

WEEP OVER JERUSALEM

The Gospel Truth About The Jews



Clement Pulaski

Copyright 2014

truesonsofabraham.com

Weep Over Jerusalem is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 3.0 Unported License](#).

Anyone is free to copy, distribute and transmit *Weep Over Jerusalem* in its entirety or individual chapters as long as the author is credited, the text is unaltered, and it is not done for commercial purposes.

Cover artwork taken from “The Destruction of the Temple of Jerusalem” by Francesco Hayez, 1867.

1. Weep Over Jerusalem

Every year, Christian supporters of Zionism gather at a conference organized by the group Christian United for Israel (CUFI). At this event, American and Israeli flags are displayed side by side while Jewish and Christian speakers share the stage. These speakers laud the indissoluble bond between American Christians and the Jewish state.

Many of the speakers at this event are Jews who reject Jesus. These Jews deny that Jesus is the Christ. The Incarnation, the Passion, the Resurrection—to the Jews, these are all lies. According to the Bible:

Who is a liar but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ? He is antichrist, that denieth the Father and the Son.
-1 John 2:22

Therefore, these Jews who deny that Jesus is the Christ are themselves antichrists.

This refusal to accept Jesus as the Messiah is a great tragedy that should be lamented, and this is exactly how our Savior saw it. When Jesus considered Jerusalem, the great city of his people, it was with unbearable sadness. The Lord was dismayed that “*He came unto his own, and his own received him not*” (John 1: 11) and that his very own Jerusalem was to reject her savior and on that account undergo great sufferings in this world and the next.

O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, which killest the prophets, and stonest them that are sent unto thee; how often would I have gathered thy children together, as a hen doth gather her brood under her wings, and ye would not!
-Luke 13:34

And when he was come near, he beheld the city, and wept over it, Saying, If thou hadst known, even thou, at least in this thy day, the things which belong unto thy peace! but now they are hid from thine eyes. For the days shall come upon thee, that thine enemies shall cast a trench about

thee, and compass thee round, and keep thee in on every side, And shall lay thee even with the ground, and thy children within thee; and they shall not leave in thee one stone upon another; because thou knewest not the time of thy visitation.

-Luke 19:41-44

The Lord loved Jerusalem, and wished to bring her salvation, but she refused it.

Returning now to the CUFI conference in contemporary America, how do the Christians in this audience react when they listen to the words of antichrist Jews, Jews who live in darkness because they refuse the light of the world? The Christians cheer. They applaud with heartfelt approbation. The faithlessness which made our Savior weep is a delight to these contemporary Christians. These Christians are guilty of the heresy of judeophilia, or “love of the Jews”. Judeophiliacs believe that even though the Jews reject Christ and the Gospel, they should still be venerated because they are the physical descendants of Abraham and claim to maintain certain religious traditions of the Old Testament era. Throughout the pages of this book, I will expose and refute this false opinion.

The refusal of the Jews to accept the New Covenant was heartbreaking for our Savior. Let us strive to follow in his footsteps, to imitate Christ in this point, as in every other. Instead of greeting Jews with smiles and cheers, let us greet them with weeping and loving rebuke. Before we begin to consider the details of Christian-Jewish relations, let us make the mind and heart of Christ our own. Let us weep over Jerusalem and her sinful obstinacy.

2. Christians And Jews Do NOT Worship The Same God

It is commonly held that both Christians and Jews worship the same God. This is patently false. As Christians, we worship the Holy Trinity—the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit—while the Jews do not. In fact, the Jews mock and ridicule the Incarnation, explicitly rejecting the Son. “But,” someone might say, “while they may reject Christ, don't the Jews still worship the God of the Old Testament?” Let us look to Scripture for our answer.

The Bible says, “*Whosoever denieth the Son, the same hath not the Father: he that confesseth the Son hath the Father also*” (1 John 2:23). The meaning of this passage is clear. It is impossible to reject Christ and belong to the God of Abraham. Jesus in his own words says, while addressing the Father, “*all things that are mine are thine, and thine are mine*” (John 17:10). Those who reject the Son do not belong to the Son, and they do not belong to the Father. The Jews may think they worship the God of the Old Testament, but in reality they only worship a false god of their own design, a god which is based upon the false beliefs of the Pharisees.

3. The Old Testament Is A Christian Text

Many misinformed Christians think that there is a natural affinity between Christians and Jews because we use the same book, the Old Testament. While it is true that contemporary Jews hold that the Old Testament is a divine text, this does not make them friends of the Church. The Jews horribly misinterpret and do not truly **believe** in the Old Testament. Our Lord explicitly states this in the Gospel of John, when he says to the Jews, “*had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me: for he wrote of me. But if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words?*” (John 5:46-47). Christ says that it is possible for the Jews to read the Old Testament and think it to be divinely inspired, and yet still not truly believe the words. The Jews might respect Moses, but they do not believe him or understand him. If they did believe Moses, then they would accept Jesus as the Messiah. As Christians, we know that any understanding of the Old Testament that rejects Christ is false.

The Jewish understanding of the Old Testament slanders Christ, denying that he is the Holy One promised in the Law and the Prophets, and therefore the Jewish understanding of the Old Testament cannot lead to salvation. Jesus says this to the Jews earlier on in the same chapter, “*Search the scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life: and they are they which testify of me. And ye will not come to me, that ye might have life*” (John 5:39-40). The meaning of this passage could not be more clear: the Jews diligently read the Scriptures, thinking that they gain eternal life, but they do not have the life because they reject Christ. Their understanding does not come from God. It is a false, man-made understanding that obscures the truth and leads to destruction. “*There is a way which seemeth right unto a man, but the end thereof are the ways of death*” (Proverbs 14:12).

According to the Jews, the Old Testament is *their* text, and Christians borrow it from them. Secularists also teach this view. The true Christian view, however, is that the Old Testament is exclusively *our* text, because we alone believe what is written in it. The Jews borrow it from us and distort its meaning, thereby cutting themselves off from salvation.

4. Christians Are The True Sons Of Abraham

...if ye are Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, heirs according to promise.

-Galatians 3:29

Many people assert that Christianity was derived from Judaism, and that Judaism is the older religion of the two. This opinion is universal among secular scholars, and unfortunately many Christians have come to accept this falsehood as well. An accurate understanding of the Bible reveals that Christianity and the religion of the ancient Israelites are one and the same, and that it is Judaism that is a more recent schism from the True Faith. Christianity stretches all the way from Abraham up to the modern-day followers of Jesus, whereas the religion known as Judaism came to be the first moment a Hebrew heard the words of Jesus and rejected them. The rejection and crucifixion of Jesus is the foundational act of the Jewish religion.

The Old Testament nation of Israel is the root of faith, of which we become partakers when made members of the Church. Paul uses the imagery of a root and its branches when discussing the apostasy of the Jews and the conversion of the Gentiles, saying,

some of the branches be broken off, and thou, being a wild olive tree, wert grafted in among them, and with them partakest of the root and fatness of the olive tree...because of unbelief they were broken off, and thou standest by faith.

-Romans 11:17, 20

Here we see that the faithless Jews are no longer members of Israel, no longer partakers of the life of the covenant. Paul says that those who lack faith in Jesus Christ, who is the fulfillment of

the ancient promise, are not to be considered Israel:

they are not all Israel, which are of Israel: Neither, because they are the seed of Abraham, are they all children....They which are the children of the flesh, these are not the children of God: but the children of the promise are counted for the seed.

-Romans 9:6-8

Those Jews who are physical descendants of Abraham but who reject Jesus are not true sons of Abraham. The true sons of Abraham are those who imitate Abraham's obedience to God when they accept God's Anointed One who came into the world for our salvation.

The tree to which the ancient Israelites belonged is the same tree onto which Christians are grafted. Through the sacred history we can trace the development of this root of faith: from Abraham, to Moses, to David, to the Prophets, to Christ, to the Apostles, and thence to the Church. This flourishing tree, planted and tended by the Lord, stretches forth from our father Abraham to the congregations of the faithful the world over; but those who reject the Son of God, the light of the world, in no way are nourished by the sap of this tree, and therefore live in darkness.

5. Jews: The Pharisees Of Today

As Christians, our foremost duty is to strive to imitate Christ. Through the example of his life, Christ showed the world what it means to live as an obedient son of God. We must look to the Bible to learn what Christ loved, what Christ commanded, what Christ condemned, and what Christ fought against. This last point is especially important for Christians today. During his earthly ministry, Jesus sought to undermine the teachings of the Pharisees and destroy their influence. Jesus condemned the Pharisees more harshly than any other group, either Jewish or pagan, saying that the Pharisees do not enter into the kingdom of heaven (Matthew 23:13) and calling them sons of hell (Matthew 23:15). For their part, the Pharisees were so offended by the Gospel message that they plotted to murder our Savior: “*the Pharisees went out, and held a council against him, how they might destroy him*” (Matthew 12:14). We Christians are therefore bound to follow our Lord and condemn the Pharisees and their teachings, not only the Pharisees of 2000 years ago, but also the Pharisees of today.

To determine the identity of the Pharisees of today, we turn to the history of the second century AD, when the victory of the Roman empire over the rebellious Jews resulted in the expulsion of the Jews from Palestine. The following information and quotes are drawn from a mainstream Jewish source, the Jewish Encyclopedia. These are not anti-Jewish views but rather the views held by Jews themselves.

According to the Jewish Encyclopedia¹, the Pharisees gained prominence as a theological faction during the second Temple period. Their chief rivals were the Sadducees, who

1 From the entry for “PHARISEES” in the 1906 Jewish Encyclopedia.
<http://www.jewishencyclopedia.com/articles/12087-pharisees> (accessed 11/16/14)

represented the Temple priests. Over the centuries, the teachings of the Pharisees gained more and more favor and became dominant in Israel. The Pharisees were responsible for “[t]he very institution of the synagogue for common worship and instruction,” which shifted focus away from the Temple as the sole site of worship. The Pharisees introduced changes in religious practice in several different areas, including the festivals, the keeping of the Sabbath, and legal decisions. By the time of Christ, the Pharisees were already a very large and influential group, who had gradually lessened the influence of the priestly Sadducees. It is no wonder then that the Pharisaic teachings became even more powerful when the Temple was destroyed and the Jews were scattered:

with the destruction of the Temple the Sadducees disappeared altogether, leaving the regulation of all Jewish affairs in the hands of the Pharisees. Henceforth Jewish life was regulated by the teachings of the Pharisees; the whole history of Judaism was reconstructed from the Pharisaic point of view...A new chain of tradition supplanted the older, priestly tradition...Pharisaism shaped the character of Judaism and the life and thought of the Jew for all the future.

This “new chain of tradition” was the foundation of the rabbinic teaching of today, and the modern rabbis are the direct intellectual descendants of the Pharisees. Over time, the rabbis came to be seen as “the authoritative teachers of the Law...who are the appointed spiritual heads of the community”.² Given these facts, we should feel confident in saying that modern Judaism is Pharisaism, and that the Jews are the Pharisees of today.

Someone might object that while today's rabbis are guilty of propagating the errors of the Pharisees, surely individual Jews will not be condemned because of the wickedness of their spiritual leaders. In response to this objection, let us turn to the words of Jesus:

*woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! **for ye shut up the kingdom of heaven against men: for ye neither go in yourselves, neither suffer ye them that are entering to go in.***

-Matthew 23:13

Here we see that followers of false teachers rightly suffer for their teachers' error. The followers of the Pharisees are estranged from the Kingdom and dwell in the same spiritual darkness.

² From the entry for “RABBI” in the 1906 Jewish Encyclopedia.
<http://www.jewishencyclopedia.com/articles/12494-rabbi> (accessed 11/16/14)

Today's rabbis preach against the Gospel, teaching their followers not to accept Jesus as the Messiah, and the Jews who listen to their rabbis will not gain salvation. By supporting their rabbis and either explicitly or tacitly acknowledging rabbinic authority and teaching, all Jews make themselves enemies of Christ and his Church.

Let us turn now to some of the specific points of Christ's condemnation of the Pharisees, points that apply to the Jews of today:

Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites!...Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of hell? Wherefore, behold, I send unto you prophets, and wise men, and scribes: and some of them ye shall kill and crucify; and some of them shall ye scourge in your synagogues, and persecute them from city to city: That upon you may come all the righteous blood shed upon the earth, from the blood of righteous Abel unto the blood of Zacharias son of Barachias, whom ye slew between the temple and the altar.

-Matthew 23:29-35

In this passage, Jesus lays out the guilt of the Pharisees. They are guilty not only of crimes that they have actually committed themselves, but also of crimes committed long ago by their spiritual forebears. He says that if the Pharisees had been alive at the time, they would have persecuted the prophets or supported those who did. We see therefore that the Jews of today incur tremendous guilt by accepting the teachings of the Pharisees. If modern Jews support the pharisaic rabbis who teach against the Gospel, why would they not have supported the Pharisees who actively opposed Christ during his lifetime? If anything, the Jews of today possess an even greater guilt. The Pharisees who persecuted Christ lived before the resurrection and the descent of the Holy Spirit, at a time when the Gospel was still preached in parables. But the Jews of today have persisted in their stubborn unbelief despite the loud and universal preaching of the Gospel for the last 2000 years.

If anyone still insists that the above passage from Matthew 23 applies only to the Pharisees and not to Jews in general, we turn to 1 Thessalonians. In this epistle, the apostle Paul speaks of:

the Jews, who both killed the Lord Jesus, and their own prophets, and have persecuted us; and they please not God, and are contrary to all men: Forbidding us to speak to the Gentiles that they might be saved.
 -1 Thessalonians 2:14-16

It is significant to note that Paul says that Jesus was killed by the Jews, not by the Pharisees or Jewish leadership. By this early period, the Bible already uses the term “Jew” to refer to the unbelieving enemies of God, not to faithful holders of the covenant. This point is absolutely essential to developing a Biblical understanding of the Jews.

One of the main subjects of the Bible is salvation history, which includes the account of the fall of man, the establishment of a special covenant with Abraham, and the life and passion of Jesus Christ. In this history, we see the establishment of the nation of Israel and the Church. As time progressed, God gave his people new revelations and commandments, changing in different ways the practices of the faithful. For example, an Israelite living in the time of the Judges was under no obligation to obey a king, but after God established the monarchy, a Israelite would be obligated to obey a king. Similarly, the Old Testament Israelites did not have the Lord's Supper, a sacrament instituted by Christ during his earthly ministry, but believers who live after the time of Christ are required to partake of this sacrament. When we look to the Bible for how to live our lives, we must take into account what the Bible teaches on a subject during the most recent phase of salvation history. Thus when we consider the Jews of today, we must think of them as the wicked Pharisees of the New Testament, not the venerable patriarchs of the Old Testament. To have a Biblical view of the Jews is to have a New Testament view of the Jews. The righteous Jews of the first century accepted Jesus as the Messiah, and in the above passage from 1 Thessalonians, Paul assigns the guilt of the murder of Christ to all Jews who reject him, not just to certain individual Jews. We must bear in mind this distinction between the Jews of the Old and New Testaments when we look at the Jews of today and understand why Paul never tells the Christians of his time to support the political or foreign policy ambitions of the Pharisees. When we offer our support to the current Zionist state, we do not aid David or Samuel, but we aid the Pharisees who crucified our Lord. This is a complete contradiction of our duty to imitate Christ and puts the soul of the Christian in danger.

6. Fellowship With Darkness

In our wicked age, many millions of Christians have fallen into the serious error of believing the Jews to be spiritual brothers and allies. This unbiblical opinion inverts the truth and makes Christians active supporters of blasphemy and proponents of the worst enemies of the Church. We must recognize that according to Scripture all who deny that Jesus is the Christ, including the Jews, are impious enemies, and furthermore, that the Jews who reject their own Messiah are especially guilty of condemnation.

The faith is always assailed by enemies from every direction, and many of these enemies are very easy to recognize:

Who is a liar but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ? He is antichrist, that denieth the Father and the Son. Whosoever denieth the Son, the same hath not the Father.

-1 John 2:22-23

From this verse we see that the Jews of today, who do not accept Jesus as their Messiah, are godless antichrists. We Christians must acknowledge this truth and not shy away from any part of God's word. The Bible says that those who reject Jesus are antichrists. It does not say that those who reject Jesus are antichrists unless they are fleshly sons of Abraham. Being Jewish by blood does not grant special spiritual privileges or exempt anyone from the ancestral curse caused by Adam's sin. The apostle Paul confirms this in the following passage. In describing the baseness of our unredeemed state, he says:

...both Jews and Gentiles...are all under sin; As it is written, There is none righteous, no, not one: There is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God. They are all gone out of the way, they are together

become unprofitable; there is none that doeth good, no, not one. Their throat is an open sepulchre; with their tongues they have used deceit; the poison of asps is under their lips: Whose mouth is full of cursing and bitterness: Their feet are swift to shed blood: Destruction and misery are in their ways: And the way of peace have they not known: There is no fear of God before their eyes.

-Romans 3:9-18

Paul says this of Jews and Gentiles because both are in need of the same salvation. Following this description of fallen humanity, Paul says that only faith in Jesus Christ can save us from the curse. Therefore those who obstinately persist in refusing Christ can rightfully be described using this language. In accordance with Scripture we say of the Jews that “*with their tongues they have used deceit; the poison of asps is under their lips*”, and that as long as they persist in their false beliefs, the Jews have “*no fear of God before their eyes*”.

While I acknowledge that the above passages from 1 John and Romans are about all unregenerate mankind and not about Jews exclusively, I believe that the wickedness of the Jews should be emphasized for two reasons.

First, it is important to focus on the Jews precisely because Christians are so confused on this subject. We do not see any formal alliances being made between Christians and atheists, Christians and Muslims, Christians and Hindus, etc., because Christians understand that all of these groups are enemies of the Church. Of all Christ-deniers, only the Jews are seen by Christians as friends and allies, and many Christians eagerly court the favor of this particular group of antichrists. The central belief of Judaism, that the Messiah has not yet come, is an evil and blasphemous opinion. To give legitimacy to this evil opinion and to praise those who hold it is a grave danger for the Christian. We invite God's wrath, ignoring the words of Isaiah: “*Woe unto them that call evil good, and good evil*” (Isaiah 5:20). By rejecting the Messiah, the Jews have cut themselves off from salvation, and yet countless Christians foolishly support the Jews and praise their piety. There is nothing praiseworthy in the false notions of the Jews, and to say otherwise is to speak evil.

Secondly, in addition to the above passages that testify to the loathsome condition of all antichrists, we also find passages in the Bible that mention the unique depravity of the apostate

Jews who rejected their own Messiah. In this passage Jesus speaks to these faithless Jews:

Then began he to upbraid the cities wherein most of his mighty works were done, because they repented not: Woe unto thee, Chorazin! woe unto thee, Bethsaida! for if the mighty works, which were done in you, had been done in Tyre and Sidon, they would have repented long ago in sackcloth and ashes. But I say unto you, It shall be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon at the day of judgment, than for you. And thou, Capernaum, which art exalted unto heaven, shalt be brought down to hell: for if the mighty works, which have been done in thee, had been done in Sodom, it would have remained until this day. But I say unto you, That it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom in the day of judgment, than for thee.
-Matthew 11:20-24

Jesus begins by saying to these Jews that they are more obstinate and less open to the Gospel than the gentiles would be, and goes so far as to say that their immorality is worse than that of Sodom. How can we call these Christ-denying Jews a blessed people when Jesus' own words tell us that their eternal punishment will be worse than what is in store for the sinners of Sodom and Gomorrah?

