

Zionism in Bible Prophecy

In the light of current events, with the conflict between the Palestinians and the Israelis out of control, it is needful to inform you how the situation developed and why. Even more important, we must see how Zionism is prophesied in the Bible and what God thinks of it.

In our last series on “Who’s Who in Prophecy,” we showed that Esau’s descendants (the nation of Edom, or Idumea) were forcibly converted to Judaism in 126 B.C. when John Hyrcanus conquered them and gave them a choice of conversion or expulsion. From that point on in history, Esau’s descendants ceased to be a nation. Better yet, Esau’s destiny became intertwined with Judah’s, for they became one nation.

Thus, the end-time Bible prophecies regarding Esau-Edom in the book of Obadiah, Isaiah 34 and 63, Ezekiel 35 and 36, and Malachi 1:1-4 are all fulfilled simultaneously with the prophecies regarding the remnant of Judah and Jerusalem. Without understanding this Judah-Edomite merger in past history, one cannot possibly understand modern Zionism and its conflict with Ishmael and Islam.

Two Trees of Judah

In Jeremiah 24 the prophet saw the nation of Judah as two baskets of figs. There were good figs, who were willing to submit to the judgment of God by submitting to the Babylonian captivity. There were also the evil figs who refused to submit. The two different attitudes among the people manifested two different baskets of figs.

These baskets obviously came from different fig trees, for Jesus tells us in Luke 6:43,

⁴³ For there is no good tree which produces bad fruit; nor, on the other hand, a bad trees which produces good fruit.

The fig tree was the national symbol of Judah, but not all of Judah produced good fruit in the eyes of God. That was why God brought judgment upon them in Jeremiah’s day. Jeremiah pronounced the judgment of God upon Judah in Jer. 7:1-16, concluding with the words,

¹⁶ As for you, do not pray for this people, and do not lift up cry or prayer for them, and do not intercede with Me; for I do not hear you.

God brought the king of Babylon to conquer Judah. But even then, God gave the people a chance to serve their sentence in their own land and merely pay tribute to Babylon. This lighter form of judgment was called a yoke of wood. Jeremiah was called to put a wooden yoke on his neck for all to see (Jer. 27:2) and tell the people in 27:12,

¹² . . . Bring your necks under the yoke of the king of Babylon, and serve him and his people and live.

The false prophets who opposed Jeremiah’s message urged the people to fight the Babylonians, rather than submit to their yoke. In fact, the prophet Hananiah went so far as the break the wooden yoke that Jeremiah had put upon his own neck. Jer. 28:10 says,

¹⁰ Then Hananiah the prophet took the yoke from the neck of Jeremiah the prophet and broke it.

Because the prophets and the leaders rejected the Word of the Lord to submit to “Nebuchadnezzar, the king of Babylon, My servant” (Jer. 27:6), God then put upon the nation the heavy yoke of iron

that was prophesied in the law of tribulation found in Deut. 28:48. Jer. 28:13, 14 says,

¹³ Go and speak to Hananiah, saying, Thus says the Lord, You have broken the yokes of wood, but you have made instead of them yokes of iron. ¹⁴ For thus says the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel, I have put a yoke of iron on the neck of all these nations, that they may serve Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon; and they shall serve him. And I have also given him the beasts of the field.

We know from reading the Bible that the nation of Judah and other nations all came under the iron yoke because of the decision of Judah's prophets and leaders. The iron yoke is described in Deut. 28 as captivity in another land after a terrible war in which many people are slaughtered. This happened to Jerusalem. The city was destroyed, the temple was destroyed, and the people were taken to Babylon to serve their 70-year sentence.

Then Babylon was conquered by the Medes and Persians (Dan. 5:28-31). The Persians allowed Judahites to return to their land and rebuild Jerusalem. However, Judah was not set free of Persia's rule. Hence, the Persians replaced the iron yoke with the wooden yoke, according to God's mercy.

This wooden yoke was to last another 70 WEEKS of years (490 years), as Daniel prophesied in Dan. 9:24. Then the Messiah was to come and set them free. However, when He came, the leaders again refused to hear His word and rejected Him as King. Most of the people followed their leaders blindly.

Why Did Judah Reject Jesus as King?

The Jews were looking for a conquering Messiah on the order of Joshua, who had been instructed to conquer the land of Canaan and put its inhabitants to the sword. They wanted a Messiah who would overthrow the Romans by military force, accompanied by miracles. However, Jesus came as the Prince of Peace, rather than as the conquering warrior. Hence, they rejected Him as Messiah.

The people did not realize that *Joshua would not have been a military conqueror either*, if the people had been obedient to God. God was not bloodthirsty. He did not hate the Canaanites any more than Jesus hated Samaritans. The only reason God gave Israel a physical sword to establish that first "Kingdom of God" was because the people had rejected the Sword of the Spirit at Mount Sinai.

Keep in mind that at Mount Sinai God spoke to the people verbally, and all of them heard His voice (Deut. 4:12). But they were afraid and hardened their hearts from hearing the voice of God (Ps. 95:8-11; Heb. 3:7-11). They all ran away and told Moses to go up the mount by himself and then return and tell them what God said (Ex. 20:19).

This great event, where everyone had the opportunity to hear the voice of God, was later celebrated as the "feast of weeks of the firstfruits of wheat harvest" (Ex. 34:22). Many years later, this was called in the Greek language, "Pentecost."

The point is that the Israelites in Joshua's day rejected Pentecost, and therefore, they refused the Sword of the Spirit by which they could have converted Canaan and the rest of the world. That sword was largely withheld from men until Acts 2, when Pentecost was finally fulfilled.

At the base of Mount Sinai, the people worshipped the golden calf, and as a result, the Levites used their physical swords to kill 3,000 men (Ex. 32:28). What *would have happened*, if those Levites had had the Sword of the Spirit at their disposal?? Look at Acts 2. The 120 disciples in the upper room were willing to hear the voice of God. God gave them the Sword of the Spirit, which is the Word from the mouth that is like a sharp sword (Rev. 19:15). This is the Sword Paul mentioned in Eph. 6:17, saying,

17 And take the helmet of salvation and the sword of the Spirit which is the Word of God.

The disciples took their spiritual swords down from the upper room and used it on 3,000 men in the streets below them. Acts 2:41 tells us the result:

41 So then, those who had received his word were baptized; and there were added that day about three thousand souls.

This is what *would have happened* at the base of Mount Sinai, if the Levites had had better weapons. But their rejection of the voice of Jesus Christ speaking to them from the fire on Sinai deprived them of this better and more effective weapon.

This is Jesus' weapon as well, as we read in Rev. 19:15,

15 And from His mouth comes a sharp sword, so that with it He may smite the nations; and He will rule them with a rod of iron; and He treads the wine press of the fierce wrath of God, the Almighty.

All of this shows us why Jesus did not come as a conquering warrior, but as a Prince of Peace. It explains why Jesus (Yashua, or Joshua) did not seem to fit the pattern of the Old Testament Joshua. The reason Joshua was given a physical sword was NOT because God loves bloodshed. It was NOT because God hated Canaanites. It was NOT even because the Canaanite religion was so wicked. It was Israel's fault for refusing to hear the voice of God. Thus, they were left with a very dull weapon that could never divide soul from spirit or discern the thoughts and intents of the heart (Heb. 4:12).

The Jews of Jesus' day could not understand this. So they were looking for another Joshua with a bloody sword with which to kill all their "enemies" and oppressors. They had heard it taught that one should love their neighbors and hate their enemies (Matt. 5:43). The Gospel of Hating Romans and Samaritans was accepted doctrine.

But those who DID accept Jesus were given the Sword of the Word, and they went forth to conquer the world by faith and truth. Unfortunately, since Pentecost is a leavened feast, they were only partially successful. It remains for the overcomers to finish the job. The overcomers must therefore learn to use the Sword of the Spirit effectively, for this Sword brings people to LIFE.

What if Jesus Had Been Accepted as Messiah?

There is historical evidence that if Judah had accepted Jesus as Messiah, Rome soon would have given them their independence without no bloodshed at all. About the year 200 A.D. the Roman Christian lawyer, Tertullian, presented Christ to the "rulers of the Roman Empire" in a letter called Apology. In chapter 21, he writes,

"All these things Pilate did to Christ; and now in fact a Christian in his own convictions, he sent word of Him to the reigning Caesar, who was at the time Tiberius. Yes, and the Caesars too would have believed on Christ, if either the Caesars had not been necessary for the world, or if Christians could have been Caesars."

In other words, Tertullian tells us that Pontius Pilate was already a Christian by the time he informed Tiberius Caesar of Jesus' crucifixion and resurrection. (We have reproduced Pilate's entire letter in the appendix of our book, [The Laws of the Second Coming](#).) In chapter 5, Tertullian continues,

"Tiberius accordingly, in whose days the Christian name made its entry into the world, having himself received intelligence from Palestine of events which had clearly shown the truth of Christ's divinity, brought the matter before the Senate, with his own decision in favor of Christ. The Senate, because it had not given the approval itself, rejected the

proposal. Caesar held to his opinion, threatening wrath against all accusers of the Christians.”

We see here that when Tiberius Caesar read Pilate’s letter telling him about Jesus, he became convinced that Jesus was a god. It was common practice in those days for the Roman Empire to recognize various gods and their religious adherents. So Tiberius proposed that the Senate proclaim Jesus to be one of the gods of the Empire. However, Roman law said that only the Senate had the right to present a new god for consideration. Since Tiberius himself had made this proposal, the Senate rejected it.

We know, of course, that this Roman rejection was part of the plan of God. But if Judah had accepted Jesus as the Messiah and King, it is certain that Pilate would have interviewed Jesus under very different circumstances. Pilate still would have become a Christian. He would have written to Tiberius Caesar, as it was his duty to keep the emperor informed of such events.

The emperor no doubt would have wanted to interview Jesus in person, at the recommendation of Pilate. Jesus would have made the trip to Rome, addressed the Senate, and I believe they would have been very impressed with His wisdom, love, humility, and miraculous signs. I believe that soon Rome would have been proclaimed as a Christian nation. I believe that Judah would have been set free, along with all other nations. Or rather, all the nations that Rome ruled would have been given to Jesus Christ, the King of Kings.

We know, of course, that none of this was actually in the plan of God. God had fore-ordained a Pentecostal Age that would fail to manifest the Kingdom in its fullness. It was also necessary that Jesus be betrayed and killed as the Sacrifice for sin. Yet by looking at what might have been, we can see how Jesus’ peaceful method of conquering the world is applicable today.

This is how the overcomers will overcome the world in our day under the anointing of the Feast of Tabernacles. The manifested sons of God (Rom. 8:19) will reflect the will and character of Jesus Christ to the world. This will spark a world-wide “revival,” and it will not take long to bring the entire world under the feet of Jesus Christ.

But it will be done by love, not by bloodshed, for we have a better sword. There will be bloodshed, of course, during this time, but it will be done by those who do not possess such a sword as ours.

The Revolt Against Rome (and God)

In Jesus’ day there were again both good figs and evil figs. The evil figs chafed under the rule of Rome, even as they had rebelled against the rule of Babylon. The more these figs rebelled, the more Rome oppressed them. The more Rome oppressed them, the more they rebelled. The situation spiraled downward until finally open revolt broke out in 66 A.D. The people of Judah destroyed Rome’s 12th Legion at the Feast of Tabernacles that year.

In Abram Leon Sachar’s 1930 book, *A History of the Jews*, page 117, this Jewish author writes,

“Ultimately, Roman patience was thoroughly exhausted and the procurators introduced measures of barbarous severity. Soldiers slew on the slightest provocation. Eminent Jewish leaders were crucified, while whole villages were razed. All in vain. A fever of martyrdom seemed to seize upon the harassed people. Fanatics went up and down the country, wild-eyed and frantic, prophesying the end of the world, and the advent of the Messiah. Multitudes were ready to follow every impossible visionary who claimed inspiration from heaven. Zealots rushed to their deaths crying in hysterical exaltation. What was one to do with such a nation? The Romans were frankly bewildered. They had dealt with many turbulent peoples, but with none so contrary—so insanely

intractable.”

Rome put down the revolt decisively. They were delayed a bit by the death of the emperor Nero in 68 A.D. But finally, at Passover of 70 A.D. the Roman armies surrounded Jerusalem and began the siege. This was precisely 40 years after John the Baptist had been executed at Passover of 30 A.D.

The city was destroyed within a few months, but the final stronghold at Masada still had to be taken. The Romans built a huge ramp of rock and earth to the top of the mountain where the fortress of Masada was located. They finished this ramp on the day before Passover of 73 A.D. That night all the evil figs at Masada committed suicide to avoid capture by the Romans.

This occurred 40 years after Jesus’ crucifixion at Passover of 33 A.D. The evil figs had been given 40 years of grace in which to repent of their rejection of the Messiah. Instead of repenting, they decided to do the work of the Messiah themselves and in their own violent way.

This method did not work. Jerusalem was destroyed. The temple was destroyed. Over a million were killed and others put into slavery. In the decades that followed, there were other uprisings in Mesopotamia, Egypt, Cyrene, and Cyprus. Abram Leon Sachar writes on page 121, 122,

“Trajan [the Roman Emperor] was compelled to send one of his ablest generals to cope with the fury of the Jews. The devastation was complete; when the last embers of the rebellion had been extinguished, it was necessary to rebuild Cyprus from its foundations. No Jew was thereafter permitted to set foot on the island, and even shipwrecked Jewish merchants who sought temporary refuge were done to death when found.”

When Trajan died, Hadrian succeeded him. He was known as a man of peace, and the Jews hailed him as a second Cyrus. But Hadrian wanted to put an end to the practice of mutilation that many people practiced, so he passed a law forbidding it. This included circumcision, and this again infuriated the Jews.

Secondly, Trajan made plans to rebuild Jerusalem as a Roman city, calling it Aelia Capitolina in honor of the patron god of Rome. This, too, infuriated the Jews and brought about the final revolt. Sachar writes on page 122,

“The soul of the revolt was the venerable rabbi Akiba, one of the ablest of Israel’s spiritual leaders . . . The Roman oppression roused the peaceful rabbi to active conflict. He centred all his hopes on a brilliant young warrior, Bar Kokba, who became the brain and sword of the revolt. . . Apparently, he claimed to be divinely inspired, and to his loyal followers he seemed the long-awaited Messiah.

“Everywhere throughout the country the word was heard that the end of suffering was at hand; the tyrant who had dared to desecrate the house of God would be swept away like chaff; the country would again belong to the people that had made it sacred. Every village, every hamlet, was stirred. Only the newly-formed sect of Christians rejected the authority of the Jewish leaders. . . The Jews believed that this last stand against the Roman eagle was like no other. It was the prelude to the establishment of God’s kingdom on earth.”

The revolt at first succeeded, and the altar in Jerusalem was rededicated. But Rome brought its general Severus from Britain and reconquered Judea. Sachar tells us on page 123,

“Bar Kokba and Akiba were both executed, along with all their followers . . . Their casualties were much greater than attended the destruction of the State in 70. . . Jews

were forbidden on pain of death ever again to set foot in Jerusalem. Only on the ninth of Ab—the traditional anniversary of the destruction of the Temple—could Jews pay for the right to weep on the site of the old sanctuary. For centuries thereafter they ‘bought their tears’ weeping over the lost glories of the past, yet never abandoning the hope that some day, in God’s own way, a restoration would come and the Holy Land would once again rise from the ruins, tenderly built up by Jewish hands.”

This was how the revolt ended. They did not and still do not understand why this tragedy befell them. They do not understand why God did not help them win the wars. This made them bitter against God, saying, “Some day the Messiah will come, and boy does he have some explaining to do!”

But the explanation is simple. God had released them from an iron yoke of Babylon to a lighter, wooden yoke under Medo-Persia, Greece, and finally Rome. But they were not content with submitting for the duration of their sentence for the sins of their fathers (the evil figs). So they revolted again in 66-73 A.D., trying to throw off the wooden yoke.

They failed, because their revolt was a violation of the law itself, as explained fully by the prophet Jeremiah.

But in this revolt against God’s judgment, they again found themselves under the iron yoke, forbidden to set foot in Jerusalem, cast off among the nations as captive slaves. This condition continued until the 1940’s, when the evil figs among the Jews again staged a revolt to gain possession of the land of Palestine.

Zionism is a movement among Jews who decided that God would never set them free, and that they had to do it themselves. Without repenting, of course. More next time.

Beginnings of Zionism

We showed previously how the divine law clearly states that Israel’s right to be in the Promised Land was contingent upon their obedience to God and His law. Because they continually refused to be obedient, God Himself “sold” Israel into the hands of foreign nations all through the book of Judges. Yet because they were allowed to remain in the land, it was merely a wooden yoke put upon them.

Only centuries later did God finally begin to impose upon them the “yoke of iron” mentioned in Deut. 28:48. This yoke was defined in the law as the removal of Israel from the land and their deportation and scattering into all nations. This actually occurred first with the northern ten tribes of the House of Israel in 745-721 B.C. Judah escaped the iron yoke for another century. But then the people refused to hear the Word of the Lord from the prophet Jeremiah. So God hired the Babylonians to bring the House of Judah under the yoke of iron.

This iron yoke lasted for just 70 years, after which time God reduced their sentence to a wooden yoke, where they remained under the yoke of Medo-Persia, Greece, and Rome until the time of Christ.

Jesus then came to give them the Word, and the people once again rejected Him and His Word. He came as the Prince of Peace, but the people preferred a more violent method of establishing the Kingdom. Hence, they chose Barabbas, the murderer guilty of sedition—leading a revolt against Rome—rather than choosing the Prince of Peace (Luke 23:18; Acts 3:14).

