

B"H

DeProgram Program

From the Mind of Sha'i ben-Tekoa

Transcript

<http://www.deprogramprogram.com>

Date: December 1, 2019 / ד' כסלו תש"ף

Parasha: Vayetsei / וַיֵּצֵא

Title: How to Deal with Muslims

Copyright: Sha'i ben-Tekoa 2019

www.deprogramprogram.com

Shalom laYehudim, Shalom laBnai Noach, Shalom laGoyim. It is the evening of the 2nd day, *dales bekbodesh Kislev, Parashas Vayetsei, taf-shin-peh*, 5780, the evening of the 1st day, Sunday, 1 December, 2019, webcasting from the vortex of the clash of civilizations, the title of an academic's skirting the reality of the menace of militant Islam.

About twenty years ago, Harvard professor Samuel P. Huntington became famous with a book he called *The Clash of Civilizations* which was a timid academic's avoidance of facing head on the looming threat of Islamic imperialism, waged by Muslim imperialists insisting that their victims were the imperialists.

The first sentence of the Wikipedia page on "The Clash of Civilizations says, "It is a theory that people's cultural and [religious identities](#) that will be the primary source of conflict in the post-Cold War world. The American political scientist Huntington argued that future wars would be fought not between countries, but between cultures."

Huntington carved up the map of the world into nine cultures, four of them religions. His list included what he called Western culture, meaning West Europe, America, Canada, Australia, New Zealand 2) Orthodox, basically Russia and Eastern Europe 3) Islamic 4) Buddhist 5) Hindu 6) African 7) Latin American 8) Sinic/China-based and lastly Japanese. Western was a euphemism for post-Christian Europe and its former colonies.

Only, in opposition to his thesis, I see no clash of civilizations in the plural between, for example, Buddhists and the West; between Hindus and Latin America. No, perhaps his overarching thesis was a function of his own gentle, academic temperament shying away from the reality, as I see it, of the clash not of civilizations but between civilization and barbarism, specifically, the menace of militant Islam.

News stories today concerned not only the two Muslims the Israel Defense Force had to kill over the last few days because they were bent on murdering Jews at random, one in Gaza of the Philistines, another near King David's first capital of Hebron and site of the family plot of the Jewish people. The Cave is not that of some famous warrior of the Jewish nation but three couples. Grandparents, parents, grandson and wife. We do not glorify David's military prowess beyond his brilliant slaying of Goliath, when he used his brains, not brawn. No, our heroes are not in the model of Odysseus or Napoleon or Alexander the Great. Our heroes interred together in Hebron are three generations, three couples who lived in the presence of the Living G-d.

On Shabbos, apparently, yesterday some Israeli or Israelis obviously not observant were motoring along not far from the Cave of the Patriarchs when some Muslim boys about Ishmael's age when expelled from Avraham's family and community because he was such a wild ass of man, were throwing bottles of flaming gasoline at a car or cars and the army just had to shoot him down, destroy him like a rabid dog. Something you don't enjoy doing but a civilized person has got to do what he's got to do.

And rabid dog is a good metaphor for the behavior of these Muslims. They seem seized with a kind of spiritual, mental rabies that propels them to murder people at random because they are not Muslims. Surely, as we saw in civilized England on Friday, London Bridge again, a Muslim with a knife murdered two people at random, wounding eight others. And since he had strapped on a fake suicide vest, likely in the knowledge the police are trained when they see such a vest to terminate the menace with extreme prejudice, which is what he wanted. He got them to kill him and presumably launch him out of this life into Muslim paradise.

The facts are that Mr. Usman Khan had done time in prison in England, sentenced to 16 years for acting like a homicidal Muslim but then some legal twist reduced that time to eight years and he was let of prison but forbidden to go to London. He was fitted with an electronic tracking device so the police would not to have to depend on this would-be mass murderer's word of honor. He was sentenced to the 16 years because he was planning on attacking the Houses of Parliament, the US Embassy, Boris Johnson then mayor of London, the dean of St. Paul's Cathedral and two rabbis.

