>43</sup>. Thus, the Jewish universe is mirrored in a caste society, where the priestly caste is separated from the rest, and social mobility is discouraged.

In the Jewish universe, Yisrael is reality, while Gentile nations and gods are but a figment of imagination. Dissolution of Gentile nations and elimination of their gods is a theological goal of Yisrael, her proclaimed mission of having one God, one Temple in Jerusalem, and no other form of worship. The very existence of Gentile nations with their own sacral sphere is an offence to the jealous Yisrael.

That is why Yisrael globalises and homogenises the world, uproots and nuclearises mankind. The Jewish support for globalisation was confirmed by Dr Avi Beker, the director of International Affairs of the World Jewish Congress, a member of the boards of Yad Vashem, Bar Ilan University and Beth Hatefutsoth, in his *Dispersion and Globalization: The Jews and the International Economy*<sup>44</sup>. He wrote:

“The dispersion of the Jewish people, their concentration in certain branches of the economy, their movements towards economic centres, and perhaps even their national and religious characteristics gave them certain advantages that were required for a global economy.

For hundreds of years, Jewish existence in the Diaspora has been based on globalization and today, as in the past, the Jews promoted the ideas of globalization, and served as its agents.”

There are a few ways to interpret the Jewish tendency to internationalism and globalisation. Optimists view it as a proof of supreme humanity of Jews. Well, this is possible. It is also possible, as the cynics say that the Jews see but little difference between various nations and peoples; for the Jews, a goy is a goy, and the goyim can be lumped together. Consider such Jewish statements as “The nationalities will disappear! Religions must pass! Israel however will not cease, for this small People is the Chosen One of God<sup>45</sup>.”

---

<sup>43</sup> <http://www.shemayisrael.co.il/dafyomi2/sanhedrin/points/sn-ps-059.htm>

<sup>44</sup> [http://www.wjc.org.il/publications/policy\\_studies/pub\\_study20.html](http://www.wjc.org.il/publications/policy_studies/pub_study20.html) Policy Study No. 20 (World Jewish Congress)

<sup>45</sup> Alliance Israelite Universelle

But won't Yisrael itself be destroyed by Modernity and Globalisation? 'Jewishness' is a deep theological element, an archetypical relationship to things and man, and the Jews believe it can survive uprooting and homogenisation. Some Jews visualise a perfectly de-ethnicised secular Jew, without a separate language, culture, or religion, but still a Jew. Some traditionalists, notably Alexander Dugin, believe Yisrael is destroyed by modernity, too, and therefore Jews can be persuaded to give up their support for uprooting in their own interests. But fire also destroys the base of its existence by devouring wood. Still, it can't be convinced to refrain from burning the forest down. The behaviour of Yisrael is equally unconditional, for there is no way one can reason with this higher persona. Like the Golem, it is doing things it was told to do in different circumstances, but is unable to stop.

The Gentile Mammonites fully support globalisation. "The adepts of Mammon do not like the delightful mosaic of races and cultures; they would rather homogenise the world. They have a practical reason: it is easier to sell goods to homogenised mankind. They have a moral reason: they do not want people to enjoy this beauty for free, so it has to be destroyed. Beautiful things of old belong in a museum, where they can charge an entrance fee, after the village is destroyed."<sup>46</sup>

Yisrael supports immigration, for it helps to homogenise Gentiles; 'multiculturalism' causes religious indifference. Weil was horrified by such 'multicultural' idea as proclaiming religion a private affair of no public importance, like the choice of a party or of a tie. She was horrified by sentences like 'Catholics, Protestants, Jews or atheists – we are all French', as if faith were an irrelevant attribute. For her, it was the most relevant quality of a Man.

But in the Jewish universe, a godless Gentile is much better than a pious one, for the godless one sincerely witnesses the absence of God outside of Yisrael, while the pious one creates for himself a false idol or pretends to the Crown of Yisrael.

Thus, the US, which is as Jewish as Italy was Catholic, has banned mention of Allah and the Koran in the textbooks of occupied Iraq<sup>47</sup>. The USAID staff asked the Iraqi ministry of education experts to remove verses from the Koran from experimental teaching materials for Arabic grammar, and replace them with neutral content: "If there is a sentence such as 'Praise be to God' in a grammar textbook, we will have a discussion about revising or changing that to a different sentence", said an American expert. War against Islam is not only war for oil, it is not only war for the state of Israel and its interests, it is also a religious war to enforce the faith in 'God of Yisrael' and uproot the existing faith.

---

<sup>46</sup> On the Move, from The Flowers of Galilee

<sup>47</sup>

<http://news.ft.com/servlet/ContentServer?pagename=FT.com/StoryFT/FullStory&c=StoryFT&cid=1069493436562>

In the US, the faith of Christ is hardly tolerated. Even the Passion of Christ appears banned: the Mel Gibson's film, condemned by the Jews can't find a distributor, while even the display of Nativity figures on Christmas is forbidden in public places. Indeed, by Jewish Law, "A gentile is liable for the death penalty if he has invented a religious holiday [such as Christmas] for himself."

What is the theological reason for this reversal of Christianity and of the rise of the Jewish Idea? It is connected to the old but still relevant question of Spirit versus Matter; the most basic question of Man. In order to understand it, we have to zoom out on the world of ideas to discover the anti-Judaic tendency on the other side of Christianity, that is Gnosticism.

Christian theology is improbable as a coin that falls on its edge; it is as improbable as the Big Bang, as boiling magma beneath a spring meadow, as explosive power of hydrogen. One of its most complex features is the cosmogony of Creation, needed to ensure the freedom of will, the ability of Man to distinguish and choose between Good and Evil. In non-creationist doctrines (for instance, Hinduism) there is no real freedom of will, no real world, no Good versus Evil, but Maya, dream-like illusion. In Judaism, there is Creation and freedom of will, but at a high cost of an unbridgeable chasm between Spirit and Matter.

In the Christian universe, this chasm was bridged by God and by the Holy Virgin, a material human being, who bore Christ, a Man and God. The bridge was for all: 'God became Man so a Man can become God' (in words of St Athanasius) without ceasing to be a Man.

This great idea opened the well of spirit to mankind, and its first adversary was this-worldly aspect of old biblical Judaism which formed the Judaic tendency. Christ rejected this tendency by proclaiming His Kingdom not of this world, by dismissing the Temple and Jerusalem, by rejecting the letter of the Law for its Spirit, but first of all by his Incarnation, the improbable Incarnation of Logos in mortal flesh. St Paul fought Judaic tendencies within the nascent church by elevating the spiritual content of the renewed faith. His high spirituality was taken too far by the Gnostics.

If the Judaic tendency within Christianity preferred to view Christ as Man (prophet or Rabbi), the Gnostic tendency saw him as God, whose incarnation was but an illusion. For the Gnostics, Matter was an evil trap for human souls; this world but a temporary prison of Spirit. In its archetypical narrative, the world was created by an ignorant (or outright evil) Demiurge, the Jewish God Yahweh, who was not even aware of Higher spiritual spheres. That is why our world is far from perfect. Sophia, the archetypical Soul, quarrelled with the Higher God and descended into the material world. Here she suffered, was debased and brought to utter misery. Then she called on Her Father, the Higher God, and He sent down Christ, Her Groom and Saviour. Christ married Her and brought Her up, back to Pleroma, to the Higher Spiritual world.

This Gnostic concept was problematic for it rejected the sublime beauty of our world, of its wonderful nature, of material joy, and of the Deed of Christ. Indeed, for Gnostics Christ had no real material body, and could not be crucified: the Golgotha execution was just a vision. The Evil Demiurge concept brought back the cleavage between Man and the World. In its extreme form, Gnosticism rejected marriage, rejected Nature, rejected society and considered man's temporary stay on earth as a prison sentence. This nihilism was unbearable, nay, suicidal for the society, and the nascent Church counteracted by turning to the Judaic tendency of glorifying the Creator and the material World.

In brief, the Judaic tendency extols Matter and reduces Spirit to a hardly necessary addition; while the Gnostic tendency extols Spirit and considers Matter an illusionary prison. These were the Scylla and Charybdis of Christian thought, and the Church navigated through these straits in hard and passionate discussions. The course charted by the Church was the Golden Mean of two contradicting tendencies; it is called the Orthodoxy. Finely tuned, the Orthodox teaching could bring Man to God while keeping him in communion with his society and nature.

We live in times of the overwhelming dominance of the Judaic tendency; belief in Matter and dismissal of Spirit. This theological point is translated into the articles of budget and criminal law. For instance, for a Gnostic, the death of a body is of little importance, or even desirable; for a Christian of the Golden Mean, one should not fear those that can kill the body, but rather those who want to kill spirit; for the Jews, one who kills a Jew is like one who wipes out the universe. These ideas are of value: Gnostic thought is good for a warrior and for a man of spirit, but can be rough on people, while the Jewish idea is seemingly humanist, but has caused massive over-population, excessive geriatric care and care for deficient children, overblown medical care for the rich, and ban on euthanasia. A return to the Christian balance would let the old people die peacefully, and young people grow up.

