

# Genesis Of A People

March 25, 2021 Category: History, Religion

Download as PDF

*[Author's Note: This is the third in my "Dubious Origins" trilogy. The first pertained to Islam (Genesis Of A Holy Book); the second pertained to Christianity (Genesis Of A Church). This essay pertains to Judaism (Genesis Of A People). Hence the central conceit of the three major Abrahamic religions. This series illustrates that the object of fetishization can be textual, institutional, or tribal; and that fetishism of some sort undergirds all cult activity.]*

The genealogy by which "Jewish" and "Hebrew" are touted as ethnic demarcations is spurious. As Shlomo Sand points out in "The Invention of the Jewish People", there was never any distinct haplo-group that might be considered "Hebrew" / "Jewish" as a function of direct ancestral lineage.

Let's start with the etymology of "Jew[ish]". The term is an Anglicized version of the Old French "giu", which was derived from the Gaulish "juieu", which was derived from the Latin "Iudaeus", which was derived from the Koine Greek "Ioudaios", a variation on the Aramaic "Ya-hud[a]i", meaning people of "Yehud"...which designated the tribe / kingdom of Judah (alt. those from the land of Judea). {5}

The term "Yehud" comes from the Old Aramaic moniker for the Aramaean city-state of Sam'al (located in northern Syria during the early 1st millennium B.C.) at what is now referred to as "Zinjerli"...which, as it so happens, is alternately rendered "Ya'udi". (!) It makes sense that there may have been onomastic conflation. After all, the Aramaeans ["Ahlamu"] intermixed with the Amorites—as well as with other Canaanites. Indeed, the Book of Isaiah (65:11) states that Judeans were known to have worshipped the Aramaean god of fortune, Gad. And some even shared the godhead, Hadad. (Never mind the fact that "El" seems to have been inspired by the Canaanite godhead, "Ba'al".) Sure enough: "Ya'udi" is found in a (Phoenician) inscription on the Kilamuwa Stele from the 9th century B.C. This was likely a reference to the godhead of Sam'al. His name: "Ya'u".

The transition for monolatry to monotheism seems to finally occur in the Book of Isaiah.

Hence the term "Yehudi[m]" in Hebrew for one of two things: someone of Jewish lineage or a practitioner of Judaism. This dual semiotic has proven to be the source of confusion, as a racial demarcation and a religious demarcation are two different things. Nevertheless, the two are often conflated by dint of a shared rubric (I topic I explore in "A Semantic Bait And Switch" forthwith).

It might be further inquired: On what might have the Aramaic term, "Y'hudai" been based? As it turns out, the godhead of the Aramaean city-state of Sam'al (later known as "Zinjerli") was "Ya'u". This explains why the Old Aramaic moniker for that city was "Ya'udi". This is attested by the Kilamuwa Stele from the 9th century B.C. (which used Phoenician script, on which Classical Hebrew would later be based). And as mentioned above, the Hebrew name for the Abrahamic deity ("Y-H-W-H") was likely derived from the godhead of the Shasu.

So what, then, of the term, "Hebrew"? This is a variation on a moniker coined by the Amorites ["Amurru"]. Notably, the Amarna letters of the 14th century B.C. (diplomatic correspondences between the Egyptian rulers and their vassals in Canaan), which refer to a group of people known as the "Habiru"—who seem to have originated from the ancient city-state of Alalakh; and may have been related to the Mitanni peoples.

Originally, the moniker did not refer to an ethnic group, or even to followers of a distinct Faith. Rather, it seems to have referred to nomadic bandits who were not considered subjects of the kingdom (possibly corresponding to the “Shasu”). In fact, “Habiru” was used throughout the 2nd millennium B.C. to refer to—as it were—outsiders.

Only later was the moniker put in service of the (fatuous) ideation of a “chosen people”—that is: a delimited group, elected by the Abrahamic deity, and delineated by patriarchal bloodlines. Thus “Hebrew” was rendered an (endonymic) ethnonym for self-serving purposes. (In other words: The ideation emerged in Judaic lore as a synonym for “Israelite”.) According to this fanciful etiology: Even as the Shasu may have been their progenitors, “Hebrews” are descendants of [h]Eber, great-grandson of Noah’s son, Shem (ergo Shem-ites; a.k.a. “Semites”). {4}

“[h]Ebru” derives from the early Semitic term, “Habiru” (used by the Assyrians) for a group of nomadic Canaanites who worshipped a godhead named “Y-H-W-H”...likely corresponding to the “Shasu”. But what is the account for the moniker, “Hebrew” in Judaic lore? As the story goes: Shem begat Arphakshad, who begat Shela[c]h [alt. “Salah”], who begat (h)Eber—who’s name would serve as the basis for the Koine Greek rendering, “Hebraios”. (Shem’s other son, Aram, is considered the progenitor of the Arameans.)

It is telling that when Saul of Tarsus penned his letter to a community of Jews, the missive came to be known as the epistle addressed to the “Hebrews”: an ethnic designation rather than a religious designation. During the Middle Ages, instead of (h)Eber-ite, the term was rendered “(h)Eber-ew”. This is an etymological quirk that can be explained by the antecedent Semitic moniker, “Habiru”. This semantic mutation attained in Judaic literature even though the ethnic designation (as self-identification) remains the equivalent of Abram-ite (descendants of Abraham).

According to Judaic lore, those who were traditionally designated as “Hebrew” (qua ethnic group) were exclusively the ancestors of (h)Eber’s son, Peleg. Even more exclusively: they were held to be descendants of Isaac’s son, Jacob (a.k.a. “Yisra-El”). (This is an irony, as Isaac’s favored son was Esau; and Jacob only seized the mantle of patriarch through deception.) So the lineage thereafter is based on a **STOLEN BIRTHRIGHT**. (For more on Jacob as “Yisra-El”, see my essay on “The Land Of Purple”.)

Meanwhile, (h)Eber’s other son, Yoktan, begat the Sabaeans (who hailed from the African horn (“Saba”; later referred to as “Abyssinia”). They were **NOT** chosen...even though they were technically Hebrew (qua Eberites). {6}

To complicate things, the (Hijazi) people of “A[a]d” [later re-named “Thamud”] are alleged to have been descendants of Eber as well, thereby making western Arabians (including, eventually, Qurayshis) Hebrew (insofar as they are descendants of [h]Eber). Unsurprisingly, in spite of this, Hijazis were not included within the demarcated “chosen” tribes of Judaic lore (as they were fashioned as “Ishmaelite”, the progeny of Abraham’s banished son, Ishmael). Such a genealogical snafu is usually glossed over in **BOTH** Mohammedan and Judeo-Christian lore.

Note that the lineage from Shem proceeds thus: Arpha[c]hshad to Shela[c]h to [h]Eber to Peleg...who sired Re’u via Lomna of Shinar [Babylonia]. Then Re’u to Serug to Na[c]hor to Tera[c]h...who was the father of Abraham (as well as of [h]Aran and Na[c]hor II).

Other Semitic peoples (Shem-ites) who were **NOT** seen as “chosen” included:

- **Amalekites:** descendants of Esau ben Isaac’s grandson, Amalek (by way of Esau’s son, El-i-faz’s union with the Horite maiden, Timna). They hailed from the Negev (the southern-most part of the

Levant); and were also associated with the progenitors of the Arabs. At the request of the Abrahamic deity, Joshua exterminated them.

- **Elamites:** descendants of Shem's other son, Elam—who hailed from south-western Persia; and presumably accounted for the Guti and/or Medes (or, later, the Achaemenids). (There was no account of the Manneans in the north.)
- **Sumerians / Chaldeans:** descendants of Arpa[c]hshad—who hailed from Babylon
- **Assyrians:** descendants of Ashur—who hailed from Nineveh
- **Ammonites and Moabites:** Lot was the son of the above-mentioned [h]Aran ben Tera[c]h (Abraham's brother). His descendants, borne by incest with his daughters, hailed from Gilead (Ammon in the northern part, Moab in the southern part). {6}
- **Midianites:** descendants of Midian, son of Abraham via his Egyptian concubine, Keturah. They dwelled in Midian, which corresponded with southern Nabataea and the Hijaz.
- **Aramaeans:** descendants of Aram—who hailed from northeastern Levant. They were alternately said to have been the progeny of Na[c]hor II's son, Beth-u-El [house of god] of Nahrma (sired via [h]Aran's daughter)...who was, in turn, father of Rebekah of Nahrma (a.k.a. "Rebecca", wife of Isaac, and mother of Jacob / "Israel"). As this alternate account goes: Beth-u-El's son, Laban, yielded the people of "Padan-Aram" [Aramaic for "Field of Aram"].
- **Kederites** (i.e. Arabians / Sabaeans): descendants of Ishmael, son of Abraham via his wife's Egyptian handmaiden, Hagar—who hailed from the further reaches of Mesopotamia and Arabia.
- **Edomites** (Idumeans): descendants of Isaac's favored (though inadvertently rejected) son, Esau—who hailed from southern Levant (northern Nabataea). {7}

Descendants of Noah's other son, Yapheth (the "Japhetites") were associated with the Caucasians and other Indo-European peoples. {8} The most salient lineages proceeded from Yapheth's eldest son, Gomer (ally of Gog, and sometimes associated with the Cimmerians / Sarmatians). The Gomerites (who hailed from the farthest reaches of Asia Minor and beyond, past Urartu in the Armenian highlands, into the Eurasian Steppes) were divided according to the progeny of Gomer's three sons:

- **Ashkenaz** came to be considered Jewish even though they were not Shem-ites, simply by dint of the fact that they adopted Judaism as a religion in the Middle Ages. Originating in the Pontic Steppes these Turkic peoples (i.e. the [k]Hazars) would end up settling in eastern Europe. (For more on this, see my essay: "The Forgotten Diaspora".)
- **Riphath** yielded the (non-chosen) Paphlagonians / Galatians of northern Anatolia.
- **Togarmah** yielded the (non-chosen) Thracians, Phrygians, Armenians, Georgians, and various Turkic peoples (e.g. the Avars and Huns)

So according to this taxonomy, Arabs are Hebrew while Ashkenazi Jews aren't even Semitic, let alone Hebrew. (Good grief!) {9}

Descendants of Noah's disgraced son, Ham (the "Ham-ites") were associated with anyone who was black. The racist view that Africans were "cursed" with dark skin due to the "curse of Ham" is a hold-over from this odious Biblical categorization. Non-chosen tribes via Ham (a.k.a. "Ham-ites") included:

- **Kushites**, who hailed from Nubia and Abyssinia (alt. Aksum; now Ethiopia / Somalia)...and possibly as far west as Numidia (the Maghreb) and as far south as the Swahili coast. Such dark-skinned people were later conflated with the Sabaeans. Oddly, though, Kush's son, Nimrod, was affiliated with the Assyrians / Babylonians. How Nimrod got all the way from north Africa to north "Shinar" (Mesopotamia) is anyone's guess.
- **Amorites**, who originally hailed from Mesopotamia (Sumer; land of the Chaldees; often associated with "Ur"), yet eventually populated the Levant. Thus their progeny became bifurcated between the

Babylonians (qua Chaldeans) and the Israelites (qua proto-Hebrews).

- **Jebusites**, who hailed from the Jordan River valley, and were the founders of the city that came to be known as Jerusalem (see my essay on the “City Of The Beloved”). As with the Amorites, they may have been the (actual) progenitors of the Hebrews; though, in order to maintain alterity, they were often associated with Hittites and other pagan OTHERS.
- **Casluhites**, who hailed from Egypt, were said to be the descendants of Ham via Mizraim (a name that was clearly concocted post-hoc, as it was simply based on the Assyrian / Old Aramaic term for Egypt: M-S-R-M). They were the alleged progenitors of the Palastu (“Philistines”). (Philistines from Gath, on the other hand, were considered Gittites.)
- **Hivites** (descendants of Canaan), who hailed from Phoenicia.
- **Het[h]-ites** (named after one of Ham’s grandsons via Canaan), who hailed from Anatolia (and so are sometimes conflated with Japhetic groups). The descendants of Het[h] ben Canaan ben Ham ben Noah were retroactively associated with the Hittites.

Note that the most notable lineage via Ishmael were the Kedarites (alt. “Nebajoth”; often rendered “Qedarites”), who were associated with the denizens of Gilead / Edom / Idumaea / Midian / Lihyan / Hijaz...all of which which were referred to by the catch-all term, “Kedar” (which Muslims consider the name of one of Ishmael’s sons; and thus progenitor of the Ishmaelites). (Early examples include the Kedarite vassal-queens of Assyria during the 8th and 7th centuries B.C.: Zabibe, then Samsi, then Yatie, then Te’el-hunu, then Tabua. Later incarnations were Nabataeans and Arabians.) What complicates this even further is that many South Arabians were in the tribe of “Hazarmaveth”, who was son of Joktan (and thus the grandson of [h]Eber). So not only were Hadramites (the people of “Hadhramaut”) Semitic, they were HEBREW. (See the Addendum to part 3 of my “On Mohammed” series for the genealogical shenanigans found in Mohammedan lore.)

And what of the Hurrians of Mitanni? The Luwians in western Anatolia? The authors of these farcical genealogies did not even know that the Eurasians, Indians, Chinese, Polynesians, Native Americans, or any other of the world’s many other peoples existed. Their taxonomy was laughably myopic because their world ended at the Caucasus mountains to the north, Bactria to the east, the Maghreb to the west, and Upper Egypt to the south. It seems, then that we are to suppose the patriarchs of the Nordic and Celtic peoples—and all the others—were stowaways on Noah’s ark. {10}

The entire topic is preposterous. For it has long been understood that there has been so much miscegenation over the centuries that NOBODY is pureblood ANYTHING...let alone purely Hebrew...or Nubian...or Nordic...or Siamese...or whatever else one might fancy. This is a good thing. Indeed, if we go back far enough, we are ALL the descendants of African forebears. So the concept of “race” is an inane one. At best, it is a crude—and misleading—way to think about amorphous phenotypic populations; and to pretend that haplo-groups have distinct boundaries with discrete origins.

With respect to something that one is “born into”, all we can sensibly talk about are accidents of birth—be it ethnic background or socio-economic position. Whatever racism still exists, it exists primarily in the form of some program for intra-tribal in-breeding; which is rationalized by racially-based exclusivity (as with “Birthright Israel” and White nationalism) or insular founder populations (as with Haredim / Hassidim and Mennonites / Amish). This typically involves an obsession with bloodlines (replete with musings about pristine “stock”); and a sense of entitlement based on those bloodlines.

So what, then, of the ultimate basis for positing an Abrahamic lineage? That is: When it comes to Yehudi[m] / Hebrews / Israelites, how are we to assay this etiological myth (viz. a singular figure: Abraham)? Let’s use as our reference the fabled (read: entirely fictitious) “Exodus” event, which would have occurred in the early 13th century B.C. (if we are to grant the Biblical timeline). This is the generation

of Moses, Aaron, and Hoshea (alt. “Yeh-o-shua”; a.k.a. “Joshua”). According to the genealogy being proffered, Joshua was of the House of Ephraim; as he was the son of Nun, son of El-i-shama, son of Amm-i-hud, son of Ber-i-[y]ah, son of Ephraim, who was the son of the patriarch, Joseph ben Jacob ben Isaac ben Abraham (via Asenath). It was Joseph who first ended up in Egypt, after being ostracized in his native land (Canaan). He eventually rose to become vizier of the Pharaoh. Joseph, then, is considered the patriarch of the Hebrews, who—so the story goes—were enslaved in the land of Goshen (Lower Egypt, just to the east of the Nile Delta).

Joseph—along with Judah—was one of the sons of Jacob via the Aramaean maiden, Rachel. Jacob, recall, had been anointed “Yisra-El”; and was the son of Isaac (via Rebekah), who was the son of Abraham via the Chaldean matron, Sarai of Ur (a.k.a. “Sarah”). Sarah was Abraham’s half-sister; hence Isaac was conceived via incest—as attested in Genesis 20:12.

This succession would place Abraham roughly three centuries prior to Exodus—thus c. 1600 B.C. {1}

Per Biblical accounts, contemporaries of Abraham may have included:

- King Kedor-laomer of Elam
- King Amraph-El of Sumer (who is sometimes equated with Noah’s great-grandson via Ham’s son Kush: Nimrod; who was himself probably inspired by Assyrian King Tukult-i-Ninurta)
- King Yabin [alt. Jabin] of Hazor
- King Arioch of Ellasar (sometimes equated with Hurrian King Ar-i-ukki)

All these figures indicate that Abraham may have lived almost a century earlier: as far back as the early 17th B.C. However, if THAT had been the case, it is odd that (Amorite) King Hammurabi of Babylon was not also mentioned in Judaic lore—being as he was significantly more prominent (at the time) than any of the aforementioned potentates. What is even more peculiar is that Hammurabi established his renown legal code—a landmark event in the history of mankind which, it might be noted, had nothing to do with the Abrahamic deity (see my essay on “The Long History Of Legal Codes”). Yet the Abrahamic deity, so keen on informing mankind of his demands, sat idly by while the rest of mankind was grappling with these important matters.

Timing of specific events is difficult to pinpoint that far back. Whenever it was, exactly, that Abrahamic lived, there was a lot going on in the world that is not accounted for in Abrahamic lore. Hammurabi’s (Amorite) son was Samsu-iluna, who was king of Babylon in the late 18th century B.C. This goes through Hammurabi’s great-great-grandson, Samsu-Ditana, who was the (Amorite) king of Babylon in the late 17th B.C. (Major deities that were worshipped at this time included Ninurta, Marduk, [h]Adad, Enlil, Inanna / Ishtar, and Shamash.) This was around the same time the Hittite conquerer, Murs[h]ili (of Hattusa) sacked Babylon. That was followed by the Kassite period (early 16th century to mid-12th century, when it was overtaken by the Elamites).

The authors of the Bible seem to have been heedless of these developments.

Also note that Halpa / Halab (Aleppo), Mari, and Ebla were thriving (Amorite) cities to the north (in Nineveh and Syria) during this period; in which great temples to Ishtar / Astarte had been erected. Apum and Gibeon (as well as possibly Rakisha / Lachish and Eglon) were other major Amorite cities at the time. Even as he lived as a lowly shepherd in the countryside, Abraham would surely have been aware of these urban centers, as well as the city of Nineveh in northern Mesopotamia (where the main Assyrian temples were located). (The dozens of major Sumerian / Assyrian cities in Bronze-Age Mesopotamia are listed in my essay: “Forgotten Cities”.)

The Abrahamic deity also neglected to mention the Minoans in Greece AND the great Indus Valley civilization AND the thriving Chinese civilization on the Yellow River (the Xia Dynasty). This is rather odd...if, that is, Abraham was supposed to have lived that far back. After all, was not Yahweh the godhead of ALL mankind; and concerned with the entire world? That he didn't address such major peoples is befuddling.

By the time Abraham would have lived, the Indus Valley civilization had already seen its heyday, and was on the wane. It had endured for almost two millennia. That's THOUSANDS OF YEARS of a flourishing society at Harappa (i.e. Mohenjo-Daro), involving a people called "Arya"...where, for some reason, the Abrahamic deity did not see fit to intervene.

In any case, the Biblical timeline would position Abraham's hypothetical lifetime at some point between the rule of (Amorite) Kings Hammurabi (followed by his son, Abba-El) of Halpa / Halab in the mid-18th century B.C. and the rule of King Sarra-El (followed by Abba-El II) of Halpa / Halab in the early-16th century B.C. (Halpa / Halab was the capital of the kingdom of Yamhad, in northern Canaan, corresponding to what is now Syria / Lebanon.) These locations were not especially close to where Abraham ended up settling (in southern Canaan), though their influence certainly would have stretched across the Levant.

It is telling that rulers of the Amorites were routinely naming themselves after the Semitic deity, "El", by this time. This may have been the basis for the godhead of the Shasu ("Y-H-W-H"), who's monotheism was prevalent in southern Canaan at around that time. (Note: Amorites were dubbed "Amurru" in Sumerian / Akkadian.)

Bottom line: This was period when Canaan was primarily populated by the Amorites. Consequently, there is a good chance that the proto-Hebrews were a divergent Amorite group (and perhaps even the Shasu themselves). If this were so, it would pose a fatal problem to Judaic genealogy, as the Amorites were Ham-ites, not S[h]em-ites (at least, according their own lore). This would be ironic for other reasons. For the demonized Babylonian Empire was essentially RULED BY Amorites for the first half of the 2nd millennium B.C.—thereby making the progenitor of the Hebrews a member of the same tribe as the kings of their putative nemesis, Babylon. This actually makes sense, as the Babylonians were primarily Chaldeans; and Abraham is supposed to have hailed from Ur, in the land of the Chaldees.

Thus we are told of one group of Ham-ites persecuting another group of Ham-ites, the latter of which retroactively re-fashioned themselves as Shem-ites. (Recall that the moniker, "Hebrew" for Abraham's identity and progeny is based on their post hoc designation as the descendants of [h]Eber: the great-grandson of Shem. Such genealogies were, of course, posited retroactively.)

Around the same time Abraham would have lived, the Rig Veda was being composed. It is peculiar that the Creator of the Universe opted not to drop any memos on the peoples of the Far East when it was they who were supposed to have been the most concerned with figuring out the workings of the cosmos; and with finding ways to get in touch with the divine. (One wonders if Yahweh was conversant in Vedic Sanskrit and Sumerian, or limited himself to Ugaritic and Phoenician.)

It is possible that Abraham—if he existed—would have been contemporaries with either Egyptian Pharaoh Ahmose or Amen-hotep (c. 1600). {2} If we are to assume that Abraham was an Amorite, it should be noted that Yamhad, the Amorite Kingdom of the early 2nd millennium B.C., was primarily located to the north, in Tidnum (later dubbed "Aram" in Hebrew; in what is now Syria). Its capital was Halpa / Halab (later dubbed "Aleppo"). This would have been at least a century after the famed Code of Hammurabi had been compiled (in the early 18th century B.C.), placing us in the 17th century B.C. Chances are that Yarim-Lim III, Hammurabi III, or Sarra-El was the ruler in Halpa / Halab at that time.

That last ruler named himself after the Canaanite godhead, illustrating that THAT particular deity was already well-established by this time, and revered by kings in the region. So if this was the deity that proto-Hebrews (perhaps the Shasu) adopted, then the earliest theology of the Hebrews is not what Judaic lore purports it to have been (*sui generis*). Sure enough, the Shasu used Y-H-W-H as a moniker for their godhead.

