

The Invisible House of Rothschild



**By
Zahir Ebrahim.**


The Invisible House of Rothschild


By

Zahir Ebrahim

Copyright © 2010, 2012 .
All rights reserved.

**For non-profit Gratis Distribution Only under Fair-Use
Doctrine**





Why is
Balfour
ion
sed to a
ild?

the
Declarat
address
Rothsch

Foreign Office,
November 2nd, 1917.

Dear Lord Rothschild,

I have much pleasure in conveying to you, on behalf of His Majesty's Government, the following declaration of sympathy with Jewish Zionist aspirations which has been submitted to, and approved by, the Cabinet.

"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 the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine, or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country"

I should be grateful if you would bring this declaration to the knowledge of the Zionist Federation.

Y. in
Arthur Balfour



About Zahir Ebrahim

Zahir Ebrahim, an ordinary researcher and writer on contemporary matters, grew up in Pakistan, studied EECS at UET, MIT, and Stanford, engineered for a while in high-tech Silicon Valley (<http://tinyurl.com/zahir-patents>), and retired early to pursue other responsible interests. His maiden 2003 book of protest, written in the aftermath of 9/11, was rejected by countless publishers and can be read on the web at <http://PrisonersoftheCave.org>. His prolific writings may be read at <http://Humanbeingsfirst.org>.

Part-1 The Endless BS Narratives

My experiments in confusion – Part-1: How many Jews does it take to confuse me? Response to 'How many Rabbis does it take to create a Racist State?'

The answer: Only one. Let me explain:

'In this particular case, it took 50 of them...' -- How many Rabbis does it take to create a Racist State?

'JERUSALEM (AFP) -- Fifty Israeli rabbis have signed an open letter warning Jews not to rent or sell property to non-Jews, saying those who do should be "ostracized," a copy of the letter showed on Tuesday.' -- December 07, 2010 'Don't rent to non-Jews,' Israeli rabbis warn 'Keep in mind that it is the Israeli himself that is the foreigner.... a fact that is way too often overlooked.' -- How many Rabbis does it take to create a Racist State?

But not according to the article by Ari Bussel, 'Israelis, Haters of Israel', appearing on December 9, 2010 at the Zionists' Canada Free Press:

'The Muslims have successfully engaged in deceiving the Western World. Deceit is permitted by their religion, even encouraged if it helps them attain their goals (of spreading Islam and reaching global dominance). It seems there was no one who excelled in it better, in recent history, than Arafat himself. He created the notion of a "Palestinian People," of some "Nationhood" and craving for Jerusalem as its "eternal capital." In short, he stole the Jewish-Zionist two thousand year history and rewrote it into his own narrative.

So successful was Arafat, that hardly even three decades later, the world itself stands saluting the idea of a Palestinian Statehood (in the boundaries of what was once known as Israel), with a Right of Return of millions of Palestinians that were kept in refugee camps throughout the Arab world, and with Jerusalem as their eternal capital.'

So, it appears that we have Jews piously arguing among themselves who "is the foreigner" and who has more "successfully engaged in deceiving the Western World".

Just as the Jews have argued pretty much about everything else under the sun from time immemorial.

Today, it spans the gamut from the invention of the Jewish peoples to the invention of the Palestinian peoples, from the King's Torah showing in how many ways the holy Jews can kill the unholy goy with Rabbinical blessings along with the holy Rabbis' latest Fatwa quoted above, to how many ways to settle the land of Canaan, which, as Shimon Perez put it on the occasion of the 60th Birthday bash when welcoming George W. Bush to Tel Aviv's Ben Gurion Airport: "Welcome to the new Israel: Three thousand years old, and going on sixty", while they all continue to live on occupied lands granted by imperial fiat.

Imperial fiat? Yes. Both, through one of empire's own instrument of the UN to legally sanction the theft of Palestine, ahem, the 1948 birth of the Jewish State after gratuitously Declaring the bold intention to birth-pang that fact into existence several years prior in 1917, and subsequently, through empire's active and tacit support for de-facto colonization since 1967 by sewing incremental fait accompli, i.e., sowing hard realities on the ground which are then argued as "impractical" to reverse.

So, even when I understand imperial fiat as it is pathetically public knowledge, whose claims can I believe? The guy who claims Jewish people are invented, or the guy who claims Palestinian peoples are invented? The guy who claims "Israeli himself that is the foreigner", or the guy who claims the Palestinians "stole the Jewish-Zionist two thousand year history and rewrote it into his own narrative"?

What confusion!

Okay, some might say, I can try to think for myself.

But when I try to do that, I run into conundrums and observe rather bizarre and funny things.

For example, the funny thing that I observe in this instance, is that when the Jews argue so energetically either side of dissent or consent, they also continue to live on the lands of the Palestinian peoples.

They continue to pay their taxes and spend their earnings into the Palestinian people's oppressors' economy.

And they continue to lend full legitimacy to the oppressors of the Palestinian peoples by being part of the very system of oppression, from economic to academic to military, by their very act of being there and spending their intellectual and physical earnings into that oppressive system, by their very act of carrying the oppressor state's identification papers, passport and travel documents, and by their very act of accepting the Jewish state's racial hospitality on the mere basis of their presumed Jewish bloodline, and most important of all, by their coming to live there eagerly when they were not themselves born there whereas those not of the right bloodline who were in fact born there are not permitted to live nor visit there!

And I find Palestinian peoples eagerly appreciating the support of these pious Jews in trying to liberate the Palestinians so very much!

I don't know about you, but I find that kind a bizarrely funny, at least in a Kafkaesque sort of way.

Here are two examples which illustrate this Kafkaesque humour more concretely than just the general empirical observations above which refer to no one in particular.

This first one is an example drawn from the late prof. Baruch Kimmerling, long time hero of many pious 'Left' Jews who glibly criticize their adopted homeland, the side which forcibly occupied Canaan most recently of course, from my essay: 'The endless trail of red herrings'. This

essay was written when prof. Kimmerling was alive, and a draft was emailed to him for his comments which he replied with stony silence. --- begin excerpt from 'The endless trail of red herrings'

Uri Avnery's confessional "I am an Israeli patriot," explains this enigma in as much clarity as the following gem from Baruch Kimmerling, another Israeli Patriot who calls Israel his land when he wasn't born there, and identifies himself in the oxymoronic category of "Jew, atheist, and Zionist" where the latter two may be consistent, but how does that pertain to being a Jew? "As a Jew, an atheist and a Zionist, I have two memorial days in my country, Israel. One for the Holocaust and one for soldiers who fell in wars. I also have one day of celebration, the anniversary of the day Israel declared its statehood. [...] Independence Day is a holiday for me, but also an opportunity for intense self-introspection. A person needs a state and land, and this is my land, my homeland, despite the fact that I was not born here. I am proud of the unprecedented accomplishments of this country, and feel personally responsible for its failures, foolishness, injustice, evil, and its oppression of its citizens and residents (Jewish, Arab, and others) as well as of those who are defined and defined themselves as her enemies. I know that my holiday, a day of joy and pride for me, is a day of mourning and tragedy for some of Israel's citizens and, more so, for members of the Palestinian people everywhere. I know that as long as we, all Jews everywhere, do not acknowledge this, we will not be able to live here in safety, every man and woman under their vine and under their fig tree. Happy holidays, Israel." (My Holiday, Their Tragedy, 2002.)

Disingenuous self interest once again? Neither calling unequivocally for abolishing the apartheid state (as far as I am aware, and if they have already done so elsewhere, I eat crow with pleasure). And neither extending to the displaced Palestinians the privileges they apportion for themselves in Israel – making it their home when not being born there (although Uri Avnery may well have been I don't know, I have never met him) when they don't accord it to those who indeed were and were kicked out by the very founding of the state which Kimmerling is so proudly calling his independence day. He does indeed magnanimously calls for Jews acknowledging the suffering of the Palestinians so that he can live in peace in Israel, but not for remedying the injustice in the only just and moral way – but then, being an atheist, whence the source of morality? God is dead, Nietzsche is alive, and so are his mantle-bearing ubermensch! Witness it in his own essay the vacuous words without the concomitant unequivocal call to abolish apartheid and make it one homeland for those forcibly displaced by his independence day:

"The transformation of the Holocaust into a solely Jewish tragedy, as opposed to a universal event, only weakens its significance and its legitimacy, tarnishing us and the memory of the victims. Likewise, its unnecessary overuse by Jews in Israel and the rest of the world, particularly political bodies, has made the Holocaust banal. Above all, a provocative and dangerous approach has bought a place in our hearts: that Jews, as the victims of the Holocaust, are permitted to treat goyim however they want. Forceful and condescending, "anti-gentile-ism" is identical to criminal anti-Semitism. ... What can I do? A person is closer to his own friends, tribe, and people. Along with that, however, I cannot forget or refrain from mourning the victims of this bloody conflict and feel deep empathy with those who have suffered and still suffer as a result of the fatal encounter between Jews and Arabs in this land. I hope that the day will come when we will commemorate together and mourn together, Jews and Arabs alike, for all of the victims of the conflict. Only then will we be able to live together in this place in safety. ... I know that as long as we, all Jews everywhere, do not acknowledge this, we will not be able to live here in safety, every man and woman under their vine and under their fig tree." (My Holiday, Their Tragedy, 2002.)

I am sorry that I am less than impressed, despite the self-flagellation. "What can I do?" Kimmerling asks? Here are three immediate things a conscionable Israeli can do if he is a Moral-Activist (see example here): 1) Start a campaign to demand genuine justice – not mere words of contrition – by requiring the apartheid nature of the state and the "Berlin Wall" to be

simultaneously demolished. 2) Stop paying taxes that contributes to the maintenance of the apartheid state. 3) As a conscionable person, leave Israel until such time that others who have more right to be there, on account of having being born there, and were forcibly evicted, are also allowed to return! To me, it appears that without any of the concomitant actions for Moral-Activism, the only reason Kimmerling calls for the recognition of the plight of the Palestinians is so that he and Zionist Jews like him can live in peace. --- end excerpt from 'The endless trail of red herrings'

The second example is drawn from the recent new hero of many Palestinians, prof. Shlomo Sand, from my essay 'Palestine: The Struggle Forward'. --- begin excerpt from 'Palestine: The Struggle Forward'

Recognizing such convolutions for what they are, is such a crucial and contemporary matter that it requires further elaboration. Professor Sholmo Sand is the new rage in the Palestinian town. Who hasn't heard of him or his book: *The Invention of the Jewish People*. He is a new hero among the Palestinians – well, among some at least, and like Professor Noam Chomsky before him, some excitedly carry him upon their head and shoulders just like they carry Professor Norm Finkelstein and many others. In fact, anyone from among the Jews who will sympathize with them becomes a new showcase for the Palestinians. Anna Baltzer is only the most recent example of that. Her leading performance with Dr. Mustafa Barghouti on American television left much to be desired. It is deconstructed here. [18] The indiscriminate attachment to Jewish sympathizers of Palestinian plight and permitting them to become the leading spokespersons for the Palestinians has been great for ensuring that the Palestinian narrative before the Western public is also controlled by the Jews – even though they be most earnest in their show of sympathy. The “soft Zionists” on the “left” have largely set the boundaries, or the book-ends, for the discourse on resolving Israel-Palestine in the West. Only a colonized mind accepts the victimizers to be their liberators. This is also a rather murky area and it is not easy to always know where to draw the line. Or whether there should even be a line in an honest common struggle when one sees enormously courageous Jews of conscience laying down their own precious lives on a matter of principle, like those in the ISM bearing witness to crimes against humanity and being shot dead by the Israelis. But let's just stay with the imposing Jewish academic in this article.

Look what Professor Shlomo Sand says in the following interview – and incidentally, after reading this interview, I lost all interest in reading his book which doesn't contain anything new for me anyway beyond what was revealed in *The Thirteenth Tribe: Khazar Jews – The revelation of another Jewish hoax*, By Arthur Koestler, 1976.

Shlomo Sand's statements in Ha'aretz, 21/03/2008, Shattering a 'national mythology' By Ofri Ilani,

Begin Excerpt

“My initial intention was to take certain kinds of modern historiographic materials and examine how they invented the 'figment' of the Jewish people. But when I began to confront the historiographic sources, I suddenly found contradictions. And then that urged me on: I started to work, without knowing where I would end up. I took primary sources and I tried to examine authors' references in the ancient period – what they wrote about conversion.”

