

DECISIVE RESOLUTIONS

**A plain common law or 'law of the land'-grounded
hardline assessment of prevailing Western
assumptions & the evidence claimed to support them:
in contrast to the various political, scientific,
legal and religious promotions of such.**

(Compiled June 2005 : Revised July 2017)



CRITICAL NOTE:

The wording of the following is not primarily intended to be immediately understood. The primary intention of this document is, as with statutory drafting, that none of it be misunderstood.

Contents

<u>SECTION 1</u>	
BIBLICAL WISDOM WITHOUT RELIGION	1
<u>SECTION 2</u>	
MODERN CIVILISATION: ANCIENT HERITAGE	6
<u>SECTION 3</u>	
MODERN CIVILISATION: ANCIENT ETHICS	8
<u>SECTION 4</u>	
MODERN CIVILISATION: INTELLECTUAL INTEGRITY	8
<u>SECTION 5</u>	
MODERN CIVILISATION: HIGHER LEARNING	15
<u>SECTION 6</u>	
MODERN CROWN COUNTRIES: CONSTITUTIONAL INTEGRITY	28
<u>SECTION 7</u>	
MODERN CIVILISATION - THE COMPONENT OF JUDAISM	45
<u>PREAMBLE</u>	45
<u>WHO REALLY ARE THE JEWISH PEOPLES..?</u>	
<i>A pro-Semitic inspection of the substance of worldwide Jewish identity</i>	46
RUDIMENTS	49
[A] EAST EUROPEAN REGION	51
[B] SPANISH REGION	58
ANCIENT TO MODERN	64
DISTINCTION	67
BASIC CONFLICT	70
JEWISH HOLOCAUST - JEWISH STATISTICS - WORLD HOLOCAUST CLOSURE	72
ANIMOSITY	92
PIETY	103
JEWISH LAND RIGHTS	115
CRUX OF THE MATTER	134
CONCLUSION OF THE MATTER	144

DECISIVE RESOLUTIONS

SECTION 1

BIBLICAL WISDOM WITHOUT RELIGION

- 1). All common law governed countries under the Crown of the United Kingdom are established on the settled rule of law and constitutional adoption of Biblical history (as distinct from Christian and Jewish history), the Bible even in modern times still containing the basis of Western wisdom and a national formula for peace, order and good government, which appropriately requires that such ancient writings be interpreted according to the same grammatical rules as oversee the devising of ancient Acts of Parliament and other legal instruments (without regard to religious faith or theology), where notwithstanding almost all Christian leaders from early times having held their religion as resting on an accurate rendition of the ancient texts, does the term 'Christian', in the context of any of its three only mentions in the Bible, portray Christians with either a promotional intent or in an unquestionably favourable light? No.
- 2). Is there any direct implication in the Biblical documents
 - i) that Christ's apostles or any of his named disciples ever became Christians, or
 - ii) that any of the New Testament was originally written by Christians, or
 - iii) that the pronoun "ye" (etc.) in any Biblical instance refers to a body of Christians? No.
- 3). Was the word 'Christian' ('Christ', with the Latin suffix '-ian' indicating a member of a group) officially used in any Biblical documents before the fourth century A.D.? No.
- 4). Does the Christian word 'church' (or 'kirk' etc.) have any word of equal meaning or even linguistic likeness to any word in the Bible's ancient Greek or Hebrew, that is, does anything corresponding to the Christian word 'church', defined as a special building or group, either exist in the early New or Old Testament manuscripts, or presage the same in the future? No.

- 5). Can it be determined from the scriptures that the 'Second Coming' of Christ was postponed until after the first century A.D.? No.
- 6). Concerning the worldwide Easter observance, does the Bible's stated time of 3 days and 3 nights match any known version of the Christian Good Friday/Easter Sunday teachings? No.
- 7). Do the earliest Greek and Hebrew manuscripts of the Bible either express or imply Christ died on a cross (or upright post with a transverse bar)? No.
- 8). In a plain reading of the Biblical texts, and noting that a distinction exists between the common attitudes of
 (i) heartfelt sympathy and
 (ii) welfare-driven compassion,
 and that the difference is substantial in terms of human behaviour, did the works of Christ at any time include extending heartfelt sympathy to any person or persons? No.
- 9). Is the term 'martyr' an accurate translation of any word in the Bible's original texts (the Greek equivalent, "*martur*", meaning an eyewitness or the like, and being later wholly redefined by religious scholars to denote a willing victim of persecution), that is, does the meaning of today's English word 'martyr' (referring to individual suffering and/or dying for a cause) accurately convey the original Biblical meaning of the word (which refers to faithful people not necessarily suffering or put to death, as is found in the Biblical phrase "a cloud of witnesses" (Hebrews 12:1; cf. 11:32-40)? No.
- 10). Of the total amount of saints referred to in the Bible, are there found to be more good saints than corrupt ones? No.
- 11). Does any major or even semi-major denomination or sect of the Christian (or any other) religion today observe the same weekly sabbath time slot (sunrise-to-sunrise) as did, for example, Moses, Christ and the (Galilean) apostles? No.
- 12). Given the senior scholastic and legally competent opinion (Spurr, Sydney 2001) that the Authorised version of the Bible '(is) the most important text for the study of all literatures in English, without which the intelligent and informed study of English literature is impossible', (the well-known cadences and phrasings of such version being still utilised worldwide from the highest literature to everyday speech), [with the same being echoed in a featured article of a primary Australian newspaper headed by "Bible a Mainstay of Western Life" ("The Australian", March 23rd, 2017 edn.), in which it is stated "The Bible's influence is everywhere already, even if it is often unrecognised.", and similarly

echoed in a more recent edition of that same publication with an editorial stating that "...any Australian child's education would be incomplete without an understanding of the Bible." (July 28th, 2017 edn.)], does any part of those early English (or 'original') versions promote a formal religion; Jewish, Christian or some other?, or alternatively, in the only seven mentions of "religion" or "religious" in the Authorised Bible, does there occur any instance in which a formally named or inferred religion is promoted? No.

- 13). Were the Abraham, Moses, king David or Christ of the Bible "Jews" in today's common understanding of the word, that is, were such personages followers of the Judaist-specific law and religion? No.
- 14). Is the one personal name of the God of the Bible as appears some 7,000 times in the Hebrew manuscripts of the Old Testament (and numerous cited in New Testament documents yet repeatedly concealed in most translations), the same intended to be in frequent use [such being the only name capable of giving sense to the Biblical words, "hallowed be thy name" - as is still recited on various religious and civil occasions in a number of countries], that is, has the personal name of the creator God, as first revealed to Moses and the ancient Israelites some 3,500 years ago (Exodus 13:14,15,16c), ever been promoted or even mentioned by the body of either the Jewish, Christian or Mohammedan religions? No.
- 14a). Further, are the four Hebrew letters long considered to spell out the name of God and which, for instance, appear as a word preserved on early British commemorative coins of national events (with such coinage prominently featuring the Hebrew name of God as part of the English heritage), only recognised and revered by the Jewish Israeli country and no other?, that is to say, is the actual name of God [a "Ten Commandments"-protected (pre-Jewish/Phœnician) readily pronounceable word of four ancient vowel/consonant letters and forming a phonetically euphonious, basically four syllable name similar to the Greek transliteration "Ia-o-ue" (a word with no consonants) and usually anglicised as "Yahweh", yet having been long misrepresented by Jews and like-minded scholars as an unpronounceable group of four Hebrew consonants (the Jews after assuming control of the Hebrew language having also introjected differing vowel sounds into such name because of a superstitious fear of voicing it), the same being regularly substituted in most English Bibles with a long admitted mistranslation of a unique personal name to

that of merely a title, "the LORD" (or, in seven independent instances, arbitrarily translated into a make-believe name, "Jehovah")],
 constitutionally identified in modern times with the source of civil power in the Jewish State only? No.

- 15). Concerning the well-known scriptural 'Day of Judgment' as is accounted to occur in the afterlife, with the earliest record on the matter, the Bible, twice noting only one judge to be in authority at that time (Romans 14:10 and II Corinthians 5:10), and where also several centuries later, the Mohammedan Koran similarly prophesied a 'Day of Resurrection/Judgment' for humanity (cf. 4:160 -*Al-Islam, Maulvi Ali translation*) (such reflecting the earlier Biblical mentions of that same day - cf. Matthew 12:36; 2 Peter 2:9) with a singular judge on that Day being also implied, and which by strict legal argument, being in both accounts the Christ of the Bible, albeit elsewhere in the Koran, Christ being portrayed as a false prophet (that is, the Koran asserting he was not actually put to death nor resurrected as he forecast of himself, and as subsequently occurred according to the Biblical record) yet still remaining the one judge inferred by both the Biblical and Koranic accounts to be presiding at the 'last time' or 'Day of Judgment', the Koran making no mention of an active involvement of either Mohammed or the God "Allah" on such prophesied 'Day of Judgment' (unlike the involvement of Christ as is indicated in both accounts), with the word "Allah" not originally being a name as such, but an Arabic descriptive title (or adjectival noun) best rendered in English as "the (one and only) God", the same describing the earlier mentioned one and only God of the ancient scriptures (Deuteronomy 6:4; Nehemiah 9:6-7; James 2:19), then

[with the Bible comprised of over sixty spiritually consistent writings of some forty writers compiled over some fifteen hundred years and completed between five and six hundred years before the time of Mohammed (and the compilation of his words and teachings in the later establishment of the Koran), and noting that although the Koran is presumed by various of his followers to be an "update" of the Bible and correspondingly presents a cordial relationship with its writings, and has its religious foundation built solely on (pre-Jewish) Israelite Biblical history, even to their early historical accounts being markedly similar in depicting a single origin of everything as well as implying such originating source to be the God of Adam and Eve (with much of the Koran incorporating copied and improvised sections of the Biblical texts even to its adopting the history of Christ's virgin birth, though rejecting any divinity attached to him (Christ's mother nevertheless having a book completely dedicated to her in

the Koran, she being regarded in the Koran as a "chosen" vessel and given a greater status than every other woman in the world, even to being mentioned more times in the Koran than in the original New Testament record))]
 if the Mohammedan Koran had been authored and published in recent times in any common law nation governed under the Crown, with the Koran being not just extensively copied from the Biblical writings, (which provide the foundation of "the law of the land" in such countries), but severally contradictory to such to the extent of involving a design of "caliphate" proportions to take precedence over that same law, forcefully, if invasively demanded

[to the extent where, with the Koranic religious segregation of non-Mohammedans from all others (all non-Mohammedans being disparaged as "infidels" or 'non-believers' (similar to the Bible's centuries earlier declaring of the same thing concerning those who reject Christ's forecast death and resurrection: that is, that all those persons, and down through the ages, which must necessarily include Mohammedans, would be similarly described as "infidels" or 'non-believers' -cf. Matthew 16:21, 2 Corinthians 6:14-15 etc.)), being a basic precept of Mohammedanism, whether enforced or not, which carries severe Koranic penalties for non-compliance (involving family, friends and community through to death), and the Koran having been so entrenched in many Middle Eastern communities from the earliest Mohammedan years of "the middle ages" with its roots grounded in a claim of kinship with Abraham's firstborn son, Ishmael, that reversing such non-segregation precept would make no sense or carry any authority to a believing Mohammedan, and there now being an increasing Western apprehension of this same time-cemented hostility as is now frequently evidenced against non-Mohammedan society in Western countries and commended in the Koran (which clearly promotes that Mohammedanism can be lived violently as well as just as clearly promoting that Mohammedanism can be lived peacefully (Mohammed's opposite teachings having the same Koranic authority and thus both held as having equal religious merit), and the Koran being increasingly criticised harshly in the Western press by comments such as

"The presence of this book is an immediate and evolving threat to the values, institutions and regulations that define Western (civilisation). There are no arguable circumstances under which it should play a role in shaping the character of any Australian (or other Western) citizen",

and that in relation to certain Islamic school students in Australia being taught in the schoolrooms

"about the truth of life from the Quranic perspective (that)... 'Peace, stability and

justice can be only achieved through the establishment of Islam and the rule of divinely appointed Imams...and nothing else, and it is (their) prime duty to strive for the establishment of Islam on the earth.'"

... with that same situation precipitating the recently reported and similarly concerned observation that

"Teaching Australian (and other civilised) children to strive for a global Islamic caliphate isn't a recipe for community harmony."],

would a criminal charge of "seditious enterprise" in relation to furthering the conflict between different classes of Crown subjects (albeit differing racially) be legally dismissible on any ground if arising from the publishing of matter promoting an intent to give a different authority than the Crown precedence over the established law of the land?, that is, if the Mohammedan Koran had been authored and published in recent times in any nation governed under the Crown and common law, would such a publishing (which is judicially noticeable as a work incorporating numerous plagiarisms of the Biblical record while simultaneously containing an intent to overthrow and replace the constitutionally established non-Mohammedan law and government of the host country), be an act outside the jurisdiction of the criminal law and not prosecutable in such Biblically grounded common law countries, and particularly with the authorised Bible being vested at law in all Crown nations as having a constitutional precedence above all religions and religious laws to such extent where, recognising such standing in law of its being the foundation for the governance of all Crown subjects, the same is ceremonially presented to the Sovereign (being part of the Coronation event) as "the most valuable thing that this world affords"? No.

SECTION 2

MODERN CIVILISATION: ANCIENT HERITAGE

- 16). Apart from the Bible's record of archaeological matters having proved accurate on numerous occasions, and despite a major ignoring by most scholars of the notable agreement of Biblical history with the archaeological evidence (those same scholars now deferring to such as the discordant Egyptian chronology and academic dating of ancient pottery), has the Bible yet been proven wrong in its archaeological references, or found inferior in historical integrity to the ancient records of any nation in any published evidence or argument? No.
- 16a). Despite the incompatible differences between the foundations of the ancient Greeks' religion and the Biblical creation record (such as the 'serpent' being revered in one

account and denigrated in the other), would a properly conducted common law anchored court of law be entitled to conclude from the available historical records that the ancient Greek gods, their supposed wisdom and exploits did not arise consequent to the personages and events recorded in the first several chapters of the Bible? No.

- 17). On a common law understanding of the available Biblical and other evidence relating to civil sovereignty, where by statute the British sovereign swears a solemn oath to administer the nations of the Crown in accord with Biblical precepts and the ancient Israelite scriptures, notwithstanding that the sovereign's swearing of such oath directly connects the English constitutional form and spirit with (not Jewish law but) the law of the ancient Israelite nation constituted under Moses (such connection being also confirmed in early English case law: the ruling of Britain being not by an absolute monarchy with an unfettered legal freedom but by a constitutional monarchy restrained by the law), is the identity of the modern day claimed "lost ten tribes" of the ancient (pre-Judaist) Israelites (as constituting the larger part of the "twelve tribes scattered abroad" earlier mentioned in the New Testament) and their current descendants, an ancient identity still "mystical" or "lost"? No.
- 18). Is Christianity the only world recognised institutional body which embraces the declaration "that the whole world is subject to the power and empire of Christ"? No.
- 19). With religion being common to the human race throughout history, and no part or parts of human DNA having been found which can be matched to mankind's preoccupation with religion, is it an exaggeration to state from the quantity and variety of unresolved religious conflicts over the ages, given that the same prevents unity in revering a Creator (such implacable disharmony in mankind's spiritual make-up sharply differing from the harmony evident in mankind's anatomical make-up), that all religions (independent of commendable humanitarian enterprises) may be described as a collection of allegiance-seeking institutions which are not just ill-informed about the nature of the human spirit and the means of gaining lasting peace and unity but are substantially ignorant of mankind's destiny beyond the mortal lifespan, that is, the erstwhile encountered (and partially substantiated) existence of an afterlife, notwithstanding most religions presuming themselves either 'afterlife specialists' or claiming high spiritual authority in such matters?, that is to say, is it wrong to hold that the substance of all religions (regardless of name or type) can be defined collectively, (on the basis of that known of the various nations across history) as a multi-faceted

devotional philosophy which, in presenting to its adherents many versions of the absolute truth concerning man's spiritual nature and ultimate fate, renders all religions and religious beliefs to be in one way or another counterfeit representations of that same core spiritual reality? No.

SECTION 3

MODERN CIVILISATION: ANCIENT ETHICS

- 20). On examination of the ancient records of the trial of Christ under the governance of the established rules of evidence and argument, could any ground relied on by the then Judaist court in relation to securing a conviction be deemed legitimate under the then laws of Rome or even under those of the Judaist religion by which the trial was conducted? No.
- 21). Does the law establishing all courts of the Crown and their processes employ the "Authorised" Bible (the only translation vested with the royal prerogative) with the intent to induce people to make a religious commitment, that is, does the legal practice of swearing an oath on the Bible to any extent imply such an oath is a religious rather than a civil one? No.
- 22). Can the fundamental law of 'common law countries', that is, that part of the common law which gives constitutional force to all valid statute law in such countries, be held as having no dependency on either fundamental "common sense" or on the juridically linked Israelite "Ten Commandments"? No.

SECTION 4

MODERN CIVILISATION: INTELLECTUAL INTEGRITY

- 23). Since in the mind of the general public in Western society the word "disease" is identified with an infection or health-injurious germs or "pathogens" as the cause, whereas an infirmity or natural deterioration of body elements is not associated with infection or "disease" (even though bodily deterioration and infectious decay both conform with the 'law of entropy'), is a medically trained advisor acting in compliance with the ethics of their profession and the 'duty of care' required of doctors etc., when either intentionally or unintentionally advising a patient with a non-germ related condition, disorder, ailment, etc., that the same has in effect contracted a known germ-based disease, and so indelibly impressing upon such patient they are not just suffering from a natural bodily deterioration, but essentially from an infectious malady, that is to say, would it be inaccurate to hold any medical practitioner to be both incompetent and pernicious, who advises a patient

exhibiting a substantially age-related bodily deterioration or impairment of some form (cardiac, vascular etc.) that they have contracted a formally diagnosed disease? No.

- 24) . On a solely grammatical reading of the Biblical accounts of Earth's beginnings, does the literal seven day week specified in the Bible's opening chapter correspond with the modern academic (and now also largely Christian) view of Earth's geological history, and allow for a number of 'evolutionary ages'?, that is to say, in terms of the plain language of the various references in the Bible to the origin of the universe and life, can such expressions as millions or "billions" of years ago be either evidentially justified or merged into the strict Biblical account of origins? No.
- 24a) . Although being frequently and often militantly expressed that the evidence for evolution stands plain and irrefutable, is the Earth's "fossil record" taken as a whole, that is, as a worldwide placement of all the different plant and animal fossils in the variously layered geological strata,
- 1) a phenomenon that establishes beyond reasonable doubt that evolutionary teachings of plant and animal origins are materially correct, or
 - 2) a phenomenon which conflicts with the Biblical account of the Earth's early history? No.
- 24b) . Concerning the discoveries of ancient remains of both human beings and "primate"-type animals of similar skeletal appearance ("primates" however containing major genetic differences from humans), and the theorised step-by-step advancements of such "primates" from a presumed earlier ape-like state as presented in textbooks, museums and the mass media,
- [albeit Darwin's theory of evolution currently being not scientifically validated and wholly unable to provide at common law any sustainable evidence for the claim of being indisputable, with the foundation of the theory (which in modern thinking considers that after a chanced first emergence of one or more life forms, a further chanced emergence of many compatible mutations occurred (opposite to that observed) in newly evolved hereditary cells which combined to create new information for new advancements of life) having existed in essence long before Darwin (as found in ancient Greek writings for example), and with Darwin himself having been once formally accused of substantial plagiarism of his grandfather's and other scientists' writings about life's origins, and with the adjective Darwinian" having first been publicly applied not to Charles Darwin but to his grandfather's works],
- would a properly conducted court, having examined scientific

discoveries relevant to humanity's origins, be wrong at law to find that instead of the rigorous discipline presumed to competently underlie scientific conclusions, a spiritually deceptive and educationally aberrant portrayal of humanity's origins has long been not just taught but widely promoted by leading scholars, with the perverse, albeit scholarly, intent to dominate the world's educational system and media services (to such extent as where largely fictional representations of humanity's history are advanced even by scholarly institutions such as N.A.S.A. and "The National Geographic" magazine)? No.

- 24c) . Concerning the controversial international body of Christian scholars known as "creationists" or "creationary scientists", whose vocation involves an evangelical (yet Biblically cemented) scientific teaching of the beginning of things, where such scientists frequently attract derision and strong *ad hominem* attacks from evolution-supporting scholars (as if creationary evidence were substantially threatening), which often extend to attacks without legitimate cause or verifiable evidence; and where considering the continuance of the same such unprovoked and implacable "evolutionist" hostility (whether active or dormant), together with the revealing of many published errors of noted science scholars not being withdrawn or corrected upon their exposure, and also the presenting by both groups of scholars of academic errors and unsustainable convictions as if having comparable status to known facts; and where, consistent with natural psychological truth, the continuance of a pronounced bias co-existing with the pursuit of scientific answers has corrupted the mindset of many researchers who in turn have passed on and promoted such corrupted interpretations of their research worldwide, and notwithstanding that both scientific groups in their albeit differing ways are similarly as dismissive as their counterparts of major material facts, can it nevertheless be sustained, for example, concerning the denigrated "creationist" group of origin-specialising scientists, albeit both groups commonly exhibiting superexcellent capabilities of literary and scientific analysis and interpretation, that the well-known writer and former science spokesman, Isaac Asimov, was accurate when declaring in a 1984 speech (reported in the January edition of "The Humanist" journal of that year) that in his and many others' modern scientific judgment, all creationist critics of evolution "are stupid lying people who are not to be trusted in any way" and that all their scientific "points are equally stupid, except where (they) are outrightly lying"? No.

- 25) . Does the immensity of benefits conferred upon humanity by scientific endeavour (with modern science being now largely

considered 'the criterion of credibility in modern culture') carry through to displaying a comparable wisdom in the understanding of how the universe and life came to exist?, that is to say: Considering the various understandings of facts by modern scientists (as often distinct from their private interpretations of such facts) that

i) there was never a time when there existed *absolutely nothing at all* (otherwise there would *still be absolutely nothing at all*, that is, not even the presence of a vacuum),

ii) by observation and the established laws of physical forces, all the matter in the universe must have had a beginning (irrespective of fanciful multi-universe theories etc.),

iii) notwithstanding a number of impressively enhanced telescopic photographs described as depicting "star nurseries", there is still no sustainable scientific explanation for the self-formation of any known type of star, galaxy or cluster of galaxies in the universe, nor even for the planets and moons in the Solar System, since according to the now commonly accepted understanding of the Sun and planets' formation, and as was publicly conceded in 1972 albeit little discussed since, it is still considered that there is no known viable means of matter at any time having physically "accreted" or accumulated in the outer region of the Solar System where the planets Jupiter, Uranus, Neptune and ninth planet Pluto and its unique surface appearance and "menagerie" of five unrelatedly spinning moons nonetheless exist: with the origin, formation and variety of this and most of the now over 2000 known "exoplanets" and moons in other systems

[including the recent finding of two nearby extraordinary, though wholly life-hostile, solar systems, (one having seven close approximately Earth size planets and the other at least four double Earth size planets, the innermost of which exhibiting an extraordinary three and a half day 'year')]

providing a bewilderment to modern astronomers concerning the forming of cosmic bodies (albeit such perplexity concealed, as with most other confounding discoveries, under the deliberate disguise of being "exciting" for humanity),

iv) despite hundreds of millions of dollars having been provided for a number of complex experiments, and the occasional claim from laboratories that life from chemicals has been experimentally created, all such creative attempts have failed decisively and consistently,

v) with the substantially intricate design found throughout nature being now impossible to deny, the same being largely conceded by even a professorial promoter of there being "no design" in the universe (R.Dawkins) in such words as: "Biology is the study of complicated things that give the appearance of having been designed" (with a

similarly well-known promoter of "atheistic science", Carl Sagan, having devised a 4-point criteria to determine from (as yet unreceived extraterrestrial signals), the presence of an "E.T." intelligence and design, while strongly dismissing, for example, that the human DNA molecule involves numerous more criteria essential for its existence than Sagan's only four point "E.T." contention, thus establishing human DNA to be far more than something which just gives an "appearance" of intelligent design),

vi) "evolutionary science", as has been described by a leading evolutionist promoter (R.E.Dickerson,1992), is often not an objective search for undiscovered truth but a "game which has one overriding and defining rule of play:

Let us see how far and to what extent we can explain the behaviour (and origin) of living organisms and the physical universe in terms of purely physical causes, that is, without invoking the supernatural", or as a well-used evolutionary stricture warns, "without letting a divine foot in the door", such having also been recently admitted in a seniormost scientific journal (Nature) that "Even if all the [scientific] data point to an intelligent designer, such an hypothesis is excluded from [modern] science because it is not naturalistic (purely physical)" (S.Todd: 1999), with such forced naturalism arising from embracing a reversed order of priorities where facts become of less importance than theory, with such revealing an adopted impediment to rational thinking in that, as expressed by a modern philosopher W. Dembski (2004),

"for the naturalist, the world is intelligible only if it starts off without intelligence. If it starts out with intelligence and evolves intelligence, because of 'a priori' (an earlier) intelligence, then somehow the world becomes unintelligible. The absurdity here is palpable(striking)."

vii) the only popularly accepted hypothesis of the physical beginnings of life, that is, in a theorised incubationary 'organic soup' (albeit rivalled by other proposals), has been found to have chemically insurmountable combining and stability problems (albeit such primeval 'soup' still being relied on and promoted as the most credible explanation for the commencement of life, with a continuing avoidance of the 1980s discovery of the existence of three unique types of fundamental "simple cells": bacteria, archaea and eukarya which appear not to have developed one from another but to be essentially distinct from each other to the extent of necessitating not one but an unlikely three different types of supposed "primeval soup" for their origins),

viii) life could not exist without the living cells of organisms regularly and effectively committing a

genetically programmed death or 'cell suicide' process (apoptosis) with such cells being quickly dismantled and portions re-utilised (a process opposite to the decay process of necrosis),

ix) the capacity to produce the essential chemicals known as folates required for both the manufacture of DNA and cell functioning in all living things is wholly absent in animal life and not found outside plants and microbes, with no evidence yet discovered indicating that animals have at any time synthesised folates themselves, and

x) none of the evidence on which the theories of either macro or micro evolution rest contain any scientifically confirmable instance of an increase in system complexity having occurred, despite the absolute requirement for vast increases in complexity if all modern things evolved from a 'primordial' state,

then and without dismissing any of the benefits to humanity from scientific endeavour especially in modern times, has the supposedly equal or comparable wisdom of explaining how all things came to exist ever been satisfactorily provided by the teachings of modern science?, that is, does any reasonably precise mechanism or process exist through which the development of the material universe could have eventuated, that is, either by chance, and/or from atomic forces or other causes as promoted by the various and still solely theoretically based (despite certain part-proofs) "Quantum", "Chaos" or "Complexity" theories of Particle Physicists and the like?, or alternatively, is there any ground to consider that some other as yet unknown primal physical force or process could have 'gathered together' or organised grossly exploded and exploding material from a theorised "Big Bang" into forming any of the stars, planets or galaxies, in the universe, or any of even the simplest varieties of life on earth? No.

- 26) . Although the Bible severally states that the life (or living force) of a creature is "in the blood", has modern scientific research on the other hand yet established where such living force or "aliveness" of an organism resides in its system, with such "aliveness" being the only force known which counteracts the tendency of all organised matter to degenerate according to the universal 'law of entropy', with this same law being often portrayed as causing the energy or motion of all matter in the universe to decay or "wind down" toward a dead or motionless equilibrium (as per Schroedinger 1944), that is, does any particular one, or group, of an organism's chemicals or internal components (whether of flora, fauna or cell life) reveal the element of "aliveness" found in it? No.
- 26a) . Concerning the complexity of the DNA genetic code (added to for example by the discovery of similarly complex genetic codes at, for example, its cylindrical (or "histone"))

centre, such central structure also containing the capacity for organising local genetic engineering when required), with human beings said to have some 100,000 different genetic proteins, with all 100,000 being inexplicably coded for by only about 25,000 protein-making genes; and considering that

- i) on the known laws of physics, none of the purely chemical elements of either the DNA's or its histones' codes (including those which organise the cell's genetic editing) would have been physically capable of joining themselves together to make an intelligibly ordered code for the construction of anything; with scientists such as F. Hoyle (originator of the "Big Bang" lampoon) and the DNA co-discoverer F. Crick, disputing the concept of Earth-originated life, Hoyle for example having stated in 1981:

"I don't know how long it is going to be before astronomers generally recognize that the combinatorial arrangement of not even one among the many thousands of biopolymers on which life depends could have been arrived at by natural processes here on the Earth....

"The notion that not only the biopolymers but the operating programme of a living cell could be arrived at by chance in a primordial organic soup here on the Earth is evidently nonsense of the highest order. Life must..be a cosmic phenomenon." (New Scientist, p.526-7, 19th November, 1981 edn.),

- ii) no code (or encryption) would have an intelligibility without there being also some previously existing means to decode it, and
 - iii) no code (or encryption) can exist without having been previously devised by a more complex intelligence than the code itself could contain,
- then considering the extreme complexity of genetic codes, such supposed as providing for all the attributes of life in the chemical structure of the DNA molecule, is it possible that all attributes of life, including the esoteric properties of consciousness, the perception of beauty in differing realms, defence of family values etc. owe their existence solely to DNA chemistry? No.

- 27). Is there any scientific proof that mankind evolved from a low intelligence to a higher intelligence, as commonly assumed by scholars to be first apparent with such as the presumed invention of the wheel, which is not necessarily contradicted by the discoveries that many types of bacteria and enzyme units which existed before humans were among the first biological systems to possess a functional (work performing) wheel [that is, such being the central part of biological electric motors, albeit of sub-microscopic proportions, with

discovered examples including i) a molecular motor constructed of one particular enzyme ("ATP synthase", claimed to be the most common protein throughout life, formed from some 3,000 amino acids and possessing a central rotor spinning at many thousand rpm), such rotor being responsible for both making and circularly distributing the energy providing chemical (ATP) necessary for maintaining cell life (the rotation of ATP being suddenly stopped by the poison cyanide), and ii) protein motors in many bacteria having rotors which spin helical-type strands (also at thousands of rpm) to propel themselves], given that such complex wheel-based devices are established as being existent before any human invention? No.

SECTION 5

MODERN CIVILISATION: HIGHER LEARNING

- 28). Although Einstein was awarded a Nobel Prize for his work on the photoelectric effect [in certain circumstances light can cause electrons (electricity) to be emitted from metal surfaces with a behaviour resembling atomic particles], and was associated with other notable practical inventions and mathematical innovations, including a refining of a colleague mathematician's (Poincaré) equation to what became established as the simpler and classically based formula $E = mc^2$ which (though also deducible from such as a jet of water hitting an absorbing wall) he later applied to atomic chain reactions which then led to the wartime invention of the atomic bomb; and that in the field of complex theories his name has been long revered among most theoretical physicists and mathematicians in the belief he had not just discovered an omission from Newton's system of kinematics but had completely "overthrown Newton" following a 1919 popularised confirmation of his second Relativity theory (still widely promoted albeit decisively refuted some three years afterward (C.L.Poor 1922), and still today (in 2017) not validated despite a number of relativity specialists over almost a century diligently seeking or wrongly assuming such has been proven), Einstein's name having become an embraced synonym throughout the world for the highest level of human intelligence (as distinct from higher-than-worldly wisdom), to the extent of precipitating a 2005 centenary memorial of the first Relativity theory's publishing, with the sum of his accomplishments revealing an obvious genius for discovery and inventiveness; but on closer examination of his theories however, and with the excellence of his scientific accomplishments notwithstanding, that is to say, incisively separating Einstein's practical inventiveness from his exotic theoretical works (such as imagining that the standard measurements of time and length depend on the speed of objects), would the plain language claims of either of

his theories of Relativity and their particular depiction of physical reality (on which theories his reputation almost wholly depends) survive close examination in a properly conducted court of law if the experimental evidence and arguments long presented for and against both theories, which include all their successful and unsuccessful predictions, and notwithstanding isolated parts of such theories being of practical use (albeit not solely dependent on Relativity): that is, and having regard to the necessity that such two separate Relativity theories demand their own distinct ("Minkowskian" or "Riemannian") theories of what space consists of, would Einstein's Relativity theories survive close examination in a legally strict forum if examined according to the rules of evidence, or alternatively, and not dismissing such anomalies as

(i) Einstein's creation of a scientific impossibility attached to his first or "Special" Relativity theory, that is, where the same mathematical argument relied on to prove the contention that 'moving clocks run slower than stationary ones' (as for example in the well-known "Twin Paradox" dispute) which proves with the same force and validity that those same slower moving clocks also run faster than the stationary clocks, where such mathematical conclusion can similarly be extended to include that two clocks can mechanically run either twice as fast or twice as slow as each other at the same time (making such relativistic mathematical conclusion in the real world an unfathomable absurdity, albeit mathematically viable),

(ii) one of Einstein's major or "Pillar" postulates of his second theory of "General" Relativity, referred to as the "Principle of Equivalence" [which presumes acceleration and gravity are the same force, despite the basis of one being fully known and the other (gravity) still being conjectural], such connection having been unsalvageably invalidated by the same type of mathematical analysis relied on to confirm it, with such assumed "Principle" thus proving to be mathematically invalid, and

(iii) Einstein's comparative lack of spiritual integrity which is not readily dismissable from his autobiographically admitted lifelong "Mistrust of every kind of authority (including that of the Biblical Deity, even though being of the Jewish faith)" on the one hand and on the other, from his fundamental behaviour as a husband and father being reported worldwide as dysfunctionally unintelligent and cruel to the extent of such being made a subject for front page levity by the mass media (he being in latter life publicised as having had a directly contrasting state of mind to his genius in mathematical physics as revealed in his acknowledging blame for two failed marriages or attempts to find "lasting consonance with a wife.., an undertaking at which I twice rather shamefully failed"),

is the following (sufficiently corroborated and judicially noticeable) critical conclusion presented by hydraulic engineer and equipment manufacturer and one time senior Nobel Physics Prize judge, H. Nordenson in the work: "Relativity Time and Reality" (1969), capable of being authoritatively denied in a common law governed court enquiry in any of its material points?...

[such Nobel Prize Institution during Nordenson's judgeship still retaining its high measure of honour and integrity intact, the same being first compromised in 2003 after the Committee's intentionally denigrative denial of a Nobel Prize to the celebrated inventor and patent holder of MRI imaging (R.Damadian -a Christian creationary scientist) while awarding such prize exclusively to the inventor's assistants, the beliefs of whom on the matter of human origins being not discordant to the judges' mindset:]

That is, Nordenson declaring that:

"With regard to the investigation I have here presented I maintain that whosoever from now upholds the relativistic ideas or applies the fundamental relativistic formulae as representing relations between physical quantities [*such as holding the flow of time to be physically connected to the dimensions of space*] without regarding and refuting my above criticism of the Theory, makes himself liable to the accusation of grave intellectual laxity.

"I do not hesitate to declare as a result of my investigation the opinion that Einstein's Theory of Relativity is not only among the most sensational fancies, but also one of the most serious logical incoherencies in the history of science.

"I have often met persons..who have expressed their astonishment that Einstein was not awarded the Nobel Prize for his Theory of Relativity, which many people consider as one of the most outstanding achievements of this [20th] century.

"As a member of the Swedish Academy of Science which distributes the Nobel Prizes of physics I am on the other hand very glad that this was not done, *since the theory of relativity is not physics but philosophy and in my opinion poor philosophy*" (author emphases)...? No.

- 29) . Concerning the primary judgements of most modern astronomers and their supporters, does the present astronomical theory that almost all of the physical universe is composed of a currently undetected and unfathomed dark, invisible, 'exotic' 'abnormal' type of physical matter and energy (such "Dark Matter" together with a postulated companion of "Dark Energy" with both considered still in 2017 to form up to 95 per cent of the universe and which are theorised to be essential for

keeping the galaxies and clusters of galaxies together for thousands of millions of years), rest on anything more than a religious depth of conviction, especially when decisive research on the matter was completed and internationally reported in such terms as:

'The search for dark matter, one of science's most iconic endeavours, has become its greatest frustration, with physicists admitting that despite spending 30 years and hundreds of millions of dollars they have not found it....and cannot work out what it is' (not knowing exactly what to search for);

with three independent major researches finding nothing to identify 'dark matter' of any kind; and where in the case of the Milky Way alone, a considered 'typical' spiral galaxy, the existence of such theoretical matter has now been excluded from further credible experiment? No.