To reiterate: Abraham is described as a shepherd who hailed from the Sumerian city of Ur (that is: “Ur Kasdim”, understood to mean Ur in the land of the Chaldeans, in Mesopotamia); yet he purportedly spent the majority of his life in the Negev (southern Canaan), the land from which the Shasu hailed. Because of this, he may have been aware of Yamhad (the Amorite homeland, in what is now Syria) and Mitanni (the Hurrian capital; a.k.a. “Hanigalbat”, in what is now Kurdistan), prominent kingdoms to the north; and possibly even aware of the burgeoning Hittite Kingdom (based in Hattusa), which was on the rise even farther to north, in Hatti (western Anatolia). This is around the time that the “Anitta tablets” were composed.

Abraham would have probably spoken a local Canaanite dialect (perhaps some variation of the proto-Semitic language of Ugarit or Ebla) rather than Hurrian or Old Aramaic (languages used by the Assyrians in the region); as attested by the Ebla tablets (written in Sumerian cuneiform) from the 25th century B.C. Being in the midst of the Amorites, there is a good chance he spoke whatever language was used by them. In any case, Abraham was likely illiterate—and so anything we’d know about him would have been purely anecdotal—apocryphal tales relayed exclusively via oral transmission by his ancestors.

This is, of course, how MOST folklore works.

A prime example of such an anecdote: One day, Abraham was commanded by a deity (perhaps the godhead of the Shasu) to slay his own son (Isaac, per Judeo-Christian lore; Ishmael, per Mohammedan lore). The Canaanite shepherd obeyed; but then stayed his hand when the deity intervened at the last moment (thereby sparing the boy). {3}

As it turned out, the interlude was simply a test. The idea was that such unconditional (blind) obedience proved his fealty to this newfound deity, Y-H-W-H; or so the story goes. Other than being completely insane, the problem with this tale is that it is—obviously—farcical. For if Abraham himself had relayed such an account to his contemporaries, they would surely have thought him bonkers.

If—on the other hand—his son, Isaac / Ishmael, had relayed the account (“One time, my father did such-and-such...”) to others, it probably would have been dismissed as a queer anecdote. The reaction almost certainly would NOT have been: “Wow; that story is amazing! This needs to be recorded for posterity, so that all mankind can be aware of it forevermore!” (Surely accounts of incensed fathers almost killing their sons were not unheard-of at the time.)

AS PARABLE, the tale has been quite significant in theological musings for over two millennia—as best exemplified by Kierkegaard’s thought-provoking work, “Fear And Trembling”. Though hallowed, the episode is almost certainly the product of confabulation. For such an occurrence would have been no more significant than myriad other events at the time—none of which warranted an appearance in scripture.

One of the better explications that positing “Hebrew” as a discrete ethnic group is entirely spurious is Shlomo Sand’s “The Invention of the Jewish People”. Indeed, most of Beth Israel today ISN’T EVEN SEMITIC (as I show in my essay: “The Forgotten Diaspora”, which addresses the Turkic ancestry of Ashkenazim.) {34} This is the best argument against BOTH Revisionist Zionism (hereafter, RZ) AND anti-Semitism—as both forms of bigotry are based on racism (read: predicated on the positing of “Jews” as a

discrete ethnic group, then singling them out from the rest of mankind). The same problem occurs with the fatuous concept, “Aryan”, which is technically based on a half-baked association of Nordic / Germanic peoples with the people of ancient Bactria / Sogdiana. In the end, we’re all Africans. The rest is a spurious treatment of a massive homo sapiens diaspora going back tens of thousands of years—stretching from the Siberian tundra to Borneo, from Greenland to the Andes Mountains. In this crucial sense, the Ummah (and Beth Israel, for that matter) is synonymous with all mankind. Ergo the only “birthright” is HUMAN rights.

## **Genealogical Machinations:**

*“[He] wondered if the ugly lie of an unpleasant outside world was some misguided attempt to keep people from wanting out. Could someone have decided that the truth was worse than a loss of power, of control? [Knowing the facts about what really happened] doesn’t matter. That’s the past; and the past is not the same thing as our Legacy. You’ll need to learn the difference.”*

—from Hugh Howey’s dystopian novel, “Wool”

If one has been reared on the narrative of one’s own exceptionalism (that is: as a member of an exalted in-group, designated by the Creator Of The Universe with unique provenance), one is inclined to adopt it; and consequently be swept up in an intoxicating sense of entitlement. Indeed, when one has heard, from mother’s knee, that certain things are OURS by divine right, one can’t help but be inculcated with this extremely ingratiating ideation; which eventually becomes an indelible impression.

Such conditioning is re-enforced ad nauseam by ideologues who stand to benefit from a just-so historiography (i.e. an etiological myth that serves an ideological purpose). So it goes with Israel’s theocratic ethno-State, which ensures that its subjects spend their days guzzling the “Hasbara” Kool-Aid that is siphoned into the Israeli agora. Here: The Creator of the Universe is fashioned as—among other things—a real-estate broker; and the Torah is treated as a title-deed to a certain tract of land (Canaan). Amongst all mankind, he also picks favorite ethnic groups.

The fixation on bloodlines (patrilineal or otherwise) to define people’s place in the world (geographically) AND in the natural order (providentially) is the engine of ethno-centricity. When a creed is inextricably tied to a certain stock, as is done in fundamentalist versions of Judaism, the result is the consecration of racism. In my essay, “The Forgotten Diaspora”, I made a simple point: The fact that Ashkenazim have Turkic, not Semitic, roots does not make them any less Jewish. {36} Only someone who is racist would insist that a certain ancestry disqualifies someone from qualifying for any given Faith.

Since the Mishnaic era, what the denizens of any given Jewish community has considered its “Heimat” [true home] was simply where they happened to reside, which was RARELY the Levant. For more on the fixation on bloodlines (viz. an obsession with blood and soil), see my essay: “The Land Of Purple”.

Taxonomies based explicitly on racial genealogy serve as a basis of racism—on the part of both the in-group (pro) AND the out-group (contra). For it supposes that each purported “race” somehow fits within a divine master-plan. Unfortunately, the Hebrew Bible speaks of everyone in the world in these terms. In other words, rather than offering a conception of mankind qua mankind, the human race was categorized into kinships (based on patri-lineage) to be characterized—and judged—by the legacy of their ancestors. All this becomes spurious once we realize that, if we go back far enough, we’re all Africans (a crucial point the Abrahamic deity neglected to make when delivering his messages).

Staking claim on a land (based on divine ordinance) typically involves the displacement or eradication of the indigenous populations. This is par for the course when it comes to natural origin myths—especially those that assert spurious claims about blood and soil (by invoking Providence). Take, for instance, the Book of Mormon, which claims that the Abrahamic deity allocated the New World (i.e. North America) for the prophet, Nephi (son of Lehi) and his progeny...even though the land had been occupied for tens of thousands of years by a native population numbering in the tens of millions.

There is nothing unique about basing the tribes of the known world on the divergent lineages of some (personified) source. In Old Turkic etiological myths, the mother wolf, “Asena” / “Ashina” gave birth to ten sons, representing the ten Gök-Turk tribes (alt. Oghuz, Altai, Tocharian). Such categorization schemes aren’t necessarily patriarchal. Kikuyu (Bantu) folklore tells of the prehistoric couple, Gikuyu and Mumbi, who bore nine daughters—each of whom begat one of the nine Kikuyu tribes.

The fabricated etiology used for the fabled 12+1 tribes of “Israel” is based on the male progeny of Jacob ben Isaac ben Abraham. This includes:

- Gad and Asher (via the concubine, Zilpah)
- Naphtali and Dan (via the concubine, Bilhah)
- Reuben [y]Issachar, Zebulun, Simeon, Levi, and Judah (via the Aramaean maiden, Leah)
- Benjamin (via Leah’s younger sister, Rachel)
- And also via Rachel, Joseph’s sons (who he sired via the Egyptian maiden, Asenath): Manasseh and Ephraim

These 13 are resolved into 12 in three different ways, depending on the source:

**THE FIRST** is by omitting Dan; as does the New Testament.

**THE SECOND** is by omitting Levi; as does First Kings. (Here, the Levites were seen more a cast of priests [kohen-im] than as a full-fledged tribe.)

**THE THIRD** is by subsuming Manasseh and Ephraim under the singular mantle of their father, Joseph...or, as with Numbers 1:32-33, simply counts Ephraim as “Joseph” (disregarding Manasseh).

This discrepant taxonomy is illustrative of the larger point: Narrative glitches are inevitable when different people are concocting their own version of events so as to comport with their own preconceptions (and accord with their sensibilities).

I discuss the significance of the number 12 in my essay on mythemes. It is a number that has played a role in cosmogony / astrology—the world over—for thousands of years. In any case, TWELVE tribes makes the arithmetic much easier when calculating the number of saved souls (144,000; which is not only a multiple of 12, but of 12 squared); especially when those souls must be from certain bloodlines in order to gain entry into heaven.

Expositors who propound a version of this spurious tribal taxonomy insist that **THEY ALONE** hold the right answer...even as all of it is confabulation. Trying to figure out which is the correct explanation is as productive as trying to figure out which color unicorns **REALLY** are.

I discuss the contrived genealogy from Adam and Eve down to Abraham in the Addendum to part 3 of my series: “About Mohammed”. The typical genealogy from Abraham down to David is as follows: Abraham sired Isaac via Sarah...who sired Jacob (a.k.a. “Yisra-El”) via Rebekah...Jacob sired the eponymous son of the Yehudim (via Leah): Judah. Hence the moniker by which the southern (Judaic) kingdom was known.

The lineage continues through Judah's son, Phares / Perez, whom he sired via his daughter-in-law, Tamar (a scenario that accounted for the salience of Levirate marriage).

The genealogy then proceeds as follows: From Perez to Esrom / Hezron to [a]Ram to Amminadab to Na[h]shon. Amminadab was also father-in-law of Moses' brother, Aaron: the High Priest of the Israelites during the Exodus.

Along with Aaron (a Levite like Moses) and Joshua (an Ephraimite), Na[h]shon was a Hebrew leader during the fabled "Exodus" from the land of Goshen in Egypt. The lineage then proceeds to Salmah / Salmon, who sired Boaz via Rahab of Jericho. Boaz then sired Obed ["worshipper"] via Ruth of Moab. It was Obed who sired David's father, Yishai / Eshai (a.k.a. "Jesse").

So far as geo-politics is concerted, the salient line is the Davidic line. David sired Solomon who sired Rehoboam—who presided over the OFFICIAL division of the Hebrews into THIRTEEN tribes.

The Kings of Judah (who were from the House of David via Manasseh; and mostly Jewish) mustn't be confused with the Kings of Israel [a.k.a. "Samaria"; alt. "Ephraim"] (who were of the House of Ephraim; and were mostly pagan). BOTH houses were from the house of Joseph. It was in the southern (Judaic) kingdom that the tribes of Judah and Benjamin settled.

After the bifurcation of the unified kingdom c. 930 B.C. (pursuant to Solomon's death), the House of David (starting with Rehoboam) presided over the kingdom in southern Canaan (Yehud[ah]; a.k.a. the Kingdom of Judah). The House of Ephraim (starting with Jeroboam) presided over the kingdom in northern Canaan (Shomron; a.k.a. the Kingdom of Israel).

The geographical area associated with the (southern) Kingdom of Judah is commonly referred to by its Romanized moniker: "Iudaea" (which correlates the the geographical "Judea"). The geographical area associated with the (northern) Kingdom of Israel is commonly referred to by its Romanized moniker: "Samaria" (from Shomron). Hence there existed a kingdom in the south (Judea) and a kingdom of in the north (Samaria). {11} This is why, today, RZs insist on referring to Canaan as "Judea and Samaria"—which they now equate with the tract of land bequeathed to them by the Creator of the Universe as a fulfillment of his compact with Beth Israel.

Consequently, RZs arrogate to themselves—by divine right—unimpeachable license to incorporate this territory into what is now fashioned as the nation-state of "Israel"; even if it entails ethnic cleansing and land-theft. Pogroms and forced evictions seem to be warranted when it is believed to have the imprimatur of the Creator of the Universe. With god, anything goes—including crimes against humanity.

(It is worth noting: The world's Jewish people—at least, those who are decent human beings—do not approve of the heinous acts done in their name by the Israeli government.)

Happily today, the term "Hebrew" usually refers primarily to a language (whether modern or Classical), not to a posited race. It should also be noted that "Semitic" is now ALSO used as a linguistic rather than an ethnic designation. In other words: It denotes a family of languages (stemming from Old Aramaic) instead of the descendants of Shem. In modern parlance, "Semitic" merely refers to anyone who spoke one of the Canaanite (i.e. Semitic) languages—the earliest of which were Eblaitic, Ugaritic, Moabitic, Edomitic, and the language of the Phoenicians. This continues on through Old Aramaic, Samaritan, Babylonian Aramaic, and—later—Punic, Mandaic, Syriac, Ge'ez, and the familiar block-letters of Classical Hebrew. Neo-Aramaic (a.k.a. Syriac; and variants like Palmyrene and Nabataean) would yield Classical Arabic (see my essay: "The Syriac Origins Of Koranic Verse").

Early Semitic scripts (which are variants of the Phoenician alphabet) coalesced into Old Aramaic. This is illustrated by the Siloam / Shiloah inscriptions from the early 7th century B.C., the text of which are clearly using a derivative of the Phoenician alphabet like the one found on the Tabnit sarcophagus from Sidon (which dates from the 6th century B.C.) It is misleading to refer to such scripts as “proto-Hebrew” or “paleo-Hebrew” or “Old Hebrew”. (It would be like referring to Attic Greek as proto-Cyrillic; as if THAT was the direction it was always going.) If anything, these Phoenician variants are proto-SAMARITAN. Classical Hebrew, on the other hand, was an offshoot of Aramaic, and came later than Samaritan.

The revamped usage of such loaded terms in modern times follows from a de-emphasis of racial taxonomy. {12} Ergo “Canaanite” no longer refers to descendants of Ham’s son, Canaan; it refers to anyone who happens to have once lived in the geographical region now dubbed the Levant (e.g. Amorites, Phoenicians, Hurrians, Philistines, Hebrews, and eventually Palestinian Arabs). This shift in SENSE reflects the fact that race (qua bloodlines) no longer matters for modern minds.

Alas, such thinking is nothing new. The vaunting of ancestors is a protocol as old as history. In Canaan, a fixation on patriarchal lineage predated Judaism, as was the case with the Philistines. Many Amorites even referred to their godhead, “El” as “Hatikuka” ( a moniker that meant “lord of the patriarchs”).

Most of us are predisposed to romanticize our own past. Consequently, we are inclined to think that our forebears were somehow more lofty than ourselves—as if bygone eras were more cosmically significant. Harking back to a (fanciful) halcyon era is a way of marshaling hope in trying times; and girding (false) pride so as to galvanize members of the in-group. This proclivity is reflected in the fact that, for progeny, we say “descendants” instead of “ascendents”—as if the progression of generations were a matter of going DOWN (a regression from some higher place) rather than going UP (a progression to an every-more-lofty stature). Even Darwin was not tempted to entitle his book on evolution: “The Ascent of Man”...even as we say that time “progresses”, and evolution tends to IMPROVE things.

The notion that certain people (i.e. the in-group) come from a special place justifies a burnished image of themselves in the present: heightened stature via heightened origins. {13} Legacy augurs destiny; so ancestry plays into eschatology.

European colonialists invoked “Manifest Destiny” when vanquishing the native population of America, so as to push the frontiers of their new-found domain. Displacement of an indigenous people (of THE OTHER) to make way for an anointed tribe.

Claims based in (divine) Providence invariably involve contrived provenance. Hence a fixation on genealogy when it comes to etiological myths (analogous to the role of Providence in teleology). This way, one can legitimate the in-group’s agenda (i.e. special privileges) by appealing to a gilded legacy. Hence the notion of “birthright” as a function of reputed bloodlines. (What good is Providentialism, after all, if it does not favor a well-demarcated group?)

Sometimes, onomastics are revamped for self-serving purposes—as with ethnic co-optation (the appropriation of that vaunted legacy). For example, Pashtun legend tells of Malak Avagana [a.k.a. “Afghana”] of Gandhara (c. 1,000 B.C.), son of the Abrahamic prophet, “Irmia” [“Jeremiah”], and thus the grandson of “Talut” (King Saul ben Kish ben Ab-i-El of the Matri)...thereby associating Afghan lore with the House of David; though not in the Davidic line. This gives Pashtuns an air of Abrahamic legitimacy, according to them an Abrahamic pedigree via the Benjamite line.

One eventually loses track of the number of dynasties within Dar al-Islam that have claimed to trace their bloodlines back to MoM himself. Even today, the (Hashemite) Jordanian monarchy claims to be

descendants of MoM...while the (Wahhabi) Saudi Arabian monarchy claims the same. So does the (Alawite) Moroccan monarchy and the (Alawite) Syrian monarchy. {14} The fact that potentates STILL feel the need to make such a silly claim illustrates that the cockamamy notion of divinely-ordained stock is as rousing as ever.

Abrahamic historiographers are not alone in the craft of genealogy-fabrication. The Sumerians / Assyrians and Egyptians pioneered it thousands of years before. Dynasties around the world adopted it thereafter. The Jews later took it to new heights in the Torah. It was inevitable that—sooner or later—Christians and Muslims would get in on the action as well. (Historiographers tend to dissemble on the matter of Abraham being an Amorite / Chaldean as opposed to a “Hebrew” qua descendent of Shem.)

All this, so that a group of people could pretend that the Creator Of The Universe was their own, personal real estate agent, and THEY the exclusive beneficiaries of his bequest. All they needed to justify this brazen assertion was a document, certifying their commanding stake. Lo and behold: The Torah was that title-deed, readily invoked to substantiate present-day territorial claims.

To illustrate the spuriousness of using ancient lore to justify geo-political agendas TODAY, let’s look at a parallel. Vedic genealogy begins with the fabled patriarch, Pandu of Hastinapur. The next major patriarch was the fabled Pandava king, Yadu of Pauravas. (This is significant because Lord Krishna was ALSO a descendent of King Yadu.) Meanwhile, the Braj region of present-day Uttar Pradesh was said to be home of the Yadavas: descendants of Yadu. According to Vedic lore, the land was ruled by King Madhu; and was thus christened “Madhu-Van[a]”. {25}

As legend has it, Madhu was overthrown by prince Shatru-ghan[a] of Kosala—twin brother of Kakshman[a] and younger brother of “Raghava” Rama-chandra (all of whom were sons of the Ikshvaku king, Dasharatha of Ayodhya and Queen Sumitra of Kashi). Shatru-ghan[a] later slew Madhu’s descendant, Lavana-sura of Madhu-pura (nephew of “rakshasa” King Ravana of Lanka). Shatru-ghan[a] would then claim the land and establish the Sura-sena Kingdom (per the Pali scripture: “Sutta Pitaka”). The Yadavas were eventually forced out of their homeland by the (Aryan) Kurus and the rulers of Magadha. Or so the story goes.

Are the Yadav (alt. “Ahir”; “Abhira”; a.k.a. “Gaoli”) people now trying to establish a Yadava ethno-State in Uttar Pradesh? No. Why not. Because resurrecting the era preceding the Sura-sena epoch would be harebrained. Indeed, such an enterprise wouldn’t make sense even if the Yadav people of today made appeals to Madhu and invoked lingering grievances with Shatru-ghan[a].

Meanwhile, the (Brahmin) Bhargav[a] leader, Par[a]shu-Ram[a] vanquished what were then known as the Haiheya (named after a great-grandson of Yadu), who hailed from Avanti (in what is now western Madhya Pradesh). The most fabled Haiheya figure was Karta-virya Arjuna. Their defeat led to the so-called “Haiheya” diaspora across the Indian subcontinent (consisting primarily of the progeny of Tala-jangha, grandson of the legendary hero, Arjuna). {26}

Today, those who now identify with the “kshatriya” heritage of the Haiheya are not trying to establish an ethno-State in Madhya Pradesh. Why not? Because resurrecting enmity with ancient Brahmins would be absurd. Indeed, identity based on the antiquated “varna” system is anathema to modern minds.

Appeals to Vedic patriarchs like Pandu and Yadu—or even to Krishna—hold no water in modern geo-politics. Making reference to legends about a particular tribe—involving events that took place in a particular land—does not confer license on that tribe to lay exclusive claim to that land. This is the case whether the legends are Hindu or Judaic; whether the genealogies are Vedic or Hebrew. Indeed, the Torah is no more credible a source of history than are, say, the Puranas.

This principle applies to the Levant as much as it does to northeast India. The Assyrians / Babylonians—then the Persians—ruled in Canaan far longer than the short-lived Judaic Kingdom under David and Solomon; or the Maccabees during the brief Hasmonean epoch. The Romans / Byzantines ruled the land longer still; and then the Arabs even longer than that. Hence: If this highly-coveted tract of land is to be declared anyone’s ancestral “homeland”, Jews are far from the top of the list (as I show in “The Land Of Purple”). And even then, only the Mizra[c]him, Sephardim, and Samaritans could make such a claim with any credence (see “The Forgotten Diaspora”).

In terms of etiological myth, the idea of a gilded suite of tribes (based on patriarchy) goes back to the Archaic Greeks, who told of their progenitor, Hellen of Pithia. Hellen begat Aeolus, Dorus, and Xuthus—hence the Aeolians, the Dorians, and (via Xuthus’ two sons: Achaeus and Ion) the Achaeans and Ionians. Ergo four Hellenic tribes. We also encounter such rigamarole in Scythian etiology, starting with the patriarch, Targitaus. According to Herodotus, his three sons accounted for the four Scythian tribes: Skoloxias begat the “Paralatae”, Lipoxias begat the “Auchatae”, and Arpoxias begat both the “Kitiari” and “Trasprians”. According to Bantu folklore, the first couple, Gikuyu and Mumbi, bore nine daughters—accounting for the nine Kikuyu tribes that exist today. Etc. Etc. Etc.