For plotting this "holy act" -- in his head -- he got those 16 years but was let out at 8, but was in London on Friday by special order of his police minders to attend a conference on deprogramming jihadis just like himself.

And like the Mussulmen here we occasionally have to put down like rabid animals, the Brits, the West really, has yet to figure how to deal with these Muslims who are the prime threat to civilization. In an age of post-colonial guilt over racism, the civilized West, which is degenerating fast, has become impossible to talk about

Muslims as the Founding Fathers of the American Republic did. They called them barbarians and savages, not only by virtue of their violence but the way they think -- if we can call it that.

Islam is nothing but Judaism stolen from the Jews, and that results in this extraordinary culture, two of whose leaders Arafat and Erekat could look two Western leaders, Ehud Barak and Bill Clinton in the eyes and declare the Jews never had any temples on Haram a-Sharif. How does one negotiate an agreement satisfactory to both sides when one side's negotiators are not playing with a full deck; or with a deck utterly unlike a Western deck of perceptions, presumptions and values? In a nutshell, fear of being called racists, the West does not let itself see just how different these Muslims are and why the West must reconfigure how it deals with them, which inevitably will mean singling them out for special treatment and being accused of being Islamophobic.

George Orwell was so right; "Politics and the English Language" one of his most famous essays, focused on the corruption of thought itself on display in the Soviet Union and its supporters in the West. Only now that the monster dragon of Communism has been slain, and the enemy of civilization is Islam, and the sooner the West and others see this, the better.

For example, one official in London was quoted saying something -- I forget the subject -- because I was struck by his use of the term "criminal violence." He described what happened on London Bridge as "criminal violence," while others in the chattering classes opined on the mistake of letting him out of prison.

When I suggest this is not criminal violence and prison is not the response to it. The very concept of the "criminal" connotes profit. He breaks laws to profit. Or he loses control of his anger and murders someone.

But this is different. This is not the act of a criminal breaking the law. Most criminals would not deny they are breaking law. But not Mr. Khan and not any of these homicidal and suicidal maniacs unique to this culture. The clash of civilizations as a concept avoids the reality that the plural does not belong here. There is no such thing as Buddhophobia, or Jainophobia, Christianophobia. The clash is not between civilizations but civilization under attack by a religion and its culture that smiles on this behavior.

"Oh no," the Enlightened cry out, "these terrorists are exceptions. Most Muslims are not like this. They are not Muslims; they are Islamists."

Yes, numerically they do not represent the masses in deeds. But that does explain why no prominent Muslim leader, in the age of the Internet and instantaneous global communication, when everybody is connected to everybody, one never hears or reads of a prominent Muslim who comes out forcefully and blasts these jihadis as agents of the *Shaitan*, Satan, for that is who they are.

How weird Islam is when such evil is melded with thoughts of heaven and the divine and a god who smiles down on such behavior as murdering strangers, stabbing them to death in the street.

I think what the UK needs, and every civilized legal system needs, is a law overriding the common practice of never punishing a native of a country with expulsion from the country. (The Russians to do that.) The standard is that when someone commits a major crime, he goes to prison.

What I would like to see for England, for the US, for all civilized societies is new legislation allowing for that.

I think the proper response to Mr. Usman Khan's plotting mass murder and mayhem was not imprisonment and programs to cure him of his Islamism. His parents emigrated from Pakistan? He should have been, though born in England, after his conviction, put on a plane for Pakistan and told, "If you ever return, obviously illegally, and we catch you, we will kill you on the spot as if you were wearing a suicide vest."

* * (Musical Interlude) *

Speaking before of expulsion of even the native born, Israel's new Minister of Defense, Israeli start-up millionaire and combat officer Naftali Bennett simultaneously declared a plan to double the number of Jews living inside of Hebron, now about a thousand; and also, as reported in brief last week by yours truly, has come out in favor of developing Gaza, improving living conditions and asking the IDF to do a feasibility study of building an artificial island off Gaza, an idea originally proposed two years ago by now Foreign Minister Israel Katz. The artificial island would be three miles off shore served by a three-mile causeway for security reasons, an island to become (I think) a business center and residential facility to raise up the Ancient Ones.