The calling of Abraham was the highest calling imaginable, and faithfulness to the calling resulted in the greatest reward, whereas faithlessness resulted in the greatest punishment. Israel was a special nation chosen by God, but they were chosen to bring forth the Messiah, not to glory in their own flesh. The Lord came to this people to offer them the kingdom of heaven, and the faithful Jews who accepted this gift were the apostles on whom the Church was built. Those who rejected the gift, however, were cursed by His words. This egregious sin of the Jews, refusing to repent when the grace of God is offered, is something that all Christians must condemn. If we refer to the Jews as the sons of Abraham, we must also make clear that those Jews who do not accept Jesus are wicked antichrists for whom the judgment will be worse than for Sodom and Gomorrah. We must be careful not to fall recklessly into the same fate by praising these antichrists. Woe unto them that call evil good, woe unto them that say antichrists are righteous.

7. The Satanic Pact At Seelisberg

During World War II and immediately following, a widespread distaste for National Socialist anti-Semitism was fostered in the USA and Western Europe. The Jews exploited this distaste and were successful in drawing Christians away from the Biblical teaching on the wickedness of the Pharisaic Jewish religion. As part of their efforts, the Jews established the International Council of Christians and Jews (ICCJ), an organization devoted to “Christian-Jewish dialogue”. Of course whenever Jews engage in “dialogue” with Christians, the only allowable topic of discussion is how to help the Jews by making Christianity more Jew-friendly.

The ICCJ arranged a meeting of 65 Christians and Jews during the summer of 1947 in Seelisberg, Switzerland. This group, which included rabbis as well as Protestant and Catholic clergy, produced a document known as the 10 Points of Seelisberg.³ The Christians who endorsed this document entered into a Satanic pact: they repudiated the teaching of the Bible and the tradition of the Church at the direction and instigation of Pharisaic rabbis, and they did this in order to win the favor of the world. At the time, the secular culture had already become fiercely liberal and anti-Christian, and Christian doctrine was blamed, at least in part, for the events of the War. Rather than stand firm against the calumnies of the Jews and gentile liberals and say that Christian doctrine is true and unalterable, the cowardly clergy yielded to worldly pressure and sought the approval of unbelievers by condemning previous generations of Christians as sinful “anti-Semites”. The Seelisberg Pact is a clear, succinct expression of the heresy of judeophilia—the false doctrine that Christianity and Judaism are somehow compatible

3 *The 10 Points of Seelisberg*, 1947. From the website *Jewish-Christian Relations*, sponsored by the International Council of Christians and Jews.
http://www.jcrelations.net/An_Address_to_the_Churches_Seelisberg_Switzerland_1947.2370.0.html?id=960 (accessed 11/16/14)

rather than diametrically opposed. The ideas expressed by the Pact have become mainstream in today's churches, and therefore deserves careful scrutiny and refutation.

In the following paragraphs, I provide a close reading of the Seelisberg Pact and show that the 10 points are meant to undermine the message of the Bible. The introduction to the Seelisberg Pact from the ICCJ website reads:

The following statement, produced by the Christian participants at the Second conference of the newly formed International Council of Christians and Jews, was one of the first statements following World War II in which Christians, with the advice and counsel of Jews, began to come to terms with the implications of the Shoa (Holocaust).

At once we see the two major misconceptions associated with heretical judeophilia: 1) that the Church should change its teachings because of the events of WWII, and 2) that Jews are qualified to give advice to Christians on theological matters.

All Christians should understand that actions carried out by sinful men, including those from a Christian cultural background, have absolutely no bearing on the truth of the Scriptures. We must make our every thought subject to Christ and not alter his message to suit the times. Regarding the second point, we must recognize that allowing the input of Jews, or of any unbelievers, to influence Christian theological decisions is completely unacceptable. The Jews absurdly claim that their unique historical suffering gives them the right to interfere with Christianity, as if unbelievers who have been maltreated by others thereby become authorities on Christian doctrine. When Jesus was being arrested and Peter inappropriately used violence against their enemies, Jesus rebuked him for it, but Jesus did not tell Peter to look to the priests and the Pharisees for guidance on interpreting the Gospel message. Those who came to arrest Christ were spiritually blind, and no amount of injustice or violence done to the spiritually blind makes them theological authorities.

Concerning the Pact itself, the text begins by saying that the anti-Semitism that was prevalent in the National Socialist regime threatens “*to poison the minds of Christians and to involve humanity more and more in a grave guilt with disastrous consequences*”. This is a common tactic used by the Jews to attack the Church: they claim that all Christians harbor latent fascist tendencies that can be awakened at any moment unless Christians enlist the healing

wisdom of the Jews to purge themselves of “sinful” anti-Semitism. According to the Jews, throughout the 19 centuries of the Church's existence, the faithful had been unable to remove the “poison” of anti-Semitism, and only by letting the Jew meddle with Christian doctrine could Christians avoid future “guilt”. The text continues:

*The Christian Churches have indeed always affirmed the un-Christian character of antisemitism, **as of all forms of racial hatred**, but this has not sufficed to prevent the manifestation among Christians, in various forms, of an indiscriminating racial hatred of the Jews as a people. This would have been impossible if all Christians had been true to the teaching of Jesus Christ on the mercy of God and love of one's neighbour.*

Here we see one of the main tactics of confusion used by the Jews against Christians: by associating Christian doctrine on Judaism with racial beliefs, Christians somehow become responsible for racial theories about the Jews promoted by secular authorities. The National Socialist regime did promote various scientific racial theories about ethnic Jews, but these are questions of biology or sociology, not religion. These racial theories frequently assert that the biology of the Jew is inherently flawed; however, from a Christian perspective, we do not comment on biology but merely affirm the truth of the Bible: being a Jew by blood is not a sin, but practicing Judaism (i.e., denying that Jesus is the Messiah) is a sin. Just like all sins, Christians are bound to speak the truth on the subject: “*When I say unto the wicked, Thou shalt surely die; and thou givest him not warning, nor speakest to warn the wicked from his wicked way, to save his life; the same wicked man shall die in his iniquity; but his blood will I require at thine hand*” (Ezekiel 3:18).

We also see that the Seelisberg Pact makes use of the word “hatred”, another common Jewish tactic. Christians are required to love our enemies, but to hate their sin. Like much of Christian living, this is a very high standard, and I do not doubt that Christians often let their hatred of sin obscure their love for the sinner; however, this does not mean that we should change the Biblical standard. The ultimate goal of the Jews is not to ensure that Christians live up to the command to love one's neighbor, but to root out from Christianity the righteous hatred of sin. Christians should hate Judaism, just as we hate Islam or pagan idolatry. Any Christian treatment of Judaism that does not emphasize this point is concealing the truth. “Love thy neighbor” is a requirement of the Christian life, but it does not compel us to mollify the

condemnations of the wicked found in the Bible.

Turning now to the 10 points of the Seelisberg Pact, let us consider each point individually:

Point 1: Remember that One God speaks to us all through the Old and the New Testaments.

I have already shown that Christians and Jews do not belong to the same God, but the point deserves repeating here: One God did speak through both Testaments, but that One God is the Holy Trinity—Father, Son and Holy Spirit—and the Jews rejected this One God when they rejected the Son. The authors of the Pact say that “*One God speaks to us all*”, implying that Jews can claim the Old Testament to somehow be “their book”. I have shown that this is not the case: Jesus says to the unbelieving Jews, “*had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me: for he wrote of me*” (John 5:46). Jesus states that although the Jews read the books of Moses, the Jews do not believe them. From God's own mouth we hear that Christians are those who believe the holy books while Jews are those who do not believe them, and yet modern Christians dare to speak of the Old Testament as if it is a text that belongs equally to Christians and Jews.

Point 2: Remember that Jesus was born of a Jewish mother of the seed of David and the people of Israel, and that His everlasting love and forgiveness embraces His own people and the whole world.

It is doubtful that any Christian has ever forgotten that Jesus was born of the seed of David, but the Christians involved in drafting this document seem to have forgotten that being ethnically Jewish does not make one immune from harsh condemnation. Jesus is addressing ethnic Jews when he says “*Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of hell?*” (Matthew 23:33). As long as the Jews persist in their rejection of the Word of God, they are worthy of such condemnation.

Point 3: Remember that the first disciples, the apostles and the first martyrs were Jews.

We remember that the first disciples, apostles and martyrs were Jews, but we also remember that those who first persecuted the Church and put the martyrs to death were Jews. More importantly, we remember that the apostles were Jews who accepted God's New Covenant, and

that those who persecuted the apostles were Jews who rejected God's New Covenant. We Christians are of one spirit with the Jewish apostles and martyrs, whereas those who call themselves Jews today are of one spirit with the Pharisees who murdered our Christ and persecuted his Church.

Point 4: Remember that the fundamental commandment of Christianity, to love God and one's neighbour, proclaimed already in the Old Testament and confirmed by Jesus, is binding upon both Christians and Jews in all human relationships, without any exception.

I already addressed this issue in the above paragraphs, but to repeat briefly: while we are to strive to love the sinner, we must always denounce sin. Practicing Judaism is a sin, and we put our souls in danger if we refuse to admit this.

Point 5: Avoid distorting or misrepresenting Biblical or post-Biblical Judaism with the object of extolling Christianity.

Christianity is anti-Jewish because the Jews are the Pharisees of today. The Jews admit that the teaching of their rabbis is wholly derived from the tradition of the Pharisees, and therefore Christians must condemn the Pharisees of today as harshly as Jesus condemned the Pharisees of the 1st century. Those who claim that Judaism is the pure religion of the Old Testament are the ones who are guilty of misrepresentation.

Point 6: Avoid using the word Jews in the exclusive sense of the enemies of Jesus, and the words “the enemies of Jesus” to designate the whole Jewish people.

Let us look at how the authors of the New Testament use the word “Jews”: “And from thenceforth Pilate sought to release him: but the Jews cried out, saying, If thou let this man go, thou art not Caesar’s friend” (John 19:12), “the Jews, who both killed the Lord Jesus, and their own prophets, and have persecuted us; and they please not God, and are contrary to all men” (1 Thessalonians 2:14-15). By the time the New Testament was written, the word “Jew” was already used to refer to those of Jewish ethnicity who rejected the Messiah. There is no reason to stray from the example presented in Scripture.

Point 7: Avoid presenting the Passion in such a way as to bring the odium of the killing of Jesus upon all Jews or upon Jews alone. It was only a section of the Jews in Jerusalem who demanded the death of Jesus, and the Christian message has always been that it was the sins of mankind

which were exemplified by those Jews and the sins in which all men share that brought Christ to the Cross.

The authors of the Pact make an appeal to what “*the Christian message has always been*” to justify their distortion of the unanimous and clear teaching of the Church that the Jews played a unique role in the murder of Christ. Above I quoted from 1 Thessalonians, where the Apostle Paul clearly says that it was the Jews who killed Jesus, not all men. When speaking of the Jews of his day, Paul says that they are guilty not only of the murder of Jesus, but of the prophets as well, showing that later generations can be guilty of crimes committed in the past if these generations persist in the same false beliefs as those who actually committed the crime. We see the same idea in Matthew 23, where Christ tells the Pharisees that they bear the guilt of murders from long ago. Thus it is wrong to say that the only guilty Jews are those who were in Jerusalem at the time of the Crucifixion.

Point 8: Avoid referring to the scriptural curses, or the cry of a raging mob: “His blood be upon us and our children,” without remembering that this cry should not count against the infinitely more weighty words of our Lord: “Father forgive them for they know not what they do.”

This is possibly the verse from the Bible that most offends the Jews: “*His blood be on us, and on our children*” (Matthew 27:25). The Church has always interpreted this to mean that those Jews who continue to support the teachings of the Pharisaic rabbis are especially cursed. As an example of a traditional Christian interpretation of this line, Matthew Henry, the great Protestant Bible commentator of the early 18th century, wrote that “*The Jews' curse upon themselves has been awfully answered in the sufferings of their nation*”.⁴ The ICCJ was founded in order to save the Jews from further suffering, but the only truly Christian answer to the question of Jewish suffering is for the Jews to repent and accept Jesus as their Messiah. When we pray for the Jews, we pray not only that God forgive them but that they convert to the Christian faith. Concealing from the world the horrible sins of the Jews as proclaimed in Scripture is a disservice to both Jews and Christians.

Point 9: Avoid promoting the superstitious notion that the Jewish people are reprobate, accursed, reserved for a destiny of suffering.

⁴ Matthew Henry's Concise Commentary on the Bible. Grand Rapids, MI: Christian Classics Ethereal Library. Page 1546. <http://www.ccel.org/ccel/henry/mhcc.pdf> (accessed 11/16/14)

The “Christians” involved in drafting the Seelisberg Pact reveal their contempt for Scripture when they label the opinion that unbelievers are destined to suffer as “superstitious”. When addressing a group of unbelieving Jews of the 1st century, Jesus says, “*I say unto you, That it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom in the day of judgment, than for thee*” (Matthew 11:24). Jesus here says not only that Jews who reject their own Messiah will suffer but also that they can suffer worse punishment than even the Sodomites. Denying that unrepentant Jews will suffer implies that the Jews are saved without Christ, an utterly blasphemous opinion.

Point 10: Avoid speaking of the Jews as if the first members of the Church had not been Jews.

As previously noted, the Apostle Paul, himself ethnically a Jew, uses the word “Jews” to refer to the enemies of Christ, and the earliest persecutors of the Church were Jews. The fact that the Christ-denying Jews of today are the physical descendants of the original Covenant nation should not be a source of pride, but rather of shame. God prepared Israel as a special nation for the purpose of bringing the Messiah into the world, and by rejecting the Messiah, the Jews go against that divine purpose.

The authors of the Seelisberg Pact wrote that they hoped their project would “*promote brotherly love towards the sorely-tried people of the old covenant*”. The sufferings of the Jews will end only when they accept Jesus Christ, who is the only spiritual health and the only salvation. True brotherly love is fearless and unadulterated witnessing of the truth, regardless of the opinion of the world or of unbelieving Jews. The Gospel should be offensive to those who think they can live without the life-giving sacrifice of Jesus, and if we soften the Gospel to make it less offensive, we perform a great injustice.

8. Opposition To The Jews Is Not A Catholic Error

A common claim made by Christian Judeophiliacs is that the traditional anti-Jewish views held by Christians were the result of Catholic error. It is first necessary to point out that many prominent reformers, including Luther and Calvin, were themselves anti-Jewish. The anti-Jewish sentiments of Luther and Calvin are well known and show that the anti-Jewish attitude of the Catholic Church was not considered a problem by the reformers. In response to this, some might argue that these figures from the very beginning of Protestantism were not fully reformed, and thus still subconsciously held Catholic prejudices. If this anti-Jewish attitude of the early reformers really was of Catholic origin and was not truly Biblical, one would expect Protestants in the following centuries to adopt a view towards the Jews similar to that held by modern Judeophiliacs. This is not the case, however, as the following example demonstrates.

Philip Schaff was a prominent 19th century American Protestant theologian and Church historian. He said the following about the Jews in his *History of the Christian Church*:

*The Jews had displayed their obstinate unbelief and bitter hatred of the gospel in the crucifixion of Christ, the stoning of Stephen, the execution of James the Elder, the repeated incarceration as of Peter and John, the wild rage against Paul, and the murder of James the Just. No wonder that the fearful judgment of God at last visited this ingratitude upon them in the destruction of the holy city and the temple...But this tragical fate could break only the national power of the Jews, not their hatred of Christianity.*⁵

The view that the Jews are the enemy of the Church, and that the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple was divine retribution for their wickedness, was commonplace and uncontroversial

5 Schaff, Philip. *History of the Christian Church, Volume II: Ante-Nicene Christianity. A.D. 100-325*. Grand Rapids, MI: Christian Classics Ethereal Library. Page 41. <http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/hcc2.pdf> (accessed 11/16/14)

among Protestants up until the 20th century.

These and similar opinions were common in the primitive Church, and there is in fact a complete lack of any pro-Jewish sentiments among the Christian writers of that era. The Catholic Church is doubtless guilty of serious errors, but when refuting these errors, such as papal authority and belief in purgatory, Protestants can easily find writings from the New Testament or the earliest Church Fathers which show that the primitive Church did not hold the same views as later Catholics. When it comes to the issue of the Jews, however, there are no texts from the primitive Church that support the Judeophilic position. There is complete continuity of thought on this issue from the New Testament through the Apostolic age all the way up until the early 20th century.

Let us turn to some passages from these ancient texts. The first passage is from the Epistle of Barnabas, which is one of the very earliest post-New Testament Christian texts. Here the author addresses the question of whether Jews or Christians are the true heirs of Abraham, comparing the situation to the transfer of Isaac's inheritance to his sons:

*But let us see if this people (the Church) is the heir, or the former (the Jews), **and if the covenant belongs to us or to them.** Hear ye now what the Scripture saith concerning the people. Isaac prayed for Rebecca his wife, because she was barren; and she conceived. Furthermore also, Rebecca went forth to inquire of the Lord; and the Lord said to her, 'Two nations are in thy womb, and two peoples in thy belly; and the one people shall surpass the other, and the elder shall serve the younger.' You ought to understand who was Isaac, who Rebecca, and concerning what persons He declared that this people should be greater than that.⁶*

Evidently the primitive Church did not teach the doctrine of a dual-covenant, the heretical notion that even after rejecting the Messiah, the Jews still have a unique covenant with God. The Christians of the first and second centuries clearly understood that only they were partakers of the covenant, and that the Jews had been rejected. They held that God had transferred his covenant from the Jews to the Church; just as in the case of Isaac and his sons, there is only one heir of the promise. Christians and Jews could not both be heirs of the promise any more than Jacob and Esau could be joint heirs of their father.

⁶ *Ante-Nicene Fathers Volume I. The Apostolic Fathers with Justin Martyr and Irenaeus.* Grand Rapids, MI: Christian Classics Ethereal Library. Page 391. <http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/anf01.pdf> (accessed 11/16/14)

The next passage comes from Justin Martyr who lived in the first half of the 2nd century AD. Justin addresses a Jew named Trypho, and in reference to the destruction of the Temple, he says the following:

these things have happened to you in fairness and justice, for you have slain the Just One, and His prophets before Him; and now you reject those who hope in Him, and in Him who sent Him—God the Almighty and Maker of all things —cursing in your synagogues those that believe on Christ. For you have not the power to lay hands upon us, on account of those who now have the mastery. But as often as you could, you did so....For other nations have not inflicted on us and on Christ this wrong to such an extent as you have, who in very deed are the authors of the wicked prejudice against the Just One, and us who hold by Him. For after that you had crucified Him, the only blameless and righteous Man...when you knew that He had risen from the dead and ascended to heaven, as the prophets foretold He would, you not only did not repent of the wickedness which you had committed, but at that time you selected and sent out from Jerusalem chosen men through all the land to tell that the godless heresy of the Christians had sprung up, and to publish those things which all they who knew us not speak against us. So that you are the cause not only of your own unrighteousness, but in fact of that of all other men.⁷

Justin Martyr states that not only are the Jews the enemy of the Church, but they are **the worst enemy of the Church**. Keep in mind that this was written after the reign of Nero when Christians suffered under Roman persecution. Justin himself would be put to death by the Roman authorities, and yet despite his obvious awareness of Roman hostility to the Church, he singles out the Jews as more dangerous and more wicked. In this passage we find beliefs commonly held by Christians from the very beginning, such as the belief that the destruction of the temple was divine retribution, that the Jews preach against Jesus in their synagogues, and that the Jews are guilty of the crucifixion of our Lord. These same beliefs were shared by the 16th century reformers and subsequent generations of Protestants. It is only with the heresy of judeophilia in recent generations that these core Christian principles have been abandoned.