So as to justify their choice of Messiah, early Christians tried to trace the vaunted Davidic line “down” to a Hebrew carpenter in Galilee named Yeshua ben Yussef (born in the late 1st century B.C.): a Palestinian Jew who is better known as Jesus of Nazareth. As might be expected, the authors of “Matthew” and of “Luke” (syncretic gospels) posit entirely different lineages for this fabled Nazarene. The more touted, that of “Matthew”, is as follows:

David to Solomon to Rehoboam to Ab-i-Jah / Abijam / Abia to Asa[ph] to Jeho-Shafat to Jeho-Ram / Joram. Then, via the maiden, Athal-i-[y]ah, Jeho-Ram sired Jeho-Ahaz (more commonly referred to as “Ahaz-i-[y]ah”). Then, via his own mother (Athal-i-[y]ah), Ahaz-i-[y]ah sired Jeho-Ash / Joash. Athal-i-[y]ah then massacred the entire royal family EXCEPT her son / grandson, Jeho-Ash (thereby erasing Ahaz-i-[y]ah from the lineage). Jeho-ash would sire Amaz-i-[y]ah via the maiden, Jeho-addan. Amaz-i-[y]ah then begat Azar-i-[y]ah / Ozias / Uzziah...who reigned for much of the 8th century B.C.

Unsurprisingly, this entire episode was omitted by the authors of “Matthew”—who skipped directly from Jeho-Ram to Azar-i-[y]ah (that is: from Joram to Uzziah). Since the first Jeho-Ahaz was re-cast as “Ahaz-i-[y]ah” (a name that would be used again), this omission likely went un-noticed.

Thereafter: Jeho-Ram to Jo[a]tham / Yotam to Jeho-Ahaz (typically referred to as “Ahaz”), as “Jeho-Ahaz” would be used for a THIRD time later on. (And NONE of these should be confused with yet another king of the same name, a pagan from the House of Jeroboam who had ruled the northern kingdom of Israel at the end of the 9th century.)

Via the maiden, Abi-Jah, THAT Jeho-Ahaz (the twelfth king of Judah) sired Hezek-i-[y]ah / Ezekias (who ruled into the early 7th century B.C.)...then to Manasseh / Manasses to Amon / Amos to the fabled prophet, Yosh-i-yah[u] / Josiah / Josias. Josiah was the king of Judah said to have who commissioned the Deuteronomic texts (though there is no extra-Biblical documentation of his existence). This brings the lineage to the late 7th century B.C.

Via the maiden, Hamutal, Josiah sired Shallum, who—confusingly—reigned as (yet another) “Jeho-Ahaz”. THAT “Jeho-Ahaz” only ruled for three months (c. 609 B.C.), and was promptly replaced by his brother, El-i-Akim (“god will make”), who was re-cast as “Jeho-i-Akim” so as to eschew the old Canaanite moniker for the godhead (supplanting “El” with “Jeho[vah]”).

King Jeho-i-Akim begat Jekon-i-[y]ah / Jechonias. Later versions of Matthew's genealogy skips directly from Josiah to Jechonias. It was Jechonias who was dethroned by Babylonian King Nebuchadnezzar II and replaced by his own nephew, Zedek-i-[y]ah (who would serve as the last King of Judah); though Zedek-i-[y]ah is not included in the relevant lineage (as he was a lackey for Babylon).

At that point (early in the 6th century B.C.), things become rather hazy—as the period of exile in Babylon (587 – 530's B.C.) began. As it happened, THAT is when much of the Hebrew Bible was composed, and Judaism started to be codified (i.e. rendered a formal dogmatic system), using Babylonian Aramaic. { 15 }

Jekon-i-[y]ah's progeny is alleged to have proceeded as follows: Shealt-i-El ("I asked El"; alt. "Salath-i-El") begat Zer-u-Babel ("One conceived in Babylon"), who was governor of the Persian Province in Canaan, Yehud Medinata. Zer-u-Babel begat Ab-i-Hud. Ab-i-Hud is often conflated with Obad-i-[y]ah; who was alternately said to be son of Hanan-i-[y]ah, who was said to be the son of Zer-u-Babel. (Obadiah is the Hebrew equivalent of the Semitic "Abd-ullah": slave of god. The name was also used for the military leader from Sechem who was sent by the aforementioned pagan King Ahaz-i-[y]ah of Israel to fight the prophet, El-i-jah.)

In either case, Ab-i-Hud / Obad-i-[y]ah allegedly begat ANOTHER El-i-Akim.

Note: It is possible that the recurrence of "El-i-Akim" involved a scribal snafu at some point; as the authors of "Matthew" may have confused any one of them with King Hezek-i-[y]ah's finance minister (of the same name; who was the son of the famed Hebrew priest, Hilk-i-[y]ah of Anathoth, who served King Josiah). (Hilk-i-[y]ah's other son was the famed prophet, Jerem-i-[y]ah.)

Anyhow, the purported genealogy continues: This latest El-i-Akim begat Azor, who begat Zadok. This may have also been a misnomer, as "Zadok" was the name of a Hebrew priest under King David. Next was...you guessed in, YET ANOTHER El-i-Akim (typically listed as just "Akim"), who begat El-i-[h]ud, who begat El-i-Azar (alt. "Eleazar": Romanized as "Lazarus"; who was presumably named after the son of Moses' brother, Aaron). { 35 }

The lineage proceeds with Matthan, who begat Jacob (presumably named after the son of Isaac and Rebekah). The authors of "Matthew" seem to have selected this as the name for the father of Joseph (of Bethlehem) because it reflects the parentage of the other Joseph: Joseph of Genesis fame, who was also the son of a Jacob (via Rachel). And so, in a reprise of the father-son sequence found in the Hebrew Bible, Matthew's genealogy concludes with Jacob's son Joseph (Jesus' father). Gilded patri-lineage complete.

Luke, on the other hand, posits Joseph's father as [h]Eli (son of "Matthat"), who was supposed to be a descendent of David's third son from Bathsheba: Nathan. Thus: Instead of David's son, Solomon, some Christians sought to trace Jesus to the Davidic line via Nathan (the son that David sired via Bathsheba; not the prophet by the same name). This was done in the Bohemian "Vysse[g]hrad" Codex from the 11th century, which depicted the so-called "Tree of Jesse" (that is: a lineage beginning with Abraham's father).

The authors of Luke had a slightly different agenda than the authors of Matthew; as they emphasized the role of the Gentiles in the new Faith. So when they decided to take a crack at this genealogy, the results were rather different. The lineage of King David down to Jesus according to Luke (a span of just over a millennium) is thus: Nathan (rather than Solomon) to Mattatha to Menna to Melea to El-i-Akim (of course!) to Jonam to Joseph to Judah to Simeon to Levi to Matthat to Joram to Eliezer to Joshua to Er to El-madam to Cosam to Addi to Melki to Neri to Shealt-i-El to Zer-u-Babel. Here, again, the lineage diverges from that of the Hebrew Bible. Instead of Zer-u-Babel siring Ab-i-Hud, who sired (another) El-i-Akim, etc., we have the following:

Zer-u-Babel to Rhesa to Jo-anan to Jo-da to Jo-sech to S[h]jemein to Mattathias to Maath to Naggai to Esli to Nahum to Amos to Mattathias (again) to Joseph (again) to Jannai to Melki (again) to Levi (again) to Matthat (again; instead of Matthan) to (h)Eli (instead of Jacob) to Joseph (third time's a charm). That's 42 generations from David to Jesus: a dozen more generations than are accounted for in the patri-lineage of "Matthew". {16}

So what of Jesus' father: Joseph of Bethlehem? {17} He was (most likely) an illiterate Palestinian peasant who (most likely) did not fashion himself as being someone auspicious...until, that is, his virgin wife notified him of her immaculate impregnation, courtesy of the Abrahamic deity.

Needless to say, the average Galilean craftsman would not have kept meticulous records of his family tree going back SEVERAL DOZEN generations. As a poor, provincial carpenter, "Joseph" almost certainly would not have been apprised of his ancestral lineage reaching back further than, perhaps, a few generations (and even that would have presumably been done orally, by his own parents and grandparents). So it is a mystery from where this crucial information (about his distant forefathers) may have come. Certainly, nobody who WAS attending to written documentation at the time was paying attention to this particular plebeian (a lowly Palestinian Jew)...until, that is, his foster son achieved notoriety as the putative Messiah. By then—long after the fact—there was probably not much to go on in the way of tracking his ancestry (beyond cobbling together tid-bits of hearsay about his ancestors from local elders).

Tellingly, this "Joseph" appears in neither the Pauline letters nor in the original Gospel ("Mark"): the earliest Christian scriptures. The (retro-active) ascription of Davidic forebears to this particular man is a post-hoc invention by those who composed the later Gospels. {18}

In concocting their respective genealogies, the authors of "Matthew" and "Luke" opted to ignore the theological snafu entailed by claims of immaculate conception: Joseph was not Jesus' REAL father (no insemination from homo sapiens was involved), yet Joseph's paternity was essential to establish the Davidic stock of the "Christ" nevertheless.

Alas, the raft of genealogical contrivance didn't end there. Pursuant to the rise of Pauline Christianity, communities started spinning tales of the so-called "desposyni" (bloodlines of Jesus)...as if the "Christos" had secretly procreated. (If god's son HIMSELF had a son, then an entire lineage of divine progeny could be posited.) In a gambit to assert a Providential heritage, the Merovingians (Franks who reigned from 457 to 752) tried to claim patrilineal bloodlines from Jesus; or possibly from his brother, James (if the thought of the Christ engaging in copulation was too much to bear). There even arose the (quasi-plausible) hypothesis that Jesus was lovers with his closest disciple: the prostitute, Miriam of Magdala...who eventually bore him children. (Though we are also told that he regularly laid with Simon-Peter.)

No matter. Even the most untenable conjecture can catch on when it serves an ideological purpose. And so it went: The Nicene Christian lineage began in the 5th century with the mythic (Salian) figure, Mar-wig ["famed light"] (a.k.a. "Merovech"), and on through his grandson: the great Frankish king, Clovis. Ergo the fabled "Merovingian" dynasty; as attested in the "Historiae Francorum" by Gregory of Tours. That this lineage could be traced back to a Palestinian Jew from the 1st century is rather far-fetched, as the Franks originally hailed from Pannonia...which means they were likely related to the Illyrians (from the south) and/or Salians (from the north). What transpired in the intervening four-plus centuries is left to speculation (seeming to have something to do with Clovis' son, Clothar). {19} The tenuous link between the Merovingians and Carolingians was (purportedly) via the Frankish Arnulfing / Pippinid line of Austrasia / Neustria, which stemmed from the union between the son of Arnoulf of Metz (Ansegisel) and the daughter of Pippin of Landen (Begga). In other words, it was Franks all the way back.

In any case, this fanciful genealogy was continued with the Carolingians—from the fabled military leader, Charles Martel (through his son, Peppin the Younger) to the great Frankish King Charlemagne, who ruled in the late 8th century (as attested in the “Chronicle of Fredegar”). The Franks could thus claim the Abrahamic mantle by the time the Crusades were undertaken; as they saw themselves as carrying out Charlemagne’s legacy.

The point of exploring these Christian genealogical musings is show that this phenomenon is not unique to Judaic lore. (I address the Mohammedan version of genealogical gimmickry in part 3 of my “About Mohammed” series.) In every case, we find that people bend over backwards to fashion themselves the latest “feature presentation” in a series that goes back to exalted forebears...who’s valiant deeds occurred during some golden age, long ago. Harkening back to a bygone era confers a veneer of legitimacy—and a sense of purpose—to the latest crusade du jour. For the way forward can then be surmised as resurrecting the glories of the fabled epoch. “If we were glorious BACK THEN,” the thinking goes, “Well, then we can be glorious again someday. It’s our destiny!”

In order for this to work, one needs to establish a discrete “WE” that has subsisted over a long period of time. (And if “we” are special, “they” are not.) Alterity is endemic to tribalism; so is the fulcrum for Exceptionalism—replete with the derogation of the other as meddling interlopers, who deign to foil that which god has willed.

A hallmark feature of tribalism is collective narcissism; which is a lot like individual narcissism in that it involves a dependence on others perpetually deferring to one’s wishes, while praising those wishes as eminently laudable. The difference between isolated narcissists and those who’ve been taken in by collective narcissism is that the latter demand special entitlements—even reverence—for their group. They are in constant need for validation; and the vilification of anyone who differs; are hypersensitive to threats to the exalted group’s image. The default reaction of the collective narcissist to having the exalted group’s image sullied is a lashing-out. When the exalted group is, in their view, criticized or insufficiently revered, collective narcissists become hostile and retaliate. It is for this reason that the proponents of RZ often revel the misfortunes of the Palestinians.

The thinking here is relatively straight-forward: If WE are the posterity of those legendary figures, then WE are entitled to do whatever it takes to seize our destiny, which we have been accorded by divine ordinance. So posit these progenitors we must. The more we glorify THEM, the more we (vicariously) glorify OURSELVES. Exaltation by association.

This is why sacred histories come in handy. First, they can be confabulated AS NEEDED. Enumerating patriarchs going back to the genesis of the human race is a cottage industry that has existed around the world—producing material from the Mayan “Popul Vuh” to the Mande “Epic of Sunjata”. (The latter gives the vaunted Malian lineage a Mohammedan twist by tracing the Malian icon back to Mohammed’s companion, Bilal ibn Rabah.)

The lesson here is clear: The easiest way to establish provenance is to claim that it has been inherited through a designated series of inseminated wombs. Delusive as this might be, the allure of such fanciful thinking is undeniable. Indeed, it is very difficult to rebuff when it favors one’s own in-group. After all, what good is a heritage if it isn’t venerable? And what better way to burnish one’s legacy than to proclaim that one’s heritage was divinely ordained?

In the end, OUR sanctified historiography is deemed to be REAL history; theirs is merely fable. OUR deity is the TRUE deity; theirs is merely a figment of their imagination. And OUR sacraments represent the ONLY way to salvation; their sacraments are just daffy rituals. Our sanctified dogmas are well-grounded

religious beliefs; their is just silly superstition. The upshot of all this: WE have the imprimatur of the Creator of the Universe; therefore WE are justified in carrying out our agenda.

## The Siege Mentality:

*“We don’t hate anyone. We just want to see good things come to our race.”* –A familiar refrain, coming from a representative of the Klu Klux Klan, 1/30/13

*“Those who deny freedom to others do not deserve it themselves.”* –Abraham Lincoln, 1860

On the opening page of Adolph Hitler’s “My Jihad”, we find a statement that underlies the logic of all other brands of militant ethno-nationalism—especially those making appeals to blood and soil: “People of the same blood should be in the same Reich.” {37}

Hitler then stated in no uncertain terms: “I believe today that my conduct is in accordance with the will of the Almighty Creator. In standing guard against the Jew, I am defending the handiwork of the Lord.”

In the Postscript to my essay, “Nemesis”, I refer to this pathological obsession with “Deus Vult” as the DGW (doing god’s will / work) syndrome. It involves the delusion that one is doing god’s work (and thus fulfilling one’s divinely-ordained destiny)...which involves waging war against a demonized OTHER—a dastardly foe by which the in-group feels itself besieged. Every tribe that succumbs to this kind of Exceptionalism (i.e. Providentialism) likes to think that god (or the gods, as the case may be) is on THEIR side. Having succumbed to collective hubris, rarely do they aspire the converse: that they are on GOD’S side. (This was a distinction made by Abraham Lincoln.)

All is done for the glory of the in-group on behalf of [insert deity here]. In carrying out its agenda, the exalted in-group enjoys the imprimatur of god. It thereby gives itself a blank check to do whatever it sees fit. Emblematic of this was the message emblazoned on the belt-buckles of Nazi soldiers: “Gott Mit Uns” [God With Us]; which was then invoked to justify the policy of “lebensraum”: making room for the in-group (by purging the homeland of the out-group). The notion of dominion (entitlement to a certain domain) via a “mandate from Heaven” can be found across the world—as with the ancient Chinese “Hua-Xia” [Our Space]. It’s what Italian fascists dubbed “spazio vitale”; what Japanese Imperialists dubbed “hakko ichiu”; and what the Croatian “Ustashe” dubbed “ciscenje terena” [“cleansing the terrain”].

Judeo-Supremacists now carry out their own version of this deranged ideology in what they lay claim to a tract of land that has—they insist—been bequeathed to them by the Abrahamic deity. It should go without saying that if it is wrong when one group does it, it is wrong when ANY group does it; and for the same reasons. (For more on the revisionism of “Israel”, see my essay: “The Land Of Purple”.)

Reliance on the principle of historic rights has fueled some of the most tendentious territorial struggles in history. Italian fascists claimed Dalmatia (Croatia) because it had earlier belonged to the Venetian Empire. The Serbs claimed sovereignty over Kosovo based on the victory over the Ottomans in 1389. {27}

It is one thing to tie tribal honor to a contrived legacy; it is quite another to base it on the seizure of a designated tract of land, based on the trumpeting of ancient fables.

We might note the Germanic concept, “Volksgemeinschaft”; as it demonstrates how quickly / easily paeans to ethnic solidarity slide into falls for racial solidarity...which invariably leads to racial supremacy. Couple with this the mythic notions of “ur-heimat” [connoting an original ethnic homeland] and Providentialism, and the result is a vile cocktail. It is entirely spurious in every instance. This goes for whether we consider

the fabled Maori homeland, “Hawaiki Nui”...or the fabled Aztec homeland, “Aztlán”.

The notion that the Creator of the Universe dolls out tracts of land according to ancestry is bonkers. The proposition that a designated tract of land has been reserved for a “chosen tribe” (i.e. a CERTAIN RACE) is downright invidious. This is the case irrespective of who is doing it. This has been the case throughout history, regardless of who is doing it. Indeed, the ideation of “god-chosen” goes back to the Bronze Age. In ancient Egypt, there was the locution “Setepen-Ra” (meaning: the chosen of Ra). To justify a deed, one need only say that one is doing the deity’s will (or that whatever one decrees has the imprimatur of the godhead). For if GOD ordains it, then who are we to question it?

For anti-Semites, “zionist” is just a euphemism for anyone who is of Jewish ethnicity. Ironically enough, Revisionist Zionists (hereafter, RZs) suppose that to be properly Jewish IS TO BE Zionist. In other words, both kinds of right-wing ideology engage in this needlessly contentious protean thinking.

Conjuring bigotry where no bigotry exists is the hallmark of the true bigot. Those who cry anti-Semitism to discredit critics of Israeli policies discredit the charge.

This grossly expanded definition of “anti-Semitism” is primarily meant to silence Jewish critics of Israel, even as Judeo-Supremacists continue to seize Palestinian land, demolish Palestinian homes, and continue to routinely perpetrate crimes against humanity, with impunity.

Those who cry anti-Semitism to discredit critics of Israeli policies end up discrediting the indictment; and vitiating the potency of an important term. (If any perceived slight can qualify, then the charge means nothing.)

Here, alterity is operative. Non-Jewish residents of the nation-State are seen as “Ger Toshav” (aliens in our midst). Lebensraum makes perfect sense if THE OTHER is seen as TRESPASSERS.

For those who contend that to criticize Israeli government deeds / policies is to be anti-Semitic, they might take pause and consider the implicit message: To be Jewish is to necessarily be fascistic. For them, it’s as if bigotry were a precondition for Jewish-ness. One might call this “inverted anti-Semitism”, as it claims to be the opposite of anti-Semitism even as it (inadvertently) ends up in the same place as (overt) anti-Semitism. This boondoggle was most flagrant when the Trump administration tried to declare Human Rights Watch, Amnesty International, and UNRWA anti-Semitic.

The repercussions of false pride are clear, especially in the context of tribalism. In his “Folly Of Fools”, Robert Trivers explains: “When a feeling of power [i.e. of “chosen-ness” or exceptionalism] is induced in people, they are less likely to take others’ [read: outsiders’] viewpoint and are more likely to center their thinking on themselves. The result is a reduced ability to comprehend how others see, think, and feel. Power, among other things, induces blindness toward others” (p. 20). Thus tribalism engenders staunch parochialism, fetters open-mindedness, and severely attenuates the scope of empathy beyond the in-group. The staunch vested interest a dogmatist has in upholding is sacrosanct “truths” precludes him from engaging in a sober, objective critical analysis. He is constitutionally predisposed to not be open-minded and impartial.

By the time RZ adopted this collective pathology, the modern (read: hyper-nationalist) sense of “lebensraum” already had a long history—going back to the 18th century. The ethno-centric tribalism expressed by the likes of Johann Herder and Johann Fichte spoke of nations (demarcated along ethnic lines) reserved the (god-given) right to include all of THEIR OWN people (the in-group, ethnically-defined) within its proclaimed borders, which entails the license to persecute and/or evict all others, as they saw fit.

Wherefore? Because it is THEIR DESTINY.

Heinrich Treitschke picked this thinking up in the 19th century. That culminated in the proto-fascist asseverations of Joseph Mazzini. In his “On The Duties Of Man”, he wrote: “Let each man among you strive to incarnate his country in himself.” There were no individual rights, only individual duties (to the nation). “Rights” only existed in tribalistic terms (i.e. as collective rights). Each “nation” (ethnically defined) had a right to a consecrated territory devoted to itself (its own people; its own destiny). This was all couched in the idiom of Providentialism. (The Creator of the Universe was an impresario of the geopolitics of homo sapients on this third rock from the sun.)

According to this thinking, the in-group has license to proclaim the scope of its territory to the extent necessary to accommodate the (exclusive) in-group, who are entitled to assert sovereignty over anyone else in that domain. It is only NATURAL for a designated people to live within a certain geographically-contiguous nation-State, to the exclusion of anyone else, so that nobody has to live amongst foreigners...the presence of whom only threatens to sully the pristine culture of the exalted in-group.

At first blush, one might suppose the analogy of Nazi “lebensraum” to be rather harsh? Note Hermann Göring: “Voice or no voice, the people can always be brought to the bidding of the leaders. That is easy. All you need to do is tell them that they are being attacked; then denounce the peace-makers for lack of patriotism and for endangering the homeland. It works the same in any country.” Carl Schmitt put it more concisely: “Tell me who your ENEMY is, and I will tell you who YOU are.” Such statements are indistinguishable from the mindset of RZs. Indeed, this is the exact rhetoric encountered in RZ ideology.

Initially, the *raison d'être* for positing a “national home” for the Jewish people was to provide a refuge from the persecutions they were enduring in Europe. According to the ham-fisted “Balfour Declaration” (at the conclusion of the First World War, and pursuant to the dissolution of the Ottoman Empire), Jews in need of sanctuary would be moved to Canaan (i.e. Palestine) with the condition that “nothing shall be done which might prejudice the civil and religious rights of the exiting non-Jewish communities already there.” This was initially a secular enterprise, oriented around SOCIALISM. RZ upended this initial (estimable) approach, eschewing the communalist spirit of the kibbutz whilst allying itself with dubious parties.