They were given a grace period of 40 years in which to change their minds. But in 66-73 A.D. the nation of Judah (Judea) decided to fight the Romans and attempt to throw off the wooden yoke by the arm of flesh. The Barabbas tactic failed, and once again they found themselves under the yoke

of iron, scattered among the nations—this time, for a much longer period of time.

How to Reverse the Captivity

The divine law specified that He would release them from their captivity only under certain conditions. The primary condition was that they repent of their hostility against Jesus Christ, who gave them this law while in his pre-incarnate existence. Lev. 26:40-42 (NASB) says,

40 If they confess their iniquity and the iniquity of their forefathers, in their unfaithfulness which they committed against Me [Jesus Christ], and also in their acting with hostility against Me [Jesus Christ]— ⁴¹ I also was acting with hostility against them, to bring them into the land of their enemies—or if their uncircumcised heart becomes humbled, so that they then make amends for their iniquity, ⁴² then I will remember My covenant with Jacob, and I will remember also My covenant with Isaac, and My covenant with Abraham as well, and I will remember the land.

The iron yoke came upon them because of their “hostility” against Jesus Christ and because of their preference for the violent methods of Barabbas.

Most people are unaccustomed to thinking of Jesus Christ as the One who gave the law to Moses. But this teaching is clear in both the Old Testament and the New. In Exodus 15:3 and again in Isaiah 12:2, we read that “The Lord” (that is, YAHWEH, the God of the Old Testament) “*has become my salvation*” (that is, YASHUA). The word, Yashua, means salvation. This was also the Hebrew name for Jesus. Hence, the Scriptures tell us that Yahweh has become our Yashua, prophesying the incarnation of the Lawgiver in the form of Jesus Christ. Jesus, then, was the One who revealed Himself to Moses by the name of Yahweh (Ex. 6:2, 3). Jesus was the Covenanter and Lawgiver who spoke the Ten Commandments to the people and taught Moses the rest of the law.

The Hebrew word for the divine law is Torah. The first letter, *tav*, was originally written as a *cross*. It literally means “a sign” and is used in Ez. 9:4, where it is translated as a “mark” to be put on the foreheads of the divinely protected ones. This is the ancient origin of the practice of writing the sign of the cross on one’s forehead.

The second letter in Torah is the *vav*, which literally means “a nail.”

The third letter in Torah is the *resh*, which means “a head” or “the head” in the sense of the leader.

The final letter in Torah is the *hey*, which, when it appears at the end of the word, means “what comes from.”

Putting these letters together spells the Hebrew word, Torah, and it literally means “**What comes from the Leader nailed to the Cross.**” It is a prophecy that identifies the giver of the Torah as Jesus Christ, the Head or King, the Crucified One, gave the law to Moses many years before He was born of Mary.

For this reason, the Jews’ hostility against Jesus Christ, the Lawgiver, was the reason for their dispersion under the yoke of iron. God used Rome to do this, but one cannot merely blame the Romans for doing bad things to the Jews. Jesus Himself said plainly in Matt. 22:7 that God considered the Roman army to be His army.

But instead of repenting, the Jewish leaders become quite angry when anyone implies that they did something wrong in crucifying Jesus. In fact, they often try to blame the Romans, whereas the New Testament never puts the blame on their shoulders. Pilate was forced to allow the crucifixion against his will. Peter testifies in Acts 3:13-15,

¹³ The God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, the God of our fathers, has glorified His servant,

Jesus, the one whom you delivered up and disowned in the presence of Pilate, when he had decided to release him. ¹⁴ **But you disowned the Holy and Righteous One, and asked for a murderer to be granted unto you,** ¹⁵ **and put to death the Prince of Life, the one whom God raised from the dead, a fact to which we are witnesses.**

This is repeated in Acts 5:30, 7:51, 52, 10:39, 40, and 13:28. The apostles did not hesitate to call the Jews to repentance for their “hostility” against Jesus Christ. In fact, it *was required* of them. It is no different today, unless we are prepared to amend the New Testament in the attempt to make Christianity more palatable to Jews or to be more politically correct.

I say this, not in hatred, but in love, for only by such repentance can they hope to reverse the sentence of the law against them, as written in Lev. 26:40-42. No Jew can be saved apart from Jesus Christ. Nor can any Jew obtain God’s blessing by moving to the nation called “Israel.”

As we stated in the conclusion of Part One, Zionism is a movement among Jews who decided that God would never set them free, and that they had to do it themselves. They have not repented, and yet they want the blessings of God while yet hostile to Jesus Christ. This is not the way to fulfill Bible prophecy.

By returning to the land apart from Christ and without accepting His peaceful methods of conquest, they have had to resort to the violence and bloodshed advocated by Barabbas. This is the attitude and method used by this Zealot leader in Jesus’ day. The people’s choice ultimately brought utter disaster upon all of the people.

Jerusalem: The Bloody City

Jerusalem was so named, because it was supposed to be a City of Peace. That was its original calling when it was named by its builder and founder, Melchizedek (Shem), king of “Salem” (Gen. 14:18). The Temple in Jerusalem was built by Solomon, whose name also means “Peace.” The temple was to be a house of prayer for ALL people.

Unfortunately, however, the people of Judah converted the City of Peace into “the bloody city.” Ez. 24:9-13 says,

⁹ **Therefore, thus says the Lord God, “Woe to the bloody city! I also shall make the pile great...
¹³ **Because I would have cleansed you, yet you are not clean, you will not be cleansed from your filthiness again until I have spent My wrath on you.”****

The fact is, the old Jerusalem is a bloody city, while the New Jerusalem is the true City of Peace. This has never been so apparent as today. The physical city of Jerusalem is identified with Hagar, Paul says in Gal. 4:25. As Hagar, that city cannot and will not bring forth the promises of the Kingdom of God—in spite of what Jewish leaders and many Christian ministers may teach.

The Scriptures teach that Hagar and her children must be “cast out” (Gen. 21:10; Gal. 4:30) before Sarah and her children can fulfill their calling to inherit the promises of God. So long as Hagar-Jerusalem is still a contender for the birthright promises to Abraham and Isaac, the promise will continue to be a future hope. That is why the day is soon coming when Hagar-Jerusalem will be destroyed by nuclear war. Only then will men have to look elsewhere for the fulfillment of the biblical Kingdom of God.

But let us return to the history of modern Zionism.

The Beginnings of Modern Zionism

Zionism as a modern movement was really born in 1897 with the book, The Jewish State, written

by Theodor Herzl. He was a reporter for an Austrian newspaper, covering the story of the Alfred Dreyfus treason trial. He was so appalled by the anti-Semitism of the trial that he came to believe that a Jewish nation of their own was the only solution. Herzl was able to raise money from wealthy contributors and thus succeeded where those before him had remained insignificant. Many viewed him as the promised Messiah.

The first armed group of Zionists in Jaffa was formed by just ten men in 1907, an organization called the Bar-Giora. In Dan Kurzman's biography of former Israeli Prime Minister, Yizhak Rabin, Soldier of Peace, page 72, he tells us of the Bar-Giora:

“Named after the last Jewish defender of Jerusalem in 70 A.D., it was a secret underground watchmen's organization whose members took the oath, ‘In blood and fire Judea fell and in blood and fire Judea shall arise!’”

So the Bar-Giora was so named to honor a man who symbolized the Jewish revolt against Rome. Their oath manifested no remorse or repentance for deliberately disobeying Jeremiah's injunction against the evil figs. Instead, these first armed Zionists came with an oath to continue their fight in the same manner as in 70 A.D. They came advocating “blood and fire.”

In 1909 the Bar-Giora formed a larger organization known as Hashomer (“The Watchman”). Ten years later, in 1919, shortly after the end of World War One, the Haganah was formed, and this remained as the official Jewish “self-defense” organization until it was transformed into the Israeli Defense Force in 1948.

The Balfour Declaration

During World War One, the British received the help of Arabs in the overthrow of the Ottoman Empire, because they promised the Arabs independent states. In 1915 the British sent T. E. Lawrence to convince the Arabs to revolt against the Ottomans.

On May 23, 1915 these Arab leaders agreed to the Damascus Protocol, by which they helped the British defeat the Ottoman Empire in exchange for the independence of all Arab land in Asia (except for Aden, south of Saudi Arabia). Subsequent letters written by General Sir Henry McMahon, the British High Commissioner for Egypt, to Hussein, Sharif of Mecca, make it clear that Palestine fell under this agreement. Alfred Lilienthal wrote in his book, The Zionist Connection II, page 16,

“For some years, because of the nuances in Sir Henry's drafting, it was contended by certain Zionist academicians, supported by the British government, that the independence pledge was purposely vague and never intended to pertain to Palestine. But the publication in 1964 by scholar Dr. Fayaz Sayegh of two British documents, the twenty-page ‘Memorandum on British Commitments to King Hussein’ and the twelve-page ‘Appendix of Previous Commitments to His Majesty's Government in the Middle East,’ clearly revealed that Palestine unmistakably was contained within the McMahan independence promise.”

These promises were given two years before the Balfour declaration, by which the Zionists laid claim to a state of their own. Hence, if the Zionists invoke the Balfour Declaration to claim a right to a Jewish State, the Arabs have a prior right to have it as a Palestinian State.

The Balfour Declaration was a letter of intent written by Britain's Foreign Minister to Baron Lionel Rothschild on Nov. 2, 1917, saying,

“His Majesty's Government view with favour the establishment in Palestine of a

national home for the Jewish people and will use their best endeavours to facilitate the achievement of this object, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine, or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country.”

This Declaration did not establish a Jewish *state*, but rather, a Jewish *national home*. It said nothing about dispossessing Arabs or denying them political or social rights. It was understood that Arabs would continue to remain the majority population, and that the Arab-dominated government would also allow Jews to purchase land and live there with *equal rights* among the Arabs, if they so desired. This is not much different from Jews freely living in America today.

Even so, the Balfour Declaration was not a signed agreement that enjoyed legal status. It was merely a letter of intent. The Zionists either ignored what it said about equal rights for all, or else they read into the letter what they wanted to hear. At any rate, Zionists used this to instill in Jews around the world the hope for a Jewish State. This ignited a fire that soon got out of control.

Hence, the Arabs were indeed promised independence in most of the Middle East—including Palestine—but the Jews were promised the right to immigrate to Palestine and live as equals in that Arab territory.

Conflicting Promises Breed Betrayal

In the time between the Damascus Protocol and the Balfour Declaration, the British made a third set of promises to France and Russia by the Sykes-Picot agreement on May 16, 1916. Sir Mark Sykes of Britain and Charles Francois Georges Picot of France agreed to divide the spoils of the Ottoman Empire among three countries. France was to receive western Syria and the city of Mosul. England was to take control from Baghdad to the Persian Gulf. Russia’s share fell outside of the Middle East and is not our concern here.

The French knew nothing of the Hussein-McMahon agreements, and the Arabs knew nothing of the Sykes-Picot arrangement that totally contradicted their promises of Arab independence. Only after the Russian revolution in late 1917 did the revolutionaries discover and publish these secret Tsarist papers, for Russia was part of the Sykes-Picot agreement. This was when the Arabs discovered that they had been betrayed.

On May 5, 1920 the Allied Council of Four partitioned Syria to France and gave Britain the mandate to rule Palestine. T. E. Lawrence (“Lawrence of Arabia”), wrote of the fraud with great bitterness on page 275, 276 of his book, Seven Pillars of Wisdom,

“The Arab Revolt had begun on false pretences. To gain the Sherif’s help our Cabinet had offered, through Sir Henry McMahon, to support the establishment of native governments in parts of Syria and Mesopotamia, ‘saving the interests of our ally, France’. The last modest clause concealed a treaty (kept secret, till too late, from McMahon, and therefore from the Sherif) by which France, England, and Russia agreed to annex some of these promised areas, and to establish their respective spheres of influence over all the rest.

“Rumors of the fraud reached Arab ears, from Turkey. In the East persons were more trusted than institutions. So the Arabs, having tested my friendliness and sincerity under fire, asked me, as a free agent, to endorse the promises of the British Government. I had had no previous or inner knowledge of the McMahon pledges and the Sykes-Picot treaty, which were both framed by war-time branches of the Foreign Office. But not being a perfect fool, I could see that if we won the war the promises to the Arabs were

dead paper. Had I been an honorable adviser, I would have sent my men home and not let them risk their lives for such stuff. Yet the Arab inspiration was our main tool in winning the Eastern war. So I assured them that England kept her word in letter and spirit. In this comfort they performed their fine things; but, of course, instead of being proud of what we did together, I was continually and bitterly ashamed.”

The British then issued the “Churchill White Paper” in June 1922, to clarify their policy:

“It is contemplated that the status of all citizens of Palestine in the eyes of the law shall be Palestinian, and it has never been intended that they or any section of them should possess any other juridical status. . . . It is not as has been represented by the Arab delegation that during this war His Majesty’s Government gave an undertaking that an independent national government should be at once established in Palestine.”

Statement after statement clarified that the Balfour Declaration never intended to create a Jewish state in Palestine, at least not “*at once*.” This raised the blood pressure of the Zionists, who, of course, had every intention of doing just that.

At any rate, the Balfour Declaration was abundantly clear on this one issue, saying: “it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine.” This is clearly one issue over which the British government cannot be accused of doublespeak.

The Zionists, however, objected to this clause and made it clear to all that they intended to force the British into creating a Jewish state at the expense of the Arabs who had lived there for over a thousand years. The Arabs read the Zionist literature and were both appalled and angered by this belligerence and lack of respect for the basic human rights of any non-Jews who got in their way.

National Boundaries Established

In 1922 the British recognized the Kingdom of Egypt that included the Sinai, which the Zionists claimed belonged to them. In 1923 Transjordan was made a sovereign nation. This at least partially fulfilled some of the British promises to the Arabs for their support during World War One. The Zionists, however, were furious, because it “gave away” more of “Greater Israel.”

These settled boundaries of Egypt and Jordan brought relative stability in those parts of the Middle East. But Palestine was still a problem, because the British wanted to retain it as a colony because of its strategic position, particularly to protect their interest in the Suez Canal. This put the British and the Zionists into direct conflict. Still, most of the Zionist leadership made some attempt to work within the framework of the British government.

But the Zionist intent was to conquer all of Palestine through immigration and settlement. They believed that a Jewish State could only be accomplished by having a majority population. The immigrants were used as their primary weapon. Arab militants began to fight back, killing these “innocent” civilians who had been enlisted by the Zionists in their designs to conquer by immigration.

This was the beginning of the conflict we see today.

Jewish Terrorism

Modern Zionism began primarily as a nationalistic movement to obtain political power in Palestine. But the 1967 war, when the Israelis took control of Jerusalem and the West Bank, sparked a type of secular messianism that had lingered just under the surface. It is a peculiar belief of messianism that

is held by atheistic Jews who dominate the Israeli government even today. It is the belief that the Jewish people collectively are its own messiah.

Jewish opinion is divided on this subject. But this is the political view that has set the course of the modern Israeli state. This means simply that the people got tired of waiting for a savior to come and free them from the iron yoke that God had imposed upon them in the first century. They did not feel that they had to repent of rejecting the Messiah, and so they could not understand why God would allow this yoke to remain upon them for 1,900 years.

They finally concluded that God either did not exist, or, if He existed at all, expected them to be their own savior. Hence, certain Jewish leaders were able to revive the ancient spirit of revolt, overturning centuries of rabbinic teaching in Judaism that they must await the coming of the Messiah before returning to Palestine.

Non-Zionist Rabbis Speak Out

There are, even today, significant numbers of Jewish rabbis who are hotly anti-Zionist, but most Christians never hear their voices. For example, Dr. Israel Shahak, emeritus professor of organic chemistry at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem until his death last year, had long been an advocate of human rights for Palestinian people. He was the founder of the Israeli League of Human Rights. He wrote a letter published by the London *Times* on Jan. 27, 1973 entitled, “A Jewish Duty or Jewish Apostasy?”

“I am a Jew living in Israel, and consider myself a law-abiding citizen. I serve in the army every year, in spite of being nearly forty years old. But I am not ‘devoted’ to the State of Israel or to any other state or human organization. I am devoted to my ideals. I believe in speaking the truth and in doing something for securing justice and equality for all human beings. . .

“But to be devoted to the State? I can well imagine Amos or Isaiah splitting their sides with laughter if somebody had demanded of them to be ‘devoted’ to the Kingdom of Israel or the Kingdom of Judah. ‘Hate evil and love good and establish judgment in the gate,’ says Amos (Chapter 5, verse 15), who does not spare a word of devotion to the great-warlike and successful Kingdom of Israel of his times.

“In fact, this new doctrine preached as a Jewish duty, is nothing but Jewish apostasy. All Jews used to believe and say it three times a day, that a Jew should be devoted to God, and God alone. A small minority still believes it. But it seems to me that the majority of my people has left God, and has substituted an idol in its place, exactly as happened when they were so devoted to the Golden Calf in the desert that they gave away their gold to make it. The name of this modern idol is the State of Israel.”

Other rabbis are just as outspoken as Dr. Shahak. Rabbi Michael Ber Weissmandel wrote an article May 26, 2000 [<http://www.jewsnotzionists.org/tenquestions.html>],

“. . . We should avoid the untenable position of the robber who prays for Divine help in carrying out his crime. We should pray that Zionism and its fruits vanish from the Earth, and that we be redeemed by the Messiah with dispatch.

“A prisoner is released only when he has served his time, or if he is pardoned by the President for good behavior. If he attempts escape and is apprehended, his term is lengthened, besides the beating he receives when he is caught.