- 29a). Is there any sustainable astronomical or other physical reason why any cosmic object could or should ever form out of dust (including small rocky matter) and/or gas? No.
- 29b). In addition to the variety of galaxies throughout the universe being substantially similar and distributed whether occurring proximate to the Solar System, deeper in space, or at the greatest distances yet observed, and concerning in particular, spiral-armed galaxies such as the Milky Way, and where such galaxies found at the remotest distances are (as based on evolutionary astronomical dating) considered "young", that is, those same galaxies being presumed to appear as they did close to the beginning of the universe (now supposed as 13-14 milliard (i.e., 'billion') years ago), since based on today's theories of astronomical dating,
- 1) such "young" spiral galaxies at the remotest distances could not have had the time to form spiral arms, or
 - 2) the fully formed "older" spiral galaxies at "closer" distances, of which the Milky Way is one, would have long ago been 'wound up' and no longer show spiral arms,
- then with there being no readily observable age difference between the far distant "young"-considered spiral galaxies and the closer "older"-considered spiral galaxies (and similarly with all clusters of galaxies of theoretically highly differing ages showing a like indistinguishability), have there been any modern estimates yet published of the age of the universe which take into account relatively identical spiral galaxies appearing across the considered immensely separated regions of time and space? No.
- 30). Concerning the dimension of time and its transcendent appeal to human thought (compared to the physical dimensions of length, breadth and width), and noting the highest academic learning on the subject including the theoretical ideas of

time advanced by Einstein, Hawking etc., as well as the widely known events of precognition and 'déjà vu'

[both commonly recognised time phenomena revealing the existence of a connection of two time zones: one being the 'regular' clock-measurable passing of time and the other being a transient but immediately informative 'flash' of imagery, unsought information and/or insightful recognition which interrupts the consciousness with a sometimes detailed depiction of a hitherto unknown past or future situation, the practical application of such human 'time traversing' faculty having been utilised and documented officially on certain occasions as material to the solving of certain criminal cases, with some of such successful resolutions having been mass media publicised], could a common law grounded court, if occasioned to examine the various reports of time-related phenomena, conclude that the actual (measurable) flow of time in the universe could only have begun, as assumed by modern theorists, together with the emergence of

- (1) space,
- (2) energy, and
- (3) matter

(where all three require a simultaneous flowing of time during and after their creation to enable their continuance; with such flow of time and the other considered "Big Bang" constituents being presumed to have appeared all together rather than consecutively, as the sequential or physical 'step-by-step' construction of a universe from its independent constituents would require)?, that is to say, with the element of time being identifiable as necessarily incorporating some form of non-physical channel through which not just the forward flow of existence but also recorded "out-of-time" events (as arising from the content of some 'supernatural-type' repository) can be experienced, that is, time in its wider sense being a non-material phenomenon existing independent from:

- (i) the physical existence of matter,
- (ii) the length of events which occur within its flow, and
- (iii) the physical dimensions of space

[notwithstanding Einstein and like-minded scientists believing on mathematical and philosophical grounds that although space has measurable type dimensions, it nevertheless possesses highly elastic properties and is similarly theorised as being made from a curveable semi-material "fabric" which in some way provides for the flow of time everywhere in the universe, with the substantially dissimilar properties of space and time (that is, while space needs time to exist, time needs no space to exist) being presented by modern science as if two parts of the one physical force, which modern

scientists have combined, through mathematics, to constitute a hybrid physical space medium now popularly fictionised as "spacetime"], is it to any extent mathematically sustainable that in non-theoretical reality the element of time can only exist in physical conjunction with the space in which it flows and thus that both must have commenced at the same physical instant? No.

- 30a) . Also, given that pure space (a fully empty vacuum) cannot be generated in the physical realm by any known means, could any of the matter (or electrical energy) in the universe have appeared before the space or means to house it were already present?, or alternately, and apart from current astronomical theories, must matter and the space necessary to accommodate it have begun their existence at the one instant? No.
- 30b) . And also according to the known laws of physics, could any magnetism or magnetic fields have been present in the universe if the electrically charged atomic particles of any shape or size were formed "still-framed" in space or absolutely motionless, that is to say (and disregarding that magnetism requires three separate elements, electric charge being one), could any magnetism whatever have appeared independently as a material force, that is, without there already having been:
- 1) electrically charged particles (or bodies) with their electric fields, and sufficient free space to allow motion,
 - 2) an external force to impart motion to such particles (no charged body of itself being capable of causing its own movement), and
 - 3) a space medium, (since motion through 'absolute nothingness' could not generate anything, therefore a non-empty space is demanded; such by deduction being filled with an indefinable fluid-behaving 'supernatural'-type substance within which moving charged bodies interact to produce the notably different force of magnetism, that is to say, without the existence of each of three such components, i) electric charge, ii) physical motion and iii) a space-occupying substance of some kind, could the force of magnetism have ever been generated? No.
- 30c) . And also, concerning the full extent of all organising information in the universe, as evidenced by the precise forces through which matter on both the Earth and everywhere else in the universe appear to be governed (active or 'meta-'governing information being required before even an atom could be formed), is it the case that this same such widely varied yet intensively ordered information, which appears to exert full control over the

nature and natural limits of all matter, organic and inorganic, life and the universe, could have arisen only together with the sudden appearance of that same matter, or more incisively, is it possible, as widely believed, that despite a number of scholars' disagreements [such as found on the Internet at <http://homepages.xnet.co.nz/~hardy/cosmologystatement.html>], all organisational information including the laws of physics exploded into existence as part of the popularly accepted "Big Bang" origin of everything? No.

30d) . Concerning the constancy of the speed of light in whatever stable medium it passes through, and given that experimental results have demonstrated that when a beam of light (either white or coloured) enters a glass block or prism for example, the air/glass interface instantly decreases the velocity the beam previously had, and correspondingly, when at that same decreased velocity the light exits the glass/air interface on the other side of the glass, the light instantly returns to its former velocity, is it correct to hold that light simply radiates or propagates through transparent substances as commonly theorised, and is not actively propelled through them? No.

30e) . Concerning the discovery that the motion of bodies throughout the universe is finely ordered, and despite that much of such order was anciently misinterpreted as indicating (both with and without the common 'pagan' ideas of origins) that most things seen in the night sky revolved around the Earth, and also despite such ancient interpretation of cosmic order having been displaced by the modern belief that the behaviour of bodies in the cosmos is explained by Einstein's theory of Relativity [from which it is reckoned, albeit largely based on impeccable mathematics, that the universe contains no centre or boundaries, but (contradicting the common observation that all explosions, of which the "Big Bang" is considered one, involve both a centre and an expanding boundary) that the universe would appear essentially the same in its galaxy arrangement, motion and variety from any place in the cosmos (that is, whether the view of the universe was from Earth or some remotely distant region)], can it now be legitimately denied that a number of recent astronomical discoveries have been made of unexpected phenomena which although originating in far distant space, indicate that the Milky Way inhabits a central region in the universe, namely, from discoveries of

- i) the evenness in strength of the incoming Cosmic Microwave Background radiation (MBR) from essentially all directions over the observable sky (with such evenness throughout being further evident by a common

signature (also as yet unexplained) of specific 'bumps' in the intensity measurements of the frequency range of that particular radiation, with such measured radiation being inexplicable by the "Big Bang" theory (and contrary to theories attempting to explain such) since the strength of such radiation is found to be only some ten per cent of the Big Bang theory's prediction),

ii) the similar evenness in strength and multi-directional occurrence of incoming far higher frequency X-Ray Background Radiation (considered as having a different cause than the Microwave Background, though the origins of both remain unproven),

iii) the also similarly even distribution essentially from all directions of the multi-daily detected Gamma Radiation bursts (currently conjectured to be produced by an as yet unknown stellar process which forces highly concentrated beams of energy from the most massive collapsing stars or supernovae),

iv) the extraordinary similarity of the calculated outward velocities (from Earth) of all galaxies, many "quasars" etc., at all specific radial distances across the universe from Earth, even reaching to the visible extremities of the universe (as per the Hubble "deep field" zones), that is, when calculated according to the current interpretation of their spectrum redshifts [and where, unaffected by technical disputes, such observed similarity in those assumed velocities vanishes if the selected point of observation (for example, at some few light-years distance from Earth) is moved sideways a short astronomical distance (say of two million light-years from Earth - which is insignificant when compared to the diameter of the universe)], with the spherical nature of this Milky Way-centred discovery being again indicated by another discovered phenomenon: a regularly separated bunching or quantization of stars having similar redshifts at regularly segregated distances from such central region, regardless of their direction, and which by modern astronomical observation demands that almost all stars and galaxies, and many "quasars", must be concentrated into a number of evenly separated spherical onion-like shells, all being concentric on the Milky Way region, (and on no other known part of the universe, the relative motions of all galaxies and clusters therefore proving to have been quite minimal in their present regional locations during most of the universe's existence, and also confirmed independently by recent observations), and

v) the clear general diminishing in all observed directions away from Earth of the quantity of galaxies per unit volume of space, albeit directly contradicting the previous predictions of an increase of galaxy numbers to be expected at further distances from Earth, which is to say, and given that the spherical nature of each of the above phenomena is also consistent with known atomic charge behaviour (where it is observed that the fields emitted from atomic charges produce spherical fronts of radiation which expand uniformly outward), can it be any way otherwise than such astronomical discoveries to date demand a more tangible explanation than any ancient superstition or the theory of Relativity provides, that is, an explanation which does not devalue validated published observations and legally sustainable reasoning, and which does not deny the astronomical finding that the Milky Way and hence the Earth inhabit an identifiably central part of the universe, (regardless of such observation being discordant to many theoretical physicists on the one hand and revered by many Bible-adherent religious minorities on the other)? No.

- 30f) . Concerning the belief of life on other planets, and that the popular astronomer Carl Sagan advanced in 1966 that there existed a critical requirement of two conditions necessary for life to exist in the universe, where such figure has since been increased through a number of following discoveries to over two hundred such critical conditions for life to exist ("Wall Street Journal" 25th December, 2014 edn.), does the modern scientific belief that it all "just happened" by itself" fit the observed facts of the matter or a cogent form of logic or common sense? No.
- 31) . Can any educated and well-informed person acting without guile or scholastic prejudice rationally conclude themselves to be an absolute atheist, that is, one uninfluenced by popular consensus or mental, emotional or physical interests, but knowing of sufficient evidence which refutes the teaching that the universe was initiated by a pre-existing intelligent Entity capable of intervening in human affairs, that is to say, given
- (i) it is absolute scientific truth, not scientific opinion, that life and the universe had a beginning,
 - (ii) it is absolute scientific truth, not academic opinion, that everything in the universe which has a known beginning had a previous cause (with scholars' attempts to dismiss such 'law of cause and effect' proving to be solely philosophical),
 - (iii) despite the many attempts to explain otherwise, no instance of wholly new physical or biological

information of even the simplest type has been reported as arising from natural (non-thinking) causes, the only real information change observed in the biological sciences (apart from apoptosis - programmed recycling of cell parts) being the continual loss of practical information, with no instance of a natural regaining of such information having yet been established (despite the rare occasions of environmental advantage incurred by a loss of genetic information),

- (iv) the present day position of conventional science still provides no prospect of cogent answers on the subject of beginnings (despite the undoubted competency in many other areas), such position on origins being reasonably described in 1998 by a multi prize-winning theoretical physicist, Paul Davies (whose widely published Biblically dismissive theories of origins once resulted in a US\$1,000,000 prize for the advancement of religion), as substantiated from the publicising of his dogmatic theoretical views:

"We can't understand how the universe came to exist except as a Quantum Mechanical process" and again expressing the same dogmatic conviction that 'all people owe their physical and mental existence to the forces of Quantum Mechanics' (November 2004), and yet again with the same conviction, declaring that an unknown "magic" produced in chemical "gunk" or "sludge" is the only reasonable cause of life's beginning, as per Davies' glibly declaring (December 2004) that there had been "opportunities for 'gunk-filled' craters on Titan to work whatever chemical magic it takes to create (life)", he more substantively presenting a number of statements concerning:

- a) the importance of science as concerns man's seeking to understand the universe: "Well in a sort of everyday sense it doesn't matter. But in a deeper sense as to who we are, how we value ourselves, how we place ourselves in nature and in the universe, it is of course immensely important that we know about where we come from, and how the universe is put together and this is of course very 'ancient press'. The Greek philosophers two and a half thousand years ago began the search for trying to understand how the universe is put together using human reasoning and of course one of the problems they came up with was what is the universe made up of and at the end of the twentieth century we don't know what the ultimate building blocks of matter are.....so unless we get clues from

nature herself [(sic) - a theorised female entity possessing all physical knowledge]...it may remain forever mysterious what these ultimate building blocks of matter are" (with no indication of such yet come to light),

- b) the 'great questions' of firstly the origin of the universe and secondly the origin of life: "Well I think that the origin of consciousness is the third. It's equally as tough as the other two. I don't think we understand what consciousness is. I don't think we've even got a clue as how to frame the very concepts we need to solve that problem", he in 2000 having portrayed the nature of consciousness as "the deepest scientific riddle of all time", and
- c) the appearance of the first reproducing molecule of life (DNA): "I really do think we're stuck on this one, I think it's a very, very profound problem", with such not being resolved or resolvable by modern genome mapping discoveries but rather more sharply focussed by
- 1) there being no cogent explanation of how a living cell may have been step-by-step assembled (with for example no article yet published in the history of the leading technical 'Journal of Molecular Evolution' which has proposed any such step-by-step explanation),
 - 2) the discovery that the machinery used by a reproducing cell to chemically recognise and decode the DNA and manufacture other chemicals consists of over fifty different expressly complex molecular parts (even to including numerous 'quality control' mechanisms), the workings of such machinery thus presenting an impasse to the mind when considering the appearance of any 'first cell', that is, a cell which would have needed not only the first DNA molecule to be present within a nucleus, but also to be likewise in close proximity to the reproducing mechanism for that molecule (the DNA molecule being a "read only" store and in no way self-decodable or reproducible), with this same clear mystery of how assembling molecules of any first cell could have been formed in such a biologically exposed (yet safely functional) contact with the DNA molecule, as well as being wholly blueprinted inside it, having been concisely expressed by an earlier reputed scholar (K.Popper) as a confoundment:

"..Thus the (DNA) code can not be translated except by using certain products of its translation. This constitutes a baffling circle; a really vicious circle, it seems, for any attempt to form a model or theory of the genesis of the genetic code", and

3) ongoing discoveries concerning micro-biological mechanisms within the (formerly supposed "simple") cell which now dictate that the extraordinary complexity of the workings within a normal cell of a creature actually exceeds the complexity of the workings of the creature's whole anatomy.

- (v) the findings of scientists from many fields concerning the precision or orderliness of life and the universe, as stated concisely in 1992 for example by the aforementioned Paul Davies: "A long list of additional 'lucky accidents' and 'coincidences' has been compiled.. Taken together, they provide impressive evidence that life as we know it depends very sensitively on the form of the laws of physics, and on some seemingly fortuitous accidents in the actual values that nature has chosen [here, reverentially inferring "nature" to be a conscious entity responsible for the beginning of the universe] for various particle masses, force strengths, and so on.... Suffice it to say that, if we could play God, and select values for these quantities at whim by twiddling a set of knobs [the main atomic forces for example being thousands of trillions of times stronger than the force of gravity which itself is many trillions times stronger than the latest supposed detected "gravity waves"], we would find that almost all knob settings would render the universe uninhabitable. In some cases it seems as if the different knobs have to be fine-tuned to enormous precision if the universe is to be such that life will flourish" (extract from a work provocatively titled "The Mind of God.." - Davies not infrequently employing the title "God", even to blaming such Entity (whose existence he denies) for a supposed lopsided shape of the universe),
- (vi) discoveries from genetic research relating to the attempted dating of the origin of modern humanity, which is still theorised to have descended from two random early but non-contemporaneous African natives (on the basis of the decay rate of the cell's (a) male Y-chromosome and (b) female mitochondrial DNA, the same two individuals being contentiously named "Y-chromosome Adam" and "Mitochondrial Eve"), are readily determinable (within the published ranges of 'molecular clock' processes) as being consistent

- with the plain Biblical account and calculable calendrical placement of the persons of 'Adam and Eve',
- (vii) the widely publicised (and still promoted) 1953 experiment to form life in a laboratory, known as "Miller's remarkable achievement" failed to achieve its aims and has been declared a fruitless scientific failure in not having produced anything relative to either the i) structure or ii) continuance of a living cell (despite most publicity conveying the opposite),
 - (viii) the discovery of many self-contained biological and anatomical "working parts" which could not have developed by successive modifications of anything before them (such as the human knee with its cross-strapped sliding pivot point and upright locktight position, and the known impossibility of it having developed from any other type of joint in humans or from the knee joints of animals),
 - (ix) one of the principal inspirers of modern atheism, Darwin, even after generally discarding his primary belief in the Deity of fundamentalist Christianity, still considered it doubtful that the human concept of morality, or returning good for evil etc., arose in the natural course of events, as was expressed in his "Descent of Man.." (1901): "Nor is it probable that the.. [evolution-reliant] conscience would reproach a man for injuring his enemy: rather it would reproach him if he had not revenged himself. To do good in return for evil, to love your enemy, is a height of morality to which it may be doubted whether the social instincts would, by themselves, have ever led us. It is necessary that these instincts, together with sympathy, should have been highly cultivated and extended by the aid of reason, instruction, and the love or fear of God, before any such golden rule would ever be thought of and obeyed",
 - (x) the well-known science theorist and atheist, Stephen Hawking, in his popular book "A Brief History of Time", directly refers to a God who created the laws of physics, and possesses above-naturalistic powers in his statement: "If we do discover a complete theory (of how everything fits together)...then we would know the mind of God", that is, since the writer acknowledges that knowing how everything fits together would reveal not an atheistic foundation but "the mind of God" where, with no other cause being allowed for it can only have been the creator Deity who exercised his mind in making everything 'fit together', and also, recognising that discussing "the mind of God", in an openly non-disparaging context (as per Davies), is, for any prominent atheist or atheists, an express contradiction of their fundamental beliefs, it follows from his words,

that a world-prominent atheist had the unconscious conviction at the time of writing an atheism-promoting work that a supernatural God exists who not only knows about, but governs how everything 'fits together', and not just as a constructive mind but as a living Entity who possesses one,

(xi) the two fundamentally opposing human philosophies of atheism and theology, as characterised by:

- 1) 'man is the measure of all things', which originated in about the fourth century BC (Parmenides) and has continued to where some scientists still openly promote that man represents the "pinnacle of evolution", and
- 2) 'God exists because the contrary is impossible' (such philosophical resolution originating in an earlier millennium),

both ideas having now been superseded, that is, according to a number of published estimates of the likely occurrence of certain cosmic and biological phenomena, and the recently established "probability theory", from which the scientific "laws of probability" have been formulated, and accordingly, when probability laws are applied to such phenomena, a cogent scientific argument on the matter can be concluded, that is, 'God exists because the opposite is *statistically* impossible', and

(xii) a number of senior evolutionary scientists have displayed in relation to their conviction toward evolution a notable dysfunctionality in the matter, as such professorial statements evidence:

"The alternative to thinking in evolutionary terms is is not to think at all" (P.Medawar) and

"Evolution has been observed. It's just that it hasn't been observed while it's happening" (R.Dawkins), then is it logically possible that a well-educated scholar could, without employing guile, determine that a creative supernatural and law-devising Entity does not exist? No.

31a). Is it consistent with human sanity for an atheism-adherent professor or scholar to deride a God which he firmly believes does not exist? No.

SECTION 6

MODERN CROWN COUNTRIES: CONSTITUTIONAL INTEGRITY

32). In the eye of British constitutional law [which emplaces for the United Kingdom and other Crown governed realms a framework of peace, order and good sovereign government, and establishes a number of immutable limitations upon the lawmaking capacity

of that government, it being conveyed under the contractual terms of the Imperial Coronation Oath as administered at British coronations that the first duty of the sovereign is to "honour...God" (3 Edw.I c.50) as statutorily required, and inseparably from such to uphold and where necessary defend in all points the Crown's authority, principles and honour for all its people, courts and Parliaments in Crown realms, and never subordinate the same to the laws of a foreign power], is there any legal untruth in the charge that notwithstanding the public professing by the current monarch, as expressed in the 2002 Christmas message to all Commonwealth citizens, that each day she "(tries) to do what is right...give of (her) best...and (to) put (her) trust in God", Elizabeth nevertheless stands in the eye of the law as the worst oath-contravening sovereign in the Crown's constitutional history (that is, being a monarchial '*minister diaboli*' -as per Bracton); with England now being in strict common law judgment the most maliciously blasphemous and seditious nation in the world, even to being the first Crown country to have had a prime political leader (J. Major) formally entertain at his senior ministerial residence (10 Downing Street, London) a well-known criminal pornography publisher), that is to say, in terms of unambiguous legal truth

[and notwithstanding appearances of majesty, sincerity, integrity and of being "a model of conservative decency" (as for example was in 2002 reflected by the first segment of the official jubilee celebration concert in England (albeit the overtly debased second segment being calculated to obliterate any celebration of royalty -with such not having been duly repugned by Elizabeth)); and apart from the unresolved constitutional question of a 1951 "technical" disqualification from the succession when, as Crown Princess, and by her civil communion with, and publicly exhibited subjection to, the sovereign papal ruler of the church of Rome at that time, Elizabeth revealed an intent to set at defiance the statutory prohibition of a British sovereign (or heir) in acting in subjection to a foreign power, in this case to the ruler and head high priest of the Roman Catholic church and civil government (that same religious and civil institution still deeming (in 2017) that all 'Protestant' churches and peoples who are not subordinate to Roman Catholic law are not 'proper'), with such subjugation openly displayed at that 1951 first meeting and, later when as Queen, at subsequent ceremonial state meetings at the Vatican Palace, by her wearing full black attire to show (an imagined) guilt or unmistakable subordination to the Pope (in notable contrast to the concession long granted to Roman Catholic "proper" queens, who are given the "privilege" of wearing white attire on such occasions), those same

events being reported internationally in the news media, with such demonstrated "holding (of) communion with" [that is, such not being restricted to the religious practice of "holy communion" administered and received in church services, but in keeping with the intention of the statute, civilly applicable to the "holding (of) communion" by the sovereign (in the regal role of acting for the whole population independent of both their religion and other private convictions) with the leader of a foreign power continuing to maintain a presumptive claim of authority over the Sovereign despite the act of such communion being forbidden],

being an act indistinguishable from a regally committed subjection to the Roman Catholic state and papal religious authority, and thus being interpretable as a treasonous and *crimen laesae majestatis* breach of the definitively implied requirements for a sovereign in accord with the securing terms of the Act of Settlement (to which no lawful means is pursuable for repealing such Act), with Elizabeth by such actions calculably being considered in the eye of the law from that time in 1951 onward (as aggravated by later similar offences) as if she, albeit the immediate heir to the throne and awaiting Crown princess, "were naturally dead" -Elizabeth in 2002 also having publicly disclosed an unlawful intent not only to override the terms of her sovereign oath if the public expressly willed her abdication of the office (in deference to a political ideology such as "human rights" or any other presumed superior governance) but thereby to also act in defiance of the law and disable that sovereign legislation, with the law's compelling consideration of living monarchs who so transgress as being "naturally dead" also confirmed by that Act's substance-preserved (38&39 Vict.66) interpretative Act, 11&12 Vict.108],

has any wearer/tenant of the Crown in British legal history more successfully effected attempts at the demise of the Crown and the debasing of its standards of good government, judgment, and finer principled human behaviour within its realms, and despite all appearances to the contrary, than the present monarch Elizabeth? No.

ADDENDUM TO ITEM 32: Concerning the often derided constitutional formula, "the king can do no wrong", which in a strict legal view accords with the same constitutional sense as conveyed in the formula "the king never dies" (an absolute legal truth which serves to allay any social disruption following a ruler's death), it being held that such formula, albeit entrenched in law, does not attribute human perfection to the monarch or express the idea that the king is supremely divine, immortal or

infallible

[since fallible human beings are the only recipients to which the sovereign office can be contracted: there being additional laws intended to protect against the natural fallibility or deviance likely to deter sovereigns from the performance of their duties],

but instead conveys that, as distinct and distinguished from any other system of government in modern history, the office of the British sovereign as constitutionally established in all Crown countries, is held as being of itself without fault in its capacity to govern, that is, notwithstanding the human occupants of that regal office often having committed unlawful wrong in the king's name, with an example of the depth to which such wrong can proceed being provided by the incumbent monarch not, as may be considered by such as Elizabeth's unlawful encouragement of the anatomically incompatible and unsanitary practice of homosexual congress among her semi-civilised peoples (such encouragement calculated to fortify and increase the approximately two per cent homosexual minority in Western society among which biologically normal marital love is impossible), such increase being prosecuted through means of her

- 1) awarding honours to those promoting such practices as if those practices provided a social benefit,
- 2) sanctioning the condoning of such debased liberality, albeit hitherto long recognised and defined as sodomy, by the established Church of England and its leader the Archbishop of Canterbury (each looked to for spiritual guidance also by peoples of other nations), and
- 3) sanctioning the public condoning/promoting of such plainly excrement-admixed biological "marital" practices and kindred-spirited behaviour to children in the British (and Dominions') school teaching regimen through the politically militant schoolroom advocating of such markedly debased practices as if socially commendable, the same inherently repugnant and depravedly unsanitary behaviour being fictitiously presented as something "equal" to normal marital relations, worthy of respect, and something to be actively pursued, unconscionably flaunted and in which pride should be taken (with its sanctioning proceeding from a constitutionally criminal intent), nor even by such unlawful wrong as the allowing in the sovereign's name of a number of convictee (Irish) multi-murderers to be freed from custody,

but rather [as a court would be entitled to decide if the following matter were made germane to a case], by her uttering of words during a 2000 visit to Australia, to wit:

"I have always made it clear that the future of the monarchy in Australia is an issue for you, the Australian people, and you alone to decide by...

constitutional means. It should not be otherwise", which expressly conveyed in the eye of the law

- i) a contempt of the established Crown and constituted government of Australia, the same being calculated to set the rule of law at defiance,
 - ii) an immediate perjury of the statutory oath of kingly office as grounded in the fundamental common law [no legislation being enactable which may legitimise any diminution of regal (or regal designated) responsibility such as would comply with modern political ideals, (including the allowing of affirmations for those entering higher Crown offices;) with neither the sovereign nor any Crown-representative governor being legitimately capable of holding office on an affirmation-based contract since by the dismissal of the Deity-established common law basis of right, affirmations lack the spiritual authority of oaths, being a sufferance of the law for those dismissive of evidence which is "clearly seen" even by the psychologically disordered, that is, according to Biblical wisdom (cf. Romans ch.1:20)], and
 - iii) a direct contravention of certain other statutes enacted to preserve the Crown, sovereign and foundations of the established legal system;
- with such advisory words of Elizabeth in legal fact being impossible for any lawful British (or Australian) sovereign to utter while simultaneously functioning with legal validity as the sovereign of the country, it remaining that any monarch functioning consistent with the terms of their contractual Coronation Oath is incapable of either (i) self-demise, (ii) contravening any provision of the law of the constitution, or (iii) doing criminal wrong.

That is to say, such words uttered by Elizabeth and intentionally addressed to the Australian body politic, in being calculated to approve of encouraging the demise of the sovereign as by law established in the sovereign's own realm of Australia, immediately constituted a contravention of the terms of not just the Coronation Oath Act and other foundational statutes enacted to preserve the Crown and constitution but also those of the statute of treasons concerning the death or demise of the king in his realm (25 Edw.III: this same (common law defining) Act still having full force in both Britain and its dominions); with one consequence of such breach being that in strict consideration of the formula "the king can do no wrong", the person of Elizabeth was severed in relation to that utterance from the lawful sovereignty of all Crown realms. Thus, and albeit wholly antithetical to the regard commonly given to the experience and expertise of Elizabeth in the higher reaches of constitutional law, in advisedly uttering such words on the twentieth day of March in the year 2000 at the New South Wales Darling Harbour commercial complex, Elizabeth acted with the

intent to set at defiance the constitutional truth that the Australian people had already decided upon the nature of the nation's permanent foundations at its inception (the role of any accepted constitution of a country being to establish its foundations and power and prevent their change by expected future attacks), that is:

- i) that such would be established as an immutable "Federal Commonwealth" (that is, subject only to "maintenance" (as per article 61, Australian Constitution), to ensure its foundational principles and legal integrity would be preserved), and
- ii) that the nation was to be established as "indissoluble ...under the Crown" (preamble, Australian Constitution), with the word "indissoluble" applying equally to both the "Federal Commonwealth" and "under the Crown", where also this same indissoluble coupling of the nation to the Crown and its system of government had not arisen primarily from philosophy, religion or notions of democracy in any of its manifestations but from the settled law and customs of recent centuries and that, as held by such, despite notable inadequacies of application by its human agents, no other modern system of government had afforded to a body politic a greater potential for peace and stability in its nationhood than a government superintended by the Crown of the United Kingdom.

And such uttered Crown-injurious words (which also implied the legal untruth that the Australian Constitution provides the people with the power and means to abandon it) were substantially aggravated by a further utterance by Elizabeth of a seemingly exemplary law-upholding commitment

"to serve as Queen of Australia under the
Constitution to the very best of my ability,
as I have tried to do for these past 48 years",

with Elizabeth being the only monarch (*de jure* or *de facto*) in the Crown's legal history to have intendedly submitted the Crown, together with its preserved foundations, standards of decency and pre-eminence of majesty, to the fallible or "democratic" will of its subjects (where "every fool's vote is equal to that of a wise man's"), that is, her submission of the Crown to the will of its naturally deviance-prone (law requiring) subjects (which automatically compels an artificial legitimacy for "human deviance" in the structure of government) being not limited to denigrations of the Crown and its attributes, but having included assents to numerous constitutionally unlawful legislative provisions in those same "48 years",

recent examples of such compromises in the wilful violation of duty including

- i) the public honouring of debased celebrities and their pride (each publicised occasion effectively adding injury to the public perception of the law's basic repute and honour), and the condoning of socially

destructive transmissions to all classes of the sovereign's subjects via the press and entertainment media of both immediate conscience-injuring language and criminally offensive (as opposed to subjectively offensive) depravity, albeit largely couched in entertaining content; with a substantial quantity of the same being wilfully aimed at the consciences of children [the now common unlawful permitting of such human deviance presentations by censorship authorities, with those authorities being legally empowered and required by duty of Office to maintain a common law grounded conscience for the nation, being indefensible at law, and duly actionable against offending officers],

ii) the approval on behalf of all Crown subjects in all Crown countries of the expressly sovereign intents of two (albeit politically allied) foreign institutions each claiming to be superior to and supreme over the Crown, such intendedly Crown-subjugating institutions being

1) the (civil) See and (denominational) Church of Rome as encompassed both in English Acts of Parliament and Romanism's own Constitutional Canon laws and directives, a fundamental claim of such Church being as its motto: "semper eadem" (forever the same) or specifically in this instance, that its aims and intents to govern the British civil law and lands will never be changed, and

2) the recently re-constituted political sovereignty of the European Union,

with Elizabeth's unlawful intention in both cases, irrespective of appearingly noble motives (and that most subjects in a recent referendum rejected (a purportedly legal) governance under the European Union), being to have effected the eventual demise of the sovereignty of the Crown in its government (which would unavoidably have made the sovereign a citizen not just of the European Union but of Britain itself) and which would have unlawfully indicated to the populace that it is lawful to change the status of both the Crown and its established law in all its realms, so making all such realms subordinate to a constitutionally alien rulership

[an example of such avoided alien rulership being the presumptive European advice to the British sovereign that the same had committed a crime against European Union sovereignty by using British measurements on her property],

Elizabeth being well cognizant that both the law, as entrenched in the Coronation oath for example in binding common law terms, and the supremacy of the Crown in its realms are Parliamentarily immutable and stand both civilly and spiritually different from both European Union and Roman Catholic law, and

- (iii) the sincere and strongly smiling public approval in her Christmas Day 2000 broadcast from Buckingham Palace of the persons of both the internationally infamous and unambiguously criminal "serial perjurer" American ex-president William Clinton

[whose publicised constitutional (and family) lawbreaking, and widely enjoyed success in committing without punishment to date the highest criminal defiance of law and justice in modern history, such conduct, not of deviant adultery but of presidential-level multi-lying under oath, and using his (and his wife's) asset of celebrity charm to induce the support of most of the polled public to the detriment and degradation of the whole United States' body politic in respect of not speaking the truth in evidence (such criminality continuing thereafter and including a largely successful attempt of a US\$190,000 theft of goods from the U.S. Government's "Whitehouse", and an instigating of the premature release of several convicted colleague criminals) could not have failed to have worsened the diminishing regard for the rule of (common) law on which the United States and other so-called 'democratic governments' are substantially grounded],

together with his kindred-spirited wife albeit of conservatively attractive appearance (the same having been internationally publicised in the 1980s as vicious, and unrestrained in "screaming the f-word", a still punishable offence at common law, such same offences being numerous reported through to September 2016 with no remorse forthcoming on any occasion, Mrs. Clinton remaining supportive of her widely publicised felonious husband, despite his contempt of the law and (to date) escaping of remedial punishment for his multiple commissions of perjury, the same having been dismissed by the U.S. government and such dismissal promoted by the news media as a commendable outcome, and even his conduct as being 'role model' behaviour, to a mass of the world's civilised people), both such persons' irredeemably constitutional delinquency and debased behaviour having been publicised in February 2001 for example, in the world-leading (and albeit previously Clinton-promoting; and again Clinton-promoting in 2016) "New York Times" newspaper and journalised in the words:

"The Clintons are a terminally unethical and vulgar couple, and they've betrayed everyone who has ever believed in them",

(with Elizabeth's display of genuine approval of both Clintons in such broadcast (while inconceivably unaware of the iniquitous conduct of such two) being followed by her politically linking a similar genuineness of praise to the

example and teachings of Christ and the major religions), much of Elizabeth's usage of the Crown's regal power being prohibited by both the letter and spirit of the law and contributing substantively to the increasingly declining social trends of all Western civilisation, Elizabeth having, despite her substantial spiritual and civil influence, presided over the greatest decline of ethics and principles in the history of such civilisation, with it being the spirit of the British Crown, and never that of the United States or its Constitution for example, which is still looked to by many other nations, despite the depth of its popular decline into decadence, as responsible for setting civilised standards for the world).

In addition, such March 2000 approval of defiance of the Crown of the Commonwealth by Elizabeth at the Sydney Darling Harbour complex was transmitted in turn with approval to the Australian public in every State and Territory by a national newspaper ("The Australian", 1st April, 2000, edn.) which in its editorial comment seditiously promoted such words of Elizabeth as:

"The Queen herself showed a commendable maturity on the issue",

where it is seen that the "maturity" being (insolently) commended in the immediate context relates solely to an approval of the intent of treason by the person of Elizabeth and her will to sustain that intent. Thus in the eye of the law which defines the sovereign as being the head of both the Parliament and government in all Crown countries, and immutably binds the person of the same to the terms of the statutory Coronation Oath and to the rule of law, when Elizabeth uttered such words, even though the law holds "the sovereign can do no wrong", injurious wrong was expressly done by Elizabeth to not just the sovereign's constitutional integrity as established in Australia for over a century but also to the power of the Crown as the symbol of fundamental right and competent good government.

- 32a) . With the many publicised opinions over past decades of Prince Charles' lack of ethical suitability for kingship and the various evidences supporting the same, including the psychiatric characteristics of his personal life (and the internationally publicised dysfunctional response to his being confronted about his infidelity by the then Princess of Wales, stating "I refuse to be the only Prince of Wales who never had a mistress", and his later 'tampon-envying' utterance) which regardless of the currently and largely embraced debased culture of most of Western civilisation, was likely to have caused a measure of mental pain and injury to the minds of a significant proportion of the law-respecting populace of the current British

Commonwealth, together with the earlier commissions of offences of indefensible criminal libel as touching the Deity and Charles' institutional heirship (which still stand unremedied), in the eye of such law as interprets the Act of Settlement, particularly in relation to what conduct constitutes disqualification of an heir from becoming a sovereign (and to which constitutional Act the wills of all judicial officers for example are inflexibly bound), are Prince Charles' knowingly committed violations of the sovereign's strict terms of allegiance prescribed by that constitutional Act, which require him to preserve the sovereignty to which he is heir, each of such violations rendering a sovereign incapable of reigning when considered by such act as if "naturally dead" (according to which statutory "technicality" of constitutional death, no provision is made for repeal), either extenuatingly dismissible acts or dispensable by the sovereign?, that is to say, under the strictly interpreted terms of the Act of Settlement does Prince Charles qualify at law as possessing the regal merit appropriate for a Crown law favoured successor to the Crown? No.

32b) . Can it be held at law that regardless of its sovereign-approved debasement, Britain has no properly secured foundation for government as is popularly argued by lawyers who charge that Britain has "no written constitution"?, that is to say, with all means sufficient to ensure a highly civilised peace, welfare and good government in any Crown realm being provided for by fundamental common law governed British constitutional statutes, and defining case law judgements and institutes, to the extent where to effect the highest public good, sovereigns are contracted to maintain the substance of such statutes and laws already established in all their realms (and to reject anything antithetical to them), is it valid to hold that since Britain has no single-document constitution it therefore has no legitimate basis of government in the modern world, and its foundational laws are now only of historical validity and carry little more force than laws preserving common conventions? No.

33) . Given it is both judicially and commonly considered that many heinous criminal acts are so satanically malicious that in the public mind even capital punishment appears an inadequate remedy and that a punishment worse than death would appear to be required in such cases so as to "fit the crime", that is, where the legal punishment for such acts is incapable of effecting an appropriate remedy either before or by the actual death of the criminal, does the widely used term "justice" [meaning more than just 'due allocation of reward of virtue and punishment of vice', with both such

applications standing under the judicial dictum of "Let Right be Done", the practical application of 'Justice' involving a guile-free rightmindedness and fairness in both the resolving of secular human issues, and apportioning of awards and punishments] convey any concessional meaning in capital punishment cases or fulfil the dictum: "Let the punishment fit the crime" if there is no additional accountability after death? No.

- 34) . In the eye of the law of the Crown which superintends Parliaments in all Crown realms under immutable constitutional enactments (15 Edw.II for example) and which determines inflexible and binding in all material points the common law terms of each parliamentarian's statutory oath (or affirmation - penalties for breaches of the same being identical), with such oath or affirmation enacted as a full-force statutory contract between 1) the electees to the parliament and 2) the sovereign and Crown, such same contract being required of each electee before the commencing of office, and thus binding the electee's conscience to the probity of the Crown, thereby statutorily ensuring an oath-compliant ministerial performance thereafter, with any coercion to ignore such contract inviting a common law charge of seditious enterprise, is any formal or informal ministerial act of encouragement to the people to accept and participate in a referendum or any other attempt or means to establish a republic in any Crown nation, State or Province, whether under colour of constitutional provision or otherwise, free of prosecutable criminal intent, that is to say, free of the treasonable intention to cause "the demise of the Crown" in its own realm? No.