Tellingly, RZ at the time colluded with the earliest impresarios of Nazism; as both wanted Jews out of Europe, relegated to a location faraway, segregated from the rest of the world. Moreover, RZ backed the precursor to Hamas. For, in basing itself on religious fundamentalism, it preferred to back ANY alternative to the P.L.O., as it was an icon of that despised beast, secularism. If Hamas would become the ever-present bugbear, then all-the-better. After all, every fanaticism is emboldened by a nemesis.

Divisive theological convictions suffuse the terrestrial grievances of RZ ideologues. Strip away the theology, and the agenda makes no sense. That is, it would make no sense short of a generic fixation on seizing territory for one's own ethnic group. Such a fixation is due to the usual tribalistic hunger for dominion over land, without outsiders getting in the way. To wit: An obsession with blood and soil. For this reason, it is a derogation of Judaism to render it synonymous with RZ. In reality, one no more has to be Jewish to be a Zionist than one has to be a Zionist to be Jewish.

It is, then, a perverse irony that RZ apologists deign to equate Judaism with RZ—as the supposition is that to be Jewish is to subscribe to such an opprobrious ideology. The upshot of this supposition is that one must be racist (Judeo-Supramacist) in order to be Jewish. Suffice to say: The insinuation that all Jews are racist in THIS way is—as it were—inadvertently anti-Semitic; as it is ostensibly championing Beth Israel. (Thus: inverted anti-Semitism.) Couple this with the fact that RZ is one of the chief instigators of anti-Semitism (furnishing those so inclined with a *casus belli*), and one finds RZ to be the primary culprit in animus

directed toward the world's Jewish people.

Playing upon insecurities and drummed-up sympathies, one can carry out ethnic cleansing under the auspices of PROTECTION. Hence the mere existence of an indigenous population of goyim in Canaan provides RZ with a nemesis to be vanquished; as those pesky goyim (i.e. native Palestinians) happen to be in the way of the proclaimed Judaic "lebensraum". How is this justified (beyond the usual claims of "Deus Vult")? "Someone did it to us; so now we can do it to someone else...as restitution to ourselves."

The raft of RZ grievances are rendered null if shorn of the deranged theological claims that undergird the attendant ideology. This grotesque manifestation of the siege mentality enables militant offense to be passed off as defense. Thus hostility masquerades as "security"; and racism masquerades as self-preservation. This imbues militarism with unassailable credence. We should recall Hermann Göring's dictum that, in ANY political system, one need only plead some dire state of victim-hood, and declare war against the designated menace. One can then marshal widespread public support for whatever one is doing, no matter how morally dubious. After all, who would have the gall to side against the designated VICTIMS? Considering the virulence of this persecution complex, one would think that Othni-El (the first Hebrew Judge) was still fighting off the Aramaeans.

RZ tend to dissemble when it comes to their siege mentality. Yet, in a rare moment of candor, Alan Dershowitz admitted the neurosis underlying his ideology—which, he conceded was a "Holocaust mentality". He described this mentality as the chronic suspicion that he was under persecution. With this Freudian slip, a craven apologist for RZ admitted that the ideology was predicated on (the perpetuation of) a persecution complex.

It is a gross irony that many of those who rail against "Holocaust denial" (with respect to the genocide perpetrated by the Nazis) are the same people who are THEMSELVES guilty of holocaust denial when it comes to the ethnic cleansing of Palestine perpetrated by their ideological brethren. (The phenomenon of holocausts is addressed in Appendix 2; where I show that nobody OWNS this term, or the travesty that it describes.)

One can't help but espouse Judeo-Supremacism after taking seriously passages like 2:1-4 and 61:5-6 in the Book of Isaiah...or 30:7-9 in the Book of Jeremiah...or 20:37-38 in the Book of Ezekiel. "God didn't make a covenant with anyone in the world but US."

And so it goes: The ideologue cannot see in himself the very crime for which he—rightly or wrongly—indicts others. ("Fine when WE do it, but wrong when anyone else does it.") The only reponse to this is "tu quo-que".

Bullies typically portray themselves as being the ones in danger from some menacing OTHER, when it is they who are the primary source of animus. Those afflicted with a persecution complex invariably become the persecutors. Hence Revisionist Zionism was born.

The siege mentality is the hallmark of ethnocentrism, and thus an indication that fascistic thinking is afoot. There is a method to this hysteria. For the overstatement of peril (being under siege) is parlayed into a rationalization for aggression. Thus militancy ameliorates insecurity; and offense is cast as a means of defense. In this (duplicitous) scheme, supposing one is under siege by X is used to justify bigotry toward X. (The Nazis used the exact same formula vis a vis socialists, Roma, Poles, Russians, and anyone who was Jewish.) Drummed-up feelings of victimization are then used as justification for aggression. It is the bully who often claims that he is under attack. For he thrives off the antagonism he decries. The grievance he has created for himself gives his hubris a veneer of moral legitimacy.

RZ is a case in point. Not since the Second World War has the socio-political exploitation of a victim narrative been taken to such extremes; and used in such a vulgar manner.

It is not for nothing that Moritz Güdemann feared that a day might come when “Judaism, with cannons and bayonets, would reverse the roles of David and Goliath to constitute a ridiculous contradiction of itself.” It is said that fascism typically emerges wrapped in a flag, carrying a religious talisman. Indeed, super-patriotism (hyper-nationalism, especially when infused with ethno-centrism) and fundamentalist religionism often go hand in hand, as both stem from some combination of delusion and zealotry.

“We, the good guys, are in a holy war with a nemesis” is a quick way to mobilize support for extreme measures—including the arrogation of power to authoritarian regime. A paranoid mob can be easily galvanized by the sales-pitch: “Give me power and I will protect you from this menace!” After all, neurosis and militancy are symbiotic. There are many ways to be delusive (a.k.a. “unhinged”), and each feeds off of the other.

And so it goes: a positive feedback loop ensues. WE feel as though we are under siege. We thus find ourselves in a dire predicament that gives US—and ONLY us—license to put THE OTHER under ACTUAL siege as a countermeasure. This will, in turn, elicit a hostile response that we can use to (further) rationalize our casus belli. And on and on. Reactions to our perceived plight is thus a self-fulfilling prophecy.

And so it goes: The proponent of RZ fuels the very thing he laments. Such projection is why White Supremacists don’t crow about “supremacy”, they prattle on about a pristinely white nation, then guffaw about a vilified OTHER (non-Anglo-Saxons) making incursions into “our” land; and then cry “white genocide”. So they circle the wagons. After all, in their minds, they’re being besieged by foreigners who threaten what they fashion as an ethnically pure homeland.

Similarly, RZs don’t explicitly fashion themselves as Judeo-Supremacists; they see themselves as fighting back against an incursion into “*eretz Israel*”. Anyone who doesn’t play along with this scheme is summarily vilified as “anti-Semitic”. (“Stand in the way of OUR lebensraum, and you’re just trying to reprise the ‘Shoah’!”) The irony is that *proponents of RZ have become the mirror image of the very thing that had victimized their forebears.*

Consumed by ancient grievances, RZ today are still preaching the gospel of racial purity and lebensraum...even as they complain about the atrocities perpetrated by the Nazis. They fail to see the glaring hypocrisy: “It’s bad when THEY did it, but it’s fine now that WE are doing it.” Of course, to be truly anti-fascist, one must be against ALL forms of fascism. (For more on this, see my essay: “The Many Faces Of Fascism”.)

Those who support the Israeli government’s right-wing policies hem and haw about Khomeinists in Iran and Hamas in the Gaza strip—both forms of deranged Islamic fanaticism. In a perverse twist of irony, BOTH entities were bolstered by the Israeli government in the early 1980’s (abetting Hamas in its antecedent form, as a countermeasure to the disdained P.L.O.; arming the Iranian regime—including support for its embryonic nuclear program—as a countermeasure to the disdained Iraqi regime).

Bring claims of (divine) Providence into the mix, and this pathology is super-charged. Divine election / appointment is the ultimate fulcrum for Exceptionalism: whereby the exalted in-group fashions itself to be special in a way that anyone else is not. So it makes sense that they accord to themselves CATEGORICAL entitlements that are unique to them. This exclusive status endows the anointed tribe with certain claims—this this case: upon a particular tract of land. In this divinely-sanctioned scheme, to not be part of the designated group is to be marginalized BY DIVINE ORDINANCE. This invidious mode of

categorization is considered sacrosanct; as the will of [insert godhead or deified figure here] is unimpeachable. After all, who's to question god's will? (As medieval Roman Catholics used to put it to rationalize their own deranged agendas: "Deus Vult!" End of discussion.)

We can—and must—fight anti-Semitism and Judeo-Supremacism at the same time. Each fight is a different facet of the same enterprise; as both ideologies are based on the same deranged principles. Indeed, their derangements are symbiotic; as one fuels (alt. feeds off of) the other. (Fanaticism stokes counter-fanaticism: Each a Reactionary mindset pitted against its mirror image.)

The charge that to be anti-RZ is to somehow be anti-Semitic is itself anti-Semitic—as it suggests that to be Jewish were necessarily to be ethno-centric and/or a religious fanatic. In other words: The charge is based on projection. What we see in such a scenario is, in effect, the racist accusing the humanist for being racist...DUE TO the latter being against the racist's own brand of racism. It's as if anti-racism were somehow a form of racism. {33}

It should come as no surprise that RZs and anti-Semites aligned on one matter: Jews were a foreign people in Europe, and so didn't belong there. (Ethno-centrism goes both ways: bigots on BOTH sides forbid miscegenation.) Common cause was thus forged between RZ and notorious anti-Semites like Arthur Balfour—who, as British foreign secretary, declared Jews "an alien and hostile people" and sponsored legislation to prevent the U.K. from admitting Jewish refugees. (Note that the only Jewish M.P. at the time, Edwin Samuel Montague, voted against the dunderheaded "Balfour Declaration".)

When hegemonic, tribal supremacy typically entails the coerced dispersion of indigenous populations, creating a diaspora. This can quickly translate to ethnic cleansing. In the most abominable cases, genocide occurs. Such an event is sometimes referred to as "holocaustum" (the Latinized version of Koine Greek: "holokauston"), meaning decimation by conflagration. This is Anglicized to "holocaust", meaning mass slaughter. I discuss the global application of this term in Appendix 2.

Note that "diaspora" can refer to any ethnic group that has been driven from its native land; and subsequently spread across the globe. There is an African diaspora (by far the largest; primarily the result of the slave trade), a Yazidi diaspora, an Armenian diaspora, a Kazakh diaspora, a Tatar diaspora, a Kalmyk diaspora, a Mongolian (esp. Zunghar) diaspora, a Hmong diaspora, a Tibetan diaspora, a Palestinian diaspora, a Polish diaspora (the "Polonia"), a Japanese diaspora ("Issei"), and countless others. Every one of them involves some degree of tragedy.

The dispersion of an ethnic people is often the result of some sort of purification program undertaken by a (more powerful) group in the exiled group's native land. The dominant group views itself as superior, and thus entitled. Such dispersion is often coerced; and—in the worst cases—the result of an ethnic cleansing campaign (as with the ethnic purging of Arabs from Palestine in since the Nakba in 1948, which is still ongoing). In the most abominable cases, genocide occurs.

The eradication of human life when it is seen as an inferior OTHER is perpetrated by those who exalt the in-group. There have been many examples of the phenomenon in recent history (as enumerated in Appendix 2).

We might note the disturbing parallels between different brands of fascism (see my essay on "The Many Faces Of Fascism"). Throughout the 1920's and 30's, Adolph Hitler enthusiastically endorsed the idea of establishing a reservation for the Jewish people in the Levant. In the 1930's, he sent the notorious SS officer, Otto Adolf Eichmann to meet with Zionist leaders in order to discuss how this might be done. The proposed program involved the transfer of Europe's Jews to somewhere—anywhere—in the Levant. This

included the possibility of the Jews forming a State of their own. The aim was to maximize—and expedite—said emigration. As late as the spring of 1938, Hitler spoke in support of precisely this program. It is a perverse irony that anti-Semites (found not only in fascist European countries, but in Russia as well) and Zionists shared the same interests in this singular respect.

Said discussions ended up yielding no fruit—as, pursuant to “Fall Weiss” (the Nazi invasion of Poland of 1939 commonly known as the “Blitzkrieg”), Heinrich Himmler proposed a far more nefarious plan for Europe’s Jewish population.

Even so, some Zionist leaders saw the Nazis as potentially useful partners...EVEN AFTER 1939. Indeed, in the autumn of 1940, the founder of the terrorist organization, “Lohamei Herut Israel” (“Lehi”; a.k.a. the “Stern Gang”), Avraham Stern sent a message to a senior Nazi official (the ambassador in Palestine). {21} It began: “Common interests could exist [between Germany and] the true national aspirations of the Jewish people.” The missive stipulated that in the event “the aspirations of the freedom movement of Israel are recognized, [we will] actively take part in the war on the German side.” (Note that this was AFTER the concentration camps had already begun operation.) Stern’s reasoning for this proposal was quite straightforward. If the resettlement were undertaken, surely Hitler would get what he wished (no Jews in Germany) while the ultimate goal of hard-line Zionists could be achieved (the in-gathering of all Jews in Palestine).

Stern further stated that such re-settlement would “strengthen the future German position of power in the Middle East”; and added that it would also “strengthen the moral basis [of the Third Reich] in the eyes of the world.” Indeed, NEITHER the Nazis NOR the Zionists wanted Jews mixing with the rest of mankind. To wit: They BOTH sought segregation along racial lines. {22}

It is no coincidence that, to the present day, both Aryan Supremacists and Judeo-Supremacists insist on singling out Jews from the rest of the human race. The fact of the matter is: It is NON-racists who encourage miscegenation, and RACISTS who demand racial purity. {23}

Note that Zionists refer to the aforementioned re-settlement program as the “Aliyah”. There is nothing unique about this ironic alignment. American president Harry Truman was an anti-Semite who unabashedly supported the establishment of the modern nation-State of “Israel”. American president Richard Nixon was an antisemite who (in deference to his psychopathic Secretary of State, Harry Kissinger) supported the Israeli military during the Yom Kippur war. Today, many of the most anti-Semitic ideologues are fundamentalist Christians who support Revisionist Zionism for their own cockamamie reasons.

And so it goes: Right-wing ideologues often have strange bed-fellows. We might recall that the earliest RZs promoted the precursor of Hamas as a counter-measure to the despised Palestinian Liberation Organization, as it was associated with those dreaded bogeymen: secularism and socialism.

This queer phenomenon is nothing new. Recall that it was the American abolitionists who harbored racist views against blacks who recommended that freed African slaves be re-settled back in Africa—an idea that has been appropriately referred to as “black Zionism”.

The opposite of this is: We WANT you to stay; we WANT to integrate you into our society; and we WANT to mix with you (in every sense). Why? Because we recognize you to be fellow humans; and THAT is all that matters.

That an ethnic group would countenance claims of ethnic supremacy in order to muster a modicum of self-esteem reveals a deep-seated insecurity. After all, Judeo-fascism, like ANY form of fascism, is predicated on a collective neurosis.

Victimhood his a fatuous basis for identity. This is especially the case when that victimhood status is largely self-inflicted. (There is no greater instigator for anti-Semitism in the world than the heinous policies of the Israeli government.) Flocking to a piece of land, viciously persecuting and evicting the indigenous population, then complaining that those persecuted / evicted peoples are now resentful as one plants one's flag on THEIR land? One cannot be genuinely "under siege" under such circumstances. One's proclaimed safe-haven cannot be a predicament that one has created for oneself in the past couple generations—thus claiming to seek refuge in a crucible of peril that was of one's own making. (To create an imbroglio that one holds to be one's sanctuary is nothing short of schizophrenic.)

Alas, the RZ case for blood and soil has a scriptural basis in the Torah. In Genesis 15:18, we are told that Yahweh promised Abraham's progeny all the land from the Nile to the Euphrates. (!) Yet the geo-political rationale for Zionism in its earliest form was that of refuge. The idea was to find a land in which the Jewish people of Europe could find sanctuary from the persecution they were incurring. It has since become an excuse to circle the wagons; and establish an ethno-State in the Levant. It now serves as a pretext for Judeo-fascism.

This is a tragedy for Beth Israel especially, as it betrays the best parts of the Jewish tradition. Judaism—especially within the Talmudic tradition—has always been known for inviting critical inquiry and embracing change. It is an open-ended tradition. It is an ASPIRATIONAL tradition. Which means it is forward-looking without needing to indulge in cockamamie eschatological musings...or delusive ethnocentric visions. "Yisra-El" means struggling with god; which entails wrestling with all that our forebears have deemed sacrosanct.

Criticizing certain (demonstrably problematic) social norms that might happen to be prevalent in a certain racial group (due to historical accident) is NOT RACISM; as no social norm is inextricably affiliated with this or that racial group. (In other words: No racial group is INHERENTLY predisposed to any given social norm.) In fact, to suggest that such criticism is "racist" is ITSELF racist. (!) For it insinuates that a certain "race" IS inherently so predisposed; and thus dysfunctional BY NATURE.

Thus criticism of RZ isn't racist; as its grievance is, after all, the RACISM endemic to RZ. (Anti-racism is not itself a form of racism) Meanwhile, the suggestion that such criticism is anti-Semitic is ITSELF anti-Semitic; as it insinuates that to be properly Jewish is to be fascistic (that the only way to be Jewish is to be a Judeo-Supremacist). Obviously, criticizing the KKK is not tantamount to bigotry against WASPs.

Being prevalent, those problematic social norms (which are accidents of history) may have deleterious effects on said racial group. In the event that IS the case, it does not preclude institutional racism (or some other structural inequality) as ALSO part of the explanation for said group's plight.

The two causes of iniquity are not mutually exclusive. One comes from within the group; the other is inflicted upon the group. The case MIGHT be made that structural inequality reinforces / perpetuates the social dysfunction; but they are still two distinct causal explanations.

The exalted in-group is seen as THE ELECT. "We have been chosen" is the collective version of "I have been chosen". It is born of the same conceit—a pathology that is mapped from hubris on the level of the individual to hubris on the level of the group.

The three primary elements of ethnic Supremacy are as follows:

1. A yearning to return to a mythical past (glory days) where the anointed tribe was pre-eminent, and thus enjoyed its rightful place in the world.
2. A belief that members belong to a perennially embattled group, perpetually under siege by a menacing OTHER; and so must fight for their survival...with the ultimate goal of re-taking the designated homeland (wherein an ethno-State shall be established).
3. A willingness to undertake draconian measures to achieve the stated goals.

In his “Nations & Nationalism” (p. 174-177), Eric Hobsbawm articulated this neurotic, tribalistic attitude thus: “If the foreigners with their knavish tricks did not exist, it would be necessary to invent them... Our very co-existence with ‘them’ now undermines the exclusive certainties of belonging to OUR people and OUR country.”

Hobsbawm then asks: “What, if anything, have such ethno-nationalist reactions in common with the recent rise of fundamentalism in many parts of the globe, which has been described as appealing to ‘people who cannot tolerate random and haphazard existence and unexplained conditions; and thus often converge on those who offer most complete, inclusive and extravagant world-views.’ It is seen as ‘always reactive, reactionary’. ‘Some force, tendency, or enemy must be perceived as potentially or actually eroding, corroding, or endangering one’s movement and what it holds dear.’ The fundamentals that fundamentalism stresses ‘always come from some earlier, presumably primal and pure...stage in one’s own sacred history.’ They ‘are used for setting boundaries, for attracting one’s kind and alienating other kinds, for demarcating.’” {24}

For a case in point, Hobsbawm notes the “markedly Old Testament phase of Likud Zionism in Israel, so different from the aggressively secularist, and even anti-religious, ideology of the movement’s founders.” He adds that “such parties—as always—like to equate themselves with the sense of collective separateness, hostility to ‘them’; and the ‘imagined community’ which may be almost universally felt in their ‘nation’.”

To rationalize their de-humanization (nay, demonization) of goyim in the Levant, RZ claim that the Palestinians are somehow unqualified to be considered a “People”. This warrants addressing two oft-made points:

**ONE:** Palestine qua Palestine was never a nation-State. The Palestinians have never had their own nation-State—a distinction shared by the Romani, Hmong, and Inuit. And though the Jains were integral to the Chalukya Dynasty, they never had a kingdom of their own. Yet no sane person would contend that none of these groups are a legitimate People (simply by dint of the fact that none of them have ever had their own nation-State). Shall we suppose the Tibetans are only to be considered a people insofar as they once had sovereignty over themselves?

This errant thinking was abetted by the invidious trope: “A land without a People for a People without a land”. Golda Mabovich (a.k.a. “Golda Meir”) perpetuated this lie in the 1970’s. It was actually the title of the 1984 book (then film), “From Time Immemorial” by Joan Peters: a landmark piece of RZ propaganda. The invidious proposition is false on BOTH counts. It is historically fallacious; and since the conclusion of the Second World War, it has (thankfully) been factually incorrect. Yet, to the present day, those who blithely deny the People-hood of the Palestinians continue to mouth it; passing their perfidy off with nary a shrug of the shoulders.

We might bear in mind that modern geographical affiliations are not always what they seem. The Jains, Romani, Hmong, and Inuit are a People without a Land. The Basque, Maya, Kurds, Armenians, and

Tibetans USED TO have sovereignty over their homeland; yet currently do not. Are they not a People entitled to their own self-determination?

The Palestinians are not unique in this respect.

Some groups end up establishing a NEW homeland after having been banished from their original homeland. The Assyrian homeland was in the Nineveh plains up to Hakkari (centered at Beth Khdeda), not in Syria. The Armenians now have a nation-State; but it is in a different place than the (original) Armenia. {38} But this does not take away from every ethnic group's right to self-determination. Just ask the residents of Hong Kong.

**TWO:** The Palestinians do not have a unique language; therefore they are not a bona fide PEOPLE. The same can be said of virtually all people in the Americas, pace Native Americans. The primary languages of Latin America (Spanish and Portuguese) are not unique. So are we to conclude that Latinos are not a people?

And what about North Americans (of the United States and Canada); and (non-indigenous) Australians? They don't have their own language either. Shall we disqualify all of them from having a sovereign nation? (So much for New Zealand!) This criterion eliminates the Swiss, Belgians, and Austrians as well.

Outside of the Arabian peninsula, NO Arab country has an autochthonous national language, as—pace Berber—they all use one or another vernacular of Arabic (and/or French) as a lingua franca.

