

B"H

DeProgram Program

From the Mind of Sha'i ben-Tekoa

Transcript

<http://www.deprogramprogram.com>

וְאֶלְיוֹן תְּשׁׁוּבָה / בַּיּוֹם הַזֶּה

Parasha: Ki Saytsay / בַּיּוֹם הַזֶּה

Title: Those Greedy Jews

Copyright: Sha'i ben-Tekoa 2015

www.deprogramprogram.com

Shalom laYehudim, Shalom laBnai Noach, Shalom laGoyim. It's the evening of the 4th day, *yud-alef beElul*, Parashas *Ki Saytsay*, the evening of the 3rd day, Tuesday, 25 August 2015, webcasting from the source of the word "Jew" that the Jewish state refuses to call its own.

Well, maybe one baby step was taken in this direction, finally, yesterday, when President Reuven Rivlin met with leaders of the Jewish communities in Judea and Samaria and, according to Agence France Press, said, "Israel has the right to settle in the West Bank" – though I doubt he said "West Bank." That is the name preferred by antiJews to cover up the real names of these hills found on all maps throughout history until just a generation ago.

Ruvi Rivlin, whose family has been here about two hundred years, grew up on the secular right, and said, "I love the land of Israel with all my heart. I have never and will never give up this land. For me, our right to this land is not a matter of political debate. It is a basic fact of modern Zionism. We must not give anyone the sense that we are in any doubt about our right to our land. For me the settlement of the land of Israel is an expression of that right, our historical right, our national right."

Okay. He was, is, a Jew raised in the non-religious Revisionist movement, and as such he knows that the Revisionists emerged as a protest against the mainstream Zionist movement led by Chaim Weizmann who was the immediate successor to Herzl as head of the Zionist Organization. The break came in 1925 when the mainstream accepted the amputation of eastern Palestine as it was labelled in all books at the time, on the other side of the Jordan. The classical maps of Palestine place the Jordan River

slightly right of center in the country. The Jordan River was never in Jewish thought reckoned to be its eastern boundary.

In the first half of the 20th century, it was common to talk of Trans-Jordan and Cis-Jordan as the terms for east and west Palestine. And when the Mandate provided for, and went through with, the detachment of Trans-Jordan from the Mandate's mandate to create a Jewish homeland, the mainstream movement protested but in the end accepted the move.

Versus Ze'ev Jabotinsky who was outraged, rebelled and left the organization to establish his Revisionist Zionists. The "revision" as a return to the beginning and seeing the whole of the Land of Israel as rightfully belonging to the Jewish people. He and his followers were outraged that Eretz Yisrael on the other side of the River was taken away from them. And not only that: in a little-known chapter of history that I deal with in my book, by this time the northern tier of Eretz Yisrael had also been amputated and given to the French who shared the area between the two states it created, Lebanon and Syria.

So President Rivlin of course grew up in a community that rejected that acquiescence and for sure would never surrender the right to land west of River, a.k.a. Judea and Samaria.

So, bully for Ruvi Rivlin for speaking this way. He has been unmoved by the politically correct new doctrine according which this real estate belongs to the Ancient Palestinian people, has from time immemorial and the Jews stole it from them. That is not the way he sees things.

Still, Rivlin does a couple things here that are characteristic of secular, even patriotic Israelis that reflect the weakness of secular Zionism that has failed completely to eradicate anti-Semitism, one of its goals. Secular Zionism built the state – hats off to it for that -- but it did not reach the goal Herzl and his Zionists hoped for: an end to the irrational abuse of Jews by gentiles, murderous abuse by them; sadistic, satanic abuse by them.

What Rivlin did is what I have seen Netanyahu do and the mayor of Jerusalem Nir Barkat do, and I find it most peculiar. When waxing patriotic like this, they call up "historic" rights. Bibi, I think, in Congress also raised the specter of Jerusalem as our capital for thousands of years, and yesterday Rivlin spoke of our "national" rights to build homes and communities in Judea and Samaria.

But none of them ever references two things: 1) modern Zionism's concrete achievements achieved via blood, sweat and tears, and 2) the religion of the Jewish people which I believe – which I know -- is the backbone, the heart, the mind and soul of the Jewish people. It is not the Land. We have lived more years without the Land than with it.