- 34a) . Given that "parliamentary privilege" in Crown Parliaments is commonly taken as being an unfettered or "extraordinary" power of freedom of speech granted to the elected representatives by an immutable Act of Parliament (1688), where abuses of such "privilege" are not unpunishable as generally believed but punishable by the Parliament rather than by a Court

[such privilege being not granted by members of parliament to themselves to enhance their personal status in their appointments, but granted solely by the Crown as

- 1) a protection for freedom of expression in parliamentary debatings against any citizens becoming aggrieved and seeking redress from a Court and
- 2) in sufferance of less refined parliamentary members being considered unable to competently perform their office without some freedom to use utterances which in other circumstances may prove to constitute a criminal offence]

can it be lawful for any judge to rule that the "parliamentary privilege" of free speech in Parliament includes the freedom to commit criminal slander, and even utterances in high contempt of the law (the same law which alone empowers the privilege enjoyed and rejects attempts to circumvent it), that is, that any Member of Parliament in any Crown-governed realm may, while in the performance of his duty override the terms of his or her statutory oath (or affirmation) if thought necessary, and may validly assume that the grant of such privilege in Parliament is unconditional and so provides an indemnity against any utterances considered as otherwise referable to Police? No.

- 34b) . Can it be held under the law of the constitution in any Crown country that the widely accepted control of parliamentary government by the modern party-political or "Westminster" based system
 (that is, a hybrid of the rule of law, independent political principles and an institutionalised infrastructure of democratic government, the inherent "mob" control of such a government having been long epitomised in the common legal belief that considering such government in terms of the "power of the people" there is no theoretical limit to the omnipotence of an elected parliament, that is, to the extent where it has been stated without material objection (and falsely attributed to Dicey) that the persons now comprising Crown Parliaments are so much empowered as to be able to make a law requiring the 'execution of blue-eyed babies at birth')
 is free of criminal purpose? No.
- 34c) . Given the common law-based truths that in the most civilised democracy the will of the Deity is held to be subject to the government of the day and that in the most civilised constitutional monarchy the government of the day is held to be subject to the will of the Deity, is it possible that based on human behaviour and past experience in such nations, any democracy could make laws to provide for a greater measure of peace, order and good government in its realm than a constitutionally common law-compliant monarchy? No.
- 34d) . In the long established view of the Crown as superintendent of constitutional government in its realms, and where in all such common law governed countries the later-appearing ideal of the "sovereign power of the people", or element of "democracy" introduced by governments into the law of those countries, presumes that "democratic principles" may be given at least an equal status to the foundational "law of the land", albeit the revering of such principles having developed largely from the ceremonial process of public

elections (an extra-parliamentary legal process by which the public who, for the good of all, and as predating the advent of democracy, are granted by the law of the land, the power to elect members of parliament, with the liability for the "good faith" of those persons elected resting not on the people who exercised their grant in law in electing them, but on the government as the supplier of such grant), can it be held that the now commonly invoked principles of "democracy", "democratic rights" and the like by numerous political electees in Crown common law countries

(where such oftenplace terms convey an intent to replace the established common laws of the land with contemporary (and ultimately "mob rule"-based) political law), are not effectively seditious principles which so act (by a presumed unchallengeable "fait accompli") in the public mind to bring into disaffection the foundations of the government relied on for those countries' stability, and so suppress the only means in the modern world of providing for the most civilised and rightminded conduct of the people, their rulers and judiciaries within those countries, (with all modern concepts of democracy for example, requiring its supporters to accept on faith that at any given time the policies of an elected government are effectively the collective "will of the people", and should take precedence over "the law of the land")?, that is, in all modern common law grounded countries governed under the Crown, has the long practised insertion of "democratic principles" into the laws and functions of such common law based governments, and thence calling those same hybrid law countries "democracies", served in any measure to establish the superiority of democracy or its principles over any of those countries' foundational "laws of the land" in the making of laws to provide for a greater measure of peace, order and good government in the realm? No.

- 34e) . Given that the only preservation of citizens' rights and liberties granted to all citizens of common law countries governed under the Crown is afforded by their foundational "laws of the land", that is, such rights and liberties being not in any measure grantable by the body of parliamentary-political electees but only by the common law such as provides the empowerment of all valid statutes, government grants and protections, for which an undivided allegiance under the Crown to the Sovereign as by law established is required equally on the part of every citizen, then in accord with the strength of preserving such rights and liberties for all citizens of those countries, is the political grant of a twofold or divided allegiance for any either foreign or natural citizen of the same (irrespective of how legal it may be regarded), in any measure lawful and not indicative of a seditious offence at least at common

law for the calculated subversion of the sole and undivided allegiance to the Crown required equally of all citizens under its protection? No.

- 35). Is any Crown judge who, while in the performance of duty (and being independent from the burden of influence on his Office by a calculably Crown-contemptuous sovereign, to whose person he has bound at law his judicial conscience in allegiance), wilfully declares or decides anything calculated to be repugnant to the common law terms of his or her judicial oath (under which statutory contract and pain of common law penalty for breaches thereof judges are bound at law to act; with such requirement of judicial obedience to both statute and fundamental common law being not just enshrined in judges' statutory oaths, but having civil substance also in being "the ultimate political fact upon which the whole system of legislation hangs" (Dicey)), such oath also inextricably embracing the authority of the words of "royal law" in the Biblical book of Deuteronomy ch.1:16,17 for example: to "judge (not just rightly but) righteously", and appropriately, with judges in Crown courts being statutorily protected by the law of treason), that is to say, is any judge who wilfully states or immediately implies in a ruling words which are unambiguous in primary meaning and can be immediately construed or soon after perceived (for example, by the minds of sufficiently informed and competent police officers) as unlawfully contradicting the plain terms of any preserved law of the constitution (that is, such a law as only the Crown-entrusted persons of judges are capable of enforcing), whether or not those same words can be immediately seen as having arisen from the private/personal will of such judge or judges, or from sympathy for any peers' or current community view, or "progressive interpretation" of statutes (calculated to supplant the common law intent of the framers of the legislation), or from any presumed duty in a matter to give precedence over the Crown and law of the land to any United Nations' Declaration or other conflicting legal Instrument, International Criminal Court decision, or other claim of legal superiority over the Crown in its realms in a matter before the court (whether or not such foreign legality has been adopted by political process), actually deemed in the eye of the law a lawful judge from the time such words are issued, and in accord with the privileges granted the judiciary, immune from immediate police arrest, legal process and an appropriate remedy for the offence committed against their (regal-inspired) statutory contractual oath? No.

SUPPLEMENT TO ITEM 35: Concerning the proceedings of any matter before a court in which a party invokes a material reliance on the Crown for any of its fundamental protections or constitutional guarantees of rights and liberties, that is,

where such reliance bears directly upon the Crown's contractual obligation to enforce the highest possible welfare for the body politic (with it being impossible at law for the Crown to be legitimately bound in its own realm to any other lawmaking body or be subjugated in any measure to the laws of a foreign power), and in present times having regard to such as:

- i) the increasing lack of public confidence in the members of the judiciary, consequent to the many perceived refusals of judges to dispense (the Crown's) integrity in justice, as progressing to such a measure of unconstitutionality and public contempt as seen in a deciding of the Australian High Court that a person convicted on four counts of aggravated indecent assault upon two children can be deemed a fit and proper person to practise as a solicitor in Crown courts,
- ii) the disenchantment of police with offence-obliterating judgements and penalties as a response to their work of apprehending offenders,
- iii) parliamentarians' relative inaction and thus effective condoning of substantial and oath-contravening deficiencies in judicial personnel even after public exposure of such,
- iv) the public knowledge that the Crown by itself is a singular and stable entity and as such is presumed to be self-consistent or singly minded in its rule
 [its several different Offices involving the delegations of sovereign authority, although being seen by many jurists to construe a "divisibility of the Crown", yet in each case being wholly subordinate to the unity of the Crown's sovereign authority as by law established],
 yet its variously appointed judges increasingly fail to reflect such relied upon authority in their decisions (many judges now adhering unlawfully to concepts such as the widely sanctioned yet largely anti-constitutional "Politically Correct" paradigm, a political authority of democracy, or to a presumed sovereign 'will of the people' (despite such 'will' now embracing the lowest common denominator of 'changing community standards'), with such deviant judges pursuing academic or philosophical principles rather than the contracted loyalty requiring an obedience to fundamental law and long established ethical standards),

it thus stands that in any matter before a competent court of senior jurisdiction in any of the common law founded nations of the British Commonwealth, that is, where any preserved fundamental law of protection, grant or right of the Crown is formally relied upon, it is now no longer sufficient in the best interests of the Crown, particularly in its higher courts (which project authoritative influences down upon not just other courts but ultimately also juries), for the Crown to rely on its expected strength of integrity in the consciences of its judges

as required by their oath (even in many cases if a solemn reassurance were given to abide by its terms), that is to say: having regard to the general increase of judicial decisions in which justice is seen not to be done, or seen to be not done, to such extent as compels an immediate injury to the integrity of the Crown in the public mind, and where all such contributions to an observedly declining integrity, especially by higher judges, are no less than punishable breaches of their statutory contract made with the Crown (every sitting judge (and magistrate) being bound under statutory oath to act in place of, and with no more "judicial activism" than, the sovereign since (in an expressly law-abiding capacity only) the sovereign is the only person in all Crown realms to whom the law grants authority to judge matters and dispense justice in all its courts (the same immediately compelling that any judge deviating from lawfully representing the sovereign in judgement is deemed at law no judge at all but merely a privileged but private person acting in breach of the law)), then in order to duly uphold the law of the constitution in present times when the Crown and its law have by the repeated defaults of many of its appointed officers, ministers and its present incumbent become substantially disaffected in the public mind to the extent of the Crown itself now having largely become "but a name and a shadow, (and so appearing) insufficient for the ends of government" (Holdsworth), it would accordingly require concerning any judge or judges sitting today in any matter involving an invoking of the Crown for its constitutional protection in respect of any of its obligations toward the welfare of the individual, the introduction of a threat of instant police action upon the issuance of any immediately discernible overriding, whether by direct utterance or otherwise by such a judge, of any fundamental law or established individual liberty granted under the constitution (one such often overridden fundamental law being that of judicial oaths, the same being intended by the Parliament to be no less enforceable than any other law and to ensure that judges not just uphold, but defend without deviance, the will of both the Crown and law-abiding sovereign), that is, with that same threat of arrest being present in the persons of sufficiently instructed police officers assigned to act without fear or favour upon their statutory oath and hence upon the full common law authority vested in them as persons bound not to consider involved legal or other distracting argument but to the best of their capability and under the terms of their own oaths of contract, to straightly police the statutory will of the sovereign and so-termed "conscience of the Crown" to the absolute exclusion of their own personal will, even, at the extreme, to the extent of an arresting of the persons of High Court justices (similar to such as occurred in the earlier (9th Century) time of King Alfred) during the course of performing their Office (where in the matter of sentencing (as

in the strict eye of the law now stands pending for a number of indefensibly offending judges), no light measure of punishment may be permitted which, in the public mind, may tend to obliterate the offence; especially with it being a maxim of the law that "the higher the man, the greater the crime").

- 36). Concerning "privatisation", or the public sale of Crown owned utilities and institutions, with all such major assets having been annexed from earliest times to the British Crown according to early legal records and the rule of law, with no presumed change of ownership now capable of proceeding without members of parliament acting politically with intent to separate and transfer the ownership of Crown possessions to the ownership of the private sector, albeit all electees to such parliament being deemed to know, even from a minimal understanding of the substance of their oath of office, that the Crown could never lawfully be dispossessed or deprived of its assets (breaches of such being remedial at common law), then with the responsibility for maintaining Crown owned utilities and institutions involving the necessity for the members of parliament to act not on their own private conscience, but at all times in office, on that in keeping with 'the conscience of the Crown' (such as is determined under sections 1 and 2 of the Coronation Oath Act, 1688), would the constitutionally required retrieval by the Crown of "privatised" public assets oblige at law even a partial compensation for the loss incurred by the purchaser, even where such was unaware of having acquired criminally misappropriated Crown property? No.
- 37). According to the fundamental law of Crown-governed countries, with any ostensibly official procedure to set such force of law aside being expressly actionable, and in consideration of the legal precepts (albeit hostile to democratic principles):
- (i) 'the long continuance of a bad usage is not decisive of its legality' and
 - (ii) 'a wrong the more common it is the worse it is',
- would the sum of punitive fines applicable under the established law in common law nations (as distinct from prison terms involved) such as are pending against almost all controlling personnel of the major "mass media" and commercial publishing and entertainment institutions for their multi-commission of indefensible offences of criminally blasphemous, seditious and obscene libel, and on occasions publishing encouragement of perjury, be of such a figure as would enable, for example, the unrestricted continuation of ownership of such institutions by any person, persons or corporate body so liable? No.

- 38) . Notwithstanding the private beliefs of most constitutionally learned judges, politicians and lawyers in Crown-governed countries in regard to the workings of constitutional power, is there any such thing in the eye of the law of the constitution as the "reserve" (or "discretionary") powers of the Crown? No.

SECTION 7

MODERN CIVILISATION - THE COMPONENT OF JUDAISM

PREAMBLE

Appendant to such variously held beliefs of modern 'Judeo-Christian' society is the acceptance of the long promoted (both Jewish and Christian-influenced) teaching that the Deity Biblically associated with the beginning of the universe and life later granted favour primarily to those of the Jewish faith, with the Jews in various measures being viewed as a people anciently selected for some high purpose which now involves all Western nations and whose identity despite numerous eradication attempts has been preserved by the Deity across history.

Given the wide belief of such impression which continues in varying measures throughout Western countries (most having in recent years forced that same impression through legislation), and that some 70 years after the special creation of a long sought for and privilege-positioned Jewish civil State for the worldwide members of that religion, a majority of Jews still prefer to reside in Western countries rather than in such State [with the social effects of their presence in today's nations having been publicly remarked upon by acclaimed Jewish scholars, one of such (Oscar Levy) declaring as early as 1920 that "The question of the Jews and their influence on the world, past and present cuts to the root of all things and should be discussed by every honest thinker"], then with the implications of this now substantially observable phenomenon being of immediate relevance to those nations' internal peace, welfare and good government, it follows that an objective and competent examination of Jewish identity is expressly warranted, that is, in solely civil terms: it being significant that in varying constitutional measures the cultural foundations of at least common law based

Western civilised nations have long been bound to the same source of providence accounted as having favoured the ancient (Mosaic era) Israelite nation and their descendants - with which national stock the Jews as a body claim both direct kinship and consequent entitlement to the entire land of Palestine.

Thus with such claim being still pursued by the Jewish religion and its supporters despite widespread dissent (including severally from the United Nations), it may be further enquired:-

WHO REALLY ARE THE JEWISH PEOPLES..?

A pro-Semitic inspection of the substance of worldwide Jewish identity

1. The word "Jews" - as is commonly used today in English-speaking countries describes a body of persons of various nationalities united by a common allegiance not to a Jewish civil ruler but to the ancient largely Babylonian-founded religion of Judaism and its basic claims and dictates; with many of its members being known in Western society for their exemplary professional talents and as possessing a capacity to excel in a number of fields; and although Jews are known as a minority group which preserves a separate religious identity, they are also known for their success in having acquired a major measure of influence in both the civil and religious affairs of Western nations.

2. To this point, in 1994 the intellectual Gore Vidal stated (in the foreword of Israel Shahak's pro-'Gentile' (professorial) publication "Jewish History, Jewish Religion") that *"Sometime in the late 1950s...John F. Kennedy told me how, in 1948, Harry S. Truman had been pretty much abandoned by everyone when he came to run for president. Then an American Zionist brought him two million dollars in cash... (Kennedy said,) 'That's why our recognition of Israel was rushed through so fast.' As neither Jack nor I was an antisemite...we took this to be just another funny story about Truman and the serene corruption of American politics...."*

"In a sense, I rather admire the way that the Israel lobby has gone about its business of seeing that billions of dollars, year after year, go to make Israel a 'bulwark against communism'. Actually, neither the USSR nor communism was ever much of a presence in the region." [Following such statement however, since the dissolution of the Soviet Union, such claimed role in offering a protection against communism by the Israeli

State has subsequently evolved into one of bolstering opposition to terrorism in the area (while also, albeit (internationally) illegally, enlarging its occupation of Palestinian land, the same continuing today unabated despite promises of relinquishments): with the Jews largely dismissing the increasing accusations that the United States' subsidising of the Jewish State, and the resulting Jewish actions toward the indigenous and culture-incompatible Palestinians are, together with militant Mohammedanism, still among the principal causes of the terrorist acts against "Western interests" in much of the world (with the Western populations' now increasing fear of terrorism being in part a natural consequence of such actions)].

3. A further prominent though comparatively little known trait of the Jewish people, is their remarkably insightful understanding of Western society and general human character, as is particularly exemplified in a largely suppressed nineteenth century factional literary compilation (or set) of 24 authoritatively written instructional documents of varying lengths and insights about non-Jewish or "Gentile" civilisations, their need for (Jewish) social guidance and the specific means to ongoingly guide it through to the twentieth century and beyond (insights now time-verified as accurately perceived with most of such established Jewish aims now largely fulfilled) and known as "The Protocols of..the Learned Elders of Zion", a work found consistent with a 1492 "Protocol" compilation by a Jewish council in Constantinople, and reportedly first drafted at an 1879 international Jewish conference in Switzerland, such "Protocols.. of Zion" being still in print in a number of languages (albeit commonly labelled a fraud or forgery (of an archived original) despite a notable November 1937 decision of the Swiss Court of Criminal Appeal fully negating such charge), and first published for the English-speaking world in 1920 by law publishers Eyre and Spottiswoode, and, overriding the many subsequent disputes about its authorship, reviewed that year by one well-known personage (the mass production automobile maker and outspoken lay-scholar of "World Jewry", Henry Ford) in the words:

"Whosoever was the mind that conceived them possessed a knowledge of human nature, of history and of statecraft which is dazzling in its brilliant completeness.... It is too terribly real for fiction, too well-sustained for speculation, too deep in its knowledge of the secret springs of life for forgery" ('The Dearborn Independent', 10th July 1920 edn.).

4. And endorsing such recognised sagacity it has been reported that at such time, although the number of Jews in Russia officially comprised only some 4.25 per cent of the population, its revolutionary leader (Lenin) stated that

"an intelligent Russian is almost always a Jew or someone with Jewish blood in his veins"(-ex R.Pipes,1990). And likewise in the West it was also recognised that "no thoughtful man can doubt the fact that they (the Jews) are beyond all question the most formidable and the most remarkable (people)..in the world" (W.Churchill,1920).

And such political recognition of the Jews' capacity to excel stands today undiminished: even an Australian Prime Minister (M.Turnbull) recently having voiced admiration for the Jews when stating that 'the greatest natural resource of Israel has been the brilliance and the enterprise of its people'.

5. Yet there is also the observation of a senior Jewish historian: "It is important to note that *all* the supposedly 'Jewish characteristics' - by which I mean the traits which... the West attribute to 'the Jews' - are *modern* characteristics, quite unknown during most of Jewish history... Take, for example, the famous Jewish sense of humour. Not only is humour very rare in Hebrew literature before the 19th century...but humour and jokes are strictly forbidden by the Jewish religion - except, significantly, jokes against other religions. Satire against rabbis and leaders of the community was never internalised by Judaism..as it was in Latin Christianity. There were no Jewish comedies (before the nineteenth century)... Or take the love of learning. Except for a purely religious learning, which was itself in a debased and degenerate state, the Jews of Europe (and to a somewhat lesser extent also of the Arab countries) were dominated, before about 1780, by a supreme contempt and hate for all learning (excluding the Talmud and Jewish Kabbalist mysticism). Large parts of the Old Testament, all non-liturgical Hebrew poetry, most books on Jewish philosophy were not read and their very names were often anathematised (made repellent). Study of all languages was strictly forbidden, as was the study of mathematics and science. Geography, history - even Jewish history - were completely unknown. The critical sense, which is supposedly so characteristic of Jews, was totally absent..." (I.Shahak (1994): 'Jewish History, Jewish Religion' -*author emphases*).

6. Despite such lifestyle having been variously enforced on Jews over the ages (through fear of transgressing religious and/or cultural teachings), and thus unambiguously imposing a barrier to the freedom inherent in the human spirit, and consequently a spiritually faulted lifestyle thereby, many Jewish scholars contend that such Western ideal as is conveyed in the term "the American Dream", and like expressions of modern English-speaking culture were developed substantially through the presentations of Hollywood films in the early twentieth century, almost all of which were produced and developed largely by Jews (in particular, by six notably entrepreneurial Ashkenazian Jews, after having individually emigrated to America from an approximately 500 mile long poverty zone in the ancient pre-Russian area of Khazaria).

On such basis and with there being no immediately apparent substantive evidence to the contrary, Jewish scholars hold that modern American culture (and hence to a large extent most of the English culture of Western society) is essentially Jewish-oriented.

Yet with the human spirit being the sole means of animating a culture in mankind, the animation of Western culture could have arisen only from an already inherent freedom of human spirit in a pre-existing, comparatively uncorrupted lifestyle or mindset already substantially free of daily religious, civil, political, etc. fear-based constraints (such as are imposed for example under the Jewish culture).

However, the basis for such a culture is not found in the Jewish religion or literature, a religion which stipulates adherence to such constraints and which in its rigidly imposed self-contained society stands inflexibly alien to such unfettered freedom as is enjoyed in the Western Christian culture.

7. With religion and culture being held as fundamentally inseparable in the Judaist community, it is found rather than such Hollywood-inaugurating Jews and their colleagues acting to create the characteristic freedom of spirit traditionally observed in American/Western culture (but not in Jewish culture), such highly entrepreneurial Jews can be observed instead as falling into the category of a catalyst, that is: a stimulant which causes something partly or wholly dormant to become operative, while essentially not being changed itself by the reaction, nor being included in it.

RUDIMENTS

8. For almost all its members, the religion of Judaism claims a material physical lineage directly back to an anciently initiated "God chosen" Semitic and Israelite race of people: that is to say, firstly via the ancient 'two-and-a-half-tribed' sectioned off nation of Judah, and thence back some centuries earlier to the prior full 'twelve tribes' family/race-based nation of Israel, to whom under Moses, the "Ten Commandments" and other foundational laws were given, and to which newly formed nation, favourable prophecies attached. The term Semitic/Shemitic however, stands applicable not only to the ancient Israelites and their descendants, but rather, as do the other two Biblical ancestral terms "Japhetic" and "Hamitic" (such deriving from the names of the three sons of Noah), to the whole of one of those three named progenitorial groups of the earth's population, the Old Testament effectively grouping all three as "Gentiles" (a 17th century A.D. Hebrew/Greek/Latin anglicised formulation used to denote

"Greeks", "nations", "peoples" or "heathen" depending on the context), "Gentiles" being an immediate translation of the Latin noun and adjective gentes/gentilis, employed instead of the earlier Hebrew and Greek words "goi" and "ethnos", all later however being increasingly used to denote only non-Jews, such translations replacing the original words for "peoples"/"nations" - as first appearing in Genesis 10:5 in relation to Japheth and his younger brothers and denoting a time before Abraham - many Arabs for example (through Abraham's bondswoman wife, Hagar) being patriarchially no less "Semitic" than the ancient Israelites: both equally having their origin in "Semitic" Abraham.

The 1933-59 edition of the Oxford Universal Dictionary presents the word "Semite" as first used in 1875 as meaning "A person belonging to the race of mankind which includes most of the peoples mentioned in Genesis 10 as descended from Shem son of Noah, as the Hebrews, Arabs, Assyrians, and Aramaeans. Also, a person speaking a Semitic language as his native tongue."

On the other hand, a solely Judaistical usage of the word Semitism (also from 1875) is given as "Jewish ideas or influence in politics and society" (with the reactive term "anti-Semitism" dating from 1882 and defined as "Theory, action, or practice directed against the Jews"). A modern-referent history definitively states: "It should always be kept in mind that the term 'Semites' does not refer to a race but to a group of peoples speaking 'Semitic' languages (Akkadian, Hebrew, Phoenician, Aramaic, Arabic..)." (W.Langer: Encyclopedia of World History (1960): p.25).

9. However it has been publicised that despite being united in aim for decades, the most learned Israeli legislators have still (in 2017) been unable to formulate any non-artificial legal definition of "Who is a Jew", even though crucial to authenticating their national identity. And such incongruity has been made further apparent with the Israeli government having rejected a number of resident Jews in their claim for an Israeli identity.

10. Thus questions arise as to (i) what exactly constitutes the Jews today as a somewhat feared yet strongly protected minority group who are still desirous of both local acceptance by others yet maintain a deep non-assimilation with them, and (ii), whether or not their claimed foundation of being the Biblical "Chosen People" (the ultimate ground on which Jewish leaders pursue a civil authority in the world) rests on historical and legally sustainable fact.

11. Firstly, and regardless of strong internal religious differences, most Jews in modern times in their ultimate reckoning would acknowledge their fundamental beliefs to be largely consistent with those of the Pharisaical Jews of pre-

first century Palestine, and accordingly, with those mentioned later in the New Testament documents. Also, respected Jewish authorities promote the depth of spirit of such Jewish roots, one prominent authority expressing the same in the terms:

'modern Judaists affirm that their religion as it is, traces its descent without a break, through all the centuries, from the Pharisees'; ... (that is,) 'despite changes of name, inevitable adaptation of custom, and adjustment of Law, the spirit of the ancient Pharisee survives unaltered.... From Palestine to Babylonia...to North Africa (and to Europe)... ancient Pharisaism has wandered with its beliefs to almost all nations of the world' (Graetz (1893): History of the Jews).

12. But although the Jews have long declared themselves to be essentially genetic descendants of the Judah section of the early Biblical nation of Israel...('God's chosen ones') and have substantially contributed to the preservation of the Hebrew Old Testament scriptures, and all Western nations largely accept the Jewish claim of a direct Israelite descent as genuine, as do most Jews themselves, their dominant racial ancestry as a body however can be traced not from a generally singular Judah/Israelite lineage, which an (earlier disputed) research project is presumed to have established, but almost wholly from two markedly different multi-racial stocks, with only one having a significant Judah/Israelite genetic component. However, in relation to the primary Israelite constitutional establishment of familial land inheritance in the ancient nation, partial Israelite descent alone, even if such were confirmed, is not sufficient to permit the possession of such inheritance, as only persons of traceable and essentially of ancient Israelite raciality qualify for such entitlement (with the practice of marrying non-Israelites having been condemned from Moses' time as such is Biblically held to compromise the 'bloodstock' of the Israelite people and the required preserving of the Jacob-anchored Israelite race, with such compromising and consequent relinquishing of Israelite inheritance to non-Israelites and their offspring warranting the punitive forfeiture of such inheritance (cf. Ezra ch.9)):-

[A] EAST EUROPEAN REGION

13. According to the conclusions of one notably expert (though academically-unpopular) researcher of the 1970s, Jewish historian A. Koestler, albeit such being strongly criticised by Jewish and other scholars, and often *ad hominem* rejected by other historians of Jewish history (which primarily rely on earlier Jewish authors), with a sizeable volume of antagonistic criticism by such scholars being contrary to other scholastic criticism as is summarised in a "New York Times" review of Koestler's research (published as "The Thirteenth Tribe", 1976), with such presented as being

"as readable as it is thought-provoking. Nothing could be more stimulating than the skill, elegance and erudition with which he marshals his facts and develops his theories... ",

and notwithstanding the well-publicised biological research into genetic similarities among Jews of different countries which indicate that a common Jewish-associated raciality and an hereditary priestline is found among widely scattered Jewish populations throughout the world and can be projected back to a nominatively reconstructed "ancestral Jewish population", (albeit later disputed on such grounds as

- i) insufficient and misinterpreted laboratory and other research data,
- ii) the blurring of the Israelite racial distinction between Jews (emerging in post-450 B.C. Babylon) and ancient Israelites (pre-550 B.C. Assyrian captivity), with the same assumed connection of the two still promoted as if a fact,
- iii) the reportedly confounding and inconclusive genetic results obtained when other east European Jews presumed to be from the same one of the twelve Israelite tribes that the aforementioned, "hereditary priestline" is held to belong were tested,

(those same results not matching with either the priestline or the general population of East European Jews, prompting the researcher who had also conducted the priestline research (molecular geneticist David Goldstein) to further research and thence conclude that although he had at first been sceptical, he now found it "plausible, if not likely" that the Jews in Eastern Europe came there from the Eurasian steppe),

and noting that Koestler's conclusions

(despite the continuing dispute on genetic and cultural/linguistic grounds being claimed as disproving such conclusions, a claim itself nullified by other and yet more recent genetic and cultural/linguistic findings), still accord with the evidence available on the subject, approximately 94.5 per cent of today's Jews worldwide (in the 1960s) descend mainly from the predominantly (not Semitic but) Japhetic various resident peoples of the "Middle Ages" eastern European/western Asian empire known as Khazaria (geographically coincident with but substantially larger than today's Chechnya and Khazakstan) which, [albeit probably including a remnant of (non-Jewish) 10-tribe Israelites, likely descended from a B.C. era Assyrian capture and partial emplacement in that region], under the dominion of the largely Japhetic Turkic Khazars (A.D. c.400-1200) who at the full extent of their power and prosperity near the end of the first millennium A.D., covered a region of some million square miles in the vicinity immediately north of the Caucasus mountains and whose population (in reportedly the

seventh or eighth century), by edict of its king for astute political motives in pursuit of a national unity for the multi-cultural dominion (to which end the recognised strength of the Mosaic (common) law was adopted) had converted en masse from paganism [the Khazars prior to that time having "professed a coarse religion.... combined with sensuality and lewdness" (Graetz op.cit.)] to adopt the Judaist religion originally introduced to the area and practised not by ancient paganised Israelites apparently "scattered" there by the Assyrians several centuries earlier but by a resident minority of ex-Babylonian (Middle Eastern) Judaist immigrants, refugees and traders comprised of

- i) Babylonian Judahites (having descent from Jacob)) and non-Israelite Idumeans (or "Edomites" having descent from Esau, Jacob's twin brother), and
- ii) Persians (of Shemitic/Hamitic origin);

with the general origin of the Khazars, which were to eventually become the body of the East European Jews, having been concisely defined by one Jewish author (B.Freedman) in 1947 in the words: "The Khazars were a non-Semitic, Turko-Finn, Mongolian tribal people who, about the first century A.D., emigrated from Middle Asia to Eastern Europe... About the seventh century A.D. the King of the Khazars adopted Judaism as the state religion, and the majority of inhabitants joined him in the new allegiance", the Jewish historian, A. Koestler, having qualifiedly reported that "...the large majority of surviving Jews in the world is of Eastern European - and thus perhaps mainly of Khazar - origin. If so, this would mean that their (indigenous) ancestors came not from the (Israelite area of) Jordan but from the Volga, not from (the Israelite region of) Canaan, but from the Caucasus...and that genetically they are more closely related to the Hun, Uigur and Magyar (Hungarian) tribes than to the seed of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob" ("The Thirteenth Tribe" 1976: p.17), such associations being noted in subsequent genetic research with also for example, the author/historian H.G. Wells in his work 'Outline of History' (1921) declaring prior to Koestler's research that "The main part of Jewry [meaning most of the world's Jewish population at that time] never was in Judea and had never come out of Judea" (Vol.I,p.354). And concerning the likely origin of such notably predominant portion of today's "World Jewry", the original Jewish Encyclopedia (1904) records that "Historical evidence points to the region of the (Russian) Ural as the home of the (K)hazars" (Vol.IV,p.1), with the mention (p.3) of there also being, "a tradition according to which the (K)hazars once dwelt near the Seir..mountains" [an area some 2,000 miles south-east of the Ural mountains below the 'Dead Sea' region of Palestine, which in ancient times was variously inhabited by Semitic and Hamitic nations who were largely hostile to the Israelites].

14. However although source material and scholarship on how Judaism emerged within such a predominantly non-Israelite Khazarian population is inadequate and sometimes conflicting, (with it even being proposed for example by the unorthodox Jewish scholar I. Velikovsky that since the Khazars are presumed (albeit incorrectly) to have occupied since late B.C. times the same remote geographical area north of the Caucasus to which a number of the centuries earlier (long pre-Jewish) "lost ten tribes" were likely relocated (cf. Daniel ch.9:7), then the two peoples must be identical, and thus the adoption of Judaism would be ultimately expected [such reckoning opposing other Jewish historians claiming the Khazars to be generally a Turko-Finn, Mongolian, non-Semitic tribal people who in those times occupied an area in Middle Asia]), a reasonable summary of the subsequent history of the Khazarian population since its mass conversion (a religious national conversion not being a unique historical event) to Judaism is that some 60 years after such conversion, its then king (Obadiah) decreed a formative re-education for the whole population along civil lines (presumably for the ultimate establishing of the Judaic teaching of the Mosaic law) such that it would adopt the (Babylonian developed) Hebrew characters as the alphabet for its long unwritten Khazarian native language (the *lingua franca* of their earlier pre-second century long standing "Steppe" (or large plains) homeland well to the east in central Asia), and accordingly, that a formal inculcation of the (Babylonian) Talmudic teachings would become mandatory for all its subjects from childhood (such teachings later described as being dominated by uniquely intricate reasonings, and as providing for both child and adult 'a severe gymnastic for the mind').

15. This change settled what was to be the only civil-state conversion to Judaism in history, that is, to what was essentially "Talmudism" [an esoteric and often unexpectedly pagan-appearing religion grounded in the "Talmud" (a derived word now meaning approximately "The Oral Teaching" or "Instruction"): the Talmud being in its first full English translation a ('censored for "Gentiles"') sizable multi-volume collection of Old Testament interpretations and numerous laws and instructions, with many intricate discussions of ancient regulatory and arcane matters and writings of mostly Babylonian origin (to this day, together with other historical commentaries, preserved intact as being sacred, and as the only anthology which fully expounds Jewish teachings and requirements (albeit with multiple contradictions), the close reading of which

still being officially discouraged for non-Jews), the Talmud as a whole being broadly formulated on the Old Testament, which 'in the letter', it often promotes, although (in no less measure) teaching both racial and religious supremacy, and (albeit largely unknown) such measure of Christ-denigration as is comparable to the most provocative blasphemy, and also permitting perjury and oath breaking to Jews in all non-Jewish situations, violation of non-Judaist women, and even carnal child, infant and animal usage under certain conditions; it having been accounted in relation to both the letter and spirit of the Talmud that:

"on 23 March 1980 hundreds of copies of the New Testament were publicly and ceremonially burnt in Jerusalem under the auspices of..a Jewish religious organisation subsidised by the Israeli Ministry of Religions....(whereas) the Qur'an[Koran] - unlike the New Testament - is not condemned to burning... but is treated as an ordinary book...(it being known that) Judaism is imbued with a very deep hatred towards Christianity.... According to the Talmud, Jesus was executed by a proper rabbinical court for idolatry, inciting other Jews to idolatry, and contempt of rabbinical authority. All classical Jewish sources which mention his execution are quite happy to take responsibility for it [even though both Old and New Testaments of the Bible ascribe part of the blame to others]; in the Talmudic account the Romans are not at all mentioned. The more popular accounts... are even worse, for in addition to the above crimes they accuse him of witchcraft. The very name 'Jesus' was for Jews a symbol of all that is abominable, and this popular tradition still persists...

[The (Jewish-)Hebrew form of the name 'Jesus' (the earlier Hebrew being 'Yahshua', which appears in the Old Testament of English Bibles as 'Joshua', where 'Iesous' is the later Greco-Christian rendering (albeit linguistically dissimilar) of the Hebrew 'Yahshua' - cf.Acts ch.7:45; Hebrews ch.4:8), that is, the Jewish rendition of Jesus, "Yeshu", is interpreted as an acronym for the curse 'may his name and memory be wiped out', which is used as an extreme form of abuse.(n.)], the the Gospels are equally detested, and they are not allowed to be quoted (let alone taught) even in modern Israeli Jewish schools" (I.Shahak op.cit.)].

16. By the end of the first millennium some two centuries later, and despite the widespread establishment of synagogues and schools throughout the (by then extensive) empire of Khazaria (even to having once involved the importing of numerous Babylonian-schooled Judahite and Levitical sages to teach there), these Khazars and their vassal peoples, by this

time well established as Judaists, were largely conquered by the Russians and others (predominantly also of Japhetic descent), and over the following three centuries a small population intermixture occurred, although oppression gradually forced a substantial number of the peoples of the (at this time shrinking) Khazarian State to migrate hundreds of miles to north-eastern Europe.

17. And also concerning the surprise of this civil state conversion of a non-Jewish population to Judaism, it is accounted by a senior Jewish authority that

"For some time the Jews of other countries had no knowledge of the conversion of this powerful kingdom to Judaism, and when at last a vague rumor to this effect reached them, they were of the opinion that (K)hazaria was peopled by the remnant of the former ten tribes" (Graetz op.cit.), they so reasoning a remnant must have existed whose location had suddenly become known, despite at that time the whereabouts of the majority remaining unknown.

18. In the thirteenth century, the remainder of Khazaria's population (after 500 years still Judaist) was conquered by Ghengis Khan's Mongols (predominantly Japhetic), after which the Khazarian State finally collapsed; though some intermixing with the conquering peoples continued to occur.