Are we really to suppose that a lack of linguistic novelty is a disqualifying factor for people-hood? “X are not a people because they don't have their own language” is a claim one could just as easily apply to Latin Americans or citizens of the United States. Shall we contend, then, that Quebecois aren't a people because they speak a tongue borrowed from France? So much, then, for the majority of “Americans” (qua people identified by geographical designation) being, well, “Americans” (qua people with rights of sovereign nationality).

People-hood is predicated on factors that transcend sovereignty and language; as ethnicity cannot be boiled down to either political power or linguistic convention. Otherwise, someone needs to notify the Catalonians that the reason they cannot have political autonomy is because they've never had political autonomy...and someone needs to notify the Brasilians that they don't have the right to their own nation—seeing as how they speak Portuguese rather than a novel language. And don't forget half the population of Mozambique. (Trying telling a Brasilian that he's not REALLY “Brasilian”, he is—in reality—*Portuguese*, as that is the language he speaks. Good luck.)

The more fanatical proponents of this execrable ideology take very seriously passages like Deuteronomy 7:3-6, in which Yahweh admonishes against miscegenation with goyim—all but explicitly touting racial purity. (Here, the Abrahamic deity summarily declares that he had elected the Hebrews to be “a special people unto himself, above all other people that are on the face of the Earth.”) Hence the emergence of organizations fixated on racial purity, such as “Lehava”.

One of the more grotesque mutations of RZ is Christian Zionism—which, in a perverse twist of irony, harbors a patently anti-Semitic theology behind its voracious support for RZ (as the Jews are doomed to perdition in their deranged eschatology). There is also a host of Christian-Zionist operations—such as Ha-Yovel, Christians United For Israel (CUFI), and Proclaiming Justice To The Nations. Christian Zionism (a mutant strain of RZ) was pioneered by the Christian fanatic, Anthony Ashley Cooper (Earl of Shaftesbury) in the early 20th century; later instigated in America by Jerry Falwell, then put into overdrive by the likes of

John Hagee and other fanatics.

One of the more popular shticks is to equate all Palestinians with militant Salafis (i.e. with Hamas). Hamas was effectively created by the Israeli government as a counterweight to the secular-socialist Palestinian Liberation Authority. Proponents of this deranged ideology can then legitimize collective punishment (that is: visit reprisal on all Palestinian civilians for the transgressions of a small subset). Such perfidy is standard when it comes to perpetrators rationalizing a genocidal mindset.

Collective punishment is the modus operandi of ALL forms of fascism, even as it is often conducted under the aegis of ideologies that do not fashion themselves to be fascistic. The key is to blame an entire ethnic group for the misdeeds of a small subset of that group.

After the Second World War, the Geneva Convention declared collective punishment a crime against humanity. Yet many are still inclined to only see collective punishment as iniquitous in certain circumstances (that is: when it isn't themselves undertaking it).

As usual, ethno-centrism has a symbiotic relationship with religious fundamentalism; as theology (i.e. etiology and eschatology) are THE BASIS FOR the racism. Those who suppose that RZ has little to do with religion are being ridiculous. Yes, RZs think primarily in terms of RACIAL demographics; and yes, they speak in terms of Jews and Arabs (rather than in terms of practitioners of Judaism vs. practitioners of Islam). But they JUSTIFY their own agenda by their own religious tenets (while vilifying the Palestinians in terms of THEIR religious affiliation). All the while, conditions for any given person's entitlement is predicated on RACIAL background, irrespective of the person's fealty to Judaism PER SE. (Are you Jewish?" is the litmus test; and it has little to do with how stringently one hews to the Halakha. It's about ANCESTRY. Ergo: "Birthright Israel".) It is to this semantic swindle that we shall now turn.

## **A Semantic Bait And Switch:**

*"When I use a word, it means just what I choose it to mean—neither more nor less."* –from "Through The Looking Glass" by Lewis Carroll

To understand the confusion that stems from the rhetorical brouhaha surrounding this issue, it is important to understand a simple bit of prestidigitation that is used. Today, the qualifier "Jewish" has two meanings (which are often conflated): one pertaining to bloodlines (Hebrew people), the other pertaining to religious affiliation (subscriber to Judaism). Thus, to be a so-called "Jew" is to be a member of a (posited) race and/or of a religion. Which is more salient depends on who one asks. This twofold nomenclature (born of a hermeneutic dualism) causes confusion; and problems. For if one intends to comment on a group of people who subscribe to a certain dogmatic system (Judaism), one is stuck with the same moniker as if one were intending to comment on a group of people defined by race. The former is a perfectly legitimate way to talk about people (in terms of their beliefs); the latter is, by definition, racial-ist (and thus a recipe for racism).

This taxonomic glitch is exploited by Judeo-Supremacists (esp. RZs), who parlay the conflation into the accusation that anyone critical of their ideology is somehow being anti-Semitic. (As is often the case, an ill-conceived nomenclature enables such prestidigitation.) More than merely the fulcrum for rhetorical sleights-of-hand, the dual meaning of "Jew[ish]" also allows Judeo-Supremacists to obfuscate THEIR OWN racism: While they judge people according to ethnicity (Yehudim vs. goyim), they can then plead that they are merely referring to a demarcation of Faith traditions (practitioner of Judaism vs. Gentiles). Such legerdemain is typical of right-wing ideology.

The rhetorical maneuver of clandestinely defining “Jewish” one way (when it suits one point) and then another way (when it suits another point) is a semantic bait and switch that often passes without notice. Such casuistry enables xenophobia to operate under the aegis of sanctuary. The hypocrisy becomes blindingly evident when a person (rightfully) denounces White Nationalists for calling for a racially-pure ARYAN ethno-State in one breath...and in the very next breath defends the call for a racially-pure JEWISH ethno-State in Canaan. Both enterprises are deplorable for the exact same reasons; yet all the arguments properly leveled against the former are seen as entirely beside the point when it comes to the latter.

And so it goes: “Jew[ish]” has a twofold semiotic. It is a racial designation on the one hand; a religious affiliation on the other. This is a recipe for onomastic confusion and semantic wrangling; and the source of interminable embroilment. “Jew[ish]” is an Anglicized version of the Old French “giu”, which was derived from the Gaulish “juieu”, which was derived from the Latin “Iudaeus”, which was derived from the Koine Greek “Ioudaios”, which was derived from the Aramaic “Y’hudai”; meaning people of “Yehud” [Judea / Judah]. Hence JoN would have called himself a “Y’hudai”. The Hebraized version of “Y’hudai” was—and still is—“Y[e]hudi[m]”. However, several languages simply refer to Jews qua ethnicity as Hebrews (e.g. “Ebri” in Persian and “Ebreo” in Italian), thus not making a distinction between the two terms. This poses problems, as “Jewish” can designate an ethnic background AND/OR a religious affiliation. This has proven to be cause for endless vexation; yet provides an opportunity for what might be called a semantic “bait and switch”. I’ll start with the RZ use of this (perfidious) rhetorical maneuver, then explain how diagnosing it helps us understand similar maneuvers made by other kinds of unscrupulous ideologues.

RZ is an ultra-right-wing (read: fascistic) ideology that has little resemblance to “Zionism” as originally conceived: a secular movement seeking a place of sanctuary for an ethnic minority that was being systematically oppressed / persecuted—primarily by fascists—in Europe UNTIL 1945. RZ emerged as a full-fledged ideology in the advent of the Second World War (that is: after 1945). It is predicated on those of Jewish ethnicity arrogating to themselves (a group identity defined by bloodlines) unique entitlements (viz. colonization of the Levant); a privilege they deny to anyone else. (Goyim are allowed to have a presence only at the pleasure of those in charge.) That is to say, RZ is based on racial supremacy (imbued with Messianic zeal), rationalized via an obsession with bloodlines, which is itself derived from a literal reading of ancient Judaic lore. So far as RZ see it, this gives them license to brutally oppress—and even viciously persecute—anyone who stands in the way of them fulfilling what they see as their divinely-ordained destiny: establishing an ethno-State in Canaan (styled as a Jewish State) under the pretext of “democracy”.

This Crusade entails slaughtering civilians, destroying homes / infrastructure, denying goyim of civil rights, and stealing land with impunity; as such deeds are given the imprimatur of the Creator of the Universe, who’s been stylized as a cosmic real estate broker. The idea, it seems, is to make sure that Arabs (subalterns, depicted as “savages” as a matter of course) pay for what the Nazis did to European Jews. (!)

It is an untenable gambit to blame contemporary Germans for pre-1945 persecution / oppression of the Jews, so the restitution must come at the expense of someone else. Since those pesky Palestinians are residing in Canaan, we’ll make it payback time for THEM. In any case, “collective punishment” is the name of the game; just as it was for the militant anti-Semites from whom they initially sought refuge. It becomes easier to perpetrate this sham once an entire ethnic group is deemed inferior to the anointed group.

There is a duplicitous use of the epithet “anti-Semite” leveled by unscrupulous interlocutors to smear anyone who criticizes the government actions / policies of the nation-State of “Israel”. Such slander is beyond cynical; it is perfidious. For it deliberately treats a stance against humanitarian atrocities (or even a lack of full-throated support for crimes against humanity BASED ON racism) with racism against those supporting those atrocities. Being against a theocratic ethno-State perpetrating war crimes is not the same of being bigoted against the ethnicity on which said State is based.

In recent times, proponents of RZ have refashioned the State named “Israel” as a “Jewish State”—demanding that all others recognize it as such. Though duplicitous, the strategy here is quite simple: By associating a State with an ethnicity (standard practice in any ethnocracy), support for the deeds of a government can be equated with support for an entire ethnic population (i.e. the chosen group). (Recall that support for German’s Third Reich was conflated with supporting the Volk, ethnically-defined.) Conversely, any grievance with the State qua institution—or with its policies—can be equated with bigotry against the ethnic group by which it defines itself.

This is a semiotic swindle. {28} It enables those who criticize the official policies of the Israeli government to be accused of slandering Jews-in-general; or, if the critic is Jewish, somehow being a traitor to his “own people” (whatever that means, god only knows). {29} According to this specious logic: To voice grievances with the so-called “Jewish State” is IPSO FACTO a grievance against all Jewish people. Q.E.D. {30}

Another variation on this is equating criticism of specific policies—or of the underlying ideology—with organizations that might have an ax to grind with said policies (or with said ideology). Some accuse those who criticize the iniquitous deeds of the IG of being in league with, say, Hamas (which is also critical of the Israeli government). This would be like holding that those who criticize the Roman Catholic Church are in league with the KKK, because the Klan was also vehemently anti-Catholic. One may as well have contended that protestation against Soviet pogroms was tantamount to Nazism (also animated by animosity toward the “communists”). These false equivalencies (based on defective analogical thinking) is commonplace in vilification campaigns: guilt by (fraudulent) association.

Tragically, such legerdemain is often effective—as demonstrated by Judeo-fascist organizations like the AMCHA Initiative and the Canary Mission. To say criticism of a government’s policies (in this case, crimes against humanity perpetrated by a Judeo-fascist regime) is equivalent to anti-Semitism is the sort of McCarthyist smear tactic indicative of ANY totalitarian ideology. One may as well contend that criticism of a sacrament (e.g. “holy communion”; or its underlying dogma, trans-substantiation) in Roman Catholicism is tantamount to a slight against all Latinos...and/or against all Poles...and/or against all Filipinos...and/or against all Italians...and/or against all Quebecois.

We should recall that McCarthyism was made possible by sewing paranoia (about the incursion of a menacing OTHER, an enemy at the gates that was putting all god-fearing Americans in imminent peril). This was done with the Orwellian “Committee On The Present Danger”, whereby Colder Warriors stoked mass hysteria to rationalize their militarist ambitions (and to syphon public funds into the military-industrial complex).

When people are told that they are in peril, they reflexively defend those who share their ethnic identity (i.e. those who have the same creed / ideology). Tribalism thrives on insecurity. Delusions about one’s identity (especially if it is a function of a collective identity, whereby the exalted in-group was THE ONLY ONE anointed by God) make the world seem to make sense; to be predictable and ordered. Fantasies that remove trepidation and doubt are attractive no matter how groundless (nay, ESPECIALLY if they are beguiling).

We should bear in mind that the authoritarian mindset is characterized by deference to self-ingratiating dogmas; and a nagging suspicion of—nay, hostility toward—the out-group. Hence a belief that the world is INHERENTLY threatening to the in-group, which is singled out as uniquely special.

But how is this in-group to be defined? Again, we encounter the dual meaning of “Jewish”: defined either by ancestry or by religiosity, as the occasion warrants. This casuistic way of framing the discussion enables racists (in this case, Judeo-Supremacists) to be racist without admitting that they are racist...and to

subsequently accuse anyone who calls them on their (actual) racism of being “racist”. This is done as if anti-racism were itself a form of racism. We are all enjoined to enter this brave new world of Doublethink. {32} Such mendacity is enabled insofar as one can dictate the terms in which (and BY which) the issue-at-hand shall be discussed.

RZ apologists insist that they be singled out from everyone else...and then call foul whenever they are singled out from everyone else. In other words, they demand to be seen differently (in ways that are advantageous to themselves), yet then complain when the demand is honored (in any way other than one that favors them above all others). One might call this identity-schizophrenia.

The bait-and-switch often perpetrated by RZ apologists is popular because it may well be the only way to rationalize the tribal chauvinism (read: Judeo-Supremacy) on which the Judeo-fascist government of Israel is based. In this scheme, haughtiness is passed off as a necessary defensive measure. For what? For a “Jewish homeland”, fabricated for the purposes of promoting RZ ideology (see my essay on “The Land Of Purple”).

The conflation of religiosity and racial background is the most invidious form of sophistry. Pretending “Jew[ish]” refers exclusively to RACE at one moment, then pretending it refers exclusively to RELIGIOSITY the next moment, as it suits one’s rhetoric, is casuistic. This hermeneutic jujitsu should be called out whenever it occurs.

Throughout history, whenever anti-Jewish pogroms were undertaken, the perpetrators did not care if one was a RELIGIOUS Jew, they only cared that one was an ETHNIC Jew. (When they come to round up “the Jews”, they don’t care whether one is secular or not; because for them, Jewishness is about bloodlines, not about beliefs.)

It is a perverse irony that RZs depend on the same conflation. When anti-Semites oppress / persecute Jews, they do so based on RACISM, not because of some disagreement on any given doctrinal point. When Birthright Israel seeks to bolster the Aliyah, there is no consideration about how religious one might happen to be. It is based entirely on one’s racial profile.

Albert Einstein shed light on the crucial distinction. He—like any humane person on the planet—was for a safe haven for a persecuted people. He even entertained a hospitable State FOR Europe’s Jews. But what he decidedly did NOT endorse was a Jewish State (qua ethno-State). Instead, what he—along with every decent person in the world—endorsed was a safe haven for the world’s oppressed / persecuted Jewish people: a measure that was urgent until the defeat of the Nazis. Such a sanctuary could be ANYWHERE—be it Uganda or Manhattan’s Lower East Side.

Yet the loaded term, “Jewish State” tends to conflate this estimable vision with the mandate for an ethno-State. This hermeneutic sleight-of-hand can be quickly exposed the moment one tries to apply the same logic to any other State, anywhere else in the world, at any time in history. Imagine a group trying to establish an Aryan State; replete with its own “Birth-right” recruitment program. The logic would be exactly the same. {31} Upon seeing the implications after universalizing the salient maxim, such coy linguistic prestidigitation is harder to pull off.

Undoubtedly, some anti-Israel sentiment spawns from genuine anti-Semitism; but the vast majority of the racism involved in the post-War conflict in Canaan is on the part of RZs—who insist on making the conflict ALL ABOUT race (their own vis a vis everyone else’s). To call them out for making it about race (and insist that things NOT be made about people’s ethnicity) is to court accusations of anti-Semitism.

Another slight-of-hand is found with the elision of the distinction between “Israelite” (a pre-Judaic, Iron Age people in Canaan, assigned a name according to Biblical nomenclature) and “Israeli” (a citizen of the modern nation-State of “Israel”). In modern Hebrew, both are referred to using the same adjective: “Y’Israeli[t]”. This semantic conflation enables one to refer to the former, then in the next breath pretend it pertained to the latter, thereby obfuscating what is a fundamental difference. By (implicitly) equating two different things, one can pretend there is somehow an unbreakable lineage from the former to the latter. Such legerdemain serves an obvious ideological purpose.

Making the Jewish citizens of the modern nation-State seem equivalent to (that is: a continuation of) the Hebrew community in Canaan dating back to the late 2nd millennium B.C., one can hold that Jews are justified in asserting territorial entitlements—doing so under the auspices of reclaiming an ancestral “moledet”.

## **FINAL THOUGHTS:**

We have explored the Judaic tale of contrived provenance—one of many such tails. As I hope to have shown, rarely is such a narrative benign. In their attempt to exalt Beth Israel, RZs infuse the collective Jewish memory with a toxic hallucinogen, turning what would otherwise be a mere conceit (chosen-ness) into a malignancy. When the Creator of the Universe is fashioned as an unimpeachable real estate broker; and the Torah is treated as an incontestable title-deed; things are bound to go amiss for those who happen to stand in the way. In this scheme, “birthright” is a mantra rather than a sign of pathological hubris.

It is a breathtaking irony that RZ is undoubtedly the most significant instigator of anti-Semitism in the world. If one sincerely aims to mitigate anti-Semitic views, then opposing RZ is step number one. There is no greater fuel for anti-Semitism in the world than the (current) policies of the Israeli government qua Jewish State. Such policies are deliberately antagonistic. That is to say: Such policies fuel antipathies by exacerbating resentments, thereby driving those on each “side” further into partisan rancor...creating a vicious cycle...which is EXACTLY how the impresarios of RZ want it. For without a justification for their crusade (read: a rationalization for their siege mentality), their ideology would evaporate. It is the manufactured jeopardy that gives them an excuse to consolidate power. Antagonism has always been the lifeblood right-wing extremism.

A persecution complex entails that one insists that one is still the victim even when one becomes the PERSECUTOR. As discussed, bullies often feign victimhood, passing their aggression off as a defensive measure.

A (positive) feedback loop of acrimony ensues. This is a matter of mutual demonization: a recipe for self-fulfilling prophecy for both parties. Fanaticism feeds off of counter-fanaticism. Recriminations are exchanged; hostility escalates. The ideologues on both sides thrive off of the enmity they stoke, using it as an excuse to become even more antagonistic...thereby validating the alarmism of the opposite side. Each side can then sew further resentment.

The fanatics on both sides of a conflict ruin things for everyone else; even as the abetted conflict is used to legitimize their fanaticism.

The right wing on BOTH sides of most conflicts thrive on conflict. Enmity (that is: seething resentment directed toward THE OTHER) is their lifeblood; as conflict is an excuse to galvanize followers, and consolidate power.

In 1975, the U.N. Resolution 3379 recognized the far-right incarnation of Zionism (RZ) as a racist ideology; also noting the ethnic cleansing it had countenanced, and the crimes against humanity it has systematically perpetrated. But it's not so simple. Ideologues are reticent to concede that crimes against humanity were committed by members of their own group—as such a concession means the jig is up. This is why in Turkey, it is a crime to refer to the persecution of the Armenians (the “Aghed” during the First World War) as a “genocide”; as doing so impugns the honor of the in-group (the Turks).

The same goes for RZ. It is very difficult for proponents of this execrable ideology to fess up to their atrocities. The toxic cocktail of a siege mentality and DGW syndrome is the dark underbelly of Providentialism—which is to say that it is based as much in neurosis as in delusion.

What is lost on proponents of RZ are the most vaunted tenets of the Faith they claim to espouse. They might recall the words of Hillel The Elder: **“That which is hateful to you, do not do to your neighbor. That is the whole Torah, the rest is commentary.”**

There are several prayers recited during the Passover dinner. One is, “All tyrannies are abominations. May the struggle for all who fight for liberty and equality be our struggle.” (We can only guess that if any proponent of RZ has ever uttered this statement, he has not grasped its full implications.) This is a prayer that ALL people of the world can make; and one that all should heed.