⁷ Ante-Nicene Fathers Volume I. *The Apostolic Fathers with Justin Martyr and Irenaeus*. Grand Rapids, MI: Christian Classics Ethereal Library. Page 544. <http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/anf01.pdf> (accessed 11/16/14)

9. The Primitive Church And Jewish Militarism

Christian Zionists, who believe that it is a Christian duty to support the current Israeli state, often argue that we must return to the primitive Church that existed in the years immediately following Christ's earthly ministry. This primitive Church, they claim, existed in a Jewish culture and was free of the “anti-semitism” that later crept into the gentile Church. These Zionists fail to understand the history of the early Church and the Jews, and arrive at conclusions completely at odds with reality. Indeed, the first Christians were ethnic Jews: both fleshly sons of Abraham and members of Christ's mystical body; but even these Christians who were Jewish by blood and lived in the Holy Land did not support the militarism of the Christ-denying Jews. In the years following the foundation of the Church, the Jews who rejected Jesus sought to achieve political independence and establish a Jewish state by military means; however, the Christian Jews living among them refused to support these military efforts.

In the first century AD the Jews were ruled by the Roman empire. A series of unsuccessful Jewish revolts from 66-135 AD led to the destruction of the Temple and ultimately to the expulsion of the Jews from the Holy Land. The Church at Jerusalem, composed of Christian Jews, lived through these tribulations, and their experience is most instructive to the Christians of today about how to view Jewish militarism.

We look first at the destruction of the Temple, which occurred during the first major Jewish revolt. Up until fairly recently, it was universally held by Christians that the destruction of the temple was God's punishment of the Jews for rejecting the Messiah and was also the fulfillment of Jesus' prophecy about the Temple (Matthew 24, Mark 13). Jesus, in speaking of the Temple, tells his disciples that “*There shall not be left here one stone upon another, that*

shall not be thrown down” (Matthew 24:2), and that in those days there “*shall be great tribulation, such as was not since the beginning of the world to this time, no, nor ever shall be*” (Matthew 24:21). When these things came to pass, the Jews living at Jerusalem suffered horribly, but the Christian Jews were spared. According to Eusebius, the most important historian of the early Church, the Christian Jews were miraculously saved from the sack of Jerusalem that resulted in such death and suffering for the Jews. Eusebius relates how the destruction of the city occurred only after its Christian inhabitants had left:

*the people of the church in Jerusalem had been commanded by a revelation, vouchsafed to approved men there before the war, to leave the city and to dwell in a certain town of Perea called Pella. And when those that believed in Christ had come there from Jerusalem, then, as if the royal city of the Jews and the whole land of Judea were entirely destitute of holy men, the judgment of God at length overtook those who had committed such outrages against Christ and his apostles, and totally destroyed that generation of impious men.*⁸

These Christian Jews did not “stand with Israel”, but followed the Lord who led them away from the carnal and godless Jews and their military efforts.

The primitive Church was consistent in its opposition to Jewish militarism, and we see this again when we turn to the final Jewish revolt (132-135 AD), which was led by the false Messiah Bar Kokhba. The hard-hearted Jews who rejected the spiritual kingdom of our Lord eagerly followed this worldly, brutish military leader, mistakenly thinking him to be the Christ. These beliefs were obviously rejected by the Christian Jews who already knew the true Messiah, and Bar Kokhba's rise to prominence intensified the conflict between Christians and Jews. According to Justin Martyr, who was alive during these events, the Christian Jews suffered greatly during the revolt:

*in the Jewish war which lately raged, Barchochebas [Bar Kokhba], the leader of the revolt of the Jews, gave orders that Christians alone should be led to cruel punishments, unless they would deny Jesus Christ and utter blasphemy.*⁹

8 Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers Series II, Volume 1. Eusebius Pamphilus: Church History, Life of Constantine, Oration in Praise of Constantine. Grand Rapids, MI: Christian Classics Ethereal Library. Pages 271-272. <http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/npnf201.pdf> (accessed 11/16/14)

9 Ante-Nicene Fathers Volume I. The Apostolic Fathers with Justin Martyr and Irenaeus. Grand Rapids, MI: Christian Classics Ethereal Library. Page 456. <http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/anf01.pdf> (accessed 11/16/14)

The rebellious Jews did not see their Christian kinsmen as allies, nor even as a neutral party, but as enemies, and they used their military power to persecute the Church.

For the sake of those modern Christians who, against all reason, prefer to trust Jews over ancient Christians, we turn to the account of the revolt given in the Jewish Encyclopedia. While the Encyclopedia entry denies that Bar Kokhba killed or tortured Christian Jews, it does admit that there was conflict between the two groups during the revolt, and says that the cause of the conflict “*seems to have been that the Christians refused to unite with the Jews in the struggle*”.¹⁰ Whether or not one accepts that Christians were persecuted for their beliefs, it is evident that the Christian Jews did not aid the apostate Jews in their revolt against the Romans, and did so on theological grounds. The Jews carrying out this revolt thought that they were acting in accordance with Old Testament prophecy. Because they rejected Jesus, they still were still looking for the Messiah, and thought that they had found him in Bar Kokhba. Today's Zionists act from the very same motivation. Although they have not identified their Messiah, the Jews do justify their military activity by appealing to Biblical prophecy, ignorant of the fact that only through the grace of Christ can anyone accurately understand the Old Testament. When Christians support Zionist Jews, they support the Bar Kokhbas of our day, and dishonor the memory of those Christian Jews who resisted the error of the antichrist Jews during the early years of the Church.

Christian Jews rejected Jewish militarism and Jewish efforts to establish an earthly kingdom as the fulfillment of prophecy. This rejection proved to be a decisive moment in the history of the Church. After the failed Bar Kokhba revolt, the Romans banished the Jews from the Holy Land. The pagan Romans apparently made no distinction between the Christian and non-Christian Jews, and both groups were barred from entering Jerusalem. After being expelled from their native land, there was no longer anything to bind together those Jews who accepted Jesus as the Messiah and those who did not. Because they no longer shared any common territory or institutions, there was no reason for Christian and non-Christian Jews to maintain a community or common identity. The antichrist Jews, trusting in their carnal hope and rejecting the Kingdom of Heaven, had their temple and their land taken away from them by God's will.

¹⁰ From the entry for “BAR KOKBA AND BAR KOKBA WAR” in the 1906 Jewish Encyclopedia.
<http://www.jewishencyclopedia.com/articles/2464-bar-cochba-bar-cochbah> (accessed 11/16/14)

The Christian Jews, who throughout their tribulations always looked to the Kingdom of Heaven, never confused the earthly military objectives of the godless Jews with their true home and salvation. Not supporting the military objectives of Christ-denying Jews was a defining feature of the Jewish Christian community, and if modern Christians truly wish to return to the primitive Church, they should follow their example.

10. The Idolatry Of Christian Zionism

Perhaps the greatest spiritual delusion, and one that men have repeatedly fallen into, is that divine favor can be gained by performing certain physical actions or rituals, regardless of the moral character of those involved. This delusion is the basis of pagan idolatry and magic, where a practitioner bargains with his god or demon and enters into a contract where each side must fulfill its duties. The same delusion is also seen in many Catholic errors, such as belief in the divine authority of the pope. Catholics claim that any earthly successor of Peter has the same honor and authority as the apostle himself, regardless of a man's character or beliefs. Thus throughout the years Catholics, thinking that anyone who holds physical dominion over the Vatican is to be God's representative on earth, have venerated numerous popes of wicked character and false opinion. Catholic doctrine has gone further and further away from Scripture because of this undue veneration of mere men and earthly institutions.

Unfortunately, many Christians who do reject the errors of the Roman church have fallen into their own idolatry: Christian Zionism. While Catholics think that any man who holds the physical seat of Peter is to be revered, Christian Zionists claim that those who are Jews by blood retain the honor and sanctity of their ancient ancestors, regardless of their lack of faith. Christian Zionists do this despite the clear teaching of the Bible that the Jews who reject Christ are branches that have been torn away from the root of the Church and cast aside.

Christian Zionists set up for themselves a carnal idol, the physical race of antichrist Jews. They give military and financial aid to the Jews in Palestine, thinking that they please God by transporting the mortal, unregenerate flesh of spiritually dead Jews to the Holy Land. The

religion of the Jews is founded on their rejection of Jesus as the Messiah, and the return of these apostates to the earthly Jerusalem is no more pleasing to God than were the sacrifices offered to him by those with wicked hearts.

This focus on the political events surrounding the earthly Jerusalem goes against the message of the Gospel, which says that we are to lift our hearts up to the heavenly Kingdom of God. The Old Testament nation of Israel was not an end unto itself, but rather the visible preparation for the spiritual revelation of the Messiah. The ancient nation was an earthly seed, a seed sown in corruption and raised in the glory of the Church, which is the spiritual communion of the saints of all earthly nations. The descendants of Ishmael and of Esau were just as much physical sons of Abraham as were the descendants of Isaac and Jacob, but because they did not maintain the covenant of faith, they became irrelevant to God's purpose for the seed of Abraham. In the same way, the Jews have cut themselves off from the covenant of Christ, and are no longer God's chosen people. As Jesus said to the Jews, "*The kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof*" (Matthew 21:43).

But for Christian Zionists, their carnal idol of the Jewish people is more important than the Word of God. Although our Lord calls these Christians to the heavenly Jerusalem, they strain towards the earthly—like Lot's wife who looked back towards the wickedness of the world. Rather than engaging in the spiritual struggle of converting the Jews to the True Faith, Christian Zionists war after the flesh, thinking that God will reward them for giving the unbelieving Jews military and political aid. The ancient pagans worshiped dead pieces of wood that could not speak; Christian Zionists worship unrepentant Jews who curse Jesus and the Church with their unclean mouths.

11. In Thee Shall All Families Of The Earth Be Blessed

Christian Judeophiliacs frequently cite Genesis 12 in support of their view that Christians must be friendly to the Christ-denying Jews of today. In this chapter, God says to Abraham,

I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee, and make thy name great; and thou shalt be a blessing: And I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee: and in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed.

-Genesis 12:2-3

John Haggee, perhaps the most prominent of all Judeophilic pastors, says of these verses that,

*No pronouncement of scripture is clearer or more decisive. God smiles on the friends of the descendants of Abraham, and they enjoy heavenly favor. In contrast, God will answer every act of anti-Semitism with harsh and final judgment.*¹¹

This Judeophilic interpretation, however, is completely false, and directly contradicts the Word of God.

Biblical interpretation is one of the most important and difficult tasks for the Christian, and one that must be undertaken with the utmost caution since the Bible contains many obscure passages, especially in the Old Testament. In some instances, however, we are fortunate enough to have a New Testament passage that directly quotes and explains a passage from the Old Testament. When this is the case, we have the infallible Word of God explaining to us how these Old Testament passages are to be understood. In Galatians 3, the Apostle Paul directly quotes and explains Genesis 12:3, and this must be the starting point of our interpretation. Paul writes,

¹¹ Haggee, John. *Final Dawn Over Jerusalem*. Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1998. Page 20.

And the scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, "In thee shall all nations be blessed"

-Galatians 3:8

And later on in the same chapter Paul writes,

Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, "And to seeds", as of many; but as of one, "And to thy seed", which is Christ.

-Galatians 3:16

These words of Paul make the meaning of Genesis 12 absolutely clear: the seed of Abraham is Christ, and the blessing received by the nations is the salvation granted through faith in Jesus. Therefore, we can say that God will curse those who curse his Messiah, and bless those who bless his Messiah: the blessing of God depends on how a nation treats the sinless Son of God and his Gospel, not on how it treats the sinful and blasphemous Jews who rejected Jesus. No group has slandered and cursed the name of Jesus more than the Jews, and therefore the warning of Genesis 12 applies to them, not to "anti-Semites".

Let us now return to the interpretation of John Hagee and see how it compares to the interpretation of Paul. Hagee argues that the blessing that God gives through the Jewish people is not only restricted to heavenly rewards, but also includes the many contributions that individual Jews have made to our society. In an attempt to prove this point, Hagee produces a long list of Jews involved in degenerate Hollywood films and the liberal mainstream media and says that, "*These people are a living testimony that 'in thee shall all nations of the earth be blessed'*".¹² Among those included on this list of Jewish "blessings" are comedian Peter Sellers, who was a mentally unstable drug-addict; actress Madeline Kahn, who is best known for starring in vulgar comedies like *Blazing Saddles*; actor Paul Newman, who has supported various left-wing causes for decades; advice columnist Ann Landers, who used her widely-read column to support legalized abortion; and talk show host Larry King, who has publicly endorsed homosexual "marriage".

The Apostle Paul clearly says that the blessing of Genesis 12 refers to the salvation of

¹² *Ibid.* Page 32.

heathens through faith in Jesus Christ, while Hagee presents these degenerate Jewish celebrities as a fulfillment of the promise to Abraham. Through his brazen distortion of the truth, Hagee reveals himself to be a blasphemer and an enemy of Scripture, leading millions of Christians into fellowship with darkness.

As shown in the above quote from Hagee, judeophilic Christians even go so far as to claim that the words “*I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee*” amount to a Biblical condemnation of “anti-Semitism”. Nothing could be further from the truth. For if one defines “anti-Semitism” to mean speaking the Gospel truth about the evil of the Pharisees and challenging the contemporary followers of Pharisaic doctrine, then anti-Semitism is not a sin—it is a **requirement for every believing Christian**. In speaking against the Jews, we are merely following two simple propositions that all Christians should affirm:

- 1) God condemns those who reject his covenant.
- 2) Those who do not belong to the God of the Bible should always be viewed with the utmost suspicion as possible enemies of the Church.

How could any Christian criticize us for affirming these two simple propositions? The righteousness of the Jewish people in the Old Testament was not due to their ethnicity. It was due exclusively to their faith in God's promise. They rejected God's promise when they rejected Christ and his new covenant. It gains the Christian no merit to bless the Christ-denying rabbis, whom God himself has cursed, declaring them to be “*children of hell*” (Matthew 23:15). The DNA of unbelieving Jews is not a magic totem that God commands us to venerate.

12. Cut Off From His People

Judeophiliacs frequently invoke Genesis 17 in support of their claim that the Holy Land belongs exclusively to the Jews:

And I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee, the land of thy sojournings, all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession; and I will be their God.

-Genesis 17:8

If we look at the following lines, however, we see that this promise to Abraham was part of God's covenant with him, and that the sons of Abraham had to uphold their end of the agreement in order for the covenant to be valid:

This is my covenant, which ye shall keep, between me and you and thy seed after thee: every male among you shall be circumcised...And the uncircumcised male who is not circumcised in the flesh of his foreskin, that soul shall be cut off from his people; he hath broken my covenant.

-Genesis 17:10,14

That is, although God chose Abraham and his descendants to be a special nation, if some of Abraham's descendants fail to uphold the covenant, then they are cut off from God's people. It would therefore be wrong to assume that Jews who reject God's covenant have a legitimate claim to the land of Canaan.

In the Gospels, we learn of a new covenant introduced by Jesus, the covenant of the Lord's Supper:

And he took a cup, and gave thanks, and gave to them, saying, Drink ye all of it; for this is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many unto remission of sins.

-Matthew 26:27-28

In John 6, Jesus explains the necessity of this covenant, and says that without it there is no eternal life:

Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, ye have not life in yourselves. He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life: and I will raise him up at the last day... These things said he in the synagogue, as he taught in Capernaum.

-John 6:53-54, 59

As John says, these words of Jesus were addressed **to the Jews in their synagogue**. Those who do not eat the flesh and drink the blood have no life and will not stand in the congregation of the righteous at the resurrection. Thus we see that the Son of God came to the Israelites and gave to them a new covenant, a new requirement for being God's people. Some of the Jews accepted this new covenant, and some of them rejected it, and those who accepted it are the ones who can still claim the promise made to Abraham, because they, like Abraham, submitted to God's will.

Some Judeophiliacs make the bold argument that the Jews who have rejected Christ's new covenant are still God's people because the covenants of the Old Testament are still valid. I have already pointed out that the words of Jesus concerning the new covenant were spoken to the Jews in their synagogue, but if some still insist that even though they rejected this covenant the Jews still have a right to the promises of the old covenants, consider the following hypothetical situation:

Imagine that some of the Jews living in the time of Moses had decided to reject the Mosaic law, saying that Moses did not receive the law from God, but simply made it up. And not only did this group of Jews reject the Mosaic law, but they killed Moses, and then told their children and their grandchildren that Moses was a liar. The faithful Jews who did accept the Mosaic law went on to possess the Holy Land, and the impious Jews who rejected the Mosaic law and killed Moses went their own way. Now imagine that a few centuries later, the impious Jews came to Israel and tried to convince the faithful Jews that both groups had an equal claim to the Holy Land because they both kept the covenant of Abraham. Would the group that had rejected Moses

still be considered God's people? Would they have an equal right to the land as those Jews that had accepted the Mosaic law? Would the two groups naturally consider each other to be spiritual brothers? These questions are too absurd to even deserve a reply. It is obvious that the promise God made to Abraham could be claimed only by those Jews who had accepted the Mosaic law, thereby showing the same obedience to God's will that Abraham had.

And yet today's Zionists make exactly the same claim as that made by the impious Jews in my imagined scenario: the Zionists claim that the Jews who rejected the new covenant of Christ have a right to the Holy Land and that Christians and Jews are spiritual brothers. This shows a complete lack of respect for God's word. Thinking that the Jews are allowed to pick and choose which covenants to keep and which to reject is like a half-hearted Christian deciding that he only has to follow part of the Bible and can ignore the parts he does not like. In both cases, the proponents of such views are led into spiritual darkness, willfully denying God's truth.

13. The Promised Land

The Bible makes it perfectly clear that the promises made by God to the Israelites were conditional upon their observance of God's Commandments. Even where God says that certain Israelites or the nation as a whole shall possess or enjoy something **forever**, this promise will not be upheld by God when men fail to uphold their end of the agreement.

An example of this is found in 1 Samuel 2, where God upbraids the priest Eli for his failure to discipline his sinful children:

*I said indeed that thy house, and the house of thy father, should walk before me for ever: **but now the Lord saith, Be it far from me; for them that honour me I will honour, and they that despise me shall be lightly esteemed...** And this shall be a sign unto thee, that shall come upon thy two sons, on Hophni and Phinehas; in one day they shall die both of them. And I will raise me up a faithful priest, that shall do according to that which is in mine heart and in my mind: and I will build him a sure house; and he shall walk before mine anointed for ever.*

-1 Samuel 2:30,34-35

God is not constrained to keep the house of Eli as priests when this house refuses to honor him.

We see the exact same conditional promises in the narrative of the Kings of Israel. When speaking to David, God says,

*Solomon thy son, he shall build my house and my courts: for I have chosen him to be my son, and I will be his father. **Moreover I will establish his kingdom for ever, if he be constant to do my commandments and my judgments, as at this day.** Now therefore in the sight of all Israel the congregation of the Lord, and in the audience of our God, keep and seek for all the commandments of the Lord your God: that ye may possess this good land, and leave it for an inheritance for your*

children after you for ever.
 -1 Chronicles 28:6-8

But although God promised that Solomon's kingdom would be established forever, Solomon's own sinful behavior made this promise void. After Solomon's descent into idolatry, the Lord spoke to him and said that the kingdom would be taken from him.

