

B"H

DeProgram Program

From the Mind of Sha'i ben-Tekoa

Transcript

<http://www.deprogramprogram.com>

Date: November 1, 2016 / ר"ח מרחשון תשע"ז

Parasha: Noach / נח

Title: Inventing Worlds and Words

Copyright: Sha'i ben-Tekoa 2016

www.deprogramprogram.com

Shalom laYehudim, Shalom laBnai Noach, Shalom laGoyim. It is the evening of the 4th day, *Rosh Khodesh Mar Keshvan, Parashas Noach, tav-shin-ayin-zion*, the evening of the 3rd day, Tuesday, 1 November 2016, webcasting from Israel, home of the People of the Book, a nickname the illiterate Arabs gave us.

And why did the Arabs call us the People of the Book? Because for 14 centuries following the giving of the Torah MiSinai to the sons of Israel, the sons and daughters of Ishmael -- son of a Hamite, married to a Hamite -- remained illiterate nomads, outlaw armed robbers who preferred the life of the nomad outside of cities where they did not develop the land but destroyed it, and all this time they were amazed by this neighboring civilization, meaning sedentary, citified people, the opposite of nomads, who lived according to laws written down in a Book, when reading and writing was considered a virtually magical act.

For thousands of years, charismatic, tribal leaders did not need to know how to read and write, that is, keep records, because they had servants to do that for them. It was amazing to these illiterate barbarians who refused to settle down and live as civilized people that any one person could do this, and here was an entire people who could do this.

And they did not worship trees and mountains. They had no idols to sacrifice to. Instead, they seemed to worship this Book that they called the Teaching. They claimed it came from one G-d, though no one knew what He looked like.

So in Arabic they were known as *Ahl al-Kitab*, the People of the Book that teaches that in the beginning, their G-d spoke and the world came to be. All that was

necessary was language, His words. The universe was created by words that produced light.

The universe, our world, is also a creation of words. Such as the words of the Special Rapporteur to the United Nations on the Palestinian Territories and the 24-7 Crucifixion of the Palestinians by the Evil Jews, Mr. Michael Lynk, mentioned last webcast. Last week, he presented, as we reported, a report to the United Nation Human Rights Council, and then on Friday addressed the Third Committee of the General Assembly, which seems to have taken the place of the Vatican “Holy Office” (I think) that administered the Inquisition for more than three centuries and the burning of Jews at the stake, and said that Israel’s status at the UN depends on ending the occupation. “I raise the question, Doesn’t the occupying power need to realize that its status in the international community and at the UN depends on allowing the Palestinians to exercise their *inalienable* right to self-determination and independence and to bring the occupation to an end?”

“Inalienable.” Now there is an interesting word. It appears in the American Declaration of Independence penned by Thomas Jefferson, a word the Arabs plagiarized. And using the magic of modern computer technology - my Kindle app – I opened my book *Phantom Nation* and was able in seconds to discover the first time ‘inalienable’ appeared in a UN document: UNGA Res. 2535 of December 10, 1969, and then there are 26 other instances of its use in UN resolutions.

My book shows how with words, World AntiJewry conjured up a “Palestinian people,” then raided, like Bedouin marauders, the UN Charter that speaks of the rights of peoples, so that since the newfound “Palestinian” people was a people, according to the UN Charter it was entitled to independence like any people.

You invent a fictitious identity -- like what Obama used to communicate with Lady Macbeth Clinton via illegal emails -- in this case, a fictional national identity, then you start claiming the rights of an a nation that are “inalienable,” a “right to self-determination and independence,” in the words yesterday of Michael Lynk, the professional, salaried antiJew Special Rapporteur on the Jews’ Cruelty to the Ancient Lords of Balestine.

This resolution, by the way, was also the first to use the term “the people of Palestine,” and its drafting was directly the result of the historic interview in the Sunday Times of London with Golda Meir the previous June on the second anniversary of the Six-Day War in which she famously said, “There were no Balestinians. They never existed,” which interview opens my book.