19. Over the next three centuries, while the Khazarian people largely remained in their own local areas to subsequently become absorbed into the various newly evolving nations then forming in that part of the world, and with some having variously migrated to areas of present day Hungary, Poland and Russia, where they had begun again to flourish, and also in a limited measure to intermix with the resident peoples of those countries, the earlier cultural identity of the generally Tartar 'warrior' Khazar peoples, who already had a long preserved militant conviction of their own group superiority before their state conversion, was gradually changing to become one of minority groups of "ethnic" Judaists, they by that time being reputed as a strongly separatist people and referring to both themselves and their former Khazarian 'mother tongue' (which by then had already accrued a number of adopted words) as "Yiddish" –

[and notwithstanding the claim that such language is of Hebrew/Germanic origin, according to the conclusions of one notable (albeit academically unpopular) researcher, widely cited Jewish linguistic expert Paul Wexler, albeit such findings (as with Koestler's Khazarian conclusions), in their diverting from the majority view being strongly criticised by Jewish scholars and often *ad hominem* rejected by other Jewish linguists (which primarily rely on earlier Jewish scholars), with a sizeable volume of antagonistic criticism by such scholars being contrary to other scholastic criticism such as summarised in a review

of Wexler's research (published as: "Yiddish - The Fifteenth Slavic Language", 1991), stating

"...that Wexler practiced a 'painstaking methodology that warrants emulation, working meticulously, never proposing a hypothesis unless thoroughly developed and supported";

and given that his conclusions

(despite the continuing dispute on genetic and cultural/linguistic grounds being claimed as disproving such conclusions, a claim itself nullified by other and yet more recent genetic and cultural/linguistic findings)

still accord with the available evidence on the subject, Yiddish is essentially a "relixification" - a massive borrowing of Germanic words onto a basically Slavic structure, Wexler also having qualifiedly reported that "The bulk of their [Ashkenazi Jewish] religious practices and folkways also prove to be of Slavic origin" and thus "the Ashkenazic [sic] Jews may be in the main *ethnic Slavs*" ("The Ashkenazic Jews: A SlavoTurkic People in Search of a Jewish Identity", 1993 - *author emphasis*).

- and although declining in usage today, Yiddish is still the first or second language of up to 80 per cent of modern day Jews living in most countries of the world (there being reportedly no "Yiddish" words in ancient Hebrew nor ancient Hebrew words in the early "Yiddish" language albeit both of them sharing the same alphabetical characters following the Khazarian conversion).

20. In the seventeenth century, the resultant overcrowding and local hostility in those north-eastern European countries caused an outspilling westward emigration to Germany (having been first settled by Jews in about the fourth century) and to Germany's neighbouring nations

[at the end of the seventeenth century however, three-quarters of the world's Jews reportedly still lived within the borders of a Poland substantially larger than today (such encompassing part of present day Russia), Poland at that time being held by Jews as a refuge in a world of persecution which lasted until the next century when a forced partitioning of that country precipitated a mass migration of Jews to Western Europe, North and South America and South Africa, which by 1939 had reduced the Jewish proportion in Poland to some tenth of that nation's then total population],

with in these times such already somewhat racially mixed Khazars - although striving to keep their separate (Judaist) identity - continuing to intermix with the various European races to become modern history's Jews of Europe and Russia: this major component of twentieth century Jews, although by 1950 having been largely forced out of their Russian and European localities and

increasingly entering the U.S.A. [with the early Hollywood film-maker dynasties, for example, being founded by Russian-Polish emigrés, New York now often being referred to by Jews as "a Jewish city" (the same even parodied as "Jew York")], as well as Palestine, the British Commonwealth, South America and North and South Africa), still remaining in essential ancestry white Turkic Khazars, and may be collectively anglicised as Ashkenazians (from 'Ashkenazim', the Hebrew equivalent of 'Germans' as first used by pre-fourteenth century German Jews). Such emergence of this same people was concisely summarised in 1953 by a noted Jewish author (Alfred Lilienthal: What Price Israel?) in the words:

"These 'Ashkenazi Jews' (as Jews of Eastern Europe are often called)...have little or no trace of Semitic blood. That the Khazars are lineal ancestors of Eastern European Jews is a historical fact. Jewish historians and religious propagandists of Jewish Nationalism belittle it..".

[B] SPANISH REGION

21. Again from the research of the Jewish historian A. Koestler, approximately 4.5 per cent of today's Jews worldwide descend predominantly from a mixture of both the Babylon-established first century B.C. Judahite/Edomite/Chaldean/Persian (Shemitic/Hamitic) intermixture, and the 600-mile distant Palestine-established first century B.C. Judean/Idumean (Edomite)/Canaanite (Shemitic/Hamitic) intermixture.

22. ORIGINS: The first reference in history to a people called "Jews" is found in the Bible (2 Kings 16:6) though it does not appear there until a point at about 735 B.C., such reference occurring some 230 years after king Solomon's reign or about 745 years after the time of the Exodus under Moses, the word "Jews" being initially used to identify residents of only a local part of the Judahite segment of the twelve-tribed Israelite people which at that particular time had been driven out of their locality by Assyrian forces.

23. The spiritual foundations of the Jewish (Talmudic) religion however, were not laid until at least 140 years later, that is, not until after the Babylonian conquest of the two-and-a-half tribe Judahite nation and the subsequent removal of most of its people to Babylon which began in 596 B.C. (such two-and-a-half-tribed nation having been established as the separate kingdom of 'Judah' to the south soon after king Solomon's death, the other nine-and-a-half of the originally united twelve Israelite tribes to the north having rejected the rule of Solomon's son and formed their own kingdom and nation of 'Israel' which by this time of 596 B.C., had long prior been conquered by the Assyrians who then carried away captive most of that northern nation to various distant places - though in the likely interests of regional stability, being distributed in quantities not likely to disrupt the resident peoples).

24. According to one non-Jewish consideration of Judaism's origins, it was specifically during such Babylonian captivity of the Judahites that 'not only the Jewish religion, but all the earliest traditions of Judaism were developed', or more specifically, 'it was not in Israel but in Babylonia that Judaism first became that which it was and still is...with the people of Judah in Babylon being its first embodiment.... Israel, therefore, having had little to do with the development of Judaism' (Harmsworth (1908): History of the World).

25. And it is similarly considered by Jewish authority that 'from the impact of the Babylonian captivity and the close confrontation with Babylonian paganism, manifold religious and cultural concepts..(and even) the..characters of...(today's) Hebrew script, were acquired in Babylonia' by the Judahites, which later 'became central and integral elements in Jewish...thought' (Graetz op.cit.), Israelites previously having employed the ancient "Phœnician" script letters for the Hebrew language.

26. Accordingly, of the whole Judahite population when released from Babylon 70 years later in 536 B.C., only some 45,000 returned to Palestine (plus servants), with one respected Jewish author advancing that

"Twelve tribes started in Canaan about thirty-five centuries ago; and not only..ten of them disappeared - more than half of the members of the remaining two tribes never returned from their 'exile' in Babylon" (A.Lilienthal (1953): What Price Israel?),

with that greater number who remained in Babylon having chosen not to leave their new lifestyle and its now increasingly influential religion: a religion which had not just been styled on the earlier Hebrew/Phœnician writings, but one which had also come to incorporate an assumed vocally transmitted "oral law of Moses", that is, such being the conviction of Jews then and now that the "Oral Law" is indispensable because without it the written law cannot be explained, with such "oral law" by about that time (536 B.C.) having become elevated to a status of greater constitutional/religious authority among its promoters than that of the nationally instituted Mosaic law

[to which established law of some 900 years prior, a strictly prohibiting Mosaic directive had been attached:

"Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you" (Deuteronomy ch.4:2; (12:32),

the completeness of which written law being also confirmed by such as king David in I Kings ch.2:3 and Psalm 119(passim), and by Christ in such as Matthew ch.5:18, the professed superintending introduction of an additional secretly

transmitted vocal 'law of Moses'

(being later advanced by Jewish rabbis concerning this presumed secret law's transmission:

"that the revelation granted to Moses had been delivered in two forms, a smaller revelation in writing and the larger one kept oral (by rote memorisation and repetition, and that), this 'Oral (Law)' had been transmitted faithfully [in secret] by the leaders of each generation to their successors, by Moses to Joshua, and then to the elders, then to the prophets, to the men of the (Jewish) Great Assembly, to the leaders of the Pharisees, and finally to the earliest rabbis" - R. Goldenberg (1984): Talmud, p.130),

with its essentials being finally written down in a compilation known as the "Mishna"),

nevertheless remaining immediately contradicted by the original Biblical account which variously expresses that the full number of the nation's laws had already been set down for perpetuity for the nation and in a book specified as containing "the whole law and the statutes and the ordinances (as enscribed) by the hand of Moses" (cf. II Chronicles ch.33:8; 34:21), such secretly transmitted "Oral Law", as is promoted to be the sole means of understanding the Old Testament law, thus being calculated to overrule the authority of the whole written law (including the 'ten commandments') under the guise of explaining it].

27. In about 330 B.C., Babylonia became governed by the Greeks [with it being reported by the first century Jewish historian Josephus that soon after such takeover, when the descendants of the returned Judahites (etc.) in Jerusalem came to be surrounded and faced with certain defeat by Alexander's forces, they had been unexpectedly spared when upon his sighting the full regalia of the high priest as he emerged from the city, Alexander then approached him without attendants and to the surprise of all, submitted to what he later explained was an authority displayed by the priest which he had recently envisioned in a dream - cf. 'Antiquities', XI, viii, 5]; and some ten years after Alexander's death and the collapse of his empire, a number of the descendants of those Judahites (etc.) who had remained in Babylon began to emigrate across to Palestine where their now well-developed religious and differing social lifestyle soon began to cause civil division.

28. But by about 165 B.C. the Judahites, in what by that time was known as Judea, had substantially degenerated in their national respect of the written law, having been generally oppressed by the post-Alexander Syrians, and finally subjugated by the Greek king, Antiochus Epiphanes, who caused the nation to adopt the Greek religion for two years until his death. Soon after, the Judeans basically returned to the Mosaic law, with a

national recovery beginning under the Maccabees, who caused their land to become independent again, albeit Judea now having accommodated some of the long-resident (racially intermixed -cf. Genesis ch.36:1-3) neighbouring Edomites (descendants of Esau).

29. By about 150 B.C., and despite continuing internal disruptions largely arising from contrary constitutional factions opposed to the 'Oral Law', and as consistent with the forecasted sustaining of an ancient hatred which had originated between Jacob and his (elder) twin brother Esau

[having involved a deceitful but technically legitimate gain by Jacob of both the birthright inheritance and patriarchal blessing conventionally due to the firstborn, Esau (cf. Genesis chs.25:31-34 and 27:34-36,41), and a consequent unrelenting desire by Esau and his descendants to regain them: such rivalry having been indicated to have existed even pre-natally (as chs.25:22,23,26 imply), and thereafter maintained throughout history (as a number of Biblical passages disclose: Ezekiel chs.35:3-5; 36:5; Obadiah 1:10-12; Malachi 1:2,3; Romans 9:13)],

the largely re-established Judahite nation in Judea had become strong enough to wholly conquer the neighbouring Edomites and an admixed remnant of Canaanites (also of non-Israelite descent), and force them to keep what had become by then, and in greater measure than on previous occasions, a substantially corrupted code of Biblical laws, those same peoples having been forced to convert to the then prevailing religion of Judea for political expedience rather than by choice, they soon after also becoming part of the newly evolved Judahite based nation.

30. However some 70 years later, and with the increasingly divisive influence of the continuing arrivals from Babylonia practising their new religion (such by this time also having Greek wisdom theologically incorporated into some parts) and a concerted striving for civil power by the politically purposed Edomites, there arose to prominence the Edomite-favoured sect of the "Pharisees" whose aims included the full gain of Judea's civil power (in accord with an ancient forecast concerning Esau/Edom's descendants -cf. Genesis ch.27:40), this being finally achieved in 76 B.C., when the Judahite rulers formally adopted the Edomite-dominated Pharisaism over and above the systems of the other Judaist sects into the then weakened nation's Mosaic legal system.

31. That is, during those preceding four centuries, though for different reasons at different times, both the Mosaic written law and its required preservation of a national race or patriarchy (of Jacob/Israel), albeit revered in form, had become to a large extent subverted by Pharisaic force and the 'Oral Law' traditions, with, in later times, the Jewish (Herodian) kings

themselves being not Israelite but of Esau/Edomite descent.

32. By the time the Pharisees had gained power, and although a strong core of pure Judahite nationals remained, a significant incorporation of the neighbouring peoples had occurred, with almost all the resultant families having become integrated into both the contemporary Judean lifestyle and its now established Jewish religion.

33. Thus that same religion and lifestyle which had been initiated by the Judahites in Babylonia, albeit by this time being imposed by people of a different racial and spiritual makeup, had emerged with more civil strength in Judea.

34. And so by the time of the first Herod's rule in 37 B.C. (who reportedly had an Israelite genealogy forged to link himself to the early Israelite king David), and more so by the time of Paul (who recalled the historical fact that not all of Abraham's descendants were Israelites -cf. Romans ch.9:7,8; Galatians 4:22,23), it was well known in the first century and over a large region that the then name of "Jew" no longer generally referred to those only of a Judah/Israelite national origin but to anyone, anywhere, adherent to the Judaist religion (including the spiritually 'rival' neighbouring Edomites/ Idumeans who according to Josephus were forced by a Judean conqueror (John Hyrcanus) to convert from paganism to Judaism -'Antiquities', XIII, ix, 1), it also being then widely known that there were a number of groups of people living within the Roman empire who had totally or partially adopted Judaism and assimilated the Jewish way of life (religion and civil society still being fundamentally inseparable in the Judaist community).

35. Therefore given the mixed but predominantly Israelite composition of the Judean population in the beginning of the first century, and then afterwards following the advent of Christ, it transpired that by about the middle of that century, many in Jerusalem considered that the recent events in the country had matched those forecast in the scriptures, and having subsequently rejected their (Babylonian-developed) Jewish religion and lifestyle, became persecuted and forced to leave the city, with some settling in outer Judea, Samaria and Galilee, and others emigrating further to become part of the majority "twelve tribes scattered abroad", as were later directly addressed in the New Testament records (James ch.1:1).

36. Some 20 years later, in the A.D.70 Roman siege of Jerusalem, a number of those Jews (and others) who had rejected earlier forewarnings to leave the city, now considered this latest event to be a further fulfilled forecast, and contrary to the Jewish religious optimism then prevailing, acted on a yet further forecasted opportunity by which they could

immediately escape the siege, leaving those who denied the worth of such prophecy to self-assertedly face the Romans.

37. After their first and second century rebellions against Roman rule had proved largely self-destructive, most of the remaining Jews throughout Palestine (at that time predominantly Judean/Idumean) emigrated to the long established and autonomous Jewish cultural centre in the more tolerant Parthian [not Roman] dominated environment of Babylonia, with such Jewish presence continuing there for some nine centuries, over which time some intermixing with the resident peoples occurred.

38. Also during those centuries a small number of Jews emigrated northward into lands which increasingly came under restrictive Christian or later Mohammedan control, and beginning in the eighth century a minority sought refuge in the by then safe haven of the Khazarian empire after its unique conversion to Judaism, with by this time its revered "Oral Law of Moses" having long been committed to writing in both Babylon and Jerusalem (such becoming the core of the Talmud, that is, "the written form of that which, in the time of Jesus, was called 'the traditions of the elders', and to which he makes frequent allusions" Graetz op.cit.; and cf. Matthew ch.15:2,3; Mark 7:13).

39. By the eleventh century, most of the Babylon-based Judaists had migrated to the Iberian Peninsula (early Spain/Portugal), having joined the descendants of reportedly some 40,000 Jews expelled from Judea by the Romans in the late first century, where some intermixing with the local peoples similarly occurred and continued for at least a further two centuries; while also during this time others were settling in the more tolerant neighbouring Mohammedan North Africa, with some having settled in other mainly Mohammedan countries east of Palestine as far as to India where again some intermixing with the resident peoples of those countries also occurred, as well as yet others migrating further into Western Europe (to join smaller communities existing since Roman times), and to England (a Judaist population having been established only after the 1066 Norman conquest), where in these places also, some intermixing occurred. Thus this now wide circle of somewhat interracial Babylonian-style middle-eastern originated Jews, still largely centred in Spain, had produced the established Spanish/Portugese/North African/Western European Jews of the thirteenth century.

40. However during the next two centuries, pogroms, conversions (both forced and voluntary) to the Christian religion, the "Black Death" and ultimately national expulsions, reduced the Jewish populations in Western Europe, Spain and Portugal to where by the sixteenth century (most of the remnant by then having found refuge in Turkey), there remained no known

Jewish communities in those areas, although many unexpelled convertees adhered to a Jewish order to secretly remain Judaists.

41. Some 150 years later, in the seventeenth century, with it being then considered safe for Jews to again reside in those same areas, permission was sought and granted for these (substantially multi-racial) Babylonian-style Jews to enter Protestant Europe, France and England, thus allowing small Jewish communities to reappear in those countries (where they were later overwhelmingly added to from north-eastern Europe and Russia by the more orthodox and somewhat racially purer (albeit racially different) Ashkenazians).

42. Following World War II, while some of the dispersed Babylonian stock of Jews migrated to other countries, a large number migrated to Palestine (as had many of the far more numerous Ashkenazians beforehand), with this formally acknowledged though minor (approximately 1/20th) component of today's Jews being in essential ancestry peoples of a Babylonian-Judahite/Palestine originated intermixture (with the aforementioned noted Jewish researcher (P. Wexler) concluding that such Jews are technically of non-Israelite origin and originated from 'Berber' (indigenous North African) 'proselytes' or converts ("The Non-Jewish Origins of the Sephardic Jews", 1996)) where all such Jews may be collectively anglicised as Sephardians (from 'Sephardim', the Hebrew equivalent of 'Spaniards' as used by pre-fifteenth century Spanish-domiciled Jews).

ANCIENT TO MODERN

43. These two variously multi-racial groups of Ashkenazians and Sephardians - together with their "proselytes" of recent decades from other stocks, which account for approximately one per cent of the total - comprise the Jews of modern times, and also explain the UNESCO statistical observation 'that such religion's cross-breeding has produced examples of traits typical of every people on earth': this noted long continuance of cross-breeding with the residents of their host countries and others, increasingly so in recent times, [and notwithstanding i) the known severity of Talmudic restrictions on miscegenation (intermixing) and ii) one research finding that similar genetic arrangements are found in different Jewish groups widely separated for centuries], also providing a means to explain

i) why broad and intensive DNA and blood group researches by Jewish scientists have revealed that as well as the finding of genes common among separated Jewish communities (including among members of the ancient priesthood), an unexpected disparity of genes is also found among separated

Jewish communities, with this same disparity not being found among separated communities of defined racial groups [with such disparity being confirmed despite later research concluding a certain genetic commonality exists among Jews worldwide],

ii) why an unexpected difficulty exists for Jews (unlike for "Anglo-Saxons" and other such distinct groups) in finding compatible bone marrow donors, the same precipitating the 1998 establishment of a multi-ethnic bone marrow registry in Israel and

iii) why the recently reported "ethnic specific" biological weapons which could attack one ethnic group's genes and leave others untouched, could not be similarly developed against Jews.

44. However whatever proportion of today's Jews remain genetic descendants of the ancient Judah/Israelite lineage and may prove to be racially justified inheritors of the ancient Israelite land and the title "God's chosen people", no reliable estimate can be made because of the lack of confirmable evidence. But since the origins of almost all the estimated 94.5 per cent of (mostly Japhetic) Ashkenazians, are different from the origins of the ancient (solely Shemitic) Israelite nation

(with the Ashkenazian Jews, unlike Sephardians, being susceptible to the degenerative "Tay-Sachs" neurological condition, to such extent that prominent screening programmes have been established in the Israeli state to deal with such prevalent condition (and for which, as of 2017, there is reportedly still no known cure)),

it follows that the number of today's Jews having a sustainable singular common raciality with Abraham (the prime descendant of his forefather "Heber" - hence 'Hebrews'), and his sons Isaac and Jacob (later renamed "Israel"), and hence a Biblically legitimate eligibility or entitlement to Israelite inheritance in the "Promised Land" of Palestine, must be statistically minimal.

45. And accordingly, rather than being the descendants of a supposedly distinct "Jewish race" (as if arising from the patriarch Jacob), the Jews of today are found to be largely of non-Israelite stock, it having been further noted that

"It is, in fact, the unanimous conclusion of all anthropologists, from Weissenberg, Hertz, Fishberg and Boas, (themselves Jews), to Ripley, Mead, Pittard and others, that wherever Jews are found, they closely resemble the people amongst whom they live. Even those of common family names, supposedly traceable to the ancient Hebrew tribes, such as Levites (Levy/Levi) and Kohans (Kohn, Cohen, Cohn), have little physical resemblance to one another. There is not one racial characteristic common to all who profess to be Jews." And, "Dr. Pittard categorically states: 'There is no more a Christian race than a Muslim/Mohammedan race, and neither is

there such a thing as a Jewish race'.
 The same conclusion is reached in a 1952 study of the United Nations' Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation" (A.Lilienthal (1953): What Price Israel?).

46. Therefore the international authority formally claimed by Judaists under the "Talmud", that is, as having a God-given hereditary mandate to rule over both Palestine and ultimately the civil affairs of the world, cannot derive from the ancient Biblical promises attached to a singular race of Israelites, since a sustainable racial connection by present day Jews to ancient (Mosaic) Judah/Israel is tenable for only a minor portion of the approximately 4.5 per cent of Sephardians (and a more minor fraction of the Ashkenazians).

47. Moreover, with (i) there being only a small proportion of today's Jews who could be expected to have a predominantly genetic Israelite ancestry and (ii) there being a significantly large number of Judahites and other Israelites both in Biblical times and across history who have been wholly unconnected to Judaism, then the outstanding majority of today's descendants of the original Biblical Judahite/Israelite nation must, in genetic predominance, be a different people from today's Jews: the existence of a continuing and sizable population of such non-Judaist peoples being well enough indicated for example, by the expressly non-Jewish British monarchy and its subject peoples having long been constitutionally accounted as an inviolably regal Judah/Israelite institution. And touching the likelihood of a connection between the ancient Israelite nation and those of the modern British realm, one renowned Jewish author expressed it thus:

"Here's a paradox, a paradox, a most ingenious paradox: in anthropological fact, many Christians may have much more Hebrew-Israelite blood in their veins than most of their Jewish neighbours" (A. Lilienthal (1953): What Price Israel?).

48. But with the word 'Jew' (formerly meaning a Judean national and which generally appears in the Bible as a cultural/religious reference) having now long applied (even in the second century A.D.) "also to all the rest of mankind, although of alien race" (Dio) who have adopted 'the Jewish ways of living', the people of such multi-racial Jewish religion, even in those early times, could not be, albeit still generally professed by the Jews, a singular ethnic body descended from any 'One Chosen People'.

That is (and now even more so eighteen centuries later), it stands established from the historical records that the Jews as a body or culture cannot be legitimately identified as a people of predominantly one ancient racial stock, even with the

majority component of Ashkenazians having a predominantly one source ancestry (as descendants of the mixed tribal peoples of the early Khazarian empire).

DISTINCTION

49. Thus, since it cannot be 'blood' or 'race' which has determined who is a "true Jew" at least since the first century before Christ, then it follows that a "true Jew", especially in modern times, is readily definable as an individual of any race or racial mixture or of any ethnic origin or origins who by tradition or choice considers him/herself ultimately subject to the teachings and spiritual substance of the Jewish religion, and thus whether religious or otherwise, basically satisfies the simple common law definition of a Jew as "a person professing the Jewish religion", that is to say, a person adherent in essence to that same solely religion based institution (Judaism having long been declared a religion by rabbinic authority without pertinence to a nation), such religion standing apart from any adjuncts of nationality, common language, culture, or racial or ethnic origins; and where concerning recent developments in Western countries and attempts to change the natural meaning of "ethnic origins", the term "ethnic group" (now frequently used by and applied to the world's Jews as if like commonly discernible racial/ethnic identities, the world's Jews also form a singular "ethnic identity"), in its so being applied to one of the world's religious communities and its particular members, stands not only contrary to linguistic integrity and hence to common law truth in the matter but is also unsustainable outside of it (without employing a contrivance of language), albeit that same usage of "ethnic" having been variously encouraged by the journalistic and entertainment media, academic institutions, and (perjuriously) in certain instances by even the judiciary

[and by construction thereby attemptedly redefining the law to impose upon the public mind the presumption that not just Jews, but by necessary implication also the 'separatist' Christian denominations of Catholics, Baptists, Methodists and other such religious groups would similarly be as classifiable as ethnic groups (that is, as if indistinguishable from peoples having a demonstrably biological or ethnic identity)], with one (Australian) (Jewish) source (cited in a New Zealand High Court 1978 case of appeal) promoting that same contrived meaning of the term "ethnic" in declaring that religious origins and ethnic origins are equally depictive of an ethnic group, that is: "By ethnic group we [the Jews] mean any group distinguished from others by characteristics of national origins, religion or race, or by a combination of them.... Thus [from such Jewish perspective], Jews, Catholics, Protestants,

Italians, Chinese, Greeks, and Negroes are all ethnic groups", with every such promotional statement suppressing, under colour of humanitarianism and its appeal to the natural senses, that the promotion of 'Jewish ethnic origins' (like some imaginary present day 'Christian ethnic origins' for example), intentionally conveys a falsity, with the nonexistence of 'Jewish ethnic origins' being again expressly indicated, in this instance by the finding that "ethnic specific" biological weapons could not be developed against Jews); an unavoidable consequence of such use of the term "ethnic" as is now increasingly employed in Western society (with Jewish representations in recent times agreed to even by the publishers of Oxford English Dictionaries) having been the enabling of an additional civil status to be claimed under protection of law by the members of "World Jewry" which members of other legally established religious groups may not claim, this particular usage of such term, as is intended to classify those of the Jewish faith as an ethnic and thus racial group in addition to their status as a religious body (the continued wrong usage of a term however being not decisive of its legality), in having acted to substantially increase their civil influence in the host populations within which they live, has advantaged that religion and its particular goals with a greater civil protection and support in those same host populations than that granted to members of those same populations' "Gentile" religious groups and their basic goals.

50. However, apart from such civil advantage obtained, and there being as with other social groups an identifiable physical appearance presented by many Jews in various parts of the world (having exclusive languages, unique religio/social culture and now even having established their own civil State and also secured the continuing philanthropy of the world's leading military nation), it nevertheless remains that "World Jewry" cannot on any authentic legal ground in any common law forum in the world, claim to have descended from any singular national, Biblical Israelite, or ethnic group. And the same remains the case despite the recent emergence in Western countries of such humanitarian styled movements as "Jews against racism", which, by immediately associating in the public mind a religious based body with a racially based one (thereby subtly promoting a religious group as having an equivalent nature to racial or ethnic groups on the legally untenable ground that each can be similarly distinguished by human 'group characteristics'), acts to impress on the public mind, whether unintentionally or otherwise, that there is no essential civil difference between ethnicity and religion, thereby effectively suppressing the common law truth that unlike a person's racial stock or ethnic origin which cannot be changed, it is a property of the Jewish religion (as opposed to its culture) that anybody in the free world may at some time become a Jew (after initiation rites) or

if already a Jew, cease to follow that religion: it being the expressly non-ethnic composition of Judaism which allows people to change either to or from it. However because Jews tend not to fully admit non-Jews into their religion, they are often mistaken for a race.

51. Further, and also despite common belief to the contrary, the separation between the governing foundations of "World Jewry" and those of ancient Biblical Israel is expressly acknowledged by the Jews themselves in their formal teaching literature: the Judaic Encyclopaedia for example stating that "Judaism is far less the child of the Bible [here meaning the Old Testament only] than...of the Talmud" (the "major guide to Jewish life"), one Jewish author emphasising that it "is not an uncommon impression and one finds it sometimes among Jews as well as Christians - that Judaism is the religion of the Hebrew Bible. It is, of course, a fallacious impression.. Much of the Bible does indeed live on in Judaism, but...the Bible knows nothing of the synagogue, of prayer service, of the office of the rabbi, of a festival like Hannukah. Much of what exists in Judaism is absent in the Bible, and much of what is in the Bible cannot be found in Judaism.....Judaism teaches a tribal morality, sanctioning theft, deception, and exploitation if practised against non-Jews
Judaism is *not* the religion of the Bible. It is (only) *founded* on the Bible...The classic character of Judaism was given form by the Sages who created the Midrash (a commentary) and the Talmud." (Rabbi B.Zion Bokser (1967): "Judaism and the Christian Predicament" -*author emphasis*) - with the Judaic Encyclopaedia accounting it "virtually impossible to exaggerate the dominant position held by the Babylonian Talmud among Jews throughout the ages", and the Jewish authority Graetz similarly expressing that it is the Talmud that "has been the banner which has served as a rallying sign to the Jews, dispersed in diverse countries; it (alone) has maintained the unity of Judaism". And such was later emphasised when the "Jewish Chronicle" in Britain in its March 26th 1993 edition published that in Jewish religious schools, pupils are "devoted to the Talmud to the exclusion of everything else", one natural consequence of this single-mindedness being elaborations such as, 'anyone who does not study the Talmud cannot understand Scripture.'

52. Consequently, since the legitimacy currently claimed by the Jews for their civil State cannot rest on any valid indigenous or racial claim to the land of ancient Israel, or on any Biblical promises to the nation itself, it must therefore rest solely on the force of ancient Talmudic beliefs and dictates (which are held to carry a decisively superior authority to that of the Bible's Old Testament).

BASIC CONFLICT

53. Accordingly concerning the term "anti-Semitic", the same being a racial term of late nineteenth century origin initially used to describe persons revealing an open hatred of Jews but now widened in usage to include persons who, even with no ill-will, express a disagreement with a particular Jewish enterprise, with the term being largely intended to cause social humiliation by inciting a measure of public enmity toward those to whom it is directed, that is, by associating such non-Jews with an unforgivably Nazi-like mentality ("anti-Semitic" now being applied equally to both wartime murderers of Jews and impartial critics of any controversial Jewish civil interest), and so constituting a formidable accusation which projects an emotional force capable of suppressing civil discussion on any such disputed matter, with the accusation "anti-Semitic" also acting not only to conceal the predominantly non-Israelite racial origin of the Jews, but to promote within the wider 'host population' the Jewish claim to a Biblical Israelite (or "Zionist") identity, that same accusation so being calculated to increasingly effect the belief that the identity of "World Jewry" is unquestionably that of the one leading Biblical race and nation whose rights, (one of which being the right to eventually rule over all Palestine and more), must be respected as deriving from the highest Biblical and hence supernatural authority.

54. This same determination to continue such 'indigenous' claims has now precipitated the present irrational situation in Palestine where the predominantly non-Semitic Jews variously consider and teach that even their Semitic Arab neighbours, in their hostile opposition to Jewish land claims, stand as unjustifiable antagonists of "God's chosen people", and are hence despicable as being "anti-Semites": this falsity of identity having developed significantly subsequent to the notable 1967 Israeli "Six Day War" and now widely endorsed to the extent that serious enquiries touching the basis of Judaist claims to that land often cause a deflective reaction even among the most learned Jewish people, such being evidenced by various condemnatory emotional responses to the effect of "Haven't we suffered enough?", "Have you no shame?", "This is just preaching bigotry and hatred", "All these things are Nazi lies", "It's our business to discuss not anybody else's", and the like which have been from time to time presented in the mass media, one revealing example arising from the 2001 attack on New York's "World Trade Centre" where in response to a British Foreign Secretary's stating he 'believed that one factor which helps breed terrorism is the Middle East anger over the years at events in Palestine', Israeli officials emotionally denounced such idea as "malicious" and an "obscenity", and by the Israeli Prime Minister's office also: "It's despicable and it's simply

wrong. I've never seen such a bunch of lies garbled together", albeit it being reasonably concludable concerning the New York and United States factor in the Middle East situation that, as expressed in one formal media report, "those who think Washington's absolute support, military and diplomatic, for Israeli interests and behaviour had nothing whatever to do with the terrorism of a week ago do not live in the real world", one example of such selective thinking being subsequently exhibited by the then New York mayor (Giuliani) with his immediate return of a Saudi Arabian prince's donation of US\$10,000,000 for the victims' support when the prince commented that America's Middle East policy (of sustaining the Jews' military supremacy and government) was partly responsible in the situation. Thus such reactionary antagonism to a Saudi Arabian criticism of Jewish interests, irrespective of any measure of validity, can be seen to involve the same behavioural characteristic apparent in other controversies involving the Jews and Western interests, where opposition to Israelis' policies (because of appearing sympathetic towards Mohammedan terrorism, disregarding the deserving millions of Palestinians forcibly displaced from their cultural birthland (to which it is repeatedly inferred by various Israeli officials they will never be allowed to return regardless of any "road map" or other peace-attempting pursuit, as such 'would dilute the Jewish majority in a matter of years')), is often silenced by the marked insistence of Jews or their supporters upon their own certitude, with any argument broached in opposition (even including constructive criticism) being largely dismissed as "non-Jewish", "biased" or considered as having been already rebutted to the extent that any further pursuit of the subject would likely invoke condemnation and an accusation of "anti-Semitism". And in another recent example, albeit falling short of direct accusation, the Israeli foreign ministry emotionally condemned the British Prime Minister for his words linking the cause of the 2003 Iraqi war to the non-settling of the Palestinian conflict as "worrying and outrageous", such latter term "outrageous" expressing an emotional force intended to brook no argument.

And the extent to which no argument would be brooked is further presented in a point-by-point 17 page document by the Jewish Wexner Foundation (which operates Jewish-only leadership training programs) published on the Internet (April 2003) that advises American-resident Jews on a decisive change of attitude towards America's non-Jews following the 2003 Iraqi war, a document immediately revealing a remarkable practical knowledge of how to influence human and social affairs (as similarly revealed in "The Protocols of the Elders of Zion" documents) and being calculated to ensure the United States' financial and military aid continues to the Israeli State regardless of its treatment of Palestinians, repeated defiance of the U.N., and refusal to relinquish illegal Israeli settlements (<http://www.adc.org/2003/04/israeli-communications-priorities-2003/>).

55. Therefore it follows that as with the modern usage of the term "anti-Semitic", which misleadingly expresses a singularly Semitic identity for the Jews, while incongruently denying such identity to the multitude of Semites who are not Jews, so a similar misrepresentation may be expected in other matters repeatedly brought to the public attention in furtherance of Jewish-centred interests. One recent example which shows that such determined misleading continues undiminished where the aiding of Jewish interests is involved was evidenced in the publicised impudence by the President of the Executive Council of Australian Jewry in condemning one of the main leaders of his Australian host country (T.Abbott), such provocatively presenting that *...the Australian Prime Minister Tony Abbott had said in relation to the Islamic State organisation, that it was "worse than the Nazis", however the record shows that the Prime Minister only voiced the observation that "The Nazis did terrible evil but they had sufficient sense of shame to try to hide it. These (Mohammedan) people boast about their evil". Following such statements, a contemporary newspaper (NSW Sunday Telegraph, 6th September 2015) reported that the Prime Minister "drew attention to that distinction (between the Nazis and Mohammedan terrorism) to make the point that there is no excuse for the world to plead ignorance, because the atrocities are in our face every day." And notwithstanding the Australian Prime Minister having made clear he was "not in the business of ranking evil", and encouraging opposition to all such evil (not just against Jews), the following day that same President of the Executive Council of Australian Jewry indicated that he had no intention of apologising for the misrepresentation of the Prime Minister's actual comments, and condemning such as "injudicious and unfortunate", that same Jewish leader impertinently stating among other things, in lieu of a warranted apology, "That's free speech and democracy - for which none of us need apologise".*

JEWISH HOLOCAUST - JEWISH STATISTICS - WORLD HOLOCAUST CLOSURE

56. The most prominent example of such a misrepresentation in the present age, and one regarded by most Jews and others as 'the worst case in history of "anti-Semitism"' against "God's chosen people", concerns what is now publicised worldwide as "the Holocaust" - that is, as frequently publicised, the depiction of the World War II tragic fate and persecutions of many Jews in Nazi Germany and its wartime territories - the word "holocaust" itself having been re-initiated in post War times largely consequent to a 1956 Yiddish language publication of a noted Jew (the late Elie Wiesel) stating that he 'personally witnessed Jews, and a lorry load of small children and infants being thrown alive into ditches from which gigantic flames ensued' (where following the emotional impact of such account, the use of the word 'Holocaust' - here meaning a fully burnt offering - was actively advanced), with no mention of gassings or 'gas chambers' in that early work, such only later being used when estimation of numbers became an issue. (The 'Holocaust' today is also known as "Shoah" in modern Hebrew

(lit. a ruinous destruction), but in this case without the 'burnt offering' or 'holy sacrifice' element - hence enabling the popularised Jewish 'in-joke': "There's no business like Shoah business", which conveys within the Jewish community by means of engaging humour that Jewish grief is a highly profitable commodity in (at least) English-speaking societies.)