“. . . We have been sentenced to exile by the King of Kings because of our sins. The eternal, blessed be he, has decreed that we accept the exile with humble gratitude until the time comes, or until we merit His pardon through repentance. If we seek to end the exile with force, God will catch us, as our sages have forewarned, and our sentence becomes longer and more difficult.

“Many times in the past have segments of our people been defrauded by false messiahs—but none of the false messiahs has been as fallacious and delusory as the lie of Zionism. . . . If we wish our exile-sentence commuted, we must appeal through repentance . . . Let it be clearly understood that never in Jewish history (even in the time of Jeroboam or Achav) have such hostile atheists stood at the helm of the Jewish people as today.”

Though many rabbis warned the people against the errors of Zionism, the idea of returning to the land proved to be too tantalizing for a great many Jews. It awakened a hope within them long nurtured by Judaism, and Zionism offered them an immediate reward without awaiting for a divine Messiah. Zionism would give them a land without the need for repentance, for they would be their own messiah. They would “redeem” the land themselves by transferring it to Jewish ownership. This would be done at first by purchasing land peacefully; but ultimately, if Arabs refused to sell the land, it would be appropriated by the Land Acquisition Act of 1953, legalizing all seizures of Arab land. The rest of the land would be conquered by military force whenever possible.

Arab Reaction to Zionism

The Jewish Agency was an organization that attempted to work primarily to bring about the conquest of Palestine by political means—that is, by immigration. The Arabs objected to the Zionist objective of establishing a Jewish State, citing earlier British promises that, if anything, there should be an independent Palestinian State. But since Transjordan had already been given statehood, the British gave them assurances that Palestine would be turned into a Palestinian State in which Jews would be allowed to live as equal citizens.

Many Arabs, however, were far-sighted enough to see that the Zionists would never content themselves by living as equals. Zionist literature showed clearly their intent to establish a Jewish state.

The mufti, Haj Amin el-Husseini, religious leader of Jerusalem, was outspokenly militant and periodically urged the Arabs to kill Jews that he believed were taking over their land and threatening even their holy places. In 1920 more than 130 Jews and close to 100 Arabs were killed in the fighting around Jerusalem, Hebron, Haifa, Safed, and other Jewish settlements. The mufti was not far-sighted enough to see that his actions merely legitimized the Zionists, who could then demonize the Arabs and garner world sympathy. Blinded by hatred and vengeance, he forsook the moral high ground and soon expended any world sympathy for Palestinian rights that the world may have had. Taking justice into their own hands, they made it more difficult for the British to defend them in their legitimate grievances.

The British government was caught in the cross-fire of their own making. By this time they knew that they had created a monster that they could not control. Resenting the Jewish insistence upon unlimited immigration rights, the British defended the Jewish Zionists only half-heartedly. They attempted to limit the Jewish immigration to the number that the land could reasonably absorb, but came under fire from the Zionists. It was obvious that they intended to establish a Jewish *state* and would never be content for a mere “homeland.”

Arabs, too, soon saw that Britain had no intention of granting them independence. They observed

the Zionists putting pressure upon Britain to turn Palestine into a Jewish state with a majority Jewish population with the intent to have Jewish rule over a Palestinian minority. Having felt betrayed by the British already, many Arabs had no confidence in the British government's will to resist the published Zionist intention of establishing a Jewish state.

With each Arab retaliation against Jewish immigrants, and seeing that the British were reluctant or unable to defend them against the Arabs, the Zionists took more and more responsibility for their self-defense. And as time passed, the people became more militant. After all, once they had accepted the basic premise of Zionism and had moved to Palestine, so now they had no choice but to defend themselves.

Vladimir Jabotinsky, Father of Jewish Terrorism

By the mid-1930's the situation was ripe for the next level of violence. The perfect man for the job was a man named Ze'ev Vladimir Jabotinsky. Jabotinsky had been the first commander of the Haganah, the Jewish defense organization founded in 1919 by the World Zionist Organization. In 1923 he founded Betar, named after the fortress where Bar Kokba made his last stand in his revolt against Rome in 135 A.D. (See [FFI #161](#).) Bar Kokba's messianic revolt was the reason Rome banned all Jews from setting foot in Jerusalem. Bar Kokba, a false messiah, was Jabotinsky's role model and the hero of all the Jewish terrorists in the 1940's.

Jabotinsky is the father of Jewish terrorism, which sought to continue the messianic nationalism of the past, whose military messiahs always found sympathy among the Jews. In 1935 he left the mainstream Zionist movement and established the radical Zionist Revisionist Organization in opposition to the World Zionist Organization, headed by Chaim Weizmann. Jabotinsky was, in fact, the embodiment of the "bloody city" principle of the old Jerusalem.

Former Israeli Prime Minister, Menachem Begin, wrote about Jabotinsky in his book, [The Revolt](#), p. 40,

"The revolt sprang from the earth. . . The renewed strength which came to us, and especially to our youth, from contact with the soil of our ancient land, is no legend but a fact. The officials of the British Foreign Office had no conception of this when they made their plans. . . They could not gauge the character of the Jews who came to Eretz Israel. They assumed that in Eretz Israel, too, the Jews would continue to be timid suppliants for protection. . . But those unseen forces, which have ever saved the Jewish people from obliteration, demolished the British assumption. Vladimir Jabotinsky appeared, educating a whole generation to resist, to be ready for sacrifice, for revolt and for war. David Raziel appeared, the greatest Jewish military mind of our generation, to carry out the decisive act; the *first attack* by Jewish arms."

Mr. Begin later became the head of the Irgun Zvai Leumi, the most important and effective Jewish terrorist organization in the 1940's.

Another former Israeli Prime Minister, Yitzhak Shamir, lauds him enthusiastically as well on page 9 of his book, [Summing Up](#),

"Without doubt, Jabotinsky was the most dynamic and controversial of the many gifted men who left their mark on the Zionist movement and, subsequently, on the State of Israel. . . . For ever the target of strong feelings, he was at once hated, worshipped, feared and admired; accepted as a supreme leader by some, he was rejected by others as a dangerous extremist whose concepts and supporters, if allowed to prevail, would degrade and destroy the essence of the Zionist cause. . .

“Today Jabotinsky’s name and spirit are kept alive mostly through the Likud Party, which, to a significant degree, represents and articulates his basic philosophy and is, so to speak, executor of his political testament.”

Later, on page 11 he sums up by saying of him,

“Essentially, Jabotinsky’s vision of Zionism achieved can be compressed into one sentence: a Jewish majority in a Jewish state in the whole of the biblical Land of Israel.”

Mr. Shamir was the second most important Jewish terrorist leader in the 1940’s, heading the Lehi (also called the Stern Gang). Jabotinsky was the spiritual inspiration behind the Jewish terrorism waged against the British by both Mr. Begin and Mr. Shamir during the 1940’s.

The Rise of Jewish Terrorism

In 1936 the mufti of Jerusalem, Haj Amin el-Husseini, called for a general strike among the Arabs. They vowed to close down the economy, but only succeeded in vacating jobs that were quickly filled by new Jewish immigrants, who were in need of employment. Enraged by the failure of the strike, they turned to more violent measures, and Palestine exploded in violence once again. The mufti was short on wisdom and long on hatred.

In this context, the Revisionist movement gave birth first to the Irgun Zvai Leumi (“National Military Organization”) in April 1937 and, shortly afterward, the Fighters for the Freedom of Israel, called F. F. I, or Lehi, the acronym for its Hebrew name, Lohamei Herut Yisrael. Named also after its founder, Avraham Stern, it is also known by their friends as the Stern Group and by their adversaries as the Stern Gang.

Jabotinsky himself died in New York in 1940. As for Avraham Stern, he was soon found by British police and immediately executed without trial in 1942. Both Shamir and Begin decried this execution as a “murder.” Perhaps it was. But in more recent years, the Israeli government has executed many Arab terrorists in similar fashion without trial. The Arabs also call this murder. The Israelis, however, operate on a double standard and do not consider the execution of Arab terrorists to be murder. It is only murder if the terrorist is a Jew.

From 1943 to 1948 the Irgun terrorists were led by Menachem Begin, the man who became the Likud Party’s first Prime Minister of Israel in 1977.

Jewish Pawns in their Leaders’ Hands

During the British Mandate government in Palestine (1922-1948), the average Jew was caught in the middle, for he was being used as a pawn in a bigger game than he realized. In 1941 and 1942 the German Gestapo offered to transport all Jews to Spain for \$1,000 for each family, on condition that these Jews not move to Palestine. The Jewish Agency declined the offer—they must move to Palestine or suffer in their own countries.

In 1944 a similar offer was made in regard to Hungarian Jews. Again, the Jewish Agency declined the offer—they must move to Palestine or suffer in their own countries to put propaganda pressure upon the European governments. Germany and Britain, during World War II, even agreed to evacuate 500,000 Jews from Europe and resettle them in British colonies. It was the Jewish Agency that refused the offer—they must move to Palestine or suffer in their own countries.

The British government granted to 300 rabbis and their families visas to the Colony of Mauritius, with passage through Turkey. The Jewish Agency stopped this plan, too, saying that the 300 rabbis and their families ought to be “gassed” for their disloyalty to Zionism. Presumably it was more

acceptable to the Jewish Agency that their Jewish pawns be “gassed” to put more pressure on Britain.

Throughout the early 1900’s, thousands of Jews were convinced to move to Palestine illegally in order to force a change in British policy. When stopped at the border (or harbor), then the game turned bloody and grim. Jewish author, Alfred Lilienthal writes on page 359 of his book, The Zionist Connection II,

“Violence was often used against their own, as on November 25, 1940, when the S.S. *Patria* was blown up in the Haifa harbor, killing 276 illegal Jewish immigrant passengers. At the time of the incident these deaths were attributed to the British, and it was not until ten years later that the responsibility for this disaster was placed at the door of the Zionists. David Flinker, Israeli correspondent of the Jewish *Morning Journal* (the largest Yiddish daily) described what had happened:

“. . . ‘It was then that the Haganah General Staff took a decision at which their leaders shuddered. The decision was not to permit the *Patria* to leave Jaffa. The English must be given to understand that Jews could not be driven away from their own country. The *Patria* must be blown up. . . . The number of victims was officially placed at 276. The survivors were permitted by the High Commissioner to land.’

“Fifteen months later the S.S. *Struma* exploded in the Black Sea, killing 769 illegal Jewish immigrants. The Jewish Agency described it as an act of ‘mass-protest and mass-suicide,’ and the U.S. media once more placed the responsibility for these deaths at the door of the British and their Palestinian immigration policy.”

The Haganah (“Defense”) was the official defense organization of the Jewish Agency in Palestine. Though it operated as an underground military group, the British allowed it to operate somewhat freely, as long as it did not attack British targets. It is apparent from the blowing up of the *Patria* (and perhaps the *Struma* as well) that the Haganah was fully capable and prepared to sacrifice its own people to put pressure upon the British government to allow more immigration. The Jewish Agency called it “mass-protest and mass-suicide.” It is more accurate to view it as “assisted suicide.”

Menachem Begin writes about the sinking of the *Patria* on pages 35 and 36 of his book, The Revolt, saying,

“The *Patria* never sailed. Jewish ‘terrorists’ placed a bomb to prevent its departure. The bomb exploded and more than two hundred Jews were killed or drowned. The British authorities noted the fact that this was not an Irgun Zvai Leumi operation; it was the Haganah which had placed the bomb.”

Obviously, the Jewish Agency, headed by David Ben-Gurion, believed that the end justified the means. Even the great Arch-terrorist Menachem Begin would not have deliberately murdered hundreds of Jews to achieve his goal of a Jewish State, though his bombing of the King David Hotel did kill 17 Jews out of a total of 91. But the Jewish Agency needed another “British” atrocity in order to help their cause. The British were apparently not sufficiently ruthless, so the Haganah had to help with the murder of 276 Jews and then blame the British for the atrocity.

But with a Haganah mindset like that, we cannot help but wonder how many other Jews the Haganah murdered in order to generate sympathy and further its cause.

The bombing of the *Stuma* had another consequence. Yitshak Shamir, who was later to become one of Israel’s Prime Ministers, was at this time a leading Jewish terrorist in the Lehi. In his biography,

Summing Up, pages 41 and 52 describe the sinking of the *Struma* and how it affected Lehi's decision to assassinate Britain's Lord Moyne.

Toronto's The Globe and Mail newspaper for Aug. 6, 1994 carried a review of Shamir's Summing Up, stating:

“Shamir took part in the decision to kill Lord Moyne, and he helped plan the bold and complex operation. The experience was to serve him well later. During his years with the Mossad, Israel's security and intelligence service, he reportedly directed a squad of assassins. Shamir says he also ordered the execution of a Lehi member, a fanatic who threatened to disrupt the organization. How many other killings he ordered, he does not say. Shamir insists he has no regrets about his actions.”

Newspapers seldom mention the fact that the Israeli state was founded by Jewish terrorists. The Israelis did not oppose terrorism until after they pardoned themselves and became the statesmen of their newly-created Jewish State.

On Nov. 6, 1944 two young terrorists from Yitzhak Shamir's Lehi (Stern Gang) assassinated Britain's Minister for Middle East Affairs, Lord Moyne, in Cairo, Egypt. The assassins were caught, tried, and hanged on Mar. 23, 1945. Menachem Begin was upset with Shamir, not because of the act of terrorism, but because Shamir had not warned Begin beforehand, which would have allowed Begin to prepare for the British reaction and their crackdowns on terrorists. In his book, The Revolt, on pages 150, 151, Begin chided the Stern Gang, saying:

“As comrades in revolt and partners in danger, we should have been informed by the F. I. chiefs of what was going forward. But they had permitted us to be taken completely by surprise.”

The F.F.I. stood for the “Freedom Fighters of Israel,” which was Shamir's Stern Gang.

The Jewish Agency, always playing politics, did not care about the assassination either, but they did care about their political position and about the British reprisals that would come. So Ben-Gurion went to the United States to raise money for arms to fight the British government. He met on July 1, 1945 with seventeen wealthy American Jews, who formed the secret Sonnenborn Institute to secure arms and smuggle them into Palestine. When all was ready, Ben-Gurion sent a letter to Moshe Sneh, the Haganah (“defense”) chief in Palestine, telling him to begin the terrorist uprising and to coordinate their operations with the Irgun and the Stern Gang.

This makes it clear that Ben-Gurion and the Jewish Agency itself believed in terrorism against the British. It was not for *moral* reasons that they refrained from terrorism most of the time. Their restraint was based upon *political* considerations, knowing that open terrorism would be detrimental to world opinion and support.

This was the basis of Ben-Gurion's “statesmanship.” He both supported and perpetrated terrorism, but usually did so secretly, so as not to let the world know that he too was a terrorist. Once he had raised money for arms in the summer of 1945, the Jewish Agency openly joined with the Stern and Irgun terrorists for about nine months in a reign of terror throughout Palestine. This “United Resistance Movement” lasted from Nov. 1945 to July 1946, ending only with the most spectacular terrorist act: the blowing up of the King David Hotel on July 22, 1946.

The Jewish Agency's shock troops, called the Palmach, was first organized in 1941 but remained relatively inactive for the duration of World War Two. But World War Two had ended in 1945. Twenty-three year old Yitzhak Rabin was appointed second-in-command of the First Battalion. During this time, they coordinated their attacks with the Irgun and with the Stern Gang, as Ben-

Gurion had ordered.

The Palmach's first action was to free about 200 Jews from the Atlith detention camp, who had been arrested for attempting to enter Palestine illegally. Rabin led his Palmach battalion on Oct. 10, 1945 and successfully broke them out of the camp and dispersed them throughout various Jewish settlements. The success of this operation encouraged them to engage in an all-out guerilla war against the British, beginning the night of Nov. 1, 1945. Menachem Begin writes on page 191 of The Revolt:

“On the ‘night of the railways’ the Haganah also sank three British patrol boats. Later they twice attacked the radar station at Haifa. . . One attack was made on the police Observation Post at Givat Olga, which was blown up. . . In February 1946 the Haganah carried out sabotage operations against installations of the Mobile Police. And in June the Haganah brought their armed resistance to a close with the comprehensive and successful attack on the frontier-bridges.”

This “night of the railways” was the first major joint operation, which occurred Nov. 1, 1945. Shamir tells us that in their part of the operation against the railway workshops, eleven Lehi members were killed. Toward the end of this united front came the “night of the bridges” in June 1946. On page 203 Begin writes of this:

“Great steel bridges in the north, the south, and the east, collapsed under the blows of the Haganah men. This was the last military operation of the Resistance Movement.”

This proved to be the final terrorist act that brought the British to strike back forcefully on the day known to Jewish historians as “The Black Sabbath.” On June 29, 1946 the British forces occupied the headquarters of the Jewish Agency and arrested nearly all of the leaders of their Haganah and Palmach.

The ranks of the Palmach (shock troops) were devastated. Yitzhak Rabin was arrested, although he was recovering from a badly broken leg suffered in a motorcycle accident. This turned out to be of benefit to him, because he was taken to a military hospital, where he received good treatment and physical therapy. Kurzman's biography of Rabin, Soldier of Peace, pages 102, 103 says,

“Actually, the British treated their prisoners quite well. They gave Rabin good medical attention, sending him to the military hospital in Gaza.”

One might want to compare the British treatment of Jewish terrorists with today's Jewish treatment of Arab terrorists.

The Jewish Agency loudly proclaimed that the Black Sabbath arrests were nothing short of a British declaration of war upon the Jews themselves. To them, the British had no right to defend themselves against Jewish terrorism. In fact, in their minds, it was the British government's own fault for provoking them to commit terrorist acts by continuing to “occupy” Palestine. Menachem Begin writes on page 205 of his book, The Revolt:

“Throughout the day the Jewish Agency's *Kol Israel* [“all Israel”—ed.] vociferated: “Britain has declared war on the Jewish people. The Jewish people will fight back. Out with the unclean sons of Titus from our Holy Land! Down with the Nazi-British regime in our country!”