“The supreme paradigm of exile was needed in order to construct a long-range memory in which an imagined and exiled nation-race was posited as the direct continuation of 'the people of the Bible' that preceded it,”

“I started looking in research studies about the exile from the land – a constitutive event in Jewish history, almost like the Holocaust. But to my astonishment I discovered that it has no literature. The reason is that no one exiled the people of the country. The Romans did not exile peoples

and they could not have done so even if they had wanted to. They did not have trains and trucks to deport entire populations. That kind of logistics did not exist until the 20th century. From this, in effect, the whole book was born: in the realization that Judaic society was not dispersed and was not exiled.”

[Interviewer]: If the people was not exiled, are you saying that in fact the real descendants of the inhabitants of the Kingdom of Judah are the Palestinians?

“No population remains pure over a period of thousands of years. But the chances that the Palestinians are descendants of the ancient Judaic people are much greater than the chances that you or I are its descendants. The first Zionists, up until the Arab Revolt [1936-9], knew that there had been no exiling, and that the Palestinians were descended from the inhabitants of the land. They knew that farmers don't leave until they are expelled. Even Yitzhak Ben-Zvi, the second president of the State of Israel, wrote in 1929 that, 'the vast majority of the peasant farmers do not have their origins in the Arab conquerors, but rather, before then, in the Jewish farmers who were numerous and a majority in the building of the land.'”

[Interviewer] Why do you think the idea of the Khazar origins is so threatening?

“It is clear that the fear is of an undermining of the historic right to the land. The revelation that the Jews are not from Judea would ostensibly knock the legitimacy for our being here out from under us. Since the beginning of the period of de colonization, settlers have no longer been able to say simply: 'We came, we won and now we are here' the way the Americans, the whites in South Africa and the Australians said. There is a very deep fear that doubt will be cast on our right to exist.” **End Excerpt**

If Professor Sand himself argues that there is no such thing as a Jewish people, and the Arab Palestinians are the original inhabitants of Palestine, then on what basis does he say the following:

Begin Excerpt [Interviewer] Is there no justification for this fear?

“No. I don't think that the historical myth of the exile and the wanderings is the source of the legitimization for me being here, and therefore I don't mind believing that I am Khazar in my origins. I am not afraid of the undermining of our existence, because I think that the character of the State of Israel undermines it in a much more serious way. What would constitute the basis for our existence here is not mythological historical right, but rather would be for us to start to establish an open society here of all Israeli citizens.” (emphasis added) **End Excerpt**

It is common among this breed of scholarly Zionists – which is perhaps why they also remain light-years ahead of the Palestinians – to argue among themselves not just whether Palestinians are a people (as both Moshe Katsav, Israel's former President, and Raphael Eitan, former Chief of Staff of the IDF, have variously pondered;), but also whether even Jews are a people. It's even reported in the New York Times: Scholars Debate Roots of Yiddish, Migration of Jews, October 29, 1996.

There is nothing new Professor Shlomo Sand has to offer Palestinians in the Zionist's endless cycle of their own myth-constructions and their own myth-destruction, except a new twisted justification for the invaders to continue to occupy Palestine, despite himself arguing that he does not have any roots there! But wait, he is not packing up to leave as a matter of conscience, as a matter of principle, after learning all that truth about the myths he had been fed. Now, it is the new mantra of “establish an open society here of all Israeli citizens.”!

It's akin to a robber comes into my house, takes over on the pretext of an asinine justification that god gave this land to his ancestors and I am the illegal occupant of his house; me and my children spend all our lives trying to show that world that the robber is not only criminal taking over my house but also an expert liar; then, a few years later, the robbers' children and

grandchildren create a different drama, some showcasing books variously showing a) that there is no god and “in the age of atheism, the Jewish people can no longer base its existence on God but only on itself alone, on its labor, on its land, and on its state”, and b) that even there is no Jewish people; but the current crop of legatees still want to stay in my house which he illegally occupied to start with?

Is that absurd? But not in Alice in Wonderland. --- end excerpt from 'Palestine: The Struggle Forward'

I find these specific cases and those like them both perplexing and funny when I begin to think for myself. I don't rightly know what to make of it.

Perhaps it is easiest to forget such paradoxes, chalk them up to life's minor inconsistencies, and just move on?

It's evidently too costly to think anyway. It can cause one to lose valued friends and allies, comfort zones and treadmills, heroes and hero-worship.

But I would like to ask Jews who evidently think for themselves, what should I make of such funny conundrums? What do you make of them?

And since many respectable Palestinian thinkers demonstrate such sympathy and solidarity with Jewish dissent emanating from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem, perhaps I can ask them too what do they do with such paradoxes. Do they simply ignore them?

Or do they take the easy way out like me and seriously consider stopping the onerous burden of thinking for themselves? The Jews most eloquently think for both sides of the divide anyway, thus certainly sparing the Palestinians any trouble.

I am most confused!

How many Jews does it take to confuse me?

Certainly not 50 pious Rabbis hell bent on exercising their chosen people's imperatives.

That categorical imperative I can quite understand.

It draws upon the ancient custom known as 'might is right'.

All rational and independent thought, all moral sense, all commonsense, must ultimately bow before that categorical imperative by definition.

No, it takes only one moral Jew to confuse me.

One single Jew who lives in Israel, is not born there, and proclaims Palestinian rights!

Pamphlet The Invisible House of Rothschild By Zahir Ebrahim 13/70

I would, I believe, be considerably less confused if all the pious Jews not born in Palestine but still living there – just because they are Jews and were given priority to immigrate there on that basis alone over those Palestinians who were born there, whose parents and grandparents were born there and forcibly evicted under state sponsored terrorism, and prevented from returning to their own ancestral continuously inhabited place of birth by the same state sponsored terrorism – were to first vacate their own personal occupation of another's home and rightfully return back to where they came from, BEFORE they started clamouring for Palestinian rights. It might be less confusing, and also more convincing, to those who dare to think independently.

I hope I may be forgiven this transgression of independent thought – it is surely a minefield and has confused the hell out of me – and I do believe the Rabbis have also forbidden the goy from thinking independently from the Jews precisely for that reason. We tend to get confused easily when we think on our own.

Isn't there also a clause in the King's Torah that any goy found thinking independently from the Jews should be immediately killed as he or she represents a potential threat to the very existence of the Jewish State? I do in fact recall statements from the King's Torah reproduced in several articles by other Jews including Gilad Atzmon's, that any goy who poses any threat to the legitimacy of the Jewish State, or to the Jews, can legally be killed by the Jews, preemptively. Desire for such preemption, the killing of the goy in cold blood, in self-defence of course, was precisely expressed by Lawrence Kulak, writing for '5 Towns Jewish Times' 5tjt.com, 11/12/2008 (cached here):

“Muslims believe in the literal interpretation of the Biblical doctrine of an eye for an eye, and they do not have respect for anything perceived as a lesser standard of justice. They killed our innocents, and unless we kill theirs, they will go on killing ours. The Torah, however, preaches a doctrine which, if implemented by the West, could finally put an end to all Islamic terror: If somebody is coming to kill you, rise up and kill him first.”

Such humble attempt at independent thinking as demonstrated here, surely poses a threat to the very existence of the Jewish state – for what if hundreds of thousands of Jews of the 4.5 million living on usurped lands, choosing not to be damn hypocrites anymore, suddenly left the Jewish state and renounced their ill-gotten citizenship of the racist oppressive state?

What if that number swelled to a million? Two million? They all, or most of them anyway, retain their original nationalities and passports, and there is no practical difficulties for them returning back once they recognize the very immorality of their being there due to their race alone when those who were born there cannot return!

Lighting such a fire in the mind of moral Jewish men and moral Jewish women of Israel, their Metanoia, surely qualifies as a dire threat to the very existence of the pariah Jewish State?

And thus easily become their target of assassination – who can hide from the almighty Mossad hitman anywhere in the world if Victor Ostrovsky is to be believed?

Could such precariousness of independent thought possibly be the reason why Palestinians often like the Jews to think for them and thus never encounter such funny absurdities in all their struggles from the safety of their forced Diaspora?

Is this also why courageous Palestinian leaders on ground zero who shy not from taking a bullet to their brains from the Israeli soldier who may or may not fire at them for their physical defiance, somehow prefer to not be assassinated for sure by Mossad for demonstrating their intellectual defiance?

For, these brave Palestinians evidently prefer to be accompanied by a beautiful Jewish voice, and principally permit her to plead for the Palestinians, as this chap, Dr. Mustafa Barghouti, did on prime time television. As I said, I get easily confused when trying to think for myself. From coast to coast, and continent to continent, excited Palestinians and their Jewish supporters cheered that finally the Palestinians' plight was heard on mainstream American television from a most beautiful and most eloquent American Jew who had suddenly woken up to the grotesque reality in the Holy lands and therefore had no reason to be biased. In fact, the narrative of the Jewish voice was almost mirrored by the Palestinian leader as well, sharing all the same axioms with precision. I must evidently be a very lonely fool to have tried this experiment of actually thinking

for myself, because I came away rather confused by all this amidst the roaring applause of the supporters. That episode is narrated at length in 'Rescuing a Failed Struggle From Its Narratives'. I could go on and on about my strange experiments with independent thinking. But I'll just end now. I will sheepishly admit though that I certainly used to enjoy life much better when I permitted others to think for me. My confusions then were much less about absurdities and almost entirely about whom to believe. It didn't matter if they were Jews, or Muslims, Christians, or atheists. Even a monkey was fine provided it came wearing a robe with 'expert' tattooed upon its forehead. I only had to choose from among the many competing experts, often going with the ones who represented my a priori world views the best. I never needed to forge my own thoughts independently.

Now, even a single moral Jew can send me off into deep convulsions of Kafkaesque proportions, as does most every other expert I encounter. Perhaps I am going about this freethinking business all wrong? Perhaps there is some happy halfway compromise to fully independent thinking which will also help me gain friends and influence people?

So, thanks in advance for any enlightenment, and corrections to my method.

Source URL: <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2010/12/how-many-jews-does-it-take-to-confuse.html>

..

Let me highlight the socio-political conundrum identified in part-1, quoting myself (since no one else ever quotes a confused person): "Perhaps I am going about this free-thinking business all wrong? The following example almost always loses me friends, tempting me to stop experimenting with independent thought altogether. I believe it is a miracle that I still dabble in it every now and then. I observed the following conundrum in 'Of Ostriches and Rebels on The Hard Road to World Order':

--- begin excerpt from 'Of Ostriches and Rebels on The Hard Road to World Order'

Herman Van Rompuy's message of hope at the completion stages [of world order] decades later was merely the cross-generational echo of Richard N. Gardner's "prospects for peace, welfare and human dignity" that had been long sewn "bottom up, rather than from the top down" such that to the uninformed public, it would always "look like a great 'booming, buzzing confusion' to use William James' famous description of reality, but an end run around national sovereignty, eroding it piece by piece will accomplish much more than the old-fashioned frontal assault."

The blood-drenched transformation stage that we find ourselves in today – the wreckage of civilizations – is truly "Between Two Ages". That brilliant description is not mine, but the title of Zbigniew Brzezinski's seminal self-serving 1970 book which [presumably] got him appointed as the Executive Director of David Rockefeller's Trilateral Commission. There are more than a dozen Trilateralists and CFRs in President Obama's Administration too, pushing the banksters' globalist agendas finally to fruition across multiple fronts simultaneously. The money behind them, at least in the United States, is primarily the Rockefellers' who own the majority stake in the New York Fed, which in turn largely controls the Federal Reserve System. In Europe, the money is primarily the Rothschilds' who control all the world's private central banks (including America's Federal Reserve and international lending-policing agencies such as the World Bank IMF tag-team and the WTO) with complex interlocking relationships among a closed-knit tiny fraternity who exercise their will upon international banking and global finance and thus upon all nations of the world, through their largely unknown Bank for International Settlements (<http://BIS.org>) located in Basle, Switzerland.

Entirely coincidentally of course, BIS is located in the same secretive banking capital where Theodor Herzl had earlier made his notorious Jewish manifesto, Der Judenstaat public in the First World Zionist Congress in 1897 to set the public stage for the creation of the exclusively

Jewish state of Israel in 1948. Also entirely coincidentally, the British Empire had gratuitously issued its famous 1917 Balfour Declaration in the name of Lord Rothschild, the principal owner and founder of the international financial system who had controlled the Bank of England since Waterloo. And again entirely coincidentally, America's entry into World War I was facilitated after the founding of its own 'Bank of England', i.e., the Federal Reserve System principally by Paul Warburg, the banking fraternal twin of Lord Rothschild in whose palace the Treaty of Versailles was signed after World War I to enable the British Mandate over the lands of historic Palestine.