57. A recent attempt to confirm such "Holocaust" as 'the worst case in history of "anti-Semitism"' was reported internationally by the BBC in April, 2017 which repeated the claim that "Six million Jews were murdered by the Nazis and their accomplices during World War Two. In many cases entire towns' Jewish populations were wiped out, with no survivors to bear witness - part of the Nazis' plan for the total annihilation of European Jewry". And it was similarly publicised that since 1954 such event has been commemorated at its highest level at the Jewish Holocaust remembrance memorial in Jerusalem, the which institution according to that same report "has been working to recover the names of all the victims, and to date has managed to identify some 4.7 million"; yet on close examination of that same list of victims (and independent of the magnitude of grief suffered by all nations and individuals who have experienced the wartime loss of loved ones), a substantial disagreement in quantity is observed, with such list being comprised of not just the number of Jews recorded as having died at the hands of the Nazis as generally publicised, but also the significantly larger number of lost Jews of varying nationalities who were reported missing or displaced during the war (many of whom reportedly for personal safety fears and discrimination concerns having subsequently adopted new and largely non-Jewish names

(with such practice similarly being prevalent among Jewish celebrities in the entertainment industry for example, and even among Israeli Prime Ministers, all of whom also having adopted or retained markedly changed names)), of which lost Jews all are nevertheless accounted "Holocaust" victims and therefore presumed to have died in either the ghettos or subhuman transport etc., with such number thus being added to those known to have been murdered by the Nazis, and hence despite the widespread humanitarian sympathy generated for such lost persons, it remains that the albeit still gradually increasing count of 4.7 million "Holocaust" victims cannot be regarded as even a close approximation of the number of deceased or murdered Jews.

58. A typical summary of the widely depicted wartime fate of many Jews was expressed in a letter to a leading Australian newspaper by the president of the Australian Association of Jewish Holocaust Survivors and Descendants:

"There is consensus regarding the scale and horror of the extermination program aimed against innocent men, women

and children conducted in the death camps. The Germans' own meticulous documentation, the Nuremberg War Crimes Trials, and the survivors themselves provide evidence that cannot be refuted - except by the very prejudiced. With such an overwhelming amount of material, some disagreement regarding detail and interpretation is natural. However, such disagreement cannot negate the overwhelming evidence regarding the Germans' often barbaric tactics and strategy towards their victims" ("The Sydney Morning Herald", 23rd August 1998 edn.).

59. Yet despite containing certain indisputable facts, and being mainly aimed at dismissing a conflicting Australian eyewitness account of Nazi war atrocities which had appeared in a previous edition of that newspaper, such assessment does not withstand close scrutiny and stands as overtly misleading in its portrayal of those same facts: the earlier published account having expressed the concerns of a former Nazi concentration camp prisoner for four years (A. McClelland, president of a Prisoner of War Survivors' Association) about a commonplace distortion of wartime facts, he being reported as saying i) that "shocking claims about concentration camps had been made in the past 15 years by Australians" and that ii) there were many claims "that are impossible for me and other concentration camp veterans to believe", iii) that "he was concerned that escalating claims about the Nazis were fuelled by, and fuelling, racial hatred against the Germans", and that iv) "many works considered authoritative can be easily demonstrated to be contradictory, yet they are never criticised in public because they are part of the 'untouchable' Holocaust mythology".

Thus, and relevant to bringing 'closure' to such a long-lasting controversy, and with there remaining substantial differences between supported "expert" evidence and eyewitness accounts, nothing asserted or argued by such eyewitnesses can be legitimately accepted without corroborative material evidence, and independent of any compassionate emotional component.

60. And although for purposes of achieving a supposedly laudable "Aryan purity" in Europe (the idea of 'racial purity' being not as generally taught a supposed "perversion" of the (still unproven) theory of evolution, but a natural consequence of it, with the title of Hitler's "*Mein Kampf*" ("my struggle") being grounded on Darwin's fostered "struggle for existence" phrase), the planned persecution of European Jews by Nazi Germany [with that same mass persecution still largely described by the word "genocide" notwithstanding a number of marked contradictions to the promoted "six million" 'genocidal' figures (now given a sacred status by Jews and their supporters), the

doubt concerning such high figures validly arising from:

- i) sizable expulsions of Jews by the Nazis themselves to areas outside German 'genocidal' reach (with it being accounted that over 25 per cent of the Jewish population had left Europe before the onset of the war),
- ii) the contradictory evidence of routine U.S. air reconnaissance photographs taken over Auschwitz during the claimed peak period of mass murder and of crematorium activity in which is immediately revealed no unusual activity (despite such dismissive claims that the photographs are subject to more than one explanation when such is visibly not the case), there thus being clear aerial photographic identification of no such ongoing activity as reported by those earnestly claiming to be eyewitnesses of it,
- iii) a release of some 1,500 short-term ordinary prisoners of various nationalities from Auschwitz during 1944 on completion of various sentences (as also revealed in Russian-captured Auschwitz documents made available after the 1991 dissolution of the U.S.S.R.), with there being no published record of any of such former prisoners having reported incidences of mass shootings or volumes of smoke from the incinerators reported to have been working to full capacity at the time,
- iv)
 - a) Russian-captured Auschwitz documents made available after the 1991 dissolution of the U.S.S.R. (as now held by the Auschwitz-Birkenau State Museum) containing efficiently compiled Auschwitz mortuary registrations of both Jewish and non-Jewish deaths between 27th July 1941 and 31st December 1943 totalling some 69,000,
 - b) the like statement by established Auschwitz authority F.Piper that "When Soviet soldiers liberated the camp in 1945, they found documents [spanning that same period] that confirmed 100,000 deaths (albeit) surviving prisoners (having) maintained that millions had perished in Auschwitz" ("Anatomy of the Auschwitz Death Camp" (1994), p.61),
 - c) a published construction of the now available mortuary documentation for both Auschwitz and its five wartime satellite camps indicating a total registration of deaths for all such camps of less than 214,000, and
 - d) the ability of at least one Jewish prisoner (the renowned activist Simon Wiesenthal) to believably report having survived thirteen Nazi

- "death camps" after which both he and his wife (herself having survived such "death camps" elsewhere) were reunited,
- v) an official 1948 newsreel concerning the 1947 Polish war criminal trial of 40 Auschwitz camp guards and staff (wherein it would seem advantageous in such trial to inflate the number of deaths) revealed that "Altogether nearly 300,000 people from the most different nations ...died" ("The New York Times" newspaper, 25th November 1947 edn., reporting the same total estimate of 300,000 accepted by that court),
 - vi) similarly, (1) the original Red Cross figures on the subject: 'Loss of victims of persecution because of politics, race or religion who died in prisons and concentration camps (not including the USSR) between 1939 and 1945....300,000'; and (2) a Red Cross 156-page Report of 1945, '*Camps de Concentration en Allemagne*', of which solely two pages (91 and 92) were deemed necessary to describe the conditions of the presumed largest "death camp", a translated synopsis including: "September, 1944...The Red Cross Delegate states that the inmates could receive parcels...That he saw many groups of men and women in small working commandos (teams). That the British Red Cross 'Insider' was a member of the British Commandos and that he mentioned to the Red Cross delegate he he had heard rumours of gas chambers. However the Red Cross delegate after careful inspection, could not verify these rumours"; with another Red Cross inspector visiting Auschwitz in June 1944 (ex Swiss army officer Maurice Rossel) on an unscheduled whole day visit to the camp and nearby environs stating (in a 1979 (later internationally televised) interview with Claude Lanzmann) that although he saw groups of thirty to forty prisoners 'looking like walking skeletons with only the eyes being alive' he could not believe it to be an "extermination camp" as later defined: he upon being then pressed said he saw 'no smoke and no smell like burnt flesh and all that' although admitting to Lanzmann that 'the wind could have been blowing the wrong way',
 - vii) the existence of (not "a few" as commonly portrayed by Jewish writers but) millions of escapees from "the Holocaust" (there having been still some 0.9 million alive more than fifty years after World War II according to a 1997 Israeli government committee estimate, albeit such figure being inflated by the inclusion of

- reckoned "Holocaust survivors" who had already left or fled Germany in the pre-war years of 1932-39, and that same 0.9 million having naturally diminished since 1997),
- viii) there being accounted only some 3.5 million Jews living in German controlled countries in the years 1939-45 according to both Jewish and non-Jewish publicised population figures,
 - ix) little difference being found in the reconstructed (USSR-excluded) world totals of Jewish-publicised population figures for before and after the war (as confirmed by the World Almanac for 1939, for example, showing the Jewish worldwide population to be 15,688,259 with a figure some nine years later of between only 15,600,000 and 18,700,000 being reported in "The New York Times" newspaper),
 - x) a constant half to one per cent per annum Western Jewish population growth rate both before and after the war as revealed by publicised figures for the periods 1940-1970 and 1970-1979 which immediately conflict with any claimed vast number of Jewish deaths,
 - xi) the unavoidable implication of there being, despite the well known inhumanity of the Nazis and their scientists' pursuits, an ongoing life-preserving infrastructure (albeit severely restricted) operating in German concentration/forced labour camps even nearing the end of the war (such as would still provide for a maximum possible war effort exploitation of prisoners), that is, on an investigation of the photographic evidence of prisoner emaciation, and having regard in the circumstances to the time required for such excessive loss of body weight to occur in not just the photographed survivors and near-survivors of various backgrounds, but in the larger proportion of unphotographed prisoners not so publicised, (such being reportedly remembered by a liberating Soviet soldier (Y.Vinishenko) in 2005: "There were Jewish, Polish, French prisoners... Very weak, sick, skeletal. We couldn't even look at them"), such intense wartime situation (of continued logistical aerial attacks on German supply lines), together with the consequent isolation incurred by the increasing collapse of the food, transport and public health systems under German control, although culminating in a major historical catastrophe, does not however afford evidence of any "extermination" pursuit such as would have naturally compelled an official withholding of

the critically short supplies from at least the numbers dying of typhus: the camp commanders' continuing to allow even meagre facilities to be used for prolonging the lives of the unexploitable, children and the terminally ill, especially in a situation of approaching defeat, being behaviourally opposite to any pursuit of genocide or policy of mass murder (albeit such extermination policy being considered by many Nazi idealists to be supported by science and its embraced theory of evolutionary progress: Darwin's primary work, "The Origin of Species.." having been plainly sub-headed: "*The Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life*"), with a later (August 1999) obituary appearing in the international press concerning a Jewish doctor (Odette Abadi) who was reported to have been "arrested..and..deported to Auschwitz and then Bergen-Belsen", such obituary continuing with an expressly notable statement which stands contrary to any official mass murder policy:

"There she worked as a doctor,
looking after those who were too ill
to be sent to the death chambers";

with even the full "Holocaust" supporting noted researcher J-C Pressac recognising an impossibility in trying to reconcile a mass murder operation with an associated health care establishment when he expressed that "There is an incompatibility in the creation (and maintenance) of a health camp a few hundred yards from four [crematory facilities] where ... people were exterminated on a large scale.." ("Auschwitz: Technique and Operation of the Gas Chambers" (1989), p.512),

- xii) the regional position of Auschwitz and its satellite camps, the same being established in an area long known for its epidemics of typhus and consequent mortalities, such for example having already been recognised in the nineteenth century by Polish officials of that region with the imposition of preventative health measures upon persons migrating through that area from Eastern Europe before being permitted entry to the West, it being known that i) such often fatal disease was primarily transmitted by hair lice, and ii) the number of deaths from such disease among that area's Jews (as arising from undue adherence to the isolationist requirements of their religion) disproportionately added to the number of deaths accounted to that disease (the incidence of

- deaths in that area from typhus between the two World Wars for example being some six times higher among the Jewish population than among the larger (70 per cent) non-Jewish population, whereby accordingly Nazi prison camp authorities being not ignorant of the danger posed by the high population congestion conditions were compelled to introduce specific measures involving among other things a general shaving of body hair and lice-killing fumigation in order to limit the spread of the disease, with many thousands of typhus fatalities nevertheless still having occurred despite such measures, so dismissing the present day view that both those same preventative health measures and the thousands of Auschwitz typhus deaths were evidence of a mass murder policy,
- (xiii) the (authentically documented) immediate halting by Hitler in 1941 of the organised mass murdering of German Jews deported by train to Latvia when informed of such atrocities, it having been now established on the material evidence, particularly from the Russian archive material examined in an expensively defended 2000 British defamation case (Irving v. Lipstadt & Penguin Books Ltd. – the (Jewish 'Holocaust lecturer') defendant's subsequent book, relating an intense personal account of matters relevant to such trial, having been recently made the subject of a 2016 British feature film, "Denial"), that Hitler could not have known about a purported national policy of Jewish extermination until October 1943,
 - xiv) the as late as 1943 success of a mass protest in Berlin by German women married to Jews who achieved the staying of their husbands from deportation,
 - xv) the retention by Hitler during the entirety of the war of two personal Jewish staff, his personal chauffeur and (health-food) cook,
 - xvi) the existence of a substantial number of known and documented Jewish and part Jewish ("Mischlinge") personnel serving in the wartime German armed forces (Army, Navy and Airforce), some 19 of whom gaining gold crosses and 15 awarded the highest military honour of the Knight's Cross,
 - xvii) prominent accounts of World War II by world statesmen and former leaders Churchill, Eisenhower and de Gaulle published from 1948 to 1959 ("The Second World War", "Crusade in Europe", and "Memoires de Guerre", summing to over 7000 pages) containing no mention of a genocide or mass murder of Jews or of any "gas chamber" usage in Nazi

- concentration camps,
- xviii) the contradictory evidence of a recently released "Auschwitz album" collection of over an hundred photographs (anonymously donated to and exhibited by the Holocaust Memorial Museum, Washington U.S.A., in September 2007) taken of off-duty Auschwitz staff by one of their colleagues during the claimed peak period of mass murder and of crematorium activity in which is immediately revealed no unusual or criminal-appearing activity (despite such reactive claims as 'the photographs are subject to more than one explanation'), and which by their world-criticised fun-loving appearance and camaraderie, reveal either there was nothing humanly untoward occurring in the staff's daily lives, or, that all of them, when they were photographed, concealed an enormity of callousness made historically unique by being beyond the limits of known human insanity, and wholly incompatible with the context of the accused mass murders they were presumed to be committing, there thus being photographic identification of no such visibly active animosity as reported by those earnestly claiming to be eyewitnesses of it, and no evidence that visible trouble was in progress,
- xix) the unexpected yet inescapable and grammatical implication in certain public statements of leading Jews that a "Holocaust", or genocidal proportion of Jewish deaths during World War II, did not in fact occur, with such an extraordinarily conflicting implication being discoverable through the occasionally repeated instances of Jewish accusations against the world's foremost civilised nations of their alleged unconscionably callous conduct toward Jews during World War II, these same accusations, as are often expressed in the form of animatedly emotional despair, having been advanced again by a former President of the Jewish State, M. Katsar, at the 2005 Auschwitz remembrance ceremony in the words:
- "Today, 60 years on, we still cannot comprehend how and why, in the 20th century, the world was able to remain silent about the Holocaust",
- with such strong expression of perplexity in the matter also conveying an underlying denigration of the world's non-Jewish (or "Gentile") populations, or more particularly, the world's leading English-speaking Western nations, that is, that such nations are in effect guilty of being

accessories to mass murder, with such accusation and denigration of those nations, although generally dismissed by persons knowledgeable in such affairs as excusable because of the (either real or artificial) highly distraught emotions involved, being nevertheless defamatory to such extent as would necessitate a close examination to determine if such Jewish denigration of those accused is materially warranted, particularly as the majority of the world's Jews choose to reside in those same denigrated countries, with it being firstly discovered from examining the context of such accusation that its conveyed denigration is launched through the immediately simple questions of "how?" and "why?" in their purportedly prima facie context, where also inherent in such questions however is the extraordinary situation that although those questions are predominantly aimed at the leading Western nations, and appear uncomplicated, it is found that the accusers presenting such emotionally charged questions are those most likely to know the answers, especially in light of their being major representatives of a body of people known to excel in academic pursuits, and in particular the understanding of human nature, the same people being naturally expected to be able to answer "how?" and "why?" the Western world's cultured populations could have presumedly acted together in an inhumanly callous manner against a single population, those same Jewish accusers being unlikely to declare that the answers to such questions have eluded them for decades, and more particularly with this same ostensible confoundment reflecting a form of psychological deficiency such as stands in contradiction to the renowned sagacity and high measure of Jewish general comprehension in matters of human behaviour, such apparent deficiency thus indicating that whatever reason is advanced for the continuing inability to answer such questions [as are calculated to impose a substantial weight of guilt on the consciences of Western nations for their presumed silence during the war concerning the publicised figure of millions of Jews murdered, (despite such nations having been their wartime liberators) with the Western nations being subsequently judged by Jews to be accessories to such claimed mass murder)], the answers do not lie with the liberators so denigrated even though those same Western nations are the only peoples to whom the

accusations of condoning mass murder can be materially applied, and despite all such liberating countries providing deterrent punishments for committing and being accessory to capital crime.

Accordingly, since the reason for the seeming inability to address such accusatory questions aimed at the Western nations can not be found anywhere within the collective conscience of such nations or be calculably deduced from their known ethics, then by default, it can only arise from the convictions of the accusers themselves, as no other people or nations have a legally sustainable connection to such accusation.

Also, although "how?" and "why?" have immediate appeal as being simple questions, with their being advanced however as a means to convey an inherently belittling defamatory judgment which necessarily implies an intent to hold such allied wartime nations to be not only guilty before the remaining Jews but consequently indebted to the same and in just recompense now duty bound to advance Jewish interests, then with Jewish civil and religious interests being inseparable when viewed through the cultural lens of the world's Jewish community, such voiced accusatory questions effectively serve to compel those same denigrated nations into giving precedence to Jewish goals and principles, even if expressly incompatible with the spirit or (in some cases) the laws of their host country.

Consequently such dominant Jewish principles and the accompanying intent to gain the Western nations' support in the furthering of post-war Jewish interests in those nations thus requires a more extensive inspection of the "how?" and "why?" defamation-conveying questions before they can be accepted as bona fide, let alone answered.

That is to say, whatever the reason for the professed Jewish internal dilemma of being unable to answer such seemingly simple, albeit loaded, questions, such does not involve either "the world", or the Western civilised nations, or nations supposed as 'remaining silent', but must primarily arise from solely Jewish-serving interests; and hence with the Jewish professed ignorance and bewilderment in trying to find an answer as to why or how the Western nations allegedly condoned mass murder (without any disagreement or attempt to refute such charge) having no tangible connection to the nations

accused, so likewise the force of such type of accusation which in other circumstances could attract police action for criminal libel (publicly accusing persons actually unrelated to an infamous crime of being material accessories to the same) can only be (mis)applied to those nations with the intent to defame them for an ultimately self-serving purpose. And with the accusers' reason for that same force being alien to those nations, and it being readily found that the only other source of such a force could be that serving to promote a Jewish interest by the making of such an accusation, then in light of such apparent illogicality and (what ultimately amounts to) inherently feigned Jewish incompetence for many decades in obtaining answers to their ostensibly bona fide questions of "how...?" and "why?...?" "...the world was able to remain silent about the Holocaust", the also inherently denigrating accusation that all the Western allied nations

[including, for example, Australia and New Zealand who honouringly commemorate a national day in remembrance of their countrymen who sacrificed their lives in the liberation of oppressed people during the two World Wars and subsequent international conflicts], rather than being nations deserving of honour or gratitude are instead to be held guilty of being material accessories to mass murder and hence are now essentially expected to give precedence to Jewish interests, demands a closer examination of its presumed veracity, with that same such denigrating accusation conveying that

1) a mass murdering of Jews by the Nazis of "Holocaust" or genocidal proportions occurred during World War II, and was well known of by Western World leaders and a significant proportion of their populations,

2) 'the world remained silent', meaning specifically that the civilised Western nations, although considered collectively responsible for the welfare of Jews, exercised an extraordinarily callous denial of conscience so to allegedly commit a wilfully malicious act of remaining silent about reported mass murderings of millions of Jews with which Western nations were presumed to be not ignorant and to have been capable of preventing,

3) a non-understanding of "how?" and "why?" such a supposed unconscionable act was

committed by the Western nations has prevailed for a number of decades, with those appearingly valid questions nevertheless presenting the accused nations as possessing not just an element of 'mindless barbarism' or the like, but also an expressly malicious slaughter-condoning tendency (such characteristics being consistent with the Talmudic portrayal of "Gentiles"), this same extraordinary accusation also implying that those same 20th century Western nations and their descendants stand largely to blame for essentially all the claimed "Holocaust" numbers of Jewish deaths and

4) from at least the 20th century, the Western nations have been outwardly respected by the Jews as a collection of civilised populations regardless of their supposed characteristics of condoning "genocide" and an apprehensively presumed likelihood of doing so again [as indicated by the number and variety of recent Jewish pursuits such as international "Holocaust" memorials, related parliamentary and financial influencing and favourable mass media coverage, with the same representing a self-appointment of the Jews as the only preventers of the Western nations repeating an alleged condoning of a "Holocaust" of Jews], where from including all such considerations it is unambiguous that the only other part of the accusation carrying a comparable force to the presumed enormity of guilt emplaced upon Western society is the force of the sympathy demanded by the asserted 'genocidal' quantity of Jewish deaths, where in regard to the high numbers publicised, since it is readily determinable that (a) the guilt inferred from such denigration of the Western nations finds no sustainable ground in either their historical, psychological or sociological background and thus in such circumstances must involve an inapplicable and inherently malicious conveying of culpability in the accusation, and that (b) the currently proclaimed magnitude of Nazi-caused Auschwitz and other Jewish deaths varies between one and nine million, with other published academic and officially determined figures being substantially lower than that lowest figure, then the intended force behind the Jews' implied accusation that the Western civilised peoples could be unconscionably callous toward Jews and permit such mass-murdering of 'fellow human

beings' can only have its origin in the worldwide promotion of the murdering enormity equated by the Jews to "the Holocaust" event, now widely considered a proven historical fact over and above all objections, it now being considered as 'settled' or 'gospel truth' to the point where no objection is considered as having merit, and where accordingly

1) the common media presented magnitude of World War II Jewish deaths and suffering is expressly supported without question, with even the heir to the British Throne, Prince Charles, in a late 2016 BBC radio broadcast, having adopted such professed magnitude as sufficiently accurate to repeat the Jewish claim of such being "an inhumane attempt to exterminate the Jewish population of Europe.."

(the denial or questioning of the commonly presented Jewish six million magnitude now treated as a crime and politically enforced in certain countries - under threat of police action) and

2) the intense sympathy naturally accompanying such alleged enormity of deaths and inhuman treatment is also supported without question, where these same such unquestioned beliefs are promoted as being of personal importance to all nations and presented by Jews as vital to the world accepting that the civilised nations, as accused by the Jews, collectively and wilfully committed a barbarity-condoning act of 'remaining silent' about a wartime enemy having instituted an ongoing mass-murdering of millions of people, and therefore in the plain understanding of its grammatical construction, and with the reason for the professed Jewish inability to comprehend the alleged heinousness conveyed in such accusation being not materially applicable to the the accused populations nor in view of the accompanying malice dismissible as an unfortunate mistake, the express falsity of the accusation becomes fixed solely to the accusers' own interest in the matter, the sole strength of which falsity being that same high measure of sympathy generated by "the Holocaust" phenomenon, in that with the ground of the accusation of collective Western malice towards the Jews in allegedly wilfully condoning of their claimed 'genocidal' mass murder being irredeemably wrong, the force in the accusation thus compels that the commonly declared number of Auschwitz and other

Jewish wartime deaths must be irredeemably wrong, thereby also rendering by the strict terms of such Jewish statements the worldwide promoted enormity of "the Holocaust" as having been greatly (over 2,000 per cent) inflated

(the same also providing a reasonable and common sense answer to the apparent Jewish mystery of "how and why in the 20th century the world was able to remain silent about 'the Holocaust'"), such alleged "world silence" being reportedly further advanced in May 2005 and in this instance doubly, and with overt malice, by the then Jewish Prime Minister, Ariel Sharon, at a memorial ceremony at Auschwitz in words expressing an authoritative warning to Jews, and notable ill-will against the rest of the world, albeit most of the Jews of the world residing in such countries: "Do not forget how millions of Jews were marched to their deaths while the world stood silent...Do not let the world forget, remember the silence of the world",

- xx) it having long been conveyed by all orthodox English dictionaries and admitted to by many senior Jews that "World Jewry" does not in any legitimate sense constitute a race or single national stock, as the word "genocide" specifically requires: there being no such thing as a 'multi-racial single race' of people (such as would allow even the world's body of accountants for example to claim racial status), and
- xxi) that after the passage of some 70 years since World War II, it still remains that no forensic or documentary evidence or reliable eyewitness accounts are known to exist which could identify beyond reasonable doubt a plausible means for the conducting of a mass human extermination program at Auschwitz, with such matters having been examined at length in the 2000 (multi-million pound Jewish defended) British High Court libel case (Irving v.Lipstadt above) where, and independent of an inadequate presentation by the ill-experienced and arrogant plaintiff and a myopic presumption of the judge that on the figures and material commonly publicised such a genocide had in fact occurred and largely by gassing, it was nevertheless revealed on all the evidence that
 - a) whereas forensic confirmation that certain rooms in the Auschwitz crematoria

were used for large scale gassings of people is crucial to the claim that a genocidal extermination of Jews was an official policy of Nazi Germany, and it being notable that among the mass of Auschwitz documents retrieved since the War including those subsequently released by Russia (Nazi officials being known to be meticulous in record-keeping), not only were there none relevant to large scale gassings, but also, and concerning the long assumed existence of readily excavatable forensic evidence of roof holes in specific Auschwitz ruins which would act to substantially support the claim of mass extermination, an express pursuit in the Jewish interest to secure such evidence (Mazal,2001) had the unintended consequence of contradicting the claim that the research was intended to support and hence has sustained the case that neither the blueprints nor the ruins give any intimation of either holes or hollow columns for the introduction of chemicals into such rooms (without which means of mass poisoning, according to the logistics involved, the claimed genocide could not have occurred), and

b) although out of the tendered 35 eyewitness and other reports of mass murder and gassings at Auschwitz, the nine accounts considered the most credible by the judge relative to gassings were observed to have an unusual "striking similarity" in certain details (with it also being mentioned by the judge concerning the value of such agreements of those nine witnesses that

"The possibility exists that some of these witnesses (of unknown number and identity) invented some or even all of the ('strikingly similar') experiences which they describe....

Van Pelt [a professor and six-figure paid expert witness for the Jewish defence] accepted that these

possibilities exist. I agree" -13.74),

it can be seen upon examining the Auschwitz accounts of each of those nine individually, in the context of the full evidence on the subject, that none can be held to have revealed the existence of any plausible infrastructure such as could have enabled the conducting of a massive extinction policy],

was unquestionably a persecution of "riddance" proportions and still remains widely believed to have developed into the establishing of a mass-population murder infrastructure, it nevertheless stands that independent of both (i) Jewish exaggerated claims and (ii) "neo-Nazi" denials or 'dismissals of the Holocaust' and similar strongly emotive contentions, any common law grounded court would be entitled to find, even on the best Jewish-favouring material evidence in the matter, that is, as would include all the evidence presented in expert French pharmacist J-C. Pressac's 1989 and 1993 sizable technical reports on execution and other facilities at the Auschwitz concentration camp complex

[in which reports the long publicised figure of some four (of the six) million people presumed killed there (now generally presented as being all Jews, though for some time following World War II as forming only a quarter of the inmates; and notwithstanding the publicised claim of a gathered 3 million individual (some often repeated) names and personal details of "Holocaust" victims) is first downgraded from that figure of 4 million to some 0.938 million unrecorded prisoners (of all types), plus a further 130,000 recorded deaths of registered prisoners— such lower totals of near one million only slowly becoming familiar worldwide (yet still much overridden by the more newsworthy and Jewish promoted "six million" figure, the which also dismissing the substantial but generally unmentioned inclusion of non-Jewish prisoners), with "The New York Times" newspaper in 1989 reporting that in relation to the continuing misrepresentation of such figures, "The larger figures (some 4 million) have been dismissed for years, except that it hasn't reached the public yet..." (*Yehuda Bauer*)

[the formal reduction of the high figures outrightly dismissed by the then Jewish prime Minister Sharon in 2005 for example, when in the Jewish Parliament he emphasised a remembering of Auschwitz Jewish deaths as being "six million murders"], it having been decisively concluded (Stannard, 1992, and also by both Sharon and most senior learned Jews) that "in Auschwitz, it is now recognised, more people died from hyperexploitation, malnutrition and disease than from gassing, hanging or shooting" - and the following year (1993) Pressac lowering his previous total of both registered and unregistered prisoners' deaths to a possible 775,000, and again the next year (1994) to some 670,000, of which 470,000 was reckoned the least number of "gassed" Jews, with such 'least number' being again revised in 2002 (F.Meyer) down to 356,000; such Jewish scholar's refined estimate now approaching the 1947 Civil estimate of total (multinational) Auschwitz deaths, that is, that "nearly

300,000 people from the most different nations died in the Auschwitz concentration camp" (1948 German newsreel of the 1947 Polish judgement of charged Auschwitz personnel), with "the camp remain(ing) as it stands today, as a monument of shame to the lasting memory of its 300 thousand victims", this same figure being consistent with an inscribed triple-languaged formal plaque affixed to an Auschwitz wall soon after the war which presented a more inclusive figure:

"During the period of this camp's existence 405,222 prisoners - men, women and children - were entered in the books. Of this number, nearly 340,000 persons perished at (both) Auschwitz and in the other camps" (there being few unregistered prisoners in the Nazi military system)],

that having regard to

1) the construction of the Auschwitz prison complex and administration (having been initiated in pre-Nazi times and having a basic function of interning a general criminal population and delousing migrants arriving from Russia and the east (such European region having a history of lice-transmitted typhus epidemics), where the same is generally considered by Jews as revealing of Nazi "death camp" policies),

2) the often pictured evidence of other German war atrocities such as i) the regional systematic mass shootings (as occurred in Latvia for example), and likewise ii) the mounds of indistinguishable corpses (albeit such deaths resulting largely from i) the lack of sufficient food supplies, ii) typhus, and iii) a ruthless expediency toward the end of the war - one official pathologist examining such corpses (Larson) being later reported as stating there "never was a case of poison gas uncovered"),

3) the Hitlerian and lesser megalomaniac threats of a planned or "holy" total annihilation of all Jews, Himmler's reported "five words": "*Jewish question - exterminate as partisans*" in an early diary entry and other suchlike comments [many of the Polish-'homeland' Jews for example subversively supporting Russia's invasion and occupation of their country],

4) the various "eyewitness" accounts of communal "gassings" and incinerations (unexpectedly conflicting and rejected by some Jews), and

5) the part-implemented (and well documented) Nazi 'guinea-pig' research and selective euthenasia program, it can be concluded that however any intended policy of the Jews' systematic" extermination in German prison camps was to be implemented (which again, at least prior to October 1943, as established in a British court (Irving v. Lipstadt, above), could not have been known to Hitler), no material proof exists,

or has ever existed (either with or without the Jewry-hostile statements recorded in Goebbels' and Eichmann's writings) which supports even on the balance of probabilities, the actual establishment of any such infrastructure for implementing a genocidal or mass population extermination policy, nor for the Auschwitz complex having ever been part of it, nor for the claim that the camp's facilities could have accommodated the cremating of 670,000 people even in thrice the time, nor for the claim that any given figure of Auschwitz deaths does not include a major percentage of other mostly European people worthy of equal concern

[again, such mostly non-Jewish European majority being estimated originally at 75 per cent of the total (close to the figure of 80 per cent of the nearby Dachau and Buchenwald prison camps' survivors not being Jews) and despite that somewhat later the number of non-Jewish persons reckoned as having died at Auschwitz was arbitrarily lowered from the recorded 75 per cent to only some 10 per cent of the total: this presentation of such different figure clerically expanding the Jewish proportion of Auschwitz Jewish deaths from some 25 to 90 per cent. -F.Piper (Auschwitz State Historian),1992].

61. Relevant to the above, summaries of contradictory evidence and argument have been intelligibly presented (particularly via means of the Internet) even by some extremist groups, one cogent summary having been presented by such a group upon its being categorised as a "Holocaust denial mob" by a Jewish spokesman:

"All too readily (the Jewish disparager) dismisses 'The Leuchter Report' [an unrefined work by former U.S. senior execution equipment designer F.Leuchter, which concludes, on the basis of a 1988 on-site forensic examination of the alleged execution gas chambers at Auschwitz and Birkenau, and an analysis of [some 30] samples taken from the sites, that these facilities could not possibly have been used to kill people as alleged]..

"As it happens, Leuchter's findings have been authoritatively corroborated and confirmed by others [including in 1990 by the Polish Institute of Forensic Research, and Auschwitz authority F.Piper].

"Dr. William B. Lindsey, an American research chemist who was employed for 33 years by the Dupont Corporation, anticipated Leuchter's findings in his sworn testimony during a February 1985 trial. Based on his own..on-site examination of the 'gas chambers' at Auschwitz, Birkenau and Majdanek, and on his..experience as a chemist, Lindsey declared under oath: 'I have come to the conclusion that no-one was wilfully or purposefully killed with Zyklon B in this manner. I consider it absolutely impossible.'

"In a September 1990 forensic report, the Institute of Forensic Research in Krakow, Poland, corroborated Leuchter's findings.

"A prominent engineer in Vienna, Walter Lueftl, explicitly defended 'The Leuchter Report' in a detailed March 1992 analysis, and similarly concluded that the widely accepted allegations of mass gassings at Auschwitz and other wartime camps are not credible.

"...a German engineer, Germar Rudolf, confirmed Leuchter's findings in a detailed 1993 forensic report. On the basis of an on-site investigation, chemical analysis of samples [etc.], Rudolf similarly concluded that the 'gas chambers' at Auschwitz and Birkenau were never used to kill prisoners as alleged.

"In January 1995, the (reputable) French weekly magazine L'Express acknowledged that the 'gas chamber' in the Auschwitz main camp, which has been shown for decades to tourists in its 'original' state, is actually a postwar reconstruction, and that 'everything is false' about it.

"In July 1998 (an) Austrian engineer, Wolfgang Fröhlich, corroborated Leuchter's findings in a district court trial in Baden, Switzerland. Testifying under oath, the expert witness explained that prisoners could not have been killed by gassing at Auschwitz and Birkenau as has been alleged for decades."

62. Yet despite legally competent reports which disagree with the publicised six million figure of Jewish deaths, and although such figure is equated with an organised murdering of six million Jews, it is found in a realm other than coincidence that over a period of 40 years before the beginning of World War II (1899-1939), in much of Jewish authored literature, the figure of six million repeatedly appears in relation to Jewish community interests at least 157 times, with no other figure than "six million" being given such prominence over that (1899-1939) period (the use of that same figure also being evidenced in 2017 in response to a United Nations resolution unfavourable to Jewish interests (#2334 of December 2016), following which the Israeli government announced it would be 'punitively' withholding six million dollars from its United Nations contributions

(with by early July 2017 the Israeli state having reportedly made its fourth U.N. funding cut in 12 months, and having since December 2016 withheld some ten million dollars as the U.N. continued to pass resolutions perceived as anti-Israeli by the Israeli government).

Also, of the 157 mentions of the 6,000,000 figure, 67 were associated with Jewish suffering and 37 with death. Additionally, over the years 1919-1942 in that same Jewish literature, the term "holocaust" had already appeared in some 7 instances, each in relation to Jewish suffering. And irrespective of the Jewish and other contradictions to such six million figure of World War II Jewish deaths, that same figure nevertheless continues to be taken as sanctified and beyond question by Jewish leaders and their supporters with such vehemence as automatically quells

dissent even from senior Jewish scholars and the rabbinic community, such senior scholars having their re-estimations of the figure rejected out-of-hand as if, like modern "hate literature", none had merit: one example of disdain for showing disagreement with the six million figure being in 1999 from a senior Jewish authority in Australia (D. Feiler) who in a letter to a leading Australian newspaper furthered the terse multi-untruth:

"Six million Jews, including more than 1 million children, were systematically murdered by the Nazis during the Holocaust. That figure is irrefutable and has been arrived at after decades of exacting academic research undertaken by numerous eminent historians and demographers" ("The Sydney Morning Herald", 10th May edn.),

with this same Jewish spokesman then disdaining further discussion on the matter by harshly condemning the newspaper for supposedly causing an intense distress to the Jewish community by its "grotesque" publicising of doubts about such considered irrefutable figures:

"Why a newspaper which has...reputation (and) credibility would...propagate the grotesque...views of Holocaust deniers is distressing to say the least."

ANIMOSITY

63. Concerning the pre-World War II European social conditions from which arose an increasing antagonism toward Jews in particular, there is evidence even from Jewish sources which indicates that the fierce (and later often barbaric) German animosity was not fully unprovoked as is now commonly believed and, that somewhat contrary to the common presentations of such, it was not firstly the Jews as individuals which the Germans had expressly come to dislike (many, for example, having married Jews) but rather the largely successful and relentless pursuing of Jewish civil desires at the expense of those of the German host population: For example, from at least the preceding century it had been noted in Britain (Disraeli (1844): *Sidonias*) that "Jews..almost monopolise the professorial chairs of Germany", and also in Europe (de Medelsheim (1847): *Les Juifs*) that the Jews "fill in proportion, thanks to their insistence, more posts than the other communities, Catholic and Protestant. Their disastrous influence makes itself felt above all in affairs which have most weight in the fortune of the country; there is no enterprise in which the Jews have not their large share..", and some 20 years later it was further noted (Bakunin (1869): *Study of German Jews*), "I know in expressing with this frankness my ultimate opinion of the Jews, I expose myself to enormous danger. Many people share it, but very few dare to express it publicly, for the Jewish sect... constitutes to-day a veritable power in Europe. It reigns despotically in commerce, in the banks, and it

has invaded three-quarters of German journalism, and a very considerable portion of the journalism of other countries.."; with the senior Jewish historian Herzl subsequently posing, "I am content to ask the Jews if, in the countries where we are numerous, it is true that the position of advocates, doctors, engineers, professors and employees of all kinds, belonging to our race, is becoming more and more intolerable", (with the sustaining of such societal predominance being coupled to the long known comparably high rate of mental problems in the Jewish community as acknowledged even from before the advent of twentieth-century medicine by the original Jewish Encyclopedia which in 1905 published that

"The Jews are more subject to diseases of the nervous system than the..races and peoples among which they dwell. Hysteria and neurasthenia appear to be most frequent. Some physicians of large experience among the Jews have even gone so far as to state that most of them are neurasthenic [a non-specific nervous disorder] and hysterical" (Vol.IX,p.225)).