How far today's Israelis have fallen from a Jewish identity for a pseudo-gentile one that prevents them from thinking Jewish. I imagine that if someone ever tells Bennett that Gaza is as much Jewish land as Hebron, Judea altogether and Samaria, he would need a few moments to compute this fact.

And even though he sees himself a Zionist, the first Zionists did not see it as their mission to midwife not only a Jewish state but a new Arab state. The most left-leaning of them envisioned the Zionist movement benefitting Arabs in the vicinity which did happen, but accepted the Partition Plan of 1947 calling for another Arab state with a piece of Palestine along with Lebanon, Syria, and Jordan, not as an indication of their desire for that. It was the price for finally having a sovereign territory of any size.

What Bennett supports, whether he knows it or not, is the philosophy that not only is Israel the guardian of the Jewish people, it must also support the welfare of these Muslims whose record of homicidal hatred of us is a matter of record.

And because Bennett is an Israeli, an identity forged by post-religious Jews, he remains blind to the lowest stratum of hatred directed at us, which has nothing to do with their standard of living, so that improving this standard will be a waste of time. They will never be our equals in education and creativity and productivity. Uneducated fools like the late Shimon Peres sold his visionary Oslo dream of a New Middle East in which Gaza would become the next Singapore -- and never mind Singapore is mostly Chinese, nicknamed by some as the "Jews of the Far East" for their intelligence and productivity. Versus the Arab Muslims in the Gaza Strip.

Bennett's plan was reported to emphasize the dual purpose of alleviating conditions in the Strip while maintaining Israeli security. No way is the population in Gaza ready for the fantasized quantum leap into a better tomorrow; all they need is more financial assistance than they have ever gotten.

And as the Brits and the rest of civilized societies have to rethink the way they deal with Muslims, who are so different from everybody else, so Israel likewise has to stop treating Arab terror as if it is a crime whose perpetrator deserves time in an Israeli prison.

I reason that the Israeli practice of blowing up the houses of Muslim murderers as the IDF did last week again, the murders of Dvir Sorek *by*"d last August, has some deterrent value but it has an odd flavor when the houses are not responsible for the terror. I also reason that many of the houses that have produced these homicidal maniacs are not such a big deal that the loss is a big deal. So, the family finds another place to live.

No, the house is not responsible for the terror. The people inside are responsible and just making them homeless, taking away their simple domicile, is not productive. The family must be expelled from the country.

For sure, the Enlightened would scream about the injustice of this variety of collective punishment, and I reply that Islam is special. We have to think outside the box. That rabid animal on two feet on London Bridge should not be classified as a criminal in a class with other murderers. He is an enemy of civilization with his violence in the name of Allah, "Allahu Akbar!" they commonly shout, the name of their pagan idea of G-d, whom they believe is the G-d of Ibrahim, when for Jews Avraham was the epitome of kindness who wanted his seed to become doctors and teachers and social workers, not blow themselves for the G-d of the Jews.

As an elementary school teacher plagued by an unruly child who makes conducting the class impossible will send him out of the room, so the remedy of Abraham for Ishmael was also expulsion, a far more humane and gentle punishment, that makes a statement to the Muslim obsessed with murder and mayhem like Mr. Usman Khan. Prison was the wrong punishment. Permanent exile -- expulsion -- would have saved the taxpayers paying for this savage barbarian's room and board for eight years and saved the lives of the two poor souls he murdered on Friday.

On Friday evening here once again, Erev Shabbos, tens of thousands of Jewish families, even non-religious ones, were eating together as families in Sderot when the

barbarians fired off another couple of missiles, each one meant to murder Jews at random but also, just launching it gives the Muslims the enjoyment of the terror that they spread and preventing Jews from enjoying the family meal.