These remarkable coincidences have today made the Rothschilds the most revered family name in Israel. Some call them the King of the Jews – and to live up to that Solomon-ly title, the Rothschilds have architected, financed and built the Jewish state's principal hall of Justice, the Israeli Supreme Court in Jerusalem. The Jewish State today enjoys the unparalleled privilege of an “Iron Wall” that none can breach. The Rothschild's frankenstein can with brazen impunity exterminate, assassinate, and bomb, to the applause of the world leaders (see 'Pamphlet: How to Return to Palestine'). And yet, strangely, the Rothschild's role in seeding and orchestrating the affairs of the modern world is consistently downplayed almost universally. No media, no academic, no scholar, no historian, no dissent-chief, no corporate executive, no billionaire on Forbes list, the Forbes list itself, and of course no politician and world statesman, dare utter that name publicly – and so long as they don't, they can say anything else they want. Elusive power such as this is not a figment of someone's imagination.

Prof. Carroll Quigley was permitted to openly state the following in his 1966 book *Tragedy and Hope*, and his controlled revelations which continued that tradition of downplaying the name of the Rothschilds, only came on the heels of the free-wheeling Eustace Mullins' well-documented exposé of how the Federal Reserve System in the United States was conspiringly created by forces representing the same globalist banking elite, and he had not spared the Rothschild name; this was followed by a series of books and documentary films in the 1970s by many others including Gary Allen, W. Cleon Skousen, G. Edward Griffin, Antony Sutton et. Al.

--- end excerpt from 'Of Ostriches and Rebels on The Hard Road to World Order'

I dared to think about that palpable omission on my own, inviting both confusion and loss of friends.

I asked: why was that most distinguished and singular Jewish family name, Rothschild, never permitted any significant mention not just in the Western press, but in the worldwide mainstream presses? It surely wasn't only because the AP and other news agencies, newspapers, newsmidia, were interlocking owned/controlled by the uber financiers of the world, the House of Rothschild. Even the brave president of Iran, Dr Ahmadinijad, and the brave president of Venezuela, Chavez, courageously challenging the status quo of the world anytime they acquire a microphone in their hands have not dared to mention that name. It is evidently still risk free to waive Noam Chomsky's 'Hegemony and Survival' from the UN podium and speak out against the criminal excesses of the sole superpower and its Allies du jour, but not okay to wonder out loud why was the Balfour Declaration issued in the House of Rothschild name?

Hmmm.... What sort of elusive omnipotent power did that magical name command such that it had erected an equally magical “Iron Wall” around Der Judenstaat? An “Iron Wall” which protected the Zionists' grotesque re-settlement and extermination project for Jewish Lebensraum being conducted with brazen impunity, often under thunderous applause of the Western leaders who continually renew their vows to support the expansion of the Jewish State created in the very name of Lord Rothschild, that none living dare mention and investigate that name while they continue to pay lip-service in support of the Palestinian peoples?

The Palestine freedom zealots in the West can boldly investigate and indict the dispensable Israeli leaders who come and go every election, but not its founder who evidently goes on forever?

By the Rothschild's own watered-down admission, they are not a has-been House:

'We provide advice on both sides of the balance sheet, and we do it globally. ... We have had 250 years or so of family involvement in the finance business, ... There is no debate that Rothschild is a Jewish family, ... For a family business to survive, every generation needs a leader, ... Then somebody has to keep the peace. Building a global firm before globalisation meant a mindset of sharing risk and responsibility. If you look at the DNA of our family, that is perhaps an element that runs through our history.' --- Baron David de Rothschild, The first barons of banking by Rupert Wright, UAE thenational.ae, November 6, 2008

That humble confession by Baron David de Rothschild quoted above exactly fulfills in this generation, the well-known directives issued by their forefather, the founder of the House of Rothschild, Mayer Amschel Bauer. A long staple of Rothschild biographers, the founding directives are even vicariously depicted by Hollywood in the 1934 film which was intended to be an ode to the Rothschild name. Watch this short clip of the movie The House of Rothschild, about half way through in that clip, the historical depiction from the mouth of great-grandfather Amschel Rothschild, is empirically being fulfilled today, 250 years later, as glibly confirmed even in that watered-down admission from his own great-grandson, David de Rothschild!

The UAE National newspaper even openly stated its lack of faith in the 'coincidence theory' of history and noted the overarching contemporary significance of the House of Rothschild:

'Among the captains of industry, spin doctors and financial advisers accompanying British prime minister Gordon Brown on his fund-raising visit to the Gulf this week, one name was surprisingly absent. This may have had something to do with the fact that the tour kicked off in Saudi Arabia. But by the time the group reached Qatar, Baron David de Rothschild was there, too, and he was also in Dubai and Abu Dhabi.

Although his office denies that he was part of the official party, it is probably no coincidence that he happened to be in the same part of the world at the right time. That is how the Rothschilds have worked for centuries: quietly, without fuss, behind the scenes.'

In fact, according to the following article in the London Times, the Rothschild's is the one unusual financial House in the world which came out ahead without any legal extortion, ahem, financial bailouts of people's money legally granted by the people's elected Representatives to the robber barons of modernity (watch that bizarre extortion racket for the forced Bailout in the United States in October 2008 here: <http://youtube.com/watch?v=sN3a1oTdDwM> , and witness my further confused experiments in independent thought in 'Why Bluff Martial Law?'):

'Not all investment bankers are having to get by on reduced or no bonuses this year. Rothschild group staff have received record bonuses, it has emerged after the bank reported a 31 per cent improvement in profits before tax to €459 million.

Record results from both its advisory and private banking operations enabled the bank to pay the bonuses to its 2,700 people in June.

Unlike conventional investment banks Rothschild, whose chairman is Davide de Rothschild, has steered clear of proprietary trading, prime brooking and other activities that have devastated rivals, although it still wrote off €96 million because of souring loans.

Rothschild's year-end of March means the bonuses were paid before the most serious setbacks to banks. Most investment banks pay out bonuses between January and May. Goldman Sachs is due to tell its staff the size of their payouts in the next three weeks.

Alongside its pro-forma group-wide results, Rothschild unveiled a joint venture with Rabobank of the Netherlands, whereby the two sides will pool their staff and clients in the food and agriculture sector.

As part of the deal, Rabobank is buying a 7.5 per cent stake in one of the key holding companies in the Rothschild empire, Rothschild Continuation Holdings, which owns the N M Rothschild business in the UK.

Rabobank becomes the second biggest investor outside the family after the trading group Jardine Matheson, which owns 20 per cent. Rabobank's vice chairman Sipko Schat joins the Rothschild board.

It is the second joint venture with a Dutch bank. Rothschild teamed up with ABN Amro for 11 years in equity capital markets before dissolving the arrangement when Royal Bank of Scotland took over ABN last year.

Rabobank's stake was held in treasury by Rothschild after it bought it from the insurer Eagle Star. No price was put on the deal. Jardine paid \$185 million for its 20 per cent in 2005.

Rothschild advisory clients include Rio Tinto, which is fighting a hostile bid from BHP, British Energy in its deal with EDF of France and Alliance & Leicester when it was sold to Banco Santander.' --- Rothschild pays out record bonuses to staff by Patrick Hosking, Times Online, November 19, 2008

With full spectrum control of the world's private central banks and BIS firmly in the hands of the House of Rothschild and their closed knit coterie, I of course, in my confused experiment of thinking for myself, chalk that wizard financial success of bailing out from publicly traded banks about to fail in a timely manner, and having only successes for one's own private family bank, up to just another coincidence. I strongly suspect that Gary Allen's confusion on such coincidences far exceeded mine as evidenced from his book None Dare Call it Conspiracy:

'Those who believe that major world events result from planning are laughed at for believing in the "conspiracy theory of history." Of course, no one in this modern day and age really believes in the conspiracy theory of history -except those who have taken the time to study the subject. When you think about it, there are really only two theories of history. Either things happen by accident neither planned nor caused by anybody, or they happen because they are planned and somebody causes them to happen. In reality, it is the "accidental theory of history" preached in the unhallowed Halls of Ivy which should be ridiculed. Otherwise, why does every recent administration make the same mistakes as the previous ones? Why do they repeat the errors of the past which produce inflation, depressions and war? Why does our State Department "stumble" from one Communist-aiding "blunder" to another? If you believe it is all an accident or the result of mysterious and unexplainable tides of history, you will be regarded as an "intellectual" who understands that we live in a complex world. If you believe that something like 32,496 consecutive coincidences over the past forty years stretches the law of averages a bit, you are a kook!' (Gary Allen, None Dare Call it Conspiracy, 1971, Chapter 1)

But more pertinent to my confusion for the main point under consideration, namely, the bizarre silence on the Rothschilds when it comes to the topic of the holy lands which they 'own' completely, as even demonstrated to the most ardent zealot fighting the cause of Palestine by the fact of the Balfour Declaration gratuitously awarding Palestine to the entire Jewish peoples being specifically in just that one singular name, doesn't that omission appear frighteningly absurd once again? See for instance: 'Zahir's Response to Francis Boyle's Jewistan – What Elephant?'

Well, to me that silence is just as absurdly confounding as the bizarre merrymaking with the 'Happy Unbirthday' song at the Mad Hatter's Tea Party confounded Alice in Wonderland. So, while searching for a way out of these absurd confusions rapidly piling up, I found this really bizarre interview asking similar questions for the first time in modern times, about the House of Rothschild, and I transcribed it: 'Rothschild Connection to World Government and Zionism: David Icke – Origins and Symbolism of the EU'.

Please see what you make of such attempts at independent thinking. Also please feel free to advise me how one ought to go about this independent thinking business, the much wanted contribution of Western civilization to modern man, or so they say, without stepping on censor toes – never mind without losing friends. Even this last thought is causing me a great deal of confusion. But first, here is the interview.

--- begin excerpt from 'Rothschild Connection to World Government and Zionism'

Transcription of Red Ice Creations' David Icke's video interview by Project Humanbeingsfirst, segment on The Rothschild Connection to World Government and Zionism, Parts 6 & 7 [Parenthesis: Transcriber's notes] [youtube=<http://youtube.com/p/03D36F59DC6F1259>]

Begin Transcription:

'They are all connected, and they are connected through the House of Rothschild. See, if people just took a breadth, and looked at the whole scene, they would ask serious questions: [Why is Israel's Supreme Court in Jerusalem built by the Rothschilds?]

Why does that slither of land, called Israel, and I have driven around it, and you can virtually drive around it in a day, why does it have so much power?

Why is it the biggest by far recipient of American aid when it is one of the richest per capita countries in the world?

Why does it have the biggest F-16 fleet outside America?

How come it can have a very considerable arsenal of nuclear weapons, refuse to sign a Non Proliferation Treaty, and have a breadth taking agreement which has just been confirmed by Barrack Obama in the last few months, that they have a policy in terms of America and other countries in Israel, that they don't ask whether they have got nuclear weapons. And therefore, Israel does not have to say if they have or not. This is an official policy!

Why, when they pepper-bomb the most crowded piece of land in the world, and instigate slaughter on a shocking scale, does the international community, apart from one or two people, say nothing? [<http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2008/05/celebrating-israels-60th-birthday.html>]

Simple.

The House of Rothschild controls Israel. It created Israel. And more than that, it created a political philosophy, note a POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY, called ZIONISM.

[<http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2009/02/letterto-dalitvoice-which-god.html>]

What they have brilliantly done, though it's breaking down, is they have equated Jewish people as a race with Zionism, which is a political philosophy. And at its core is a secret society, connects into the other secret societies.

And, so if you challenge Zionism, and its horrors, and its impositions, and its hypocrisy, and its slaughter, you are equated with being prejudiced against Jewish people.
What they don't tell you is significant number of Jewish people are actually appalled by Zionism.
And actually openly protest against it.

[<http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2009/11/genesis-to-genocide-golem-not-jewish.html>]

And there is some fantastic young people in Israel that refuse to serve in the military, and end up in jail because of it. And you, know they are incredible people to have that sense of value.

The questions that I have just posed can be answered very easily.

[<http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2009/10/respto-what-cost-israel-lobby-jeffgates.html>]

The House of Rothschild control American politics. They control the neo-cons, they control Bush, they control what I call the demo-cons that control Obama.