64. And also shortly after World War I, the same disproportional representation in civil affairs was still seen to be maintained:

"In no place so much as in Germany do the Jews (in finance, industries and commerce) hold such an important, almost preponderant part. Therefore it might easily be said that all the newly-rich and war-profiteers were Jews.... The immense majority of the influentials in Austrian Socialism were and still (in 1921 were) Jews.... Finally, in a certain sense the Jews oppose themselves to non-Jews.." (Batault (1921): Le Probleme Juif).

64a). That same observed cause of animosity arising against Jews has also been expressed in more recent times by such as Roald Dahl, the internationally noted writer and World War II air ace, squadron leader and British diplomat, he being reported as stating in 1983 that although

"I am not anti-Semitic...There's a trait in the Jewish character that does provoke animosity... I mean there is always a reason why anti-anything crops up anywhere; even a stinker like Hitler didn't just pick on them for no reason."

65. And from Russia for example, a similar situation to that evidenced in Germany was widely reported, as the following media extract conveys:

'Following the 1917 Bolshevik revolution, such event allowed Jews, formerly hated by the Tsarist regime, to become the new ruling class of Russia in all respects, including the secret police, Gulag camp management, the foreign service and spy department, the press and various news agencies, the cultural

and professional elites, the Communist Party's chief spokesman, and a disproportionate share of the upper level positions in every commissariat... Jews remained prominent in cultural and professional circles until the end of the Soviet regime – and also provided a highly disproportionate number of the assassins and terrorists of the pre-1917 period.'

66. Even a Jewish apologist (Jesse H. Holmes) writing for 'The American Hebrew' of June 1938 advanced that "It can hardly be an accident that antagonism directed against the Jews is to be found pretty much everywhere in the world where Jews and non-Jews are associated. And as the Jews are the common element of the situation it would seem probable...that the cause will be found in them, rather than in the widely varying groups which feel this antagonism" (cited by H. Ford (1920) in 'The International Jew', Vol.IV,p.222).

67. However, although such conclusion may be seen as being an admission of responsibility for a "probable" Jewish cause, it has further been advanced that such widespread antagonism toward Jews is not precipitated by the civil pursuits of Jews, but by a natural character trait inherent in all human beings (though necessarily self-cancelling in the case of Jews): the Jewish authority Samuel Roth in 1934 in his book "Jews Must Live" and under the chapter title of "Jew Hatred as a Natural Instinct" diverting the cause of such antagonism away from the Jews and placing it on all mankind, thereby subtracting from the integrity of human conscience and consequent responsibility of the individual as is paramount in at least all common law countries, when he declared for all people (though again self-cancelling for Jews)

"that anti-semitism is so instinctive that it may quite simply be called one of the primal instincts of mankind, one of the important instincts by which the race helps to preserve itself against total destruction. I cannot emphasise the matter too strongly. Anti-semitism is not, as Jews have tried to make the world believe, an active prejudice. It is a deeply hidden instinct with which every man is born. He remains unconscious of it, as of all other instincts of self-preservation, until something happens to awaken it."

68. And taking such contention further (that is, that "anti-semitism...may quite simply be called one of the primal instincts of mankind"), the Jewish spokesman Elie Wiesel, speaking at a 2002 global Jewish conference on the appeal of Judaism described "anti-Semitism" as not just "a natural character trait inherent in all human beings", but an "irrational disease", and in an emotional emphasis, coupled "anti-Semitism" to pernicious infections with no known cure:

"The world has changed in the last 2,000 years, and

only anti-Semitism has remained... We have made great strides in philosophy, in science, and we can even prevent disease... The only disease that has not found its cure is anti-Semitism."

69. And in 1933, after Germany had proceeded to reduce the disproportion of Jews in German professional society, and in many influential positions had forcibly replaced them with Germans (with such accounts of disproportionate Jewish influence in Europe having been again confirmed in 1943 by U.S. President Roosevelt (U.S.Govt.publ.) in his reflection to the French on 'eliminat(ing) the...understandable complaints which the Germans bore toward the Jews in Germany, namely that while they represented a small part of the population, over fifty per cent of the lawyers, doctors, schoolteachers, college professors, etc. in Germany were Jews';

[a similar situation being feared in the United States in more recent times, there being a number of published admissions by various Jewish spokesmen, including:

a) in 1993 political science professor Benjamin Ginsberg stating that "Since the 1960s, Jews have come to wield considerable influence in American economic, [religio-]cultural, intellectual and political life. Jews played a central role in American finance during the 1980s, and they were among the chief beneficiaries of that decade's corporate mergers and reorganizations. Today, though barely two per cent of the nation's population is Jewish, close to half its billionaires are Jews. The chief executive officers of the [then] three major television networks and the four largest film studios are Jews, as are the owners of the nation's largest newspaper chain and the most influential single newspaper, the New York Times... The role and influence of Jews in American politics is equally marked..." (The Fatal Embrace: Jews and the State, pp.1,103),

b) in 2001, a former Director of the American Jewish Committee, Stephen Steinlight, mentioning i) the "disproportionate political power" of Jews, which is "pound for pound the greatest of any [religious or] ethnic/cultural group in America." and ii) that "Jewish economic influence and power are disproportionately concentrated in Hollywood, television, and in the news industry" (The Jewish Stake in America's Changing Demography: Reconsidering a Misguided Immigration Policy, 'Center for Immigration Studies' publ.),

c) in 1995, Jewish authors, Seymour Lipset and Earl Raab, stating that "During the last three decades Jews [in the United States] have made up 50 per cent of the top two hundred intellectuals...20 per cent of professors

at the leading universities...40 per cent of partners in the leading law firms in New York and Washington... 59 per cent of the directors, writers, and producers of the 50 top-grossing motion pictures from 1965 to 1982, and 58 per cent of directors, writers and producers in two or more primetime television series." (Jews & the New American Scene, pp.26-27),

d) in 1996 Jewish author and film critic, Michael Medved, stating that "It makes no sense at all to try to deny the reality of Jewish power and prominence in popular culture... Any list of the most influential production executives at each of the major movie studios will produce a heavy majority of recognizably Jewish names" ('Is Hollywood Too Jewish?', "Moment", Vol.21,4, p.37), albeit with many if not most in such industry having evaded others' perceptions of their Jewish origins by feigned assimilation with the "Gentile" majority and adoption of English names,

e) in 1996, editor of the Jewish weekly "Forward", J. Goldberg, also mentioning that "In a few key sectors of the media, notably among Hollywood studio executives, Jews are so numerically dominant that calling these businesses Jewish-controlled is little more than a statistical observation...Hollywood at the end of the twentieth century is still an industry with a pronounced ethnic tinge. Virtually all the senior executives at the major studios are Jews. Writers, producers, and to a lesser degree directors are disproportionately Jewish - one recent study showed the figure as high as 59 per cent among top-grossing films... The combined weight of so many Jews in one of America's most lucrative and important industries gives the Jews of Hollywood a great deal of political power. They are a major source of money for Democratic candidates" ('Jewish Power: Inside the American Jewish Establishment', pp.280,287-288; cf.39-40,290-291),

f) in 1979 Jewish scholar A. Lilienthal declaring, "How has the Zionist will been imposed on the American people? ... It is the Jewish connection, the tribal solidarity among themselves and the amazing pull on non-Jews, that has molded this unprecedented power... In the larger metropolitan areas, the Jewish-Zionist connection thoroughly pervades affluent financial, commercial, social, entertainment, and art circles" (The Zionist Connection, pp.206,218,219,229), and

g) in 1996 a senior Jewish official (A. Foxman) summarising the American majority's perceptions of the Jewish influence (with Jews then comprising only between 2-3 per cent of the U.S. population) stated that 'surveys show nearly a third of Americans believe Jews wield too much power',

that is to say: self-advancing Jewish power and interests in America thus being considered by a sizable proportion of its citizens as substantially detrimental to the nation's cultural future and stability, a matter of concern also to a number of American government officials such as Admiral Thomas Moorer, former chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the same having in 1983 declared that "I've never seen a President - I don't care who he is - stand up to them. It just boggles the mind. They always get what they want. The Israelis know what is going on all the time [a comment immediately consistent with "The Protocols of Zion" documents]. I got to the point where I wasn't writing anything down. If the American people understood what a grip those people have got on our government they would rise up in arms. Our citizens certainly don't have any idea what goes on" (Moorer interview quoted in P. Findley: They Dare to Speak Out: People and Institutions Confront Israel's Lobby' (1984/5), p.161); there being also a similar situation reported from Russia (1998) where following the bombing of a Jewish synagogue in Moscow, a prominent Russian politician was reported that the explosion was prompted by popular anger over Jews being in top positions in the Russian Government, it being later reported that "Some Russian politicians are increasingly speaking against Jewish influence in the new market economy", and further in 2005, the same being again complained of where reportedly 20 ministers of the Russian parliament forwarded a letter to the "Prosecutor General" requesting a ban of all Jewish groups, accusing the same of being "extremist", of dominating politics and the world of finance abroad, and of promoting a seditious movement against the support of Russian patriotism; with the same sentiment having earlier been advanced no less stridently in 2003 as reported from a "summit" conference of 57 variously different Mohammedan nations, a former leader of Malaysia (Mahathir) openly advancing, and notwithstanding an expected condemnation from Western nations, that: "the Jews rule the world by proxy. They get others to fight and die for them", and in referring specifically to his own religion, stating that "1.3 billion Muslims cannot be defeated by a few million Jews. There must be a way": such leader revealing a fear of many nations being financially and socially subject to the Jews and, disapproving of the current extremist violence, urging that Mohammedans "cannot fight them through brawn alone. We must use our brains also", the leaders present at the conference having been

shown as applauding such speech, revealing that the threat expressed was perceived as imminent, as was likewise perceived on earlier occasions by other governments; and albeit in this instance associated with Mohammedan thought (though Mahathir also being accomplished in civil matters to the extent of it being reluctantly reported in the Western press that the same "has been the greatest leader of any developing country since the postwar independence movement began"), that same Malaysian leader also concisely expressing the essence of the many logical objections now becoming prevalent: "Israel is a small country. There are not so many Jews in the world. But they are so arrogant, they defy the whole world. Even if the United Nations says no, they go ahead. Why? Because they have the backing of all these (Western) people"],

the Jewish world responded to those early 1930s German replacements of Jews to the extent where the British "Daily Express" newspaper for example reported the Jewish response for English readers in its March 24th (1933) edition, quintuply headlining the front page with

"JUDEA DECLARES WAR ON GERMANY",
 "JEWS OF ALL THE WORLD UNITE IN ACTION",
 "BOYCOTT OF GERMAN GOODS",
 "MASS DEMONSTRATIONS IN MANY DISTRICTS" and
 "DRAMATIC ACTION"; with the report proceeding:

"A strange and unfortunate sequel has emerged from the stories of German Jew-baiting. The whole of Israel throughout the world is uniting to declare an economic and financial war on Germany. Hitherto the cry has gone up: 'Germany is persecuting the Jews.' If the present plans are carried out, the Hitlerite cry will be 'The Jews are persecuting Germany.'" The newspaper report continues, "All Israel is rising in wrath against the Nazi onslaught on the Jews", and later, "Resolutions are being taken throughout the Jewish business world to sever trade relations with Germany ... Germany is a heavy borrower in foreign money markets, where Jewish influence is considerable ... A concerted boycott by Jewish buyers is likely to involve great damage to the German export trade...".

70. From that time (1933), and despite the Nazi government's co-operation with "Zionist" Jews who in fact had for some years been promoting a Judaist civil state as the "final solution of the Jewish question" (Herzl 1897;1920), and that Germany's support for the question of Jewish emigration extended to providing more funds to Judaism than were advanced to others as well as establishing some 40 Jewish-conducted agricultural training centres throughout Germany to facilitate their resettlement in Palestine, justifiable Jewish anger at their

also being prejudicially and, later as "Mischlings", treated as lowest class citizens and then restricted to only temporary residence in Germany, rose to such intensity as to cause an assassination of a German embassy official, it having been reportedly publicised as early as 1934 in Britain by the 'national chairman of the United Jewish Campaign' (David Brown) that "We Jews are going to bring war to Germany", with the then British prime minister (Neville Chamberlain) being reported as having himself observed such intent in remarking: "The Jews want war with Germany".

And in 1938, with Goebbels some months prior to that assassination having initiated a new anti-Jewish campaign [the Jewish assassin Grynszpan nevertheless still surviving at least five years after the event], such murder prompted a greatly increased persecution as evidenced by his ordering the 1938 "Crystal Night" barbarism, his relevant diary entry reportedly reading "This is one dead man who is costing the Jews dear...Our darling Jews will think twice in future before simply gunning down German diplomats."

And worldwide Jewish anger against Germany rose to where in January 1939 it provoked Hitler to intensify his hatred toward the Jews to the extent of stipulating to a full German parliament: "(newsreel translation:) *If the international Jewish financiers succeed in provoking another world war the result won't be a victory for world Jewry but the destruction of the Jewish race in Europe!*"

71. However when seven months later World War II began, and notwithstanding safety concerns for the many Jews still resident in Germany, an international Jewish leader (Weizmann) via a press release of "The Jewish Agency for Palestine in London" declared on behalf of all Jews in the world, a joining in hostilities against Germany "in defence of (Judaism's) sacred values". And although this particular declaration of hostility was made in 1939, it was reported that in February 1940 another international Jewish leader in Britain (Perlman) had publicly stated (concerning the earlier (1933) Jewish war declaration) that "The World Jewish Congress has been at war with Germany for seven years." Similarly, in 1941 and before America entered the war, wide and favourable attention was given to a U.S. Jewish author's work by "Time", "Washington Post" and other periodicals ('Germany Must Perish!' - T.Kaufman) which recommended the systematic sterilisation of the full German population - a German translation of which being reportedly presented to Nazi officials some months later, shown by Goebbels to Hitler, and subsequently linked to a more radical animosity toward Jews. And despite a full post-war generation having arisen long after the Nazi defeat, such anomalous Jewish hatred toward even today's Germans remains only partly diminished (that is, toward not just the citizens of Germany but also the 20-25 per cent of the U.S. population who are German in ethnic origin), with a U.S. Jewish personage in 1968, Elie Wiesel,

[one of many who claimed being an Auschwitz "Holocaust victim" despite an incongruous report in his autobiography that Auschwitz prison officials extended care and compassion toward himself and his father] publishing the open encouragement, contrary to the common law principles of his U.S. host country, and in disdain of the more than fair measure of apologies and continuing compensation by Germany up to that time (such by 2012 having reportedly amounted to some ninety thousand million US dollars, with no cessation in financial demands to date), that

"Every Jew, somewhere in his being, should set apart a zone of hate – healthy virile hate – for what the German personifies and for what persists in the German" (Legends of Our Time (1968), p.142),

with the fostering of such "virile hate" still being pursued by that personage in 1999 with his then advocating (in an internationally telecast interview and severally repeated) that both the "Holocaust" suffering of Jews and German answerability for it should be taught worldwide "until the end of time" (to which end not just the increase of memorial buildings but an annual "world Holocaust day" has also recently been added into the civil life of Western and other nations). And confirming the relentlessness of such hatred as was openly exemplified in 2005 for example, at the noted memorial ceremony at Auschwitz before several thousand people in May of that year, the then Israeli Prime Minister, Ariel Sharon, reportedly urged:

"You are standing here with your heads bowed, probably with eyes filled with tears...Let them flow and remember them... Always remember the victims, never forget the murderers.... Do not let the world forget – remember the silence of the world. Do not forget how millions of Jews were marched to their deaths.."

72. Also, in another 1968 publication Jewish author J. Yaffe commented on the continuing Jewish hatred of Germans, with the intent to dissolve all blame in the matter by appealing to reason and sympathy: "It's almost as if some symbiotic relationship now exists between the Jews and the Germans. We can never break loose from them; we're doomed to go through the ages together, tied to them by our hatred" ('The American Jews', p.58). And similarly some two decades later, the Jewish former managing editor of "The New York Times" newspaper, A.M. Rosenthal, stated: "On (the subjects of) German history and the German soul...every Jew is a specialist" ('Press Enterprises', 27th April 1990).

73. And again, when considering the effect upon Western society of the universally promoted and near full belief of a World War II Nazi-planned "final solution of the Jewish question" or policy of "race" extermination of Jews, [such assertions of an unwritten Nazi-initiated murder plan of 'genocidal' proportions being coincident with that of

i) an immediately post-World War I published statement in a leading U.S. Jewish weekly newspaper (by a former New York State Governor) that a "six million men and women... holocaust" had already been occurring in Europe "through the awful tyranny of war and a bigoted lust for Jewish blood" (The American Hebrew and Jewish Messenger, Vol.105, No.22, 31st October 1919 edn.), with the headline immediately above such 1919 "six million" claim declaring "*The Crucifixion of Jews Must Stop!*",

ii) the historic claim (now refuted) that millions of Jews were killed during the Spanish Inquisition, and

iii) the claim of the Talmud that at least hundreds of millions of Jews including some 64 million Jewish children (written as 400x400x400) were killed by the Romans],

since the Western news and entertainment media repeatedly present material immediately relative to World War II Jewish suffering (all such media being professionally aware of the material value in publicising dramatic grief), but only infrequently to the suffering experienced by greater amounts of people among the populations of Britain and its wartime allies, it stands as natural psychological truth that such repeated exposures to largely Jewish suffering act to impress people in the Western world with the strong sentiment that a more heightened or reverential public concern is warranted for the European Jews' wartime suffering and loss than is warranted for the suffering and loss encountered by the considerably larger numbers of the Western and allied host nations. And such skewed picture of wartime suffering is still promoted as the correct view with the Jews now educating their host nations that, independent of German culpability, the "Holocaust" was permitted by those same nations, and so is an occurrence logically blameable on them also, there being no allowance for any consideration of forgiveness (presuming forgiveness were applicable in some way), and despite such nations having been effectively forced into a large scale war at extreme material cost, to eventually be the Jews' liberators, subsequent benefactors, and thus in terms of conscience, nations worthy of gratitude, not blame.

74. And the force of such blame shows no sign of diminishing but rather extends to hold worldwide Christianity, as well as Western society in particular, as accountable: In a 1998 Australian newspaper ("The Sydney Morning Herald", 7th April edn.) an article appeared expressing dissatisfaction with the then just issued official apology of the Roman Catholic Church to Jews worldwide for wartime religious discrimination against them, the writer (R.Apple), a senior Judaist spokesman, repeating the accusation of Western blame for the widely accepted Jewish depiction of the "Holocaust" (and by implication, for subsequent decades of Jewish suffering), and utilising such accusations not just as a means to further

impress on the public mind the presumption that the body of Western Christian society largely shared the criminal morality of Nazi German leaders, but also that such Christian societies thus have an accountability to the Jews and a consequent obligation to preserve the world's Jewish population.

75. In that writer's patronising attitude of extending partial gratitude it was advanced that

"The problem is that while the Holocaust has left Jews... gravely hurting, no-one is unscarred by its legacy. The Jewish spokesman Elie Wiesel [cf. item 68 above] wrote:

'...in a certain sense, [Western] society gave itself over to death at Auschwitz [such meaning not just the society of wartime Germany, but also the societies of other predominantly Christian nations regardless of their being opposed to the Nazi regime]'

If, therefore, Christianity was part of the sin that created the Holocaust, then Christianity [as "part of the 'sin'" and therefore basically evil in spirit] must be part of the effort [by the Jews] to ensure there will be no more holocausts for Jews or for anybody."

From such statements it can be determined that despite having a 'popular appeal' or humanitarian component, this skilled denigration of the Christian foundations of Western nations, such as requires either insight and/or higher learning in order to detect the extent of its falsity, reveals the measure to which such patronising attitude towards Western society prevails in the minds of many senior Jews and their sympathizers. And furthering such assumedly authoritative denigration, a senior executive of the (Judaist) "Simon Wiesenthal Centre" (M.Hier, 2003) similarly advanced the long promoted Jewish misteaching that the record and teachings of the last day of Christ's life "is a story for which millions (of Jews) paid with their lives ... They were burned at the stake, killed in pogroms.. and it was those ideas that served as the foundations of the Holocaust. (Jews) have a right to be concerned."

76. That is to say, this same portrayal of Christianity is intended to convey that without question Christianity as an institution, with all its denominations and sects, is, like the Nazi regime, essentially an evil institution and 'scarred for life' with a presumed collective responsibility for mass murdering millions of "God's chosen people"; with such denigration going further to condescendingly convey that for their part, those same Western nations in particular, notwithstanding their active resistance to tyranny, and proven integrity in regard to liberating oppressed peoples, are nonetheless a class of people who not only need to be taught that mass murder should be actively opposed, but whose presumed Biblical 'sin' requires them to be regarded as nationally responsible for any possible future mass murder of Jews or

others. And such a similarly high handed accusation had been launched some years earlier to the Jewish community as being an absolute truth for the entire non-Jewish civilised peoples of the world, with author M. Holeczer having declared that civilisation could only be considered 'saved', "if the (whole)[Christian] world were to acknowledge its collective guilt against the Jewish people" ("Open Your Eyes, World", 'The Jewish Press', 23rd November 1990, p.12).

PIETY

77. An example of the nature of such Jewish condemnations of Western societies is seen in that often directed against the World War II era pope, Pius XII, concerning his lack of publicised protest during most of the war about the Nazis' brutal treatment of many civilians and prisoners, such view having been first publicly raised in an early 1960s Jewish play; with that same silence of the pope being widely publicised thereafter because of the increasing Jewish interest in their suffered war casualties (to the exclusion of the notably greater number of European and other war casualties who were not of that religion). That is to say, such pope's public silence during most of the war (he prior to becoming pope having condemned Hitler as the new "antichrist" and "a fundamentally wicked person", and in 1942 having issued a formal papal protest via a senior bishop against the mass deportations which included a large number of Jews) is now widely regarded by Jews as a malicious silence having been "anti-Semiticly" directed against them because of the alleged traditional Roman Catholic stand of unyielding enmity toward the Jewish religion (the Jews' own prior instigated (and later Talmud approved) severe hostility toward both Christ and the Christian religion having been at all times maintained, even to the extent of senior Jews continuing to approve that Christ and his first followers deserved the treatment they received, with the Jewish rulers of that time being still fully revered by today's leading Jews). And similarly to other Jewish accusations of Western blame concerning Jewish war victims, such condemnation of that pope in particular, has become a basis for conveying a sense of shame against the whole institution of Western Roman Catholic and Protestant Christianity and thereby, all nations encultured with Biblical ethics, with in this instance at least, the intent of such accusations being to induce a belief of culpability and guilt-based subservience of Western nations to the Jews on the ground of their strongly asserted World War II-caused suffering and losses (the same pursuit being immediately conducive to procuring decisive civil advantages in their respective host countries). However, although such condemnations of that pope even extend to accusations of being "Hitler's pope", a

"Nazi sympathizer" and the like, the little publicised history of the matter reveals facts which straightly contradict such publicised Jewish conclusions, the same being: soon after Poland suffered Nazi invasion the then pope publicly denounced both the invasion and Nazi Germany, such however having the then unexpected effect of a widespread reprisal by the Nazis, including the reported murder of over two hundred of Poland's Roman Catholic religious leaders, where such animosity and brutality also extended toward not just Roman Catholics but the Polish population at large, which included some 2-3 million Jews or approximately 10 per cent of the populace. And with that pope having been informed of the consequences of his denunciations and hence effectively threatened against provoking further Nazi reactions, (and more so when Italy became allied with Nazi Germany), he discontinued such public criticism; it being reportedly confirmed even in February 2000 by the Vatican Ambassador to the Jewish State that the pope's later absence of protest was sound policy, where in respect of the Jewish proportion of Nazi victims such senior officer stated, "I am convinced that a strong condemnation would have increased Hitler's persecution of the Jews, and that the Vatican believed it should act to save individual Jews in silence"

(as was done in Italy during its Nazi occupation, with the Chief Rabbi of Rome in 1945 (I.Zolli) not just converting to Roman Catholicism mainly because of that pope's rescue effort on behalf of Italy's Jewish population, but also formally changing his first name to the first name of the then pope Pius XII: 'Eugenio'; and when the Jews of Rome were faced with an impossibly high Nazi demand for gold, Pius offered to provide the shortfall for them (and even made convents, monasteries and his own summer Retreat sanctuaries for Jews); Jewish relief agencies reportedly having later in gratitude donated over a million U.S. dollars to the Vatican Catholic Church, and the Jewish authorities awarding that pope the title "righteous Gentile" (albeit such title being derisively condescending) and later, to commemorate the Jewish estimate of Jews saved by him, it publicising the intent to plant 850,000 trees in his honour, with there being at least up until 1950 a number of world figures having publicly honoured that pope for his war efforts, such even including the seniormost Jewish public figures Chaim Weizmann and Golda Meir).

And in further corroboration of that pope's war efforts, the same was reportedly warned in 1944 by a senior German SS officer (Wolff) that Hitler had ordered he and his entourage be kidnapped and removed to a German castle (the allied invasion soon after ending such plan). However although the pope's "wartime silence" was understandable in terms of common sense and served to preserve the lives of numerous Jews in Poland (as well as many Roman Catholics and others), that same course of action of the pope has now been almost institutionally

condemned by Jews (and largely echoed by the Western news media) as if such had been a viciously un-Christian act directed toward both the world's Jewish or "chosen" people and their long successful religion by the pope, he being condemned for supposedly having been willing to allow his leading Western religious position (albeit largely irrelevant to Britain's some 90 per cent non-Roman Catholic population) to be used for propaganda purposes by Nazi Germany for his leading influence with the Western nations. And revealing further depth of such Jewish condemnations even in recent times (March 2000... with the same sentiments still unabated in 2005) the seniormost rabbi of the Jewish State was widely reported as further accusing such pope as having refused to aid non-Jews at the time, that same pope in effect being wrongly accused and forcibly misrepresented as having in the manner of a war criminal, "stood silently on our [religiously Jewish] blood and did not say a word to stop the bloodshed of innocent people, including my people, the Jewish people".

78. This same condemnatory attitude (which reflects a substantial lack of appreciation for both the ultimate liberating of many Jews and other wartime prisoners by the allied nations, and the risk-taking initiatives of the numerous Roman Catholics and other individual Christians who subsequently aided the escape of many Jews from the Nazis) such as was evidenced in 1994 at a 50th year memorial gathering of several thousand Jews at the former Auschwitz concentration camp in Poland when the political leader of the Israeli State (Weizman) strongly derided those same nations for not having given priority to the protecting of Jews (as the Talmud presumptuously conveys), this same sentiment being again transmitted in 2005 in an address by Elie Wiesel at a Jewish-urged special session of the United Nations to mark the 60th year since the liberation of Auschwitz, Wiesel reportedly restating the accusation that Western nations were provided with many opportunities to save the Jews but did not act on any, and even declaring in an unambiguous insinuation of callousness on the part of the Western nations that "This shameful indifference we must remember", such criticisms being aggravated by implications that the allies had unconscionably decided not to destroy the particular railway lines which transported Jews to Auschwitz, so alleging the allies were both spiritually and civilly responsible for a substantial proportion of the Auschwitz Jewish deaths; with such accusations being taken yet further by the charge that additional blame for the "Holocaust" should be imputed to Western nations because of their supposedly Christian reasons for not granting the Jews *in toto* the 1930s British Empire occupied land of Palestine [wrongly believed to be British property], before the emergence of Nazi Germany.

79. Therefore with the frequently worldwide publicised "Holocaust" notably serving to give the Jews' suffering a pre-eminence over that of the tens of millions of 'allied' wartime deaths, and hence a solemn religious significance ['holocaust' not being derived from the Hebrew religious ritualistic word "olah" ('burnt offering') as claimed by many Jews but from a similar term of Greek origin 'holokauston', originally denoting a fully fire-consumed animal sacrifice offered to a pagan god or gods, and in later times, used in a general sense to denote any large fiery destruction, it being little used before the late 1970s, albeit having since been raised by English-speaking Jews to frequent Western usage and applied solely to the World War II deaths and suffering of European Jews: the concept of a declared human "six million...holocaust" however, already having been broached in 1919 (cf. Item 73 above) in the official Jewish newspaper "The American Hebrew and Jewish Messenger" (31st October edn.) under the headline "*The Crucifixion of Jews Must Stop!*", with such being presented as the result of an "awful tyranny of war and a bigoted lust for Jewish blood"], it is thus natural that such repeatedly presented forceful impressions of Jewish suffering must act to attribute to the Jews a form of spiritual superiority higher than all others, which in the public mind readily supports their claims of being both "God's chosen people" and Semitic in ancestry. And such implied spiritual superiority is emphasised by senior Jews in unmistakable terms, one such official, A. Foxman, [national director of a Jewish advancement institution in the U.S. (named the "Anti-Defamation League"), being another having claimed to be an Auschwitz "Holocaust victim" despite his earlier published autobiography mentioning the protection throughout the war by a Christian family and then being returned to his also surviving parents after it], in recent times declaring that "The Holocaust is...a singular event. It is not simply one example of genocide but a near successful attempt on the life of God's chosen children and, thus, on the life of God Himself. It is an event that...must be remembered from generation to generation" ('On the Frontline', January 1994), such statements being formally intended to impress in the public mind the "Holocaust" as being unexceedably 'the world's worst crime', to the extent of its being calculated to replace, with greater magnitude, the understanding in all Western nations' roots of history that the killing of Christ was the world's most maliciously driven criminal act.

80. Further confirming its importance to the Jews, a number of senior Jewish writers have observed an extensive permeation of "Holocaust" teachings: in a 1992 lecture the professorial historian, Y. Bauer, advanced: "Whether presented authentically

or unauthentically, in accordance with the historical facts or in contradiction to them, with empathy and understanding or as monumental kitsch, the Holocaust has become a ruling symbol of our [both American and Jewish] culture... Hardly a month goes by without a new TV production, a new film, a new drama, new books, prose or poetry, dealing with the subject, and the flood is increasing rather than abating" (publ. in 'The Final Solution: Origins and Implementation' (1994), D.Cesarani ed. pp.305,306). Even some ten years prior another professorial writer Paula Hyman, observed "With regard to [Jews], the Holocaust may be used to forestall political criticism and suppress debate; it reinforces the sense of Jews as an eternally beleaguered people who can rely for their defense only upon themselves. The invocation of the suffering endured by the Jews under the Nazis often takes the place of rational argument, and is expected to convince doubters of the legitimacy of current Israeli government policy" ('New Debate on the Holocaust', "The New York Times (Magazine)", 14th September 1980 edn. p.79). And consistent with that cited above, in 2000, another senior Jewish writer, N. Finkelstein openly presented that "invoking the Holocaust" is "a ploy to delegitimize all criticism of Jews." ... "By conferring total blamelessness on Jews, the Holocaust dogma immunizes [World] and American Jewry from legitimate censure... Organized Jewry has exploited the Nazi holocaust to deflect criticism of [the Israeli State] and its own morally indefensible policies." But Finkelstein further writes accusatorily of the "shakedown" of Germany, Switzerland and other countries by the Israeli State and organized Jewry "to extort billions of dollars... The Holocaust may yet turn out to be the 'greatest robbery in the history of mankind'" (The Holocaust Industry, pp.130,138,139,149).

81. Thus, and as aforementioned, while the modern media emphasis on the Jews' wartime suffering acts to continue their supposedly Biblical identity, the high measure of sympathy produced by the featuring of such suffering acts to raise the perceived integrity of Jews to a level over and above that of Western society, that is, to the point where any opposition, intelligent or otherwise, to anything controversial in which Jews or their religion may be involved

[such as why the common word "terrorist" has come to be little used by Western reporters when describing Jewish (Talmud-sanctified) acts of malicious wounding and murder (from the Begin/Shamir (later Israeli prime ministers) "Irgun/Stern gang" assassinations and brutal massacres of British and Arabs in the 1940s, to the present day and their publicised 'staged waves of assassinations' of Palestinians, the Jewish State itself having had an observably similar internal terrorist problem to that of its neighbouring Middle Eastern nations), with such acts of Israelis having been widely publicised even via archival film in the Jewish State (as part of a 50th year

documentary presentation) and subsequently to the world through television news reports, such documentary having highlighted terrorist acts of substantial brutality against the 'indigenous' Palestinians, with these same acts reported as having surprised most younger residents of the Jewish state],

is now further likely to be considered by the Jews as a "racial" affront and condemned with a formidable force of accusation: essentially all outside arguments disagreeable to Jewish interests, no matter how impartial, being thus more strongly dismissed by both the Jews and many others as constituting unreasonable or malicious personal attacks from "right-wing extremists", "Holocaust deniers" or the like (the latter being an intimidatory term used to denounce persons who enquire into or even partially query the well known account of Jewish wartime deaths), and thereby automatically presumed to be "anti-Semitic".

82. And despite its being falsely authoritative and misleading, such common use of the term "anti-Semitic" in Western countries, combined with the current "fear of the Jews" now evident in those countries (being not dissimilar to the fear of the Jews referred to in New Testament times - John ch.7:13 etc.), has curtailed freedom of speech on any matter involving a conflicting Jewish interest to the extent that anything condemned as "anti-Semitic" by any Judaist or media outlet is now becoming considered by the people of such predominantly Christian based host countries, including their judiciaries, as an offence far worse than civilly seditious blasphemy, the wielding of such Jewish-based accusation of "anti-Semitic" having now entered into Western usage not just in the cases of business and political threats such as are calculated to remove social and/or financial advantages from those so accused, which subsequently now precipitates a hurried apologetic reaction whether warranted or not, but also into the non-Jewish community at large, which produces immediate and often hostile division.

82a. The extent to which such "fear of the Jews" has now permeated Western culture can be seen from the increasing level of respect given to Jews and their religious beliefs of being 'God's chosen people' over and above the respect shown to those of non-Jewish religions, with such respect in Jewish-engaging communications expressly calculated to avoid any accusation of "anti-Semitism", such being well enough demonstrated in the recent minor phenomenon concerning the current (2017) Israeli Prime Minister, Benjamin Netanyahu and the fawning use of the affection-conveying English-attractive pet name "Bibi" (a name immediately incongruous with the well-documented brutal aspects of his political life in relation to achieving the goals of his religion), this same beguiling infant-like term being widely used in the media and

recently also, repetitively by U.S. President Trump and even extending to the leaders of other Western nations including Australia for example, all embracing such 'nickname' and thus enabling, in whatever conflict of interest may arise, the avoidance of any feared condemnatory and costly accusation of "anti-Semitism" as is known to be liberally employed by Jews and their supporters to quickly end disliked discussion.

83. An unusual use of the term "anti-Semitic" was recently published in an Australian national newspaper ("The Australian", 16th January, 2017 edn.) and involved a local (Mosman N.S.W.) Mayor who had been invited to attend an annual legal function at the "Great Synagogue" in Sydney. Such invitation however was declined by the Mayor who, in a written reply, responded, "Thank you for your invitation to the Great Synagogue Law Service for 2017. I will not be attending. I should express my deep personal concern about the gross and illegal occupation of the West Bank which creates intense international division and bitterness and, unresolved, will cause endless terrorism across the globe, including here (in Australia)."

With such declining of the invitation being passed to a ruling group of Jews, the Australian "Jewish Board of Deputies", the response of such was to issue a written accusation of "anti-Semitism" against the Mayor and to charge that "he was not effectively representing Jewish residents in the area", the head of which Jewish group emotively adding that he was personally "shocked" and "astonished really" by the Mayor's reply and that "We are appalled that you would refuse to represent the Jewish constituents of your ward because of your views on the Israel-Palestine conflict."

[Such Jewish head either dismissing or not knowing with regard to elected bodies or "Councils" as commonly constituted, the Council electees thereof cannot be partitioned to favour and maintain single persons or interest groups exclusively, Jewish or other: the electee being elected to represent and serve all constituents equally.]

Further to such charge of "anti-Semitism" by that ruling "Board of Deputies" however, is that the same was found to have originated from a little known Jewish "Holocaust" Alliance Group contention that a person is guilty of anti-Semitism if "holding Jews collectively responsible for actions of the State of Israel", even if those Jews support such actions, which the spokesman for "The Jewish Board of Deputies" indicated he did.

However, in this case, in exposing such "anti-Semitism" condemnation as a device serving to silence opposition to such illegal settlement actions, and in a revealing statement, the Mayor responded, "There are large numbers of people, Jews around the world, who respect Jews and Jewishness, who are critical of the occupation of the West Bank. To say someone

who is critical of the West Bank is anti-Jewish is just nonsense... My father's family was wholly Jewish... there is no discrimination against Jewish or any other (communities in his constituency)" he said.

Such comment in opposition to the broad-based Jewish support for illegal Israeli settlements and the Mayor's refusal to be seen to condone such activities were, as could be expected, met the following day in that same news publication with strongly opposed pro-Jewish/Israeli letters supporting the "anti-Semitism" accusation.

84. And designedly or otherwise, (with there being a notable proportion of Jews employed in most Western fields of endeavour), the fear generated particularly in Western countries by the denigration of persons who disagree with any Jewish pursuit has acted to reduce the people's wider conscience and freedom of speech from that previously enjoyed in those countries (it being similarly observable that within these same predominantly Christian host countries, Jewish-sourced investigative media programmes have portrayed the New Testament documents as if substantially fraudulent).