The following year, on 4 November 1970, the UN General Assembly voted on a resolution using the term “the Palestinian people,” and the rest is history.

This Michael Lynk is a sterling example of a contemporary Jew-hater who being fashionably correct in our time would of course deny that. No, as he orated on Friday,

he blamed the “occupation” for the low regard in which Israel is held and the “settlements” for the “occupation.” “It is impossible to separate the occupation from Israel’s settlement project. If there were no settlements, there would be no need for the occupation.”

And I ask, “Could there be any greater example of the ignorance of the situation than this?” Or, maybe at some level he knows the history but due to his powerful antiJewism he twists the truth. Surely, he knows that the “occupation” preceded the settlements. He has got it all backwards, in most cases, by a decade and more.

The “occupation” began in June 1967 when the IDF drove the Jordanian army and government functionaries from Judea and Samaria, and the settlement enterprise did not take off until 1977 when Menachem Begin stunned Israel’s ruling class of Leftists, that had dominated the country since day one, by winning the elections and becoming prime minister. For the first decade following the “occupation” by the military in legal self-defense, there was no significant settlement movement. On the contrary, for that decade Israel under the Left waved the flag of the Allon Plan that called for keeping a serious piece of liberated Judea and Samaria in the hope of being able to sell back, so to speak, the rest to the Arabs in exchange for peace.

So Michael Lynk has got it all wrong. First came the military presence, then the settlements because rational Jews after ten years had come to the inescapable conclusion that the dream of being able to sell back much of Judea and Samaria for peace was their dream that the Arabs refused to help realize.

Indeed, the 1970s was carnival of murder and mayhem by bloodthirsty Arab savages murdering Jews, Israelis and bystanders with no indication the Arabs wanted the deal the Israeli Left wanted them to want. In a nutshell, the Arabs did not want to trade land for peace. And not only did they not want back the land lost in 1967 if the price was peace, they still, as before ’67, wanted all the land that Israel had ruled since 1949 a.k.a. the demise of Israel, G-d forbid.

In that reality, sober Israelis decided that since the Arabs refused the deal, and Israel could not unilaterally retreat for nothing, willy-nilly Israel was going to stay, and in order to stay permanently, Jewish communities had to be built. At no time after 1967 did any sober even leftist Israeli imagine returning the crest of hills, the ridgeline of Judea and Samaria where radar installations had been put for the security of the state, and in that case, there needed to be contiguous Israeli life between the old 1949 line and these radar installations.

For that first, post-war decade, Israelis “waited for the phone to ring,” in Moshe Dayan’s expression at the time, when on the other end would be the Arabs agreeing to receive back *some* land in exchange for full peace.

I thought like that too in that period. But then along came the Iran Hostage Crisis of 1979, which led to my obsession with researching the so-called and misnamed

Barbary Pirates, which research required delving into Islam and discovering Jewish life under Islam, and coming to the conclusion that Israel could surrender Judea and Samaria because Islam was irredeemably hostile to Jewish freedom from Islamic tyranny. And in that case, settling the hills was inescapable.

So here is this oh so fashionable antiJew in our time, Michael Lynk, who thinks there is a “Palestinian” people with an “inalienable right to statehood” on land the League Nations said was the historic homeland of the Jews, which perversion of history makes understandable his perverse understanding that “If there were no settlements, there would be no occupation.”

This is the face in our time of what used to be called antisemitism.

* * (Musical Interlude) * *

Yes, the Israeli Left had the dream in the 1970s of “land for peace,” originally a slogan invented by Israelis, which for many years now has been a verbal weapon of world antiJewry to bash Israel with. Like the Btselem fool Haggai El-Ad who said on TV on Motzei Shabbos that all the Arabs want is Judea and Samaria, today they bleat “land for peace. If Israel wants peace, it must give land.” They have stolen that slogan too.