Thus, Judaism is not a foreign, totally different faith for Christians, like Tibetan Bon, or Sikhism; it is an extreme tendency on the margin of Christianity, like Trotskyism is on the margin of the Communist Church. It is dangerous because it resonates with the fundamental base of Christian society. Resonance is an awful force: a marching platoon was known to cause a bridge to collapse. That is why the Jews do not endanger non-Christian societies: their concepts do not resonate with deep structures over there. Jews in India, China or Japan were just ethnic or religious minorities of little importance, but for Christian societies they formed a deadly destructive force.

Rene Guenon formulated a concept of 'counter-initiation', that is, of a group of adepts fully conversant with the esoteric side of a faith but acting against its goals. For him, Satanists or

some Masons were adepts of counter-initiation. But Alexander Dugin<sup>48</sup> proposed a different view: some religions act as ‘counter-initiation’ groups towards each other. Judaism and Christianity are such a pair of mutually counter-initiated religions. They grew at the same time, in the first centuries after Christ, when the Church fathers on one hand and *Tanaim* and *Amoraim* on another hand composed, in full awareness of their adversary, their mutually exclusive commentaries on the Bible. A properly trained Jewish scholar acts as a counter-initiate in the Christian society, and a Christian priest in the Jewish state undermines blind loyalty of Jews. Not in vain, in the Jewish State, Christianity is persecuted. In order to live, Christianity must fight the Judaic tendency, even if it is disguised as a non-religious movement. But the symmetry is not a full one.

Religions usually double as delimiters of societies and protectors of diversity. Shi’a-Sunni divide helps Arabs and Persians to preserve their cultural differences. Likewise, separate existence of the Orthodox and Catholic churches helped Russians to secure their own culture even in the times of Western ascendancy. Some religious communities can peacefully coexist in one state: Sunni Islam and Orthodox Christianity provide an example of good life together from Palestine to Turkey to Russia. But this pair can’t share one state with the Western Christians, Catholics or Protestants, as it was manifested by breakdown of Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia, by inability of the Ottoman Empire to keep the Catholic Croatia and of Russia to secure Catholic Poland and Lithuania and Protestant Baltic states. Difference of religions is often an indicator of inability of the societies to mix. The Russians joke: “What is healthy for a Russian, is deadly for a German”.

The pre-Meiji Japan allowed the Dutch traders to enter their borders on one condition: they had to trample upon the Gospel. The Japanese felt that such traders carry no religious baggage and do not endanger cohesiveness of the Japanese society. But if we return to Judaism and Christianity, we shall find a problem: the Judaic tendency can enter a Christian society in a materialist non-religious guise and disrupt it. As opposed to the Japanese example above, the Jewish rejection of their traditional faith is far from enough.

The Gnostic tendency is a traditional remedy against Judaic influence, and that is why Simone Weil followed Marcion into rejection of the God of Jews and the Old Testament. Gnostic influence is particularly strong in Islam: Muslims, like Docetist Gnostics, believe that the Crucifixion was just a vision, and that God brought Christ to Heaven while leaving an image of a man on the Cross. By excluding the Bible from its Canon, the Muslims saved themselves from the letter-bound Judaic tendency; by banning usury they blocked the way of the

---

<sup>48</sup> Alexander Dugin, Counter-initiation (in *Metaphysics of the Good News*), 2002 Moscow

Mammonite-Jewish alliance. By having neither Pope nor Vatican, they avoided concentration of spiritual power in one place to the impoverishment of the rest.

The Muslim victory over the Jews was so complete that the Jews ceased to be a threat to Islam. A small community dealing with the forbidden (interest, loans and magic spells) was up to a point similar to the Burakumin of Japan, the pariah caste which engaged in animal slaughter, forbidden by Buddhist law. But only up to a point: the Burakumin could not improve their lot by strictly adhering to the Buddhist norm, while the Jews in the Muslim world could join the society by accepting Islam. In *The Thousand Nights and a Night* tales composed in Abbasid Baghdad, a rich, mean and nasty Jewish sorcerer, whenever defeated by Muslim hero, is required to forego his evil creed. Jewish women were easily converted and given in marriage to Muslims.

That is why anti-Judaic ideology in Islam hardly exists at all; the Muslims do not need and do not understand the anti-Judaic thought of West European or Christian Orthodox society; and no amount of *Protocols* in print, not even the Jewish-led anti-Islamic propaganda can change this fact. For Muslims, the Jews present no ideological danger; and the Jews have to fight them with tanks and missiles instead of the more subtle means they use against Christendom. Talks of 'Muslim antisemitism' are not only misleading, they are simply wrong. But it also means that Muslim influence is not liable to help besieged Christendom against its oldest enemy.

Only recently did the Wahabi sect with its rejection of pilgrimages to local shrines (ziyara) and of venerating saints, with its 'strict monotheism' arise, with its turn towards Judaic tendency. The Wahabis aren't friends of Jews, but neither were the forerunners of Christian Zionists.

Within one Christian doctrine, the tension between Jerusalem and Athens, between Creation and Manifestation, between Judeo-Christianity and Hellene-Christianity found different solutions East and West. Even before the schism, the Eastern Church preferred the Hellene tendency with its esoteric features and Christ the God, the Western Church preferred the Judaic tendency of exoteric cult and Christ the Man. The East preferred Spirit, the West preferred Matter within the same Orthodoxy. The schism of East and West strengthened these opposing tendencies, and Western Christendom, disengaged from its spiritual roots in the East, moved towards greater materialism.

But this was not enough for the Calvinists, who practically re-created Judaism without Jews. They turned to the Old Testament, legitimised usury, renounced the Virgin, rejected the Church and sacraments, caused genocides galore and brought forth predatory capitalism. If one wants to be positive about it, one can identify the Judaic tendency with freedom: freedom from society restrictions, freedom from morality, freedom for the strong to oppress the weak, and ultimately, freedom from God. Its kingdom of freedom was but a temporary stage on the way to

enslavement of uprooted man, but freedom-seekers did not understand that. Eventually the Judaic tendency won the day in the West by creating de-spiritualised, profaned world ready for the Judaic church of Mammon.

The battle was not over: the Judaic tendency was attacked from the left by Communists and from the right by National Socialists. We live today in the aftermath of the great victory of the Judeo-Mammonites over these rebels, but let us look back.

### **Right and Left against Mammon**

For over a hundred years, right-wingers were certain that Communism is a Jewish plot. Communism is Judaism, they stated, and stressed Jewish origin of Karl Marx and of the Russian revolutionaries. But Judaism is a cult of Chosen-ness, of inherent difference between an evil shard and a good spark. Christianity is the belief in inherent goodness of Man. Ontologically, Communists are Christians, not Jews.

If Mammonite neo-liberalism is an atheist reading of Jewish attitudes within the Gentile world, epitomised in ‘Man to Man is a Wolf’, communism is an atheist reading of the Christian attitude of ‘Love thy Neighbour as Thyself’. The Russian Communists’ slogan was ‘Man to Man is a Friend, Comrade and Brother’. Indeed, the Communists were traditionally hostile to the Jews. Not only Marx wrote: “Their God is greed”, Rosa Luxemburg referred to the Gentile leaders as ‘shabbesgoyim’ (‘Jewish slaves’, a favourite insult of antisemites), Lenin expelled the Jewish party of Bund from his Bolsheviks, and Simone Weil’s opinions are well known for being as anti-Jewish as anybody’s. There was a strong anti-Jewish current represented by Proudhon; Stalin and Trotsky were almost equally anti-Jewish.

Borrowings by Russian Communists from their Orthodox Christian heritage were common. Joseph Stalin studied theology, and his rhetoric remained Christian; he often used the anti-Jewish theology of St Paul and quoted the New Testament. This was noted by many authors<sup>49</sup>.

There was a Judaising tendency in Communism, as there is in Christianity. There are no ideas so vile that can't be turned into goodness; there are no ideas so good that can't be turned into vileness. The Judaic tendency within communism promoted modernity, uprooting, homogenisation, centralisation, the Imperial vertical of power and the Church-like qualities of the Communist Party.

---

<sup>49</sup> Leo Trotsky, V. Chernov, N. Valentinov, A. Avtorchanov, Michael Agursky (“Stalin's Ecclesiastical Background” Survey, No. 28, 1984), Robert C. Tucker (Stalin as a Revolutionary) and many others.

Bertrand Russel noted<sup>50</sup> in 1920: “Bolshevism is .... an aristocracy insolent and unfeeling, composed of Americanised Jews. Russians are a nation of artists, down to the simplest peasant; the aim of the Bolsheviks is to make them industrial and as Yankee as possible. Imagine yourself governed in every detail by a mixture of Sidney Webb and Rufus Isaacs, and you will have a picture of modern Russia.”