## Footnotes:

{1 By the time Abraham would have lived, the Isin-Larsa period would have come and gone. Note that the Hebrews were allegedly in Egypt for about two centuries (early 15th century to the early 13th century), which correlates with the duration between Joseph (great-grandson of Abraham) and Joshua (contemporary of Moses): which accounts for approximately six generations. Hence a century corresponds to about three generations, which sounds about right. Extrapolating backward from Joshua, that puts Abraham at c. 1600 B.C.}

{2 This occurred just before Egypt's Pharaoh was a woman: Hatshepsut. Evidently, this was not something adequately importune to warrant mention in the (decidedly patriarchal) Torah.}

{3 Note that this Abrahamic tale was likely a reworking of the ancient Greek legend of Agamemnon of Mycenae. In order to appease the gods (spec. the goddess, Artemis), the Spartan leader was told he must sacrifice his daughter, Iphigenia. To curry favor, he was willing to oblige. Yet at the last minute, he was allowed to replace her with a deer. (Ref. Aeschylus' account from the beginning of the 5th century B.C.) The Hebrew version was likely composed in the early 6th century B.C., the Greek tale likely predates it by at least a century.}

{4 The etymology of “Semitic” from the Biblical figure, Shem, began with the German philologist, Ludwig von Schlozer in the early 19th century.}

{5 Note that several languages simply refer to Jews as Hebrews (e.g. “Ebri” in Farsi and “Ebreo” in Italian), thus not making a distinction between the two.}

{6 As it turned out, the Abyssinians played a key role in Mohammedan lore.}

{7 These groups hailed from trans-Jordan and northern Hijaz, and may have been conflated with the Nabataeans. They were demonized (as dark-skinned Ham-ites, typically associated with Africans), and eventually became emblematic of anti-Semitism (i.e. iconic adversaries of the Jewish people). Ironically,

such a stigmatization was itself racist. One of the explanations for the Ham-ites' tainted nature is that they were progeny of the ante-deluvian "Nephil-im"...via the so-called "Repha-im" (associated with the dreaded "Philistines"; alt. the Amorites of Ugarit), as well as the so-called "Emim-im" (Edom-ites) and "Anak-im" (Moab-ites). We should bear in mind that Judeo-Supremacy is the mirror image of anti-Semitism. Behold bigotry in opposing directions. (To wit: They are both deranged; and for the same reasons.) Ham-ites encompass the Numidians, Nubians, and Abyssinians—including the Berbers. The descendants of Esau who are most focused upon are the progeny of his son, Eliphaz (who was associated with the Edomites): Teman, Zepho, Gatam, Kenaz, and Amalek (the last via the Arab concubine, Timna). Along with the Edomites and Midianites, the Amalekites were a vilified people hailing from the southern Levant / northern Arabia (i.e. Nabataea).}

{8 Amongst Japhet[h]ites, Cappadocians are also thrown into the mix somehow, perhaps via the Cimmerians (who originally hailed from the Eurasian steppes). The Medes (proto-Persians, of Media) were considered the descendants of Japhet[h]'s son, Madai. Other groups are simply assigned ad hoc genealogies—as with, say, the giant "Repha-ites" (that is: "Repha-im"; progeny of the "Nephil-im"), from whom descended the fabled "Anak" (forefather of the so-called "Anak-im" of Moab and "Emim-im" of Edom; antagonists of the Hebrews). Other demonized tribes that the Abrahamic deity ordered exterminated: the Zamsumm-im, the Hor-im, and the people of the vilified Amorite king, Og of Bashan / Argob...all deemed remnants of the dreaded "Nephil-im".}

{9 Historical evidence points to the fact that the Ashkenazim are actually descendants of the [k]Hazars who adopted Judaism in the 9th century...and then refashioned themselves as not only as "Jewish" qua religiosity, but "Jewish" qua bloodline (that is, not merely Semitic in religious tradition, but ethnically Semitic).}

{10 Indeed, the earliest Celtic peoples hailed from central Europe—as Celt-Iberian and proto-Gaulish (e.g. the Hallstatt culture). As for the early civilizations of the Indus Valley [the proto-Vedic people of Harappa c. 3,300 B.C], the plains of the Yellow River [the archaic Chinese of Jiahu c. 7,000 B.C.], and the Americas [the Norte Chico of Huaricanga c. 4,000 B.C.], the Mikra has little to say. Was there another (unattested) ark predating the Biblical flood by several millennia? Never mind that the Hassuna / Samarra / Ubaid peoples were settling in northern Mesopotamia by 6,000 B.C. And once the Sumerians established Uruk c. 4,000 B.C, they still had over a millennium remaining before Noah would sire his progeny. Hence: Short of there being some clandestine program involving time machines and artificial insemination, we can safely dismiss ALL patrilineal lore as hokum.}

{11 The Kingdom of Judah (in the south) and the Kingdom of Israel (in the north) became separate shortly after Solomon's death. The latter lineage was actually divided into nine Houses: Jeroboam, Baasha, Zimri, Omri (which included the notorious King Ahab), Jehu, Shallum, Menahem, Pekah, and Hos[h]ea. The House of David proceeded from Judah's tribe. Meanwhile, Moses came from Levi's tribe (via his father, Amram, who was son of Kohath). Joseph's tribe was actually comprised of three lineages: that of Ephraim (most famously: Joshua), that of Manasseh, and that of Benjamin (as with King Saul of Gibeah). Jacob seized Isaac's blessing from his brother, Esau; thereby rendering his progeny (the sanctified lineage) the result of a stolen birthright. Joseph (Isaac's grandson) was the first of Jacob and Rachel's sons; the 11th of Jacob's total 12 sons—each of whom was progenitor of a so-called tribe of Israel; or so the story goes. This Balkanization of the early Hebrews occurred as follows: The northern Kingdom was comprised of ten of the tribes (Zebulun, Issachar, Asher, Naphtali, Dan, Manasseh, Ephraim, Simeon, Reuben, and Gad); the southern Kingdom was comprised of two of the tribes (Benjamin and Judah). As we've seen, Levi—whom Jacob sired via Leah, and who's progeny would entail a thirteenth tribe—is typically not accounted for in this explanation. His progeny were deemed the high priests: "kohen-im" (see footnote 20 below). At any rate, the Kingdom of Judah yielded the prophet, Isaiah (among others); while the Kingdom of Israel yielded the

prophets Jonah, Amos, and Hos[h]jea. The former was mostly Judaic. Ironically, it was the latter that was mostly pagan; though WHY the moniker “Israel” was adopted by those who were mostly pagan remains somewhat of a conundrum. Perhaps it was done retroactively by later chroniclers for reasons that made sense at the time. }

{ 12 The irony is that those who support Palestinian rights are often deemed “anti-Semitic” when, in fact, Palestinians are Semites. To wit: Persecuting Palestinians is just as anti-Semitic as persecuting Jews. }

{ 13 Esteem / status can derive from either an “Aition” (first cause) or a “Telos” (final cause). }

{ 14 These regimes have all claimed descent Mohammedan bloodlines. The claim itself is preposterous, yet the most disturbing thing is that they find the need to do so. Even more disturbing is that so many take such claims seriously. The obsession with bloodlines seems to persist in the most Reactionary / parochial precincts, irrespective of culture. To this day, we find the same daffy atavism in England (the House of Windsor is an offshoot of the Germanic House of Wettin from the Holy Roman Empire; thereby tracing bloodlines that go back over a thousand years), Japan (the Imperial House claims direct decent from Emperor Jimmu from the 7th century B.C.), Thailand (the Chakri / Rama line, dating back to the beginning of the Rattanakosin Era in 1782), and even America (Mayflower fetishism, harkening back to 1620). All of it is ridiculous; yet it continues to be taken seriously amongst the uneducated. }

{ 15 Pre-Exilic Hebrew theology was polytheistic. Asherah / Astarte was probably worshiped as the godhead’s consort. Temples seem to have existed in Jerusalem, Bethel, and Samaria. Moreover, Yahweh seems to have been worshipped along with the Canaanite deity, Baal...until, that is, the Deuteronomic sources formalized Judaism as an explicitly monotheistic religion. I explore this subject at length in my essay: “City Of The Beloved”. The first texts would have been composed in Babylonian Aramaic, as with the Story of Ahikar. }

{ 16 Note: ONLY THREE of the names prior to Jesus’ father are in common between these two Gospels: El-i-akim (who occurs much earlier in Luke) and Shealt-i-El with his son, Zer-u-Babel (typically rendered “Zerubabel”). }

{ 17 Interestingly, in all four canonical Gospels, only a Joseph of Arimathea is mentioned. }

{ 18 The gimmick of retroactively re-writing lineages goes back to time immemorial. Take, for instance, the infamous House of Rothschild [Red Shield], which traces its lineage back to Moses ben Kalman [Bauer], who begat Amschel in 1710, who begat Mayer in 1744. Mayer was considered the modern patriarch of the family, and had five sons: Amschel II, Solomon, Nathan, Carl, and James. Nathan, who was based in London, died in 1836. Coincidentally, the other four all died in 1855. I explore the Turkic roots of this lineage in Postscript 1 to my essay: “The Forgotten Diaspora”. }

{ 19 The best that can be done is trace this lineage back to Richomer[es], who lived in the late 4th century. He begat Theodemer[es], who begat Marcomer[es], who begat Chlodio, who begat Merovech. Another version stems from Marcomer[es]’s brother / son, Faramond. }

{ 20 Levi was actually cursed by Jacob for having massacred the residents of Shechem in the northern kingdom (as vengeance for the rape of their sister, Dinah). The Levites (i.e. Kohen-im) were categorized according to Levi’s three sons: Gershon and Merari (keepers of the tabernacle), then Kehath (grandfather of Moses and Aaron via Amram). It seems that most Kohen-im fashion themselves as being in the line of either Aaron’s son, Elijah (adversary of Ahab)—specifically, through the line of Iddo the Seer, and on through Zechariah. }

{21 The Nazis and the earliest RZs actually shared a foe: the British. Of course, this was for different reasons. In the former case, the British stood in the way of Nazi hegemony across Europe. In the latter case, the British were in charge of the Mandate of Palestine (an arrangement made in the advent of the Ottoman collapse), and so stood in the way of RZ designs in the Levant. Today, many forget that the first terrorist attacks in Palestine were by RZs (esp. the Stern Gang) against the British. Many also forget that the first RZs allied themselves with the Muslim Brotherhood—actively supporting the precursor to Hamas as a countermeasure to the dreaded (secular-socialist) Palestinian Liberation Organization. }

{22 Of course, up UNTIL 1945, the Jewish people of Europe WERE in desperate need of sanctuary; as they had endured oppression and persecution since Classical Antiquity, and had just incurred the most horrific chapter in their history. Ironically, it has been SINCE the Second World War that European Jews have had to contend with anti-Semitism the LEAST, and so have LEAST required refuge. And even to the extent that some may have still sought a safe haven, doing so does not require the establishment of an ethno-State; nor does it confer license to displace and viciously persecute OTHER ethnic groups. }

{23 Of course, RZ has never really been based on a sincere concern for anti-Semitism; as its policies serve as the world's primary instigator of anti-Semitic sentiment. (This is not an excuse for anti-Semitism, it is a causal explanation.) Indeed, Judeo-fascism exploits the perception of anti-Semitism to justify its existence, as its existence is predicated on a siege mentality. RZ thrives off of anti-Israel animus...which is (perfidiously) equated with anti-Semitism. RZ policies endanger the lives of Israeli citizens more than even the fiery sermons of the most virulently anti-Semitic Salafi imam. One wonders how Hamas emerged; and how it marshals support, look no further than the opprobrious policies of the Israeli government in Palestine. One cannot be at the same time against anti-Semitism and a proponent of RZ. }

{24 Hobsbawm noted that such groups conform to George Simmel's observation: "Groups, and especially minorities, which live in conflict...often reject approaches or tolerance from the other side. The closed nature of their opposition, without which they cannot fight on, would be blurred [by such diplomacy]. Within certain groups, it may even be a piece of political wisdom to see to it that there be some ENEMIES in order for the unity of the members to be effective; and for the group to remain conscious of this unity as its vital interest." For more on the use of a trumped-up adversary in getting people to rally behind an ideological agenda, see my essay: "Nemesis". }

{25 This is Sanskrit for the "dense forest" of Madhu. It was the basis for the name of the ancient city of Madhu-pura (later rendered "Mathura") on the Yamuna River, which would serve as the kingdom's capital. }

{26 This lineage is also hallowed in Buddhism, as it traces itself to Buddha's disciple, Katyayana. }

{27 This also had to do with the Christian majority who spoke the Serbian dialect until the end of the 19th century—yet another excuse to delegitimize the Muslims of Kosovo, who are ethnic Albanian.) Claims upon land based on a toxic cocktail of ethnic supremacy and divine Providence (i.e. an obsession with "blood and sand") is a contentious ideological fulcrum—nay, one of the most incendiary pretensions imaginable. Insofar as one's claim of ownership is believed to be divinely ordained; it is seen as unimpeachable. Shlomo Sand noted: "From the Italian fascists, who claimed the Croatian coast because it had earlier belonged to the Venetian Empire (and, before that, to the Roman Empire), to the Serbs, who claim sovereignty over Kosovo based on the battle of 1389 against the Ottoman Muslims, and the existence in the region of a Christian majority that spoke Serbia dialects until the end of the 19th century, reliance on the principle of historic rights has fueled some of the ugliest territorial struggles in modern history." }

{28 Note, for example, the nomenclature used for RZ organizations like the “World Jewish Congress” and the “Jewish Defense League”. Such titles conflate a fascist ideology with Jewishness. This unfounded generalization only ends up derogating Jews. (Tellingly, a related enterprise was dubbed the “World Zionist Organization”; thereby revealing what the titles REALLY mean.) Insofar as being Jewish is held to be equivalent to being Zionist, RZ disqualifies the majority of the world’s Jewish population—an invidious proposition. Judeo-Supremacism—as with ALL brands of supremacism—works towards self-segregation; as Judeo-Supremacists don’t want goyim amongst them; and they’d prefer not to be amongst goyim. In effect, RZ is the largest self-segregation program in history. Those of us who are cosmopolitan / humanist work toward the opposite goal. We embrace diversity, and so encourage those of any given ethnicity to intermix—in all senses—with those of all other ethnicities. The only “tribe” that really matters is the tribe of mankind—wherein we are all members (simply because we are all fellow human beings). Meanwhile, there are only two nations in the world the existence of which is based on a racial purity campaign: Choson (a.k.a. “North Korea”) and Israel. }

{29 This acrimonious smear (often perpetrated using the vulgar epithet, “self-hating Jew”) has been leveled against such stalwart Jewish scholars as Hannah Arendt, Noam Chomsky, Shlomo Sand, Ilan Pappé, Norman Finkelstein, Tanya Reinhart, etc. The approach: “I don’t like what you say, so I’ll paint you as a bigot” is merely an act of projection. It has the same rhetorical ballast as the juvenile retort, “I know you are but what am I?” It is made even more perverse in that it conveys the message: “You are ethnically one of us; so you are obligated to embrace the ethno-centric ideology that we are promoting. Otherwise, per said ethno-centric ideology, you are a traitor.” This inversion of racism normally passes without comment. We encounter the same inversion with PIA—where the epithet du jour, “Islam-o-phobia”, makes even less sense; as Islam is not a race...and, in any case, the Ummah is comprised of dozens of ethnicities. }

{30 The other version: Those who criticize the policies of the Israeli government (i.e. its crimes against humanity) are, in doing so, somehow denigrating all the world’s Jewish people. This is analogous to holding that those who criticize the KKK are bigoted against WASPs. ANYONE can be a fascist, and they must be indicted for their fascism, irrespective of the ethnicity in which it happens to be couched. Jews who support fascism (i.e. the Judeo-fascism of the Israeli government) must be called out for their support of fascism QUA FASCISM. It must be borne in mind that it is the Judeo-fascist who makes their agenda all about their ethnicity; and THAT is the problem. The point is to STOP making it about their ethnicity. Turpitude itself has no ethnic biases. What many don’t understand about anti-Semitism is that it is a matter of RACISM, and so is directed against people who are Jewish because they are ethnic Jews rather than due to some bone to pick to specific dogmas. Anti-semites are not motivated by the fact that Jews won’t eat ham and cheese sandwiches; they are consumed by antipathy toward a certain racial group—irrespective of doctrinal points. Those who conflate criticism of DOGMAS with bigotry against those who espouse those dogmas must always be called out for their perfidy. }

{31 If Choson had a Korean diaspora, then it too might have a “birth-right” program. Had it prevailed, Nazi Germany certainly would have had such a program. Special entitlements based on race is the obverse side of special limitations based on race: one logistically entails the other, even if tacitly. Positive discrimination in favor of one ethnic group cannot exist without a concomitant negative discrimination—whether implicit or explicit—against all other ethnic groups. Aryeh Eldad (former member of the Knesset) put it best when he said, “If we are not here because of what’s written in the Bible, if we are not here because this is the land that god promised to the Jewish people, then we have no good reason to be hear.” Ironically, the most noble-minded humanist could not have put it any better himself. So, according to Eldad’s own phantasmagoric logic, the Jewish people QUA JEWISH PEOPLE have no good reason to be undertaking an ingathering in Canaan. As if to confirm his insanity, Eldad added, “When we rebuild the temple, then we’ll know the Messiah will come.” This is no less delusional than Juche. Statements like this

reveal the *raison d'être* of RZ in the clearest terms; thereby verifying its spuriousness. }

{32 It is common practice for RZ to project their own (unwitting, tacit) anti-Semitism onto critics of their fascistic ideology; all in a gambit to discredit interlocutors (via a programmatic onslaught of disparagement). In reality, RZ demean the world's Jews by insinuating that to be Jewish is to be RZ, and vice versa. They thereby (inadvertently) derogate all Jewish people. For the insinuation is that Jewish-ness is concomitant with endorsing the crimes against humanity perpetrated by the Israeli government; so criticism of said crimes is ipso facto criticism of Jews qua Jews. This is a textbook case of projection. To be Jewish is no more to be a Judeo-Supremacist than to be WASP is to be a white nationalist. Moreover, virtually ANYONE can be a fascist—though certain Faiths (Quaker, Jain, Tibetan Buddhist, Druze, Sikh, Baha'i, Wicca, etc.) make such an ideological bent intractable. }

{33 The political equivalent of this is corrupt regimes that criminalize any exposure of their corruption—as if being against crime were itself a kind of criminality. The flawed logic in this contorted taxonomy can be demonstrated with an analogy: Person A is a heavy drinker; while person B practices temperance. Person A has contempt for people who don't drink. Person B has contempt for people who have contempt for people who don't drink, though has nothing against those who happen to drink. In a sense, person A is a drinker-supremacist—what might be called a “drinkist”: someone who thinks those who imbibe are in some way superior to those who don't (and, by dint of that fact, should be accorded special privilege). And what of person B? It is not that he is a temperance supremacist; he is simply anti-drinkist (that is: against those who judge people simply based on whether or not they happen to regularly imbibe). B's approach is pluralistic: to each his own. Ergo B is NOT the analogue of A. To take the analogy even further: To be against excessive drinking is not tantamount to bigotry against those with a drinking problem. Such an activist does not seek to harm heavy drinkers; he seeks to identify the problem—a problem, it might be added, that harms EVERYONE. He has nothing against the person; his grievance is with the dysfunction. }

{34 It is interesting that both Hebrews and Muslims have employed the idiom of a HOUSE (Bet[h] Israel; Dar al-Islam)...even as the common Semitic term “Beit” / “Bet[h]” / “Bayt[h]” was available. The Old Semitic lexeme for house, “bit” may have had Akkadian origins. The palace of Aramaean King Kapara of Guzana (c. 1,000 B.C.) was known as “Bit Hilani” [House of Pillars]. That was likely Old Aramaic. Thinking of one's tribe as residing in a physical enclosure—a safe place to call home—is a useful semiotic; as it serves as an apt analogy for the tribal mindset, which, it might be noted, has been at the root of so many problems. This is analogous to the broader usage of “oikos” in Greek—as found in the Gospel of Luke: “Go into the highways and hedges, and compel them to come in, that my house may be filled” (14:23). This is, of course, not a literal house. Here, “oikos” is a metaphor for a global religious community. The same goes for Classical Hebrew—as when Isaiah states: “For my house will be called a house of prayer [beit tepilah] for all people” (56:7). Hence the moniker “Beit Yisra-El”, whereby the global Jewish community is referred to as a house. I explore this idiom in my essay on “The Land Of Purple”. }

{35 Eleazar ben Aaron was the progenitor of the Levite line of high priests. Interestingly, “Azar” seems to have come from the Persian term for fire; which would make the name “El-i-Azar” mean “god of fire”. However, the etymology is alternately taken as “El-Azar”, which is Semitic for “god helps”. }

{36 “The Forgotten Diaspora” has two points. First: To show that Jewish people who happen not to have Semitic genes are no less Jewish. Second: To show the lengths to which hidebound ideologues will go to obfuscate any history that does not comport with their preferred narrative (in this case, an etiological myth that abets their ethno-centric agenda). }

{37 The direct translation of the title, “Mein Kampf” in English is “My Struggle”. However, the English word “struggle” does not capture the religious connotations of “kampf” (as it is used in this context). Nor

does it have the dual meaning of “kampf”: on the one hand, an existential struggle; on the other hand, a militant struggle. The Arabic “jihad” succeeds on both counts; as I discuss in the Appendix to part 2 of my essay on “The History Of Salafism”. “My Religious / Political Crusade” would be another way to interpret the book’s title. A good indication that “My Struggle” is an inadequate translation is the fact that it is ALSO the translation of Karl Ove Knausgaard’s 2009-11 memoir (from Norwegian). The German translation of Knausgaard’s book even went so far as to ALTER the title so as to avoid a conflation with Hitler’s book, which used “struggle” in an entirely different manner. Suffice to say, the Arabic translation of Knausgaard’s book is NOT “Jihad-i”; it is “Sirae-i”.

{38 Armenians were banished from original ethnic homeland: “Van” (alternately dubbed “Hayk”, after the mythical patriarch), which was located in Eastern Anatolia (now part of Turkey). It was dubbed “Urartu” during the Iron Age, and included Art[s]akh. What is NOW “Armenia” is in the southern Caucasus. While the modern nation-State does not correspond geographically to the original homeland, Armenians now consider this new territory their home. As Eric Hobsbawm put it: “‘Armenia’, one might say, was what was left when Armenians had been exterminated or expelled from everywhere else” (“Nations & Nationalism” p. 165). The willingness to refrain from designating a certain tract of land divinely-ordained (based on ancient historiographies) may serve as a lesson to RZs, who simply claim to want a place for Beth Israel to call home.}

## APPENDICES:

### **Appendix 1: Revisionist Zionist Figures & Organizations**

Judeo-fascism can be defined as militant Jewish ethno-nationalism: a toxic cocktail of ethno-centricity and hyper-nationalism with theocratic underpinnings. The cultic elements stem from either fundamentalist Judaism (or, as a proxy, fundamentalist Christianity). It is no surprise, then, that the more religious a Jew or Christian happens to be, the more he is apt to endorse the Revisionist form of Zionism—a grotesque mutation of its original (secular, humanist) form, as envisioned by Theodor Herzl.

A dozen notable sources for this deranged ideology might be named. Behold the preachments of:

- Ze’ev Jabotinsky (bellwether for Revisionist Zionism)
- Abraham Isaac “ha-Kohen” Kook
- Gush Emunim (esp. his “Book of the Faithful”)
- Zvi Hirsch Kalischer (esp. his “Drishat [t]Zion”)
- Samuel Klein (esp. his “Sefer ha-Yishuv”)
- Judah ben Solomon Chai Alkalai
- Moses Leib Lilienblum
- Ben-Zion Dinur
- Abba Ahimeir
- Meir David Kahane of Brooklyn (an unabashed Judeo-fascist)
- Zvi Yehuda Kook
- Avraham Shapira (of the notorious “Mercaz Ha-Rav Kook”)

Prominent politicians touting this execrable ideology have included the likes of Menachem Begin and Benjamin Netanyahu. Terrorist organizations, including the Israeli government itself, have also proliferated—most infamously: “Lohamei Herut Israel” [Fighters For the Freedom of Israel; a.k.a. “L-H-I”; the “Stern Gang”] and “Ha-Irgun Ha-[t]Zva’i Ha-Leumi b-Eretz Yisrael” [a.k.a. “I-Z-L”; “Irgun”].

Probably more than anyone else, Jabotinsky made the Judeo-Supremacist obsession with racial purity explicit. In his “Letter on Autonomism” he wrote: “It is quite clear that the source of the national sentiment cannot be found in education, but in something that precedes it. In what? I thought about this question and answered myself: In the blood. And I persist in this view. The sense of national identity is inherent in man’s ‘blood’, in his physical-racial type, and only in that.”