85. Further touching the foundations of those host populations' Biblical and/or Christian governing principles, Judaism is increasingly presented (and largely uncontested) as being an authority superior to such foundations: In one instance of considering disagreement from his host population as inconceivable, a senior Judaist spokesman in Australia (R.Apple), responding to a senior politician in a letter to an Australian national newspaper ("The Australian", 22nd March, 1994 edn.) presented the (aggressively false and self-incriminating) reply:

"To suggest that they [the Pharisees] 'brought about the death of Jesus Christ because of their blindness' is a gratuitous insult to the historical truth"

(which antagonistically rejects for example not only the Biblical historical record (Luke 24:20 etc.; Acts:3:13) but also Christ's widely-known words: "forgive them for they know not what they do": the Pharisees even in those times having strongly considered themselves to be not "blind" (John 9:39,40) concerning their condemnation and treatment of Christ, but 'well knowing what they do'); this same Jewish spokesman thus attempting to annul the historical veracity of the New Testament documents, and necessarily inferring that even today, the person of Christ would still warrant the death penalty under Jewish law

[where (again), "According to the Talmud, Jesus was executed by a proper rabbinical court for idolatry, inciting other Jews to idolatry, and contempt of rabbinical authority. All classical Jewish sources which mention his execution are quite happy to take responsibility for it [as per Matthew 27:25]; in the Talmudic account the Romans are not even mentioned"

(Shahak (1994): Jewish History, Jewish Religion)], with that same (Australian) Jewish spokesman adding the strongly emotive (yet notably aberrant and even Talmud-contrary) declaration that

"Scholars have proved over and over again that the bad press the Pharisees receive in parts of the New Testament is quite unjustified and if Jesus could be said to have been close to the teaching of any sect or party of the time, it would have been the Pharisees with whom he had most in common. It is not they who should be accused of having 'brought about the death of Jesus Christ'", a point publicly contradicted even in an Easter editorial of a major Jewish-honouring newspaper ("The Sydney Morning Herald", 18th April 2003 edn.) in a reference to the death of Christ in the unambiguous words:

"the divine sacrifice of Jesus on trumped-up charges that even the Roman authorities who ordered His execution knew to be groundless..."

85a. In an earlier (1990) similar pronouncement, in similar denial of the "classical" Jewish sacred texts which are 'quite happy to take responsibility for Christ's execution' (I.Shahak op.cit.), the influential American Jewish "Anti-Defamation League", in direct denial of the clarity of accusations in the record of Luke of chapter 24:20, published that the Romans alone, not the Pharisees, were responsible for Christ's crucifixion and that it was Pilate, not the Pharisee Caiaphas, who actively conspired in his death. Some ten years later, this same anti-New Testament contention was reported as having been endorsed by a 2000 American National Conference of Roman Catholic bishops, and more so by the pope (immediately contradicting age-long Roman Catholic teaching on the subject) who conferred a Roman Catholic type knighthood on a Jewish A.D.L. representative because of his success in publicising that Jewish view; with this new such view, as would be unsustainable in a properly conducted common law court, being now widely promoted as if Biblical fact.

86. Notwithstanding only moderate publicity being given to such an attack on the foundations of Christianity, none of the Australian host population's senior Christian leaders (church officers largely presumed familiar with the Biblical documents) appeared in print to answer such attack, with such Jewish hostility showing no signs of diminishing, as more pointedly indicated in 1999 by another seniormost Australian Judaist spokesman (P. Wertheim), who was reported as stating:

"In the eyes of Judaism, any acceptance of the divinity of Jesus is a form of idolatry [a Jewish capital offence since New Testament times] and compromises the..[one revered God] of Judaism" ("The Sydney Morning Herald", 27th March edn.),

this intentionally hostile statement toward the predominant Christian classes of such host country also appearing wholly unaddressed by any Christian representative (and so effectively distancing the Biblical substance from the Christian faith and theology).

87. That is to say, in a Western civilisation environment, and with the spiritual authority claimed by the Jews worldwide being largely unchallenged, any definitive Jewish influence, declaration or behaviour which is seen to be essentially in conflict with the fundamental culture of Western society or contrary to the greater (Western) public interest is now largely avoided in normal conversation and thus from objective criticism, with any general discussion, comment or even query by non Judaists in relation to such matters no longer being considered by most ordinary people in the West as an expression of free speech or legitimate opinion, but to be some form of "anti-Semitic" malevolence and hence something to be feared.

88. Indicative of the misrepresentation associated with the "Jewish identity" (and notwithstanding that reportedly more than half of today's Israeli State citizens are from the minor (Sephardian) component of the world's Jewish population), it is ultimately found that only the wide and mainly non-Semitic racial diversity of the Jews can provide a reason for the seemingly inexplicable situation that for over 70 years and despite unity of purpose in their own interests, and direct access to the highest Babylonian, Persian, Greek, European and British scholastic and Biblical wisdom in the world, Israeli legislators have been unable to establish who or what constitutes one of their own group: they well knowing the dangers of racial antagonism since it is rigidly held by Judaists that whosoever cannot be defined as a Jew, is automatically disparaged as a "Gentile" (again such word as used today, unlike its wider meaning in New Testament times as denoting simply "peoples" or "nations" in general, having long been corrupted to become a solely Jewish-oriented and often hostile term, even though having linguistically originated from the Latin noun and adjective gentes/gentilis, which also denoted other nations or peoples independent of their religion), such contemporary Jewish use of the word "Gentile" and its Hebrew equivalent word "Goi" (the first appearance of the word "Goi" meaning foreign peoples and predating Judaism by some thousands of years) in modern times now conveying an added ingredient to its early usage, that is, in today's common Jewish/Talmudic usage, "goi" not just conveys a foreign or non-Jewish person, but is also used to convey a pejorative component of filthy-like ungodly uncleanness, with such type of uncleanness being inseparably joined by Talmudic texts to the

rest of the world's non-Jewish population (which by necessary implication includes all non-Jewish civil leaders and officials), and also conveys an inference of 'inherently inferior and usable servant(s)' or the like: this same Talmudic-prescribed disdain by Jews toward those not of their religion being opposite in intent to that of the legal foundations of all civilised (or "Gentile") nations, regardless of the widening "post-civilised" degeneration of former social graces, decency, politeness and integrity, and opposite also to the formal meaning of the Old Testament Hebrew word "goi" which refers not just to so-called "Gentiles" but in its first instances in the Bible, to all populated nations or groups of people (such particular word being translated in various ways: Gentiles, nations, people, heathen, according to the context and considerations of the translators), thus ultimately meaning that by adopting the plain terms of the Hebrew Old Testament, as all Jews are held to be descended from Noah, a non-Jew or "goi", they are thus equivalent to "Gentile" stock themselves (Genesis ch.10:5 with 31,32 and ch.46:2,3, etc.; with again, the full population of the world being termed "goi" in Zechariah 12:3c).

89. And the deeply rooted or largely subconscious civil disdain among Jews for what they term "the goi", or lower classes, that is, for all other peoples than themselves, also presents a basis for understanding the commonly perceived preoccupation of most Jews with their own suffering (largely to the exclusion of the suffering of others), and also for their (albeit lesser publicised) formidable antagonism in any host country when Jewish-interest projects are opposed by civil authorities (albeit opposition to such projects occurring far less frequently in present times for the fear of being considered "anti-Semitic", with the same such constriction now observed to be worsening in terms of free speech in Western society).

90. And further, such assumed high level of religious sanctity has been also evidenced in recent times with the re-emergence of a Jewish-coined patronising (civil) title: "righteous Gentile" (condescendingly given to pope Pius XII and thus patronisingly subjecting both he and his wartime leadership to a presumed superiority of Judaism), the necessary implication of such term "righteous Gentile" being that apart from select Jewish conferrals of such status upon "Gentiles", all "Gentiles" in the world are held to be "unrighteous"

[similar to all non-Mohammedans being formally abused as "disbelievers" and largely considered by the Koran as "infidels" - with such copying a many centuries prior edict in the Bible which, through Paul, declared all who reject Christ, and inseparably his forecast death and Resurrection, to be "infidels" -cf. Matthew 16:21, 2 Corinthians.6:14-15

(with those labelled "infidels" by the Koran being held as not able to "convert" to Mohammedanism since their religion holds that, since the creation, all the world's population have been in spirit born believers in "Allah", such believers being later identified in the Koran formulation as, in effect, inherently Mohammedan ("follower of Mohammed" or in modern terms, "Muslim" or "Islamist"), that is, such considered "infidels" can not "convert" but only "revert" to Mohammedanism/Islamism)],

where "Gentiles", if they remain "unrighteous, or non Jews", are also held to be "ungodly" and hence deserving of civil contempt – as is also the unambiguous teaching of the Talmud:

"There is also a series of rules forbidding any praise of Gentiles or for their deeds, except where such praise implies an even greater praise of Jews and things Jewish For example, the writer Agnon, when interviewed on the Israeli radio upon his return from Stockholm, where he received the Nobel Prize for literature, praised the Swedish Academy, but hastened to add: 'I am not forgetting that it is forbidden to praise Gentiles, but here there is a special reason for my praise – that is, they awarded the prize to a Jew'.

"Similarly, it is forbidden to join any manifestation of popular Gentile rejoicing except where failing to join in might cause 'hostility' towards Jews, in which a 'minimal' show of joy is allowed" (I.Shahak op.cit.).

91. But since i) "Talmudism", or the religion of Judaism, originated not in the ancient Biblical land of Israel but much later in Babylon (at that time the most wealthy of the ancient world's religion-based imperial powers), and ii) the Biblical documents (on which the most refined principles of modern civilisation are founded) not only straightly condemn that religion (as did Christ whose death ensued from such antipathy), but also forecast for future times a revival of this same influential religion (termed "(high) Mystery, Babylon the Great" – the context of the term revealing a globally pre-eminent commercial and ritualistic body by whom "all nations (become) deceived"), with such Biblical document also mentioning the phenomenon of people "which say they are Jews (meaning Judeans of ancient Israelite stock) and are not", then in the absence of sustainable evidence to the contrary, it cannot be dismissed that the worldwide body of followers of Judaism (or "World Jewry") which originated in Babylon, such as also continues the religion of the ancient Pharisees, and which even before the twentieth century, had begun its rise to become the most financially and religiously influential institution in the world, is the only known body of people on earth to whom such identifying characteristics could be reasonably applied.

JEWISH LAND RIGHTS

92. The material facts of the situation therefore raise at least three questions of high international law concerning the 'Title Deeds' to today's geopolitically-critical Jewish/Palestinian region, or who should share what (the Jewish State being created by a United Nations' decision and persuaded by both monetary and humanitarian considerations, that is, by

- i) the acceptance in part of many Jews' religious beliefs independent of unresolvable inconsistencies,
- ii) the Jewish religion's lack of a "homeland", albeit no other religion having such a claim, and
- iii) the disputed claim to the rightful ownership of Palestine)

that is to say, since contrary to common opinion and stridently advanced complex genetic arguments the various communities of the world's Jewish population cannot be legitimately classed as a race of people predominantly of either Semitic or Israelite origin, and race identity, not religion, is the sole basis on which all Jewish claims of a "homeland" ultimately rest, then it can be directly questioned:

- (1) is the continuance of a Jewish State valid on any legally sustainable ground (other than the expediency of avoiding military hostilities),
- (2) did Britain in 1917 (and consequently the United Nations in 1947) grant an occupancy of Palestine to the representatives of the Judaist religion, and
- (3) do Judaists or members of "World Jewry" have a valid civil ground to occupancy of any modern day State or Nation other than by gift? — the ultimate answer to such three questions being no.

92a. And referent to the second question above, whereas Jewish leaders unsustainably and with no international or British common law authority assert

"By the [1917] Balfour Declaration 'Eretz Israel' (the homeland of the ancient Israelites, having an area larger than Palestine and adopted from the Mosaic decree to ancient Israel recorded in Deuteronomy ch.1:7,8) became the declared Jewish national home" (Encyc.Jud.v.3, col.744),

(and although the Israeli State attempted to justify its admitted "holding three and a half million Palestinians under occupation" (Sharon 2003), by advancing that an international right of conquest from the 1967 war applied the same to the Jews today as it would to the then warring Arab nations), upon examination of such Balfour "Declaration" such proves to be one of the most extraordinary (albeit only semi-governmental) documents in history, being neither a declaration nor an entitlement advice, but merely a formal

letter written to a leading Jewish financier by the then British Foreign Secretary, the text of which conveying the expression of one nation solemnly promising a presumed other "nation" a "home" within the country of a third, which at that time belonged to a fourth (not Great Britain); with there also being an explicit proviso of

"it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of the existing non-Jewish communities" resident in that land

[such provision however later interpreted by the Israeli State's 1952 Nationality Act, to allow for a Jew to become a citizen after one minute in the land, although that same status may be denied to an Arab in spite of his ancestors being indigenous to that land for over a thousand years - such Palestinians thence being made subject to the Jews], that same Balfour letter being in no measure a legal declaration or possessing decisive Crown or international authority but on examination proving to be only ostensibly a document having the authority of the British Crown (such Crown authority ultimately deriving its force from its being an immutably established Mosaic-based non-Judaist civil institution), and being incompetently worded as to its express purpose and conditions, as well as being contrary to common law principles in its intent, and wilfully misread by Judaist and supportive authorities in order to implement an assumed land granting authority. And referent to the stipulation not to "prejudice the civil and religious rights" of the existing (Palestinian/Arabic) residents, it is found that over half a century since 1955 more than 140 violations of such stipulation have been noted by the United Nations institution in the form of disapproving draft resolutions against the illegal actions of the Jewish State (one example being that of the March 1998 condemnation (by 120 to 3 votes) of an increasing 'West Bank' injection of Israeli citizens, the same express disapproval of Judaist civil pursuits being numerously repeated in various measures until March 2002 and the then-precedential passing of an American sponsored resolution which affirmed "a vision of a region where two states, Israel and Palestine, live side by side.." despite the cultural differences, and calling for "the immediate cessation of all acts of violence" (such 2002 resolution being straightly dismissed by the Jewish State), a further declaration by the United Nations' Secretary-General being passed soon after condemning not solely Palestinian acts of terror, but primarily those of the Israeli nation, to wit:

"You must end the illegal occupation..."

[illegal not just because of being established under false pretences and contrary to Geneva Convention law but also illegal under Jewish local

State law, despite such illegality being directly funded by the Jewish government; with Jewish inhabitants of Palestine having increased 12-15 per cent within two years of such U.N. demand for the cessation of encroaching occupations; it also being reported in mid-2005 by a former Israeli State Prosecutor (T. Sasson) that no notice was taken of a Prime Minister-commissioned report released three months earlier yet again calling for a ceasing of further settlement building in Palestine, the number of constructions in the three months following such report's release being near to double that of the previous three month period]..

"...You [Jews] must stop the bombing of civilian areas, the assassinations, the unnecessary use of lethal force, the demolition and the daily humiliation of ordinary Palestinians":

the same being a significant change from the over 30 earlier such draft Resolutions since 1972 which had been vetoed by the United States; this now recognised extent of Jewish maltreatment of Arabs, as connected to, yet independent from, the Arab maltreatment of Jews, continuing to adversely affect Palestinian and neighbouring countries on a daily basis and thus indicating that independent of opinion, and notwithstanding it being reported in early 2017 that despite the coverage of the mass media, compared to

- i) the continuing multi-national Middle Eastern Sunni/Shiite conflict,
- ii) the failure of the various socio/economic models attempted in the Arab world,
- iii) the development of Mohammedan extremist violence and dictative ideology,
- iv) the recent wars and anarchy in Syria, Yemen, Libya etc.,

'...the Israeli/Palestinian situation is not the biggest source of unrest in the region', it being also journalised that 'You can go down the list and find conflicts throughout the region that make the observed Israeli-Palestinian conflict look like a therapy session', while Arabs living in the Israeli State 'have more freedoms and economic opportunities ...than in any country in the region', nevertheless a not insignificant part of the "Middle East problem" has arisen over the last several decades substantially from the increasing Western mental, financial and military accommodation of the Jews' Talmudic beliefs and consequent civil attitudes, and (again) with no diminishing of civil force

[the same being further braced by such as the American effectual stand of supporting the Jews' several hundred kilometre regionally intrusive wall illegally built on Palestinian land and the U.S. acting to sanction the increasing Jewish occupations

inside that Palestinian land (notwithstanding America's subsequent action of a 'token' punitive reduction (of some 7.5 per cent) in "loan guarantees" to the Israeli State, and the return of the smaller "Gaza Strip" acquisitions), both the concrete separation barrier and occupations of Palestinian-owned land being numerously declared to be illegal enterprises under international law as anchored in the fourth Geneva Convention of 1949 and through to the latest U.N. 2016 Resolution No.2334); the U.S. having been condoning not just exclusively Jewish nuclear weapons in the region but also an escalation of Middle East hostilities if considered necessary by the Jews to "maintain their statehood", such support for the Jewish State acting to sovereigntise the Jewish religion in the area],

with this same accommodation of such Jewish beliefs and attitudes also being evident in another vein from the phenomenon of Jewish instituted "shame-shrine" World War II "Holocaust memorials" emergent in Western society, and publicised by the largely Jewish-influenced news media as being notable 'showcases' established for Western interests – again all constructed and intended to further introject into predominantly Christian-based communities at the human conscience level a dominant grief and guilt-imposing sympathy for Jewish deaths and suffering, the which "memorials" effectively achieving such purpose of propagating and maintaining shame and grief whilst also acting to minimise attention to the death and suffering of the far greater number of Christian and other individuals in the rest of the world's peoples (that is, even to intentionally suppressing attention to the solemnity warranted by the first century treatment of Christ by the Judaist leaders on the one hand and that warranted for the tens of millions killed by 20th century world leaders on the other), and thus procure support for solely Jewish/Talmudic objectives.

93. And such Western accommodation of the Jews' religious beliefs and attitudes continues despite the Jews' formal rejection of Western ideals and values:

"Anyone who lives in Israel knows how deep and widespread these attitudes of hatred and cruelty towards all .. (non-Judaists) are among the majority of Israeli Jews. Normally these attitudes are disguised from the outside world, but since the establishment of the State of Israel, the 1967 war and the rise of Begin, a significant minority of Jews, both in Israel and abroad, have gradually become more open about such matters" (I.Shahak op.cit.).

That is to say, apart from Jewish leaders' presenting pleas to the West from time to time for "tolerance" and "human rights" for Jews while unabatedly advancing an uncompromising Jewish

supremacy in more of Palestine than just the Israeli State, these same hardened attitudes and beliefs of senior Jews toward non-Israelis are now more openly aired, particularly when precipitated by Palestinian attacks or other Arab opposition, as for example in a 2001 instance of a former chief rabbi of Israel and later respected politician (Ovadia Yossef) who publicly stated that the Arabs should be "annihilated" with missiles because they are [spiritually] "evil and damnable", even declaring that "it is forbidden to be merciful to them."

Further, the extent of a presumed supremacy of Judaists in comparison to all others was emphasised in another statement that year by the then Jewish Prime Minister (Sharon) who declared:

"No one in this world has the right to put Israel on trial. No one. On the contrary, Israel may have the right to put others (other nations) on trial, but certainly no one has the right to put the Jewish people and the state of Israel on trial."

94. And some two years later in 2003 in response to an American led pursuit to promote a "road map" to an eventual establishment of a Palestinian State (jointly initiated in 2002 by the United States, the European Union, the U.N. and Russia), a peace plan albeit reluctantly accepted by the Palestinians and made straightly dependent on regaining their Israeli-occupied territory, that same Prime Minister rejected any return of such territory, having been reported as declaring that the return of Jewish occupied land to the Palestinians "is not an issue on the horizon" ('Jerusalem Post' newspaper, 13th May 2003 edn.).

95. Since that declaration however, international political pressure has forced a change at least in appearance whereby the eventual evacuation of most Jewish settlements in the "Gaza Strip" was advanced as having an intent to reduce the amount of Israeli citizens residing on Palestinian land when in sum, such was not the case as the amount of Israeli civilians and settlement construction in the Palestinian West Bank zone are known to have increased with the financial support of the Israeli government, despite its having intermittently acted to appease opposition to such intrusions with temporary only abstainments from settlement growth: the Jewish State claiming to have, with no grant of authority, a militant and superintending religious right to the region (the Jordanian/Palestinian Arabs having the traditional residential right to a substantial part thereof), the Jewish leaders thereby excusing themselves (on a solely religious based authority) from the multiple charges having accrued and are still accruing from the many occasions of aggravated defiance of U.N. international law (with, in 2017, settlement constructions being defiantly accelerated, and in addition,

Israel passing a law [unlawfully] legalising Israeli settlements (retrospectively), such being an expressly U.N. contravening law and a direct expression of contempt for such institution and the rest of the civilised world).

96. And albeit it being reported that Israeli illegal settlements comprise only some 3-4 per cent of West Bank territory, in a subsequent report of March 2005, jointly compelled by the United States and the then Israeli Prime Minister, its authoress, a former Israeli State Prosecutor, reported 105 "outposts" (as distinct from settlements) as having been illegally built since the mid-1990's and facilitated by Israeli government approval together with financial assistance, such "outposts" being said to be in "continual, blunt and institutional breach of [Jewish State] law, executed by the institutions of the State themselves", such action revealing a criminal-level intent to defy any lawful non-Jewish favouring legislation established for the region.

97. However following such public condemnation and the positive appearing Jewish response of a decision to take immediate action to remove such outposts, the former Jewish State Prosecutor dismissed such response as being one of a number of intentional Israeli/Jewish deceptions:

"It all continues, nothing has stopped... Let no one be fooled that just because a report has been published, and is being discussed nicely on television, that it means this has been brought to an end."

And the accuracy of such insight was shown when in June some three months later a public report declared that the number of planned constructions on non-"outpost" (but still U.N.-deemed illegal) settlements in Palestine over that time had not diminished but in defiance of international law and compared to a similar three month period beforehand, had almost doubled, with such settlements still continuing to increase in density where (despite a comparative lull in settlement construction activity during the U.S. Obama Presidency (2008-2016), as recently as 2016, the amount of scheduled new constructions was more than twice that of 2015. Such gross civil flouting of established United Nations law by the Israeli government not just confirms a continuing contempt and insolence toward a higher world authority which is of greater regional importance than the authority of the Israeli State (and so warrants decisive remedial action against it to satisfy the most recently passed 2016 U.N. resolution No.2334, which endorsed the previous 1979 resolution No.446 (still in force), the same condemning Israel for its settlement policy, which even at that time declared such settlements as having "no legal validity and constitut(ing) a serious obstruction to achieving a

comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the Middle East"), but with the lack of punitive action for such extent of international law defiance having already entrenched a material barrier between the civil comments of Judaist leaders and those of law-supporting Western civil officials, the existence of such barrier to guile-free trust thus necessitates Judaist civil comments of Western importance be finely examined when considering their merit.

98. And also in late 2016, on the draft of that same U.N. resolution being tabled, which defined the continuing illegal Jewish settlements as a "flagrant violation of international law" (the word "flagrant" being employed not in an emotional sense, but rather defining a legal position (continual re-offending without fear of warranted remedy)), the Israeli Prime Minister's office, in reportedly fearing the prohibiting of current and future settling of Israeli citizens on Palestinian land, hurriedly contacted the then U.S. President elect's (Trump) office to have him urge the outgoing President (Obama) to block or 'veto' the resolution (and so enable the Israelis to continue their enlargement of Jewish settlements on Palestinian land), the Israeli Prime Minister Netanyahu also personally contacting the President of Egypt (the sponsor of the resolution) to similarly urge Egypt's withdrawal of its support for such, with an added unambiguous blackmailing element of threatening to 'work in the U.S. Congress' against Egypt's pursuits if it did not comply with Jewish interests.

99. Such coercion by the Israeli Prime Minister was largely repeated by the U.S. President elect (Trump) who then contacted and (unsuccessfully) urged President Obama to reject the pending U.N. resolution and so facilitate the continuing of Jewish settlement construction activity rather than act to halt such, with the U.S. President-elect (Trump) also similarly telephoning the Egyptian President, after which Egypt withdrew its sponsorship of the resolution (though not relinquishing its contrary vote).

100. However with the 2016 settlement resolution being decided in the last month of U.S. President Obama's term of office and with his reportedly "no longer need(ing) to pander to the Jewish vote", Obama refused to block, or 'veto', the anti-settlement resolution, thereby allowing the Security Council to validate the collective vote of the 14 of the 15 other Council members.

101. Yet despite the rigid legitimacy of such voting event, particularly with the same involving a longstanding dispute and questions of international law, such Council ruling has been widely denigrated as invalid because of its resting on a supposedly undemocratically conducted vote (such accusation being *ad hoc* and unsustainable) with the Israeli Prime Minister

later agreeing that such vote had in fact been validly conducted, and justifying such validity by the utterance in forcibly emotional terms of his disagreement with the resolution outcome (with no legally sustainable support for such disagreement being offered), while impliedly accepting the same as now part of U.N. law, and thus determining that the Israeli Prime Minister's objection to the resolution proceeded from not a legal pursuit but primarily from a personal conviction to promote Israeli illegal takeover interests, that is, with such Israeli Prime Minister's objection to the condemnation of its illegal settlement activities being typically presented in the expressly emotional terms (and unsustainable by fact) of

- "shameful", [a word often used in Jewish argument with other like emotional terms to induce shame as a replacement for cogent fact and argument],
- "this shameful resolution" and
- "this absurd...distorted and disgraceful...resolution".

102. And despite such resolution having been not just legitimately conducted but also comprising a fulfilment of the law by having effectively restored unlawfully seized Palestinian land to its legal ownership after 37 years of illegal possession and residency (albeit the state of Israel rejecting that resolution and still continuing its West Bank occupation), such Jewish Prime Minister also issued an authority-defiant accusation against the United Nations calculated to cast a presumed deserved shame on the Security Council for their having exercised their entitlement to a free vote, which in this case finally accorded with

- (i) the longstanding concerns of the Security Council's majority condemnations of Israeli land theft, and
- (ii) the longstanding position of both Republican and Democrat administrations in the U.S. which, since 1967, have opposed Israeli settlement construction on occupied Arab land, with such opposition by those administrations having arisen consequent to illegal settlement construction, those same constructions again being unambiguously illegal under international law, with such law being enshrined in the Fourth Geneva Convention's prohibition on an occupying power transferring its civilian population to territories it occupies, this same U.S. position being reaffirmed by former U.S. President Reagan who in 1982 addressed the same issue of illegal settlement encroachment, expressly declaring that the United States

"will not support the use of any additional land for the purpose of settlements",

the immediate Jewish response however to the recent U.N. resolution No.2334 having been passed, which demanded that

"Israel immediately and completely cease all settlement activities in the occupied Palestinian territory, including east Jerusalem", was conveyed by Prime Minister Netanyahu who declared that "Israel rejects this shameful resolution...and will not abide by its terms" (thus manifesting himself as a national leader who considers himself above international law).

103. And although that same terse response is to some extent warranted by a religious idea of self-importance and

- i) the conflicting Jewish and Palestinian land claims (albeit land seizures having been conceded as unlawful even by the Israeli nation's first Prime Minister (Ben-Gurion) who declared "If I were an Arab leader, I would never sign an agreement with Israel. (The Arabs' hostility) is normal; we have taken their country."),
- ii) the Mohammedan violence following the increasing Jewish civilian encroachments, in regard to which it was internationally reported (via the BBC "World News" of 22nd July 2017):
 - "Israel says Palestinian incitement has fuelled the attacks.. (whereas) The Palestinian leadership has blamed frustration rooted in decades of Israeli occupation",
- iii) the less educated culture prevalent in Palestinian/Arab populations typical of developing countries (which by circumstances are largely compelled to perpetuate their less prosperous living conditions) and,
- iv) the Israeli Prime Minister being constrained by the pro-settlement faction of his political party, whose beliefs were recently voiced (February, 2017) on their behalf by a minister in the Jewish parliament (O.Akunis) who in a publicised belligerent statement said:

"We are voting.... on our right to the land....
We are voting... on the connection between
the Jewish people and the land. This whole
land is ours. All of it",

[where in relation to the assertion that "This whole land is ours. All of it.", a report appeared in the Australian press ("The Weekend Australian" (Magazine) July 22nd 2017 edn., in a feature article: "Man in the Middle"), that "this whole land" was

"...the prize that many political factions in the country coveted: (that is,) formalising the occupation of the West Bank into official annexation and achieving Greater (embodying all Palestine) Israel."

with such comment being followed by the definitive observation that,

"Scores of foreign journalists, diplomats and businesspeople who have lived in Israel long enough have come to this same conclusion. For the Israeli

(political right wing), the prize of Greater Israel far outweighs any criticism the country receives. In order to continue pursuing its endgame of annexing the West Bank, it can't allow the international community to form the view that the occupation is unacceptable. So reports of (Israeli) brutality in the West Bank are minimised so that international opinion does not turn against it... The problem is that the (international) media sometimes reports the reality: that it is relentlessly growing settlements, encouraged by financial incentives and a free security, the IDF (Israeli Defences Forces)..."

with that same report further stating that although such realities, including the treatment of Palestinian children by the Israeli military, are frequently reported on in the Israeli press,

"the supporters of Israel want to prevent stories like this from spreading overseas... The only way for powerful groups to manage this, then, is to attack the (international) media. As long as the media is seen as anti-Israel or anti-Semitic, the thinking goes, then Israel is not at fault... and Israel operates one of the most effective public relations machines in the world... Because Israel so brilliantly manages its reality, many people - tourists, diplomats and journalists... are shocked when they come to Israel and see the occupation up close."]

nevertheless, regardless of such considerations, it remains that the continuing illegal Israeli settlement activity on Palestinian land still stands as "a violation of international law", despite such settlement activity also being further enabled by the Jewish supported fictional claim (and as was aggravated by the intervention of the then U.S. President elect Trump prior to the passing of the recent resolution) that because Israel and its supporters hold it to be maintaining a Western democracy in the region, the U.S. has an international civil duty to protect the Jewish (State) (that is, from actions contrary to Jewish interests) and subsequently the then U.S. President (Obama) was therefore guilty in some undeclared way, of a substantial dereliction of (Jewish supporters') required 'duty', with Prime Minister Netanyahu having added an ostensibly amiable political assurance with the words "Israel looks forward to working with President-elect Trump and with all our (Jewish interest-supporting) friends in Congress, Republicans and Democrats alike, to negate the [claimed] harmful effects of this absurd... distorted and disgraceful... resolution". And with that same condemnation being uttered with a similar tenor and accusatory strength as his describing the U.N. resolution as "shameful", and such expressly emotional judgments (as are largely unsupported by

fact) being common in Jewish culture (and where a political and unquestioning support for the Jews, by Jewish reckoning, is inseparable from full support for their religion), that same condemnation of the resolution by the Israeli Prime Minister makes such strongly professed "friends" of the Jews, in supporting Israel's illegal settlement activities, in effect "stooges" when seen from a Jewish political perspective.

104. Further to such comments made by the Israeli Prime Minister after the passing of the resolution, and in distinct contrast to the declaration of former U.S. President Reagan who in 1982 had formally addressed the same issue of illegal settlement encroachment, he then (as beforementioned) having declared that the United States in accord with (the unanimously approved) resolution 242 of 1967

"will not support the use of any additional
land for the purpose of settlements",

President-elect Trump instead unfortunately continued to behave in denial of a number of decisive historical facts, and accordingly yielded to Jewish interests rather than to his own legally fortified learning and often sagacious judgment, he being moved to betray such long-established U.S. commitment, and among other similarly ill-advised comments, publicly stated that "The big loss yesterday for Israel in the United Nations will make it much harder to negotiate peace" (such being the direct opposite of the intent and stated reason for the recent resolution, as per a number of news commentaries), President Trump also adding an anti-U.N. semi-malicious comment:

"As to the U.N., things will be different after January 20th - (the U.S. Presidential inauguration date)."

105. Following the passage of such resolution, and the Israeli reaction when effectively denied United Nations approval to continue illegal settlement construction, the Jewish Prime Minister, having dismissed the vote of the U.N. Council, summoned individually to his office in Jerusalem the 12 ambassadors of the 15 member U.N. Security Council nations which have political offices in the Israeli state to appear two days later in order to be reprimanded for having supported the (democratically pursued) resolution, with no due diplomatic respect being shown for either the U.N. Security members' democratic freedom to vote freely, or for the unanimity of the vote (14 of the 15 being unanimous, with the U.S. abstention not being an opposing vote).

106. And with the Israeli Prime Minister's particular timing of conducting those same multiple reprimands on Christmas Day, and the unwarranted 'regal-like' urgency of summoning 12 U.N. Security Council members' ambassadors to his office (to no effective purpose as the resolution had already passed), coupled with the publicised Jewish emotive blaming of a number

of others involved (for their "failure" to approve further settlement activity and enlargement, and for that resolution having reaffirmed a number of previous draft resolutions as per the words of the latest resolution, that is, again, condemning such illegal settlement activity as "a flagrant violation of international law"), such Prime Minister therewith expressed a contemptuous disregard for the substantial proportion of Christian-minded persons of the Council member nations, he being in full knowledge of, yet dismissing, Christmas and its being the day of the year most honoured for both the West and for most Christians elsewhere in the world, with the same level of insulting disdain (and notwithstanding the democratic sufferance in Israel to Christians and those of other faiths to practice their religions) being inseparable in nature from the Talmudic hatred propagated concerning Christ. And that same lack of humility in refusing to accept the U.N. resolution as obligated by law and duty, even though unanimously agreed to by his United Nations peers, and the unambiguous Talmudic hatred and contempt for Christ and his teachings, was soon after again similarly evidenced by his also reportedly having provocatively, and with a denigrating use of the well known words of Christ, warned nations against taking any further actions on the issue, aggressively declaring that

"Israel is a country with national pride,
and we don't turn the other cheek",

with the Jewish reaction to the U.N. resolution thus exhibiting contempt of not just the Security Council (for their voting contrary to Jewish interests) but also of the influence of the substantial Christian component of the U.N. member nations, with such contempt being aggravated by the Jewish Prime Minister in his displaying of the same in a manner not markedly different from a controlled tantrum, and with such attitude being unconcealed from other Middle Eastern leaders, that is to say, in acting as if he himself were a superior authority or 'C.E.O.' of the U.N. Security Council, and displaying the same, as internationally reported, by the ferocity of his condemnation of a resolution none of the Security Council opposed, and soon after such episode, similarly 'reprimanding' each of those same nations' resident ambassadors on Christmas Day for their countries' vote in their passing of such resolution, and his later disparagingly using the words of Christ in a warning to nations not to support the resolution, such brash comments and behaviour by the Israeli Prime Minister, as telecast to local and international audiences, conveyed an agitation consistent with that of an angry "spoiled brat".

107. But rather than such attitude of pompous supremacy having arisen solely from the personal character of the current Israeli Prime Minister (and albeit his renowned determination to maintain and advance Jewish interests above any, even legitimate, international opposition being increasingly commended in the

Western media), more importantly, that same (Talmudically inculcated) attitude is promoted by Judaism to the extent where a presumed Biblically deemed supremacy of senior Judaists in the world is, where considered necessary, to be assertively imposed on the world's non-Judaist peoples, as was emphasised in the similarly aggressive 2001 statement by the then Jewish Prime Minister (Sharon) who (as per item 93) had declared:

"No one in this world has the right to put Israel on trial. No one. On the contrary, Israel may have the right to put others on trial, but certainly no one has the right to put the Jewish people and the state of Israel on trial."

However notwithstanding

- i) such Talmudic presumption of absolute Jewish supremacy over other peoples,
 - ii) the recent contempt by the Israeli Prime Minister, Israeli President and others, for the properly conducted and unopposed U.N. resolution No.2334,
 - iii) the legally pointless summoning of U.N. Security Council member nations' ambassadors to be 'reprimanded' for their vote,
 - iv) such 'reprimand' being scheduled to occur on Christmas day, the day of the year most honoured by both the West and other Christians worldwide, with such honour being in full measure disregarded,
 - v) the later direct warning by Prime Minister Netanyahu to other nations against taking further action against the Israeli state in relation to such U.N. resolution,
 - vi) that same warning, as was in large part addressed to predominantly Christian Western countries, incorporating express derision of the words of Christ,
 - vii) Prime Minister Netanyahu's contempt for both the United Nations and that same recent U.N. resolution being further evidenced by his having derogatorily declared such long established U.N. democratically conducted voting procedure in the matter to have been a "gang up" against the Israeli State,
 - viii) the resolution itself being reported as "critical" of Israeli settlements rather than the factually direct reporting that such settlements had unambiguously been ruled as criminal: again, the U.N. having condemned such settlement construction as illegal to the extent of being "a flagrant violation of international law", and
 - ix) the (substantially Christian) United States for example being a host country for a significant number of primarily foreign-nation allegiant Jews,
- nevertheless there exists a substantial proportion of officials in senior governmental positions in the U.S. who acting with assumed impunity dismiss the pertinence of such material facts, and masquerading as being sound-minded, contemptuously oppose both the U.N. authority and even their own country's

longstanding democratic principles and position on illegal Jewish settlements (the same having been settled prior to President Reagan's 1982 declaration), with the current (2017) House Speaker, Paul Ryan, for example, having with agitated emotion impudently advanced his support of the continuing illegal behaviour of the Jewish State leaders in his effectively joining with the Jewish community view, that is, that the U.S. abstention from the U.N. Security Council vote (which (as aforementioned) effectively supported a unanimous agreement of the 14 member majority of the Security Council to continue refusing the illegal settlements to be classified as legitimate), was "absolutely shameful" (even though no shame-causing act by any person or persons had been committed), Ryan having been more influenced by Israeli illegal expansion interests than by either U.S. or international law, he further deriding such lawfully conducted U.N. vote adding the fallacious advice

"It is time to repair the (supposed) damage done by this misguided hit job at the U.N."