They also fought against the Russian Orthodox Church and caused it much suffering.

This war against the Church was an element of modernity, Communist or not. In non-Communist France, the churches were robbed of their properties; the beautiful paintings and utensils were removed and sold to the highest bidder at the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. In non-Communist Norway the unique *stavkyrkor* (wooden churches) were burned in the 19<sup>th</sup> century to free the land for other use; in Communist Russia they ruined uncounted medieval churches, venerated icons, treasures of the spirit accumulated over hundreds of years. In Russia as elsewhere, the struggle with the Church caused a break with the past and promoted the Nomad Civilisation of Jacques Attali.

Jacques Attali, the Jewish banker, called for creation of the New Nomad, a man ‘free from all limitations – free from national roots, cultural traditions, political passions, constant family ties’ and of Nomad Civilisation of men connected by financial relations only. In the Soviet Union, there was a tendency to uproot Man, and it was quite successful: a New Soviet Man was not a commercial animal as that of Attali’s dream, but he lived in a modern high rise, lost his traditions, never went to church, and he was as alienated from nature as his Western counterpart.

Thus the critique of Marx by Simone Weil was correct: elimination of commercialism in the communist society did not solve the problems created by uprooting. Communism helped to educate people, provided them with security, housing, work, gave them free time to think and act, but its weak theology was one of the reasons for its undoing. Godless philosophy necessarily drifts into the Judaic tendency with its Absent God, away from Christian feeling of God Alive. Without Christ, the idea of brotherly love lost its basis, and the elites were tempted to accept the ‘Man to Man is Wolf’ attitude.

Alienation from Nature was connected to surrender of the traditional cult of Theotokos, Our Lady, for Her image signified Love of Man to Earth in Christian societies. The capitalist breakthrough of North Europe was based on elimination of the cult of Our Lady, as it allowed man to substitute Love to Earth by Domination over Earth. The Western power with its predatory relationship to Earth, Nature and Man was stronger than its Earth-loving victims, like a cannibal is strongest in the besieged city. The Russian Communists went the same way, they

---

<sup>50</sup> The Autobiography of Bertrand Russell, George Allen & Unwin, London 1975, pp. 354-5:

gave up their love for Mother Earth in order to succeed in the competition with the US. Without Christ and His Mother, the Russians survived the armed challenge of the West but eventually lost the ideological war.

Still, the Russian Communists under Joseph Stalin undermined the Judaic tendency, and gave the descendents of Jews a chance to join the people. Many descendents of Jews used it: they intermarried, joined the Party, and later on came to the Church. This was especially true concerning children of intermarriages: until 1990 they invariably chose Russian identity. If the Soviet Union had existed another fifty years, it probably would have succeeded in assimilating its Jews, just as Sicily, Spain and China did.

At no time did the Russian Communists turn to biological hatred of Jews; that was the hallmark of the German National Socialism. The Germans went too far in their rejection of the Jews, and rejected Apostolic Christianity as well. Konrad Loew's new book, *Die Schuld* (The Guilt), with the subtitle 'Jews and Christians in the Opinion of Nazis and in Present Times' (Resch Press, 2002) quotes Hitler as wishing to trample the Catholic Church 'as one does a frog'. According to the Nazi mainstream, Christianity's roots in the Old Testament meant that whoever was against the Jews should also be against the Church, for 'the unconquerable arm of the spirit of blood and earth against the Hebrew plague and Christianity'.

The Nazi mainstream was equally anti-Communist and anti-Christian. A leading ideologue and a government minister Dr Robert Ley, in a programmatic speech<sup>51</sup> said: 'Our teaching affirms life. It is the idea of race, blood and soil, the idea of this life and the beauties of the earth, Mother Earth, that is our Fatherland. That is our defence against the dark powers of Marxism, Bolshevism, liberalism, Free Masonry and a belief in the Messiah (Christ – ISH), the Jewish doctrine of salvation'.

The German National Socialists misunderstood the dialectics of Hegel and went too far. It is all right to be against 'the Jews', but to a reasonable extent. Otherwise, one falls into the abyss of rejecting Christ, and the great edifice of our culture was built upon Christ.

For faith of Christ is a narrow path on the crest between two chasms, that of the Judaic tendency and that of the Gnostic tendency, between Athens and Jerusalem. Both tendencies can become deadly if followed too far. It is natural that at the time of the Gnostic ascendancy we turned to Judaic cure, as the Church Fathers did in the days of Marcion; while at time of the Judaic ascendancy we turn to Gnostics for compensatory balance, as did Simone Weil.

Alfred Rosenberg, a leading Nazi ideologist, was interested in Gnostic ideas, but he adopted the Jewish idea of inherent Jewish qualities. There is no biological 'Jewishness', but ideology and theology which should be confronted and exorcised. This thought was understood

---

<sup>51</sup> Robert Ley, "Wir oder die Juden...", *Die Hoheitsträger* 3 (May 1939), pp. 4-6.

many years later by an unusual man, a member of the far left Red Army Fraction and a founder of the far right German National Party – Horst Mahler. He wrote:

“Only in April 1945 did Hitler understand that the Jews are bearers of a certain Spirit that could be cured from its one-sidedness (meaning ‘defeated’ in Hegelian terminology - ISH) only by Spirit and not through the murder of Jews. We should criticize the Jewish principle of the separation of God and Man, and realise that the "scientific vision of the World" and Atheism are but the negative message of Judaism. We should speak against the biological racism of historic National Socialism, which reduced the human being to his animal impulses, destroyed the spirituality of Man, in that they recognized the Spirit not as infinite, and therefore not as immortal. They did not understand that Freedom is the essence of the Spirit, and conceived the freedom of the individual as the root of Evil. In a radical gesture, they have torn out this root -- and thereby have destroyed their very selves.”

Thus Mahler, who spent 10 years of his life in prison, stressed the positive function of the Jews – for uprooting of Man frees man, together with the negative function of separation of Man and God. For him, a follower of Hegel, the Spirit of the Jews should not be defeated but ‘cured from its misbalance’ by the way of synthesis.

### **Josiah Comes Back**

My friend and a sincere friend of Palestine, Jeff Blankfort wrote to me: “Most of the Jews I have known over the years, are not only not synagogue attendees, they know very little of what is contained in Jewish scriptures and at best, observe the holidays. The Jews, in general, do not subscribe to the anti-gentile tenets that Israel Shahak described in his book and that were taken from Jewish religious text and their interpretations”. This is true, as true as the fact that out of the hundred brave paratroopers at 101 km hardly one or two understood why they had come there. Very few of the soldiers felt any hate or hostility towards the Egyptians. Nor was it needed: our commanders laid out the plans, and we were to do what soldiers do.

In a similar vein, ordinary (and even not-so-ordinary) Jews do not know and do not understand the plans of Yisrael. They are obedient – and this is sufficient. Thus a soldier does not have to hate the enemy or understand the plans of his generals: it is enough if he is doing his small job. The problem is caused not so much by their conscious action, for they are also just a Donkey for their Guiding Spirit.

Nor are the Orthodox Jews worse than atheists. Rather, other way around: for a religious Jew is dimly aware of God, while an atheist Jew often thinks that the buck stops here, and there is no god but Yisrael. The Jewish ‘plan’ is no secret; there is no need to re-read *the Protocols* or to ask Jews what they want.

Yisrael ostensibly wants the same things Israel wanted before Christ, and these desires are hallowed for Christians, at first glance. Indeed, Christians read the same books of Prophets, find inspiration in the same Psalms, and their goals appear identical to those of Jews to an outsider.

“The LORD will become king over all the earth; on that day the LORD will be one and his name one. The whole land shall be turned into a plain, but Jerusalem shall remain aloft and shall dwell in security... The wealth of all the Nations shall be gathered together, gold and silver in great abundance...”

In short, Yisrael like Israel before her wants to unite the world under her spiritual guidance; the Temple of the God of Yisrael is to be located in Jerusalem, the centre of this Jewish-ordered universe and all Nations will bring tribute to it. The Nations will worship God by serving Yisrael.

This paradigm of Globalism is not particularly appealing; and some modern thinkers have traced its origins to the Old Testament. Our friend Professor Marek Glogoczowski, an interesting Polish philosopher from Krakow, compared it with the ‘One folk, one Fuehrer’ slogan of Hitler, and drew a hasty conclusion: Jews and Christians are the same, and President Bush is doing what the Prophets desired. The same conclusion was reached by the Christian Zionists; though the bottom line is different. The Christian Zionists follow Bush and the Bible, while Marek G. follows Marcion and repudiates Bush and the Bible. (He goes well beyond Marcion, who loved St Paul, and rejects the Pauline teaching, too, but that is another story).