*And the Lord was angry with Solomon, because his heart was turned from the Lord God of Israel, which had appeared unto him twice, And had commanded him concerning this thing, that he should not go after other gods: but he kept not that which the Lord commanded. Wherefore the Lord said unto Solomon, **Forasmuch as this is done of thee, and thou hast not kept my covenant and my statutes, which I have commanded thee, I will surely rend the kingdom from thee, and will give it to thy servant.***
 -1 Kings 11:9

Throughout these passages, we can see the fundamental scriptural principle that “*whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved*” (Romans 10:13). God's promise is to the faithful, not to the apostates. Those who do not call upon God and follow his word should not expect to enjoy his promises.

But given all this, how is it possible for Christians to believe that the Jews still have a claim to the Old Testament promises about territory in the Middle East? The Jews reject the Messiah and the Gospel. They reject the revealed word of God, and refuse to enter into the New Covenant. It is not the duty of the Christian to “stand with Israel” by supporting Zionist military action. It is the duty of the Christian to speak the truth about Scripture, and affirm that as long as the Jews refuse God's commandments, they have no right to God's promises. This is precisely what the Lord declared to the Israelites when he told them of the severe punishment that would follow if they should turn from his ways:

When thou shalt beget children, and children's children, and ye shall have remained long in the land, and shall corrupt yourselves, and make a graven image, or the likeness of any thing, and shall do evil in the sight of the Lord thy God, to provoke him to anger: I call heaven and earth to witness against you this day, that ye shall soon utterly perish from off the land whereunto ye go over Jordan to possess it; ye shall not prolong your days upon it, but shall utterly be destroyed. And the Lord shall scatter you among the nations, and ye shall be left few in number among the heathen, whither the Lord shall lead you.
 -Deuteronomy 4:25-27

Here God is directly saying that failing to follow the conditions of the covenant would result in losing the right to claim the promised land.

When speaking to the Pharisees who conspired to murder him, Jesus explicitly says that the kingdom of God will be taken from them because of their unrighteousness:

Therefore say I unto you, The kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof...And when the chief priests and Pharisees had heard his parables, they perceived that he spake of them.

-Matthew 21:43,45

This fits perfectly with the Old Testament pattern seen in the preceding passages. We have it directly from the mouth of the Lord that Solomon's failure to follow God's commandments resulted in the loss of his kingdom, and that the unrighteousness of the Pharisees resulted in the kingdom being taken from them and given to another nation. If any contemporary Christian were to find himself living in Solomon's time, would he dare to say that God was wrong in his judgment, and that God is required to keep the kingdom in the hands of Solomon's heirs? Such brashness is difficult to imagine, yet this is exactly what the Christian judeophiliacs do today, when they claim that the antichrist Jews have an inalienable right to the promised land.

14. The Samson Option: The Depths Of Moral Depravity

Christian Zionists are guilty of a great evil when they declare our “duty” to support the Zionist state in Palestine, for they are lying about God's word and the nature of his covenant. But in addition to this evil, Christian Zionists are also guilty of giving military and financial aid to a state that threatens the safety of the entire world.

We Americans are constantly told that Israel is our greatest ally, and that our two countries are completely unified when it comes to foreign policy objectives. Given this intimate alliance, it should be of great interest to Americans that many Israelis have expressed support for what is known as the Samson Option. Named after the final act of the Biblical figure Samson, who ensured that his enemies died along with him when he tore down the pillars of the temple of the Philistines, the Samson Option proposes that if Israel faces destruction, its nuclear arsenal should be used to attack the entire world, possibly bringing about the complete annihilation of humanity.

The Israeli government refuses even to acknowledge the existence of its nuclear program and therefore has not made any official statements concerning the Samson Option. The existence of such a plan, however, is well documented. For example, Martin van Creveld, professor of military history at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, has said:

We possess several hundred atomic warheads and rockets and can launch them at targets in all directions, perhaps even at Rome. Most European capitals are targets for our air force...Our armed forces, however, are not the thirtieth strongest in the world, but rather the second or third. We have the capability to take the world down with us. And I can assure you that

*that will happen before Israel goes under.*¹³

Van Creveld is correct in his assessment of Israel's nuclear ability: the Zionist state does have the arsenal to successfully execute the Samson Option. One might ask why Van Creveld promotes targeting European cities like Rome when it is the Muslim countries of the Middle East that would likely be responsible for an attack on Israel. The answer is that the Jews harbor a deep-seated hatred of Christian Europe, and hold modern day Europe responsible for alleged injustices of the past. Jewish author Pamela Geller writes:

*I pray dearly that in the ungodly event that Tehran or its jihadi proxies (Hezbollah, Hamas etc) target Israel with a nuke, that she retaliate with everything she has at Tehran, Mecca, and Medina...Not to mention Europe. They exterminated all their Jews, but that wasn't enough. Those monsters (Europeans) then went on to import the next generation of Jew killers (muslim immigrants).*¹⁴

Geller believes that all Europeans are deserving of death because of the actions of their grandparents, not taking into account the fact that millions of Europeans died fighting against the anti-Jewish regimes of the 20th century. (It is also interesting to note that the Jews routinely hold Christian Europe collectively responsible for the crimes of past generations, but then insist that it is impossible for the Jews to be collectively guilty of the murder of Christ.)

In the interest of fairness, one might still be inclined to pity the Jews, given their political and military position, and be led to think that the Jews who promote the Samson Option would deem it an appropriate response for any nation facing similar circumstances. However, the Jews do not justify the Samson Option by their political situation alone, but by their unique status as Jews. The Jews in the Middle East are not the only nation facing existential threats, and yet I doubt any Jew would suggest that an African or Asian nation would be justified in destroying humanity in retaliation for past injustices. Israeli poet Itamar Yazo-Kest demonstrated this supreme hubris of the Jews when he wrote:

there is a right reserved only to us Jews (if indeed any human on Earth has this right): to be destroyed and to take the weary and sated world with

13 Extract from *The Gun and the Olive Branch* by David Hirst, in *The Guardian*. September 20, 2003.

<http://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/sep/21/israelandthepalestinians.bookextracts> (accessed 11/16/14)

14 Geller, Pamela. *This new hatred comes from Muslim immigrants. The Jewish people are afraid now.*

http://atlashrugs2000.typepad.com/atlas_shrugs/2010/02/this-new-hatred-comes-from-muslim-immigrants-the-jewish-people-are-afraid-now.html (accessed 11/16/14)

*us to the non-existence, along with its wondrous libraries and heart-stirring tunes – just so, after we descend to the grave, while the ground emits radioactive rays to all four winds. Indeed – we have the right!*¹⁵

Thus we see that the Jewish support for the Samson Option is based on a murderous hatred of gentiles and a belief in the innate superiority of the Jews over all mankind. Yaoz-Kest holds the Jews in such high regard that he deems lifeless desolation to be the most fitting fate for the world after the disappearance of his own tribe.

It is difficult to rank different acts of evil and declare one to be worse than another. However, I do feel confident in saying that it is hard to imagine a worse crime than destroying all of humanity out of pure spite. Jesus tells us that, “*Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends*” (John 15:13). If the greatest love is to lay down one's life for another, what great hatred it is to destroy all human life for no purpose whatsoever! For the Samson Option proposes to murder humanity indiscriminately, not out of the desire to save the lives of others, nor to bring about a better future, but simply out of revenge. It is designed for scenarios when Israel is already doomed to destruction. It would not be a last-ditch effort to save Israel, but rather an act of malice following upon Israel's destruction.

The Christian heart should be appalled at the Samson Option and ask how anyone could desire to commit such a crime; but it is Christians who have enabled the Jews to amass their nuclear stockpile and pose a threat to the survival of the entire world. Blinded by the heretic preachers of Christian Zionism, many of the faithful have given unwavering political support to the Jewish state and have encouraged and applauded the growing military might of Israel. If Christians had stayed true to the teaching of the Bible, then they never would have allowed this Jewish threat to develop.

Up until the 20th century, Christians always viewed the Jews with suspicion, thinking them to be capable of the greatest acts of immorality. Above I stated that murdering all mankind would be one of the greatest crimes, and indeed it would, but in fact the Jews have already committed a greater crime than this, for these are the same people who clamored for the death of

15 Ronen, Gil. *Israeli Letter-poem to Grass: If We Go, Everyone Goes*. April 8, 2012. <http://www.israelnationalnews.com/News/News.aspx/154608#.T4H4MtXAE14> (accessed 11/16/14)

our Lord upon the cross. The Jews are capable of wanting to murder mankind because they have already murdered the sinless Son of God. This reprobate people continues in its obstinate refusal to repent and recognize the Savior, and we must understand that the Jew's criminal desire for destruction is the direct result of his twisted religion. The Jews routinely claim that Christians are guilty of "anti-Semitism", but the true guilt of Christians comes from their refusal to recognize that the Jews are the enemies of God. By continuing to support these enemies, we blacken the name of the Church and take part in the most depraved crimes.

15. All Israel Shall Be Saved

Some judeophiliacs cite Romans 11 in support of their position that Christians and Jews should be friends:

*For I would not, brethren, that ye should be ignorant of this mystery, lest ye should be wise in your own conceits; that blindness in part is happened to Israel, until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in. And so **all Israel shall be saved**: as it is written, There shall come out of Sion the Deliverer, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob: For this is my covenant unto them, when I shall take away their sins.*

-Romans 11:25-27

There are two main ways of interpreting the verse “*all Israel shall be saved*”:

- 1) “Israel” here refers to the Church, that is, to those who are members of the New Covenant. God's people are precisely those who have faith in God and his son, therefore all of God's people will be saved.
- 2) Although a part of physical Israel is currently in blindness, at some point in the future all or most of the Jews will accept Jesus as the Messiah.

I will not argue in favor of either of these interpretations. Instead, I will argue that whichever interpretation one accepts, this does not have any bearing on how we are to relate to the current generation of unbelieving Jews.

Even if it is true that the Jews will accept Christ in the future, this does not mean that Jews who live and die as apostates will also be saved. For Christ was speaking to Jews when he said “*it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom in the day of judgment, than for thee*” (Matthew 11:24). He was also speaking to Jews when he said “*woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye shut up the kingdom of heaven against men: for ye neither go in*

yourselves, neither suffer ye them that are entering to go in” (Matthew 23:13). Jesus explicitly tells certain Jews that they will be condemned at the Judgment and that they do not enter the kingdom of heaven. It is obvious that these Jews are not part of the Israel that shall be saved. It is also obvious that as long as the Jews persist in their unbelief, they should be viewed as enemies of the Church.

Even in the case of individuals like Paul who eventually accept Christ, they are still enemies up until the point of their conversion. Paul spoke of his previous state as an enemy of the Church with great shame: *“For I am the least of the apostles, that am not meet to be called an apostle, because I persecuted the church of God”* (1 Corinthians 15:9). If Paul thought himself unworthy of being an apostle even *after* his conversion, how much more unworthy are the Jews who persist and die in their unbelief? As Christians, we should no more accept unbelieving Jews than the early Church accepted Paul *prior* to his conversion.

At the beginning of Romans 11, Paul compares his situation to that faced by the prophet Elijah. Paul lived in a time when many (even most) of his Jewish kinsmen rejected God. Paul is here comparing the apostate Jews of the first century with the Baal-worshiping Jews of Ahab's time:

I say then, Hath God cast away his people? God forbid. For I also am an Israelite, of the seed of Abraham, of the tribe of Benjamin. God hath not cast away his people which he foreknew. Wot ye not what the scripture saith of Elias? how he maketh intercession to God against Israel, saying, Lord, they have killed thy prophets, and digged down thine altars; and I am left alone, and they seek my life. But what saith the answer of God unto him? I have reserved to myself seven thousand men, who have not bowed the knee to the image of Baal. Even so then at this present time also there is a remnant according to the election of grace.

-Romans 11:1-5

The apostate Jews bow down to the idol of Pharisaic doctrine. Though more subtle and deceptive, this Pharisaic idolatry is just as detestable to God as the worship of Baal. The only Jews who will be saved are those who are regenerated by faith in Christ. Jews who cling to Pharisaic doctrine are blasphemous Ahabs who will meet a well-deserved and shameful end.

16. Judeophilia Is Inner Filthiness

Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye make clean the outside of the cup and of the platter, but within they are full of extortion and excess. Thou blind Pharisee, cleanse first that which is within the cup and platter, that the outside of them may be clean also. Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye are like unto whited sepulchres, which indeed appear beautiful outward, but are within full of dead men's bones, and of all uncleanness. Even so ye also outwardly appear righteous unto men, but within ye are full of hypocrisy and iniquity.

-Matthew 23:25-28

These words of our Lord warn us against placing too much value on outer appearances and neglecting inner character. We err greatly both when focusing on our own outer appearance, and when we are deceived by others who falsely present themselves as righteous, when in truth they are wicked. Failure to heed Christ's teaching on this subject is at the heart of the scourge of judeophilia. Christians ignore the inner character of the Jew because they are enchanted by the Jew's illustrious lineage and his superficial adherence to Old Testament custom.

Against the claim that the Jews should be venerated because of their physical descent, I quote the words of John the Baptist addressed to the Pharisees and Saducees:

think not to say within yourselves, We have Abraham to our father: for I say unto you, that God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham. And now also the axe is laid unto the root of the trees: therefore every tree which bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down, and cast into the fire.

-Matthew 3:9-10

Without the righteousness that comes through faith, physical descent from Abraham is worthless. Physical descent, no matter how illustrious, cannot bring salvation. According to

John the Evangelist, “*Whosoever denieth the Son, the same hath not the Father*” (1 John 2:23). No one denies the Son more vehemently than the Jews, and therefore they are without the Father and cut off from God. Given their rejection of the God of Abraham, no credit should be given to the Jews for their physical descent. If anything, their physical descent should be a reproach to them.

Many Christians respect the Jews because they claim to practice the religion of the Old Testament. Judeophiliacs will often feel moved when witnessing the antichrist Jews in prayer at the Wailing Wall or in the synagogue, but these feelings of sympathy directly contradict the teaching of Scripture.

We have already seen that contemporary Judaism is the religion of the Pharisaic rabbis, not the religion of the Old Testament. But even if the Jewish claim about practicing the religion of the Old Testament were true, and the Jews were, essentially, “Christians without Christ”, their religious observance would still be an affront to God, because they have rejected his Son. If the Bible tells us that the Jews do not have the Father, then all of their religious observance, even when it closely follows the commands of the Old Testament, is empty and worthless.

If avowed atheists were to carry out the form of Old Testament worship, would we give them any respect? Or would we rather doubly condemn them for their hypocrisy and vanity? An atheist is one who denies God. A Jew is one who denies Christ, and therefore is without God. There is no reason to view the Jew any more favorably than the atheist.

The Jews claim to worship God with their festivals and religious services, but if we are serious about believing the truth of the New Testament, then we must agree that “*Whosoever denieth the Son, the same hath not the Father*”. Therefore, rather than respecting the Jews for their Old Testament practice, we must condemn them for it. And in making this condemnation, we are following the words of the prophet Isaiah directed against the apostate Jews of his age.

For Isaiah wrote,

Hear the word of the Lord, ye rulers of Sodom; give ear unto the law of our God, ye people of Gomorrah...Bring no more vain oblations; incense is an abomination unto me; the new moons and sabbaths, the calling of assemblies, I cannot away with; it is iniquity, even the solemn meeting. Your new moons and your appointed feasts my soul hateth: they are a trouble unto me; I am weary to bear them. And when ye spread forth your

hands, I will hide mine eyes from you: yea, when ye make many prayers, I will not hear: your hands are full of blood.

-Isaiah 1:10,13-15

Speaking through Isaiah, God tells the apostate Israelites that their outer worship is an abomination. They may fulfill the external ordinances, but their hearts are impure and hypocritical. This is exactly the same charge that Jesus brought against the Pharisees. The Pharisees make a show of righteousness, but their hearts are full of sin, just as the false and idolatrous Israelites of Isaiah's age were.

The Jews admit that their religion is based on the traditions of the Pharisees. We have also seen that Christ tells the Jews who reject him *“That it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom in the day of judgment, than for thee”* (Matthew 11:24). Isaiah calls the faithless Jews of his age Sodom and Gomorrah, Jesus tells the faithless Jews of his age that they are worse than Sodom and Gomorrah. There is absolutely no reason why Isaiah's harsh words to his contemporaries would not equally apply to the Jews of today who stubbornly refuse to hear the Gospel even after it has been preached to them for nearly 2000 years. The guilt of the Jew does not diminish the farther we get from our Lord's Crucifixion. On the contrary, their guilt is multiplied by their unyielding stubbornness. In the book of Acts we read,

Paul was pressed in the spirit, and testified to the Jews that Jesus was Christ. And when they opposed themselves, and blasphemed, he shook his raiment, and said unto them, Your blood be upon your own heads; I am clean: from henceforth I will go unto the Gentiles.

-Acts 18:5-6

These Jews refused to hear the Gospel, and Paul said that they are responsible for their own death. These are Jews who lived in the very early days of the Church, when the prophecies concerning the New Testament Church had not yet been fully completed. But now, with the miraculous spread of the Church to all corners of the world, the Jews have even less of an excuse. Generation after generation, the Jews have witnessed the blossoming of the Gospel and have repeatedly been encouraged by Christians to accept Jesus as the Messiah. But despite all of this, their hearts have merely grown harder and harder. They are as unwilling as ever to accept Jesus as Lord, and every harsh condemnation of the faithless Jews, whether found in the Old or New Testament, is still applicable today.

Therefore, keep these words of Isaiah 1 firmly in your mind the next time you witness Jewish worship. Are you charmed by their Hebrew recitations? Their incense and chants? Their observance of the Sabbath? If these outer trappings of religion seduce you into thinking fondly of the Jews, then you are falling into the same snare that Satan used to draw this cursed people away from the redeemer. The Jews to whom Paul said “ *Your blood be upon your own heads*” also followed the outer forms of synagogue worship, and yet were still far from salvation. If you, as a Christian, send the message to the Jews that their worship is pleasing to God, then their blood is upon your head as well. When we give respect to the religion of the antichrist Jews, we bring their pollution into the Church.

Both arguments in favor of Christian judeophilia share this feature: they are carnal and superficial, focusing only on externals and ignoring the inner filth of the Jews. Judeophiliacs will wax poetic about hearing the Old Testament being read at a synagogue, but what does the pleasure of hearing these verses matter when they are said with a faithless heart? Consider the following words from Isaiah:

He was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed.

-Isaiah 53:5

These words clearly predicted the Passion of Christ. When a Jew reads this verse, it is a moral abomination, no matter how beautifully he pronounces the Hebrew, because he denies the true meaning of the verse. The synagogue worship uses passages from the Old Testament, but these passages are like the lovely white tombs, and the souls of the Jews reading them are like diseased, rotting corpses.

Christians today have been seduced by sensuality, and put the external, physical aspects of Jewish worship and ancestry ahead of doctrinal principles. The Jews killed Christ and are still guilty of this crime. They are a tribe of antichrists who corrupt and undermine all truth and decency, and Christian judeophilia enables their wicked work. Even when churches or pastors stick to genuine Biblical teaching on all other issues, if they lie and say that the Jews are righteous and free of guilt, they become tools of the adversary. Judeophilia is a perversion, and judeophiliacs prostitute themselves with the idolatry of Jew-worship.

The importance of confronting judeophilia cannot be stressed enough. In failing to speak the truth on this one point, the conservative churches sully themselves. They may appear Godly in other respects and have an attractive outer sheen, but inside they are corrupt. Let us strive to follow more closely the teaching of Christ, and with his help cleanse the Church of this Jewish pollution.