In other words, any time the British defended themselves or attempted to arrest the terrorists who had blown up the bridges, police stations, etc., the British were always said to be the aggressors who had “declared war on the Jewish people.” But when Jews declared war, it was always justified

in their eyes as a “fight for freedom.” Jewish casualties of the fight were the fault of the British “murderers,” and any British casualties were also the fault of the British just for being there.

Likewise, when Arabs were killed by these same Zionists, it was their own fault for just being there after they were warned to leave their farms and villages and flee to other Arab nations. The moral blind spot is beyond belief. The double standard has no rational explanation.

At any rate, the Jewish Agency was not nearly as committed to the cause as the Irgun or Lehi. They were too political to accept casualties as a fact of war, and in this way they differed greatly with the Irgun and Stern Gang. With close to half of their fighters in prison, they left the fighting to Begin and Shamir and returned to their official political status. They even issued a public denouncement of terrorism, although they continued to support it secretly. In fact, they decided to take revenge upon the British for arresting their members, and so at that point they approved the bombing of the King David Hotel.

Such was the political duplicity of the Jewish Agency.

Destroying the King David Hotel

A few months before the arrest of the Haganah and Palmach leaders, they had already begun to plan an attack on the King David Hotel, where the military headquarters for the British government was located. In the Spring of 1946 the Irgun submitted a plan to the Haganah, but the Haganah thought it was too ambitious.

Then on July 1, 1946, two days after the British had arrested many of their leaders, they approved the plan whereby the Irgun would blow up the hotel. In their way of thinking, this was an appropriate “reprisal” for the Black Sabbath occupation of the headquarters of the Jewish Agency. At least, that was how they justified it later.

In actuality, Begin makes it very clear that they had planned this action months before the British occupied the Jewish Agency headquarters. The arrests on Black Sabbath caused the Haganah leaders to capitulate to the British and publicly renounce terrorism, but they continued to carry out a secret terrorist war against the British. The only difference was that they now remained in the background and let the Irgun do the dirty work. Begin relates the entire story in chapter 15 of his book.

The operation was led by “Gideon,” (Yisrael Levi). They brought milk cans loaded with explosives into the basement through the hotel’s Regence Café. When completed, one of them telephoned the hotel and told them to evacuate the building, because bombs had been placed. They were timed to go off in half an hour. However, according to Begin’s account, the hotel was not evacuated, because the British high command refused to “take orders from the Jews.” Whatever the reason, 91 people were killed in the explosion.

The explosion was more effective than any of them believed possible, both in its destruction and the high number of casualties. The Haganah panicked again, and asked the Irgun to take public responsibility for this terrorist act. Mr. Begin complied, saving the Haganah any further embarrassment and arrests.

Nonetheless, the Haganah once again became the public adversary of the Irgun, even helping the British arrest Irgun members! Mr. Begin seems largely justified in his contempt for the Haganah and their duplicity. Begin, who calls himself the “Number One Terrorist” on the first page of his book, at least had principles, for he was not a politician, but a military man.

The Haganah not only knew of the operation, but approved of it in advance. It was called “Operation Chick.” Begin writes on page 218,

“Operation ‘Chick’ was carried out exactly three weeks after we received the Haganah’s

instructions to execute it. During that time a number of meetings took place between us and the leaders of the Resistance Movement. Once the F. F. I. called for a postponement as they were not yet ready for their task. Twice or thrice we postponed the attack at the request of the Haganah Command.”

The blow-up of the King David Hotel brought the “Big Curfew” in Tel Aviv, as Yitzhak Shamir calls it on page 63 of his book, Summing Up. In the British search for terrorists, an officer recognized Yitzhak Shamir in spite of his disguise and imprisoned him. Ultimately, the British court exiled him to the prison camp in Eritrea in Africa, and he was out of the fight until May 1948.

The Deir Yassin Village Massacre

This occurred nine months after the destruction of the King David Hotel, a time when the British government began to give up on keeping the peace in Palestine.

On April 9, 1947 for no good strategic reason Begin’s Irgun Gang teamed up with Shamir’s Stern Gang and massacred over 250 men, women, and children in Deir Yassin, a peaceful village outside of Jerusalem. Most of the men were absent, because they were working in Jerusalem. The people were quickly subdued, those who resisted were killed on the spot, and the rest were lined up against a wall in the town square and shot. Many of the women were raped before most of them, too, were killed.

Later apologists tell us that *it was their own fault for not leaving when they were warned*. Surely, such apologists must be a bit insane to think that a few minutes’ warning relieves terrorists and murders of all moral responsibility for the massacres! Begin writes on page 163, 164 of The Revolt,

“One of our tenders carrying a loud speaker was stationed at the entrance to the village and it exhorted in Arabic all women, children and aged to leave their houses and to take shelter on the slope of the hill. By giving this humane warning our fighters threw away the elements of complete surprise, and thus increased their own risk in the ensuing battle. A substantial number of the inhabitants obeyed the warning and they were unhurt. A few did not leave their stone houses—perhaps because of the confusion. The fire of the enemy was murderous—to which the number of our casualties [four Irgun fighters were killed—ed.] bears eloquent testimony. Our men were compelled to fight for every house; to overcome the enemy they used large numbers of hand grenades. And the civilians who had disregarded our warnings, suffered inevitable casualties.”

This “warning” given to the civilians is contradicted by Alfred Lilienthal, who wrote on page 154 of The Zionist Connection II,

“No warning had been given to the villagers, as was later claimed (Begin has stated that all victims of Irgun attacks had been warned beforehand), because the armored truck with its loudspeaker had tumbled into a ditch and been tossed on its side far short of the first houses of the village. Advised by a night watchman of the approaching Jewish raiders, some inhabitants, with only a robe thrown around them, managed to flee to the west.”

“Jon Kimche, the Zionist writer, calling the incident ‘the darkest stain on the Jewish record throughout the fighting,’ stated, ‘The terrorist justified the massacre of Deir Yassin because it led to the panic flight of the remaining Arabs in the Jewish state area.’ Jewish writer Don Peretz described the result of Deir Yassin as a ‘mass fear psychosis which grasped the whole Arab community.’ Arthur Koestler wrote, this ‘bloodbath . . . was the psychologically decisive factor in the spectacular exodus of Arab refugees’.” (p.

Menachem Begin also claimed that the town was of strategic military value. He bases this on a letter from Mr. Shaltiel, the Haganah Regional Commander, who had written to Begin:

“I learn that you plan an attack on Dir Yassin. I wish to point out that the capture of Dir Yassin and holding it is one stage in our general plan. I have no objection to your carrying out the operation provided you are able to hold the village. If you are unable to do so I warn you against blowing up the village which will result in its inhabitants abandoning it and its ruins and deserted houses being occupied by foreign forces. This situation will increase our difficulties in the general struggle. A second conquest of the place will involve us in heavy sacrifices. Furthermore, if foreign forces enter the place this will upset the plan for establishing an airfield.”

So the strategic value of Dir Yassin (or Deir Yassin) was that the Haganah was planning to turn it into an airfield! Certainly that would justify the destruction of the village. And if the people object and fight back, this would certainly justify their massacre. After all, who are they to object to a Jewish airfield? Don't Jews have rights?

The Haganah, as usual, had denied all knowledge of the Irgun's plans to destroy Deir Yassin. But Begin makes it clear that they knew about it and even approved of its operation. Begin says he did the “humane” thing by telling the people to flee from their homes before his attack. It was the Arab villagers' own fault, he think, because they did not all flee and leave everything to the Jewish settlers who were soon to occupy the village. When they fought back, then the Irgun invoked its right to “self-defense.”

Do Arabs lack the right to fire upon invading Irgun and Lehi attackers? *It was not Deir Yassin that attacked a village of the Irgun.*

The primary goal of this massacre was to terrorize the Arabs into fleeing from their land, for only by their leaving could Jews confiscate it for themselves. Once the Arabs had fled—even if they went to a nearby town to stay with relatives for a time—they would not be allowed to return.

This Zionist definition of self defense is still used today as they confiscate more land and destroy more Arab villages. They come in and tell everyone to leave town, then blow up the town and move Israeli settlers to the land, giving the new settlement an Israeli name. Deir Yassin was no exception. I beg to differ with them on their basic definitions of morality and justice.

This murder was so diabolical that even the Chief Rabbi of Jerusalem, to his credit, excommunicated those who participated in the massacre.

Jacques de Reynier was the Chief Representative of the International Red Cross at the time of the massacre. His report of his inspection of Deir Yassin the day after the massacre may be viewed on a web site on the internet under <http://www.palestinehistory.com/mass01.htm>: It makes grim reading:

“Suddenly the officer tells me . . . the story of this village populated by 400 Arabs, disarmed since always living on good terms with the Jews who surround them. According to him, the Irgun arrived 24 hours previously and ordered by loudspeaker the whole population to evacuate all the buildings and surrender. There is a 15 minute delay in the execution of the command. Some of the unhappy people came forward and would have been taken prisoners and then turned loose shortly afterwards toward the Arab lines. The rest did not obey the order and suffered the fate they deserved. . . .

“Former Haganah officer, Col. Meir Pa'el, upon his retirement from the Israeli army in 1972, made the following public statement about Deir Yassin that was published by

Yediot Ahronot (April 4, 1972): ‘In the exchange that followed, four [Irgun] men were killed and a dozen were wounded. . . by noon time the battle was over and the shooting had ceased. Although there was calm, the village had not yet surrendered. The Irgun and LEHI men came out of hiding and began to “clean” the houses. They shot whoever they saw, women and children included, the commanders did not try to stop the massacre . . . I pleaded with the commander to order his men to cease fire, but to no avail. In the meantime, 25 Arabs had been loaded on a truck and driven through Mahne Yehuda and Zichron Yousef (like prisoners in a Roman “March of Triumph”). At the end of the drive, they were taken to the quarry between Deir Yassin and Giv’at Shaul, and murdered in cold blood. . . The commanders also declined when asked to take their men and bury the 254 Arab bodies. This unpleasant task was performed by two Gadna units brought to the village from Jerusalem.

“Zvi Ankori, who commanded the Haganah unit that occupied Deir Yassin after the massacre, gave this statement in 1982 about the massacre, published by Davar on April 9, 1982: ‘I went into 6 to 7 houses. I saw cut off genitals and women’s crushed stomachs. According to the shooting signs on the bodies, it was direct murder.’”

Even today, there are Zionists who deplore this murder. Ami Isseroff, of the Peace Middle East Dialog Group, implores his fellow Zionists,

“It is long past time for Israeli Zionists, like myself, to apologize. The Israeli government has never apologized for the massacre of Deir Yassin . . . The perpetrators of the massacre at Deir Yassin were never punished.”

As you can see, the roots of the present-day conflict go back to the days of Jewish terrorism. *It worked so well for them, the Arabs decided to try to same tactics.* The Jewish state was founded on terrorism by terrorism. This is the true basis of their claim to “the right to exist.” This is part of God’s reason for prophesying its destruction.

The Cursed Fig Tree

In discussing the spirit of Zionism, we saw in previously that the Jews got tired of waiting for a messiah to end their dispersion and bring them “back to the Promised Land.” Their dispersion did not end, because the Jews did not (as a people) repent of their “hostility” to Jesus Christ—which the divine law specified as a condition for the end of captivity (Lev. 26:40, NASB).

Certain Jews finally decided that the time had come for them to take matters into their own hands. They saw no reason to repent, for in their eyes Jesus was a false messiah that was worthy of death. Likewise, they persecuted the early Church, believing that they deserved to die for spreading the “heresy” of Jesus’ teachings and of the “lie” that He rose from the dead.

They saw no connection between the beheading of John the Baptist at Passover of 30 A.D. and the beginning of the Roman siege of Jerusalem 40 years later at Passover of 70 A.D.

They saw no connection between Jesus’ crucifixion at Passover of 33 A.D. and the fall of Masada that marked the end of the war 40 years later at Passover of 73 A.D.

They were willing to follow false messiahs, as long as they were military leaders eager to fight those that God had put over them. But they were not willing to repent in order to let God set them free—at least, not until the prophet Daniel did so in Dan. 9.

The Violent Take the Kingdom by Force

We have shown from the prophet Jeremiah that there were (and still are) two types of “figs” from the fig tree of Judah. There are good figs and evil figs. The good figs are those that peaceably submit to the judgment of God, and there are those who would rather fight and die (Jer. 24-30). This was true in Jeremiah’s day, and it was again true in Jesus’ day. Jesus said of these people in Matt. 11:12,

¹² And from the days of John the Baptist until now the kingdom of heaven suffers violence, and violent men take it by force.

Jesus denounced the Jewish belief that the Kingdom of God must be taken by violence and force. Forty years later, God brought judgment and captivity upon Judah, this time at the hand of Rome. It was all for the same reasons that we find in the writings of Jeremiah six centuries earlier. One would think that the people would have learned, since they claimed to believe the writings of Moses and the prophets.

Judaism and the Traditions (Precepts) of Men

The problem was that these people did not believe either Moses or the prophets. Jesus said in John 5:45-47,

⁴⁵ Do not think that I will accuse you before the Father; the one who accuses you is Moses, in whom you have set your hope. ⁴⁶ For if you believed Moses, you would believe Me; for he wrote of Me. ⁴⁷ But if you do not believe his writings, how will you believe My words?

Jesus said that the Jews did not believe Moses, and that this was the reason they would not believe Jesus and accept Him as the Messiah. They believed only the traditions of men, which Jesus severely condemned (Matt. 15:1-8). Jesus concluded in verses 7-9,

⁷ You hypocrites, rightly did Isaiah prophesy of you, saying, ⁸ This people honors Me with their lips, but their heart is far from Me. ⁹ But in vain do they worship Me, teaching as doctrines the precepts of men.

These precepts, or traditions, were written down from about 50 B.C. to about 500 A.D. in a body of Jewish literature called the “Talmud.” This is the sacred literature of Judaism. It is NOT the Bible, not even the Old Testament. Dr. Israel Shahak writes on page 5 of his very scholarly book, Jewish Fundamentalism in Israel,

“Jewish fundamentalists believe that the Bible itself is not authoritative unless interpreted correctly by talmudic literature.”

Dr. Shahak was an Israeli citizen in Jerusalem for over 40 years until his death on July 2, 2001. He was a professor emeritus of Organic Chemistry at Hebrew University as well as a human rights activist. Dr. Shahak further writes on page 25,

“The teachings of the biblical prophets, the books of Job and Ecclesiastes and numerous other parts of the Bible are studied neither in the heders [elementary schools] nor the yeshivot [talmudic schools of higher learning] and are therefore unknown to the Haredim [fundamentalists].”

Dr. Shahak is telling us that the religious rabbis do not normally study the Bible itself. They study the traditions of men, which is what men SAY the Bible teaches. The Talmud is often diametrically opposed to the teaching of the prophets themselves.

The Talmudic teachings seldom reflected the real teachings of the Bible. It is often assumed among Christian circles that Jews only need to add Jesus to their Judaism in order to get the perfect religion. This is not true. The Talmud plus Jesus does not equal Christianity.

We showed in Part Two of this series that Jesus Christ was the One who gave the law to Moses. He is the One called Yahweh in the Old Testament, as we see from Ex. 15:2,

² The Lord [Yahweh] is my strength and song, and He has become my salvation [Yahshua].

The Hebrew name translated “Lord” is Yahweh, the name of God that was revealed to Moses in Ex. 6:3. The Hebrew word translated “salvation” is Yahshua, which is Jesus’ Hebrew name. Thus, Moses prophetically writes of the incarnation of Jesus, saying that “*Yahweh. . . has become my Yahshua.*” It proves that Jesus Christ is the God of the Old Testament and that He came to be born of a virgin in Bethlehem in the New Testament. This prophetic concept is repeated in Isaiah 12, saying,

² Behold, God is my salvation [Yahshua], I will trust and not be afraid; for the Lord God is my strength and song, and He has become my salvation [Yahshua]. ³ Therefore you will joyously draw water from the springs of salvation [Yahshua].

Jesus referred to this passage in John 7:37 and 38 when He said on the last day of the feast of Tabernacles,

³⁸ He who believes in Me, as the Scripture said, From his innermost being shall flow rivers of living water.

Jesus was telling the people that the true water of life comes only through Him. The outpouring of the Spirit would result in the people becoming springs of living water. Jesus told the Samaritan woman in John 4:14, He who drinks of this water will never thirst again.

Jesus came to manifest to the world the true meaning of the Scriptures. He did this by example and by teaching. His teaching contradicted the chauvinistic teaching of the religious leaders of the day. For this reason, instead of repenting, they crucified Him.

The Fig Tree Cut Down

John the Baptist admonished the people not to claim that their descent from Abraham would save them. He said in Luke 3:8 and 9,

⁸ Therefore bring forth fruits in keeping with repentance, and do not begin to say to yourselves, We have Abraham for our father, for I say to you that God is able from these stones to raise up children to Abraham. ⁹ And also the axe is already laid at the root of the trees; every tree therefore that does not bear good fruit is cut down and thrown into the fire.

In other words, the nation of Judah was not going to be spared just because they could claim descent from Abraham. God spared neither Israel nor Judah in the days of the Old Testament. Neither would He spare them in the first century A.D. except for those who would repent.

John was called to introduce Jesus to the world and present Him as the Messiah. After fulfilling that call, he was soon cast into prison and finally executed. Jesus then ministered three years, showing the mind of God by His character and explaining to them what He meant when He gave the law to Moses. Most of the people either did not understand or they disagreed with Him.