However, these friends and enemies of the Old Testament are equally wrong. The same ideas, the same Bible verses are interpreted differently by the Jews and the Christians; and accordingly, the desires of Israel (the Church) and Yisrael (the Jews) are quite different. It was to be expected, for Yisrael is just a parody, an evil mocking of old prophecies, while Israel the Church represents their spiritual reading. In the words of Marx, Judaism is a sordid Christianity, while Christianity is the spiritual Judaism.

The Jewish reading of the Old Testament is quite different from the Christian reading. For instance, the commandment ‘Thou Shalt not Murder’ for Jews means ‘You should not kill a Jew’. Accordingly, the lofty dreams of prophets (spiritual unity of mankind around Jesus Christ) receive sordid interpretation of material possessions. For Christians, ‘Jerusalem’ is a symbol of the universal Church, for Jews, a concrete city crossed by a 12-foot wall with barbed wire.

In the Jewish reading, the exclusive sacrality of Jerusalem and of Israel calls for desecralisation of the Nations and the rest of the world. There will be no churches nor mosques, no Christian nor Muslim priests. The world will become a profane desert populated by profaned beasts, the Nations, and their shepherds, the Jews.

Church Fathers were aware of the troublesome Jewish concept of Jerusalem as the sacral centre of the world, for it de-sacralises the rest of the world. St Gregory of Nyssa objected even to pilgrimages to the Holy Land, for he was afraid Christians would consider their own churches not sufficiently sacred. Indeed, Christianity is global and local at once. Though Christ is the same Christ, His Church has no single focal point. Every church in Moscow or Paris is as good as the temple of Jerusalem. Every priest is as good as the Jewish High Priest. Thus the Church is not a globalising force; a small parish church is as good as the Chartres Cathedral.

During the first millennium of its life, the Church had no titular head either. The sees of Constantinople and Rome, Alexandria and Jerusalem, Antioch and (later) Moscow had their own autocephalous Popes, or Patriarchs. It was an important policy aimed at decentralisation of the Church, balanced by the Ecumenical Synods where the leading divines of all national churches discussed and decided on joint theology. In the East, this tradition was preserved: more and more national churches turned autocephalous while preserving joint theology; even small Serbia or Georgia has its own independent national church. In the West this tradition tragically failed: national churches of Northern Europe, while struggling for independence, broke away and drifted too far. They chose their own theology, and came to an erroneous belief that a National Church can be created just by sovereign decision. They were wrong: in order to be alive, a national church should be in sacramental communion with the Church created by Christ.

The Church is one, as Israel is one; it was created by God, and can't be created by men; its doctrinal unity should be restored while decentralisation encouraged. It is not a political question of power struggles. Christianity (including pre-Christian Christianity) presupposes Divine Presence spread in the World. Localised – in churches and in holy sites, but widely spread. As opposed to it, Yisrael wants to profane the world – save Jerusalem. The Jews want to re-enact on the global scale the feat of King Josiah, who destroyed every holy place in the country in order to establish uniqueness of the Jerusalem Temple (2 Kings, 23). “He burned the vessels, deposed idolatrous priests, defiled temples and high places, broke the pillars, pulled down the altars etc.» Simone Weil correctly said:

“If the Jews of their better days were to come back to life and be armed, they would exterminate all of us, men, women and children, for idolatry. They would kill us for worshipping Baal and Astarte, as they perceive Christ as Baal, and Our Lady as Astarte. But in truth, Baal and Astarte *were* images of Christ and Our Lady.”

She wrote these words in 1942, when ethnic Jews were experienced a great calamity; but even then Weil felt her duty to warn people of the ideological danger of Jewish theology, its tendency to globalise, de-spiritualise the world and uproot its people. “Les Juifs sont le poison du déracinement”, the Jews are the poison of uprooting, wrote Simone Weil.

## The Spiritual Pump

We quoted above the prophetic image of the Messianic age when all nations will send their gold and silver to Jerusalem: “The wealth of all the Nations shall be gathered together, gold and silver in great abundance etc.” For Christians, this has only spiritual meaning, not related to the Holy Land at all, just as the parables of Christ do not really refer to vineyards.

But Yisrael, strengthened by collapse of the Church, carries out his own programme, based on literal reading. Its *peshat* (literal interpretation) apparently became true – Jews probably have more money than Christians or Muslims, but the US and Germany still keep sending billions dollars our way. But there is a *derash* (deep interpretation): the nations will deliver their spirit to the Jews, as well. This has also been realised to an extent: it is difficult to find a sphere of spirit application where Jews do not provide the leading role. As a result, the European and American national spirit manifests itself in supporting a Jewish practical, faceless style in architecture, conceptual art, Frankfurt sociology, Chicago economics, Viennese psychology, Neo-Con politics, Holocaust theology and Zionism. This does not mean the Jews are brilliant: they merely succeeded in making their agenda the universal one.

For instance, at the same time two important events transpired in Russia: the trial of Bayliss, accused and found innocent of charge of child murder for religious purposes; and the tragedy of Leo Tolstoy’s last days. Though for universal man the second event was more significant, this trial received (and still receives) more coverage. Nowadays, graffiti on a synagogue wall attracts much more attention than the church of St Barbara being destroyed by the IDF.

At the same time there were the tragedy of Jewish losses in the WWII and the tragedy of Hiroshima. Until the Rise of Jews in 1968, there was *Hiroshima Mon Amour*; now there is only *Schindler’s list*. The spirit of the West has become subservient to the Jewish agenda.

There is a *sod* interpretation, too: in the Jewish universe, there was a catharsis preceding and connected with the destruction of the Temple. The exile of Yisrael was caused by the need to repair a cosmic disaster which occurred when the Heavenly Vessels broke under pressure of Divine Light; its shards fell to earth and intermingled with the sparks of light. While Yisrael is the sea of light, the Nations are basically evil shards, but some of them bear a spark of light. This is a Jewish soul entrapped in the Gentile world. Eventually, from generation to generation, all the sparks will be gathered in the Jewish People; while the shards – the Goyim - will become totally dark and spiritless. This is the purpose of Jewish exile: careful removal of spiritual sparks from the Gentile world.

Now, we witness this phenomenon, too. In recent years, there are dozens of institutes where Gentiles are being taught some form of Judaism: they are not converted, but form a second echelon of support. Many religious persons prefer a non-religious ‘God’, which also fits into a Judaic pattern. Theism is another form acceptable to the Jews, for it claims there are no particularly sacred focal points.

It is a commonplace that the Jews wish to dominate the world. But they do not seek the dominion of a King, but that of a church; in the very end a theocratic church-state. The Jews do not want to convert Gentiles, to make them Jews, just as the Church does not wish to confer priesthood upon its laity. For Christians, anyone can become a priest; for Jews, it is as easy as for a cat to become a man, as for a goy to become a Jew. The demands of the Jewish church on its Gentile laity are not very strenuous: they may do what they want, they may amass riches and power, provided they give up their soul and agree to have no spiritual inspirations. They should not help each other, either, for altruism is the unique ability of a Jew, according to Jewish doctrine. And many agree with the demand. Debased or not, the Christian Church was founded by Him who washed feet of his disciples and promised that the first will be last. The Jewish Church was based on the promise to the adept that his own brothers will kneel before him. Thus the Jewish Church is more suitable for those who seek dominance.

In the Jewish universe, the Gentiles should submit to the Jews. Acceptance of the Seven Noahide Commandments<sup>52</sup> is a way of such admittance. In brief, a Goy has to refrain from worshipping other gods. Even more important, a Goy should have no feasts or rites of his own. As long as he has no religion he is all right; his de-spiritualised existence causes no alarm. Rambam (or Maimonides) expounded: “A Gentile who creates or follows a religious rule beside the Seven Commandments should be lashed and warned that he will be executed if he persists. We do not allow the Gentiles to make religious rites and commandments for themselves”<sup>53</sup>. By accepting the Seven Commandments, a person agrees to his status of a Goy in the Jewish Universe.

When St Paul and St Peter began their mission to Gentiles, at first the Jerusalem Church leaders – Jews who came to Christ – demanded to circumcise the new adepts<sup>54</sup>. In their eyes, Christianity was just for the Jews; though they were prepared to accept converts. St Peter refused. Then the Church leaders offered a compromise: let the new Christians of Gentile origin accept the Noahide Commandments and refrain from eating pagan sacrifices. St Peter was ready to accept it, for he did not understand the meaning of the prohibition. St Paul refused, for he understood: by accepting, his New Christians would agree to fit into the Jewish-ordered

---

<sup>52</sup> <http://www.noahide.com/covenant.htm>

<sup>53</sup> Mishneh Torah, Hilchoth Melachim 10

<sup>54</sup> Acts 15:9

universe<sup>55</sup>. He did not insist on eating it, but it was necessary to say: we may; this ‘prohibition’ is irrelevant for us.