[<http://humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2008/10/not-voting-is-yes-vote-to-reject-system.html>]

And in the White House as I speak, we have the White House Chief of Staff, Rahm Emanuel, who is the puppeteer, immediate puppeteer of Obama, [Just like Bush's Brain was Karl Rove] and his father actually served in an Israeli Zionist terror group called Irgun, which, with others, bombed Israel into existence and forced 750,000 to 800,000 Palestinians to leave their homeland after 1948.

The reason, therefore, that Israel is the biggest recipient of American aid and military support, is because this hand [points to right hand] called the House of Rothschild, takes the money from the United States and hands it to this hand [points to left hand] called Israel of the House of Rothschild, and says thank you very much!

The reason that there is no questioning of Israeli nuclear capability, that they get away literally with mass murder, time and time again, is because the House of Rothschild controls the countries of the European Union, and controls the European Union. I mean, Tony Blair is a "yes sir no sir, three bags full sir, how high would you like me to jump sir" front man for the House of Rothschild. [<http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2009/11/rescuing-thestruggle-for-palestine.html>] So who do they put in after he left the British Government, as negotiator of peace in Israel - Tony Bloody Blair! 'What should I say Mr. Rothschild, thank you very much, thank you thank you' [mimics Tony Blair]. That's it.

So when you have got the same force controlling all these different agencies, than of course they are gonna be coordinated.

That's the way Israel gets away with what it gets away with.

And if people think its anti-Semitic, well actually anti-Semitic means anti-Arab by the way, then they'll have to take it and shove it somewhere where the sun don't shine 'cause I ain't shutting up about this because it is fundamental to understanding the world, and to understanding the European Union and world events!

The Jewish people, in general, have been mercilessly used by the House of Rothschild, and their front secret society, satanic secret society, called Zionism, as a front which they can hide behind. [<http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2009/09/is-zionism-hegelian-dialectic.html>]

So it is House of Rothschild organizations like B'nai Brith, Sons of the Covenant, who created an organization called the Anti-Defamation league, which goes around defaming everyone ironically, who have not just campaigned for hate laws that stop you exposing these people, they have actually written the bloody legislation in America, in North America and Canada.

And so, these hate laws which say you can't say this you can't say that, because that's prejudiced and all that, they are not there to protect gay people - everyone ought to their own I say, I couldn't care less - they are not there to protect Jewish people, or minorities.

They are there, simply, to stop legitimate investigation of the Rothschilds and its network. That's what they are there for.

[<http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2009/10/respto-what-cost-israel-lobby-jeffgates.html>]

And, they are in so many ways the Rothschilds. At operational level, the center of the spider's web.

And they need to be exposed.

[Therefore, focussing on Jewish political action groups like AIPAC, ADL, JDL, Chabad Lubavitch Hasidics, et. al., who put Israel first to influence the superpower's policies, or the hundred Jewish-dominated opaquely funded private think-tanks like the AEI, CFR, et. al., who ab initio construct the polices of war and hegemony favoring Israel, without betraying any comprehension of the actual prime-movers behind them, is not only an exercise in futility, but these visible magnets are deliberately there, and manifest themselves with their inexplicable arrogance, precisely in order to draw fire away from the prime-movers!' -- <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2010/05/palestine-theway-forward.html>]

Because if they get exposed, and they go, when I say go [I mean] they are removed from their positions of power, 'cause to be honest, if they went to jail, for what they have been responsible for, the House of Rothschild, they would have to reincarnate hundreds of times to complete the sentence!

['If fair punishments are ever to be awarded for their crimes against humanity for just the past 100 years in any Just court of law, Adolph Eichmann would have to be retroactively let go by resurrecting his soul from his grave with high honors and awarded multiple peace prizes plus compensation, in order to administer hanging and extraction of restitution as the graduated scale of ultimate punishment for the ultimate prime-movers of all wars and pestilence before which their errand boys' and patsies' crimes against humanity pale in comparison.' -- <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2009/11/rescuing-thestruggle-for-palestine.html>]

And, we've ignored them. Or we have not ignored them, people have ignored their power for long enough because they have brilliantly hidden it. It needs the light to be shone on it because when they come down, in so many ways, the House of cards comes down!

[<http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2010/04/resp-abusitta-rothschild-not-zabara.html>]

Thank you very much.'

End Transcription by Project Humanbeingsfirst.org, Parts 6 & 7 [Parenthesis: Transcriber's notes]
--- end excerpt from 'Rothschild Connection to World Government and Zionism'

Conclusion

Aaaaaah, confusion, confusion! I could just scream. No wonder why the goyem don't think much, and it is not recommended for us to think by the doctors who conveniently do all the original thought experiments for us to save us the burden. Here is the problem alluded to earlier, stepping on censor toes, and it can only be the inevitable conclusion of our zeitgeist: If one avoids tabooed thoughts for fear of censorship, loss of friends, being indicted and incarcerated under the thought-crimes Bill pending in many a legislature's quarters worldwide, is that still considered 'independent thinking', the gift of Western civilization to mankind? Perhaps it is so under NewSpeak, the newly revised gift of Western civilization to the Dawn of the New Age? The New Age being hasteningly beckoned by Zbigniew Brzezinski, cited above, wherein, he justified/rationalized humanity's deadly plight in our zeitgeist by quoting Hermann Hesse from *Steppenwolf* thusly; "Human life is reduced to real suffering, to hell, only when two ages, two cultures and religions overlap. . . . There are times when a whole generation is caught in this way between two ages, two modes of life, with the consequence that it loses all power to understand itself and has no standard, no security, no simple acquiescence."? That profound insight, of brilliant hindsight and self-serving foresight, very well could be the elusive key I have been searching for to open the mysterious door past which I can't see.

Further Study

To catch only a fleeting glimpse for yourself of that veil past which evidently no one else is able to see either, and which is seeding so much confusion among those wanting to do their own independent thinking that unless one opens up the final edition of the Newspeak dictionary described by George Orwell in his seminal work '1984' (watch the movie here), one is destined to stay confused, read the following two books by Eustace Mullins: *The World Order – A Study in the Hegemony of Parasitism*, and *The Curse of Canaan – A Demonology of History*. Additionally, *The Thirteenth Tribe* by Arthur Koestler, and *The Empire of "The City"* (world superstate) – *The Jekyll/Hyde Nature of the British Government* by E. C. Knuth, are both helpful in thinning out the powerful fog of confusion which surrounds the origins and the rise to power of Black Nobility. A careful study of these books (PDF available on the web; search, download and read them before these out-of-print books get banned, or, reading them is made a thought-crime), helps one understand the elusive power which has corrupted and co-opted almost all of dissent in the West today creating the sort of absurdities highlighted in my confusions. The pernicious nature of that indomitable power to mould, influence and corrupt across the board world-wide was captured in the following way by W. Cleon Skousen in his commentary on Carroll Quigley's *Tragedy and Hope*:

'The real value of *Tragedy and Hope* ... [is the] bold and boastful admission by Dr. Quigley that there actually exists a relatively small but powerful group which has succeeded in acquiring a choke-hold on the affairs of practically the entire human race. Of course we should be quick to recognize that no small group could wield such gigantic power unless millions of people in all walks of life were "in on the take" and were willing to knuckle down to the iron-clad regimentation of the ruthless bosses behind the scenes. As we shall see, the network has succeeded in building its power structure by using tremendous quantities of money (together with the vast influence it buys) to manipulate, intimidate, or corrupt millions of men and women and their institutions on a world-wide basis.' (W. Cleon Skousen, *The Naked Capitalist*, pg. 6)

The publicly available need to research (as in need to know) private archives of the House of Rothschild is now on the web. Presumably sanitized of any adverse material – since its primary purpose evidently is to glorify the 250 years of exploits of the House of Rothschild – for those inclined to experiment in forensic confusion, it may yet prove to be an invaluable treasure trove of discovery: <http://www.rothschildarchive.org/ta/>. The private Rothschild Archives I imagine is where the official biographers have always received their source material to write their pandering odes to the House of Rothschild. See for instance, *The House of Rothschild* by Niall Ferguson. Now it's available to you as well!

For those unable to read, but still inclined to experiment in some self-inflicted confusion, Grace Power's Amenstop Production DVD 'Ring of Power' may be a good starting point (watch part-1, part-2, the second part focusses on the House of Rothschild). I rather like Grace Powers' DVD presentation which is based on some of the historical material presented in the above books, because she addressed her video to the lowest level mental acumen in Western society with an easy to follow narrative. I have never met Grace Powers, communicate with her every now and then over email, consider her a seeker of knowledge based on her work, but don't agree with her many esoteric opinions and conclusions which, rather strangely, anyone who speaks of the oligarchy, secret societies, and the Black Nobility, also often seem to hold. I am glad the authors whose books are recommended reading above appeared to be an exception to this bizarre contemporary empiricism. Mullins' The Curse of Canaan is an intriguing deconstruction of history which he based on his understanding of the Bible and study of the Talmudic literature. One may draw from Mullins' pointing fingers what one may, perhaps using Bruce Lee's wisdom expressed in his martial arts movie Enter the Dragon: "Don't concentrate on the finger or you will miss all that heavenly glory" (watch movie clip here).

I too apply such Zen of analysis to my own self-inflicted confusions (when I could just as well bow before 'experts' and save me the bother), and Grace Powers' work is no exception. What that specifically means in this case is not to throw the baby out with the bath water. Leave aside the speculative material for some future time, and focus directly on the rational analysis based on obvious and historical facts. On the whole, Ring of Power's narrative on the House of Rothschild is penetratingly contemporary, as Grace Powers attempts to forensically tie 9/11 and the documented historical quest for World Order of the Black Nobility for the average dumbed-down television watcher of America. If the size of the 'United We Stand' crowd and the size of protests in the immediate aftermath of 9/11 are any indication, the dumbed-down and indoctrinated peoples of America likely constitute well over 90% of its 300 million population! What brazen absurdity once again. The mightiest superpower on earth in this information age is also home to the most ignorant and mind controlled peoples, including The Master Builders of the Technetronic Era! Who created such pathetic state of affairs in this once unassailable nation and why? There is very little time left for its public to find out. A short 10-minute readable summary is: 'Of Ostriches and Rebels on The Hard Road to World Order'.



**The Rothschild - Israeli
Parliament**

We provide advice on both sides of the balance sheet, and we do it globally. ... We have had 250 years or so of family involvement in the finance business, ... There is no debate that Rothschild is a Jewish family, ... For a family business to survive, every generation needs a leader, ... Then somebody has to keep the mindset of sharing risk and responsibility. If you look at the DNA of our family, that is perhaps an element that runs through our history.' --- Baron David de Rothschild, The first barons of banking by Rupert Wright, UAE the national.ae, November 6, 2008

When, in my state of perpetual confusion whereby my experiments in independent thinking sometimes get out of hand, I have immoderately challenged many a rebel leader on their omitting to mention the Rothschild name in their otherwise erudite critiques of modernity, I have always come up empty handed. This is amply demonstrated in my responses to Salman Abu Sitta, Antoine Raffoul, Ismail Zayid, Khalil Nakhleh, Shadi Nassar, Mustafa Barghouti and Anna Baltzer, Jeff Gates, Jeff Blankfort, et. al. My most recent challenge was yet another unsolicited letter, this time to an old timer Western rebel of the United States of America, Mr. Jeffrey Blankfort. He courteously replied:

'I do not mention the Rothschilds because I have yet to see a single shred of evidence that they control the world's money supply, the CFR, or anything else of such substance as to influence the way the world works. As far as I can tell whereas once members of the Rothschild banking family ran the banks of Western Europe, I see no evidence that they do so today. ... Again, if you have any direct evidence with unimpeachable sources that the Rothschilds are running everything or for that matter anything behind the scenes I would appreciate receiving it but lacking that up to now, I never mention their name apart from Walter Rothschild being the recipient of the Balfour Declaration.' --Jeffrey Blankfort replying to Zahir Ebrahim Nov. 11, 2010 (see full correspondence at the end of this article)

I was simply delighted that my new friend Jeff Blankfort had even bothered to write back, as most brilliant chiefs, both Eastern and Western, gallantly rising to defend the Palestinians as their own cause célèbre, simply tend to ignore the meddlesome and the confused who don't buy their craftsmanship. The crazy thing is, that among the Palestinians themselves, many appear to prefer running from Jew to Jew to solve their problems, as was observed by a Palestinian friend of mine out of sheer frustration: "We run from Jew to Jew, they create the problem, and also argue the solution, they control the full spectrum of our discourse as well as our existence." I promised Jeff: "Thank you mon ami for your reply. I will compose a thoughtful reply later...". This Part-3 attempts to respond to Jeff Blankfort's request for evidence for the trumpeting-defecating elephant in the bedroom. As quoted above, Jeff asked for "direct evidence with unimpeachable sources".