None of these Israelis sing the praises of the pioneers who drained swamps, who died from malaria, who reclaimed desert wastes and turned them into apple orchards and orange groves -- some of them yours truly has worked in.

No mention is made of heroic military efforts, the sacrifice of thousands, the cruel aggression of our neighbors hungry for our land – as if our neighbors did not have enough land.

It is almost as if the Zionist movement never existed. The reference to King David's rule they can bring up, but then they jump to the present.

But above all, none of them ever says this Land is rightly Jewish in international law. The anonymous AFP journalist here felt it necessary to remind his readers that “Jewish settlements are considered illegal in international law.”

And I say this has got to stop. Where in international law does it say this? Which law do people have in mind and in which book of laws can we find it? The answer is pretty much silence.

What more sophisticated anti-Jews will do is parry and say, “This refers to the 4th Geneva of 1949 which forbids creating new communities in land taken in battle.”

First of all, the language in that text there prohibits “Individual or mass forcible transfers...The Occupying Power shall not deport or transfer parts of its own civilian population into the territory it occupies.”

Yes, “Forcible transfers...deportation.” Well, no Jew was forcibly transferred. There were no deportations of anybody. The Jews who moved into the territories taken in 1967 did so on their own initiative; nobody forced them and they settled on barren acreage. Nobody among the enemy was displaced or lost his home.

Article 49, published in 1949, was written, so to speak, looking backwards at the horror of World War II when one of its most salient facts was Nazi Germany’s maniacal overrunning of one country after another claiming to be the Master Race therefore had a right to do that.

And wherever they went, they rounded up Jews and deported them from their native country into Poland where the death camps were built. Article 49 was written in reaction to what the Nazis did, and there is no comparison whatsoever between that and Israel’s rightful self-defense in 1967 and subsequent development of the land taken from the enemy as per the League of Nations Mandate for Palestine, whose principle mandate was explicitly the creation of a Jewish homeland in Palestine. And there is no territory more central to classical Palestine than Judea and Samaria. Judea is where the name “Jew” comes from. If Jews have no right to Judea, they have no right to any real estate on this planet.

So, on the one hand, it was encouraging to hear an Israeli politician use the word “right” to describe Jewish life reborn in Judea and Samaria, but still we are long way from Israelis being able to stand up to and confront world anti-Jewry, face to face, and say, “There is not now, nor has there ever been, a ‘Palestinian’ nation with national rights to the land of Palestine, to use the language of the League of Nations, which Mandate was legally incorporated into the Charter of the successor organization, the United Nations.

Israelis are tone deaf, I am afraid, to enemy propaganda and unaware that the entirety of world hatred against us is the fantasy of a Palestinian nation whose ancient homeland we Jews stole from them.

I don't know about you but I find this state of affairs, Israel's silence, bizarre. It's why I wrote my book.

* * (Musical Interlude) *

Today, there were two separate stories that really are the same story. One was about the famous historian who moonlights as a Hollywood actress, Natalie Portman, who is bothered that Jews focus on the Holocaust at the expense of other genocides.

The other was about a new book being launched at the Van Leer Institute in Jerusalem that finds a similarity between the Holocaust and the Nakba. Both stories reflect ignorance, cowardice and the narcissism of Jewish anti-Semitism.

First, Natalie Portman, whose father is an Israeli, her mother an American Jewess. Natalie was born in Jerusalem but at age three they went to live in America. She attended the Jewish day schools of the Conservative Movement then went to Harvard. On Friday, in the London's anti-Jew Independent, she said in an interview that the Holocaust was "no more tragic than other genocides." She spoke of her girlhood when she discovered in the news the Hutus doing to the Tutsis what she did not know, and probably still does not know, what the Tutsis had done to the Hutus in the past. Massacres *en masse*. And of course she sermonized, "We need to be reminded that hatred exists at all times and remind us to be empathetic to other people that had experienced hatred also."

Well, JPost yesterday ran the headline "Natalie Portman raises hackles by saying Holocaust no more tragic than other genocides." And here I fault the Jewish people as a whole for tolerating literally the theft of the word "genocide" which was invented by a Polish Jewish survivor whose family did not survive. He lost 49 relatives. Raphael Lemkin also happened to be a first-rate linguist and philosophical theorist of language who could speak nine of them and read fourteen of them. He invented the word "genocide" because there was no word in any of these languages that described what had happened to the Jewish people.