The Left dreamed this dream in the 70s and into the 90s when they tried to bring it to life via the Oslo Abomination. Have there ever been two less sophisticated, communal leaders in Jewish history than Rabin and Peres who on the White House Lawn made a deal with Arafat and Abbas, these cold-blooded, antisemitic Arab Muslim murderers, thinking that they wanted what Israel wanted, their own cute little state next door in their mutually ancient homeland for their stateless people, just the like Jews after World War II?

But above all, as I argue in my book’s last chapter, what drove the Oslo Delirium most was the “horror” of Israel retaining Judea and Samaria for religious reasons. In the 1920s, 30s and 40s, the settlement building in Mandatory Palestine was done by the communards of the Left, the *kibbutzniks* and *moshavniks*. And then in first decades of the State, when maybe three percent of the population lived in these collectives, they dominated the government, the officer corps in the IDF and air force and the Histadrut, the national labor organization. But because their leader David ben Gurion was clear-eyed about the Arabs, more so than some of his colleagues on the Left, Israel took no chances with its security, with one of his lieutenants/acolytes none other than the late Shimon Peres.

In these decades, Peres was as hawkish as anyone in the inner circle of leadership. He was there the day Ofra was founded; he was there the day Ariel was founded. Thanks to the Oslo Delirium, it is hard to remember these days that it was the hawkish Israeli Left after 1967 that came up with the Allon Plan. And you can get look at it in as many seconds

as it took me to find the word “inalienable” in book. Do a Google search for “Allon Plan” and look at how much of Judea and Samaria Peres and Dayan imagined holding onto.

Notice too how Kiryat Arba was planned to be cheek-by-jowl next to Hebron, for the idea of denying in the future access to the Cave of the Patriarchs to Jews --going back to the way it was under Jordanian rule -- was simply unthinkable.

So what happened? What happened to Peres and the Israeli Left?

Last week, there was a demonstration calling for the formal annexation of Maaleh Adumim, which initiative included hanging posters and banners on the buildings overlooking the Begin Highway inside Jerusalem, with text and photographs of Shimon Peres saying that “Maaleh Adumim was indispensable for Israel’s security.” But today, we read in the papers of the outrage in his family at the use of his image and his words. Said his son-in-law Dr. Rafi Walden, the campaign was dishonest and the quote from Peres was 38 years old. “I see this campaign as a disgusting prank by a criminal advertiser. They are deceptively presenting themselves as carrying on his legacy. There is no limit to the cynicism of the advertisers who know that Peres vigorously opposed the occupation. When Peres thought the country’s existence was in danger, he focused on its security, but when conditions ripened for peace, he fought for it.”

No, Dr. Walden. This is an honest campaign exposing the dishonesty of Shimon Peres and the Israeli Left who abandoned their principles, their values and even their good sense because the spirit of their movement was dying, that of secular, indeed socialist, non-religious, anti-religious Zionism, as Religious Zionism rose to the fore. So these Israeli Leftists, loathing the religious settler movement, betrayed them. Oslo was passed in the Knesset without a Jewish majority. It depended on the Arab MKs, which was a betrayal of a consensus as old as the State that one Jewish faction would not align with an Arab faction to betray Jews. There was nothing more disgusting in the Oslo Abomination than that act of betrayal.

Surely, this physician, Dr. Walden, has the IQ to know that contrary to his claim that “conditions ripened for peace and Peres fought for it,” there was no ripening of conditions for peace. There is not one shred of evidence to support this claim. In 1992 and 1993, when Peres and his altar boy Beilin cooked up the deal with the PLO criminals, there had not been one editorial in one Arab newspaper calling for peace with Israel; that had not been one political TV talk show in the Arab countries calling for peace with Israel.

There had been no conferences between Arabs and Jews exchanging good wishes for peace. What was he talking about when he said, “conditions ripened for peace”?

What happened was not only the rise of the hated religious Jews raising communities on barren land, but also the SCUD War of 199, which I believe scared Shimon Peres to death, personally, so that he decided land was “no longer important in the age of missiles.”