I will humbly endeavour to provide both – direct, unimpeachable. And before concluding, I will even suggest that the legal standard itself for proving criminal conspiracy is far less than what Mr. Blankfort has generously demanded from me, for the obvious reasons that even half-smart conspirators usually hide behind their errand boys, like the Mafioso, and don't leave their calling cards. More empirically however, unlike the dumb Mafioso who rob, extort, and kill illegally thus enabling the state policing apparatuses to be used to juridically hang them, brilliant conspirators usually enact legalisms and statutes, and directly employ the state's governing apparatus itself to mask and legalize their dastardly plunders, their war-mongerings, their social-engineering, and their pernicious subversions of the peoples' democratic institutions and constitution. Even the flag-waiving ordinary indoctrinated American understood how that craftsmanship worked when he and she witnessed the banksters' bailout extortion racket in October 2008 (see 'Why bluff Martial Law') and their subsequent brazen accounting of how they spent it (watch).

And yet, the law of un-intended consequences, i.e., nature, still has its ways to un-obscure the golem if one has the eyes and the will to perceive.

Let me first state the criterion for proof as Blankfort did not stipulate any beyond "direct, unimpeachable". I intend to demonstrate that an omnipotent power exists, that such a power visibly existed not too long ago using unimpeachable sources, and since there is no evidence of such a power suddenly eviscerating, that by the sheer force of logic, it must still exist even if occulted from mainstream Americans today. And I will top that off with the confirmation of its own existence by the omnipotent power itself. I invite the readers to pretend that they are a jury member, and reach their own verdict whether the following can be sufficiently deemed "direct

evidence” from “unimpeachable sources” to satisfy the request of Jeffrey Blankfort and all those like him who choose to wilfully remain innocent of knowledge of the most glaring, trumpeting, shitting, elephant in the bridal suite.

First, the unimpeachable source: Nuremberg Military Tribunal and its official Record. I don't think there can be anything more unimpeachable a source than that, do you?

Let's first see what transpired at Nuremberg in the score-settling with victor's justice in the aftermath of World War II with respect to the Nazi banker most instrumental in financing the Nazi war machine, Hjalmar Schacht. While 21 Nazi chiefs were hanged (watch) by Robert H. Jackson, the chief prosecuting counsel for the United States (watch), the banker whom the chief counsel as the official representative of the United States government to the Nuremberg Military Tribunals, most wanted to hang, was set free due to the intervention from the Bank of England governor Sir Montagu Norman!

Say what? Bank of England is so powerful that it prevailed upon their own military Allies at Nuremberg to let go of the principal enemy who financed the destruction of entire Europe and of the British Empire itself – with agreement from all the Allied military high command and their governments (with only Russia dissenting)? No, you did not read that in history books did you, nor did you hear Noam Chomsky talk about the inconvenient case of Hjalmar Schacht even when he waxes eloquence about victor's justice at Nuremberg by highlighting the case of Admiral Karl Dönitz, and evidently, nor did you hear Mr. Jeffrey Blankfort bring it up in all his dissent-ing critique of Noam Chomsky.

I get really confused when I encounter such blind-sighted omissions regarding the King of the Jews among the moral Jews who become dissent-chiefs for the dumb goy, and book-end their own dissent so wonderfully while still giving the illusion of vigorous debate. Chomsky explains this Machiavellian construction rather elegantly even as he implements it himself with involuntary help from his own antagonist, Jeff Blankfort, and the goyem cheer for their favorite horse – don't matter which horse wins, the real winners are those who benefit from the calculated omissions, the race course owners:

‘This “debate” is a typical illustration of a primary principle of sophisticated propaganda. In crude and brutal societies, the Party Line is publicly proclaimed and must be obeyed — or else. What you actually believe is your own business and of far less concern. In societies where the state has lost the capacity to control by force, the Party Line is simply presupposed; then, vigorous debate is encouraged within the limits imposed by unstated doctrinal orthodoxy. The cruder of the two systems leads, naturally enough, to disbelief; the sophisticated variant gives an impression of openness and freedom, and so far more effectively serves to instil the Party Line. It becomes beyond question, beyond thought itself, like the air we breathe.’

‘Democratic societies use a different method: they don't articulate the party line. That's a mistake. What they do is presuppose it, then encourage vigorous debate within the framework of the party line. This serves two purposes. For one thing it gives the impression of a free and open society because, after all, we have lively debate. It also instils a propaganda line that becomes something you presuppose, like the air you breathe.’

‘The smart way to keep people passive and obedient is to strictly limit the spectrum of acceptable opinion, but allow very lively debate within that spectrum – even encourage the more critical and dissident views. That gives people the sense that there's free thinking going on, while all the time the presuppositions of the system are being reinforced by the limits put on the range of the debate.’ --- Noam Chomsky.

At this point, before I go any further, please permit me to dust out the following observation of novelist Aldous Huxley in the Brave New World to illustrate why I consider artful omissions

and silence, as counter-intuitive as it might appear to the profoundly innocent of knowledge, to be a most powerful propaganda tool:

‘The greatest triumphs of propaganda have been accomplished, not by doing something, but by refraining from doing. Great is truth, but still greater, from a practical point of view, is silence about truth. By simply not mentioning certain subjects, by lowering what Mr. Churchill calls an “iron curtain” between the masses and such facts or arguments as the local political bosses regard as undesirable, totalitarian propagandists have influenced opinion much more effectively than they could have done by the most eloquent denunciations, the most compelling of logical rebuttals. But silence is not enough. If persecution, liquidation and the other symptoms of social friction are to be avoided, the positive sides of propaganda must be made as effective as the negative.’ — Aldous Huxley, Preface (circa 1946) to *Brave New World*, 1931, Harper, pg. 11

I have to wonder about my sanity sometimes – why don't I get it when brilliant chiefs inexplicably dabble in their own thought control, in their own self-policing?

Why do I persist in experimenting with independent thinking? Just accept the pious statements of the Jewish chiefs that there is not a shred of evidence of the existence of the King of the Jews controlling the state of affairs in the world today, lest I be labeled a 'kook', a 'denier of established truths', and carted away to some re-education camp for my own, as well as other's safety! 'Denier' I have already been anointed by none other than a recovering Jew, a reformed Zionist, Christian friend of mine, Israel Shamir! Yes, I know I have accumulated some lovely friends in my few journeys into the unknown world of independent thinking! I now try my best to stay away from such confusions, and I believe this is one of my last few times as my new year's resolution!

Before we jump too far ahead as I briefly did in the preceding passages to give a taste of the acerbic logic about to develop, let's study this shockingly revealing fact of Hjalmar Schacht which is so uncontrovertibly recorded in the pages of victor's justice at Nuremberg, and the circumstances surrounding this fact. The following is excerpted from David Irving's *Nuremberg, the Last Battle* (PDF). It appears in my document “Monetary Reform: Who will bell the cat?” as footnote [11] and [13] and is reproduced below along with the passage being footnoted:

'Yes, confessionals after faits accomplis, is a characteristically “cleansing” Christian tradition. Somehow, it only seems to work for those in absolute power, never for the common man. “You're right, we did it. We're very sorry. But thanks to you, we won't do it again” [Ben Bernanke to Milton Friedman] doesn't seem to be part of the ordinary judicial system where the common man is made accountable for stealing bread. But it is part of the Nuremberg Military Tribunals which let Dr. Hjalmar Schacht, the former governor of the Reich Bank [11] – the Caption Nuremberg, the Last bankster who orchestrated the financing for Hitler Battle: Bank of England and enabled his war machine with funding from overriding the victorious Allies Wall Street [12] and the City of London financiers and freeing the Nazi Banker – go scot-free!

Hjalmar Schacht from the hangman's noose. Image courtesy fpp.co.uk Whence such awesome power to even let a fascist banker who caused the destruction of all of Europe – as per the Nuremberg established principle of “all the evil which follows” – become a prominent and influential member of the financial community once again in post-war Germany “as though there had never been a blemish on his character”? [13]

Footnote [11] Dr. Hjalmar Schacht (Reich minister of economics until 1937, Reichsbank president until 1939). David Irving, *Nuremberg, The Last Battle*, 1996, page 160. [Jackson] regarded the former president of the Reichsbank as the most contemptible of all the defendants. He had provided the finance for the spectacular rise and rearmament of Hitler's Germany. More than any other, this man's financial genius had paved the way for the violation of the Versailles Treaty.” (page 157)

“Ambitious and arrogant, Schacht [Highest IQ 143, page 292] had walled himself in behind a belief in his own righteousness. He seethed with rage at being imprisoned with Hitler’s henchmen. He admitted to having violated the Versailles Treaty, but countered that since the Allies were in collusion against Germany this was no crime. .. He admitted rebuilding Germany’s run-down economy, but not for the purpose of waging war; Hitler had dismissed him as soon as he balked at the aggressive planning that began.” (page 293)

“Hjalmar Schacht – ‘after Göring the toughest of them.’ He [Jackson] had always regarded Schacht as one of the most despicable defendants. The banker’s arrogant attitude since the trial had begun only vexed him all the more.” (page 327)

“Even more irritating for Jackson was that Schacht was overheard in the cells confidently predicting that he would be acquitted. Irritating rumours circulated that the prosecution of Schacht was not in earnest. Letter-writers taunted Jackson that he would never succeed in convicting a big banker – whether friend or foe, they were the new Untouchables. He soon became aware that the Nazi banker did indeed have friends in the most unlikely places and influence everywhere. One day one of his team, the eminent New York international lawyer Ralph Albrecht, reported to him that the British assistant prosecutor Colonel Harry J. Phillimore – later a lord justice of appeal in London* – had accosted him in the hall outside the courtroom and urged the Americans to relax their remorseless pressure on the banker. When Albrecht, perplexed, asked ‘Why?’, Phillimore uneasily explained that certain representations had been made by Sir Montagu Norman, governor of the Bank of England from 1920 to Pamphlet The Invisible House of Rothschild By Zahir Ebrahim 41/70

1944. ‘It would be most unfortunate,’ murmured the British colonel, ‘if anything were to happen to Schacht.’ In fact Schacht had been an informer of Sir Montagu, secretly apprising him of the political and financial decisions taken at the highest level in Berlin for sixteen years before the war.” (page 328

)

“There is in the records of His Majesty’s treasury in the British archives an illuminating file on the efforts made by Sir Montagu Norman to get Schacht released.” (page 329)

“He [Jackson] regarded the case against the banker as a test of the good faith of the entire prosecution. As he had said in a secret meeting of all the chief prosecutors in April, of which there is a shorthand record in his files, ‘If the court, for instance, holds that we have no case against Schacht, then it seems clear that we can have no case against any industrialist, as the case against him is stronger than the others.’ ... He [Jackson] privately recorded later, ‘I would at least stand out forthrightly in demanding his conviction, convicting him if I could.’ He harried the banker mercilessly in the witness box, addressed him as ‘Schacht,’ tout court, confronting him with the evidence of his participation in Hitler’s aggressive planning until eventually the defendant had to admit that he had been untruthful about his dealings with the Führer. Jackson showed the Tribunal newsreel film of Hitler’s triumphant return to Berlin in July 1940 after the defeat of France – long after Schacht would have had them believe he had fallen into disfavour. There was Schacht, in Prince-Albert morning coat and top hat, the only civilian among the generals waiting on the station platform to pump the Führer’s hand – indeed with two hands he caught hold of the Führer’s, stepped out of line, and followed him ‘in almost lickspittle fashion,’ as Jackson remarked later. And this was the Nazi gentleman for whom the British lawyer Phillimore and banker Sir Montagu Norman were interceding. All the more acute was Jackson’s fury when the Tribunal – with only the Russian judge publicly dissenting – acquitted Schacht. Biddle, who read out this part of the judgement, claimed some months later that he had also wanted to convict, but the British had insisted on an acquittal and had left him no choice.” (pages 329-330)

Also see page 392. <http://www.fpp.co.uk/books/Nuremberg/NUREMBERG.pdf>

Footnote [12] Antony C. Sutton, Wall Street and the Rise of Hitler, 1976

Pamphlet The Invisible House of Rothschild By Zahir Ebrahim 42/70

http://www.reformed-theology.org/html/books/wall_street/

Footnote [13] David Irving, Nuremberg, The Last Battle, 1996, page 402: “As he was released from his [Nuremberg] cell, German police stepped forward and arrested him. A German court sentenced him to eight years’ imprisonment as a major offender under the denazification laws enacted by the Control Council in Berlin. He served two years in solitary confinement, and was eventually released in 1948. The world of banking absorbed him again as though there had never been a blemish on his character.”