17. Judaism Is Not The Religion Of The Old Testament

The Jews often claim that they practice the religion of the Old Testament and that their doctrine has remained pure throughout the ages, while Christianity has been tainted with paganism. Some Jews even claim that because of their doctrinal purity, they are in a position to teach Christians about the Bible and the origin of the Church. Many Christians, especially those who consider medieval Christian practices to be of pagan origin, are tricked into accepting this Jewish claim of doctrinal purity. However, this Jewish claim is completely false, and in fact, Judaism has been more polluted by idolatry and blasphemy than any branch of Christianity. Superstitious, pagan beliefs have been widely accepted by the Jews, and their chief holy book, the Talmud, is a shockingly vulgar and godless text.

One of the more striking examples of this pagan influence is the Jewish belief in reincarnation. Reincarnation is the belief that after death, the soul is reborn into another body, and this doctrine has been held by several different pagan religions throughout history. It is quite surprising to most people that many Jews believe in reincarnation, but it is easy to show from Jewish sources that this indeed is the case. It is important to point out that this Jewish belief in reincarnation is not modern, nor is it found among New Age Jews who dabble in eastern religions while neglecting their own traditions. This belief is found among Hasidic Jews, who make up a branch of Orthodox Judaism. The fact that Orthodox Jews, who are known for their distinctive black clothing and strict adherence to traditional customs, should accept such a clearly unbiblical doctrine reveals how completely Judaism has been corrupted.

Chabad Lubavitch is the most prominent Hasidic organization and one of the largest

Jewish organization in the world. Its official website features an article by Rabbi Yerachmiel Tilles that endorses reincarnation, claiming that “*reincarnation - the 'revolving' of souls through a succession of lives, or 'gilgulim' - is an integral part of Jewish belief*”.¹⁶ Tilles dares to cite Scripture in support of his false doctrine, attempting to explain the lack of evidence for his position by saying that the Bible “*is a multi-layered document. Many of its deeper levels of interpretation are not readily accessible; and they may not lend themselves to obvious, practical application in daily life*”. The only scriptural passage cited in the article is Genesis 38:8, which reads “*And Judah said unto Onan, Go in unto thy brother’s wife, and marry her, and raise up seed to thy brother*”. It is obvious to anyone that this verse has nothing to do with reincarnation, but according to Tilles, the idea that the verse relates to reincarnation goes all the way back to the 13th century rabbi Nahmanides, one of the most prominent figures in the history of Judaism. Tilles also cites 16th century rabbi Isaac Luria and his belief that “*every Jew must fulfill all 613 mitzvot, and if he doesn't succeed in one lifetime, he comes back again and again until he finishes*”. (The 613 mitzvot are a Jewish codification of the commandments of the Old Testament). The audacity of using Scripture in support of their pagan views shows that these Jews have no respect for the Word of God.

Any faithful student of Scripture can easily see that for centuries the Jews have indulged in the most shameless distortions of Biblical teaching. Many Christians mistakenly believe that contemporary Judaism is a religion that faithfully follows the Old Testament, making it a sort of Christianity without Christ. In reality Judaism has failed to keep out doctrines whose pagan origins are blatantly obvious.

One might wonder how the Jews could possibly twist Scripture in such unnatural ways. The answer lies in the Talmud, the sacred book of the Jews. The Talmud is a collection of Rabbinic writings from the first few centuries after Christ. As we saw in a previous chapter, the Rabbis were the direct intellectual and spiritual descendants of the Pharisees. In the time of Christ, the Pharisees were already developing a system of Biblical interpretation that allowed them to violate the spirit of Biblical commandments while fulfilling them in a superficial way.

16 Tilles, Yerachmiel. *Judaism and Reincarnation*.
http://www.chabad.org/kabbalah/article_cdo/aid/380599/jewish/Judaism-and-Reincarnation.htm (accessed 11/16/14)

An example of this is found in Mark 7:

He answered and said unto them, Well hath Esaias prophesied of you hypocrites, as it is written, This people honoureth me with their lips, but their heart is far from me. Howbeit in vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men. For laying aside the commandment of God, ye hold the tradition of men, as the washing of pots and cups: and many other such like things ye do. And he said unto them, Full well ye reject the commandment of God, that ye may keep your own tradition. For Moses said, Honour thy father and thy mother; and, Whoso curseth father or mother, let him die the death: But ye say, If a man shall say to his father or mother, It is Corban, that is to say, a gift, by whatsoever thou mightest be profited by me; he shall be free. And ye suffer him no more to do ought for his father or his mother; Making the word of God of none effect through your tradition, which ye have delivered: and many such like things do ye.

-Mark 7:6-13

Here Jesus rebukes the Pharisees for adhering to legalistic man-made tradition while neglecting the law of God. This same rebuke must be directed at the rabbis who wrote the Talmud and at the Jews of today who follow these same teachings. If we examine the Talmud, it becomes obvious that the Jews ignored Christ's rebuke and continued down the path of wickedness. The Jews have progressed so far down this path that they no longer worship God, but instead worship their own techniques of hairsplitting argumentation. Nowhere is this more clearly demonstrated than in the following episode from the Talmud (Baba Mezi'a 59b). In this passage, the Rabbi Eliezer is debating with his fellow rabbis about the cleanness of an oven. The other rabbis refuse to accept Eliezer's argument, even after God himself speaks from heaven on Eliezer's behalf:

On that day R. Eliezer brought forward every imaginable argument, but they did not accept them. Said he to them: 'If the halachah (Jewish law) agrees with me, let this carob-tree prove it!' Thereupon the carob-tree was torn a hundred cubits out of its place — others affirm, four hundred cubits. 'No proof can be brought from a carob-tree,' they retorted. Again he said to them: 'If the halachah agrees with me, let the stream of water prove it!' Whereupon the stream of water flowed backwards — 'No proof can be brought from a stream of water,' they rejoined. Again he urged: 'If the halachah agrees with me, let the walls of the schoolhouse prove it,' whereupon the walls inclined to fall. But R. Joshua rebuked them, saying: 'When scholars are engaged in a halachic dispute, what have ye to

*interfere?' Hence they did not fall, in honor of R. Joshua, nor did they resume the upright, in honor of R. Eliezer; and they are still standing thus inclined. Again he said to them: 'If the halachah agrees with me, let it be proved from Heaven!' Whereupon a Heavenly Voice cried out: 'Why do ye dispute with R. Eliezer, seeing that in all matters the halachah agrees with him!' But R. Joshua arose and exclaimed: 'It is not in heaven.' What did he mean by this? — Said R. Jeremiah: That the Torah had already been given at Mount Sinai; we pay no attention to a Heavenly Voice, because Thou hast long since written in the Torah at Mount Sinai, After the majority must one incline. R. Nathan met Elijah and asked him: What did the Holy One, Blessed be He, do in that hour? — He laughed [with joy], he replied, saying, 'My sons have defeated Me, My sons have defeated Me.'*¹⁷

It is difficult to imagine greater effrontery. In their twisted imagination, the rabbis not only think that they can out debate God, but that the Lord would even be pleased by his defeat. This outrageous pride of the rabbis contrasts sharply with the piety of the Old Testament saints. When speaking to God about the fate of Sodom and Gommorah, Abraham said “*Behold now, I have taken upon me to speak unto the Lord, which am but dust and ashes*” (Genesis 18:27). David spoke with the same reverence when he said “*Who am I, O Lord GOD? and what is my house, that thou hast brought me hitherto?*” (2 Samuel 7:18). Abraham and David spoke to God with fear and reverence, not with Rabbinic impudence. Who, therefore, are the true sons of Abraham: the Jewish rabbis who dare to claim that they have outwitted God, or the Christian apostles who humbled themselves and declared themselves to be the greatest of sinners?

As shocking as this passage from the Talmud may be, it only begins to reveal the filth and blasphemy contained within the Jewish holy book. In order to see the true extent of Jewish depravity, it is necessary to turn to the passages of the Talmud that directly slander and insult Jesus Christ. The Jewish insults against our Lord are covered extensively in the book *Jesus in the Talmud* by Peter Schäfer. Schäfer is Perelman Professor of Judaic Studies and the director of the Program of Judaic Studies at Princeton University. The book was published by Princeton University Press, and has received positive reviews from several Jewish journals and newspapers. According to Schäfer, the stories about Jesus in the Talmud:

ridicule Jesus' birth from a virgin, as maintained by the Gospels of

¹⁷ *The Soncino Babylonian Talmud. Book III Folios 58b-90b.* Translated by H. Freedman.
<http://www.halachah.com/rst/nezikin/32c%20-%20Baba%20Metziah%20-%2058b-90b.pdf> (accessed 11/16/14)

Matthew and Luke, and they contest fervently the claim that Jesus is the Son of God. Most remarkably, they counter the New Testament Passion story with its message of the Jews' guilt and shame as Christ killers. Instead, they reverse it completely: yes, they maintain, we accept responsibility for it, but there is no reason to feel ashamed because we rightfully executed a blasphemer and idolater. Jesus deserved death, and he got what he deserved. Accordingly, they subvert the Christian idea of Jesus' resurrection by having him punished forever in hell and making clear that this fate awaits his followers as well, who believe in this impostor.¹⁸

In the Gospel narrative, the Jews instigate the Romans to execute Jesus. While some lying judeophiliacs try to promote the idea that the Romans, not the Jews, are truly responsible, the Talmud fully accepts Jewish responsibility for the crucifixion. In fact, the Talmud not only accepts responsibility, but shamelessly celebrates it. The Talmud declares that Jesus was a magician who led Israel astray. It *downplays* Roman involvement and emphasizes that Jesus was justly executed according to Jewish law. Rather than blaming the Romans, the Talmud claims that Jesus was close to the Roman government, and that because of this closeness the Jews were forced to be especially careful in carrying out Jesus' trial and execution. According to the Talmud,

On (Sabbath eve and) the eve of Passover Jesus the Nazarene was hanged. And a herald went forth before him 40 days (heralding): Jesus the Nazarene is going forth to be stoned because he practiced sorcery and instigated and seduced Israel (to idolatry). Whoever knows anything in his defense, may come and state it. But since they did not find anything in his defense, they hanged him on (Sabbath eve and) the eve of Passover.

Ulla said: Do you suppose that Jesus the Nazarene was one for whom a defense could be made? He was a mesit (someone who instigated Israel to idolatry), concerning whom the Merciful [God] says: Show him no compassion and do not shield him (Deut:13.9)

With Jesus the Nazarene it was different, for he was close to the government.¹⁹

In previous chapters, we have seen that the New Testament unambiguously declares the guilt of the Jews. Now we see that the Talmud agrees with the New Testament on this issue: the Jews did kill Jesus. How can anyone claim that the New Testament and the Talmud are both wrong on

18 Schäfer, Peter. *Jesus in the Talmud*. Princeton University Press, 2007. Page 9.

19 *Ibid.* Pages 64-65.

this crucial question? The Apostles charged the Jews with killing Jesus, and in the Talmud the Jews plead guilty to this charge.

The Talmud condemns Jesus as an idolater, it declares his murder to be an act of justice, and it even goes so far as to describe Jesus' humiliating punishment in hell. The details of Jesus' supposed punishment are found in the section of the Talmud that tells the story of a gentile named Onqelos who is considering converting to Judaism.²⁰ As part of his inquiry, Onqelos uses necromancy to summon the spirit of three former enemies of the Jews, one of whom is Jesus. In his discussion with Onqelos, the Talmud has Jesus say that the Jews are honored in the afterlife and that he (Jesus) is eternally punished in boiling excrement (the same passage also has Balaam being punished in boiling semen).

The Jews twist God's Word, they hate the Messiah, they worship their own man-made traditions, and they use their filthy imagination to dream up disgusting punishments for their enemies. They are antichrists who merely masquerade as God's chosen people, a fact that is quickly revealed when we examine their own sacred texts and traditions.

Before moving on, it is necessary to counter a common argument used by Jews when defending the Talmud. When confronted with the passages in the Talmud that insult Jesus, many Jews will simply deny that these passages exist or deny that they refer to Jesus. And indeed, these Jews can point to certain editions of the Talmud in which these passages have been altered or omitted. These doctored editions disguise the truth about the Talmud and do not faithfully follow the earliest Talmud manuscripts. For example, when asked about the story of Jesus being boiled in excrement, some Jews might point to modern editions of the Talmud that say that it is not Jesus but “the sinners of Israel” who are boiled in excrement. But Schäfer has provided detailed information about the manuscript tradition of each controversial passage,²¹ and he shows that including “the sinners of Israel” instead of Jesus is a modern invention. The earliest manuscripts that include the story of Jesus in hell come from the 14th century, and these all mention Jesus as the one being boiled in excrement. A printed edition of the Talmud from the late 15th/early 16th century leaves out Jesus' name but does not put anything in its place (a clear

²⁰ *Ibid.* Pages 84-85.

²¹ *Ibid.* Pages 131-144.

indication that the text has been censored). It is not until a printed edition from the late **19th century** that we find any mention of “the sinners of Israel”. What has happened is obvious: there has been a deliberate effort to disguise what the Talmud really says about Jesus. Beginning in the late middle ages, there were increasing Christian efforts to study Judaism and uncover its unholy teachings. This led to a greater Christian awareness of the Talmud, and naturally Christians were shocked at what they found. It is therefore unsurprising that later editions of the Talmud began to omit the name of Jesus in some of the more outrageous passages. But these changes were superficial. The Jews had not undergone any change of heart, they simply wished to avoid any negative attention from Christians. The name of Jesus was left out, but the disgusting stories remained, including the blasphemous account of the “victory” of the rabbis over God. The same pride and wickedness exhibited by the Pharisees is found in the version of the Talmud studied by the rabbis of today.

18. Deicide: The Crime At The Heart Of Judaism

Over the last two thousand years, the Jews have often been called the killers of Christ. This charge is not made idly. The murder of our Lord is the foundational act of the Jewish religion, and grasping the significance of this crime is key to understanding the Jewish role in the world today.

In the most obvious and literal sense, the Jews are said to be the killers of Christ because they were the ones who, according to the Bible, cried out for our Lord to be crucified (Luke 23:21). It is undeniable that the Jews of today are the spiritual descendants of the Pharisees. The Jews themselves admit that their Rabbinic religion comes from the wicked Pharisees, and the Jews refuse to turn away from the lies of the Talmud. In Matthew 23, Jesus tells the Pharisees that they are guilty of the righteous blood spilled generations ago, for they are of the same black heart and evil mind as those who personally committed those acts. And just as Christ condemned his contemporaries for past crimes, so we Christians must condemn the Jews for spilling the most precious and innocent blood of our Lord.

Satan and his special people, the Jews, crucified Christ, but their efforts were in vain. For in his suffering and humiliation, Jesus obtained victory over death and sin. As it is written in the Bible, “*O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory?*” (1 Corinthians 15:55). Our adversaries’ greatest crime was also their greatest defeat. Just as Satan’s rebellion made him an outcast from Heaven, so the crime of the Jews made them outcasts from all decent races of men.

For several centuries the Jews were kept at a distance, but tragically, due to the societal

and technological upheavals of the past few centuries, the Jews have managed to gain supreme control over the nations that were once known as Christendom. This leads us to the deeper meaning of the Jews as Christ-killers: as soon as they gained control of our media and academic institutions, the Jews set about trying to kill Christ over again. Of course they do not attempt to violate the actual body of our Lord, rather they attempt to kill Christ *in us*.

Christians are those who have put on Christ and allowed faith in him to be the foundation of their new life. When the Jews use their influence to promote Marxism, Freudianism, and countless other evils, they urge our brothers and sisters to abandon the work that Christ has done in them. Christ is the rock of virtues by whose strength we endure the temptations of the world; the Jews desire us to be without moral stability. Christ is the wisdom of discernment by which we can choose what is good and holy; the Jews wish for us to be blind, foolish cattle enslaved to lust. Christ is the Way, the Truth, and the Life; the Jews plot to keep us lost, blind, and spiritually dead. The Jews called for the brutal execution of Jesus, and since then they have sought to suppress and pervert his saving Gospel. They desire a world where faith in Christ is unknown, a world where their crime has been completed.

19. Religious And Secular Jews

In the previous chapter I mentioned the doctrines of Marx and Freud as being typical of the nature of the Jew. Judeophilic Christians would object to calling these doctrines Jewish, and point out that these men were atheists. Marx and Freud might have been ethnically Jewish, but they rejected the truth of the Jewish religion, and therefore the Jewish religion cannot be blamed for their errors. These Christians will make the same argument when anyone brings up the Jewish background of those who are destroying America. George Soros, Sheldon Adelson, Michael Bloomberg, David Axelrod, along with countless television and film executives, they are all Jewish, but these Jews are almost all secular in their lifestyle and beliefs.

When judeophilic Christians defend the Jews by saying that “all the bad Jews are atheists”, they are implying that there is something good in the Jewish religion and that religious Jews are our friends. Nothing could be further from the truth. For religious and secular Jews are united in their hatred of Christ and his Church. It was religious Jews who wrote and propagated the Talmud. It was religious Jews who called for our Lord to be crucified. It was religious Jews of whom Paul said “*the Jews, who both killed the Lord Jesus, and their own prophets, and have persecuted us; and they please not God, and are contrary to all men: Forbidding us to speak to the Gentiles that they might be saved*” (1 Thessalonians 2:14-16). The religious Jews of the past were no friends to us Christians.

And in the modern era it is no different. For it was religious Jews who, according to the Israeli newspaper Haaretz, burned hundreds of copies of the New Testament:

Orthodox Jews set fire to hundreds of copies of the New Testament in the latest act of violence against Christian missionaries in the Holy Land.

Or Yehuda Deputy Mayor Uzi Aharon said missionaries recently entered a neighborhood in the predominantly religious town of 34,000 in central Israel, distributing hundreds of New Testaments and missionary material.

After receiving complaints, Aharon said, he got into a loudspeaker car last Thursday and drove through the neighborhood, urging people to turn over the material to Jewish religious students who went door to door to collect it.

“The books were dumped into a pile and set afire in a lot near a synagogue,” he said.²²

It was a religious Jew who, according to Ynet News, tore up a copy of the New Testament in the Israeli parliament:

MK Michael Ben Ari (National Union), a member of the Israeli parliament tore up a copy of the New Testament and threw it in the trash, an act that was apparently caught on camera.

Ben Ari and several other Knesset members received by mail on Monday a copy of the New Testament, sent by the Bible Society in Israel, an organization that distributes religious books.

In the letter sent with the book, director of the Christian organization Victor Kalisher wrote that the new edition “sheds light on the Holy Scriptures and helps understand them.”

“We hope the book will help you and illuminate your way,” Kalisher further wrote.

However, while most MK's chose to ignore the book or return it to its sender, the rightist lawmaker chose to term the book a “provocation,” tore it up into shreds and then threw it out.

“This abominable book (the New Testament) galvanized the murder of millions of Jews during the Inquisition and during auto da fe instances,” Ben Ari said adding that “Sending the book to MK's is a provocation. There is no doubt that this book and all it represents belongs in the garbage can of history.”²³

And it was a religious Jew, in fact a former chief Rabbi of Israel, who said that God created non-Jews solely to serve the Jews. According to the Jewish Telegraphic Agency:

22 *Orthodox Jewish youths burn New Testaments in Or Yehuda.* Haaretz. May 20, 2008. <http://www.haaretz.com/news/orthodox-jewish-youths-burn-new-testaments-in-or-yehuda-1.246153> (accessed 11/16/14)

23 *Brot, Tzvika. MK Ben Ari rips up New Testament.* Ynet News. July 18, 2012. <http://www.ynetnews.com/articles/0,7340,L-4257174,00.html> (accessed 11/16/14)

Israeli Sephardic leader Rabbi Ovadia Yosef in his weekly Saturday night sermon said that non-Jews exist to serve Jews.