There are no small things in the world of spirit. A cabbalist from Safed, Joseph della Reina, captured Satan within a magic pentagram and ordered him to release the soul of the Messiah, according to a medieval Jewish tale. Satan agreed, on one small condition: he asked Joseph to light a candle for him. Joseph lit the candle, and this act of worship turned Satan free. He seized Joseph and threw him far away, all the way to Tiberias.

In a similar way, small agreements with the Jews caused the submission of Christendom – not only to the Jews, but also to their Guiding Spirit. It begins with small things: removal of religious signs from schools and public places. But our souls interpret this surrender of spirit as the proof of Jewish victory. Some time ago, the US Congress, in a most strange act of submission, agreed to give the status of law to the Seven Commandments<sup>56</sup>. It was quite irrelevant: anyway we do not eat sacrificial food; it was as irrelevant as the candle of della Reina, and as catastrophic as the folly of the Cabbalist.

An even worse folly was the idea of two valid Covenants of Vatican II. A Christian may argue that the New Testament is different from the Old one, but then he should accept the idea of Supercession, as the Catholics did. Alternately, one may believe, with the Orthodox, that there is just one Covenant, and the Old one is identical to the New. Then he should state that the Jews who reject Christ are not part of the Covenant anymore. But in no way may a Christian state that the Jewish Covenant is valid; for it undermines the very meaning of Christ’s sacrifice. Necessarily, it creates a two-tier religion, of the first-class ‘Christian Jews’, members of two covenants, and the second-class Goyim, members of the second covenant only. The Church should attract and baptise Jews, but without giving them a special status. Otherwise the Church, the most powerful defence against the ongoing Jewish offensive, will be subjugated, and the majestic lady from Strasbourg will change places with the Synagogue.

The Jewish Universe is being built, brick by brick, and one of its signs is the lowering of the educational and spiritual life of Gentiles. In the bigger Jewish state, the US, one needs over \$30,000 a year to pay for a good university education. The vast majority of Americans can’t even dream of such sums, but it is still affordable to Jews. American films degrade their viewers, while the TV is able to turn an insistent viewer into a zombie.

---

<sup>55</sup> I Cor 8

<sup>56</sup> The U.S. Congress officially recognized the Noahide Laws in legislation which was passed by both houses. Congress and the President of the United States, George Bush, indicated in Public Law 102-14, 102nd Congress, that the United States of America was founded upon the Seven Universal Laws of Noah. For this purpose, this Public Law designated March 26, 1991 as Education Day, U.S.A.

The delicate subject of school integration comes to mind. John Spritzler of [New democracy](#)<sup>57</sup> wrote: “Here in the U.S. I saw (in the 1970’s) the liberal elite, in the name of ending racial segregation, order white parents to place their kindergarten children on busses to take them all the way across the city of Boston -- an hour long bus ride -- to distant schools that, like all the schools for working class children in Boston, were terrible and under-funded. The liberal judge who ordered this would not even consider an alternate plan proposed by black parents that would have ended the segregation with short distance and far more reasonable bussing. Whites who objected to the judge's order were labelled "racist" by the liberal Boston Globe newspaper (owned by the biggest business leaders).”

Please notice: the Boston Globe is a Jewish-owned newspaper. This bussing was a great thing for the Jewish schools and kindergartens: they did not undergo bussing, so they could attract all the Jews plus high-class Gentiles and charge good fees. And consider the extra fun of annoying and humiliating the WASPs - or integrating all goyim into one happy family. For certain, the bussing – good or bad, right or wrong otherwise – led to a drop in the education level of the American middle class, and this debilitation of WASP America was a necessary step in the takeover of the American mind. For total victory of the Jewish spirit will be reached only when a debilitated illiterate goy will thankfully lick a Jewish hand and bless him for his guidance.

## **The Holy Land**

What do the Jews want in the Holy Land? To live in peace, say their supporters. They want to kill or expel the Palestinians, say their adversaries. They hope to create a super-state from Nile to Euphrates, say pessimists. It does not matter, as long as they will leave us in peace, say antisemites, and they are mistaken. Surely there are Jews who want one of these three things. But ‘the Jews’ (as opposed to ‘Jews’) intend to turn Jerusalem into the supreme capital of the world, and its rebuilt temple into the focal point of the Spirit on Earth. That is the only thing that is still missing in the ongoing construction of the Jewish Universe.

In 1962, *Look* magazine invited the founder of the Jewish state David Ben-Gurion to picture the world 25 years into the future. He (mis-)predicted that World Government would already be in place by 1987, with the Supreme Court for Mankind (the higher ecclesiastic body) to be established in Jerusalem, as well as a shrine there, commemorating the Jewish role in the bringing-together of mankind<sup>58</sup>.

If and when it will be done, the world will be changed irreversibly. Christianity will die, the spirit will depart from the nations in our part of the world, and our present dubious

---

<sup>57</sup> [www.newdemocracyworld.org](http://www.newdemocracyworld.org)

<sup>58</sup> David Ben Gurion quoted by LOOK magazine Jan 16, 1962: <http://users.cyberone.com.au/myers/bengur62.jpg> .

democracy will be supplanted by a vast theocratic state. Peace is the last thing people should expect in such circumstances. Theocratic states are not pleasant to live in, be it Jesuit-managed Paraguay or the Papal State, or Puritan New England. However, the Jewish theocratic state will be considerably worse, for the ordinary Gentiles will have no share in its rule and no access to its spirituality. De-spiritualised and uprooted, homeless and lonely, yesterday's Masters of the World will become slaves in all but name.

Now we begin to understand the supreme mystery of double unity of two seemingly opposite political ideas, Zionism and Mammonite Liberalism. While Zionism establishes the basis for the NWO HQ, the Mammonite Liberalism establishes the world-wide slavery. Jabotinsky and Soros are doing different tasks for one system; the Iron Wall and the Open Society are just different names for the same thing. When the Jews in the Holy Land assert their right to drive tanks wherever they want, to snatch their enemies from all over the world, to privatise the lands of the Palestinians and the aluminium plants of the Russians, they exercise the Open Society paradigm. When they build the Wall on the lands of Palestinians and force their Chinese slaves to sign "No sex, no God"<sup>59</sup> contracts, they turn to the Iron Wall hypostasis.

Moreover, the Open Society can't exist without the Iron Wall. The members of the prised-open society, robbed of their livelihood, will attack the robbers, who will have to erect the Iron Wall. In the Holy Land, the Jews have water and land, the Gentiles have hunger and thirst; that is why the Palestinian territories are Open for the Jewish incursions, while the Wall protects the Jews.

Describing the High priest of the Open Society and his ideas, Marek G. wrote: "The bulk of von Hayek's writing is devoted to the elaboration of methods of making people mutually alien, devoid of any trace of friendship and altruism"<sup>60</sup>. He proposes that populations of the Global Empire should be constantly intermixed, so no durable and distinct cultures will appear (or remain preserved from the past). Inhabitants of the Global Empire are supposed to be nationhood-less (and thus automatically, identity-less) humanoids, "individualistically" moving in directions dictated to them by "invisible" financial commanders, whose existence is implicit in Hayek's writings. He proclaims that "***Liquidation of the sovereignty of states is the necessary and logical goal of the liberal program.***" The only collective goal of human activity admitted in

---

<sup>59</sup> JERUSALEM (AP) - An Israeli company has required thousands of Chinese workers to sign a contract promising not to have sex with Israelis or try to convert them, a police spokesman said Tuesday. (Tue, December 23, 2003)

<sup>60</sup> This is not at all an exaggeration. The promotion of egoism and selfishness has become a true "American mission" in the world. At the end of August 2002 I participated in a Congress "Mut zur Aethik" at Feldkirch, Austria, where I heard the (former) American senator Bob Barr extolling "the virtue of selfishness". According to Barr - who in a mechanic way repeated opinions of American philosopher Ayn Rand - "*all of history could be described as the individual moving away from the influence of the tribe.*" [note of Marek G].

the Global Empire should be acquisition of private property, especially of these mobile, shinning items, which are subjects of a competitive mass production and distribution.”<sup>61</sup>

The (neo-) liberalism is the Judaic vision of the world under the Jews. It is the main line of assault by Yisrael, while Zionism with all its cruelty is but a minor operation. Now we witness an interesting phenomenon: George Soros, this Guderian of Yisrael, complains that imprudent actions by American Zionist neo-cons endanger his much more important operation<sup>62</sup>.

It is not unusual in the army for a general to demand the curtailment of a successful operation by another unit, because it undermines the main effort. George Soros succeeded single-handedly (well, almost) in colonising Eastern Europe<sup>63</sup>, and he hopes to offer an alternative to the bellicose neo-cons for the Western Europe. It seems that the pet project of Yisrael will be completed in our lifetime.