Let's also recall from my article “Of Ostriches and Rebels on The Hard Road to World Order” what Professor Carroll Quigley had stated about Montagu Norman, and all the other governors of world's private central banks:

'The powers of financial capitalism had (a) far-reaching aim, nothing less than to create a world system of financial control in private hands able to dominate the political system of each country and the economy of the world as a whole. This system was to be controlled in a feudalist fashion by the central banks of the world acting in concert, by secret agreements arrived at in frequent meetings and conferences. The apex of the systems was to be the Bank for International Settlements in Basel, Switzerland; a private bank owned and controlled by the world's central banks which were themselves private corporations. Each central bank, in the hands of men like Montagu Norman of the Bank of England, Benjamin Strong of the New York Federal Reserve Bank, Charles Rist of the Bank of France, and Hjalmar Schacht of the Reichsbank, sought to dominate its government by its ability to control Treasury loans, to manipulate foreign exchanges, to influence the level of economic activity in the country, and to influence cooperative politicians by subsequent economic rewards in the business world.' (Carroll Quigley, Tragedy and Hope, 1966, Chapter 20, page 324)

'It must not be felt that these heads of the world's chief central banks were themselves substantive powers in world finance. They were not. Rather, they were the technicians and agents of the dominant investment bankers of their own countries, who had raised them up and were perfectly capable of throwing them down. The substantive financial powers of the world were in the hands of these investment bankers (also called “international” or “merchant” bankers) who remained largely behind the scenes in their own unincorporated private banks. These formed a system of international cooperation and national dominance which was more private, more powerful, and more secret than that of their agents in the central banks. This dominance of investment bankers was based on their control over the flows of credit and investment funds in their own countries and throughout the world.' (Carroll Quigley, Tragedy and Hope, 1966, Chapter 20, page 326)
Is it too rude to ask – that if Montagu Norman is merely among the “technicians and agents of the dominant investment bankers of their own countries”, then who is the dominant investment banker of England who has in fact controlled the Bank of England and the City at least since Waterloo?

Rothschild N. M. and Sons.

This is what they confirm of themselves today on their own website: Rothschild has been at the centre of the world's financial markets for over 200 years. Today, it provides Investment Banking, Corporate Banking and Private Banking & Trust services to governments, corporations and individuals worldwide. Baron David de Rothschild has already been quoted in the beginning of this article, proclaiming: 'We provide advice on both sides of the balance sheet, and we do it globally. ... We have had 250 years or so of family involvement in the finance business'

But here we shall just stick with Nuremberg for the moment.

Sir Montagu Norman, at the behest of the owners of the Bank of England, set one of their own criminal banksters free from the clutches of the hangman's noose. Those owners, both commonsense and force of logic suggests, commanded at least that much power which could trivially prevail upon all of the Military Tribunal members, except Russia who voted against it. Americans had lost 300,000 soldiers in that 'just war' against the axis powers, the United Kingdom had lost its empire along with its jewel in the crown, and Europe lay decimated, 6 million Jews exterminated – we won't quibble with the holocaust industry here – 20 million Russians butchered, and sum-total of 50 million human beings, mostly Christians, and most of them German civilians under the unspeakable fire-bombings of civilian cities by the Allies, lost their lives in the name of fighting the aggression initiated by the Nazis which was even termed “... the supreme international crime differing only from other war crimes in that it contains within itself the accumulated evil of the whole”.

Just watch the video of the closing speech of Robert Jackson condemning the Nazis (cited earlier). It was a superlative public relations Tribunal, because, it was utmost important for the United States of America, the emerging superpower from the ashes of World War II, to pontificate to the entire world its moral and military supremacy, and condemn the abhorrence of aggression of the Nazis as it was itself entering a new Cold War with the new enemy. Nuremberg was entirely about public relations. And the United States judges at Nuremberg wanted to make an outstanding example of the Nazi war machine and its bankster to demonstrate their own moral high grounds.

Despite all of these empirical motivations, those who controlled the Bank of England, call it Foundation-X for the lack of a better handle to refer to this non-existent power which none can see, could spring one of their own from the sure jaws of death?

This incontrovertible fact and its significance indicates the existence of a power which is superior to the combined power of the victorious allies of World War II.

So, the evidence of Hjalmar Schacht being set-free unequivocally demonstrates at least the existence of an elusive omnipotent power in 1946.

And we already know that this immense power also existed in 1917, when the Balfour Declaration was issued in its name (see Part-2).

Where did that amazing power, which was confirmed to exist in 1917 when it prevailed upon the British empire to grant the Zionists another's Balfour Declaration November 2nd 1917 - The land, and again in 1946 when it prevailed upon the British and American empires to grant of first-cause of Palestinian genocide in the Land the British and American empires to grant of Canaan is in the Name of a Rothschild and yet they don't know that name! Amnesty to their own arch enemy that had seen tens of millions of Christians dead, so suddenly vanish in the mere 60 years since?

Did the earth swallow it, did the sky absorb it, or was there an earthquake which sunk it? What happened to it?

In my experiments in confusion, I valiantly searched for such a catastrophic event which could have silently vanquished that Foundation-X which had existed only 60 years earlier.

I am sorry to report here that there is no known documentation existing on planet earth in the annals of public archives which records any such cataclysmic event where that elusive power could have disappeared. If one exists in secret classified archives, like aliens abducting them off the face of the planet, I do not possess such powers to access those classified documents, let alone unlock them of their public relations baggage. We shall just wait for Wikileaks to let us

know if UFO-Abduction is indeed that elusive cause of their sudden vanishing from the face of the earth. Julian Assange has already hinted: "it is worth noting that in yet-to-be-published parts of the cablegate archive there are indeed references to UFOs."

In the meantime, back here on earth outside the Plato's cave, by the sheer force of inevitable logic, I must rationally conclude that such a power, Foundation-X, still exists right here on earth. And, since I have also not found, despite vigorous search in libraries and on the web, any evidence that the Foundation-X ownership surreptitiously changed hands except from generation to generation within the same DNA cess-pool, and as admitted by the scions now wielding the baton themselves, then, whomsoever were the owners of Foundation-X in 1946, and in 1917, are still the owners today.

Casa de Rothschild!

Let me know if this sufficiently constitutes Jeff Blankfort's requirement for evidence: "if you have any direct evidence with unimpeachable sources that the Rothschilds are running everything" Now let me briefly examine the legal requirement for evidence in the United States. The following definition is excerpted from my Editorial: Some Dare Call it Conspiracy! Are you among them? April 19, 2009:

Conspiracy: "in law, agreement of two or more persons to commit a criminal or otherwise unlawful act. At common law, the crime of conspiracy was committed with the making of the agreement, but present-day statutes require an overt step by a conspirator to further the conspiracy. Other controversial aspects of conspiracy laws include the modification of the rules of evidence and the potential for a dragnet. A statement of a conspirator in furtherance of the conspiracy is admissible against all conspirators, even if the statement includes damaging references to another conspirator, and often even if it violates the rules against hearsay evidence. The conspiracy can be proved by circumstantial evidence. Any conspirator is guilty of any substantive crime committed by any other conspirator in furtherance of the enterprise. It is a federal crime to conspire to commit any activity prohibited by federal statute, whether or not Congress imposed criminal sanctions on the activity itself." -- Columbia Encyclopaedias.

Permit me to highlight the core legal standard in that passage with emphasis:

- 1) The conspiracy can be proved by circumstantial evidence.
- 2) Any conspirator is guilty of any substantive crime committed by any other conspirator in furtherance of the enterprise.
- 3) A statement of a conspirator in furtherance of the conspiracy is admissible against all conspirators, even if the statement includes damaging references to another conspirator, and often even if it violates the rules against hearsay evidence.

My goodness! The entire gang of banksters despite their web of control can be roped in even if one conspirator can be indicted. I have just demonstrated the corrupting power of the banker fraternity, and shown that the Casa de Rothschild exists today because it existed in 1917 and 1946 by the evidence of Balfour Declaration and Nuremberg Military Tribunals, respectively. This fraternity has such immense powers that it can legally enact Federal Statutes, like the Federal Reserve System of the United States, by having the American Congress enact their preferences into law. When such an extortion happens, the above artfully defined definitions of conspiracy become irrelevant. The law of the sovereign becomes the ultimate arbiter of what is crime and what is virtue, as aptly demonstrated by Saint Augustine of Hippo in the 4th century:

"When the King asked him what he meant by infesting the sea, the pirate defiantly replied: 'the same as you do when you infest the whole world; but because I do it with a little ship I am called

a robber, and because you do it with a great fleet, you are an emperor.” (The City of God against the Pagans, Page 148).

This modus operandi, of theft of public's wealth by legalism enactment by the sovereign, appears to be right out of the Protocols. Witness Protocol 1, items 3 through 5 which lend an empirical definition to the term “legal” when applied to control the masses:

3. It must be noted that men with bad instincts are more in number than the good, and therefore the best results in governing them are attained by violence and terrorisation, and not by academic discussions. Every man aims at power, everyone would like to become a dictator if only he could, and rare indeed are the men who would not be willing to sacrifice the welfare of all for the sake of securing their own welfare.

4. What has restrained the beasts of prey who are called men? What has served for their guidance hitherto?

5. In the beginnings of the structure of society, they were subjected to brutal and blind force; after words – to Law, which is the same force, only disguised. I draw the conclusion that by the law of nature right lies in force.

Based on insights gleaned from these contortions, especially item 5), if you can enact Federal Statutes and laws to protect your graft by wielding the hidden might of your indomitable force, then, there is no “conspiracy” in the legal terms because you did not violate any Federal Statutes! Isn't that just marvellous?

So, the House of Rothschilds, using their hired front men and political errand boys, backed by their interlocking interests in all the world's central banks, have protected themselves from that definition of Conspiracy by shrewdly employing the uber-Machiavellian Protocols!

But have they protected themselves from RICO?

See my editorial which contains an extended excerpt of laws from the late Eustace Mullins' 1985 book World Order, which could have potentially been used in earlier times.

I now believe that the accelerated pace towards world government today, under the complete co-option of all organs of state worldwide, makes the bankster fraternity almost immune by way of any legal recourse in the entire Western Hemisphere. They might occasionally sacrifice a red herring errand boy here and there at the altar of reform to keep the plebeians happy, if it ever came to that! These are the ultimate UNTOUCHABLES! No one can even see them.

I hope that between Part-2 and Part-3 of this series of my goyish attempts at independent thinking, there is sufficient grounds for courageous moral Jews like Mr. Jeffrey Blankfort to finally perceive their own brethren – the King of the Jews – who have bestowed upon Zionistan its creation. Its ethos. Its “iron wall” that none can breach. Their full spectrum interlocking control of the world's private central banks continually enables them to implement their own two centuries old familial boast “give me control of a nation's money supply and I care not who makes its laws” with such brazen impunity that it is almost always accompanied by the thunderous applause of European and American goy statesmen and law makers. The King of the Jews have inflicted upon the entire Jewish peoples a calumny that the Jews shall not be able to outlive even if they exist for another 3000 years! See: From Genesis to Genocide in Palestine : The Golem Is Not Jewish!. The following sentiment barely captures it:

'If fair punishments are ever to be awarded for their crimes against humanity for just the past 100 years in any Just court of law, Adolph Eichmann would have to be retroactively let go by resurrecting his soul from his grave with high honours and awarded multiple peace prizes plus

compensation, in order to administer hanging and extraction of restitution as the graduated scale of ultimate punishment for the ultimate prime-movers of all wars and pestilence before which their errand boys' and patsies' crimes against humanity pale in comparison.' --- <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2009/11/rescuing-thestruggle-for-palestine.html>

All persons of any faith (or no faith) not entirely consumed by depravity, apathy, Faustian pacts, and if I might be so bold as to emphatically add, pious hypocrisy, should have no qualms calling a spade a spade. What prevents one from doing so, is suggested in my pamphlet: How To Return to Palestine This Day Forward.

What can one do about it today? Practicably nothing, as suggested in: “Of Ostriches and Rebels on The Hard Road to World Order”.

But I pray that I am mistaken, that Machiavellian political science and infinitely deep pockets of the oligarchy exuded through their tax exempt foundations, private central banks, income tax levied upon masses, and national debt levied upon nations – an inflexion of power which can bring combined superpowers to their knees – can straightforwardly be trumped by copious narratives of dissent chiefs and plebeians' abundant prayers!