“Goyim were born only to serve us. Without that, they have no place in the world; only to serve the People of Israel,” he said during a public discussion of what kind of work non-Jews are allowed to perform on Shabbat.

“Why are gentiles needed? They will work, they will plow, they will reap. We will sit like an effendi and eat,” he said to some laughter.

Yosef, the spiritual leader of the Shas Party and the former chief Sephardi rabbi of Israel, also said that the lives of non-Jews are protected in order to prevent financial loss to Jews.

“With gentiles, it will be like any person: They need to die, but God will give them longevity. Why? Imagine that one’s donkey would die, they’d lose their money. This is his servant. That’s why he gets a long life, to work well for this Jew.”²⁴

When a Jew is said to be devout, this should not be considered a compliment. Saying that a Jew is devout is merely saying that he is more zealous in following an utterly false religion, the religion handed down by the Christ-killing Pharisees. We should expect nothing virtuous or good from the Jews, whether religious or secular.

But it is not enough merely to recognize that both religious and secular Jews are our enemies. We must come to understand that despite any disagreement or conflict between these two groups of Jews, they still work together to grow Jewish power and influence.

If we consider the Pharisees of the New Testament, we can see that their false religion was based primarily on two errors:

1. Pride in following the letter of the law.
2. Pride in their physical descent from Abraham.

While secular Jews largely fail to follow the letter of the law, they still take just as much pride in their physical descent as do religious Jews. This shared pride in being ethnically Jewish binds the two groups of Jews together, and provides enough cohesion to successfully carry out

²⁴ Oster, Marcy. *Sephardi leader Yosef: Non-Jews exist to serve Jews*. Jewish Telegraphic Agency. October 18, 2010.
<http://www.jta.org/2010/10/18/news-opinion/israel-middle-east/sephardi-leader-yosef-non-jews-exist-to-serve-jews> (accessed 11/16/14)

massive undertakings. The success of Zionism is a perfect example of this. The creation of Zionism is largely credited to Theodor Herzl, who was a Jewish atheist, and yet devout Jewish rabbis been some of the most enthusiastic supporters of Herzl's plan. Secular Jews and religious Jews support each other because both groups see any Jewish success as proof of the superiority of Abraham's physical seed. This mutual support is not limited to Zionism. Wherever the Jews live, secular and religious Jews support the same Jewish organizations and networks. That is, they are both part of organized Jewry. There are openly pro-Jewish organizations in politics and business. These organizations draw support from both secular and religious Jews, and in turn promote the interests of both secular and religious Jews. Religious Jews might criticize the way that secular Jews in Hollywood behave, but they are still glad that Jews, not gentiles, are in positions of prominence. The secular Jews who run Hollywood might scoff at the supernatural beliefs of any religion, but when it comes time to feature “unenlightened” religious “wackos” in films or television, they almost always choose conservative Christians, not Talmud-following rabbis.

Pride in being fleshly sons of Abraham is at the center of the Jewish religion. In other words, the Jews are both a race and a religion. If anything, it would be fair to say that the Jews of today are more concerned with race than religion, given that some of those who wish to immigrate to Israel are subjected to DNA tests, not religious examinations.

According to the Times of Israel:

A number of people from the former Soviet Union wishing to immigrate to Israel could be subjected to DNA testing to prove their Jewishness, the Prime Minister's Office said Sunday.

The policy was reported in Maariv on Monday, one day after the Israeli paper revealed that a 19-year-old woman from the former Soviet Union was required to take the test to qualify for a Birthright Israel trip.

The Prime Minister's Office confirmed that many Jews from the FSU who were born out-of-wedlock can be required to bring DNA confirmation of Jewish heritage in order to be allowed to immigrate as a Jew.

A source in the PMO told Maariv that the consul's procedure, approved by the legal department of the Interior Ministry, states that a Russian-speaking child born out-of-wedlock is eligible to receive an Israeli immigration visa if the birth was registered before the child turned

3. *Otherwise a DNA test to prove Jewish parentage is necessary.*²⁵

Religious Jews strictly follow the rabbinic law codes and deny the truth of the Gospel. Secular Jews largely ignore the rabbinic law codes and also deny the truth of the Gospel. Both groups of Jews adhere to the Jewish principle of the superiority of the fleshly sons of Abraham. Both groups of Jews support and defend the other, and they see each other as natural allies against the whole of Western, Christian civilization. Whether religious or secular, the Jews are all blindness and evil, and we should expect nothing good from them. Furthermore, Judaism is a uniquely wicked religion, as it is the only religion based on the doctrines of those who directly murdered the Messiah. Therefore, just as religious Jews promote the most offensive religious doctrines, it should not be surprising that secular Jews promote the most offensive secular doctrines. The twisted soul of the Jew continues in its unique wickedness even after it has abandoned the strict rules and rituals of the Pharisees.

²⁵ *Russian-speakers who want to make aliya could need DNA test.* Times of Israel. July 29, 2013.
<http://www.timesofisrael.com/russian-speakers-who-want-to-immigrate-could-need-dna-test/> (accessed 11/16/14)

20. Agape vs Eros Part 1: Introduction

Thus far I have examined the Jews from a religious perspective, looking at what the Bible says about the apostate sons of Abraham and what these blasphemers actually believe. It is now necessary to change to a slightly different subject: Jewish secular thought. This subject is important because the ideology promoted by secular Jewish intellectuals has become so powerful in contemporary America, that no contrary opinion is tolerated in our universities or the mainstream media. It can truly be said that our culture is thoroughly Jewish, and that anyone whose opinions are shaped by the media and the academic establishment is under Jewish control. At the outset of this section of the book, I would like to impress upon the reader that although wading through the perverted thoughts of radical leftists can be quite tedious for the Christian, nevertheless we must study the intellectual weapons of our enemies if we are to overcome them. I have tried my best to present the essential features of Jewish thought in the most succinct and straightforward manner possible.

This system of secular Jewish thought is best described as “Cultural Marxism”. Although the average American is unfamiliar with the term Cultural Marxism, it is the key to understanding why conservative Christians have lost every battle in the culture wars. The earliest origins of Cultural Marxism are, naturally enough, the doctrines of the Jew Karl Marx. Marx taught that the only way for oppressed workers to receive justice was by completely destroying all traditional aspects of civilization (including faith, family and nation), and by guaranteeing the communal ownership of property under the management of a centralized state. Marx also believed that the Communist revolution was an inevitable outcome of historical development, a faith shared by his Jewish followers. When the disproportionately Jewish

Bolshevik revolutionaries seized power in Russia, many Jewish intellectuals celebrated the dawn of a new era of human progress and justice. But Marx's prediction of a communist utopia proved to be false. The Soviet state soon became synonymous with gulags, starvation, and murderous purges. It also became clear that even when ruled by “enlightened” Marxists, the average Christian still clings to his faith. Outside of a few emotionally-damaged upper class gentiles, Marxism never reached into the heart of any Christian people. Honest, everyday Christian folks were never taken in by the Marxist demand to completely destroy civilization. Dissatisfied workers might join in strikes and other agitations out of a desire to raise wages and improve working conditions, but in the end, they were still largely loyal to God, family and country. These Christian, blue-collar workers had no interest in the Satanic subversion of God's law demanded by Marx. But the Jew was not content with the average Christian's dismissal of Marxist doctrine, nor did the horrors of the Soviet Union convince the Jew to reject Marxist theory. According to the Jew, the nightmare of Communism was not due to any flaw in the theory, but to the stubborn refusal of the Christian to abandon his faith and identity. If the Christian would not accept Marxism when it was explained to him honestly and openly, then the Christian must be forced to accept Marxism by covert means. In order to bring about this covert imposition of Marxism, Jewish intellectuals employed the work of Jewish pervert Sigmund Freud.

Freud reduced all of human civilization to base sexual desires, and taught that true happiness is to be found by abandoning the strict sexual morality demanded by religion. Religion and chastity, therefore, should be considered mental illnesses that must be cured. A group of Jewish intellectuals originally based in Frankfurt, Germany (and hence known as “the Frankfurt School”) combined the theories of Marx and Freud, creating a new doctrine that came to be known as Cultural Marxism. Cultural Marxism shares the same goals as traditional Marxism—the complete destruction of faith, family and nation—but rather than focusing primarily on property ownership, it focuses on the complete “liberation” of the individual from traditional morality and responsibility. This doctrine is a total inversion of Christianity, for it preaches that fallen man's sinful desires for fornication and other selfish enjoyment are the highest virtues, and that denying unlimited pleasure to oneself or others is the greatest sin. In this basic proposition we can see the root of all of the modern world's social problems.

Everything from the “freedom” of sodomites to marry to the “right” of welfare abusers to avoid hard work can be traced back to the Cultural Marxist position that unlimited pleasure is the ultimate goal of all human existence, and that any limit to carnal enjoyment is “oppression”.

In the following chapters I will explain the development of Cultural Marxism in greater detail by analyzing the original writings of Marx, Freud and the Jews of the Frankfurt School. But before beginning this analysis, I would like to stress three points that should be kept in mind throughout:

1) These Jews present themselves as “enlightened” and “scientific” when attacking “primitive” and “irrational” Christianity. This presentation is completely false. Cultural Marxism is not science, it is pseudo-science. As we will see in the following chapters, Cultural Marxism is based on completely unverified statements about history and human nature. It sometimes claims for itself the certainty of the empirical sciences, but at other times it dismisses scientific certainty as an illusion. Cultural Marxism is therefore completely untethered from both religion and science, and has absolutely no intellectual legitimacy.

2) When examining the nature of Jewish control, we must not fall into the trap of making a distinction between religious and secular Jews. Despite what I demonstrated in the previous chapter about religious and secular Jews, I can imagine a reader once again thinking that these Cultural Marxists, who so strenuously promote atheism, simply have nothing to do with “religious” Jews. I therefore repeat once again that “religious” Jews do not belong to the God of the Old Testament, nor are they members of God's covenant. They do not follow the word of God. They follow their own false doctrines, and ultimately worship themselves. Even though “religious” Jews invoke the supernatural to justify their beliefs in Jewish superiority, this does not make them religious in the true sense. And as we will see in the following chapters, even after Jews reject the supernatural element of religion, they still consider their own tradition and their own race to be unique and superior to all others. Jewish Marxists may have abandoned belief in the supernatural, but they did not abandon the rabbinic teaching that the Jews have the power to redefine truth and reality as they see fit. The shared faith in Jewish superiority binds “religious” and atheist Jews into one unified body.

3) According to the Bible, love is the greatest Christian virtue (1 Corinthians 13:13). The original Greek word that is translated as love is *agape*. The Bible also declares that God is

Agape (1 John 4:8), and that it was because of Agape that God sent his son to save us (John 3:16). Therefore, the importance of Love/Agape in the Christian life cannot be overstated. Agape is completely selfless concern and goodwill for others. Agape is giving up one's own life in order that others might live. Diametrically opposed to Agape is Eros. *Eros* is the Greek word for "lust", but it is often mistranslated as "love". This opposition between Agape and Eros and the confusion of the two concepts in today's culture are at the center of the Jewish subversion of Christianity. For Eros is selfishness. Eros seeks self-gratification at the expense of others and drives men to abandon God's law, which is seen as "oppression". When the Jews rejected Jesus, they rejected true love. The legacy of this rejection is still very much with us in the form of Jewish Cultural Marxism. Cultural Marxism completely disregards Agape, both the spiritual Agape taught by the Bible, and the more mundane Agape that is seen even among unbelievers (such as the love and concern that an unbelieving mother has for her child). In place of Agape, Cultural Marxism establishes Eros as the supreme governing force in human affairs, and the chief goal of human existence. For Cultural Marxism, social progress is found in the ever greater satisfaction of Eros, not in developing greater control over base desires. In this elevation of Eros, we can easily recognize the deeply Satanic nature of Cultural Marxism. In our time, the ongoing struggle between light and darkness is most clearly seen in this contest between Christian Agape and Jewish Eros.

21. Agape vs Eros Part 2: Karl Marx

Sin and unbelief have been the common lot of men ever since the fall of Adam. In every generation most men have denied God to some degree and have put self-satisfaction at the center of their lives. Therefore, it would not be accurate to say that Karl Marx (1818-1883) was the first to make excuses for ungodly behavior, or even that he was the first to promote atheism and materialism as positive goods. But in the doctrine of Marx, we find a coalescence and distillation of nearly all the vice and blasphemy of preceding ages. It is under the rule of Marxism that the destruction of Church, nation, family and private property has been most successfully carried out. Marxism has murdered millions of innocents over the past 150 years, and this slaughter continues in our own times. In Marxism Satan found the perfect formula to blind man and draw him away from his savior. Although Satan has not hesitated to enlist both Jews and gentiles in the ranks of Marxism, he has appointed Jews as the chief earthly agents for spreading this disease. This evil doctrine was formulated by the Jew Karl Marx, was heavily supported by numerous Jewish intellectuals, and inspired the Jewish Frankfurt School.

In this chapter I will look at several passages by Marx, taken mostly from *The Communist Manifesto*. But before examining Marx's writings, it is important to clear up a common misconception. Marxism is often presented as primarily an economic system. This view is incorrect. Marxism has always had as its chief end the selfish gratification of base desires and "liberation" from restraint and responsibility (in other words, the free reign of Eros). Economic theories have only been means to achieve this end. By focusing on the purely economic aspect of Marxism, many observers have come to think that Marxism disappeared with the dissolution of the Soviet Union. This is completely untrue. Marxist Jews never gave up

on the essence of their system. They merely found a more effective way to market their beliefs, as we shall see in the following chapters.

Marx's demand for the abolition of private property certainly was wicked and destructive, but it was his demand for the abolition of all former moral values that has truly scarred humanity. Because Marx was a materialist, he viewed religion and all human culture as merely the outcome of blind economic and biological processes. The Christian sees the moral law as the foundation and starting point of civilization, but for Marx, morality is merely a surface phenomenon shaped by the true driving forces of history. With this shallow understanding of morality and culture, it was easy for Marx to reject all earlier standards of goodness and decency. In *The Communist Manifesto* Marx writes:

*Does it require deep intuition to comprehend that man's ideas, views and conceptions, in one word, man's consciousness, changes with every change in the conditions of his material existence, in his social relations and in his social life? What else does the history of ideas prove, than that intellectual production changes its character in proportion as material production is changed? The ruling ideas of each age have ever been the ideas of its ruling class.*²⁶

Elsewhere in the same text, Marx addresses the imagined criticism of those who believe that eternal moral standards remain constant despite changes in political and economic life:

"Undoubtedly," it will be said, "religious, moral, philosophical and juridical ideas have been modified in the course of historical development. But religion, morality philosophy, political science, and law, constantly survived this change."

"There are, besides, eternal truths, such as Freedom, Justice, etc. that are common to all states of society. But Communism abolishes eternal truths, it abolishes all religion, and all morality, instead of constituting them on a new basis; it therefore acts in contradiction to all past historical experience."

What does this accusation reduce itself to? The history of all past society has consisted in the development of class antagonisms, antagonisms that assumed different forms at different epochs. But whatever form they may have taken, one fact is common to all past ages, viz., the exploitation of one part of society by the other. No wonder, then, that the social consciousness of past ages, despite all the multiplicity and variety it displays, moves within certain common forms, or general ideas, which

26 The Project Gutenberg Ebook of *The Communist Manifesto* by Karl Marx and Freidrich Engels. <http://www.gutenberg.org/cache/epub/61/pg61.html> (accessed 11/16/14)

*cannot completely vanish except with the total disappearance of class antagonisms. The Communist revolution is the most radical rupture with traditional property relations; no wonder that its development involves the most radical rupture with traditional ideas.*²⁷

When confronted with the charge that his doctrine will destroy every eternal truth, Marx does not deny it. Instead he celebrates the “radical rupture” with the past that he hopes to bring about. According to Marx, all past societies have been based on class exploitation, and therefore every moral system promoted by these societies is worthy of annihilation. Marx proposes the creation of a new world based on shared property and absolute equality. This new, unprecedented social order will naturally bring with it a new morality.

At this point the perceptive reader should have recognized the profound dishonesty of Marx. Leaving aside the utter impracticality of Communism, we should be puzzled at Marx's ability to deny the moral absolutes of his opponents and simultaneously to promote his own set of moral absolutes. We should ask Marx, how is it possible to deny eternal truths such as Freedom and Justice, but at the same time declare the moral superiority of Communism?

Thus already in the 1840s, when *The Communist Manifesto* was published, we can see the seeds of “postmodernism”, the pseudo-intellectual deception that has been used by nearly every single Jewish liberal and revolutionary. According to postmodernism, we Christians are fools for believing in moral absolutes, when in reality truth is relative and there are no objective moral standards. But after making this anti-Christian argument, the postmodernist then goes on to propound his own moral commandments. As we have seen, Marx gleefully dismisses “bourgeois” morality as a random product of historical development, but at the same time unhesitatingly accepts the absolute moral goodness of “liberation” and “equality”. Similarly, today's Jewish liberals dismiss Christian moral teachings as irrational and unscientific, but then fail to provide any scientific evidence to support their own moral dogmas. The Marxist/postmodernist reduces religious morality to the blind activity of economics and biology, but then assumes, without any logical explanation, that his own moral standards somehow transcend these material forces. When he does this, the Marxist shows that his doctrine is a sham. After all, if human life is entirely made up of chemical reactions that randomly arose from

²⁷ *Ibid.*

the primordial chaos, then how can one form of political organization be morally superior to another? If our sentiments and judgments do not have any objective reality, then all morality, including leftist morality, is an illusion. If a man who denies the existence of moral absolutes were to be logically consistent, he would cease to make moral declarations at all, and the issue of private property, and every other social and economic concern, would become completely irrelevant. But the Marxist is not logically consistent. The Christian affirms that there is a God, and then bases his moral judgments upon God's revealed moral standards. The Marxist denies that there are any true standards, and then proceeds to declare moral absolutes.

And not only does Marx promote his own "eternal truths", but he promotes a morality that is the complete inversion of Biblical teaching. God commands that we do not steal; Marx demands the theft and collectivization of all property. God commands that we honor our mother and our father, and not to covet our neighbor's wife; Marx declares that marriage and family relations are merely the result of economic convenience, and will be done away with under Communism. God commands that we love our neighbor as ourselves; Marx preaches the dehumanization and destruction of certain economic classes. God commands that we love him and worship him alone; Marx teaches atheism. God is Agape; Marxism is Eros. Once eternal truth has been banished, moral standards cannot be based on any valid authority or logic; and without authority or logic, moral standards are increasingly modified to suit our base desires.

This demonic Marxist morality has always been horrifying to Christians, and to anyone else who has any basic respect for natural order or social stability. In the 19th and early 20th centuries, love of God, family and country were very strong amongst the common people, and therefore the moral demands of Marx were never widely accepted. The only ones to fully embrace Marxist morality were Jews and a small minority of emotionally-damaged gentiles, almost all of whom came from privileged middle or upper class backgrounds. Whenever Marxist revolutionaries seized power, the common people fiercely clung to faith and family. To the horror of Marxist intellectuals, the churches in Eastern Europe survived decades of communist rule, and in many cases emerged stronger than the churches in the West. This triumph of Agape during Communism is just one of many lessons learned from the tragic history of the Soviet Union and its kindred regimes. Another lesson is that Marxism simply does not work politically or economically. Jewish Marxism brings about starvation, misery and mass

murder for the very people it claims to “free from oppression”. Communist governments were forced to build walls to keep their own people in. It is difficult to imagine a stronger indictment of a political system.