However, the total profanation of Man is physically impossible. Just as deprivation of normal sex life in jails causes perversions, a perversion of Western spirituality will come to life. The African slaves in America developed a new slave cult, mixing their old beliefs with those of

---

<sup>61</sup> Western Concepts of Social Order: from “European Corporation” of A. Comte (1842) to “Global Tumour” of F.A. von Hayek (1939) by Dr Marek Glogoczowski

<sup>62</sup> <http://www.nytimes.com/2004/01/25/books/chapters/0125-1st-soros.html>

<sup>63</sup> George Soros, NS Profile by NEIL CLARK / New Statesman 2 June 2003

Neil Clark wrote in the New Statesman:

“The conventional view, shared by many on the left, is that socialism collapsed in eastern Europe because of its systemic weaknesses. That may be partly true, but Soros' role was crucial. From 1979, he distributed \$3m a year to dissidents including Poland's Solidarity movement, Charter 77 in Czechoslovakia and Andrei Sakharov in the Soviet Union. In 1984, he founded his first Open Society Institute in Hungary and pumped millions of dollars into opposition movements and independent media. The Yugoslavs remained stubbornly resistant and repeatedly returned Slobodan Milosevic's unreformed Socialist Party to government. Soros was equal to the challenge. From 1991, his Open Society Institute channelled more than \$100m to the coffers of the anti-Milosevic opposition, funding political parties, publishing houses and "independent" media such as Radio B92, the plucky little student radio station of western mythology which was in reality bankrolled by one of the world's richest men on behalf of the world's most powerful nation.

“Soros stresses his belief in the "open society", but Soros' "open societies" don't tend to be all that open in practice. Soros deems a society "open" not if it respects human rights and basic freedoms, but if it is "open" for him and his associates to make money. He copied a pattern he has deployed to great effect over the whole of eastern Europe: of advocating "shock therapy" and "economic reform", then swooping in with his associates to buy valuable state assets at knock-down prices.

“More than a decade after the fall of the Berlin Wall, Soros is the uncrowned king of Eastern Europe. His Central European University, with campuses in Budapest, Warsaw and Prague and exchange programmes in the US, unashamedly propagates the ethos of neo-liberal capitalism and clones the next pro-American generation of political leaders in the region... has pursued the classic Soros agenda of privatisation and economic liberalisation—leading to a widening gap between rich and poor.”

Soros is interconnected with other adepts of Yisrael: “At his Human Rights Watch there is Morton Abramowitz, US assistant secretary of state for intelligence and research from 1985-89, and now a fellow at the interventionist Council on Foreign Relations; ex-ambassador Warren Zimmerman (whose spell in Yugoslavia coincided with the break-up of that country); and Paul Goble, director of communications at the CIA-created Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty (which Soros also funds). Soros' International Crisis Group boasts such "independent" luminaries as the former national security advisers Zbigniew Brzezinski and Richard Allen, as well as General Wesley Clark, once NATO supreme allied commander for Europe. The group's vice-chairman is the former congressman Stephen Solarz, once described as "the Israel lobby's chief legislative tactician on Capitol Hill" and a signatory, along with the likes of Richard Perle and Paul Wolfowitz, to a notorious letter to President Clinton in 1998 calling for a "comprehensive political and military strategy for bringing down Saddam and his regime".

their masters. Similar slave cults are growing now among the Europeans, and the cult of Holocaust is one of them.

Theologically, this cult is an adaptation of the Jewish spiritual rule for Christian minds, as it replaces Christ with Israel, Golgotha with Auschwitz, and the Resurrection with the creation of the Jewish state. People who argue with the dogma of Holocaust are met with treatment the heretics were given in the days of yore. They are excommunicated and excluded from society.

Usually, they are people of scientific mind; their arguments recall the arguments of naïve atheists who were prone to say, 'A whale can't swallow man, ergo, the story of Jonah is not true'. In a similar vein, heretics of the Holocaust cult say: such vast amounts of Jews could not be killed, or there are no gas chambers to prove their existence. But these arguments cut no ice: people who found themselves in the Jewish universe have to invent some religious tools and dogmas.

On a subconscious level, the Americans and to lesser extent Europeans have already accepted their defeat. Claude Lanzmann sounded the challenge when he said: "If Auschwitz is true, then there is a human suffering with which that of Christ simply cannot be compared. In this case, Christ is false, and salvation will not come from him. Auschwitz is the refutation of Christ<sup>64</sup>". This challenge was not met. No new Roland picked up the glove of the advancing enemy. Lanzmann was not ostracised, his films were screened in the cinemas of France, while theologians discussed 'Christianity after Auschwitz'. Spiritual capitulation of the West was manifested by the removal of the Cross and of a church from the grounds of Auschwitz; it was confirmed by the Pope's Canossa in Jerusalem, when the head of the Roman Catholic church asked forgiveness from the Jews.

It was a mistake. It is not a coincidence that soon afterwards, Sharon marched on the Temple Mount and started the World War Three. The Jews are no Christians, and they consider apology a sign of surrender. Our friend Paul Eisen wrote:

"To the Christian and to the entire non-Jewish world, Jews say this: 'You will apologise for Jewish suffering again and again and again. And, when you have finished apologising, you will then apologise some more. When you have apologised sufficiently we will forgive you, provided you let us do what we want in Palestine.'"

Eisen was too optimistic. Palestine is not the ultimate goal of the Jews; the world is. Palestine is just the place for the world state headquarters; necessary, for otherwise the people of Europe wouldn't be magnetised like a rabbit in the headlights of a car. If a Jewish state would be established in say, Argentina, as per Baron Hirsh, in Uganda as per Theodor Herzl or in

---

<sup>64</sup> Les temps modernes, Paris, December 1993, p. 132, 133

Madagascar as per Hitler, it would not be able to activate deep levels of Christian consciousness. Now, appearing as a part of prophecy, it has captivated their mind.

It has captivated the mind of Israelis, too. Their task in the whole setup is admittedly limited. The Jews in their drive to world domination need a base, and the Israelis are to seize and secure this base. For such a job they do not need much imagination, and Zionists are a simple-minded folk. Even average Israeli IQ is 95, below the mid-European 100 and way below the European Jewish 105. The lower IQ is not the result of Sephardi Jews being counted in, as sometimes is claimed, but of a well known fact: clever and successful Jews hardly ever immigrated to Israel. They made their career in the US or Russia, in France or Germany. They make money on Wall Street, fight antisemitism on the pages of *Le Monde* and *the Times*, rule nations and write art reviews. Israelis are the riffraff of World Jewry, sent to conquer the land for the NWO HQ.

Very few Israelis look beyond the next hill they hope to take away from the Palestinians. They are possessed by their desire, though they can't understand or explain why. A good case is Dr Benny Morris. The expert on the Palestinian Tragedy of 1948, he now approves of it, regrets it was not more complete, and wishes to repeat it multiplied and amplified<sup>65</sup>. This is not a Holocaust denial, it is Holocaust approval. For Morris, uprooting of Palestinians and destruction of their culture, land, and uniqueness is not a big deal: they were not killed in biological sense, were they? And the Goy is just a biological machine, an animal, whose environment and way of life may be destroyed if it is needed for a supreme being. And Morris says "I still think of myself as left-wing." If this is the Jewish Left, what is Jewish Right?

As time goes by, recognition of their mission sinks into Israelis' consciousness. The metamorphosis of Nathan Sharansky, a human rights fighter of yesteryear turned into a right-wing Jewish nationalist, proves it. Once a liberal, he recently<sup>66</sup> he called for the retention of the Temple Mount in Jewish hands even at the cost of endless war. Benny Morris, yesterday's friend of Palestinians, today calls for ethnic cleansing and predicts eternal war with nuclear holocaust within twenty years. Jews elsewhere are infatuated with the state of Israel, though they did not care much for it before 1968, for only after this momentous year they began to feel the advance of Yisrael's global plans.

In Israel, the share of people approving of the Third Temple plans steadily grows, and now exceeds 60 per cent. With Iraq occupied, Palestinians locked behind the wall, Iranians cowered and Saudis scared to death, it is just a matter of months until the Golden Dome will be blown up and the Third Temple erected. It is difficult to calculate the consequences; whether

---

<sup>65</sup> "Survival of the Fittest", interview by Ari Shavit, Haaretz, Friday Magazine, January 9, 2004, <http://www.haaretz.com/hasen/pages/380986.html>.

<sup>66</sup> Haaretz 16.10.2003

they will be blissfully limited to a nuclear Armageddon, or (much worse possibility) our Ecumene shall drift into the Jewish universe.

Well, not exactly: while the Christian nations will die spiritually, no amount of temples will open the non-existent communication line between Jews and God; no grace will flow into this temple from heaven and to people. The Satanic Mocker will laugh at Jews who believed that tanks and bulldozers can put God into their pocket.