Finally, toward the end of His ministry, he told a parable of the fig tree, which completed what John had said in Luke 3 (above). We read in Luke 13:6-9,

⁶ And He began telling this parable: A certain man had a fig tree which had been planted in

his vineyard, and he came looking for fruit on it, and did not find any. ⁷ And he said to the vineyard-keeper, Behold, for three years I have come looking for fruit on this fig tree without finding any. Cut it down! Why does it even use up the ground? ⁸ And he answered and said to him, Let it alone, sir, for this year, too, until I dig around it and put in fertilizer; ⁹ and if it bears fruit next year, fine; but if not, cut it down.

The fig tree was the symbol of the Judah nation. Jesus came looking for “fruits in keeping with repentance” (as John called it) on this national tree for three years and found nothing. But the vineyard-keeper interceded for the tree, asking for one more year to see if it would bear fruit. And so, in the middle of the fourth year of His ministry, He came to Jerusalem one final time to see if He might find fruit of this tree.

Instead of repenting, they crucified Him. This was not the “fruits in keeping with repentance” that John expected from this tree. Thus, the prophecy says in Luke 13:9, “*if not, cut it down.*” This is what happened from 70-73 A.D. The Judah tree was cut down and the people scattered. It was the beginning of their “yoke of iron” (Deut. 28:48).

Many modern Christians listen to the Jews claiming descent from Abraham, and they think this nullifies their need to repent before God removes from them the iron yoke. Such people ought to believe John the Baptist.

The Fruitless Fig Tree Withers

Just before Jesus was crucified, He came upon a fig tree that was full of leaves. The story is told in Matt. 21:18-20,

¹⁸ Now in the morning, when He returned to the city, He became hungry. ¹⁹ And seeing a lone fig tree by the road, He came to it, and found nothing on it except leaves only; and He said to it, No longer shall there ever be any fruit from you. And at once the fig tree withered. ²⁰ And seeing this, the disciples marveled saying, How did the fig tree wither at once?

This is an event that illustrated Jesus’ parable in Luke 13:6-9 (quoted earlier) about the fruitless fig tree. This tree had many leaves but no fruit. It put on a good show to the eyes, but it did not meet God’s requirements. So Jesus prophesied that it would not bring forth fruit at all. At that, the fig tree withered and died.

Adam and Eve Used Fig Leaves

Fig leaves have been a problem from the beginning. When Adam and Eve sinned, they discovered that they were “naked.” So the story says that they used fig leaves to cover themselves (Gen. 3:7). But fig leaves cannot cover one’s nakedness (sin) before God. Fig leaves are a symbol of man’s covering for sin, man’s rationalizations, and man’s excuses.

The true covering for sin is the blood of Jesus Christ, which cleanses us from all sin (1 John 1:7). There is no fig leaf big enough to cover sin or to substitute for the blood of Jesus Christ.

The Jews who reject Jesus Christ and His covering for sin have instead covered themselves with fig leaves in order to hide the fact that they have not brought forth the fruits of repentance that God requires. To this day they refuse to repent of their “hostility” against Jesus Christ (Lev. 26:40). They continue to rationalize their sin and claim to be innocent of His blood. And then in the past century they have formed a Zionist movement to try to take the Kingdom by force and throw off the iron yoke by violence, terrorism, theft of land, and bloodshed.

And if anyone dares to confront them with their hostility toward Jesus Christ, they feel insulted.

They merely claim descent from Abraham, as if that is supposed to justify their terrorism. If anything, being a descendant of Abraham makes one *more accountable* before God. It can *never* be used to justify sin.

Jesus Prophecies of Modern Zionism

In Matt. 24:32 and 33, Jesus gave His interpretation of the fig tree near the time of His second appearance:

³² Now learn the parable from the fig tree; when its branch has already become tender and puts forth its leaves, you know that summer is near; ³³ even so you, too, when you see all these things, recognize that He is near, right at the door.

This “fig tree” is recognized by many Bible teachers as referring to the modern Jewish State. Thus, even they believe that Jesus prophesied of this State being formed in the latter days when Jesus second coming is “*near, right at the door.*” I fully agree with this interpretation.

But Jesus said nothing about this fig tree bringing forth FRUIT. He only says that it will bring forth more leaves. In other words, it will come to life, and the Jewish State will indeed be established—but it will not bear fruit that would save it from being cut down once again. If it bears no fruit, it is fit only to be cut down, Jesus said.

Modern evangelical and pentecostal teaching says that the Jews will soon repent, and God will save them at the last minute. Then their Jewish State will become the headquarters of Christ’s Kingdom on the earth. They say Jesus Christ will rule from a rebuilt temple in Jerusalem (after the Antichrist has vacated it, of course).

Here I absolutely disagree. If the nation were to repent, it would bear the fruits of repentance that John and Jesus required from the beginning. But if it should bear fruit, then Jesus’ prophecy would fail, for He said in Matt. 21:19, “**No longer shall there ever be any fruit from you.**”

If we do not believe Jesus’ words here, then why should we believe anything else that He said?

Jesus’ Second Zionist Prophecy

In Luke 19 Jesus told one of His many parables about the nobleman (who represents Jesus Himself). Verse 12,

¹² He said therefore, A certain nobleman went to a distant country to receive a kingdom for himself, and then return.

The parable continues, telling us that this nobleman entrusted to his servants various amounts of money and told them to do business until He returned. The servants represent those who serve Him—Jesus. That is, they represent the Christian believers. Verse 14 then says,

¹⁴ But his CITIZENS hated him, and sent a delegation after him, saying, We do not want this man to reign over us.

The citizens who hate Jesus and rejected His Kingship are the Jews. This statement, “We do not want this man to reign over us,” brings us back to what the people said in the days of the prophet Samuel. In 1 Samuel 8 the people rejected Yahweh’s rule over them and demanded an earthly king like the nations around them. 1 Sam. 8:7 says,

⁷ And the Lord [Yahweh] said to Samuel, Listen to the voice of the people in regard to all that they say to you, for they have not rejected you, but they have rejected Me from being king over them.

In the New Testament, as we saw earlier, Yahweh became Yahshua, or Jesus Christ. In other words, the people in Samuel's day rejected Jesus Christ from ruling over them. The same situation occurred again after Yahweh was born in Bethlehem and named Yahshua (Greek: Iesus; English: Jesus).

In the parable Jesus said that the servants received various rewards according to what they did with the money they were given. This speaks of the rewards given to the believers at the Great White Throne, where every man is judged according to his works (Rev. 20:12).

Then at the end of the parable, Jesus gave His verdict for the "citizens" who hated Him. Verses 27, 28 say,

27 But these enemies of mine, who did not want me to reign over them, bring them here and slay them in my presence. 28 And after He had said these things, He was going on ahead, ascending to Jerusalem.

In other words, Jesus prophesied that those who had rejected Him would be brought back "here" to "Jerusalem" for judgment. "*Slay them in My presence,*" is the verdict.

The modern Zionist movement did not take Jesus Christ by surprise. Jesus prophesied that it would happen. Yet Jesus made it clear that the nation as a whole would NOT repent or bear the fruits of the Kingdom. Further, God's purpose in allowing them to return was to bring them to destruction for not wanting Jesus to reign over them.

Zionism is in the plan of God, but Zionism is not a godly movement. God's motive in allowing the Jewish immigration to Palestine and Jerusalem is to gather them for judgment at the place where they committed their offense. Of course, there are always individuals among them throughout the centuries and even in the present time who have accepted Jesus as King. But the nation itself, the Jewish State, will not bear fruit and will be cut down.

The Fate of Jerusalem

Jeremiah 18 and 19 tells us the fate of the northern ten tribes of the House of Israel and the southern two tribes of the House of Judah. In 18:1-1-6 the prophet speaks of the jar of wet clay that represents the House of Israel. God says that He will remake the House of Israel into a new vessel, even as a potter can do with wet clay. Verse 6 says,

6 Can I not, O house of Israel, deal with you as this potter does? declares the Lord. Behold, like the clay in the potter's hand, so are you in My hand, O house of Israel.

This is a prophecy of the northern "lost" ten tribes of the House of Israel, who had already been taken into Assyria a century before Jeremiah's time. These did not return to the old land—and never will—because they were given a completely different set of prophecies to fulfill.

In the rest of chapter 18 and all of 19 the prophet turns his attention to "*the men of Judah and the inhabitants of Jerusalem*" (18:11). This was the southern Kingdom of the House of Judah. He tells their sin, and then in 19:1 God tells Jeremiah,

1 Thus says the Lord, Go and buy a potter's earthenware jar, and take some of the elders of the people and some of the senior priests. 2 Then go out to the valley of Ben-hinnom, which is by the entrance of the potsherd gate; and proclaim there the words that I shall tell you.

This jar, the Lord explained to the prophet, represented Judah and Jerusalem. Jer. 19:10, 11 then says,

10 Then you are to break the jar in the sight of the men who accompany you 11 and say to them, Thus says the Lord of hosts, Just so shall I break this people and this city even as one

breaks a potter's vessel which cannot again be repaired.

It is clear from this that God was to “break” both the people and the city as *a jar that could not be repaired*. This stands in stark contrast to prophecy of the wet clay of the House of Israel in Jer. 18:1-6. The people and city were destroyed in 586 B.C.—but they were restored and the city repaired 70 years later. The city was again destroyed in 70 A.D.—but repaired later.

Hence, Jeremiah's prophecy has not been fulfilled yet. It is yet future. And this future is soon coming upon them. God has brought them back to the old land in order that His Word will not be broken. That is Zionism's purpose.

Zionist Persecution of Jews

The United Nations Partitions Palestine

By the Spring of 1947 the British government saw that its presence in Palestine was untenable. The work of the Jewish terrorists had become too successful. It should be noted that it was not Arab terrorism that caused the British to leave Palestine. It was the work of the Jewish terrorists, most notably Menachem Begin and Yitzhak Shamir.

The British government gave the Palestinian problem into the hands of the newly-formed United Nations, which debated the resolution from Nov. 21-29, 1947. The Arab states objected that the Jews would be given any land at all in a partitioned state, but this objection was not feasible, since there were by this time hundreds of thousands of Jews already living along the coast of Palestine and could hardly be expelled at this point.

It was well known that immigration and settlement itself was the most effective means of winning a war. It is difficult to displace that many people who are already living in an area. For this reason, Zionism fought fiercely to bring more Jewish settlers to Palestine. For this reason Zionist leaders were even willing to sacrifice hundreds of lowly Jews for the “greater good” of securing the land.

When the U.N. passed the resolution partitioning the land of Palestine, the conflict escalated. Both sides began a battle to obtain more land. Arabs attacked Jewish settlers, and Jewish settlers began to destroy Arab villages and drive out their citizens. One such example was Deir Yassin, whose story we told in Part 4 of this series. As of today about 400 Arab villages have been destroyed, and many of the survivors still live in refugee camps.

The British troops finally left Palestine on May 13, 1948, and the Jewish Agency leaders (led by Ben-Gurion) immediately declared a Jewish State. The neighboring Arab countries then declared war.

In the attempt to end the fighting, the U.N. sent as its official mediator Count Folke Bernadotte, the nephew of the Swedish king. He was also the head of the Swedish Red Cross.

The Assassination of Count Folke Bernadotte

On Sept. 17, 1948 Bernadotte and his aide, Col. Andre Pierre Serot, were assassinated in Jerusalem for advocating the U.N. plan to partition Palestine and internationalize Jerusalem. Yitzhak Shamir, the head of Lehi (Stern Gang), justified this terrorist assassination on the grounds that his U.N. policy “represented a disaster.” On p. 75 of his book, Summing Up, he wrote,

“The Bernadotte Plan was a development that would have opened the way, without question, to putting an end to the Jewish state within weeks of its birth. . . . Lehi took no responsibility for the deed; the idea was conceived in Jerusalem by Lehi members operating there more or less independently. The assassination was attributed to a splinter group, ‘The Fatherland Front’. Israel's Provisional Government acted quickly; it

declared Lehi illegal, arrested all the members it could find and broke up the Jerusalem units; for a while it both prosecuted and persecuted us. Gera was imprisoned; Eldad and I went into hiding, outlaws again, back in the underground but determined not to fight the State of Israel.”

Shamir does not say specifically who was guilty, but Alfred Lilienthal writes on page 360 of his book, The Zionist Connection II, about who was responsible for this assassination:

“During a February 1977 press conference marking the publication in Israel of a new book on David Ben-Gurion, The Secret Life of Heinrich Roehm... the late Prime Minister had the names of the three who had carried out the assassination; one of them, Yehoshva Zeitler, was one of Ben Gurion’s best friends. Zeitler explained that ‘we executed Bernadotte because he was a one-man institution who endangered the status of Jerusalem by his declared intention of turning her into an international city’. . . The decision to kill Count Bernadotte had been taken by three Stern Gang leaders, Nathan Yelin-Mor, Dr. Israel Eldad-Sheib, and Zeitler, commander of activities in Jerusalem and an immediate friend of the first Prime Minister.”

At the time, however, the new Israeli government did not know who had actually committed this murder. They did question Shamir in 1948, however, after he had arranged to negotiate with Shaul Avigur, the Deputy Minister of Defense, for a general amnesty. Avigur wanted to know—for the record—who was responsible, but Shamir refused to reveal their names (p. 75, 76, Summing Up). Soon the assassins that had been arrested were freed. After some negotiations,

“. . . Ben Gurion cut through the tangle to proclaim a ‘general amnesty’ and the Provisional Government passed a special law so that all Lehi and Irgun members be released, including those already sentenced.” (p. 76)

“Later on, an order was issued which put an end to such judgments by decreeing the destruction of the dossiers of all ‘dissidents’—and instructing government offices to treat them like everyone else.” (p. 77)

Perhaps the Israeli government was afraid of the Jewish terrorists among them, or Ben Gurion discovered that his friend, Zeitler, was one of the murderers. Whatever the reason, the government decided to assimilate the Lehi and Irgun terrorists into the mainstream of Israeli political and social life, rather than prosecute them for their murderous acts. In so doing, they paved the way for the day when these same terrorists, led by Menachem Begin, would form the Likud Party in 1975 and ultimately take over the Israeli government itself.

Zionist Persecution of Iraqi Jews

The Zionists have persecuted their fellow Jews in foreign lands in order to induce them to move to the Jewish State. We have already seen how they were willing to sink the *S.S. Patria* in 1940, killing hundreds of unsuspecting immigrants. But they have done other things as well. Dr. Israel Shahak wrote on page 47 of his book, Jewish Fundamentalism in Israel,

“The Israeli government induced Jewish immigration from Iraq by bribing the government of Iraq to strip most Iraqi Jews of their citizenship and to confiscate their property.”

Alfred Lilienthal writes on page 360 of his book, The Zionist Connection II,

“In 1950 Zionist agents in Baghdad threw bombs at a synagogue and at other Jewish

targets in order to pressure Jews into emigrating to Israel.”

Naeim Giladi, an Iraqi Jew, undoubtedly had no idea that his fellow Zionists would do such a thing. He was part of the Zionist underground in his early years, suffering two years of imprisonment and torture in an Iraqi military camp for his Zionist beliefs. He then escaped and went to the Promised Land, arriving in May, 1950. There he soon discovered the reality of Zionism. His story is on a web site at <http://www.jewsnotzionists.org/iraq.html>. He tells how the Labor Office hired him to get Palestinians to sign petitions—written in Hebrew—to the U.N. asking to be transferred out of the Jewish State to Gaza, which was under Egyptian control at the time.

“I read over the petition. In signing, the Palestinian would be saying that he was of sound mind and body and was making the request for transfer free of pressure or duress. Of course, there was no way that they would leave without being pressured to do so. These families had been there hundreds of years, as farmers, primitive artisans, weavers. The Military Governor prohibited them from pursuing their livelihoods, just penned them up until they lost hope of resuming their normal lives. That’s when they signed to leave.

“I was there and heard their grief. ‘Our hearts are in pain when we look at the orange trees that we planted with our own hands. Please, let us go, let us give water to those trees. God will not be pleased with us if we leave His trees untended.’ I asked the Military Governor to give them relief, but he said, ‘No, we want them to leave.’

“I could no longer be part of this oppression, and I left. Those Palestinians who didn’t sign up for transfers were taken by force—just put in trucks and dumped in Gaza. About four thousand people were driven from al-Majdal in one way or another. The few who remained were collaborators with the Israeli authorities. . . .

“I was disillusioned at what I found in the Promised Land, disillusioned personally, disillusioned at the institutionalized racism, disillusioned at what I was beginning to learn about Zionism’s cruelties.

“And I began to find out about the barbaric methods used to rid the fledgling state of as many Palestinians as possible. The world recoils today at the thought of bacteriological warfare, but Israel was probably the first to actually use it in the Middle East. In the 1948 war, Jewish forces would empty Arab villages of their populations, often by threats, sometimes by just gunning down a half-dozen unarmed Arabs as examples to the rest. To make sure the Arabs couldn’t return to make a fresh life for themselves in these villages, the Israelis put typhus and dysentery bacteria into the water wells.

“Uri Mileshtin, an official historian for the Israeli Defense Force, has written and spoken about the use of bacteriological agents. According to Mileshtin, Moshe Dyan, a division commander at the time, gave orders in 1948 to remove Arabs from their villages, bulldoze their homes, and render water wells unusable with typhus and dysentery bacteria.

“Acre was so situated that it could practically defend itself with one big gun, so the Haganah put bacteria into the spring that fed the town. The spring was called Capri and it ran from the north near a kibbutz. The Haganah put typhus bacteria into the water going to Acre, the people got sick, and the Jewish forces occupied Acre. This worked so well that they sent a Haganah division dressed as Arabs into Gaza, where there were

Egyptian forces, and the Egyptians caught them putting two cans of bacteria, typhus and dysentery, into the water supply in wanton disregard of the civilian population. ‘In war there is no sentiment,’ one the captured Haganah men was quoted as saying.”