These words could have been spoken by a garden-variety Aryan-Supremacist. Jabotinsky continued: “The people’s mental structure reflects their physical form even more perfectly and completely than does that of the individual. ...That is why we do not believe in mental assimilation. It is physically impossible for a Jew descended from several generations of pure, unmixed Jewish blood to adopt the mental state of a German or a Frenchman, just as it is impossible for a Negro to cease being a Negro.” Heinrich Himmler could not have said it any more plainly himself.

Contemporary American proponents of this heinous ideology include Morton Klein, David Horowitz, David Friedman, and Yossi Klein Ha-Levi. The odious cause is also bankrolled by billionaire tycoons like private equity kingpin, Adam Milstein; media baron, Haim Saban; Oracle CEO, Safra Catz; clothing retail magnate, Leslie Wexner; film producer, Arnon Milchan; and (the late) casino mogul, Sheldon Adelson.

Even as they are acting remotely (i.e. from America), all these men are effectively the Judaic analogues of the (WASP-oriented) Ku Klux Klan—which is simply to say that they are Judeo-fascists. Their agenda is seen as part of a broader “Miluim”: the (purported) duty to serve RZ interests.

It is key to note that such figures are not against fascism PER SE; they are—like any other fascist—merely against any form of fascism other than their own. The key difference is that they fancy themselves to be DEFENDERS AGAINST fascism rather than proponents of it.

Judeo-fascism encompasses a potpourri of fanatical right-wing organizations: the (overtly terrorist) Jewish Defense League, the Shalem Center, the Koret Foundation, the Tikvah Fund, the Jewish National Fund, Stand With Us, etc. Judeo-fascism is an ideology that persists to the present day...as attested by the prominence of Ben Mileikowsky (a.k.a. “Benjamin Netanyahu”).

We are all aware of the predominant political party in Israel today: Ha-Likud (“The In-gathering”). A dozen more of the most fanatical organizations / parties:

- Kach [derived from the Irgun motto, “rak kach”]: “only thus”
- B’rith Ha-Birionim: “Strongman Alliance” (alt. “Thugs of the Covenant”)
- B’nai B’rith (alt. “Bene Brith”): “Sons of the Covenant”
- B’nai Akiva: “Sons of Akiva” (the youth movement of Agudat Yisrael)
- Agudat[h] Yisrael: “Union of Israel” (a.k.a. “Aguda”)
- Herut: “Liberty” / “Freedom”
- Gush Emunim: “Bloc of the Faithful”
- Ha-Makhteret Ha-Yehudi[t]: “The Jewish Underground”
- Otzma Yehudi[t]: “Jewish Power”
- Ha-Beit Ha-Yehudi[t]: “The Jewish Home” (formerly the National Religious Front; and has recently spawning another fascist off-shoot: “Ha-Yamin He-Hadash”)
- Yisrael Beiteinu: “Israel Our Home” (which, preposterously, fashions itself as “secular”)
- Yisrael Sheli: “My Israel”

Also note the “Tnu’at Ha-Moshavim” [Moshavim Movement], in which there has been radicalization of what was originally the (secular / socialist) Labor Zionist movement. Judeo-fascist organizations focused

on hegemony in Jerusalem include the “Ir David Foundation” (a.k.a. “El-Ad”) and “Ateret Kohanim” [“Crown of Priests”]. A jurisprudential arm of the ideology is “Shurat Ha-Din” [Strict Judgement]. There is no better illustration of the emphasis on ethnic purity in the RZ movement than “Le-Meniat Hitbolelut B’Eretz Ha-Kodesh” (a.k.a. “Lehava”), which means “The Prevention of Assimilation in the Holy Land”.

Meanwhile, the “Herzl Institute” is nothing but a Hasbara-propagation apparatus; which was ironically named after the secular / socialist founder of the original Zionist movement. (“Hasbara” is the Israeli euphemism for propaganda.) Also a promulgator of RZ propaganda is “Chovevei Zion”, the Israel Action Network (IAN).

The Institute for Advanced Strategic and Political Studies (IASPS) marries Revisionist Zionism with free-market fundamentalism. The Israeli-American Council (IAC, formerly the ILC) and the American Jewish Conference (AJC) promote RZ ideology in America. In media, “Arutz Sheva” is the primary RZ propaganda outlet. The American lobby for this tendentious political agenda is AIPAC, which uses its prodigious resources to strong-arm politicians into endorsing policies amenable to their ideological agenda. (Though not quite as overtly fascist as the IAC, it has the same ideology.) All of these organizations specialize in Hasbara-peddling.

On American college campuses, there are organizations like “The David Project” and “Religious Zionists of America” (RZA)—each of them overtly fascist.

The fascistic nature of such organizations is especially striking when juxtaposed against estimable Jewish organizations like “Partners For A Progressive Israel” and “Jewish Voice For Peace”. Movements impelled by a Progressive version of Judaism serve as a reminder: One cannot at the same time be impelled by tribal (esp. ethnic) loyalties and pursue humanist goals. They are mutually exclusive BY DEFINITION.

## Appendix 2: Genocides

The crimes perpetrated by the Nazis against the Jewish people are most accurately characterized as crimes against HUMANITY, because Jews are humans. The crimes were rationalized by denying Jews their status as fellow human beings. The racial alterity made a contra-distinction between god’s people (those of Nordic / Germanic ancestry) and the vermin who infested society (anyone of Slavic or Jewish ancestry; or anyone who endorsed socialism).

Likewise, the crimes perpetrated by Judeo-fascists against the Palestinians are crimes against HUMANITY, because Palestinians are fully human. The crimes are rationalized by denying Palestinians their status as meddling interlopers, trespassing on the hallowed ground of Beth Israel.

In such cases, we find that it is a rebuke of our shared humanity that leads to the usual rationalizations (whereby those swept up in the fervor of tribalism eschew universal moral principles in favor of their own, self-serving ideologies. This is the basis for X-Exceptionalism / X-Supremacy; irrespective of X.

A a distillation of the mantra used by BOTH white nationalists and Revisionist Zionists: “We must ensure the security / future of the [insert ethnicity here] nation / State.” Naturally, for the ethno-centrist, calls for an ethno-State OTHER THAN one of his own ethnicity sounds utterly strange. Racism is easy to condemn when it’s not one’s own. For the fascist of a certain brand, it makes perfect sense to criticize other brands of fascism.

The largest holocaust in history was perpetrated by Mao Tse-Tung, where peasant fatalities far surpassed 40 million (some put the figure as high as 80 million)—including the programmatic execution of innumerable

intellectuals and political dissidents. (Scholars and civil rights activists are often the first targets.) Most of the deaths were primarily due to an artificially-induced famine, visited upon peasants across the Chinese countryside. That is: It was not by design; it resulted from sheer idiocy. The tell-tale sign that one is dealing with a demagogue afflicted with sociopathy is he is un-moved by such atrocities; and does nothing to correct course.

(The Maoist Holocaust was largest if one does not count the mass-death of Native Americans wrought by European settlers in the 16th through 19th centuries.)

It's worth noting the other holocausts around the world. Here are a dozen:

- The over 20 million people slaughtered by Timur of Kesh (a.k.a. "Tamerlane") during his "jihad" in the late 14th century.
- The programmatic killing of almost 17 million Communists / Socialists, gays, political dissidents, Poles, Slavs, Romani, Afro-Germans, and Jews by the Nazi regime between 1941 and 1945. (Almost 6 million Jews were executed.) In addition, the Nazis killed well over 20 million Russians during the course of the war. Jews refer to this as the "Shoah", though many tend to focus only on Jewish casualties.
- Stalin killed 14 million people in the Great Terror of 1937-38. (3 to 4 million people perished in the Gulag at Kolyma during the course of Soviet rule.) In addition, he perpetrated atrocities against so-called "kulaks" (various Turkic peoples across Eurasia, ranging from Khazaks to Kyrgyz); and carried out a virtual ethno-cide of the Mongols.
- The holocaust visited upon the Bengalis by the (Pakistani) "Razakar" in 1971 (3 million fatalities).
- The holocaust visited upon the Cambodians by the Khmer Rouge (led by Pol Pot) between 1975 and 1979 (3 million fatalities).
- The holocaust visited upon the people of East Timor by the (U.S. backed) Indonesian dictator, Suharto in 1965-66; involving the slaughter of over a million civilians.
- The holocaust visited upon the Dzungar Mongols by the Qing Chinese between 1755 and 1757 (500 – 800,000 fatalities).
- The holocaust visited upon the Tutsi by the Hutu in Rwanda in 1994 (500 – 600,000 slaughtered; including half a million women raped).
- The holocaust visited upon the (Syriac) Assyrians by Turks during the First World War (up to 300,000 civilians slaughtered)
- The holocaust visited upon the people of Nan-jing by the Japanese at the end of 1937 into early 1938 (up to 300,000 civilians slaughtered; including tens of thousands of women raped).
- The holocaust visited upon the Hutu by the Tutsi in Burundi in 1972 (100 – 300,000 slaughtered)
- The holocaust visited upon the Isaaq of Somalia between 1987 and 1989 (100 – 200,000 slaughtered).

There are more:

- In the Eastern Congo, **over 5 million** civilians died (almost 400,000 massacred; mostly Hutus) in the advent of the second Congolese War, which began in 1998.
- Up to half a million of the indigenous peoples of Darfur have been killed by the (Salafi) Janjaweed since 2003.

There is another possible explanation for such travesties: diffidence. This is not active slaughter; but can be just as deadly. Rather than direct execution, it stems from simply NOT CARING whether or not a population perishes—as is the case with the (Juche) theocracy in North Korea. We encounter this with tyranny in which the avarice of those in power renders them un-empathetic to the suffering of the common-man. This includes programs of deliberate starvation.

Indeed, some genocides are not perpetrated by guns and extermination camps; they are orchestrated famines. The holocaust (a.k.a. “Holodomor”) visited upon the Ukrainians by the Soviet regime killed over 7 million; never mind the many millions more killed under Stalin—14 million MORE in the Great Terror of 1937-38.

The Bengal famine of 1943, orchestrated by the British (under Churchill; upon the advice of Lord Cherwell) led to the deaths of **2.3 million**.

Three of the most infamous:

- Pasha Mehmet Talaat’s orchestration of the “Aghed”: a hyper-nationalist Turkish campaign involving pogroms and the eviction—and predictable starvation—of over a million Armenians from Anatolia between 1914 and 1923, esp. 1915-16 (1.5 million fatalities). The campaign also involved the slaughter of Syriac Christians in the “Sayfo” genocide, which—by 1924—had led to the deaths of up to 400,000 ethnic Assyrians.
- Joseph Stalin’s orchestration of the “Holodomor”, whereby 4 to 8 million Ukrainians (as well as over a million Khazaks, innumerable Kyrgyz, and over 2 million other so-called “Kulaks”) starved to death in 1932-33. Casualties also included the Circassians in Asia minor. This was not a devastating blunder; it was a calculated scheme of extermination. Starvation was the GOAL.
- As mentioned earlier, Mao Tse-Tung’s “Great Leap Forward” between 1958 and 1962, leading to the (completely avoidable) starvation of over 40 million people.

Any holocaust is a consequence of the dehumanization of an entire group—typically egged on by pernicious dictators who, only concerned with their own aggrandizement, couldn’t care less about the impoverishment of their citizens...if that’s what it takes to further their agenda.

The Kurds have arguably been enduring an ethnic cleansing campaign for longer than anyone else in the world—culminating in the Baathist-perpetrated Anfal in 1988; and continuing on through the incursions of Daesh. And the Yazidis have likely endured more holocausts than any ethnic group in history. In almost every case, we find some instance of holocaust denial.

Revisionist Zionists decry “Holocaust deniers” when THEY THEMSELVES are deniers of another holocaust...perpetrated by their ideological brethren (and STILL being perpetrated to the present day).

This is not unique to Judeo-Supremacists; ALL perpetrators can see the moral outrage when OTHERS perpetrate atrocities; yet fail to see the transgression when they are the culprit themselves. Even with pogroms occurring against BOTH the Tibetans and Uygurs in western China, there is nothing but denial by Chinese government apparatchiks.

So what of the term, “holocaust” (from the Greek term for burnt offering: “holo-kaustos”)? The Nazi campaign against non-Aryan peoples of Europe has recently been assigned this descriptor as a proper name (THE “Holocaust”), eliding the fact that it was one of many such travesties—some of which were larger in scope than the one perpetrated by the Third Reich.

To reiterate: THAT holocaust involved the killing of almost 17 million people by the Nazi regime (almost 6 million Jews alone) between 1933 and 1945. The Hebrew term, “Shoah” refers solely to the Jewish victims.

The U.S. government is especially reticent to admit the numerous holocausts it has wrought—as with:

- Native Americans (well over 50 million total in the Americas prior to European hegemony)

- Filipinos (hundreds of thousands under President McKinley)
- Vietnamese, Cambodians, and Laotians (over 3 million during the late 1960's and early 70's)

Civilian populations don't matter when the in-group's interests are seen as the sine qua non.

As we saw, tribalism—be it in the form of racism, nationalism, religionism, or anything else—typically feeds off of a siege mentality. Enveloped in this makeshift neuroticism, the in-group is behooved to say: “We're under siege, so we need to circle the wagons!” Division create divisiveness, which in turn reinforces the division, and on and on, in a vicious cycle.

Tribalism can transcend both race AND religion—as was demonstrated by the feud in Rwanda between the Tutsi and Hutu, and in the Sudan between the Naath (a.k.a. “Nuer”) and Dinka. In both cases, the tribes (roughly) shared BOTH the same racial background AND religious affiliation. Tribalism prevents us from seeing other people as fellow human beings. It precludes human solidarity by positing alterity along SOME dimension; according to SOME criterion...no matter how fatuous.

Alas, bringing this to the attention of the culprits in a Sisyphean task; as one cannot shame the shameless.

One will find that tribal Exceptionalism plays a role in every one of the above cases. It might be noted that Hitler cited the European genocide of the Native Americans (undertaken in the name of “Manifest Destiny”, the American version of “lebensraum”) as precedent for his “Final Solution” to the “problem” of European Jewry. So he figured nobody would mind if he engaged in his own genocide? Prior to the outbreak of the second World War, he asked: “Who, after all, is today speaking about the destruction of the Armenians?” Who, indeed.

## Appendix 3:

### **A Tale Of Power Asymmetry**

Proponents of RZ often take their position on ostensibly humanitarian principles. According to their own topsy-turvy narrative, the plight of (Jewish) Israelis is one of unilateral victimization at the hands of a horde of anti-Semitic, religious fanatics—a characterization that is summarily applied to ALL Palestinian goyim (read: Arab Muslims in the Levant).

This vulgar caricature is used to rationalize a program of collective punishment—that is: punishment of all Palestinians. This is a matter of holding an entire ethnic group—including women, children, and demonstrably innocent bystanders—accountable for the iniquitous actions of a subset of their population. In this case, the collective punishment entails:

- The slaughter of civilians: Military strikes (bombing campaigns); as well as the piecemeal murder / imprisonment of unruly protestors
- Theft of land: Violent eviction; and the systematic destruction of homes
- Brutal oppression: The chronic humiliation; and programmatic deprivation of civil rights
- Draconian laws: Restrictions on movement; and mitigated access to public goods.

The relentless oppression of Palestinians is undertaken in the name of “security” for (Jewish) Israelis; and for (Jewish) Israelis alone. After having endured such traumas—carried out with impunity—day after day, year after year, decade after decade, resentment within the persecuted population inevitably reaches a boiling point.

Whenever a contingent of disgruntled Palestinians lashes out in desperation (attacking—and sometimes killing—a handful of Israelis), the act is accurately deemed “terrorism”; yet it is then attributed to ALL Palestinians (as if every man, woman, and child were culpable in the act). Meanwhile, when the Israeli government slaughters THOUSANDS of Palestinian civilians (indiscriminately destroying homes, hospitals, and vital infrastructure in the process), thereby causing unspeakable suffering, death, and destitution amongst MILLIONS of people, it is deemed a perfectly-justified act of self-defense.

Thus we are asked to assess this massively-lopsided interaction, of reciprocating violence according to a double standard. According to this (contorted) heuristic, it is only the Israelis who are the victims of “terrorism”; while what THEY are doing must be categorized according to entirely different criteria.

It is plain to see that militancy and religious fanaticism on EITHER side of a conflict is wrong (especially insofar as it perpetuates violent aggression against innocent bystanders, irrespective of the identity of those bystanders). However, in this scenario, it does not follow that there is parity in moral culpability.

Let’s leave aside the perfidy of collective punishment, and attend to the moral implications of power-asymmetries; coupled with disparities in moral culpability. Add to this the disproportionate response, and there is an imbalance in transgression as well. Imagine one day coming across the following scene:

A large, muscular man is viciously beating a small, frail man. The former has the latter pinned down, and is striking him with tremendous force...over and over and over.

The smaller man—supine and mostly constrained—scratches in desperation at the dominant man; but to very limited avail. As he squirms to liberate himself, he manages to land a few feeble strikes here and there—some of which draw a bit of blood.

The burly assailant has a jackboot on the smaller man’s throat as he pummels him without mercy, using much superior power. He seems to be increasingly offended the more the other man fights back, and is irked by the scratches he has received on his ankles and forearms...even as he inflicts ever-more-severe injury on his struggling opponent. He repeatedly yells: “Why don’t you accept a truce?” between each punch.

The smaller man is clearly determined, and very stubborn. Writhing on the ground, he continues to frantically claw at the larger man—who apparently becomes more aggravated by each abrasion. The more the smaller man flails, seeking to retaliate in any small way he can, the more the larger man feels justified in carrying out his ferocious onslaught. After all, this pesky varmint IS clawing at him; so must be subdued!

Evidently, the larger man is incensed due to some grievance with his tiny antagonist.

This is not a brief encounter; it is ongoing: The weaker man continues to lash out spasmodically as the stronger man bears down systematically. You remain in stunned silence—witnessing the protracted ordeal persist for what ends up being quite a long time. The brutalization is clearly way out of proportion to what the larger man would require if he were merely seeking to restrain the (much smaller) man. You stand aghast, bewildered...until, after a significant period of time, you finally opt to intercede.

A reasonable reaction to such a (disturbing) scene would be to address the larger man. This is for two reasons: One: The significant asymmetry in strength. Two: The obvious disparity in damage being wrought. {A} The onus is therefore doubly on the larger man to bring this lopsided altercation to an end.

“Please stop,” you plead. “What in heaven’s name are you DOING?” The larger man ignores you; so you persist by asking him why he is doing what he is doing. His response is as follows:

“Behold the scrapes on my ankles and forearms from this man, injuries I have incurred as he continues to lash out at me. I keep telling him that striking another person is unjust; yet he stubbornly persists in his assault on me. By beating him so severely, I am merely protecting myself...and teaching him a lesson.”

You retort, as any reasonable person would: “He is, indeed, stubborn. And I see that he has scratched you a bit. But he is obviously fighting back because of the position you have put him in. Note the repeated blows—far more severe—that he is incurring from YOU.”

The large man’s rejoinder: “I will only stop beating this man when he stops scratching at me.” He turns back to the smaller man and, holding him down with augmented hostility, proceeds to pummel him. The smaller man struggles in vain, barely having time to take a breath—let alone respond to this rhetorical question—before the next devastating blow lands.

Frustration mounting, the smaller man continues to flail on the ground, his meager attempts to fight back only managing to further incite his assailant. He manages to inflict one more scratch on the larger man before incurring yet another devastating blow as reprisal. Bones are now breaking. It is astounding the smaller man is still conscious. You throw your arms up in exasperation.

Question: Why is this scenario ridiculous?

Striking another person is, indeed, unjust—irrespective of who is doing the striking and who is struck. Two wrongs don’t make a right; so the larger man is correct in this respect. As a general rule, drawing blood as reprisal for injury has dubious moral grounding. This holds water EVEN IF the retaliation seems to be in response to a far greater assault; and EVEN IF the lesser aggressor seems to have few other options available to him (e.g. after seeking help from the wider global community, which stands idly by). {B}

But let’s continue this parable. Imagine that you THEN discover how the altercation began. You find out that the larger man had arrived in town a while ago; and that he had been seizing and/or destroying most of the smaller man’s property ever since; and that—even now—he CONTINUES to do so (in between meting out routine beatings to keep the smaller man in line). After claiming the proximal turf for himself (which, we are informed, had been the smaller man’s home going back many centuries), the smaller man confronted him; whereupon the present row ensued.

The altercation has continued ever since, without relent, in roughly this manner...even in the midst of FURTHER property theft by the larger man. {C}

The excessive use of force could not be more blatant. So you continue to plead with the larger man: “You need to stop this. Please.”

His response, as he persists in his assault of the smaller man is as follows: “Why are you just asking ME to stop? What about the gashes on my ankles and forearms that I have incurred from this man? Don’t you see what he is doing? You should be telling HIM to cease and desist. Then I’ll no longer have the need to pummel him.”

“But you are hurting him much more than he is hurting you,” you point out. “He is in the less advantaged position, and is merely trying to fight you off.” You add: “This only began when you showed up...and started stealing his land, invading his house, and persecuting his family.”

The final reply from the larger man is as follows: “The blows I strike are justified; as he is the criminal here, not I. I am a the TRUE victim in this scenario. After all, I am merely retaliating against his retaliation. Yet he obstinately persists in his defiance. What is preventing him from just giving up and

leaving town? He chooses to stand his ground, to remain in my way. So why don't you blame HIM for this imbroglio? What do you have against ME?"

The absurdity here is plain to see. {D}

This predicament is actually even worse; as this parable assumes the Palestinian collective is homogenous; and thus has a shared (i.e. evenly distributed) responsibility. In other words: Even if we were to grant—against all reason—that the large man is perfectly justified in his (rash) handling of the situation, it still assumes that collective punishment is justified. (This basically amounts to equating all Palestinians with Hamas.) In fact, it is only the militant Salafis who tend to engage in the meager retaliations; yet ALL Palestinians are punished for it.

All this is often accompanied by an incredulous shrug on the part of RZs: “Why on Earth do they resent us so? What’s the heck’s their problem? The only possible explanation is anti-Semitism.” To be clear: When religious fanatics within the ranks of Levantine goyim (mostly Muslims) engage in collective punishment, it is equally invidious; and invidious for the exact same reasons. But anti-Semitism amongst some fraction of Palestinians does not make ALL Palestinians guilty (let alone deserving of such tribulation). Moreover, venality on the part of some Palestinians does not warrant the heinous treatment of the entire Palestinian population that has occurred since 1948; and especially since 1967.