And yet, miraculously, Jewish intellectuals still revere Marx and his theories. Marxists believe that the destruction of religion, family and nation is necessary in order to bring about fair working conditions. This belief has been disproved again and again, and yet the hard-hearted Jews still cling to their error. This is because Jewish Marxists have never really cared about or understood working class gentiles. This is evident in the false and callous statements made by Marx about the working class.

From *The Communist Manifesto*:

The proletariat is without property; his relation to his wife and children has no longer anything in common with the bourgeois family-relations; modern industrial labour, modern subjection to capital, the same in England as in France, in America as in Germany, has stripped him of every trace of national character. Law, morality, religion, are to him so many bourgeois prejudices, behind which lurk in ambush just as many bourgeois interests...The Communists are further reproached with desiring to abolish countries and nationality. The working men have no country. We cannot take from them what they have not got... The Communists disdain to conceal their views and aims. They openly declare that their ends can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions. Let the ruling classes tremble at a Communistic revolution. The proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains.²⁸

According to Marx, Christian workers have already lost their attachment to country and family, and therefore they would not be at all bothered by “*the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions*”. This has never been the case when Marxism has been forced upon a nation, as the history of the 20th century has proven. Millions of Christian workers and peasants refused to give up Christ, and chose bloody persecution at the hands of Marxists over apostasy.

In *The Communist Manifesto*, Marx proposed the abolition of private property and the creation of a totalitarian state that would control the economy. And yet in this very same text, Marx dares to claim that this totalitarian state is the only path to freedom: “*In place of the*

²⁸ *Ibid.*

old bourgeois society, with its classes and class antagonisms, we shall have an association, in which the free development of each is the condition for the free development of all".²⁹ In another one of his works, *The German Ideology*, Marx expands on what life will be like in the "free" communist paradise where division of labor has been abolished:

*For as soon as the distribution of labour comes into being, each man has a particular, exclusive sphere of activity, which is forced upon him and from which he cannot escape. He is a hunter, a fisherman, a herdsman, or a critical critic, and must remain so if he does not want to lose his means of livelihood; while in communist society, where nobody has one exclusive sphere of activity but each can become accomplished in any branch he wishes, society regulates the general production and thus makes it possible for me to do one thing today and another tomorrow, to hunt in the morning, fish in the afternoon, rear cattle in the evening, criticise after dinner, just as I have a mind, without ever becoming hunter, fisherman, herdsman or critic.*³⁰

This laughably infantile vision of society could never possibly work. Gaining proficiency in a profession requires years of experience. Humans are simply incapable of mastering five or more trades simultaneously. Certain professions will always be more desirable, and there will always be greater demand for certain products. No amount of totalitarian planning can bring about a situation where everyone can do whatever he wants all the time. It is a completely false promise, the pursuit of which has brought about untold suffering.

Although today's Jewish subversives have largely abandoned Marx's promise of unlimited *professional* freedom, they still make a similar promise of unlimited *personal* freedom. Cultural Marxism promises the unlimited freedom to pursue sexual perversion and self-gratification. According to the Cultural Marxist, we should all be free to fornicate, terminate unwanted pregnancies, engage in sodomy, watch pornography, do drugs, dress immodestly, gluttonously consume junk food (or obsessively pursue fitness and exercise out of personal vanity), get plastic surgery, and even change our gender. Our own personal whim is to be the only judge. Cultural Marxists do not say that you can be a fisherman one day and a doctor the next, but they do say that you can be a man one day and a woman the next. The horrors of Cultural Marxism are the logical consequences of Marx's original doctrines, but in order to

²⁹ *Ibid.*

³⁰ *The German Ideology*. <https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1845/german-ideology/ch01a.htm#2> (accessed 11/16/14)

understand the shift of focus from class struggle to unrestrained hedonism, it is necessary to look at the influence of another wicked Jew idolized by modern society: Sigmund Freud.

22. Agape vs Eros Part 3: Sigmund Freud

Just like Karl Marx, Sigmund Freud (1856-1939) employed pseudo-scientific arguments in favor of rebellion against God's law. But rather than focusing on economics, Freud focused on (and greatly influenced) the young science of psychology. With the rise of atheism in the 19th century, men sought for something to fill the void left by abandoning Christian doctrine. While 19th century man made great advances in physics, chemistry and biology, these sciences could not provide any answers to the questions of morality and the meaning of life. Psychology was an attempt to provide a “scientific” approach to these issues. As Christians, we know that any attempt to answer these ultimate questions without relying on revelation will inevitably fail. It is therefore no surprise that the empty farce of psychology provided the perfect avenue for deception and sin. And once again, a Jew was Satan's lead henchman.

I will do my best to avoid the sickening details of Freud's disgusting sexual theories. (Any reader who wishes to do so can easily find more information on Freud's ridiculous and unfounded theories about Castration Anxiety, Penis Envy, and the like). I will focus instead on how Freud used these theories in an attempt to undermine the Christian worldview and justify extreme hedonism and selfishness.

Near the end of his life, Freud wrote *Civilization and Its Discontents*, in which he succinctly expressed the conclusions of his psychological research and its implications for human society. Freud explicitly rejects the validity of selfless, compassionate love (Agape), and leaves selfish, irrational desire (Eros) as the only true source of happiness. This rejection of Agape and embrace of Eros inevitably leads to the destruction of all that is truly good in human life.

Freud's definition of happiness is purely hedonistic. Happiness is merely the enjoyment of pleasure and the avoidance of pain, based on what Freud calls the “pleasure principle”:

*[Humans] strive after happiness; they want to become happy and to remain so. This endeavour has two sides, a positive and a negative aim. It aims, on the one hand, at an absence of pain and unpleasure, and, on the other, at the experiencing of strong feelings of pleasure. In its narrower sense the word 'happiness' only relates to the last... As we can see, what decides the purpose of life is simply the programme of the pleasure principle.*³¹

But for Freud, not all pleasures are equal. There is one pleasure in particular that he puts above all others: the pleasure of sex.

*...one of the forms in which loves manifests itself—sexual love—has given us our most intense experience of an overwhelming sensation of pleasure and has thus furnished us with a pattern for our search for happiness. What is more natural than that we should persist in looking for happiness along the path on which we first encountered it?*³²

From these two simple statements, it is easy to see that for Freud, happiness = sex, and that sexual pleasure is the primary factor in human experience. Everything else in life is a repression or mutilation of our sexual desires, and human institutions can be judged by the degree of sexual “freedom” they provide. On this definition of happiness, civilization has greatly hampered the happiness of mankind. For Freud, the essence of civilization “*lies in the fact that the members of the community restrict themselves in their possibilities of satisfaction, whereas the individual knew no such restrictions*”.³³

In Freud's view civilization begins with the restriction of Eros; for the Christian, civilization begins with the flowering of Agape, with the formation of families, tribes and nations working together in brotherly love towards a common good. For Freud, Agape is defined negatively as the restriction of Eros. Giving up one's own gratification to help another takes away from our happiness. This is the complete inversion of Christianity. For the Christian, Agape is the highest virtue. Jesus says that no man has greater love (*agape*) than to lay down his

31 Freud, Sigmund. *Civilization and Its Discontents*. Translated by James Strachey. W.W. Norton and Company, 1961. Page 25.

32 *Ibid.* Page 33.

33 *Ibid.* Page 49.

life for another. When we lay down our life for another, we deliberately and consciously deny ourselves any future enjoyment of physical pleasure. Therefore, Freud would view Christian Agape as the complete opposite of Eros. In this, the Christian would naturally agree, for Agape is man's true source of lasting happiness, while Eros is the cause of man's fall and damnation.

Of course Freud cannot deny that selfless love exists, as the actions of the great martyrs readily show. To explain this phenomenon, Freud claims that religious individuals repress their desire for genital satisfaction and that this repressed Eros is transformed into Agape. This makes Agape a weakened, mutilated form of Eros, and can therefore only provide man with a small fraction of his true possible happiness. In speaking of men living in a Christian society, Freud states that:

A small minority are enabled by their constitution to find happiness, in spite of everything, along the path of love. But far-reaching mental changes in the function of love are necessary before this can happen. These people make themselves independent of their object's acquiescence by displacing what they mainly value from being loved on to loving; they protect themselves against the loss of the object by directing their love, not to single objects but to all men alike; and they avoid the uncertainties and disappointments of genital love by turning away from its sexual aims and transforming the instinct into an impulse with an inhibited aim. What they bring about in themselves in this way is a state of evenly suspended, steadfast, affectionate feeling, which has little external resemblance any more to the stormy agitations of genital love, from which it is nevertheless derived.³⁴

For Freud, only a small number of “weak” individuals can be happy with this mutilated form of Eros. For those with healthier, more “normal” sexual appetites, sexual restraint is a form of oppression:

As regards the sexually mature individual, the choice of an object is restricted to the opposite sex, and most extra-genital satisfactions are forbidden as perversions. The requirement, demonstrated in these prohibitions, that there shall be a single kind of sexual life for everyone, disregards the dissimilarities, whether innate or acquired, in the sexual constitution of human beings; it cuts off a fair number of them from sexual enjoyment, and so becomes the source of serious injustice.³⁵

Only the weaklings have submitted to such an extensive encroachment

³⁴ *Ibid.* Pages 56-57.

³⁵ *Ibid.* Page 60.

*upon their sexual freedom.*³⁶

Since sexual enjoyment is man's greatest end, then preventing this sexual enjoyment—no matter what form it takes—becomes the greatest violation of human rights. We can see this same argument at play in the “free love” and “gay rights” movements that became dominant in the 1960s. Not only was Freud the principal theorist behind the 60s sexual revolution, but he even went far beyond what most hippy libertines would support. For example, Freud declared that the prohibition against incest was somehow a violation of man's original sexual freedom:

*[Civilization's] first, totemic, phase already brings with it the prohibition against an incestuous choice of object, and this is perhaps the most drastic mutilation which man's erotic life has in all time experienced.*³⁷

While this statement on incest might seem shocking, even to most contemporary “progressives”, it is the logical conclusion of the ideology of sexual liberation. Freud is simply being more honest and more consistent. He displays this same brutal honesty when discussing the relationship between religion and the purpose of life. Unlike many liberals today, Freud does not even try to pretend that morality in the traditional sense can exist for “secular” society. Rather, he boldly declares that “*One can hardly be wrong in concluding that the idea of life having a purpose stands and falls with the religious system*”.³⁸ Keep in mind that Freud considered all religion to be a mass delusion, and therefore would have us believe that in a mentally “healthy” society, there would be no higher values and no purpose to life other than physical gratification.

Before proceeding further with Freud's theories, I must stress how thoroughly unscientific and irrational Freud is. This is especially important to point out because secularists like Freud claim to hold a strictly scientific worldview and constantly ridicule Christians for holding unscientific beliefs. Freud's theory that all Agape stems from frustrated Eros certainly falls into the realm of pseudo-science. It is not based on any real evidence, and it cannot reasonably account for a number of human experiences. The absolutely selfless Agape that a mother feels for her child is not rooted in frustrated Eros. This maternal love is innate, biological, and hormonal. Many mothers have consciously risked their own lives for that sake of

³⁶ *Ibid.* Page 61.

³⁷ *Ibid.* Page 59.

³⁸ *Ibid.* Pages 24-25.

their children without any hope of future physical enjoyment. There have also been many men who gave no thought to sexual purity, and yet still died willingly while defending their family, friends or country. Agape is what drives us to the greatest sacrifice and the greatest bravery. A man motivated by pure lust might put himself at some risk when pursuing his aim, but he will never walk into *certain* death. The vast majority of mankind, even nonbelievers, would admit that the Agape felt amongst family members is more noble and more praiseworthy than Eros, and that a truly good person is one who takes care of his family before his own personal desires.

Therefore, given that most men and women perceive Agape to be superior to Eros in value, and given that Eros and Agape both have biological, hormonal components, there is no good reason for Freud to assume that Eros is more “natural” or more essential to human happiness than Agape. Freud's choice to do so is not scientific, it is ideological. He desires a society where unlimited sexual gratification is celebrated, and therefore he stubbornly refuses to admit the existence of any genuine human good that is not ultimately subordinate to sexual lust. It is obvious that Freud's teaching contradicts Christianity, but even from a secular, materialistic perspective, his arguments make no sense. Given man's capacity for both base sexual enjoyment and refined intellectual activity, there is no good “scientific” reason simply to assume that greater happiness is derived from the former and not the latter. Those who over-indulge in physical pleasure often regret it. Leaving aside the question of salvation, these over-indulgent individuals often regret their neglect of family and friends, of career advancement, or of physical health. Even worldly satisfaction is not purely physical, for in order to be truly happy, a man's rational faculty must be satisfied as well. In fact, physical pleasure is fleeting and soon passes away, while the knowledge that one has made the right, rational choice can provide satisfaction for years into the future. These considerations would strongly suggest that a truly scientific examination of human wellbeing would conclude, at the very least, that rational self-control is just as important as physical gratification. But it is essential for Freud that he reject such a conclusion. For once it is admitted that physical gratification should be guided by reason, this opens up the way to declaring certain physical pleasures to be undesirable because of their negative consequences. Reason demands that choices be made with a regard to the future. If a particular pleasure, such as sexual intercourse outside of marriage, can potentially lead to the negative consequences of contracting a disease or producing a child with someone

who would be an unfit parent, then reason would warn against engaging in such activity. But for Freud, such rational self-control would be an “injustice”, and therefore must be declared an enemy of humanity. In his decision to choose physical pleasure over intellectual self-control as the mark of genuine human wellbeing, Freud is not being at all scientific.

Despite the natural appeal of carnal enjoyment, Freud and his message of sexual liberation have always been met with strong opposition. Fallen man might be easily seduced by Eros, but by God's grace we have been blessed with religion and an innate sense of guilt, both of which have done a great deal to curb our sinfulness. Freud understood the challenge posed by religion and guilt, and therefore sought to undermine them, stating that it is:

..my intention to represent the sense of guilt as the most important problem in the development of civilization and to show that the price we pay for our advance in civilization is a loss of happiness through the heightening of the sense of guilt.³⁹

Unsurprisingly, Freud traced the origin of religion and guilt to restrictions on physical gratification.

In order to understand Freud's thought on this subject, it is necessary to examine Freud's ridiculous theory about the Oedipus Complex and the origin of civilization. This theory is likely the most brazen example of Freud's pseudo-science. According to Freud, the first form of social organization to arise from the “freedom” of animal existence was a primitive horde where the father ruled over his wives and children as a tyrant. This ancient father was cruel and oppressive. He forced his sons into labor and prevented them from obtaining sexual gratification, as he reserved the women of the horde for himself. The sons living under such a father desired physical gratification, but the fear of their father's punishment kept them in line. Eventually, however, the sons banded together and killed their father. But even after killing their oppressor, the sons were still left with a sense of remorse, which led to the development of guilt:

We cannot get away from the assumption that man's sense of guilt springs from the Oedipus complex and was acquired at the killing of the father by the brothers banded together.⁴⁰

This remorse was the result of the primordial ambivalence of feeling towards the father. His sons hated him, but they loved him, too. After their hatred had been satisfied by their act of aggression, their love came to the

³⁹ *Ibid.* Page 97.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.* Page 93.

*fore in their remorse for the deed...Whether one has killed one's father or has abstained from doing so is not really the decisive thing. One is bound to feel guilty in either case, for the sense of guilt is an expression of the conflict due to ambivalence.*⁴¹

This is obviously pseudo-science. There is no evidence that the killing of the father by his sons was a common phenomenon. There is no good reason whatsoever to assume that such a thing ever happened. Even from a secular perspective, there are no grounds for assuming that civilization was founded on such oppression and murder as described by Freud. It is much more reasonable to assume, for example, that political organization began when sons joined together *with* their fathers in opposition to *other* families. Blood ties provide the most natural and obvious basis for trust and community, and there is no reason to think that the earliest political violence was caused by conflict between fathers and sons. Freud's theory of sons killing their father is not based on evidence, and does not accord with common sense. It is pure pseudo-science. Of course another major problem with Freud's theory is that we all experience a sense of guilt without ever having killed our fathers. Freud explains this away by saying that we all wanted to kill our fathers at some point, and even though we were not able to, we still felt ambivalent about our desires, which led to the development of guilt. When it is objected that none of us remember wanting to do this, Freud assures us that we did wish to kill our fathers, but did so at a very early age, which is why we cannot remember! While the sons living in Freud's imaginary primal horde consciously experienced parental tyranny as more mature children, we are told that all infants experience similar "tyranny" at a very young age when their irrational desires are frustrated by paternal interference. This interference leads to the infantile desire to kill one's father. In saying this, Freud demonizes the loving structure provided by parents and identifies it as the root of guilt, and consequently of unhappiness. Thus, together with genital desire, Freud puts the infantile temper tantrum at the heart of human existence. Obviously it is healthy and natural for fathers to prevent their children from carrying out certain irrational desires that could cause serious harm. But Freud is so far divorced from reality, that even these basic impediments to irrational, infantile desires must be treated with suspicion.

Freud's fixation with infantile experience pervades much of his thought and frequently

⁴¹ *Ibid.* Page 95. Emphasis added.

reaches absurd levels. For example, he even claims that “*the dwelling-house was a substitute for the mother's womb, the first lodging, for which in all likelihood man still longs, and in which he was safe and felt at ease*”.⁴² Aside from being unverifiable, this statement ignores the obvious fact that houses are very convenient for avoiding exposure to the elements and for repelling enemies. There might be an analogy between the womb and a house, but there is no reason to think that man, even on a subconscious level, was trying to recreate the womb when first building permanent dwellings. In every instance, Freud places the infantile above the mature, implying that mature human thoughts and emotions are merely corrupted, malformed versions of the infantile originals. Such an absurd ordering of things is like saying that walking is a deformed version of crawling. Infants are immature and not fully formed, both anatomically and emotionally. Infancy is a stage that we progress beyond as we mature, and it is not the standard by which human happiness ought to be measured.

In explaining the development of religion, Freud once again cites infantile frustration as the key factor:

*The derivation of religious needs from the infant's helplessness and the longing for the father aroused by it seems to me incontrovertible.*⁴³

*The common man cannot imagine this Providence otherwise than in the figure of an enormously exalted father. Only such a being can understand the needs of the children of men and be softened by their prayers and placated by the signs of their remorse. The whole thing is so patently infantile, so foreign to reality, that to anyone with a friendly attitude to humanity it is painful to think that the great majority of mortals will never be able to rise above this view of life.*⁴⁴

Given that Freud is an atheist, it is not surprising that he assumes religion to be man made. But he goes further than this, declaring that religion is not to be traced to human speculation, but to irrational infantile desires. Many atheists have suggested that religion arose from man thinking about the origin of the universe and the causes of natural phenomena, but even this explanation is too noble for Freud. He instead focuses on the conflicted emotional life of the infant: hating and fearing the father because of his discipline, but at the same time desiring the father's aid and

42 *Ibid.* Page 43.

43 *Ibid.* Page 20.

44 *Ibid.* Page 22.

protection. Freud shows incredible insolence in dismissing religion as “infantile”, while he is the one who elevates base, irrational, and infantile desires. Christianity, along with common sense, teaches that this life is inevitably full of both pleasure and pain. Reason, toil and sacrifice are necessary in order to live virtuously. Christianity also teaches that the transcendent, ineffable creator of the universe has established what is right and what is wrong, and that just punishment will come to those who do evil. Freud, on the other hand, teaches that true happiness can only come with the “liberation” of our base, animal desires, and that “*primitive man was better off in knowing no restrictions of instinct*”.⁴⁵ He places the chaos of animal savagery above the moral and intellectual advancements of civilization, because only in the state of nature can man pursue absolute fulfillment of selfish lust. I ask you, which worldview, Christianity or Freudianism, is “foreign to reality”? Which one is “patently infantile”?