Thank you, ladies and gentlemen of the jury.

Source: <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2010/12/my-confusion-pt3-omnipotent-rothschilds.html>

From: Project Humanbeingsfirst.org
To: Jeffrey Blankfort
Wed, Nov 10, 2010 at 7:51 PM

Dear Jeff,
Hello.

I am not sure that you would necessarily care to know my opinion – but I thought I'd forward you the following letter nevertheless. It is a short communication to an MIT co-alum who had asked me for my opinion of your recent interview (Jeffrey Blankfort: Chomsky misfires on US-Israel relations — By Kathleen Wells on November 4, 2010).

Just as you observe in your interview of others who don't seem to [perceive] some other daylights, my own take is similar, that “It's like the monkey: see no evil, hear no evil, speak no evil.” ...
With Best wishes, Zahir

Forwarded message
From: Project Humanbeingsfirst.org
Date: Wed, 10 Nov 2010

I finally got some time to read the interview – and read almost half-way through until I got bored. Mr. Blankfort is both perceptive and accurate, as far as he goes. I learnt some interesting factoids in it, like He is Jewish, that he had joined AIPAC, etc.

I admire Mr. Blankfort all the more for his standing up to what is right and moral irrespective of his own tribal affiliation, and his not giving in to expediencies and abhorrent political realities on the ground. The latter argument is Noam Chomsky's forte, and my good professor has made them time and again, all of which I have deconstructed in considerable depth in my 2007 essay “The endless trail of red herrings”.

More pertinent to your inquiry however of what I thought of this interview, the issue of the Jewish Lobby in the United States – which Professor James Petras itemized here:

<http://atlanticfreepress.com/news/1/13763-james-petras-phd-the-state-and-local-bases-of-zionist-power-in-america.html>

and this was my letter to Professor Petras for the energies he spent compiling his excellent list:
<http://bloghumanbeingsfirst.wordpress.com/2010/09/08/zahirs-response-to-james-petras-the-state-and-local-bases-of-zionist-power-in-america/>

James Petras' list includes only a subset of the hundreds of Jewish organizations throughout the world, and almost all the national and international level think-tanks along the Hudson and the Potomac, not to forget Hollywood/newsmedia moguls, nor the average Jewish person who is suckled on the mother's milk of Zionism since birth which creates that tribalism that Mr. Blankfort mentions.

For my take on the Jewish Lobby's efforts for Zionism – the root cause – please see the first portion of this article:

<http://bloghumanbeingsfirst.wordpress.com/2009/10/16/at-what-cost-the-israel-lobby-its-only-an-errand-boy-by-zahir-ebrahim/>

How comes Europe succumbs to the same pressures as the United States?

What is the common prime-mover?

Blankfort is silent. I am not.

The difficulty is that Mr. Blankfort's silence is more meaningful and instrumental than my loquaciousness because I am an unknown, whereas Blankfort is nationally and perhaps internationally known.

But I seek truth wherever I can find it – perhaps because I belong to the 'untermenschen' class bearing the brunt of “imperial mobilization”. And all the Jewish exponents of truth that I have ever met, including who take bullets to their head to uphold decency and morality, directly affiliate with the civilization bringing us “imperial mobilization”:

<http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2010/03/davidicke-rothschild-connection-zionism.html>

And here is a letter I had written Mr. Blankfort:

<http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2010/07/let-jeffblankfort-rothschilds-palestine.html>

And the following outlines my thoughts on how to deal with Zionism, as activists, with Mens et

Manus:

<http://humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/p/pamphlet-how-to-return-to-palestine.html>

Best regards,
Zahir.

--- --- ---

From: Jeffrey Blankfort

To: Project Humanbeingsfirst.org

Wed, Nov 10, 2010 at 10:52 PM

Dear Zahir,

I do not mention the Rothschilds because I have yet to see a single shred of evidence that they control the world's money supply, the CFR, or anything else of such substance as to influence the way the world works. As far as I can tell whereas once members of the Rothschild banking family ran the banks of Western Europe, I see no evidence that they do so today. There are a number of other Jewish bankers who have surpassed them in influence and if the Rothschilds were as powerful today as you claim them to be, there would be some kind of trail to find at least a hint of what they have been doing.

I have a number of personal suppositions about how and why certain things have happened but if you read what I say and write I am always able to document my claims. In my radio program today, I explained in brief how the Balfour Declaration was the payment to the Zionists for their having succeeded in bringing the US into World War One at a time when the British were about to lose and I provide unimpeachable documentation for that statement. It is one of the most important buried pieces of the puzzle that most advocates for Palestinian justice have ignored.

Here is the link: <http://www.radio4all.net/index.php/program/4702>

1

In my interview I spoke only about the Zionist operations in the US because they are far and away the most important but I am more than aware of their activities in the UK with all the major parties as well as in France, Italy and Germany. It is their money combined with their organization, plus the fact that there is no serious political opposition that enables what I call the Ziontern (Zionist International) to have its way. As in the US, most Palestinian and pro-Palestinian groups are hesitant to take on the Ziontern internationally or in their own backyard because they are either dominated by or intimidated by what Gilad Atzmon first identified as "Jewish tribalists," who while they may be genuinely anti-zionist are as ready and willing to shield Jews from collective blame for their crimes against the Palestinians and Lebanese as any Zionist. These are the folks who routinely attack me on their blogs when I expose their hero, Chomsky.

Again, if you have any direct evidence with unimpeachable sources that the Rothschilds are running everything or for that matter anything behind the scenes I would appreciate receiving it but lacking that up to now, I never mention their name apart from Walter Rothschild being the recipient of the Balfour Declaration. It was Judge Louis Brandeis, however, an American Jew, who apparently was the one who convinced Woodrow Wilson to break his vow to the American people to go to war. And it was Edward Bernays, Freud's nephew and the father of modern propaganda who devised the campaign to get Americans willing to support the war.

Finally, I support BDS, not because that is the ideal tool for international organizing against the Zionists but that given the relative little strength we have as a group, it is the only means at the moment that has a chance of getting anywhere. Here, in the US, I would like to see campaigns exposing every member of Congress who has sworn their loyalty to Israel, be they Jewish or not, but I don't see that happening. Even at Al-Awda conferences, there is a tendency to stay away from discussing such political activity.

Yours,

Jeff

--- --- ---

From: Project Humanbeingsfirst.org

To: Jeffrey Blankfort

Thu, Nov 11, 2010 at 12:41 PM

Thank you mon ami for your reply. I will compose a thoughtful reply later... regards, zahir.

--- --- ---

Appendix The BDS Red Herring

“Finally, I support BDS, not because that is the ideal tool for international organizing against the Zionists but that given the relative little strength we have as a group, it is the only means at the moment that has a chance of getting anywhere.” -- Jeffrey Blankfort in his letter to Zahir Ebrahim

April 15, 2011

Preamble

My following comment on BDS, made in March of 2010 to the article “Leaked Zionist strategy Paper to counter BDS” (PDF cached here) on the now defunct website Palestinethinktank.com, is archived below. Its accuracy is testified by the unchallenged rise of the Jews only State of Israel as the new ruling state of the West, and perhaps the world in a one-world government. A ruling state cannot be dictated to by other nations, but it can and does dictate to other nations, including to the world's sole superpower! Does the Jewsonly State of Israel fit that bill?

This new ruling state exudes power throughout both hemispheres through many proxy arrangements. It, in turn, is controlled by those who own the world's major financial institutions. These oligarchs select presidents and prime ministers of the world's nations from behind the scenes as puppet masters, mobilize or neutralize the public by their control of the world's mass media, and enact war and peace making events to suit their own timetables. These rulers of the world were explored in my Confusion Series in the context of Israel in part-1, part-2, and part-3. Anyone wishing to confront the abhorrence of the new up and coming ruling state of the world would surely be wise to examine its elusive and impenetrable power-base which is examined therein.

The deconstruction of the ineffectiveness of BDS noted below remains unchallenged by empiricism in which it is solely rooted. BDS is evidently yet another “collection agency” like most of Western dissent, to gather the energies of conscionable peoples into good solid runs on the treadmills of inefficacy. While activists feel content patting themselves on their back on how great their movements are, systematic new realities are constructed on the ground by “history's actors” which subsequently cannot be reversed nor rolled back. Useful idiots blindly jumping on the bandwagon of BDS are many, thoughtful people rather few. And that's why the rulers win!

They win because, as some statistics suggest, less than 2% people in the public actually think, 8% think they think, and 90% would not be caught dead thinking. The rulers just love to throw crumbs of plausible effectiveness through their own fabricated opposition, just like they throw crumbs of plausible deniability through fabricated cover stories, and create many side shows to occupy men and women of conscience lest some end up focussing their considerable energies and inventiveness on those factors which can actually alter imperial faits accomplis before they can transpire.

This concept of fait accompli is evidently most poorly understood by even the uber learned pied pipers of dissent. Here is a senior White House Advisor explaining it to the New York Times correspondent for those who only learn wisdom from the podiums of power:

“We're an empire now, and when we act, we create our own reality. And while you're studying that reality -- judiciously, as you will -- we'll act again, creating other new realities, which you can study too, and that's how things will sort out. We're history's actors . . . and you, all of you, will be left to just study what we do.” (Ron Suskind, New York Times, Oct. 17, 2004)

And here is Ariel Sharon, former prime minister of Israel, explaining it to Winston S. Churchill III:

'Winston S. Churchill III, grandson of the famed British prime minister, recalled last October at the National Press Club here a telling encounter he had had in 1973 with the hawkish Ariel Sharon, now the Israeli prime minister, about Zionist objectives. "What is to become of the Palestinians?" Churchill asked. "We'll make a pastrami sandwich of them," Sharon said. Churchill responded, "What?" "Yes, we'll insert a strip of Jewish settlements in between the Palestinians, and then another strip of Jewish settlements right across the West Bank, so that in 25 years' time, neither the United Nations nor the United States, nobody, will be able to tear it apart.'" (cited in Zahir Ebrahim, *Rescuing a Failed Struggle From Its Narratives*, November 2009)

Project Humanbeingsfirst.org on March 11th, 2010 at 20:12:

Hi – how was this position paper leaked?

In concept, it is not too dissimilar to the publicly available document discussed here previously by Paul J Balles, bringing knowledge of The Israel Lobby's Global Propaganda Manual to us. I subsequently could easily download the TIP report's PDF from the publicly available source-website and enjoyed reading all its 116 pages. It was not a secret. Why is this one? What does "leaked" mean for this document?

What is so shocking, or even revealing in it? To warn them to watch what they say (and not what they do)?:

"No Israeli should feel compelled to change their politics, no matter what Chomsky and Finkelstein would choose to do. But ALL Israelis should watch their language, understanding that false Nazi/Apartheid/ Racism analogies feed Israel's harshest enemies, who wish to wipe out the state."!

Give me a break – when Zionistan can bomb and kill and burn men women and children with impunity in front of the entire world's powerless spectating eyes, when every Western statesman from the Queen to the President pays homage to them, especially their visit on Israel's 60th birthday bash while their own Bibles were being burnt downtown, and when their sugar-daddy owns/controls all the Western world's central banks thus controlling their national/supra-national laws, someone expects me to believe that Israel is afraid of the BIDS?

Ever hear of a "limited hangout", the "hegelian mind fck", and "red herrings"?

Someone may well be laughing up there in the darkened rooms of the Knesset, and at the BIS, puffing on their cigars.

Not to suggest that conscientious people shouldn't try with whatever means at their disposal to check and counter state-tyranny upon a beleaguered peoples. But also to not forget that to keep dissent and opposition deluded as useful idiots and kept running on treadmills is a key element of political science based statecraft – one that wages wars by way of deception. A fabricated Israeli opposition to the ineffectual BIDS reinforces the belief among the innocent and the pious that it is an existential threat to Israel.

So let us analyse this BDS threat to Israel. Threats are a calculus – not a linear equation. There are variables which scale in different dimensions with each other. Akin more to operations research and game theory than any simple formulaic prescription. The calculus of threat and its mitigation deals in probabilities, and pushing odds of the preferred outcome overwhelmingly in one's favour.