In sum: Responsibility is to be placed on the much larger party, who has inflicted far more harm, who’s actions (ethnic cleansing, land theft, brutal oppression) instigated the conflict in the first place; and continues to incite resentment.

This verdict is not only due to the massive power asymmetry AND the huge disparity in harm done. It is also due to the huge difference in moral culpability from the get-go. Indeed, both parties are guilty of assault; yet the overwhelming preponderance of transgression is clearly on one side. Hence it is that party to whom we must address our entreaty to cease and desist. Moreover, it is incumbent upon that party to undertake measures in the way of restitution.

The prognosis for this hypothetical episode is a no-brainer for any sane person; so why is it so difficult for ostensibly “liberal” people who are apt to apologize for RZ to see the verdict when the same logic is applied to the present conflict in the Levant? Factor in the iniquity of collective punishment, and the prognosis is even more obvious. (To reiterate: Not all Palestinians are perpetrating crimes; yet virtually all are being punished.)

The explanation for such heedlessness is relatively straight-forward: Double standards are endemic to hidebound ideology. Self-righteousness entails applying different criteria for moral judgements to others than those that one applies to oneself. The problem is that when the logic of Exceptionalism is applied everywhere, it ends in contradiction; or simply devolves into a Kafka-esque nightmare.

*{A See my essay: “King Bibi”. Note the Israeli Government’s conflict with Gaza in 2014, in which a few dozen Israelis (mostly military) and over 2,300 Palestinians (mostly civilians) were killed. Preposterously, the outrage focused primarily on Gazans as the culprits.}*

*{B We can disregard, for a moment, the logistical discrepancy in this metaphor: The fact that each character in this allegory represents an entire ethnic community. It doesn’t. It is only a small subset of the smaller man that is lashing out by clawing in desperation; while it is the sovereign government of the larger man (i.e. a nation-State) with full U.S. support, that is issuing the brutal beating. Felicitously, the majority of the world’s Jewish people do NOT support such opprobrious policies, nor the RZ ideology underlying it.}*

{C Note on the metaphor: The larger man has selected this particular party as his antagonist not merely because he happens to BE THERE, but—more saliently—because he does not share the same ethnicity.}

{D This metaphor could also be used to describe the Kurds vis a vis the Turkish government or the Tibetans vis a vis the Chinese government.}

## Appendix 4: An Apt Analogy

On his TV program, *Real Time*, Bill Maher once made an interesting point: If people from Quebec started bombing New England, surely the U.S. government wouldn't stand for it; and would undoubtedly respond by *bombing the shit out of* Quebec.

Regarding this hypothetical, Mr. Maher may very well have been correct.

Presumably, he was insinuating that—due to the crude rockets sporadically lobbed into Israel from Palestine, and the occasional suicide bomber deployed—the Israeli government is justified in relentlessly attacking Palestinian civilians with an on-going military incursion; including the routine destruction of public infrastructure, relentless oppression, and the systematic demolition of residences. However, Maher's analogy is flawed—or at least very incomplete. A more accurate analogy would be as follows:

In a brazen effort to expand the territory of New Hampshire and Vermont, Messianic New England WASPs have gone over the Canadian boarder and started forcefully evicting Canadians from their homes. Quebec, the New England expansionists insist, was their Promised Land; so they're merely taking what was theirs by divine right. To support this contention, they point to a piece of ancient scripture that they treat as a title-deed to the designated land. In it, their godhead is portrayed as a cosmic real estate broker; and it is stipulated that—thousands of years ago—THEY were the appointed beneficiaries of that particular territory in North America. (For a discussion of this contention as it pertains to "Zionism" vis a vis Palestine, see my essay: "The Land Of Purple".)

The New Englanders promptly established a brutal military occupation of Quebec, replete with the relentless oppression of all Québécois—who's ancestors, being FRENCH, do not qualify for the divine charter that has been invoked. (It also doesn't help that they are Roman Catholic instead of Protestant.) This includes regularly bull-doing countless houses in Quebec in order to make way for New England settlers who are coming up from New Hampshire and Vermont (in a Yankee "Aliyah").

For the past two generations, this hegemonic process (call it "Yankee lebensraum") has involved restricting the freedom of movement of all Québécois; while cutting off the primary means by which Canadian civilians were able to provide themselves with food, potable water, medicine, and other crucial supplies. Moreover, it has included the routine bombing of Canadian schools, hospitals, and vital infrastructure...not to mention the indiscriminate slaughter of innocent civilians (often women and children) in order to assert the (divinely ordained) Yankee presence on this particular part of Canadian soil. Such drastic measures were, of course, all carried out in the name of "New England security".

(Stay with me. Here's where it gets interesting.)

In a move of desperation, *some* of the more incensed Québécois lob crude rockets into Vermont and New Hampshire: a meager retaliatory effort pursued for lack of better options. For them, there was no other recourse; as nobody else in the world was doing anything to remedy their dire situation. From time to time, one of their crude rockets kills a small handful of New England residents who were living close to the boarder. Each time THAT happens, in response, the U.S. government "bombs the shit out of" Quebec,

massacring dozens—if not hundreds—of (innocent) Canadian civilians; along with some of the culprits. The rationalization for such a colossally disproportionate response: protecting Yankees (while punishing the Québécois terrorists).

Of course, this retaliatory response only serves to exacerbate the hostility, sewing yet more resentment. In a continued act of desperation (and in reprisal for their slaughtered brethren), some Québécois lob a few MORE rockets into New Hampshire and Vermont—again: the only means at their disposal to retaliate, short of throwing rocks at the New England tanks making incursions onto their farmland; and sometimes as the fleet of Caterpillar bull-dozers demolishing their orchards and houses. (Any other resistance, they have found, has proven utterly futile.)

The vicious cycle continues—orders of magnitude more Canucks are killed for each New Englander killed. The media expresses outrage at any Yankee casualty...while ignoring the order of magnitude more Québécois fatalities that regularly occur. And there is nary a peep about the on-going suffering of all French Canadians in the region.

The plight of the Québécois is dismissed as a necessary means to a Providential end: Making the entirety of Quebec province part of New England, which the Creator Of The Universe had promised to the American WASPs long, long ago (according to sacred Yankee lore).

To reiterate: The Québécois endure daily oppression, persecution, and eviction—even as the Messianic New Englanders complain about the occasional, isolated deaths of Yankees (Vermont and New Hampshire residents) from the crude Canuck rockets. This all persists, even as more New England expansionists continue to bull-doze orchards and homes, stealing yet more land in Quebec...and, in doing so, essentially rendering Quebec a massive militarily-occupied, open-air prison for the destitute Québécois.

How does Maher's analogy look now?

Another hypothetical to mull over: Imagine how the U.S. citizenry would react if a (hypothetically) superior Canadian military force did all the above to everyone in New England. One wonders if people in the Northeast Kingdom and Coos county would limit their reprisals to throwing stones at the Canadian invaders...after their families had just been slaughtered by missiles reigning down from the sky.

Suddenly, it seems to matter exactly WHO'S homes are getting bull-dozed. Who is oppressing whom?

We Americans should be especially aware of the atrocities associated with the slaughter and forced expulsion of indigenous populations for the glory of a favored tribe...in the name of Providence (a.k.a. "Manifest Destiny"). This realization should be stark, be the victims Seminoles in Florida, Arabs on the West Bank of the Jordan River, or Viet-minh peasants in the rainforests of Indo-China. Shame on those of us who would be so perfidious as to endorse such behavior anywhere in the world, by anyone, at any time, for any reason.

## **Appendix 5:**

### **Theonomic Nomenclature Based On Semitic Etymologies**

The oldest Semitic word for "god" is "El", which was the Ugaritic term for the godhead; used by the Amorites (spec. the Shasu). Hence the Aramaic term "Elah[a]" / "Elim" / "Elo[i]" / "Eloah" for the godhead—a lexeme that served as the basis for the Syriac "Alaha"...which became the Arabic "Allah".

(For more on this, see “The Syriac Basis For Koranic Text”.) In the earliest Canaanite tradition, the godhead (whether fashioned as “El” or “Baal” or “Yahweh”) dwelled on Mount Zaphon (as reflected in Isaiah 14:13); and his consort was “Asherah”. Consequently we encounter monikers throughout the Hebrew Bible like:

- El Shaddai: God Almighty
- Elohe Ha-Elohim [alt. “Elah El-ahin”]: God of Gods
- El Roi: God that Sees
- El Olam: God of the Ancients (alt. “Eternal God”)
- El Elyon: God Most High
- El-Sabaot[h] (alt. “-[t]Sebha’oth” or “-Tzva’ot”): God of Hosts
- Elah Yisra-El: God of those who struggle with god

The abode of the Abrahamic deity is referred to as “Beth-El” [house of god]. When one says “thank god” in Hebrew, it is “toda-l-El”. As with “Abd-ullah” in Arabic, “Abd-i-El” in Hebrew means “slave of god”. In Judaic lore, Babylon was named “Bab-El” (Gateway to God); as “Bab” was the Old Semitic term for “gateway” (see Appendix 2). (Note that the nomenclature “Abd-X”, where X was the name of a deity, went back to the Bronze age—as with one of the early rulers of Jerusalem: the Hurrian, Abd-i-Heba[t].)

The derivative nature of the Abrahamic deity is reflected in its various Biblical epithets: “the bull” (derived from the Canaanite “toru”), “lord of patriarchs” (derived from the Canaanite “hatikuka”), “warrior” (derived from the Canaanite “gibbor”), as well as the aforesaid “Olam” [the Eternal]. The original nomenclature often involved “Baal”—as with:

- **“Jerub-Baal”** (“Baal multiplies” in the Book of Judges) which became “Jerub-Beshet” (in Second Samuel 11:21); used as a moniker for the Biblical Gideon (descendent of Ab-i-Ezer ben Gilead of the Manasseh).
- **“Esh-Baal”** (“Man of Baal” in First Chronicles 8:33) which became “Ish-Bosheth” (“man of shame” in Second Samuel 2:8)
- **“Meri-Baal”** (“One who is like Baal” in First Chronicles 8:34) which became “Mephi-Boshet[h]” (which is sometimes translated as “mouth of shame”)

As it so happened, “El” was the moniker used for the Canaanite godhead. Lo and behold: The Canaanite deity, Baal also went by the Old Semitic moniker “Adon”. (!) To obfuscate this etymology, “the Lord” transplants Y-H-W-H in most translations of the Bible, though it makes no sense in, say, First Kings (chapt. 18). “My lord” was preferable to “My Baal”.

Indeed, an alternate epithet for “Baal” was “Adon”...which was the basis for “Adonai”: yet another epithet for “Yahweh”. (Meanwhile, “Adon-i-jah” was the name of the would-be heir to King David; supplanted by Solomon.) Both godheads are portrayed as storm / thunder gods who make the earth quake, as warriors (Exodus 15:3) who descend from mountains, and are associated with the horns of a wild bull (Numbers 23:22 and 24:8). For further parallels, see the Ugaritic “Baal Cycle”. The derivative nature of the Hebrew moniker is revealed explicitly in Hosea 2:16, where Yahweh proclaims: “Henceforth, you will call me by ‘my husband’ and no longer by ‘my Baal’.”

Clearly, in the early days, tribute to the godhead was a profession of henotheism / monolatry, not of monotheism. \* Which deity was seen as the godhead? “Yahweh” (as opposed to, say, Baal). This assertion was a matter of repudiating all worship of the other deities, not an assertion that there only existed one deity. After all, the name El-i-Jah[weh]” (a.k.a. “Elijah”) MEANS “God is Yahweh”.

In the Book of Exodus, the Abrahamic deity introduces himself to Moses by saying: “I am Yahweh. I appeared to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob as ‘*El Shaddai*’; but I didn’t make my name, ‘*Yahweh*’ known to them.” The Shasu godhead, “Yahweh” may have been a roughly-hewn cognate of the Sumerian / Assyrian “Ea” (which may have morphed into “Yah”). Y-H-W-H is often mistranslated as “Lord”. Hence the locution “Yahweh your god” is often rendered “the Lord your god” in translations of the Hebrew Bible (which was originally composed in Babylonian Aramaic). Various monikers for the godhead ensued:

- **Yahweh Sabaot[h]**: Lord of Hosts (a variation on the aforementioned “El-Sabaot[h]”)
- **Ha-Shem**: The Name
- **Adon-ai**: My Adon (synonymous with “My Baal”)
- **Ab-inu M-L-K-inu** (conventionally rendered “Avinu Malkeinu”): Our Father, Our King
- **Elohim**: “God” in the royal plural

Pagan etymological origins were not uncommon in Abrahamic theology. Take, for instance, the serpent (Leviathan) of the primordial waters, “Tehom”—referenced in Job 41, Isaiah 51:9, as well as in Psalms 74, 104, and 107. That moniker was derived from the Sumerian / Akkadian / Assyrian “Tamtu” (a.k.a. “Tiamat”). As mentioned earlier, the Babylonians believed that in the beginning, all was dark waters, without form—the ocean dubbed “Bythos” in Greek. Memetic transference was ubiquitous in the ancient world.

There is a long list of theophoric names in the Abrahamic tradition—most ending in “-El”. Even the name of cities used this nomenclature—as with “Bab-El” (gate of god) and “Bet[h]-El” (house of god). This was most famously done with “Dan-i-El” (judged by god). Here are thirty other given names that use “El” at the end of the moniker:

- Beshal-El [alt. “Bezal-El”]: shadow of god
- Raz-i-El: secret of god
- Duda-El: cauldron of god
- Shamsh-i-El: sun of god
- Uzz-i-El: strength of god
- Gamal-i-El: reward of god
- Jof-i-El: beauty of god
- Othn-i-El / Ar-i-El: lion of god
- Abd-i-El: slave of god (rendered “Abd-ullah” in Arabic)
- Mik[h]a-El: like god (often rendered “Michael”)
- Azaz-El: god strengthens [alt. “impudence toward god”]
- [h]Ezek-i-El: god empowers
- Eman[u]-El: god with us
- Jegud-i-El: glorifies god
- Shealt-i-El [alt. “S[h]elaph-i-El” / “Salath-i-El” / “(t)Zelath-i-El”]: beseech god [alt. “prayer of god”]
- Rafa-El / Israf-El: god heals
- Shem[a]-El [alt. “Ishm(a)-El”]: god hears (often rendered “Samuel”)
- Yek-i-El: god lives (sometimes rendered “Yechiel”)
- Net[h]an-i-El: god gives [alt. “gift of god”] (often rendered “Nathaniel”)
- Ab-i-El: father god \*\*
- Gabr-i-El [alt. “Uzz-i-El”]: (strong) man of god
- Ram-i-El [alt. “(j)Erem-i-El”]: thunder of god
- Anan-i-El: rain of god
- Sam-i-El [alt. “Sama-El”]: venom of god
- Sar-i-El [alt. “Sur-i-El”]: prince of god

- Azar-El: god helps (the variation “Azra-El” was used for the god of death)
- Yehud-i-El [alt. “Jud-i-El”]: god of Judah (i.e. god of the Jews)
- Bar[a]k-i-El: blessed by god
- [c]Hus-i-El: regard for god
- Ith-i-El: sign of god

And, of course, [n]Ur-i-El, meaning “light of god”. Bat[h]-sheba [“daughter of the oath”] was famously referred to by the sobriquet, “Ur-i-El”...which can be alternately rendered either “El-i-Nor” or “El-i-Ora” (basis for “Eleanor”). This is curious, as Bathsheba’s initial spouse (the man to whom she was betrothed before King David sent him to his certain death so as to claim her for himself) was “Ur-i-[Y]ah”, thus employing the other lexeme for god in “light of god”. This Hittite couple was thus divine illumination wed to divine illumination. Incidentally, if there was ever a Bathsheba, it is possible that she was the primary author of the earliest Torah (be it the Yah-weh-ist proto-text or the Deuteronomic proto-text)...which would be especially ironic, as she was a Hittite—thereby rendering the mother of the Dividic line NON-Hebrew. (!) Such authorship would also mean that the Torah was initially composed by a woman—descended from a pagan Anatolian people—before it was rendered by Ezra at the conclusion of the Exilic Period.

It’s worth noting other variations. “Azar-El” can be alternately rendered “El-i-azar” (meaning “helped by god”). And while “Ab-i-El” means “father is god”, “El-i-Ab” means “god the father”—a reminder that “god” can be specified first in the lexical sequence. The same goes for “[c]Hanan-El” and “El-[c]Hanan” (alt. “El-Kanah”; meaning “god is gracious”) as well as “Am-i-El” and “El-i-am” (meaning “nation of god”; “god’s nation”). Other examples of using El at the beginning of the moniker:

- El-i-za: pledged to god
- El-i-sheb[a]: oath of god (alternately: “Elisheva”)
- El-i-an[a]: god answers
- El-i-sha: god saves [god is salvation]
- El-i-nor / El-i-Ora: light of god [god is light] (often rendered “Eleanor”)
- El-i-akim: god rises

Other familiar given names are Romanizations of the Hellenic version of a Hebrew theonym—as with “Elizabeth”, derived from the Greek “Elisabet”, which was based on “El-i-Sheba” (god is my oath).

The alternate moniker for the Abrahamic deity, “Yah-weh” / “Jeho-vah” (often abbreviated “Yeh” / “Yah” / “Jeh” / “Jah”) is also sometimes used in a theonym—as with:

- Ahaz-i-[Y]ah: held by god
- Jos-i-[Y]ah: healed by god (often rendered “Hosiah”)
- Obad-i-[Y]ah: servant of god
- [i]Sha-i-[Y]ah: saved by god (typically rendered “Isaiah”)
- Gedal-i-[Y]ah: greatness of god (from the Assyrian lexeme for great, “gal”)
- Azar-i-[Y]ah: helped by god (“Esdras” in Greek; Anglicized to “Ezra”)
- Athal-i-[Y]ah: afflicted by god
- Amaz-i-[Y]ah: strengthened by god
- [h]Ezek-i-[Y]ah: empowered by god
- Jerem-i-[Y]ah: appointed by god
- Jekon-i-[Y]ah: established by god (often rendered “Jechoniah”)
- Zekar-i-[Y]ah: remember god (often rendered “Zachariah”)
- [h]Oda-i-[Y]ah: praise god (often rendered “Odeya”)
- Shema[r]-i-[Y]ah: heard by god

- Zephan-i-[Y]ah: concealed by god

The most famous of these is “Yedid-[i]-Yah” (eventually rendered “David”), meaning “Beloved of God”. Again, god can be specified at the beginning of the name—as with:

- Jeho-S[h]aphat: god judges
- Jeho[-i]-Ada: god knows
- Jeho-Ash: god gives
- Jeho-Ram: god exalts [alt. “god is exalted”; “ram” meant “high place”]
- Jeho-Ahaz: god holds
- Jeho[-i]-Akim: god rises
- Jeho-Nadab: god wills [alt. “god is willing”]

This nomenclature is most famously used for “Yeho-Shua” (alternately rendered “Hos[h]ea” or “Joshua”) meaning “god is salvation” or “god saves”: the given name of the Messiah in Christian lore, later Romanized to “Jesus”. It is also the basis for “John”. Jeho-Nan (alternately rendered “Yohanan” / “Jo[h]anna[h]”; Romanized to “Io[h]annes”) means “god is gracious”.

Note, then, that “Yah[-weh]” / “Jeho[-vah]” is synonymous with “El”. The semiotic parity is captured by:

- “[h]Ezek-i-El” and “[h]Ezek-i-[Y]ah”: god empowers
- “Azar-i-El” and “Azar-i-[Y]ah”: god helps
- “El-i-sha” and “[i]Sha-i-[Y]ah”: god saves
- “Ar-i-El” and “Ar[-i]-Yeh”: lion of god
- “Zedek-i-El” and “Zedek-i-[Y]ah”: grace of god
- “Ab-i-El” and “Ab-i-[Y]ah”: father is god \*\*

It makes sense, then, that the disgraced king of Judah, “Jeho-i-Akim” was also referred to as “El-i-Akim” in the Hebrew Bible. (He’s the king who acquiesced to the Babylonian king, Nebuchadnezzar II.) The respective histories of “Yah-weh” and “El” are shrouded in mystery. As we saw in the preceding monograph, the former seems to have been the name for the godhead of the Jebusites; and was perhaps even used by a tribe in southern Canaan (the Negev). The latter is an ancient Canaanite moniker for “god” in one or another context, going back to Ugaritic. Both were adopted by the Babylonian scribes during the Exilic period.

It comes as no surprise, then, that some names use both monikers—as with “Ya[h]-El” / “Ja[h]-El” (alt. “Jo-El”) and “El-i-Jah” / “El-i-[Y]ah” (alternately rendered “Elia[s]”); both of which are the equivalent of “El-i-El” and “Yah-i-Yah”—meaning “god [is] god”. (Another notable example is [Y]ah-i-Thoph-El.) This lexical equivalence was demonstrated when—in the third verse of chapter 6 of Exodus—the Abrahamic deity declared to Moses that he had theretofore been identified as “El”, but is thenceforth announcing himself as “Yahweh”.

\* \* \*

*{\* Henotheism (a.k.a. “monolatry”) was more common than many realize. The earliest Vedic theology was henotheistic, with “Brahman” at the head. The Sumerian moon-goddess, “Inanna” (later rendered “Ishtar” by the Assyrians) was considered a deity above all deities. The earliest instantiation of the Abrahamic deity was conceptualized in the same way. In a poem in the Book of Exodus, the Israelites chant: “Who is like you, lord, among the gods?” Translation: “There are many gods; but you’re the best.” They were clearly NOT monotheistic. This is made plain by the commandment reading: “You shall*

*worship no other gods before me” rather than “There are no gods other than me.” The commandment deals with precedence, not existence. It is a statement regarding priority rather than ontology.}*

*{\*\* The form “Ab-i-X” was used in the earliest Canaanite nomenclature. It meant “Father of X” or “Father is X”—as with “Ab-i-El”, alternately rendered “Ab-i-Yah” or even “Ab-i-Baal” (depending on the moniker of choice). This can be inverted—as with “El-i-Ab”, “J[eh]o-Ab”. and “[y]Ah-Ab”. Later, there were names like Ab-i-Melek, Ab-i-Ezer, Ab-i-Athar, Ab-i-Shur, and Ab-i-Ga[y]il. Typically, the “father is” doesn’t require the “-i”—as with, say, “Ab-Ner”. “Ab[ba]” was the Old Aramaic for “father”; and was used by the Akkadians / Assyrians during the Bronze Age. And “Ab-inu” is a moniker meaning “Our Father”.}*