And what does Israel do? It spends huge amounts of money on Iron Dome and launching serious warplanes with expensive ordinance to drop bombs on inert enemy places and things. And it never seems to occur to Israel that having done this umpteen times, the behavior continues. Bennett last week said he is ready for arrangement but every missile, he said fired at us will be answered.

So what else is new? That has been Israeli behavior for decades that never defeats the enemy, a defeat that can only come when the enemy is routed off the land that he uses to torture us. And I do mean torture.

Last Thursday's video of those two little Jewish children trembling in terror was heartbreaking.

* * (Musical Interlude) * *

On the political front, nothing has changed except the growing number of voices on the Right who think Netanyahu should step down in the name of national unity or something, or just to have government already, any government.

But not me. I stand with the America jurists, Dershowitz, Lewin, and Rabbi and law professor Dov Fischer who say none of these charges have ever appeared in a US court; that Israel's *procklitut* is making up laws, and I would add because they think there should be such laws.

As Lieberman continues to prove my view that he stands for nothing that will benefit the Jewish people in Israel. His entire program is a war against the Jewish religion. His demands are for civil marriage, which I would support for non-Jews here but not for Jews. They cannot have their cake and eat it to; to be identified as a Jew but not respect the laws of marriage and divorce, the laws that have sustained this people over thousands of years? Lieberman wants to dilute the Jewish people with people who do not believe as Jews do in the matter of marriage.

He also demands public transport on the Sabbath if a local authority wants it. There are also laws against commerce on the Sabbath that he wants to see abolished.

He also wants conversion controlled by the non-observant.

He also wants to enlarge the area nears the Western Wall for what the dishonest Reformers call pluralistic and I call gentile-style prayers, which demand exposes clearly this man's antagonism to the Jewish people. Does he not know the relationship in the US between the Reformers and their practice of rampant intermarriage that is diminishing the Jewish community there at warp speed? Does he not know of the correlation between the Reformers and their big ideas and their hostility to the most pro-Israel president since 1948?

The irony of this anti-religionist dictating to religious Jews how they manage the Temple Mount; the chutzpa of this character to make such demands which are of no benefit to the Jewish people. Civil marriage, as I say, is something I favor for gentiles living here that would be a benefit to them and I have no objection to that.

So, as I say, Lieberman's supporters here are the gentiles. Those Israelis who support the Blue and White leaders, Gantz, Lapid and the cipher Ashkenazi, are also anti-religious in their not wanting to be hobbled by the strictures of Jewishness, but without the hatred of the Jewish religion characteristic of this crusader, this Marxist educated ex-Soviet.

What does it benefit the people of Israel that Yvet Lieberman wants a bigger "pluralistic" prayer space for Jews who do not believe in the Jewish religion? What Reform Jews believe is simply not Jewish; and this is not rocket science. What they believe in is what yours truly was taught in college and graduate school when studying religion: the Five Books were the handiwork of rabbis who after the return from Babylon edited together different versions of the Chumash. I still have my so-called Old Testament from a college course on same marked up according to the professor's lecture that such-and-such verses are the product on this writer, and such-and- verses the product of another writer, because it is a myth that there was a man named Moses who wrote down what the Almighty dictated to him. That is a legend, say the academics. In my day, a half-century ago, they taught that there had been four separate writers, and now I have heard they teach there were sixteen different authors.

And so, in response to Naftali Bennett's plan to allow another 1,000 Jews to live in Hevron, close by the Cave of the Patriarchs, the enlightened here shrieked that this is "a war against peace," out of the mouth of Arab MK leader Ayman Odeh. It is "a dangerous and messianic vision," he said.

Meretz MK Tamar Zandberg, now called the Democratic Camp, said, "Someone who establishes Jewish neighborhoods in the heart of the capital of Israel's apartheid instead of dismantling them, is a messianist and intentionally harms the State of Israel."

This is pathetic. This is some kind of hysterical seizure. This woman is identified with the Jew-haters. She said this was "a win for the ideology of the fascist, far right lawmaker Kahane."

I doubt this idiot knows what Fascism is.

* * (Musical Interlude) *