Tragically, this word in our time has been turned into a synonym for massacre when it is not. Genocide includes massacres but its meaning refers to its goal, not its method. Its goal is the extermination of a nation, that is, of everyone in the nation. And of course it is not exclusively a territorial goal. What Germany's Nationalist Socialists were after was every Jew on the planet who had to be tracked down and murdered.

In this sense, there has been in human history only one genocide -- that failed. The Jews survived. That was the Holocaust. It is the only one.

The Enlightened in our time say the Turks committed genocide against the Armenians when that is simply not true if the German example sets the standard. What the Turks did to the Americans was monstrous, satanic, cruel, barbaric, savage, criminal. I knew personally some of the survivors. But it wasn't genocide. There is not a scrap of evidence that the Turks were bent on hunting down Armenians all over the world to kill them. What the Turks wanted was the land on which these Armenians were living and being barbarians

did not scruple to do their worst to drive them off that land. More than a million Armenians were butchered, raped, maimed, mutilated, tortured and of course murdered.

But there is no record of any Turk saying Armenians are not human beings but gigantic microbes. That is what Hitler believed about the Jews. He believed the Jews were gigantic germs with the unbelievable ability to mimic what a human being looks like and sounds like and talks like. But, make no mistake, the Jews were out to overrun Germany and then the whole world, he believed. In his demented mind, Hitler saw in the Final Solution a preemptive form of self-defense: do to the Jews first what the Jews want to do to the Germans.

In previous generations, Jews were a religious person's devil incarnate. In the post-Christian, scientific age, they were scientifically a menace to mankind, almost a health problem, these "germs." The Germans made propaganda films likening Jews to swarming rats.

And there was nothing like this in the wretched behavior of the Turks. They just acted like their own forebears the conquering Ottomans. They acted like Attila and his Huns, Genghis Kahn and his Mongols; like the Caesars of Rome for whom building an empire meant overrunning one people after another mercilessly. The Romans were masters of cruelty.

So, bottom line, the very concept of genocides in the plural is an antisemitic one that Natalie Portman and too many others have fallen victim to. Its purpose is to look away from the Holocaust and diminish its demonic force. The hunt to murder all Jews in the world resulted in World War II and the death of 60 million people and the reduction of cities to rubble.

What the Turks did to the Armenians, what the Hutus and Tutsis have done to one another, never led to such world-historical destruction and death.

And this corruption of the term genocide is tragic not only for us Jews but the world no less, for the bulk of those 60 million were not Jews. The Holocaust should be engraved in the hearts of all men, particularly in Europe among non-Jews, as a warning to what lunatic mass Jew-hatred can lead to.

Look at what's unfolding before our eyes these days. Muslims are inveterate Jew-haters and the Muslim in the Oval Office is one of them. He has succeeded in allowing Iran to build atomic bombs which have the potential of triggering a Middle East bristling with them, which increases the probability exponentially of some lunatic dictator at some point thinking it would be a good idea to bomb not just Israel but other countries in the region and the consequences to humanity be damned.

Barack Hussein Obama is an evil man.

* * (Musical Interlude) *

So, I said before that there were two separate stories today that really are the same. First, Natalie Portman, and now the second, this book being published in a few weeks by

the publishing arm of the United Kibbutz Movement, those old-time socialists with their collectivist mockery of Judaism and all religion really, in conjunction with the Van Leer Institute in Rehavia, Jerusalem that represents Western culture at its most liberal and corrupt. Any and all progressive movements are celebrated at Van Leer, founded by a couple of wealthy Dutch Jews.

This new book is called, *The Holocaust and the Nakba: Memory, National Identity and Jewish-Arab Partnership*.

Dear me. The last word here is the giveaway. In the 1920s, the brand new Hebrew University was led by an American Jew, Judah Magnes, a Reform rabbi who was part of a small group of intellectuals calling themselves the Covenant of Peace/*Brit Shalom*. They believed the solution to the violence in Mandatory Palestine being visited upon Jews by Arabs was to transcend the chauvinistic aspiration for a Jewish homeland and opt for a bi-national state. A variation on a theme, really, still extant in the Oslo Abomination that envisioned a condominium ownership of the land west of the River, a mutually cooperative sharing between the State of Israel and a State of Palestine.