So someone who has looked at BDS closely, as well as studied Israel's overall assets in the world – from people to banks to laws – kinda help me out here. Please put up a seed analysis of why BDS is of any real empirical consequence to Israel (as opposed to some philosopher's theoretical one)? That, why is the above "leaked" document anything other than a red herring, a psyops to get conscionable people to ineffectively pursue what's not of any real consequence – as they have all along been doing for the past 60 years? In 2007, Uri Avnery wrote an interesting article titled "Facing Mecca", to which I had written a response – it is here:

<http://humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2007/03/endless-red-herrings.html>

I could be wrong, and this may not be a red herring. "Show me" – as they might say in Missouri, that this "leaked document" is not a Mighty Wurlitzer's piece.

Just FYI, Fletcher Prouty in his book "Secret Team" observed the following. Great for introducing red herrings, "cognitive diversity", and variations on "limited hangout" by the Mighty Wurlitzer: "There is another category of writer and self-proclaimed authority on the subjects of secrecy, intelligence, and containment. This man is the suave, professional parasite who gains a reputation as a real reporter by disseminating the scraps and "Golden Apples" thrown to him by the great men who use him. This writer seldom knows and rarely cares that many of the scraps from which he draws his material have been planted, that they are controlled leaks, and that he is being used, and glorified as he is being used, by the inside secret intelligence community.

Allen Dulles had a penchant for cultivating a number of such writers with big names and inviting them to his table for a medieval style luncheon in that great room across the hall from his own offices in the old CIA headquarters on the hill overlooking Foggy Bottom. Here, he would discuss openly and all too freely the same subjects that only hours before had been carefully discussed in the secret inner chambers of the operational side of that quiet Agency. In the hands of Allen Dulles, "secrecy" was simply a chameleon device to be used as he saw fit and to be applied to lesser men according to his schemes. It is quite fantastic to find people like Daniel Ellsberg being charged with leaking official secrets simply because the label on the piece of paper said "top secret," when the substance of many of the words written on those same papers was patently untrue and no more than a cover story. Except for the fact that they were official lies, these papers had no basis in fact, and therefore no basis to be graded top secret or any other degree of classification. Allen Dulles would tell similar cover stories to his coterie of writers, and not long thereafter they would appear in print in some of the most prestigious papers and magazines in the country, totally unclassified, and of course, cleverly untrue.

In every case, the chance for complete information is very small, and the hope that in time researchers, students, and historians will be able to ferret out truth from untruth, real from unreal, and story from cover story is at best a very slim one. Certainly, history teaches us that one truth will add to and enhance another; but let us not forget that one lie added to another lie will demolish everything. This is the important point. Consider the past half century. How many major events — really major events — have there been that simply do not ring true? How many times has the entire world been shaken by alarms of major significance, only to find that the events either did not happen at all, or if they did, that they had happened in a manner quite unlike the original story?'

Here is a note on the Mighty Wurlitzer:

<http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2009/05/note-on-mighty-wurlitzer.html>

Thanks.
Zahir Ebrahim

Project Humanbeingsfirst.org

The Language of Zionism

Response to 'Joseph Massad – The Language of Zionism'

Preamble

My comment to Joseph Massad, a Palestinian professor of Middle Eastern Studies at Columbia University, made in May 2010 for his article "The Language of Zionism" (PDF cached here) on the now defunct website Palestinethinktank.com, is archived below. It once again illustrates how the Palestinians have themselves become a victim of their own narratives. They miss by a mile while the golem is barely half a furlong from the finish line.

Project Humanbeingsfirst.org on May 9th, 2010 at 2:09:
On the conclusion of the article:

"After 62 years of persistent Israeli colonialism of Palestine, unless President Obama and Israeli leaders understand that colonialism is war and anti-colonialism is peace and that the only viable state project in the area would be one that encompasses all Palestinians and Israeli Jews as equal citizens in it, whatever "peace plan" they offer to the Palestinians will be nothing short of a war plan."

I would add that Edward Said stated exactly the same thing in "The Mirage of Peace", October 16, 1995 in The Nation: "These two communities must be seen as equal to each other in rights and expectations;"

The fact that JM has to repeat it 15 years later and the reality on the ground is orders of magnitude worse only indicts the "N" among the Palestinians themselves. The "C" are rather constant in their nature, since time immemorial.

First, here is an Excerpt from Said:

"The deep tragedy of Palestine is that a whole people, their history and aspirations have been under comprehensive assault—not only by Israel (with the United States) but also by the Arab governments and, since Oslo, by Arafat...."

I do not pretend to have any quick solutions for the situation now referred to as "the peace process," but I do know that for the vast majority of Palestinian refugees, day laborers, peasants and town and camp dwellers, those who cannot make a quick deal and those whose voices are never heard, for them the process has made matters far worse. Above all, they may have lost hope....

I have been particularly disheartened by the role played in all this by liberal Americans, Jewish and non-Jewish alike. Silence is not a response, and neither is some fairly tepid endorsement of a Palestinian state, with Israeli settlements and the army more or less still there, still in charge. The peace process must be demystified and spoken about plainly. Palestine/Israel is no ordinary bit of geography; it is more saturated in religious, historical and cultural significance than any place on earth. It is also now the place where two peoples, whether they like it or not, live together tied by history, war, daily contact and suffering. To speak only in geopolitical clichés (as the Clinton Administration does) or to speak about "separating" them (as Rabin does) is to call forth more violence and degradation. These two communities must be seen as equal to each other in rights and expectations; only from such a beginning can justice then proceed."

On the central theme of the article, I would contend that Hitler had exactly the same language semantics of Zionism for his Nazism; and that the language of Zionism today is not any different

from America's own language of "American Peace" employed by both PNAC in "Rebuilding America's Defenses" and by Brzezinski in "American Primacy and Its Geostrategic Imperatives". Here are some pertinent excerpts:

“Hegemony is as old as mankind. ... The earlier empires were built by aristocratic political elites and were in most cases ruled by essentially authoritarian or absolutist regimes. The bulk of the populations of the imperial states were either politically indifferent, ... or infected by imperialist emotions ...a quest for national glory, 'the white man's burden', 'la mission civilisatrice', not to speak of the opportunities for personal profit – all served to mobilize support for imperial adventures to sustain essentially hierarchical imperial power pyramids. The attitude of American public toward the external projection of American power has been more ambivalent. ... Public opinion polls conducted in 1995 – 1996 indicated a general public preference for 'sharing' power with others, rather than for its monopolistic exercise. ... It is also a fact that America is too democratic at home to be autocratic abroad. This limits the use of America's power, especially its capacity for military intimidation. ... Public opinion polls suggest that only a small minority (13 percent) of Americans favor the proposition that 'as the sole remaining superpower, the US should continue to be the preeminent world leader in solving international problems'. ... Moreover, as America becomes an increasingly multicultural society, it may find it more difficult to fashion a consensus on foreign policy issues, except in the circumstance of a truly massive and widely perceived direct external threat. More generally, cultural change in America may also be uncongenial to the sustained exercise abroad of genuinely imperial power. That exercise requires a high degree of doctrinal motivation, intellectual commitment, and patriotic gratification. ... In brief, the U.S. Policy goals must be un-apologetically twofold: to perpetuate America's own dominant position for at least a generation and preferably longer, ... the ultimate objective of American policy should be benign and visionary: to shape a truly cooperative global community.” (Brzezinski in *The Grand Chessboard*)

“As long as wars and other military operations derive their logic from political purposes, land power will remain the truly decisive form of military power. ... In sum the ability to preserve American military preeminence in the future will rest in increasing measure on the ability to operate in space militarily. ... But over the long term, maintaining control of space will inevitably require the application of force both in space and from space, including but not limited to antimissile defences ... Cyberspace, or 'Net-War' If outer space represents an emerging medium of warfare, then “cyberspace”, and in particular the Internet hold similar promise and threat. And as with space, access to and use of cyberspace and the Internet are emerging elements of global commerce, politics and power play. Any nation wishing to assert itself globally must take account of this other new “global commons”. ... there nonetheless will remain an imperative to be able to deny America and its allies' enemies the ability to disrupt or paralyse either the military's or the commercial sector's computer networks. Conversely, an offensive capability could offer America's military and political leaders an invaluable tool in disabling an adversary in a decisive manner.

Taken together, the prospects for space and “cyberspace war” represent the truly revolutionary potential inherent in the notion of military transformation. These future forms of warfare are technologically immature, to be sure. But, it is also clear that for the U.S. Armed forces to remain preeminent and avoid an Achilles Heel in the exercise of its power they must be sure that these potential future forms of warfare favour America just as today's air, land and sea warfare reflect United States military dominance. Until the process of transformation is treated as an enduring military mission – worthy of constant allocation of dollars and forces – it will remain stillborn. ... Further, the process of transformation, even if it brings revolutionary change, is likely to be a long one, absent some catastrophic and catalysing event – like a new Pearl Harbour” (PNAC *Rebuilding America's Defences* pages 51-61)

“The Price of American Preeminence: The program we advocate – one that would provide America with forces to meet the strategic demands of the world's sole superpower – requires

budget levels to be increased to 3.5 to 3.8 percent of the GDP... We believe it is necessary to increase slightly the personnel strength of U.S. Forces – many of the missions associated with patrolling the expanding American security perimeter are manpower-intensive, and planning for major heater wars must include for politically decisive campaigns ... Also this expanding perimeter argues for new overseas bases and forward operating locations to facilitate American political and military operations around the world. ... Keeping the American peace requires the U.S. Military to undertake a broad array of missions today and rise to very different challenges tomorrow, but there can be no retreat from these missions without compromising American leadership and the benevolent order it secures.” (PNAC Rebuilding America's Defenses pages 74-76)

“[...] We are in danger of squandering the opportunity and failing the challenge. We are living off the capital — both the military investments and the foreign policy achievements — built up by past administrations. Cuts in foreign affairs and defense spending, inattention to the tools of statecraft, and inconstant leadership are making it increasingly difficult to sustain American influence around the world.

[...] We seem to have forgotten the essential elements of the Reagan Administration's success: a military that is strong and ready to meet both present and future challenges; a foreign policy that boldly and purposefully promotes American principles abroad; and national leadership that accepts the United States' global responsibilities.

[...] we need to accept responsibility for America's unique role in preserving and extending an international order friendly to our security, our prosperity, and our principles. Such a Reaganite policy of military strength and moral clarity may not be fashionable today. But it is necessary if the United States is to build on the successes of this past century and to ensure our security and our greatness in the next.”

[...] we need to promote the cause of political and economic freedom abroad;” (PNAC Statement of Principles)

Just look at the last sentences of the passages, and words like 'moral clarity' and 'political and economic freedom abroad', to reflect the benevolence of hegemony in the language of 'American peace' and the 'benevolent order it secures.':

"the ultimate objective of American policy should be benign and visionary: to shape a truly cooperative global community"

"Keeping the American peace requires the U.S. Military to undertake a broad array of missions today and rise to very different challenges tomorrow, but there can be no retreat from these missions without compromising American leadership and the benevolent order it secures."

Are they much different from the language of Zionism?

I am too lazy to dig out my William Shirer or the Nuremberg transcripts. It is too well known that Hitler perfected the mantra of "preemptive war" for maintaining the "German peace" in his extended Lebensraum.

I contend that the Palestinain elite's psychological cataracts cannot be due to mere language mis-translation of the "language of Zionism" – that language resemantification is quite standard fare, and "as old as mankind". And "Colonialism is peace; anti-colonialism is war" has been the language of all ubermensch since time immemorial. Zionism didn't invent it. I find the following unraveling of it which is almost 1600 years old and surely none is unfamiliar with it, revealing: “When the King asked him what he meant by infesting the sea, the pirate defiantly replied: 'the same as you do when you infest the whole world; but because I do it with a little ship I am called

a robber, and because you do it with a great fleet, you are an emperor.'” (The City of God against the Pagans, Page 148).

What the commonality in the aforementioned excerpts also show is that the struggle against Zionism is futile by itself. The struggle against the ubermenschen's penchance for Lebensraum needs to be both understood and waged in the context of the singular noun "Hectoring Hegemon" to be effective. If people can only comprehend that, then the hectoring hegemon's common shared agenda, and common prime-movers: the common financiers and common thinkers, automatically come into focus.

The Zionist enemy is aided and abetted by an "invisible force" today as a crucial link in a chain of the quest for "full spectrum dominance" for a "Zion that will light up all the world", and that's the real problem of beleaguered Palestine.

A problem of accurate diagnosis. Not a problem of mis-translating a language that is as old as empire.



**THE NEW CHRISTIAN CRUSADE
CHURCH**

CALLING THE PEOPLE OF BRITAIN

At last the bible makes sense!

At last we know its meaning.

Its the book of the RACE

**"For out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the
Word of the Lord from Jerusalem"
(Isaiah 2:3)."**