In a story by Charles de Coster, the trickster and mocker Tyl Ulenspiegel<sup>67</sup> sold Jews a magic sachet, promising they would be able to divine the future by sucking it. The Jews hoped to find out when their Messiah will come, and sucked hard, just to discover the sachet was full of bullshit. Similar disappointment lays in wait for the temple builders.

But the evil consequences of this enterprise will be very real, for acceptance of Satanic rule will influence the extremely powerful if not omnipotent collective conscience of mankind. The Manhattan Project scientists who were called to create the first nuclear bomb were afraid the chain reaction would destroy the Earth, turning it into a star. Meddling with divine spheres can cause an equally damaging result of turning the world into spiritual desert.

In order to save the world from possible spiritual devastation, the Jewish state must be dismantled. Even if Yasser Arafat were to swear loyalty to Ariel Sharon, it has to be done – not only for the sake of the Palestinians, but for the sake of entire world. It can be done softly, without transfers and bloodshed, by creating a democratic state for all residents of Palestine, native and adoptive Palestinians. It won't be a Jewish state, but Israeli Jews will eventually be absorbed by Palestinians, as the Jews of old were absorbed by Palestinians during the 2<sup>nd</sup> to 7<sup>th</sup> centuries.

After all, Native Palestinians and Israeli Jews are the same people, separated by religion. In a recent study Spanish geneticist Professor Antonio Arnaiz-Villena, of Complutense University in Madrid found Jews and Palestinians share a very similar gene pool and they must be considered closely related, not genetically separate. Rivalry between the two groups is therefore based "in cultural and religious, but not in genetic differences," stated the authors<sup>68</sup>. Thus, the family of Abraham will be reunited, and the world will slowly recover from the devastation caused by Yisrael.

## Curse Or Blessing?

---

<sup>67</sup> De Coster, *La Légende et les aventures héroïques, joyeuses, et glorieuses d'Ulenspiegel et de Lamme Goedzak au pays de Flandres et ailleurs* (1867; *The Glorious Adventures of Tyl Ulenspiegel*).

<sup>68</sup> <http://cgis.jpost.com/cgi-bin/General/printarticle.cgi?article=/Editions/200>

Is there a way to decide objectively who is right, which model of the universe is true, Jewish or Christian, or it is a matter of taste, like a choice of coffee or tea? And should we care about it at all? Oh yes there is, and yes, we should. If what the Jews say is true, and they are the True Israel, their presence should be blessing for the people they dwell amongst; if what the Church teaches is true, and their Yisrael is an impostor, the Rise of the Jews is likely to be a curse for the native people.

This is a point of mutual agreement between Jews and Christians: blessing is the criterion. A popular Jewish spokesman Irwin Graulich, whose article *Obsessive-Compulsive Judaism*<sup>69</sup> was much circulated on the Internet wrote:

“The answer (whether to abide by the Jews or not) is actually quite simple and stems from an important sentence in the New Testament. ‘Those who bless the Jews will be blessed and those who curse the Jews will be cursed.’ Anyone who believes in this statement will take the road of religious American Christian [Zionists]. It is no wonder that America has become the most blessed country in the history of the world. And which nations are the most cursed today? Obviously the Arab and Muslim world, even with all their oil wells!”

There is no such sentence in the New Testament. Synagogue of Satan, yes. The Jews persecuted Jesus, yes. The Jews sought all the more to kill Him, yes. The Jews acted insincerely, yes. But the sentence Irwin Graulich claims to find there is abundantly absent.

Graulich did not invent the blessing and the curse: he confused the New with the Old Testament, where it means something completely different. The actual quote<sup>70</sup> reads “And I will bless them that bless thee (Abraham), and curse him that curseth thee: and in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed.” For a Christian, God is referring to Christ, a direct descendent of Abraham. What could be a higher and better blessing than being a forefather of Christ? Indeed, through Christ, all families of the earth (gentiles) were blessed, and all those who accepted Christ became children of Abraham, in words of St Paul<sup>71</sup>. But those who rejected Christ became cursed by the same curse.

Since Christ had opened the Covenant for all, the Christian Church became the True Israel, and the Jews that rejected Christ do not belong to the True Israel anymore, nor do divine prophecies pertain to them anymore. By applying the pre-Christ promises to after-Christ reality, Graulich tricks his innocent reader.

The opinion of a Graulich would mean very little in this world; but the same line was propagated by The New Scofield Reference Bible, Oxford 1967 and subsequent editions, a vast Jewish-inspired enterprise popular with simple-minded American preachers. This ‘Bible’ is

---

<sup>69</sup> <http://www.jewishindy.com/article.php?sid=2931&mode=thread&order=0> and other sites.

<sup>70</sup> Gen. 12:3

<sup>71</sup> Rom. 4:11

rather a Talmud, a vast set of ‘commentaries’ and ‘footnotes’ upon the Bible text. The result is as far removed from the Old Testament as the Jewish Talmud, another set of ‘commentaries’. For instance, the Talmud comments upon the word ‘man’ as follows: ‘it means a Jew, for a non-Jew is not called ‘man’. The Oxford editors of the Scofield Bible implanted the following footnotes to the Old Testament:

“(3) there is a promise of blessing upon those individuals and Nations who bless Abram's descendants, and a curse laid upon those who persecute the Jews<sup>72</sup>. It has invariably fared ill with the people who have persecuted the Jew, well with those who have protected him. The future will still more remarkably prove this principle”<sup>73</sup>.

Let us check whether it fared well with the people who have protected the Jew, in the best place for such a check, in the Jewish state. In the sandy and dusty Negev hills, the vast arid area in the South of the Holy Land, just below the Roman-built Scorpio Pass, on the edge of Arava Valley, half-way from Jerusalem to Eilat and from Gaza to Petra, there is a venerable and venerated millennia-year old jojobe<sup>74</sup> tree. Under its eternally-green spreading and leafy boughs, there was once an abundant spring of water, called En-Hazeva in the Bible, and Ain-Husub in modern Arabic. Its gushing waters attracted caravans of Nabatean traders carrying myrrh and frankincense from Arabia Felix to Mediterranean, Israelites of old dwelt next to it, Edomites built a small temple on the hill above, and the Romans erected a bath house. In modern times, many Bedouin shepherds, children of Abraham, wandered with their flocks to its blessed stream and swore their oaths at the tree in its deep and cool shadow.

It is the Promised Land’s border, home to the pastoral figure of the shepherd with his lamb on his shoulders. Lean and sturdy in white loose clothes, with a noble weather-bitten face in the white frame of his headdress girdled by black knitted string, a rolled cigarette of home-grown weed in his rough hands, the Arab feels himself in the bare vastness of desert as much at home as you on your High Street. Always relaxed and friendly, he is a pleasure to meet. Many times, wandering in the desert I came across a Bedouin black tent and was enlivened by their *maramiye* tea, forever warming in a big aluminium kettle on the amber coals.

The stars, huge shaggy desert stars above their camp fire were so much more impressive and moving than the flat TV screen we are doomed to stare at. Electricity, this doubtful blessing, has given us the pleasure of reading books at night, but has stolen the stars; it is easier to turn on electric light than to lit a fire, but the Arab has a live warmth of fire in addition to light for the same effort. For settled folk, walls stop the wind, but block the view; but the Arab has the live

---

<sup>72</sup> (Page 19, 1967 Edition Genesis 12:1-3)

<sup>73</sup> footnote (3) bottom of page19-20Genesis 12:3 quoted by WHTT

<sup>74</sup> *Ziziphus spina-christi*

view of virgin nature untouched. Roofs protect us from sun and rain, but the Arab has this high heaven to remind him of God.

From afar, all inhabitants of the Middle East are 'Arabs', but here, this name belongs exclusively to the Bedouin. In the beautiful mosaic of Palestine, the Arab shepherds, the Fellah peasants, and the city burghers are as distinct as basic colours; all very good and different. The Fellah has his green fingers; he makes almonds blossom and olive to give fruit; he builds terraces and stone houses. The city people live amidst great churches and mosques of Palestine; the learning and the trade are done by them. The Arabs are different from settled folk, for they are exposed to elements; washed by rain, warmed by sun, purged by wind, they are an integral part of nature. T.E. Lawrence was in love with them, and thought the Jews would protect the Bedouins from the Fellahs and city folk. For this reason he supported the Balfour declaration and the Jewish colonisation of Palestine.

However, with Israel's unilateral declaration of independence in 1948, the Jews drove the Bedouins out of Arava Valley into Jordan, Sinai and Gaza Strip. Only one family remained near the spring of Ain Husub, the family of Ali Abu el Mesk Amrani whose father 'protected the Jew': he helped the Zionist soldiers to find the way south to Eilat in 1949. As a reward, he was allowed to stay on the land of his ancestors near the great old tree and abundant spring. But not for long: in 1960's, the Jewish settlers came to Arava. They wanted to use its warm climate to create profitable agriculture for export to Europe. The soil was poor, so they took over the Jordanian lands across the border. The work was hard, so they brought in Thai workers. Their ideas of agriculture were developed in Europe with its plentiful water, so they drilled deep wells, and sucked out the juice of the land. In 1964 the ancient spring of Ain Husub dried up; in a few years all 26 small springs that once supplied Ali's lambs with water were dry and dead.