Well, here is this book's subtitle ending in the word "partnership," when I say, Noo Yawk-style, "Fuggediboudit. Ain't gonna happen." There is a bottomless pit, an abyss between Jewish civilization and Arab culture that cannot be bridged. We saw it the other day in that video clip, the link I put up, of that Israeli Arab actor refusing to call airline pirates terrorists. "No, they are freedom fighters," he said.

This vision of a partnership is a cousin of Natalie Portman's belief in the equality of all "genocides" because it refuses to recognize the uniqueness of the fate of the Jewish people. And like her, millions recoil from Jews claiming something so important as uniquely theirs, and so do these dopes at Van Leer and in the kibbutz movement who have swallowed enemy propaganda that there is some equivalence between the Holocaust and the Nakba.

First of all, they are blind to what the Arabs see in that equation. They don't see equality with Jews other than saying that as the Jews suffered from the Nazis, so the Palestinians suffered from the Jews who acted like Nazis.

Indeed, the official Van Leer spokesman said the book grew out of meeting between "Jewish and Palestinian citizens."

And I cannot forget that in the first decades of this state until very recently, the Arabs here were called "Israeli Arabs" not "Palestinian Israelis" as the fashion has become. The problem with these post-Jewish liberals is their stupidity in swallowing the term "Palestinians" because what that term does is give these people title to the land of Palestine, when the League of Nations never heard of such a people and the Grand Mufti in Jerusalem at the time denied there was even such a land as Palestine.

In both news stories, Natalie Portman's interview and this one, there is the same post-Jewish reluctance to claim the Jews as a unique people. "No, we are just like other peoples. No Chosenness here. We had our genocide and other peoples have had their genocides. And ours was no more tragic than anybody else's."

And here at Van Leer the same psychological imperative is at work. Stripping the Jews of their unique history and beliefs. What, after all is Christianity and Islam but the plagiarizing of Judaism? Hence the clichés: the Three Great Monotheistic religions; a city holy to three religions.

But I say, no, I don't see either of the other two as monotheistic. Both claim to worship the G-d of the Jews found in the Jews' Bible, but each adds a human being to the cosmos at His side. God and Jesus, Allah and Muhammad.

The Roman Church even blatantly claims to be the real Israel.

In a word, everyone wants a piece of the action, of what we have, and when we insist on sole ownership, we are called "greedy Jews" who do not want to share with non-Jews. Early Christians said the covenant with God is not exclusive to one people; everyone has a share in that covenant.

And at the moment the Jews are really being greedy in refusing to share Palestine with the "Palestinians." "Two states for two peoples." And the fools at Van Leer have swallowed that lie, hook, line and sinker. Their book's subtitle is about "national identity." Israeli national identity and Palestinian national identity.

And it is precisely because these are post-Jews, they are happy to want to share this land with another nation. They want to share their capital – and never mind there is no record in the annals of the human race of two nationalities so different sharing one capital city for two states.

The fantasies that anti-Jews, Jewish and non-Jewish alike, come up with is the history of Jewish suffering.

The patriotic NGO *Im Tirtzu* is protesting the abomination of this book launch at Van Leer, and I say "Bravo."

* * (Musical Interlude) *

Okay, last item. Maybe you saw the news that ISIS at Palmyra in Syria, famous for antiquities, beheaded the chief architect there and exploded one of the more important temples.

Like the Muslims in Afghanistan, remember, in 2001 who shelled and destroyed the historic, gigantic Buddha statutes at Bamiyan that were carved into a mountainside.

This is once again the Arab-Muslim relationship to the past that marks them as barbarians. In Mosul too, I think it was, a few months ago, they shattered and smashed famous ancient statues in a museum.

What they do to archaeology is what they do to history in general. Smash it. Deny it. The Holocaust never happened. The Ancient Palestinians had their entire land stolen from them by the Jews.

History is anything you want it to be.

Muslims are on the march. Their barbarism is on the march, and the evil enemy in the Oval Office is one of them.

25.8.15.

DeProgramProgram.com

Leila tov miEretz Yisrael.