This is a mere sampling of the things that the Zionists have done to the Palestinians in the name of God and supposedly for the good of all Jews. The extremists cannot understand why dissident Jews do not appreciate them for all the “good” that they have done for their country and for Jews in general. They do not understand that not all Jews condone murder, terror, and biological warfare for the good of the state.

Zealot Attitudes Against Peaceful Zionists

The Likud, along with the increasingly violent and radical settlement movement (called the Gush Emunim), has intimidated many more moderate Israelis into silence for fear of their lives. In fact, if the Israeli government itself should dare to suggest making peace with the Arabs, or to limit the number of new Israeli settlements on Arab land, they run the risk of assassination.

This actually occurred in 1994 when Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin was assassinated by Yigal Amir. In Dan Kurtzman’s book about Rabin, Soldier of Peace, page 432, he writes about Rabin’s campaign promise in 1992,

“He promised to make peace with the Arabs within nine months and stop building ‘political’ settlements, while strengthening the army he had built and led to victory.”

As early as 1975 while Rabin was Prime Minister for his first time, he was busy negotiating peace with Egypt, laying the foundations for the Peace Accord that was ultimately signed by Egypt’s Anwar Sadat and Israel’s Menachem Begin in 1978. A main ingredient of this peace was to return the Sinai to Egypt, where the Israelis had already been busy building settlements in order to make such a return impossible. Kurtzman writes on page 323 about this peace agreement:

“For most Israelis, the agreement offered the relief of a violent sandstorm dissipating into a tranquil desert wind. But right-wing extremists, especially members of the Gush Emunim, an extremist religious group, were outraged by the accord. When Kissinger had earlier visited Israel, members ‘horrified’ Rabin and other Israelis by crying anti-Semitic epithets such as ‘Jew-boy’, while one rabbi referred to Kissinger as ‘the husband of a gentile woman.’ They demonstrated before the Knesset, and one rightist journalist wrote that the secretary deserved the fate of UN mediator Count Folke Bernadotte, who was assassinated during the 1948 war. Rabin would later rail:

“I felt so thoroughly shocked and ashamed before Kissinger—indeed, before the whole world—that there were no words to express my anguish. I doubt I shall ever witness more deplorable or misguided behavior on the part of my countrymen.

“He was wrong, of course.”

Kurtzman was referring to Rabin’s assassination on Nov. 4, 1995. Anyone opposing the terrorist policies or the legalized theft of Arab land is immediately demonized as an “anti-Semite” or “self-hating Jew.” Those who must resort to name-calling have lost the argument.

This violent suppression of anyone who speaks out against the injustice of Zionists is not a new phenomenon. In an article written May 26, 2000, G. Neuburger tells about the Jewish organization called *Agudath Israel*, “Union of Israel,” founded in 1912 . . .

“to represent the true Jewish people in the world and to unmask the unwarranted and unjust claims of the Zionists. Rabbis everywhere joined Agudath Israel, as did masses of observant Jews.

“Shortly thereafter, Jacob de Haan, a former distinguished Dutch diplomat who was then leader of Agudath Israel in Palestine, initiated talks with Arab leaders with a view toward the eventual establishments of a state there in which Jews and Arabs would have equal rights. In this way he hoped to forestall the creation of a Zionist state. Despite threats to his life, de Haan, fully aware of the ultimate dangers of a Zionist state, continued his talks and negotiations. On the eve of his departure in 1924 for Britain to meet with authorities there, he was assassinated by the Haganah, the Zionist paramilitary force, in the center of Jerusalem as he came from evening prayers

“The greatest leader of the Neturei Karta [an offshoot of the *Agudath Israel*—ed.] was Rabbi Amram Blau, an inspired and dedicated leader whose compassion equaled his courage. He could not keep silent in the face of injustice, immorality or hypocrisy. He was beloved by Jews and respected by Christians and Muslims. Born in Jerusalem, he never left the Holy Land during his entire life. In his writings he stressed many times that Jews and Arabs had lived in harmony until the advent of political Zionism. Rabbi Blau was imprisoned in Jerusalem, not by the Ottoman authorities, not by the British, and not by the Arabs, but by the Zionists.”

Thus we see that Zionism has quite a history of repression and even murder of dissenting Jews. The ultimate goal of this violence is to force all Jews into being Zionists and thus to equate Zionism with Judaism. So it is no great surprise that such murder and persecution would occur as early as 1983 with the murder of Emil Grunzweig, when Jews protested the unjust and murderous policies of Ariel Sharon in Lebanon.

On page 212, Friedman writes that Peace Now organized a rally to protest this massacre, drawing over 400,000 Israelis who demonstrated against Sharon. They were attacked by Sharon’s supporters. He writes,

“Several months later, an anti-Lebanon War rally organized by Peace Now in front of the Prime Minister’s Office in Jerusalem was violently attacked by right-wing thugs wearing knitted yarmulkes and chanting, ‘Begin, Begin, King of Israel.’ Women demonstrators were spit upon and told, ‘You are Arab women! You should have been in Sabra and Shatila.’ Then a grenade was thrown into the crowd, which included many officers from elite combat units. Emil Grunzweig, a young high school math teacher from Kibbutz Revivim in the Negev, was killed in the blast. Later, at the hospital the injured demonstrators were attacked and beaten, as were the doctors, by Jewish extremists screaming, ‘It’s a shame that only one was killed!’ Not since the clashes between Begin’s Irgun and Ben Gurion’s Haganah in the 1940’s had the danger of serious clashes between Jews in Israel seemed so great.

“In the months following Grunzweig’s murder, prominent liberal Israeli academics, artists, and journalists became targets of right-wing violence. Homes and cars were vandalized and firebombed. In one instance, the apartment of a political pollster who reported that a majority of Israelis were ready to trade land for peace was torched. Peace Now founder Dede Zucker was pummeled outside his Jerusalem home by right-wing toughs. Zucker moved to Tel Aviv. The climate of intimidation and fear was encouraged by government officials like Sharon, who publicly labeled members of Peace Now

‘defeatists’ and ‘traitors.’ Kahane did the bellicose ex-general one better by calling on his followers to liquidate liberal Jews whose views he found pernicious.”

It is apparent that the terrorist mentality of the 1940’s is still alive and well, and it has largely taken over Israeli politics today. Those of the Likud Party chanted, “Begin, Begin, King of Israel” as they killed those who objected to the violent side of Zionism.

The terrorists of the 1940’s were given full amnesty after establishing their nation, so instead of being brought to justice, they were able eventually to take power and keep all dissenters in line through terror and fear. The terrorists have become statesmen of the Jewish State. They have little moral ground to condemn modern Arab terrorists for doing what they themselves did in the 1940’s and 1950’s and have continued to do to the present day.

Yitzhak Shamir’s definition of a terrorist was given over the radio in 1991, quoted by Jewish author, Robert Friedman, in the introduction to his book, Zealots For Zion, page xxxii,

“Terrorism is a way of fighting that is acceptable under certain conditions and by certain movements,” he said, adding that while terrorism was appropriate for Jews fighting for their homeland, it is not for Palestinians who ‘are fighting for land that is not theirs. This is the land of the people of Israel’.”

This is called a “double standard.” In a footnote, it is noted that the Irgun and Stern Gang killed at least 40 Jews to settle personal accounts. Apparently, this too was within Shamir’s rights as a “freedom fighter” and does not constitute terrorism or murder. I suspect that the victims’ families might feel differently about this.

Woe to Ariel

Judaism’s sacred texts are called the Talmud, which are rabbinic commentaries on the Bible. Dr. Israel Shahak says on p. 5 of his Jewish Fundamentalism in Israel,

“Jewish fundamentalists believe that the Bible itself is not authoritative unless interpreted correctly by Talmudic literature.”

After the fall of Judea and the cessation of the temple rituals in the first century, the rabbis could not help but understand that God had done this to them because of their sin. However, they never believed that they sinned in crucifying the Messiah. Yet the famous Talmudic passage in *Tractate Ketubot*, page 111, laid the foundation of Jewish thought on the Messiah and the Holy Land. Dr. Shahak writes about this on page 18 of his book,

“. . . God is said to have imposed three oaths on the Jews. Two of these oaths that clearly contradict Zionist tenets are: 1) Jews should not rebel against non-Jews, and 2) as a group should not massively emigrate to Palestine before the coming of the Messiah. (The third oath, not discussed here, enjoins the Jews not to pray too strongly for the coming of the Messiah, so as not to bring him before his appointed time. . . During the past 1,500 years, the great majority of traditional Judaism’s most important rabbis interpreted the three oaths and the continued existence of the Jews in exile as religious obligations intended to expiate the Jewish sins that caused God to exile them.”

Yet there was one dissenting rabbi named Moshe Nachmanides, who died in the year 1270. Speaking of this rabbi, Dr. Shahak says (p. 19) that he . . .

“. . . opined that Jews should not only emigrate to but should also conquer the land of Israel. Other important rabbis of that time and for many centuries thereafter ignored or

strongly disagreed with the view of Nachmanides.”

“In the 1970’s, seven centuries after his death, Nachmanides became the patron saint of the NRP {National Religious Party in the Jewish State} and the Gush Emunim settlers.”

The Gush Emunim (“Block of Faithful”) is the primary settlement movement in the Jewish State that is messianic in its ideology. That is, while they reject Jesus as the Messiah, they are messianic in that they are looking for another messiah that is more to their liking—such as Barabbas, Bar Kokba, or the Eliezar ben Jair, the leader of the Assassins (Sicarii) at Masada.

The Chief Rabbi of Palestine from 1920-1935 was Avraham Yitzhak Hacohen Kook (1865-1935). He was the primary rabbi who developed the most extreme form of Zionism. His son, rabbi Tzvi Yehuda Kook succeeded him at his death as head of the NRP until his own death in 1981 at the age of 91.

In 1977 the NRP formed a “holy alliance” with the newly-formed coalition of extreme Zionist parties founded by Ariel Sharon with the help of Menachem Begin. It is called the Likud Party. This was when the Gush Emunim began to exert a huge influence on Israeli policies, particularly in regard to the settlement movement in the occupied territories.

Basic Doctrine of the Gush Emunim

Rabbi Kook was primarily influenced by the ideas of Rabbi Yitzhak Luria, who was the founder of the most influential school of Cabbala (Jewish mysticism) in the 16th century. Luria’s book, The Gates of Holiness, taught that all non-Jews have satanic souls. According to Rabbi Hayim Vital, who was Luria’s chief interpreter,

“Souls of non-Jews come entirely from the female part of the satanic sphere. For this reason souls of non-Jews are called evil, not good, and are created with [divine] knowledge.” [quoted from Shahak’s Jewish Fundamentalism in Israel, p. 58]

This same teaching was echoed by Rabbi Schneerson, who was the head of the Lubovitcher Hassidic movement and lived in New York until his recent death. On page 59, 60 Dr. Shahak quotes from Schneerson’s book of recorded messages entitled, Gatherings of Conversations:

“. . . the body of a Jewish person is of a totally different quality from the body of [members] of all nations of the world . . . An even greater difference exists in regard to the soul. Two contrary types of soul exist, a non-Jewish soul comes from three satanic spheres, while the Jewish soul stems from holiness.”

Later, on page 61, Dr. Shahak mentions:

“Ariel Sharon was the Rebbe’s favorite Israeli senior politician. Sharon in turn praised the Rebbe publicly and delivered a moving speech about him in the Knesset after the Rebbe’s death.

This sheds much light on the personal ideology of Ariel Sharon in his treatment of non-Jews. It explains why the Arabs hate him above all Israelis.

Ariel Sharon

Mr. Sharon’s own autobiography, Warrior, tells us much about him, although he omits many things and lies about that which is forced to admit. He was just 20 years of age in 1948, so he was too

young to join the terrorist organizations of Begin and Shamir during the 1940's. But he then joined the military and soon rose to higher ranks.

On October 14, 1953, Ariel Sharon, commander of "101 Unit," was just 25 years of age when he dynamited 56 houses of Kibbiya (or Qibya) one night, killing 67 civilians who were trapped inside and not allowed to leave. Sharon tells the background of this raid in his own words, writing on pages 85 and 86 of Warrior,

"At times the successes were mixed with tragedy and sometimes controversy, as happened at the village of Kibbiya in mid-October. The raid on Kibbiya was mounted in response to a particularly horrendous incident at the town of Yehud, where terrorists murdered a young mother named Susan Kaniyas and her two infants, one and three years old, while they were asleep. The police investigation indicated that the killers had infiltrated from the direction of Kibbiya, a Palestinian village near the border

"The paratroop officer and I were informed that General Headquarters had decided to carry out a retaliatory operation against Kibbiya

"This would be the first major Israeli reaction to Arab terrorism. . . ."

On page 88, Sharon continues the story:

"The orders were clear. Kibbiya was to be a lesson. I was to inflict as many casualties as I could on the Arab home guard and on whatever Jordanian army reinforcements showed up. I was also to blow up every major building in the town. A political decision had been made at the highest level."

In Sharon's book he excuses himself, claiming he did not know there were people in the houses. He says on pages 89, 90,

"According to the radio, sixty-nine people had been killed, mostly civilians and many of them women and children. I couldn't believe my ears. As I went back over each step of the operation, I began to understand what must have happened. For years Israeli reprisal raids had never succeeded in doing more than blowing up a few outlying buildings, if that. Expecting the same, some Arab families must have stayed in their houses rather than running away. In those big stone houses where three generations of a family might live together, some could easily have hidden in the cellars and back rooms, keeping quiet when the paratroopers went in to check and yell out a warning. The result was this tragedy that had happened."

Sharon tries hard to make people think this was just a "tragedy," over which he had no control. And yet he says specifically that his orders were to inflict as many casualties as possible. *Where did he expect those casualties to come from, if not from civilians?* It was, after all, a "reprisal raid" for an attack on a civilian Jewish woman and her two children, killed by an Arab "terrorist" who had no right to oppose Zionist immigration and conquest of his own land.

The incident forced David Ben-Gurion, Israel's first Prime Minister, to make a public apology for Sharon's actions. However, Sharon makes it clear that he was only acting under orders—Ben Gurion's orders! Frankly, I believe he tells the truth here. This is supported by Livia Rokach's book, Israel's Sacred Terrorism, page 15, which is a report on the published diaries of Moshe Sharett, who was the Foreign Minister under Ben-Gurion at the time.

"Sharett tried to block the Kibya reprisal operation which had been endorsed by Ben Gurion on the eve of his departure for a vacation preceding his formal retreat. He

pointed out that the minor border incident which was to have served as a pretext for the planned attack on the West Bank village had just been publicly condemned by Jordan and that the Jordanian representatives in the mixed armistice commission had promised to see to it that similar incidents would not be repeated.”

Rokach quotes directly from Moshe Sharett’s diary dated Oct. 14, 1953, page 37 where Sharett writes:

“I told Lavon that this [attack] will be a grave error, and recalled, citing various precedents, that it was never proved that reprisal actions serve their declared purpose; Lavon smiled . . . and kept to his own idea Ben Gurion, he said, didn’t share my view.”

The next day, after the massacre of Kibya, Sharett wrote this:

“According to the first news from the other side, thirty houses have been demolished in one village. This reprisal is unprecedented in its dimensions and in the offensive power used. I walked up and down in my room, helpless and utterly depressed by my feeling of impotence . . . I was simply horrified by the description in Radio Ramallah’s broadcast of the destruction of the Arab village. Tens of houses have been razed to the soil and tens of people killed. I can imagine the storm that will break out tomorrow in the Arab and Western capitals.”

Sharon’s willingness to murder Arabs is why he rose in the ranks of the military. Sharon writes a very revealing paragraph on page 250 of his book, Warrior,

“Years before, not too long after I had taken over the paratroopers, Dayan had once said to me, ‘Do you know why you’re the one who does all the operations? Because you never ask for written orders. Everyone else wants explicit clarifications. But you never need it in writing. You just do it.’ Now it was almost twenty years later and absolutely nothing had changed. Anyone other than Dayan would have carefully formulated an order describing what should be done and defining the parameters of the intended action. But from him there was only a signal, the nod of a head. That meant, as it always had, ‘Do what you want. If you succeed, fine. If it backfires, don’t start looking to me for support’.”

So we see the typical way in which Israeli politics was conducted in the years that the Labor Party was in power. They supported terrorism, but did not want to be held liable for their terrorism. So they hired Sharon as their “hit man” to do the dirty work for them. Sharon’s account of his own innocence is contradicted by Alexander Cockburn’s Feb. 6, 2001 article for *Upstream*, entitled “Ariel Sharon—the People’s Choice?” where we read,

“Sharon’s order was to penetrate Qibya, blow up houses and inflict heavy casualties on its inhabitants. His success in carrying out the order surpassed all expectations. . . Sharon and his men claimed that they believed that all the inhabitants had run away, and that they had no idea that anyone was hiding inside the houses.

“The UN observer who inspected the scene reached a different conclusion. ‘One story was repeated time after time: the bullet splintered door, the body sprawled across the threshold, indicating that the inhabitants had been forced by heavy fire to stay inside until their homes were blown up over them.’

“The U.S. Department of State issued a statement on 18 October 1953, expressing its ‘deepest sympathy for the families of those who lost their lives’ in the Qibya attack as well as the conviction that those responsible ‘should be brought to account and that effective measures should be taken to prevent such incidents in the future’.”