After losing his livelihood, Ali decided to build a house and to switch to modern way of life. But he was not allowed to: the authorities that permitted Jewish settlers to build their villas, forbade it to Ali the Goy. He and his family remained living in his torn tents, near the dried-up spring of Ain Husub, near the prosperous villas of the Jewish settlers, near small shantytown called Bangkok for Thai labourers. Here we may forsake post-modern multiculturalism, the anti-hate, no-offence-given approach proclaiming the equal value of all religions, and answer the question who is right, which model of the universe is better: Jewish or Christian.

Indeed, the Jewish universe is good for the Jews, but it is a curse for others. The Church had it right: their blessing became curse, and whoever blesses them is cursed; as Americans experience now on their own skin. Jewish dominance is not a good sign for the ordinary people, and it has been tried many times.

In Eastern Europe, times of Jewish dominance were the worst experienced by the ordinary people. Post-Revolutionary Russia experienced the reign of terror in 1920's, destruction of its churches, the great famine in Ukraine, and the massive uprooting of peasants. They did not mean harm, my Jewish grandfathers, they weren't evil monsters. Like a boy who pulls the goldfish out of the bowl so they will enjoy sunshine, Jews meant well. They wanted to turn Russia into a modern efficient country without churches, without Dostoyevsky 'the antisemite', without its primitive native culture. If the Russians needed a church, they were ready to oblige and supported the Church-like hierarchy of the CPSU with an Inquisition-like ideological police force, the Cheka.

The Jews lost their high positions in the Communist Church by 1934, and the life of ordinary Russians improved greatly. After 1991, the Judeo-Mammonites enforced their paradigm upon Russia, and the life of ordinary Russians was degraded, while the new elites prospered.

In Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary the years of Jewish dominance (1945-1956) were the most harsh and unpleasant. In Germany, Jewish pre-eminence in 1920's coincided with terrible inflation and unemployment for Germans, and the growth of Jewish wealth and influence. The native Gentile is crushed to earth in the Jewish state of Israel. And in the US, as Jewish influence has grown steadily since 1968, the lives of ordinary people has worsened and the social gaps has grown manifold.

A right-wing American *Business Week*, in an article titled "Waking Up From the American Dream", reported that between 1973 and 2000 the average real income of the bottom 90 percent of American taxpayers actually fell by 7 percent. Meanwhile, the income of the top 1 percent rose by 148 percent, the income of the top 0.1 percent rose by 343 percent and the income of the top 0.01 percent rose 599 percent. Upward mobility shrunk from 25% to 10%, and very few children of the lower class are making their way to even moderate affluence. Paul Krugman writes in the *Nation*<sup>75</sup> that America creates a caste society, where low position of ordinary Americans is entrenched by cuts in education and health, and by shifting the tax burden to workers away from the rich and sophisticated.

This tendency is strong in the Jewish state, where stock market profits, and profits from real estate are not taxed at all in many cases, while the labour is taxed at full capacity. It is not a coincidence: the Jews traditionally despise labour and workers, and the rise of the Jewish church has had severe repercussions for ordinary working people. In the State of Israel, the question 'curse or blessing' is really a no-brainer. The native Gentiles of the Holy Land suffer from destruction of their country; their olive trees are uprooted, their income is a fraction of the Jewish income, while they are locked up behind the great Sharon's Wall.

---

<sup>75</sup> <http://www.thenation.com/doc.mhtml?i=20040105&s=krugman>

An Israeli author, Ran HaCohen wrote in Antiwar.com: “It is high time to say it out loud: In the entire course of Jewish history, since the Babylonian exile in the 6th century BC, there has never been an era blessed with less antisemitism than ours. There has never been a better time for Jews to live in than our own.” I agree. But is not it the high time to say it out loud: A good time for the Jews is not a good time for the rest of mankind. Since 1968, the Jews have it better and better, while ordinary people have it worse and worse.

Thus we have found an answer to the question: the blessing of the Jews is a curse for others, and therefore the Jews are not the blessed Israel. A Jewish theologian from New York, Saadiya Grama, put it succinctly: “Jewish successes in the world are completely contingent upon the failure of all other peoples. Only when the gentiles face total catastrophe do the Jews experience good fortune.”<sup>76</sup> His book was rightly condemned as racist, for he claimed: “The difference between the people of Israel and the nations of the world is an essential one. The Jew by his source and in his very essence is entirely good. The goy, by his source and in his very essence is completely evil. This is not simply a matter of religious distinction, but rather of two completely different species.”

Grاما said explicitly and bluntly what many other Jews – from Lubavitch Hassids to Matti Golan – think. More importantly, it is a true presentation of the Jewish theological paradigm, cleansed of PR lies and dissimulation. It would be objectively true even if no Jew were to express or even consciously entertain such thoughts. In the same way, America was separated from Europe by the Atlantic even when its existence was not known to the Europeans.

### **Chinese Take-Away**

In 13<sup>th</sup> century, the French took over the island of Sicily. They settled in the cities, and formed an upper class, separated from the natives. They were more wealthy and powerful than the Sicilians, and the French troops stationed on the island protected them. But on Easter 1282, at the vespers time, the docile people of Palermo rebelled and killed off the French soldiers and settlers. 2000 Frenchmen were slaughtered in the course of what remained in history as Sicilian Vespers. France lost its hold over the kingdom. And ten years later, the Crusader Kingdom of Acre was vanquished by Sultan Halil al-Ashraf, and the Frank colonists were slaughtered, sold into slavery or fled to Cyprus.

This is not an unusual solution to the problem of foreign supremacy. If the ruling foreigners keep to themselves, and do not integrate with the natives, they prepare for themselves the unpleasant fate of the French in Sicily or the Franks in Outremer. But there are less sanguine ways to deal with foreign elites, as we can discover over a dinner.

---

<sup>76</sup> <http://www.forward.com/issues/2003/03.12.19/news4a.html>

In better Chinese restaurants, one enjoys a visual pleasure, in addition to a good meal: their waitresses wear a full length skirt with an opening aside slit all the way to their waist, so every step of these delightful creatures flashes a view of their superb legs. It is not a sign of Western decadence: even very traditional Chinese restaurants in China observe this exhilarating custom. They do not want to distract their clients from enjoying a Peking Duck – the slash in the skirt has a different meaning.

It is a memory of conquest of China by the Manchu, a Mongo-related people from China's North East province of Manchuria. In 1644 the Manchu repelled the Russian advances in Amur Valley, and with the help of dissident Chinese, established themselves as the new rulers of China under the name of Ch'ing Dynasty. The Chi'ing dynastic rule of China lasted until 1911, for almost three hundred years. During this time, the Chinese assimilated their semi-nomadic rulers: the Manchu lost their language, their specific culture, their customs and became Chinese.

But assimilation is a two-way process. The Manchu – both men and women - were intrepid warriors and horse riders; the Manchu ladies of high birth wore long skirts with a waist-deep slash that allowed them to sit astride the horseback. They brought the skirts with them to their new Imperial capital in Beijing, and soon all Chinese aristocratic ladies adopted this fashion though they never rode horseback.

The revolution of 1911 turned China into a republic; the Manchu rule was over and done with, despite a short-lived Japanese attempt to create a new Manchurian state of Manchukuo. The only thing that remained from the centuries of Manchu rule was the court dress with deep slashes for riding; and even that is now relegated to the Chinese restaurant uniform.

This is a way to undo dominance of foreign elites. It is not always possible to expel the invader, sometimes it is easier to assimilate him. The Jewish dominance in the US and in Palestine calls for speedy assimilation of Jews. Some traces of the period of the Jewish ideological rule will remain, but when brought down to the level of Manchu skirts, they won't represent a danger. Indeed, while condemning the Jewish theology and ideology, we want to save Jews from the spell, make them good, bring their energy to the service of the people. The fire of Palestine provides the way.

This forthcoming Easter is a very special time. This year all Churches of East and West will celebrate Easter together, for the differently calculated Easter of the Eastern and Western Churches coincide from time to time. This year, Good Friday will coincide with Deir Yassin Massacre Day, the day when hundreds of Palestinian men, women and children were massacred in 1948 by the Jews in order to seize Jerusalem, despite the UN decision to keep the city under international control. It will also coincide with the massacre of Jenin two years ago, when their bulldozers buried live people under the rubble of their homes. It will coincide with their

sacrilegious siege of the Nativity Church in Bethlehem. This connection of the Palestinian tragedy and of Crucifixion is therefore inbuilt in history. But we know that after Crucifixion, there is Resurrection.