He also was an absolute sucker for the love of the gentiles who kept telling him Israel just had to retreat from Judea and Samaria because the “Palestinians” had the same

“inalienable” right to independence as the Jews, two states for two peoples with the identical rights to this land as their “mutually” historic homeland. The League of Nations singled out only the Jews for that description, but in the 1960s and 70s, the world discovered a heretofore unknown ancient nation in Palestine called the Palestinians whose rights and needs had been ignored by the League of Nations and the United Nations, a people deserving justice as the victims of the Jews’ Zionism.

What riles Dr. Rafi Walden and fellow Leftists about this ad campaign is the exposure of Peres’s betrayal of himself. He and his soulmates are simply deluding themselves into thinking “conditions had ripened for peace.” And never mind the festival of murder and mayhem, thousands of murdered and crippled Jews in the second intifada, that erupted during the rule of that prince of the communes Ehud Barak.

The truth is that nothing ripened. The Arabs today are the same Arabs they were 38 years ago, the Arabs they were 3,000 years ago.

* * (Musical Interlude) * *

Yes, words from the Holy One Blessed Be He created all that is, and words continue to shape our lives. Here we saw contemporary antiJew Michael Lynk use the identical language the Arabs stole from the UN Charter at the UN to imagine “the Palestinians’ inalienable right to self-determination,” and Shimon Peres’s son-in-law using language to lie about the cowardice and corruption of his father-in-law. “Conditions for peace had ripened,” my eye.

There was also another example of this behavior not mentioned last webcast when we examined the performance of the traitor Haggai El-Ad last weekend on Israeli TV. When asked to address the accusation that his organization turns a blind eye to Palestinian attacks on Israelis – this is from the Times of Israel– the website said these attacks “have spiraled over the past 12 months, claiming dozens of lives,” and he replied, “We take issue with all forms of violence.”

And this is another verbal maneuver the Arabs have used for decades. In 1970s and 80s, Rabin had gotten Kissinger and later the US Congress to make three demands of the PLO in exchange for recognition, one of which was the renunciation of terrorism, which the Arabs dealt with for decades in this manner. Whenever a journalist asked a PLO leader about this, the PLO would say, “We condemn all forms of terrorism, especially state terrorism.” For decades, not one Arab would condemn the slaughter of Israelis by his brethren. This was the formula used: “We condemn all forms of terrorism,” because in their moral universe, every violent act by an Israeli, including reprisal and self-defense, was experienced as an act of aggression, a crime against the Balestinians. This was, more or less, *sharia* law. Jews had no right to attack a Muslim even in self-defense.

And here was Haggai El-Ad sounding like an Arab, which makes perfect sense because he has so identified with them against his own people. Judea and Samaria, he believes, belong to the Balestinians, and the only reason they hate Israel is the “occupation.” Retreat and they will respect the pre-1967 dimensions of the Jewish state.

How like the hysterical Mr. Peres who flip-flopped from security hawk to opponent of the communities he once thought were necessary to build.

Nothing had changed in the hearts and minds of the other side. The change was in him and exclusively of his own making.

And here was Haggai El-Ad as a representative of the Israeli Left today, lying with this expression in order to cover up the truth that calling his Btselem a human rights organization is a nasty antiJew lie because his group never protests the violation of Jewish human rights at the hands of the savages he identifies with.

Btselem is no human rights organization but an enemy propaganda factory whose work is painting Israeli soldiers and civilians in the colors of racist, fascist, imperialist oppressors of a third world people.

And in a related facet of this story, there was talk of stripping him of his citizenship, which I would not support. What I would support is Jewish (!) legislation. I would put him in *herem*, that is, social excommunication. Catholic priests, as I understand it, have a god-like power to condemn a sinner to eternal damnation, but Jews cannot do that. What can be done is expulsion from the community, from the synagogue. One can turn one’s back on a turncoat who has given offense to the community. I might support a law allowing any shopkeeper, restaurant owner or businessman to refuse his business; a law giving a citizen the right to reject his patronage; the right of a landlord not to rent him an apartment; the right of anyone to refuse dealing with him; the right to give him the silent treatment because he used his words against the People of the Book.

* * (Musical Interlude) *