Sharon, of course, was never brought to trial, nor was he held accountable in any way. Such murders continued unabated. Sharon himself has never wanted peace and has actively worked against any peace arrangement, believing that the only solution is to drive all Arabs off the land.

This has been the consistent policy of the Gush Emunim’s settlement movement, backed by Sharon. Ariel Sharon is the perfect man to fulfill Bible prophecy, and even his name identifies him with the “bloody city” of Jerusalem. The prophetic name of Jerusalem is Ariel. We read in Isaiah 29:1-4,

¹ Woe, O Ariel! Ariel the city where David camped! Add year to year, observe your feasts on schedule. ² And I will bring distress to Ariel, and she shall be a city of lamenting and mourning; and she shall be like an Ariel to me. ³ And I will camp against you encircling you, and I will set siegeworks against you, and I will raise up battle towers against you. ⁴ Then you shall be brought low. . . ⁵ But the multitude of your enemies shall become like fine dust, and the multitude of the ruthless ones like the chaff which blows away; and it shall happen instantly, suddenly. ⁶ From the Lord of hosts you will be punished with thunder and earthquake and loud noise, with whirlwind and tempest and the flame of a consuming fire.

It has been assumed that God was speaking about destroying the non-Jewish enemies who had come against Jerusalem. But that is simply not true. God did not say that He would save the Jews from annihilation at Jerusalem. He was speaking to Jerusalem itself, which would be delivered from God’s enemies. Luke 19:27 says,

²⁷ But these enemies of mine, who did not want me to reign over them, bring them here and slay them in my presence.

He was speaking of the Zionists themselves. They are the “enemies” of Jesus Christ in the parable, the “citizens” who hated Him and refused to have Him reign over them. These are also the enemies of Jerusalem itself. These are the people who have invaded and conquered Jerusalem. (See also Is. 63:10.) The city will be cleansed by a nuclear strike that is clearly described in Isaiah 29:5, 6 above.

In a nuclear strike, people are vaporized—that is, they “become like fine dust.” It happens “instantly” and “suddenly,” as the prophet says. It is accompanied by a “loud noise,” and the earth shakes as if struck by an “earthquake.” The blast creates a huge “tempest and the flame of a consuming fire.” Anyone who has seen pictures of a nuclear test know that Isaiah 29:5 and 6 is a perfect description of a nuclear blast.

In this way Jesus’ words will be fulfilled in Luke 19, where He says of the Zionists, “*Bring them here and slay them in my presence.*” It is my opinion that Ariel Sharon is the one called to lead the Jewish State to this destruction. It is also possible that the present escalation in the conflict is the beginning of a series of events that will end with this nuclear strike. The Arab nations are very disturbed over his invasion of the West Bank, the destruction and carnage that He has ordered and for which he is personally liable. Even now, before the damage has been assessed fully, the U.N. monitors, the Red Cross representatives, and the media are shocked at what they are finding.

All of this is vintage Sharon and fits perfectly with what he said in the interview with Amos Oz in 1982. In a news article dated April 19, 2002,

“The United Nations envoy to the Middle East, Terje Roed-Larsen, visited the most heavenly damaged area and described the scene as ‘horrific beyond belief.’ He told

Israeli Army Radio: 'Jenin will forever be a blot on the history of the state of Israel'. . . Yesterday the Foreign Secretary Jack Straw added his voice to the calls for an outside investigation into Israel's 'excessive actions' in Jenin, which is forces invaded on 3 April in a 'counter-terrorism' operation. Mr. Straw said, 'Such is the scale of the evidence that there is a strong case for Israel to answer'."

The next day Mr. Roed-Larsen reportedly said:

"Combating terrorism does not give a blank check to kill civilians,' he said, angering Israeli officials who said the envoy had seemed to ignore the deaths of Israelis there."

If these officials were speaking of the deaths of 23 Israeli soldiers in the siege of Jenin, the charge is rather ludicrous. The "gunmen" in Jenin were defending their city from the Israeli invasion. Have they no right to defend themselves from Israeli soldiers under orders from Ariel Sharon to inflict as many casualties as possible and destroy as much as they can?

Most incredible is how President Bush could call Sharon "a man of peace," as reported on April 19. Ariel Sharon does not even believe that about himself! He believes that he is just doing the necessary "dirty work" on behalf of his country.

Also on April 19, Mr. Roed-Larsen was reported in the Washington Post to say, "*Israel has lost all moral ground in this conflict.*" Protests "*turned violent when Israeli security forces fired tear gas and beat the participants. Among those beaten were three members of the Israeli parliament.*"

West Bank Settlements

Lasting peace is impossible in the Middle East as long as both the Arab people and the Jewish State exist. It is even doubtful if even the establishment of a Palestinian State would resolve this problem, because both sides would insist upon having Jerusalem as its capital. Neither side will budge on the issue of Jerusalem. Thus, the war will continue until one side exterminates the other, or until all of them are dead.

As the situation exists today, it is impossible that the Jews would concede defeat and leave the area peacefully. It is just as inconceivable that the Palestinians would accept continued tyrannical rule at the hands of the Israeli government.

Israeli long-term policy has been to make life as miserable for the Arab population as possible in order to encourage them to sell their property to Jews and to emigrate to another country. If they should refuse to leave, the government would simply confiscate the land for "security reasons," that catch-all phrase that justifies all land theft. Some did leave, of course, but most of them recognized the policy and dug in their heels, refusing to leave. The pressure on them increased, and the result is continued oppression and tyranny.

Jewish author, Robert Friedman, writes in his book, *Zealots For Zion*, page 73, about the policy of the Likud Party of Begin, Shamir, and Ariel Sharon:

"Part of Likud's plan was to deny Palestinians residential building permits in an attempt to stem their expansion on land they had resided on from time immemorial and squeeze them into crowded cities."

Israeli government policies have spawned the feeling of hopelessness. An increasing number of Arabs would rather die as martyrs and freedom fighters than live under such conditions. Many of their religious leaders as well have encouraged such martyrdom with their militant brand of Islamic belief. And so there is an increasing supply of suicide bombers, for they have been denied all other

methods of obtaining freedom.

They target civilians, because civilians are being used on both sides as soldiers in this war. The Israeli government uses the West Bank settlers as front-line soldiers armed to the teeth. Arab suicide bombers are also civilians, because the Palestinians have no standing army. The success of their missions, of course, solves nothing, but only brings more retaliation and further oppression, as the Israelis forcibly suppress them back into submission. And the cycle of violence spirals higher and higher.

Rabbi Levinger

Rabbi Moshe Levinger is one of the founders of the Settlement Movement and considered by many Israeli settlers to be a hero. His attitude and actions speak for themselves. On pages 6-8 of [Zealots For Zion](#), Jewish author Robert Friedman tells the story of Abdul Rahman Samua, who became the object of Levinger's wrath after the Rabbi's daughter was teased by Arab girls.

“One afternoon in the spring of 1988, he [Samua] closed the metal shutters on his shop and walked the few blocks home for lunch and a nap. Suddenly, Samua was jolted awake by screams. He came out of his bedroom to find Rabbi Levinger standing in the middle of his living room beating his wife and children while three armed settlers watched. ‘Levinger had his hands around the neck of my [seven-year-old] daughter and tried to kill her,’ Samua told me matter-of-factly in Hebron. When his nine-year-old son intervened, the rabbi punched the child in the eye, then twisted and broke his arm. Samua's wife, a big woman, scooped up her daughter, holding her tightly. ‘Levinger beat my wife on her back with his fists. It all happened in a matter of seconds’

“By the time a jeepload of Israeli soldiers pulled up in front of Samua's home, Levinger was shouting for someone to fetch his pistol. Levinger's daughter and a pack of her friends, teenage girls in white blouses and black skirts, stood in the front doorway, egging the rabbi on. The Samuas' television had been kicked in, and the dining-room furniture had been smashed into kindling. Levinger refused to budge, calling one Israeli soldier who tried to shove him outside ‘a PLO agent’. ‘*This is my house!*’ screamed Levinger. ‘*This is my house!*’

“Yisrael Medad, New York-born settlement leader from Shiloh on the West Bank and a friend of Levinger's, explains, ‘The fact that an Arab insulted a Jewish child after we've ruled Judea and Samaria for twenty-three years was for Rabbi Levinger simply intolerable. It was an assault on Jewish sovereignty and honor’.

“Palestinians also have a keen sense of honor. But Samua told me that he was afraid to press charges. It was only upon the urging of the Israeli military officers who investigated the incident that he agreed to bring Levinger to trial. ‘About eight months later, the Israelis sent a police car to my house and drove me to a Jerusalem court,’ recalled Samua. After a brief trial, Judge Yoel Tsur acquitted Levinger on assault charges and on charges that he insulted an Israeli soldier. (The judge dismissed testimony from the Samua family, saying they were ‘interested parties.’) In dismissing the testimony of the soldier who was the first to enter Samua's home—and who corroborated much of the Arab family's account—the judge ruled that once he left his rooftop post, he was no longer officially on duty. Tsur also acquitted Levinger of trespassing, ruling that when he barged into Samua's home, it was as a neighbor visiting a friend. The state prosecutor appealed to a three-judge appellate court, which, in an extremely rare action, overturned Judge Tsur's ruling. It criticized him for blatantly

disregarding evidence and convicted the rabbi of assault.

“Levinger was sentenced to four months in jail on January 14, 1991, the day the world counted down the hours to the Persian Gulf War. When the sentence was read, Levinger bounded over the defense table, shrieking that the court was a tool of Yasir Arafat. His attorney, David Rotem, dragged him outside. The rabbi was sentenced to an additional ten days for the outburst. Sometime later, Samua said, he was closing his shop when three burly settlers wearing knitted yarmulkes and brandishing clubs beat him unconscious.

“There was the time when the rabbi let loose Doberman pinschers on Arab demonstrators. And there was that wild afternoon when he gunned down an Arab shoe-store owner in a fit of hysteria.”

Friedman was referring to the time Rabbi Levinger drove to Hebron, parked his car, and walked toward Arab demonstrators, firing his pistol indiscriminately. Friedman writes on page 38 of his book of an incident that occurred in 1988,

“. . . Ibrahim Bali, an Arab textile salesman, was buying new shoes for his daughter when he heard the shooting. He was standing outside a shop when a bullet tore through his shoulder. A bullet also ripped into the chest of Khayel Salah, who was about to close the metal shutters of his shoe store. The Israeli Army company commander who witnessed the shooting said that after the rabbi fired his weapon, he walked down the road screaming ‘You’re dogs’ at Arab vendors, kicking over vegetable crates and flower containers. The officer said he grabbed Levinger’s trembling hand and told him not to move. Levinger snarled back, ‘Leftist! Arab lover!’”

Levinger was finally tried for negligence and sentenced to five months in prison. He was released after serving just ten weeks. Victor Ostrovsky, former Israeli spy for the Mossad, in his book, By Way of Deception, page 335, quotes an Israeli Supreme Court judge who commented upon Levinger’s court case:

“Justice Heim Cohen, a retired judge of Israel’s supreme court, said, ‘The way the situation is going now, I would be afraid to say where we are going. I never heard of anybody who was tried for negligence after shooting somebody in cold blood. I’m probably getting old’.”

Friedman records on page 39 of Zealots For Zion the words of Salah’s brother, Khaled:

“Khaled says the short prison term Levinger received for killing his brother just compounds his family’s grief. ‘When I see Levinger in the street today with a pistol and a rifle, what shall I do? There is a saying in Arabic, ‘If your enemy is the judge, to whom are you going to complain?’”

Friedman also notes on page 4,

“Ariel Sharon calls Levinger and his wife ‘true heroes of our generation’.”

This is why the Palestinian people have revolted to the point of giving their lives as suicide bombers. Lack of basic justice has spawned Arab terrorism. There will be no peace, because the Israelis have never ruled Arabs with equal justice for all. Israelis are not overcomers. They are not chosen to rule the world. Zionism is not a godly movement. And God will have no tyrants ruling in

His Kingdom.

West Bank Settlements

The greatest obstacle to peace remains the issue of the West Bank Jewish settlements. Jews presently own 42% of the West Bank territory. Yet they want it all and are working feverishly to obtain it all, legally or illegally. Friedman writes on page 118,

“Rabbi Aviner has put it this way: ‘We must settle the whole Land of Israel, and over all of it establish our rule. In the words of [Nachmanides]: “Do not abandon the land to any other nation.” If that is possible by peaceful means, wonderful, and if not, we are commanded to make war to accomplish it’.”

Gush Emunim ideology teaches that the Messiah will not come if any part of *Eretz Israel* is relinquished. They believe that all Arabs are simply “resident aliens” on Jewish land and therefore have no right to be there at all, much less have their own Palestinian state. From their point of view, the right of a Jewish State to exist means that a Palestinian State has no right to exist.

It is important to them that Jews immigrate and settle the West Bank, because only when all Arabs have been expelled from the West Bank and Gaza Strip can they foment another war with neighboring countries for the purpose of taking more land. Ultimately, their intent is to take all of Jordan, Syria, Cyprus, the Sinai, and even parts of Iraq, Kuwait, and Saudi Arabia. They firmly believe that all of this land belongs to Jews only. The occupation of the West Bank is only the beginning of a long-term strategy to displace millions of Arabs in the region.

This is called “Greater Israel.” One of the Gush Emunim’s greatest supporters from the start was Sharon.

In the introduction of Jewish author Robert Friedman’s Zealots For Zion, written in 1992, he writes:

This is a book about the settlers and their controversial enterprise. Whatever its future, the settlement movement has changed the geography and character of Israel. Far more than a massive construction project, it is a marriage of Jabotinsky’s militant secular nationalism and Gush Emunim’s messianism. Revisionism and militant religious nationalism, both marginal Zionist ideologies for the first two decades of Israel’s history, had combined to set the national agenda of the Jewish state. . . . And if Labor falters and Likud returns to power, there may be no turning back. The heirs of Jabotinsky and of the Zealots who fought the Romans will have triumphed over the liberal Zionist idea, the Palestinian Arabs, and the nascent peace process. Four million Jews will then permanently rule two million hostile Palestinian Arabs, and Belfast will seem like Disneyland.”

Friedman’s greatest fears have now been realized. The Likud Party returned to power under Netanyahu, Barak, and now finally, Ariel Sharon.

One of the earlier West Bank settlements was at Hebron and known by the name Kiryat Arba. It was established in 1970 on land confiscated from Hebron’s mayor, Sheikh Humammad Ali Ja’abri. A few years later, in 1973 Rabbis Kook and Levinger formed the Gush Emunim, “Block of the Faithful.” Their ideology was said that establishing the borders of “Greater Israel,” laying claim to the entire land, and filling it with Jewish settlers was the key to Israel’s redemption. Rabbi Kook taught vehemently that the Torah forbade them to give up even one inch of land. They call this “redeeming the land.” By this they mean that the land is redeemed when ownership is transferred from non-Jews to Jews. Friedman writes on page 75,

“Indeed, a 1983 report by the Israeli state comptroller said that much of the thirty-one thousand acres of West Bank land bought by Jews had been fraudulently obtained. On August 23, 1985, a *Ha’aretz* editorial strongly criticized unscrupulous Israeli land brokers for conducting business on the West Bank as if it were ‘the Wild West.’ ‘Swindlers must be dealt with in a most forceful manner’ . . .

“*The New York Times* reported on August 20, 1985 that Shamir had ordered the police not to look too deeply into West Bank land-fraud cases, saying, according to the Times reporter, that ‘a certain amount of sleight of hand’ was needed to obtain land from the Arabs. ‘Redeeming land in the Land of Israel often necessitated crafty and tricky devices,’ Shamir said in a speech at about the same time.”

Consider the case of Moshe Zar, friend of Ariel Sharon, and Iranian Jew who is one of the biggest land dealers on the West Bank. Friedman writes of him on page 25,

“Residents of the nearby Arab village of Jinsafut say they have lodged hundreds of complaints against him in a Nablus court for fraudulent land deals.

“‘When Zar moved here, he was very sweet, very nice, and offered us a lot of money for our land,’ a Jinsafut resident told me. ‘When we said no, he kept persisting. Finally he just showed up in our field with armed men, a bulldozer, and a piece of paper that said the land was his’.”

Zar was also a member of a Jewish terrorist organization called the Makhteret, (“underground”). This group was founded primarily to plot the destruction of the Dome of the Rock Mosque. Its chief ideologue was Yehuda Etzion, whose father, Avraham Mintz, fought in the Irgun under Begin in the 1940’s.

On June 2, 1980 he and his cohorts rigged a bomb to a car owned by Nablus mayor Bassam Shaka. The mayor lost his legs in the explosion. Others in the organization rigged a bomb to the Cadillac of Ramallah mayor Karim Khalif, who lost a foot in the explosion. They also rigged a booby trap at Hebron’s soccer field and in a mosque, injuring Arab schoolchildren and adults.

Prime Minister Begin refused to do anything about it, because he had profusely supported the Gush Emunim. But finally, on April 26, 1984 the Jewish terrorists were caught red-handed. Three of them, including Rabbi Levinger’s son-in-law, attached bombs to five buses in East Jerusalem. One of the buses had been chartered by a German tour group. Agents of the Shin Bet (Israeli FBI) dismantled the bombs and arrested three dozen of the Makhteret. Friedman writes of this on page 31,

“In a signed confession, Menachem Livni told Shin Bet that several prominent rabbis, including Levinger, were actively involved in the underground and had ‘blessed’ the attacks on the mayors.”

“After recovering from the shock of the arrests, Gush Emunim sympathizers set up a legal-defense fund—primarily with American Jewish donations collected by Rabbi Weiss, who raised more than \$100,000. (About \$75,000 of that sum was donated by Charlie Fox, and elderly Jew from Florida who had been mobster Meyer Lansky’s bagman.)