And this same contempt of anyone opposing such Jewish interests is also becoming more evident in the Western media with the United Nations being accused of "incessant Israel bashing", and the United States adding to the dispute by a boycotting of certain U.N. projects and threatening to substantially cut funding to the U.N. (in effect conveying coercion and a blackmailing intent).

107a. But although the United States has been seeking a resolution to the Israeli/Palestinian land dispute since the late 1970s (albeit as of 2017 still unworkable) and in an address to the United Nations General Assembly on 1st October 2015, in appreciation of American aid, Prime Minister Netanyahu stated that,

"...in Israel, we never forget one thing. We never forget that the most important partner that Israel has, has always been, and will always be the United States of America. The alliance between Israel and the United States is unshakeable",

nevertheless the integrity of such strongly claimed alliance is directly brought into question by an express duplicity on the part of Mr. Netanyahu as is revealed in the content of an informal 2001 video recording of comments he made in an Israeli constituent's residence while considering the video equipment turned off, such recording having been secured and telecast by Israel's Channel 10 in 2010, in which he is seen and heard boasting of not just being able to manipulate United States' foreign policy on Palestine, stating (as translated)

"I know what America is...America is something that can be easily moved, moved in the right direction... They won't get in the way (of what we want)",

but of also having tricked the U.S. into allowing Israel

to further extend control over large areas of Palestinian land, thereby enabling him to state with bravado that (contrary to the syndicated news media claim of Palestinian terrorists having nullified the internationally approved 1990s Israeli/Palestinian peace agreements (the "Oslo Accords")) it was actually he himself who was responsible for their overturning, he proudly admitting,

"I de facto put an end to the Oslo Accords", and in revealing the means by which he circumvented such Accords, stated

"I was asked before the elections: 'Will you act according to them?' and I answered, 'Yes, but...I'll give such interpretation to the Accords that will make it possible for me to stop this (rush to comply with the United Nations requirement to return to the established 1967 Israeli borders)'... How did we do it?... (because) No one said what (actually) defined military sites... (so) 'Defined military sites', I said were security zones";

and in that same recording, he was seen to smile and heard recalling how he had deceptively coerced former U.S. Secretary of State Warren Christopher to agree that

"only Israel, would be the one to define what those ('security zones') are, the location of those military sites and their size..."

and then contemptuously added,

"As far as I'm concerned the whole Jordan Valley (being a major part of the Palestinian 'West Bank' territory reserved for the proposed Palestinian State) is a defined military site (and therefore counted as a security zone suitable for Israeli-empowered takeover)",

and in regard to the subsequent Israeli settlement expansions and increasing seizures of areas in the Israeli occupied Palestinian territories (under the guise of such areas being declared "military sites", thereby providing further land for solely Jewish civil interests), in that same interview he is also heard to advocate the means by which to counter Palestinian violent and unrelenting opposition to such capture of land on which they had lived for a number of generations, that is, he militarily adding that,

"The main thing, first of all, is to hit them. Not just one blow, but blows that are so painful that the price will be too heavy to be borne. The price is not too heavy to be borne, now. A broad attack on the Palestinian Authority. To bring them to the point of being afraid that everything is collapsing",

and then in disdain of a perceived gullibility on the part of all U.N. member nations, he concluded

"The world won't say a thing. The world will say we're defending (ourselves against terrorism)".

108. Yet regardless of

- i) such statements and actions of the Israeli Prime Minister as revealed in the televised exposé,
- ii) the various statements issued in support of illegal Jewish settlement activities in Palestine by both wilfully and willingly misled U.S. government officials,
- iii) the albeit predictable violent and implacable character of Palestinian reactions to their land having been seized and a foreign nation's civilians being increasingly placed on it,
- iv) the recently passed U.N. resolution No.2334 vote being later dismissed out of hand in the U.S. House of Representatives' (albeit in an "In House" "non-binding" majority decision) some two weeks after the unanimous passing of the resolution by the other U.N. Security Council member countries (including their longstanding allies Great Britain and France), with such U.S. House instead overwhelmingly voting to condemn both the U.N. Security Council decision and the Obama administration for not using the veto option to cancel the democratic decision of the Security Council majority,

it nevertheless remains that such continuing Israeli settlement construction activities are still in direct defiance of both international law as straightly expressed in the recent U.N. resolution which reaffirms that such settlements have "no legal validity", and are also in contempt of that notably observed and commented on by the U.S. Ambassador to the U.N. (S.Power) at the recent Security Council meeting:

"The U.S. has been sending messages for five decades privately and publicly that Israeli settlements in occupied land must stop", and that

"We cannot stand in the way of this resolution as we seek to preserve a chance of attaining our longstanding objective of two states living side-by-side in peace and security", Ambassador Power also advising all nations when required

"...to distinguish in their relevant dealings, between the territory of the (official) State of Israel and the territories occupied since 1967".

109. This same advice of such American representative to the U.N. was soon after made more pertinent with announcements of Jewish "accelerated settlement expansion initiatives" made shortly after the passing of the recent U.N. resolution No.2334, such announcements being

- i) one made in the week immediately following the inauguration of U.S. President Trump, that "Israel has approved...building permits for another 11,000 buildings" in East Jerusalem,
- ii) that "Separately, Israel's Defence Ministry announced

...a planned 2,500 homes in the West Bank", and that "The total settler population in the West Bank is now thought to be 550,000..."

- iii) in a third announcement within 12 days of President Trump's inauguration, that "the Israeli government approved plans to build 3,000 new homes at settlements in the West Bank", and that now "More than 600,000 Jews live in about 140 settlements built since Israel's 1967 occupation of the West Bank and East Jerusalem... There are also more than 95 outposts..." and
- iv) a fourth announcement made soon after by Prime Minister Netanyahu (while at the same time Israeli police were forcibly removing one of such unauthorised non-settlement "outposts", the same being deemed illegal even under Jewish law) who announced plans to build a wholly new settlement in the West Bank for the first time in more than two decades.

Thus with the numerous instances of variously supported Israeli illegal settlement activity and the Jews' (religion-motivated) defiance of its own (civil) government's advice and of an attempted international "road map" supposedly being in progress, any compassionate understanding of the Jewish and Palestinian issue must needs be tempered accordingly, that is, without dismissing the continuing settlement illegalities under international law.

110. That is to say, and concerning the highest civil interests of today's common law countries whose institutions have long hosted and supported individual Jewish communities, and to date have given substantially more than a hundred thousand million dollars toward sustaining by largely military means a separate Jewish State, with the United States alone in recent times reportedly giving aid at variously between two and six thousand million dollars each year (and with an additional demand to the U.S. in 1999 for example, for some seventeen thousand million dollars having been made by such Jewish State, and it having been reported in late 2016 that "the U.S. has been providing more than three thousand million US dollars ... annually in defence aid, and that will soon rise to US\$3,800 million under a new decade-long pact, the biggest pledge of U.S. military aid in history"), the increasingly promoted fallacious impression that the members of the Judaist religion not only possess a pre-eminent Semitic identity but as such, should presumably, and under pain of reprisal, be submitted to wherever possible, whether in religious or civil pursuits, warrants an extraordinarily conscientious re-education of the populations of those countries, particularly with the majority of those same populations, unlike the majority of Judaists, being discoverable as predominantly Semitic in the proper historical and racial (genetic) sense of the term.

111. Thus since contrary to both Jewish and "Neo-Nazi" beliefs, the world's body of Jews are not legitimately classifiable as a Semitic race or as an Israelite or Hebrew people, where such as the 1980 'Jewish Almanac' declares the same in the words:

"Strictly speaking, it is incorrect to call a contemporary Jew [racially] an 'Israelite' or a 'Hebrew'", (p.3), then from common law principles a caution arises as to whenever and for whatever purpose the term "anti-Semitic" is used by Jews and their supporters in opposing any matter or matters contrary to Jewish/Talmudic interests, such term in being grammatically contrived and outside the scriptural narrative possesses no Biblical authenticity, and similarly as with the terms "Israel", "Israeli", "Zionist", "Hebrew" etc., and other appropriated Biblical names and terminology which prima facie denote an Israelite ancestry, "Semitic" possesses little or no genetically racial meaning for either today's world Jewish community or Judaism's civil State, with the term "anti-Semitic" in legal analysis being no more in substance than a colloquial term meaning "against the Jewish religion".

112. One recent example of the use of such Biblical terminology which has little or no racial meaning for either today's world Jewish community or Judaism's civil state, but is nevertheless used by Jews and their supporters to oppose matters contrary to Jewish/Talmudic interests, was the concerted response by the Israeli state, as published in the international media, to UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation) in 2017 which ruled to acknowledge Hebron (the city containing the tomb in which it is believed the many-centuries pre-Jewish progenitors of the Biblical Israelites, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob were buried) as a "Palestinian heritage site". A number of reactions and emotional comments by various Israeli government representatives were reported at the time, the same opposing not only such UNESCO decision but also the United Nations member nations themselves, and act to further the Jewish claim of a Biblical Israelite racial ancestry (and hence advance the presumptive claims to Palestinian land), such reports including:

"Israel's ambassador to UNESCO (Carmel Shama-Hacohen) walked out of a session by the UN agency after learning that the Old City of Hebron had been referred to as Palestinian, not Israeli. Israeli officials slammed the move saying it overlooks the deep Jewish ties to the Biblical town.",

"A shouting match reportedly broke out between the ambassador and the Palestinian and Lebanese envoys over the issue.",

"Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu also wasn't happy, calling it 'another delusional decision by UNESCO'",

"Denouncing the UNESCO vote, Netanyahu announced that Tel

Aviv would trim a further \$1 million from the country's United Nations contribution. Israel plans to channel those funds to set up a Museum of the Heritage of the Jewish People in...Hebron."

"In the face of UNESCO's denial, the Prime Minister is determined to present to the whole world the historical truth and the thousands of years of deep Jewish roots in Hebron' the Prime Minister's Office said."

"Defence Minister Avigdor Lieberman responded by calling UNESCO a 'politically slanted organization, disgraceful and anti-Semitic, whose decisions are scandalous' "

"Jewish ties to Hebron are stronger than the disgraceful UNESCO vote' said Naftali Bennett, Israel's education minister and head of the country's national UNESCO committee", with his also being reported as having "denounced the vote and accused the U.N. agency of being 'a political tool'" and having presumptuously stated the Biblical untruth that "the Jewish connection to Hebron goes back thousands of years. Hebron, the birthplace of King David's kingdom, and the tomb of the Patriarchs, the first Jewish purchase in Israel..."

(albeit such Jewish assertion being not legitimately sustainable since the first mention of Jews in the Bible (either as individuals or a definable body) does not appear until an historical event some thirteen hundred years after the tomb was purchased (cf. item 22))

"...and resting place of our (claimed) forefathers - are (one of the Jewish) people's oldest heritage sites...(so) UNESCO's resolution must be rejected, and Jewish efforts to strengthen the city of (the alleged Jewish ancestors) increased.' "

(with that same claim to a common racial kinship with the patriarchs Abraham, Isaac and Jacob further acting to advance the continual Judaist claim of having priority land rights not just to such Patriarchs' tomb and Hebron, but by necessary implication, to the entire Israelite "promised land" in Palestine).

Yet despite the vehement insistence of an age-old familial connection as is conveyed by such statements, and with the alleged common raciality advanced as the reason and justification for Jewish claims to Palestinian land, it remains that from common-law principles and grammatical analysis such appropriated Biblical names and terminology which prima facie denote a true Israelite ancestry and shared racial identity with its Patriarchs, still possess no Biblical authenticity or authority (the Talmud having no merit in Biblical matters).

CRUX OF THE MATTER

113. Thus taken to its highest reach, the question "Who exactly are the Jewish peoples?" cannot rightly be answered in terms which rely on race, but only in terms of the group mentality acquired by the Jews from their ancient Babylonian-originated hybrid-type religion, the spirit of which having been preserved intact since its adoption in Babylon, this same religion (no less than many other religions) infusing its members with among other things a disparaging regard toward those not of their religion; with such ill-regard being readily identified by a large number of Talmudic teachings antagonistic toward Christian based and civilised society, its ethics and principles, which, notwithstanding the claims of Jewish authority that such teachings are

"amply counterbalanced..by the doctrines of benevolence and love of all men" (Graetz op.cit.) and that

"In its attitude towards non-Jews, the Jewish religion is the most tolerant of all the religions in the world" (Chwolson (1879): Do Jews Use Christian Blood?), and that at the highest level it is believed aesthetically that "the Babylonian Talmud represents God in the flesh"

(J.Neusner (1995), Rabbinic Judaism, p.62),

it nevertheless remains that those same untoward teachings have not been excised from any Talmudic writings but are devotionally preserved to this day (to which it is noted that the chief rabbi in Britain (Sacks,2002) was compelled to withdraw, under threat of Jewish court punishment, the promotion of his book declaring that Judaism may fall short of perfection, his defence being that such was written for a "Gentile" readership); such Jewish spirit also being immediately conveyed by a number of, albeit little known, teachings of the official and 'censored' first published full English language Babylonian Talmud [Soncino, 1934-48; the 'Steinsaltz' (1990-2000) edition (21 volumes) being the second], which define the nature of regard to be held by Jews for their own persons compared to that due to the other peoples of the world, as may be exemplified thus:

"If a ..[non-Jew] smites a Jew, he is worthy of death...

He who smites a..[Jew] on the jaw, is as though he had thus assaulted the Divine Presence; for it is written, One who smiteth man (that is, a Jew, as having a humanity exclusive from non-Jews) attacketh the Holy One." Sanhedrin 58b

'For murder, whether of a goi [a Hebrew word commonly used by Jews to denote non-Jews] by a goi, or of a Jew by a goi, punishment is incurred; but of a goi by a Jew, there is no death penalty....It applies (also) to the withholding of a labourer's wage. One goi from another or a goi from a Jew is forbidden, but a Jew from a goi is permitted.' Sanhedrin 57a

- "Whosoever destroys a single soul of Israel [here intended to denote the life of a Jew exclusively], Scripture imputes guilt to him as though he had destroyed a complete world; and whosoever preserves a single soul of Israel [similarly referent to Jews exclusively], Scripture ascribes merit to him as though he had preserved a complete world." Sanhedrin 37a (Jewish trans. - the corresponding Western humanitarianised quotations, as exemplified in the 1990s motion picture 'Schindler's List', notably omitting the racially/religiously qualifying words: "of Israel")
- "The (cooking) vessels of Gentiles ['goim': all non-Jewish inhabitants of the world], do they not impart a worsened flavour [to the food cooked in them]?" Abodah Zarah 67b, (and in a later place (72b): "A ..[Jew] was drawing wine through a siphon consisting of a large and small tube. A..[non-Jew] came and laid his hand upon the large tube, and [the Rabbi] disqualified all the wine [as spiritually unclean]", the foundation of such concept occurring earlier (22b): "When the serpent came unto Eve he infused filthy lust into her. If that be so the same should apply also to ..[the Jews]! [But] when..[the Jews] stood at Sinai that lust was eliminated, but the lust of ..[non-Jews], who did not stand at Sinai, did not cease.")
- "A ..[Jewish] woman should not suckle a child of a ..[non-Jew] ... (but): A [non-Jewish] woman may suckle a child of a ..[Jewish] woman, so long as there are others standing by her, but not if she is on her own." Abodah Zarah 26a
- 'A goi who studies the Torah [the 'law of Moses'] deserves death, for it is written, *Moses commanded us* a law for an *inheritance*; it is *our* inheritance, not theirs.' Sanhedrin 59a
- "No occupation is inferior to that of agricultural labour; for it is said, 'And they shall come [humiliatingly] down'" Yebamoth 63a [Concerning this teaching it has been noted (I.Shahak op.cit.) that after approximately A.D. 800 (there being "very little..known about Jewish society before A.D. 800"), "Everywhere, classical Judaism developed hatred and contempt for agriculture as an occupation and for peasants as a class, even more than for other Gentiles - a hatred of which I know no parallel in other societies."]
- 'A heathen [non-Jewish] boy causes defilement from the age of nine years and one day (and) a heathen girl communicates defilement from the age of three years and one day.' Abodah Zarah 36b-37a; it being similarly promoted that "When a grown-up man has intercourse with a little girl [less than three years and a day old] it is nothing, for when the girl is less than this it is (no more an injury than).. if one (accidentally) puts the finger into the eye." Kethuboth 11b.

'The name of God is not profaned when a Jew lies to a goi as long as it is not known by the goi.' Baba Kamma 113a

114. And further to the above are secondary Talmudic and similarly official teachings such as have been freely translated:-

"Needy goim [non-Jews] may be helped as well as needy Jews, for the sake of peace.." Maimonides' Hilkhoth Akum X,6

"A Jew may keep anything he finds which belongs to the Akum [the Christian or non-Jew], for it is written: Return to thy brethren what is lost.. For he who returns lost property (to Christians) sins against the Law by increasing the power of the transgressors of the Law. It is praiseworthy, however, to return lost property if it is done to honor the name of God, namely, if by so doing Christians will praise the Jews and look upon them as honorable people." Choschen Hammischat 266,1

"It is not permitted to sell water to an Akum (Christian) if it is known that it will be made into Baptismal [here meaning spiritually unclean] water." Iore Dea 151,1 (Hagah)

"A child must not be nursed by a Nokhri [non-Jew] if a ..[Jew] can be had; for the milk of the Nokrith hardens the heart of a child and builds up an evil nature in him." Iore Dea 81,7 (Hagah)

115. One of the strongest Western critics of official Talmudic teachings was an Elizabeth Dilling in the U.S. in the 1930s who instigated (a successful) court action against a seniormost Jewish official (in the U.S.), Stephen Wise, who had funded the first English translation of the Talmud (cf. extracts above). On the one hand, it was reported that following the out-of-court settlement of the matter, Wise made the public statement: "This meeting is to fight the mamser (Yiddish meaning 'bastard') Dilling whose lies about the Talmud have set Judaism back a decade. She dragged our sacred Talmud in the sewer..".

116. On the other hand, Dilling was reported as responding: "If I had done so, it might have helped clean it up; for a sewer is a normal channel for cleaning; The Talmud is an abnormal, diabolical channel for funnelling sub-sewage into the minds of those who follow it.. "The whole Talmudic religion would have to be revamped to bring it up to the level of a sewer... Its doctrines (were once)...(fundamentally) illegal in all civilized countries. It stands for mass murder of non-Jews, mass-enslavement of mankind and the reversal of all laws based on Old and New Testament morality."

117. In 2000 such strident criticism of the Talmud had not diminished, with one "revisionist" publisher (M. Hoffman, also a promoter of Roman Catholicism) then stating:

"The uncensored Talmud is replete with Procrustean absurdities and the filthiest and most psychotic libels and maledictions against non-Jews, women, and Bible patriarchs conceivable.

"...(There are) numerous..Talmudic citations of sexual obsessions and pathologies so foul and despicable, they would be difficult for most people to even imagine... its unexpurgated contents are perhaps the greatest single indictment of the religion of Judaism. Maybe that is why, up until recently, the study of the complete and uncensored Talmud by Gentiles was an offense punishable by death (Sanhedrin 59a)".

"Books brimming with Talmud selections may be found in stores across the land, containing passages that have been falsified outright (as the 'Schindler's List' quotation [based on Sanhedrin 37a]), or those surgically edited to limit the contents to segments which appear to impart the 'wisdom and humanitarianism of the (Jewish) sages'."

118. In addition to the Talmud being known as containing much sound educational and altruistic material, it also contains "much that is immaterial and frivolous, of which it treats with great gravity and seriousness" and which naturally reflects "an incorrect exposition of the Scriptures, accepting, as it does, tasteless misinterpretations" (Graetz (1893): History of the Jews), again it being this same Jewish-sanctified collection of material, the Talmud, that is "the written form of that which, in the time of Jesus, was called the traditions of the elders, and to which he makes frequent allusions" (op.cit.).

119. And the basically Christ-repugnant nature of this same Babylonian-Judaist spirit was again identified in recent historical times by numerous published accounts of strident, yet formal Jewish declarations such as:

a) a statement expressing continuing Jewish worldwide aspirations and achievements, as reportedly presented in a "Funeral Oration for Grand Rabbi Simeon-ben-Ihuda" made by a senior Rabbi (Reichhorn) in Prague in 1869 and which appeared in the March 10th 1921 edition of the journal 'La Vielle France' following a 1920 publication in France of a related Russian document, and the publication in England that same year of "The Protocols...of the Elders of Zion" (a copy of that same Oration also appearing in the November 27th 1933 edition of 'Libre Parole') a translation being effected in 1934 (Marsden) in his work "The Protocols of Zion": "Every hundred years, We, the

Sages of Israel, have been accustomed to meet in Sanhedrin in order to examine our progress toward the domination of the world which Jehovah has promised us, and our conquests over the enemy - Christianity.... By the ceaseless praise of Democratic Rule we shall divide the Christians into political parties, we shall destroy the unity of their nations, we shall sow discord everywhere. Reduced to impotence, they will bow before the Law of our Bank.....For ages past the sons of (Judaism), despised and persecuted, have fought bravely to prepare the way for victory. Now we are approaching our aim. We already dominate the economic life of the damned Christians; our influence preponderates over politics and over manners. At the wished for hour, fixed in advance, we shall let loose the Revolution, which by ruining all classes of Christianity will definitely enslave the Christians to us. Thus will be accomplished the promise of God made to his people",

b) a statement expressing the instigating of widespread unrest throughout all civilised countries and published in a British 1920 work 'The World Significance of the Russian Revolution' (Pitt-Rivers) by prominent Jewish personage O. Levy: "For the question of the Jews and their influence on the world past and present, cuts to the root of all things, and should be discussed by every honest thinker, however bristling with difficulties it is, however complex the subject as well as the individuals of this (religion) may be... There is scarcely an event in modern Europe that cannot be traced back to the Jews... You have noticed with alarm that the Jewish elements provide the driving forces for both communism and capitalism, for the material as well as the spiritual ruin of this world... I confess it to you, openly and sincerely, and with a sorrow... We who have posed as the saviours of the world, we, who have even boasted of having given it "the" Saviour, we are today nothing else but the world's seducers, its destroyers, its incendiaries, its executioners... We who have promised to lead you to a new heaven, we have finally succeeded in landing you into a new Hell... There has been no progress, least of all moral progress... And it is just our Morality, which has prohibited all real progress, and - what is worse - which even stands in the way of every future and natural reconstruction in this ruined world of ours... I look at this world, and I shudder at its ghastliness: I shudder all the more, as I know the spiritual authors of all this ghastliness...",

c) statements of similar substance published in 1924 in the provocative Jewish publication 'You Gentiles' (M. Samuel): "There are two life-forces in the world I know: Jewish and gentile, ours and yours....I do not

believe that this primal difference between gentile and Jew is reconcilable. You and we may come to an understanding, never to a reconciliation. There will be irritation between us as long as we are in intimate contact. For nature and constitution and vision divide us from all of you forever....We will not accept your rules (of living) because we do not understand them.... Not that WE do not know how to die for a cause. But we must die for a serious cause, for a reason, for right, for God....You have your way of life, we ours. In your system of life we are essentially without honour" ...In your system of life we must forever appear graceless; to us you must forever appear Godless. Seen from beyond both of us, there is neither right nor wrong. There is your Western civilization....In the heart of any pious Jew, God is a Jew. Is your God an Englishman or American?....Repudiation of the Jewish religion or even of Jewish (affinity) does not alter the Jew. Some of us Jews may delude ourselves as some of you gentiles do. But in effect modernization seems to have done nothing to decrease the friction between us...

We Jews, we, the destroyers, will remain destroyers forever. *Nothing* that you will do will meet our demands. We will for ever destroy because we need a world of our own, a God-world, which it is not in your nature to build...." (*author emphases*),

d) that of a similar substance reportedly declared by Jewish expositor M. Eli Ravage in an article titled 'A Real Case Against the Jews' published in the January 1928 edition of the American 'Century Monthly' magazine: "You [of Christian civilization] make much noise and fury about the undue Jewish influence in your theaters and movie palaces. Very good; granted your complaint is well-founded. But what is that compared to our staggering influence in your churches, your schools, your laws and your governments, and the very thoughts you think every day? A clumsy Russian forges a set of papers and publishes them in a book called 'The Protocols of the Elders of Zion' which shows [among other things] that we plotted to bring on the late World War (of 1914-18). You believe that book. All right. For the sake of argument we will underwrite every word of it. It is genuine and authentic. But what is that beside the unquestionable historical conspiracy which we have carried out, which we have never denied because you never had the courage to charge us with it, and of which the full record is extant for anybody to read?....You accuse us of stirring up revolution in Moscow [in 1917]. Suppose we admit the charge. What of it? Compared with what Paul [the ex-Jew] of Tarsus accomplished in Rome, the Russian upheaval is a mere street brawl.. ..Take the three principal revolutions in modern times - the French, the American and the Russian.

What are they but the triumph of the Jewish idea of social, political and economic justice?..

..We conquered you as no empire of yours ever subjugated Africa or Asia. And we did it all without armies, without bullets, without blood or turmoil, without force of any kind. We did it solely by the irresistible might of our spirit, with ideas, with propaganda.. ..You have not begun to appreciate the depth of our guilt. We are intruders. We are disturbers. We are subverters. We have taken your natural world, your ideals, your destiny, and played havoc with them. We have been at the bottom of not merely the latest great war[WWI], but of nearly all your wars,..(and) of every other major revolution in your history. We have brought discord and confusion and frustration into your personal and public life. We are still doing it. No one can tell how long we shall go on doing it" (*author emphases*),

e) a letter of similar substance reportedly written to Karl Marx by Jewish expositor Baruch Levy and subsequently published in June of 1928 in 'La Revue de Paris' and later translated: 'The Jewish people as a whole will be its own Messiah. It will attain world dominion by the dissolution of other races, by the abolition of frontiers, the annihilation of monarchy, and by the establishment of a world republic in which the Jews will everywhere exercise the privilege of citizenship. In this new world order the (Jews) will furnish all the leaders without encountering opposition. The government of the different peoples forming the world republic will fall without difficulty into the hands of the Jews. It will then be possible for the Jewish rulers to abolish private property, and everywhere to make use of the resources of the state. Thus will the promise of the Talmud be fulfilled, in which is said that when the Messianic time is come, the Jews will have all the property of the whole world in their hands',

f) that reportedly made by Rabbi A.F. Feinberg in an article published in the 5th September 1967 edition of the Canadian "Maclean's" magazine and reflecting the Jews' purpose for the racial dissolution of the world's non-Jewish peoples and in particular, those of Western Christian heritaged nations:

"If anything, the law should encourage, not forbid, the intermingling of bloods... But legislation cannot change the human heart. The only way we can accomplish that, the only way we can achieve a Final Solution to racial prejudice, is to create a melange of races so universal that no one can preen himself on his racial 'purity' or practice the barbarism to safeguard it. The deliberate encouragement of interracial marriages is the only way to hasten this process. And it may be that time is growing

short. The dominance of our world has begun to shift, like cargo in a listing vessel, from the white races to the colored. The sooner we adjust to this fact, the better it will be for our children. For we might well acknowledge, even the most enlightened of us, that we will never completely eliminate racial prejudice until we eliminate separate races";

with such article presenting the same intention to be an unshakeable aim of Judaism, the which being expressed in modern times reportedly at least as early as 1883:

"The great ideal of Judaism is that the whole world will be imbued with Jewish teachings, and that in a Universal Brotherhood of Nations, a greater Judaism in fact, all the separate races and religions shall disappear" ('The Jewish World' (London), 9th February edn.),

g) that reportedly made in 1972 by Rabbi M. Siegel and published soon after in the 18th January edition of the 'New York Magazine': "I am devoting my lecture in this seminar to a discussion of the possibility that we are now entering a Jewish century, a time when the spirit of the community, the non-ideological blend of the emotional and rational and the resistance to categories and forms will emerge through the forces of anti-nationalism to provide us with a new kind of society. I call this process the Judaization of Christianity because Christianity will be the vehicle through which this [Western] society becomes Jewish",

h) statements reportedly made in 1976 by prominent U.S. Jewish political identity Harold Rosenthal (a U.S. Senator's assistant) in a paid interview with a prominent U.S. publisher, Walter White Jnr., and published in the journal 'Western Front': "At first, by controlling the banking system we were able to control corporation capital. Through this, we acquired total monopoly of the movie industry, the radio networks and the newly developing television media. The printing industry, newspapers, periodicals and technical journals had already fallen into our hands. The richest plum was still to come when we took over the publication of all school materials. Through these vehicles we could mold (sic) public opinion to suit our own purposes. The people are only stupid pigs that grunt and squeal the chants we give them, whether they be truth or lies... We Jews have put issue upon issue to the American people. Then we promote both sides of the issue as confusion reigns. With their eyes fixed on the issues, they fail to see who is behind every scene. We Jews toy with the American public as a cat toys with a mouse... There is no such thing as the "silent majority" for we control their cry and hue(sic). The only thing that exists is an unthinking majority and unthinking they will remain as long as their escape from

our rigorous service is the opiate of our entertainment industry. By controlling industry we have become the task masters and the people the slaves. When the pressure of daily toil builds to an explosive degree, we have provided the safety valve of momentary pleasure. The television and movie industries furnish the necessary temporary distraction. These programs are carefully designed to appeal to the sensuous emotions, never to the logical thinking mind. Because of this, the people are programmed to respond according to our dictates, not according to reason...

...We have castrated society through fear and intimidation... Being so neutered, the populace has become docile and easily ruled... their thoughts are not involved with the concerns of the future and their posterity, but only with the present toil and the next meal... With our control of the text-book industry and the news media, we have been able to hold ourselves up as the authorities on religion... We are amazed by the Christians' stupidity in receiving our teachings and propagating them as their own. Judaism is not only the teaching of the synagogue, but also the doctrine of every Christian Church in America. Through our propaganda the Church has become our most avid supporter. This has given us a special place in society, their believing the lie that we are the 'chosen people' and they, gentiles... These deluded children of the Church defend us to the point of destroying their own culture. This truth is evident even to the dullard when one views history and sees that all wars have been white fighting white in order that we maintain our control. We controlled England during the Revolutionary War, the North during the Civil War, and England and America during World War I and II. Through our influence of religion we were able to involve the ignorant white Christians in war against themselves which always impoverished both sides while we reaped a financial and political harvest. Anytime truth comes forth which exposes us, we simply rally our forces — the ignorant Christians. They attack the crusaders even if they are members of their own families... Through religion we have gained complete control over society, government and economics... The gullible clergy in one breath instruct their parishioners that we are a special, chosen people while in another breath proclaim all races are the same... Their inconsistency is never discovered. So we Jews enjoy a special place in society while all other races are reduced to common equality. It is for this reason we authored the equality hoax, thereby reducing all to a lower level... The American people have been easily ruled through our propaganda that the pen is mightier than the sword. We virtually get away with murder, and all the goy do is to talk about it, which is ineffective since we, the masters of propaganda, always publish a contradicting account..." , and

i) those concerning extreme yet wholly Talmudic claims of a genetically based spiritual superiority above non-Jews and made for example by such as Y. Ginzburg who stated: "We have to recognize that Jewish blood and the blood of a goy (considered inferior to Jews) are not the same thing" ("The New York Times" newspaper, June 6th 1989 edn.); and also in the same spirit: "Jewish life has an infinite value. There is something infinitely more holy and unique about Jewish life than non-Jewish life" ("Jewish Week", April 26th 1996 edn.).

120. And today, the danger to the fundamental integrity and welfare of the Jews' 'host' nations from the effect of such Talmudic aims now pervading them is no less reduced (that is, notwithstanding the communication and publishing freedoms now afforded by the Internet), with that same danger having been brought to public attention in modern historical times from reportedly as early as 1787 in the United States for example, by the American personage Benjamin Franklin at the U.S. Constitutional Convention of that year, he subsequently being published as expressing such an apprehension to other participants of that Convention in the words:

"Gentlemen, in whichever land the Jews have settled in any great numbers, they have lowered its moral tone, depreciated its commercial integrity, have segregated themselves and have not been assimilated. They have sneered at and tried to undermine the Christian religion upon which that nation is founded, by objecting to its restrictions; have built up a State within a State: and when opposed, have tried to strangle that country financially",

the same being no less observed earlier this century (1920) by the formerly mentioned U.S. personage (and pro-Semitic "World Jewry" scholar) Henry Ford that:

"...before Jewish influence began to be felt in American business, sound quality and fair price were the rule. It is the Jews' ceaseless boast that wherever they go they change business, but not for the better....In every movement toward a lower standard, a looser relationship, especially toward the overthrow of old Christian safeguards, do not Jewish names predominate?" ('The International Jew', Vol.IV, p.225),

with the same promotion of lower standards remaining undiminished in present times where it was declared by the entertainment critic, M. Medved, in his book "Hollywood vs. America" (1992), which concerned the character of modern films (the Hollywood industry having been long dominated by Jews, with such domination being again publicised in 2001 via an internationally televised documentary):

"Hollywood no longer reflects - or even respects - the values of most..families.. ..On many of the important issues in contemporary life, popular [Jewish compliant]

entertainment seems to go out of its way to challenge conventional notions of decency" [with an overriding intent to subvert the same], (such industry being also condemned in a 2000 U.S. government report for 'routinely' aiming to entice and corrupt the minds of teenage children throughout the country), with in 2002, Medved's pointed criticism being also applicable at large not just to North America but to entertainment and media industries throughout the Western and Western-influenced parts of the world, he also adding (in 2002):

"American popular music has never been so ugly, so profane, so degrading, so lacking in any restraints at all, so ready to promote larceny and rape", and in relation to such new 'post-Christian' culture: "There's no question that mass media have led that trend. They haven't just followed it".

CONCLUSION OF THE MATTER

121. Thus despite the many differences of Jewish opinion on their religion (multi-opinions being also characteristic of Talmudic writings, with there being even a popular Jewish aphorism to that effect: 'when you get two Jews together you get three opinions'), since the spirit of the religion and of any person professing to be a Jew is inseparably allied to the teachings of the Talmud (it long being taught that 'The study of Judaism is that of the Talmud, as the study of the Talmud is that of Judaism, they being one and the same..'), then with 'the modern Jew being the product of the Talmud', and the question "Who exactly are the Jewish peoples?" as asked in a Western civil context, which immediately becomes relevant to the preserving of the foundations of Western society, it can be reasonably answered that for the Western world at least, and without disregard of the many acclaimed achievements therein of individual Jews, any governmental approval of any unambiguously Jewish based civil enterprise which gives perceptible bias to the Jewish religion over and above the foundational principles of Western law and culture, thus acts to further the now declining enjoyment of public freedoms, standards of decency and just judgement in such countries, with it being solely by virtue of the 'good fortune' that all Christianised/common law countries' constitutions are founded on such distinctively un-Talmudic ideals as: "Love your enemies, do good to them which hate you, bless them that curse you, and pray for them which despitefully use you" (Luke 6:27) etc., which has made it possible for many others socially less fortunate, including the Jews, to acquire and enjoy full residency within such nations.

122. Noting there exists a significant difference in spirit between fundamental Judaist beliefs and the basis of common law grounded societies, it was professorially concluded in 1994 that although

"..the talmudic system is most dogmatic and does not allow any relaxation in its rules even when they are reduced to absurdity by a change of circumstances...(and that) the Talmudic meaning, even where it is contrary to the literal sense, is always the operational one...(nevertheless)... The road to a genuine revolution in Judaism – to making it humane, allowing Jews to understand their own past, thereby re-educating themselves out of its tyranny – lies (solely) through an unrelenting critique of the Jewish religion. Without fear or favour, we must speak out against what belongs to our own past.."(I.Shahak op.cit.).

123. That is, considering such past of the Jews and Judaism's present civil influence in the world, any proper understanding of long established Jewish goals must include not just their historical involvement with Christian nations (in which a majority of Jews have enjoyed residency), but also their harbouring of a notable spiritual hostility toward the foundations of those same 'host' nations, independent of outward appearances. Thus without taking into account such inherent hostility when intending an objective analysis of Judaism, a proper perception of the drive and spiritual purpose of the religion cannot be gained.

124. Therefore concerning the element of Judaism as is prominent in its modern civilised host countries, and independent of the history of that religion and its followers, it remains that whether recognised or not, a civil duty rests at all times upon all the citizens of those civilised nations, whether indigenous or otherwise, and particularly those professing the Jewish religion, to vigorously resist anything recognisably opposed to the fundamental spirit and freedoms preserved in the established law of such lands, especially with the exact same spirit and freedoms of such countries being unremittingly threatened by one of the most revered Talmudic teachings inculcated into persons raised in a Judaist environment: that which promotes the ultimate dissolution of all nations' highest ethical foundations and a replacement of such with its own, with the extraordinary Jewish "Protocols of Zion" publication revealing the means by which such replacing has long been proceeding.

The preceding information provides a number of definitive answers to a range of educated enquiries of modern interest, and an addendum containing an inspection and overview of the Jewish religion and its impact on "Judeo-Christian" Western society, with all the above matters being presented as sustainable common law-grounded resolutions determined by the available evidence, legal argument and rules governing English statutory drafting: all such conclusions thus being advanced as hardline judicial assessments with the ability to withstand scholars' or jurists' most forcible arguments to the contrary.