Although in 1985 the perpetrators were found guilty, and their sentences ranged from four months to life in prison, the court in Jerusalem also stated for the record that these men should be “praised

for their pioneering ethos and war records. The following day Shamir began to press for clemency” (Friedman, p. 32). By 1992 all of these Jewish terrorists were free.

The Jewish Defense League

The JDL was founded in 1968 by Rabbi Meir Kahane and Morton Dolinsky. Friedman tells the story on pages 48, 49,

“Kahane and Dolinsky met again in 1967 in Laurelton, Queens. Blacks were beginning to move into the quiet, tree-lined, predominantly Jewish, working-class neighborhood. ‘Larelton home-owners didn’t want blacks in!’ Dolinsky said emphatically. ‘We knew what would happen to property values.’ The prophetic tradition of Judaism teaches Jews to fight social injustice; but as far as Kahane and Dolinsky were concerned, it was Jews who were being mistreated by blacks who were moving into their neighborhoods, taking over their schools, and turning their streets into battle zones of drugs and crime. It was Jewish civil rights, they asserted, that needed to be defended. They created the Jewish Defense League in 1968 to combat these problems. . . . Within a year of its founding, the JDL had evolved into a militant right-wing Zionist organization that used terror violence against its perceived enemies, most notably Arab-Americans and Russian diplomats. Dozens of its members, mostly lower-middle-class Jews from New York’s ethnic neighborhoods, fled to Israel, often one step ahead of federal indictments.”

Friedman writes further about the founding of the JDL on pages 182, 182,

“By 1970 the JDL’s bombings and shooting attacks against the Soviet embassies in America and Europe were so numerous that, according to confidential State Department documents, President Richard Nixon became concerned that Kahane would wreck the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks...Little did they know that the JDL’s guerrilla war against the Soviet Union was orchestrated by right-wing Mossad officers led by Israel’s future prime minister, Yitzhak Shamir. . . .

“During the next few months, Cohen, Shamir, and a group of Mossad officers and Jewish businessmen helped lay the groundwork for the JDL’s violent campaign to publicize the plight of Soviet Jewry.”

Alfred Lilienthal, writes of Kahane on page 394 of his book, The Zionist Connection II, saying,

“The five-year suspended sentence given him in 1971 after his admitted manufacture of bombs, harassment of Soviet diplomats, and acts of violence against American and Arab citizens was scarcely believable. Only in a Brooklyn District Court presided over by Judge Jack Weinstein and in an America under Zionist domination could this have happened.”

It would appear that Jewish terrorists are treated more sympathetically at least in the New York court system than their Arab counterparts would be treated. And why is it that it is illegal to contribute to an Arab organization that might have terrorist ties, but no one is ever prosecuted for contributing to Jewish terrorist organizations?

Replacement Theology

It is commonly taught among prophecy teachers that in 1948 the nation called “Israel” was the fulfillment of the biblical promises to Abraham and all the prophets. We have attempted to show

that this is not so. The nation called “Israel” is the fulfillment of a different set of prophecies in the Bible.

First, it is the fulfillment of Matt. 24:32, where Jesus prophesied that the cursed fig tree would again bring forth leaves at the end of the age. This was the same fig tree that Jesus cursed in Matt. 19, saying, “*Let no fruit grow on thee henceforward for ever.*” This tree will not bear the fruits of the Kingdom, because that calling is reserved for the other fig tree, the one bringing forth the good figs in Jer. 24.

There are two fig trees of Judah. The tree bringing forth the evil figs, Jeremiah says, are those who refuse to submit to the judgment of God according to the law of tribulation. The tree bringing forth the good figs are those who submit to God’s judgment and (in the prophet’s day) go to Babylon.

This basic problem in Judah continued and was very evident in Jesus’ day, where the majority of the people preferred a military messiah to throw off the yoke of Rome that God had imposed upon them. Jesus came as a Prince of Peace, however, and those who accepted Him were of the good fig tree that brought forth good fruit.

God then brought judgment upon the evil fig tree of Judah in 70-73 A.D. The Christians, however, escaped that judgment. God used the Jewish religious leaders of the evil fig tree to drive out most of the Christians by persecution described in the book of Acts. In this way, the good figs from the good tree were sent abroad into a type of captivity, much like Daniel and others had gone into captivity in Jeremiah’s day.

These Christians as a body formed what is called “the Church.” It was actually the good fig tree of Judah, whose Root was Christ (Rev. 22:16). To this tree were engrafted peoples of all nations, each producing its own good fruit, and each sustained by the life of Christ. Soon these other nations outnumbered the Judahites. But it was still a Judah fig tree.

Hence, the Church never *replaced* Judah; it always WAS Judah. The only possible replacement that might have taken place was if the good fig tree replaced the evil fig tree in carrying the promise of the Kingdom.

The Church in later centuries began to think of itself as having *replaced* the fig tree, for it forgot that the very trunk of this tree was Judah. This was how they developed “Replacement Theology.” But they were wrong. They replaced nothing.

God considers the Church to be true Judah. This is what Paul tells us in Rom. 2:28, 29, where the apostle tells us who IS a Jew (Judean) and who is NOT a Jew (Judean). These are God’s definitions, even if the world thinks otherwise.

The Law of Sacrifice

In Lev. 17:1-4 the law tells us that if anyone makes a sacrifice and does not bring it to the place where God has chosen, he would be “*cut off from among his people.*” In other words, he would lose his citizenship status in his tribe and nation. He would be exiled.

It was necessary that Jesus be the Sacrifice for sin and that the priests perform this sacrifice. This was prophesied in the law. The Romans did not crucify Jesus, for the law must be fulfilled, and God never authorized the Romans to kill the sacrifices.

The Levitical priests had to do this in order for it to be an acceptable offering that did not violate the law. For this work, we can thank them. This is not meant as a word of blame or condemnation. However, the law tells us that anyone who does not apply the sacrifice of Christ in the proper manner is cut off from Judah.

Our bodies are the true temples of God (1 Cor. 3:16). Those who brought Jesus’ blood and sprinkled

it upon the altar of their hearts (Heb. 10:22) were NOT cut off from Judah.

Those who refused to do this, having no faith in His blood, were cut off from Judah (in the eyes of God). The issue, then, is not whether or not the Jews killed Christ, but rather what they did with His blood.

It is the same for all men, for there is no difference. We must all be saved in the same manner by the same Messiah. If anyone says that there is more than one way to be saved, he has departed from the faith. If anyone says that a Jew, by virtue of his race or religion of Judaism, is already under grace and is saved by virtue of the old covenant, he has departed from the faith.

Let me be as plain as possible, so there is no misunderstanding as to where I stand on this issue. Judaism does not worship the God of the Old Testament. The God of the Old Testament was Jesus Christ in His pre-incarnate state. To reject Jesus is to reject Yahweh, for Exodus 15:2 says,

² Yahweh is my strength and my song; He also has become my Yashua [Joshua, or Jesus].

Judaism can only produce bad figs, for it is the evil fig tree in Jer. 24, and it is the fig tree that Jesus cursed in Matt. 21:19. The way is open for all men, including Jews, to be engrafted onto the good fig tree. But they must accept Jesus as the Messiah first. When they accept Jesus, they are removed from the unproductive tree and engrafted onto the fruit-bearing tree of God's Kingdom.

The evil fig tree will NEVER bring forth the fruits of the Kingdom that God requires. Only the true Judah fig tree will bear fruit from whatever type of branch is connected to it, whether a "natural" fig or an engrafted branch from a different type of fruit.

Some people think this to be inflammatory and accuse me of driving a wedge between Christians and Jews. Am I to apologize that Jesus Christ and the cross is a stumbling block to the Jews? I did not make it so. I am not the one who formed two fig trees, one good and one bad. It was God's decision to separate men into two categories: believers and unbelievers. Whether we like it or not, the wedge is already there, and I have no power to remove it, even if I so desired. My only mandate is to agree with God and to bear witness to His Word.

To remove this wedge would be to re-unite believers with unbelievers, to make both trees one again. There are many who now do this, saying that a Jew is saved by virtue of his race or religion, apart from Christ.

Is this shocking? Surely only a tiny minority of Christians would say such a thing! No, as of August 12, 2002 this is the theological position of the United States bishops of the Roman Catholic Church.

Jews Saved Apart from Christ?

You may read their entire statement online at: <http://www.usccb.org/>, which is the website of the "United States Conference of Catholic Bishops." Click on "What's New" and scroll down to the seventh article entitled: *Reflections on Covenant and Mission.*"

This article was issued by the National Council of Synagogues and Delegates of the Bishops' Committee on Ecumenical and Interreligious Affairs.

The article gives a history since the Second Vatican Council's declaration in 1965 called *Nostra Aetate*. It says,

"The post-*Nostra Aetate* Catholic recognition of the permanence of the Jewish people's covenant relationship to God has led to a new positive regard for the post-biblical or rabbinic Jewish tradition that is unprecedented in Christian history."

In other words, this new teaching is unprecedented. Even the disciples did not teach this.

“Knowledge of the history of Jewish life in Christendom also causes such biblical texts as Acts 5:33-39 to be read with new eyes. In that passage the Pharisee Gamaliel declares that only undertakings of divine origin can endure. If this New Testament principle is considered by Christians today to be valid for Christianity, then it must logically also hold for post-biblical Judaism. Rabbinic Judaism, which developed after the destruction of the Temple, must also be ‘of God’.”

Here they have challenged God to either destroy Judaism (and the Israeli state) or leave it alone and let it be validated as being “of God.” This is huge. Watch what God does about this. The article continues,

From the point of view of the Catholic Church, Judaism is a religion that springs from divine revelation. As Cardinal Kasper noted, ‘God’s grace, which is the grace of Jesus Christ according to our faith, is available to all. Therefore, the Church believes that Judaism, i.e., the faithful response of the Jewish people to God’s irrevocable covenant, is salvific for them, because God is faithful to His promises.’”

This is saying that if a Jew is merely faithful to Judaism, then he is saved. They reason that God made an “irrevocable covenant” with the Jews, so that regardless of whether or not they accept Christ, they will be saved by that covenant.

Are they referring to the old covenant under Moses? If so, then they are saying that the law has the ability to save men. But Paul makes it clear that all have sinned (Rom. 3:23). Can any man receive justification apart from Christ? Will Jews be justified by their works, while the rest of “us gentiles” have to be saved by faith in Christ? If this is how a Jew is saved, then no Jew has ever been saved in all of history. The “doers of the law” are certainly justified (Rom. 2:13), but because all have sinned, the law must condemn all men without exception (Rom. 3:19).

To say that Jews are saved by the works of the law is to condemn all Jews, not to save them. The Catholic teaching here may mollify the Jews, but they are merely confirming them in their unbelief and to certain judgment.

I, on the other hand, do my best to warn them of the judgment to come, both at the Great White Throne and also the more immediate judgment that will surely come upon the Israeli state. They may not like to hear this, but who is their *real* friend?

Paul says in Galatians 1:13 how he acted as a member of Judaism in good standing:

² For you have heard of my former manner of life in Judaism, how I used to persecute the church of God beyond measure, and tried to destroy it.

In Gal. 4:25, Paul says that the children of the old Jerusalem are in bondage. But apparently the Catholic Church has decided to leave the Jews in their bondage. Paul also said in 1 Thess. 2:14, 15,

¹⁴ . . . for you also endured the same sufferings at the hands of your own countrymen, even as they did from the Jews, ¹⁵ who both killed the Lord Jesus and the prophets, and drove us out. They are not pleasing to God, but hostile to all men.

The article continues,

“This statement about God’s saving covenant is quite specific to Judaism. Though the Catholic Church respects all religious traditions and through dialogue with them can discern the workings of the Holy Spirit, and though we believe God’s infinite grace is surely available to believers of other faiths, it is only about Israel’s covenant that the Church can speak with the certainty of the biblical witness. This is because Israel’s scriptures form part of our own biblical canon and they have a ‘perpetual value . . . that

has not been canceled by the later interpretation of the New Testament’.

“According to Roman Catholic teaching, both the Church and the Jewish people abide in covenant with God.”

I can understand if the Church does not know the difference between the Jews and Israel, because God was responsible for causing Israel to be “lost sheep.” It was necessary in His plan for Israel to be lost, even as Joseph was lost and presumed dead until his revealing in the end. However, to say that God’s “saving covenant” was given to the Jews in the ancient past, and that this saves them even if they continue to reject Jesus Christ, is rank heresy.

It is not that this is really a new doctrine. In fact, the same article explains that it has been pushed by Prof. Tommaso Federici for the past 25 years. The article says,

“He argued on historical and theological grounds that there should be in the Church no organizations of any kind dedicated to the conversion of Jews. This has over the ensuing years been the de facto practice of the Catholic Church.”

Really? So for the past 25 years the Catholic Church has considered Jews to be already saved, so long as they are faithful to Judaism, which hates Jesus and rejects Him as Messiah? Well, it is about time that they make it public. Let us keep reading:

“. . . the Church must bear witness in the world to the Good News of Christ, so as to prepare the world for the fullness of the kingdom of God. However, this evangelizing task no longer includes the wish to absorb the Jewish faith into Christianity and so end the distinctive witness of Jews to God in human history.”

Let me see if I understand this correctly. The Church thinks that if a Jew accepts Christ, he loses his status as a Jew, and if all Jews accepted Christ, then this would “end the distinctive witness of Jews to God in human history”?

Perhaps we ought to admonish Jesus’ disciples for following Jesus. Perhaps we ought to chastise the 3,000 who were converted on the day of Pentecost. Perhaps the Great Commission did not include Jews at all. Perhaps Paul erred greatly in preaching in the synagogues. Perhaps Peter himself was wrong in being a minister to the circumcision. We continue reading:

“Thus, while the Catholic Church regards the saving act of Christ as central to the process of human salvation for all, it also acknowledges that Jews already dwell in a saving covenant with God. The Catholic Church must always evangelize and will always witness to its faith in the presence of God’s kingdom in Jesus Christ to Jews and to all other people. . . .

“However, it now recognizes that Jews are also called by God to prepare the world for God’s kingdom. Their witness to the kingdom, which did not originate with the Church’s experience of Christ crucified and raised, must not be curtailed by seeking the conversion of the Jewish people to Christianity.”

We thank the Catholic Church for clarifying their heresy in public. My opinion, of course, has no weight. So I will simply quote Peter, whom the Catholics name as their first pope, who said in Acts 4:10-12,

¹⁰ Let it be known to all of you and to all the people of Israel, that by the name of Jesus Christ, the Nazarene, whom you crucified, whom God raised from the dead—by this name

this man stands here before you in good health. ¹¹ He is the Stone which was rejected by you, the builders, but which became the very corner stone. ¹² And there is salvation in no one else; for there is no other name under heaven that has been given among men, by which we must be saved.

This was spoken to the high priest of Judaism (4:6). It is evident that the Church today is NOT the same Church as it was in the book of Acts. What happened to the Church is the same as what happened to the Old Testament Church. In both cases their traditions made void the law of God.

The Church tells us that God has continued His covenant with the evil figs and that the divine law did not really cut them off from among their people for refusing to apply the blood of Jesus Christ to their heart altars.

The Church taught Replacement Theology for a thousand years, where the Church supposedly replaced the Judah tree. But now the Church teaches Replacement Theology in a new form—that the evil figs of Judah have replaced the good figs.

If the promises to the Fathers in Israel means that Jews are saved apart from obedience and apart from accepting Jesus as the Messiah, then that covenant is far better than the New Covenant under which the Church operates. Under the New Covenant, men are required to follow Jesus to be saved, and therefore, they say, the vast majority of humanity are doomed to hell. But how fortunate is the Jew, who is under a better covenant than we, who can reject and even hate Jesus Christ and still be saved by following the traditions of Judaism!

If that were true, it would have been far better for Jesus to have never come. Judaism should have remained the one true religion, and men should simply have converted to Judaism.

One might ask, “What if a person converts from Catholicism to Judaism? Does his conversion grant him a special privilege of salvation that Catholics do not enjoy?”

God’s Promise to Esau Fulfilled in 1948

We have shown in past bulletins the history of Esau, whose descendants were called Edom, or Idumea, and sometimes Mount Seir. Edom was conquered and absorbed into Judaism in 126 B.C., as any encyclopedia affirms.

From that point on, Judah took upon itself the responsibility to fulfill both sets of prophecies—one for Judah, and one for Esau. One cannot read Obadiah without seeing that the Kingdom of God will be taken from Esau and his violent men and given to the children of Joseph.

This is what is about to take place.

Judah was the cursed fig tree. It could not return to the old land while under the iron yoke that God imposed upon them. The iron yoke could not be removed until and unless the people repented of their hostility against the God of the Old Testament, Jesus Christ (Lev. 26:40-42). This they have not done. Hence, they still remain under the iron yoke, regardless of their conquest of Palestine.

However, God (through Isaac) had made a promise to Esau that he would one day receive the dominion mandate, because Jacob had stolen it from him (Gen. 27:40). This is why God allowed the Zionists to win the struggle in 1948.

In 1948 God fulfilled this obligation to Esau through their descendants who were absorbed into Judaism. The Jews were unable to take Palestine under the banner of Judah, but they were able to do so under the banner of Esau. That is why the Zionists took it by violence and theft. That is the character of Esau.

It is my belief that Esau’s descendants were given the land and even the birthright name of Israel for

one complete Jubilee cycle of 50 years from 1948-1998. At the point, they became responsible to declare the Jubilee, for this is the responsibility of those who would take the name of Israel. They failed to do this.

I believe that the destruction of the Israeli state is imminent. Zionism is about to eat of the violent fruit that it has sown.