While everything that Freud says might seem very silly, his poisonous teachings should be taken very seriously. Reason, self-control, the family, religion, civilization—Freud labels all of these things as enemies. Freud's theories have not been restricted to the world of eccentric academics; his theories have infiltrated every level of society and have come to shape public morality. In the mainstream media, Christianity and chastity are mocked, while undoing the “injustice” of homophobia is praised as a great moral advancement. This triumph of degeneracy has been effected by a group of Jewish intellectuals known as the Frankfurt School, which used Freud's theories as a revolutionary weapon. Freud taught that mental illnesses are caused by erotic frustration and the attendant sense of guilt, especially guilt caused by failure to live up to the high moral standards demanded by Christianity. Freud's Jewish disciples in the Frankfurt School attempted to “cure” society of the diseases of morality and religion.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.* Page 73.

23: Agape vs Eros Part 4: The Frankfurt School And Cultural Marxism

With the Russian revolution, Marxists gained possession of one of the great empires of the world. They were able to use this populous and resource-rich land to conduct their socialist experiments. The results of these experiments were nightmarish. Millions upon millions of innocent people were murdered, and Christian congregations were destroyed, bringing about the largest generations of martyrs in the modern age. Whether in Russia, China, Cambodia or North Korea, wherever Marxist Communism is implemented, the same environment of misery and terror is to be found. By the 1940s, Marxism had been given its chance, and it had failed to deliver on every promise it made. But the obvious failure of Communism did not deter the great bulk of Jewish intellectuals, who were dismayed that Christians throughout the West were not clamoring to follow the Soviet Union's example. These Jews refused to accept that their precious ideology was a failure. Instead they placed the blame on gentiles whose religion and morality prevented them from seeing the “truth” of Marxism.

For Jewish Marxists, the Communist Utopia is the inevitable outcome of history. They believe that in this future state, all “oppression” will be gone and there will be freedom to pursue every sinful impulse. In this Utopia, the law of God—against which the apostate Jews have fought since they attempted to murder the Living Word—would be banished forever. Therefore, the Jews viewed the rejection of Marxism as a failure of the West: a failure of Western civilization, a failure of Western religion, a failure of Western morality, and a failure of Western logic and reason.

This “failure” had to be corrected. By the 1930s many Jewish revolutionaries had come to realize that preaching to the masses about economic theory was not a winning strategy, so

they changed their approach by combining the work of Freud and Marx. These Jewish revolutionaries had already decided that Marxism is the only reasonable ideology, and that it is therefore impossible for a reasonable person to reject Marxism. And since no one could reject Marxism on truly rational grounds, the rejection of Marxism must be due to some sort of mental or emotional defect. These Jews did not merely label their opponents as greedy, as was usually the case under classical Marxism. Instead, they declared their opponents to be mentally ill and incapable of accepting the truth until their inner life was radically altered. Freud provided these Jews with a psychological theory that allowed them to explain Christianity and Western civilization as the result of sexual repression. The next logical step was to promote selfish hedonism and sexual liberation, not as the end result of Communism, but as the means of bringing about revolution. This new Freudian variant of Marxism was developed by a group of scholars originally based in Frankfurt, Germany, who came to be known collectively as the Frankfurt School. Their ideology is frequently called Cultural Marxism, because it seeks revolution by transforming the culture through psychoanalysis and propaganda rather than through organization of industrial workers. Cultural Marxism has been remarkably successful in carrying out its aim, which is not surprising given our fallen nature. Carnal man has always been ruled by Eros, and he is therefore easily taken in by an ideology that promotes sexual promiscuity as a moral good.

This chapter deals with material that is obscure and tiresome, material that is written by Jewish theorists whose names are unfamiliar to a great majority of Christians. I beg that the reader have patience and strive to follow this chapter carefully. The ideas of Cultural Marxism have become completely mainstream, and the breakdown of society over the past decades is the direct result of Cultural Marxism and its promotion by Jewish individuals and organizations. In conquering the West, Cultural Marxism has succeeded where the tanks and bombs of the Soviet army failed. Understanding the arguments of Cultural Marxism and being able to counter them is key if we are to have any hope of taking our country back.

We begin with Max Horkheimer (1895-1973) and Theodor W. Adorno (1903-1969), two Jewish scholars who co-authored *Dialectic of Enlightenment*, one of the key texts in the development of Cultural Marxism. The book was originally published in 1944, and it shows the Jewish loyalty to Marxism, Freudianism, postmodernism and pseudo-science. The authors

attempted to discover why it is that Western Europe had reached such a high level of civilization during the Enlightenment, and yet still maintained a barbaric attachment to capitalism, patriotism, and other supposed evils. The elements that were already present in Marx and Freud are combined with the bile-spitting hatred that the Jew felt towards the dumb goyim who refused to abandon their faith and traditions in favor of Communism. Horkheimer and Adorno are also particularly fixated on the issue of anti-Semitism. Jews have never been liked by anyone who has ever had to live with them, and they have been kicked out of dozens of countries and communities throughout history. To the Jew, this is not evidence of any flaws in Jewish character or behavior. Rather, it is an indication of a widespread mental disorder that just so happens to infect every non-Jewish ethnic group in the world. Just as no reasonable person could be opposed to Marxism, likewise no reasonable person could have any legitimate reason for disliking the Jews. Only by curing the two related diseases of anti-Semitism and anti-Communism (both of which are caused by sexual repression and sub-conscious feelings of inadequacy) can the world enter into a truly “human” era of civilization.

The Jews of the Frankfurt School are undoubtedly secular, and yet they still view the Jewish people as the key to history and to the salvation of intolerant, anti-Semitic humanity. These Jews reject as “delusional” any suggestion that Jews are attempting to undermine society, but at the same time they affirm that Jews are superior and that the Jews ought to transform or abolish important aspects of gentile society in order to make it more Jew-friendly. In particular, Horkheimer and Adorno label Christianity, capitalism, and sexual repression as the main sources of anti-Semitism that must be done away with.

To the authors of *Dialectic of Enlightenment*, it is self-evident that the Gospel is false and illogical when compared with the Jewish (Talmudic) religion. Therefore, faithful Christians will always suffer from a sort of inferiority complex when they compare themselves to the Jews. Horkheimer and Adorno claim that in order to believe in Christianity, one must repress rational thought, and that anti-Semitism arises out of Christian resentment that the Jews have not made this “sacrifice of reason”. Christians “*convinced themselves of Christianity as a secure possession*”, and therefore they “*were obliged to confirm their eternal salvation by the worldly ruin of those who refused to make the murky sacrifice of reason [i.e., the Jews]. That is the religious origin of anti-Semitism. The adherents of the religion of the Son hated the supporters*

of the religion of the Father as one hates those who know better”.⁴⁶ In essence they are saying: forget the Pharisaic plot against Jesus, forget the persecution of the early Church by Jewish authorities, forget the evil blasphemies of the Talmud. The *real* cause of Christian animosity towards the Jews is a psychological flaw *in Christians!*

Given their harsh condemnation of the faith of Christians, one might expect that Horkheimer and Adorno would strongly support the Western tradition of logic and science. After all, the idol of “science” is commonly celebrated by those in rebellion against God. But for the Jews of the Frankfurt School, science and logic are just as much the enemy as Christianity, because science and logic were developed by capitalist society and are therefore tools of capitalist oppression. In a previous chapter we saw that Marx held all forms of thought to be shaped by economic conditions, an idea which the Cultural Marxists enthusiastically embraced, despite its impossible consequences. I say that the consequences are impossible because the Cultural Marxists do not merely claim that morality is dependent on economic factors and therefore mutable; they even dare to claim that the very rules of logic are shaped by economic exploitation based on the division of labor, and are therefore suspect:

*Even the deductive form of science mirrors hierarchy and compulsion. Just as the first categories represented the organized tribe and its power over the individual, the entire logical order, with its chains of inference and dependence, the superordination and coordination of concepts, is founded on the corresponding conditions in social reality, that is, on the division of labor.*⁴⁷

This is the height of absurdity. Dismissing logic is like dismissing mathematics. Both of these branches of knowledge are demonstrable true, regardless of the economic situation in which they were developed. The rules of logic and mathematics are inherent to reality, and it is impossible to reject them and still try to make any claims about anything. As the above quote shows, logic involves analyzing reality and dividing creatures and phenomena into different categories. These categories are based upon objective characteristics and the similarity or dissimilarity of these characteristics. An example of this logical process would be dividing the animal kingdom into different species and sub-species, or dividing the constituents of matter

⁴⁶ Horkheimer, Max and Adorno, Theodor W. *Dialectic of Enlightenment: Philosophical Fragments*. Translated by Edmund Jephcott. Stanford University Press, 2002. Page 147.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.* Page 16.

into different families of atomic elements. Our capacity for logical thought is one of our defining characteristics as humans, but the Cultural Marxists are willing to abandon this capacity because it is an impediment to Communist revolution.

Horkheimer and Adorno say that all value judgments are unfounded,⁴⁸ so we might expect them to refrain from making any value judgments themselves. This would be the logical thing to do for a man who has deemed such judgments to be impossible. But of course these Jews have rejected even logic itself, and therefore they freely make statements about what is best for humanity. When faced with value judgments they do not like, they declare value judgments to be unfounded, but then turn around that make their own value judgments about the virtues of Communism and sexual liberation. We are reminded of the Rabbis from the Talmud who claim that their arguments override the direct command of the Almighty. This Talmudic fable perfectly captures the attitude of modern Jewish intellectuals. The natural order, logic, science, even God himself; all must bow down to unhinged Jewish theory. The Jews decide what is good and what is evil, and it is insolence for a gentile to ask a Jew for a logical account of his judgments. After all, logic is a tool of gentile bourgeois oppression. Asking the Jew such questions is surely anti-Semitic.

Freud believed the repression of base desires to be the cause of human unhappiness. According to Horkheimer and Adorno, this repression not only causes us to be deprived of erotic pleasure but also makes us feel irrational hatred towards completely innocent groups. When the Christian refuses to give in to his lust, the lustful urge still remains in his psyche, and rather than acknowledging its presence, the Christian “projects” his lust onto another group. By this projection he attributes to an outside group (often the Jews) characteristics that they do not actually have, which causes him to hate the outside group instead of hating the lust within himself.

Anti-Semitism is based on false projection...false projection makes it surroundings resemble itself...displaces the volatile inward into the outer world, branding the intimate friend as foe. Impulses which are not acknowledged by the subject and yet are his, are attributed to the object: the prospective victim...The sexual impulses suppressed by humanity survived in both individuals and peoples and asserted themselves in the

48 Ibid. Page 74.

*imaginary transformation of the surrounding world into a diabolic system.*⁴⁹

In this passage, Horkheimer and Adorno completely exonerate the Jew from any wrongdoing and claim that anti-Semitism is the result of a diseased mind. This total denial of Jewish guilt and responsibility is especially odd when discussing the charges of Jewish sexual deviance. For if the Cultural Marxists criticize Christian, capitalist society for being too prudish, then presumably a Jewish, Communist society would enjoy more sexual “freedom”. But if this is the case, then the Christian is not suffering from “false projection” when he accuses Jews and Communists of trying to destroy traditional morality. Rather, he is acting in response to an undeniable objective fact: Jewish Communists *do* promote sexual liberation. We should also note that Horkheimer and Adorno dismiss this accusation against the Jews as being crazy in the very same book in which they themselves argue in favor of sexual liberation. Jewish dishonesty knows no limit.

While the Cultural Marxists obviously find fault with Christianity and the sexual repression associated with it, they identify capitalism as the real culprit behind human suffering. In their view, prior to capitalism, man existed in a paradise of free erotic enjoyment, in which there was no sexual repression, no religion, no “false projection”, and therefore no prejudice. This paradise was wrecked by the introduction of capitalism, because capitalism brings about social distinction through division of labor. Division of labor is a great evil because it requires a level of social cooperation and self-control, and because it brings about a situation where immediate base desires are resisted in order to achieve long-term, communal goals. While a healthy individual would see such progress from primitive anarchy towards rational civilization as the triumph of cooperative Agape over selfishness, these Jews see only the cruel repression of Eros. It should also be noted that the primordial paradise of the Freudian-Marxists is not to be equated with the conditions of primitive natives in Africa or the Amazon, because in these societies there already exists the conceptual division between man and nature and a division of labor between men and women. Horkheimer and Adorno assert that even these early changes from the primordial chaos were brought about only by “violence”:

49 *Ibid.* Page 54.

In the first stages of nomadism the members of the tribe still played an independent part in influencing the course of nature. The men tracked prey while the women performed tasks which did not require rigid commands. How much violence preceded the habituation to even so simple an order cannot be known.⁵⁰

The harmonious workings of a tribe or a family where different tasks are given to those with different abilities, and where unity provides security against the dangers of the outside world—in all this, Horkheimer and Adorno can see only violence and oppression. They did not come to this conclusion from scientific evidence. Just like their hero Freud and his theory of sons murdering the primordial father, Horkheimer and Adorno are engaging in ungrounded, pseudo-scientific speculation. They completely dismiss man's innate desire to find companionship and security in a group, and decide to define man exclusively as a creature that seeks to satisfy his own lusts. It is true that as civilization grows, man often has less opportunity for immediate gratification of animal desires, but he becomes much safer and more secure in his physical being, and he also becomes capable of a much grander, more exalted form of enjoyment: the rational enjoyment of being part of a whole that is greater than himself. Horkheimer and Adorno refuse to admit that any of these advantages of civilization actually improve the life of man. For them, civilization is a net loss:

The history of civilization is the history of the inversion of sacrifice—in other words, the history of renunciation. All who renounce give away more of their life than is given back to them, more than the life they preserve.⁵¹

To use a favorite word of Freudian psychology, this attitude is absolutely infantile. Putting some restraint on personal appetites in order to serve the community is simply part of becoming a mature individual. Only a madman or a spoiled child would think that a life of perpetual, immediate gratification of animal desires would be possible, or even desirable.

As is to be expected, the primitive pleasure in which Horkheimer and Adorno are most interested is sex. They speak of “sexuality's better, prepatrilarchal past”,⁵² where tribal orgies gave birth to the concept of pleasure. Our true essence as humans is to be found amongst these sexually depraved savages, and the civilized virtues associated with Agape are simply

50 *Ibid.* Page 15.

51 *Ibid.* Page 43.

52 *Ibid.* Page 84.

“pacified” forms of unrestrained, primordial Eros. By returning to this stage of savage promiscuity, man can escape from rational thought and capitalist oppression:

*Only when dream absolves them of the compulsion of work, of the individual's attachment to a particular social function and finally to a self, leading back to a primal state free of domination and discipline, do human beings feel the magic of pleasure...Thought arose in the course of liberation from terrible nature, which is finally subjugated utterly. Pleasure, so to speak, is nature's revenge. In it human beings divest themselves of thought, escape from civilization. In earlier societies such homecoming was provided by communal festival. Primitive orgies are the collective origin of pleasure.*⁵³

*But even the most incorporeal tenderness is transformed sexuality; the hand stroking the hair, the kiss on the brow, which express the rapture of spiritual love, are in pacified form the beating and biting which accompany the sexual act among Australian aborigines.*⁵⁴

And just as sexual morality is a weapon that capitalism uses against humanity, so sexual perversion is a weapon that revolutionaries can use against capitalism:

*the criminal violation of taboos...lives on, with sublime love, as fidelity to the utopia brought near by the availability of physical pleasure to all.*⁵⁵

In these passages, one can see the essence of Cultural Marxism: the Utopian promises of Marx combined with the sexual fixation of Freud. The revolutionaries no longer sought to defeat capitalism and Christianity by educating the masses in economics. Henceforth they sought to bribe the masses with promises of limitless pleasure.

This blending of Marx and Freud was put into clearer and more explicit terms by the Jew Herbert Marcuse (1898-1979), one of the main popularizers of Cultural Marxist doctrine who became something of an intellectual idol of the 1960s hippy movement. Like Horkheimer and Adorno, Marcuse sees capitalism and sexual repression as being closely related. Marcuse bizarrely argues that capitalism brought about the limitation of sexuality to genital functions, and that in man's natural state, all of life and all of the body is sexual. Capitalism restricted sexuality to the genitals in an effort to enslave the remainder of the human body. Sexuality is

53 *Ibid.* Page 82.

54 *Ibid.* Page 85.

55 *Ibid.* Page 86.

free, so in order to make man's body an instrument of capitalist exploitation, it was necessary to "desexualize" it. According to Marcuse, the development of capitalist society "*achieves the socially necessary desexualization of the body: the libido becomes concentrated in one part of the body, leaving most of the rest free for use as an instrument of labor*".⁵⁶ In turn, doing away with sexual repression would bring about the end of capitalism, the family, and civilization as we know it:

*[The] unrepressed development [of the senses] would eroticize the organism to such an extent that it would counteract the desexualization of the organism required by its social utilization as an instrument of labor.*⁵⁷

*No longer used as a fulltime instrument of labor, the body would be resexualized. The regression involved in this spread of the libido would first manifest itself in a reactivation of all erotogenic zones and, consequently, in a resurgence of pregenital polyamorous sexuality...The body in its entirety would become...a thing to be enjoyed, an instrument of pleasure. This change in the value and scope of libidinal relations would lead to a disintegration of the institutions in which the private interpersonal relations have been organized, particularly the monogamic and patriarchal family.*⁵⁸

Hence Marcuse does not simply argue in favor of promiscuity, homosexuality, and other perversions. To be sure, he praises sexual perversion because "[t]he perversions...express rebellion against the subjugation of sexuality",⁵⁹ but he wants something more. He wants a return to the imaginary primordial state where erotic feeling is unlimited and all of human life is completely sexualized:

*Originally, the sex instinct has no extraneous temporal and spatial limitations on its subject and object; sexuality is by nature "polyamorous-perverse."*⁶⁰

The obvious objection to this Eros-obsessed attitude is that sexuality is inherently irrational and short-sighted, and that it therefore must be made subordinate to logic in some respect. Marcuse boldly counters this objection, not by means of rational argument, but by openly declaring that

56 Marcuse, Herbert. *Eros and Civilization*. Routledge, 2005. Page 48.

57 *Ibid.* Page 39.

58 *Ibid.* Page 201.

59 *Ibid.* Page 49.

60 *Ibid.* Page 49.

liberated Eros is capable of “*transforming this world into a new mode of being*”⁶¹ and of replacing logic as the source of human judgment. In what is one of the gravest intellectual perversions ever attempted by sinful man, Marcuse expressly and unambiguously rejects Logos in favor of Eros.

In the Greek New Testament, the *Logos* is the “Word” that became flesh. The Logos is the Word that was with God in the beginning, through whom everything was made. The Logos of God gives order and regularity to the creation, and this order is what allows us to possess life, consciousness and reason. Logos is also the origin of the word logic, which was developed by ancient Greek philosophers. The Greek philosophers lived without the divine light of revelation, but still dimly grasped after an orderly, governing force of the universe, which they often termed Logos, because of the inherent connection between speech and rationality. These Greeks founded Western logic and science, those capitalist evils against which Horkheimer and Adorno so stubbornly protested. Marcuse joins them in this protest, stating that the:

*idea of reason becomes increasingly antagonistic to those faculties and attitudes which...tend toward gratification rather than transcendence ...They appear as the unreasonable and irrational that must be conquered and contained in order to serve the progress of reason...The Logos shows forth as the logic of domination.*⁶²

*When philosophy conceives the essence of being as Logos, it is already the Logos of domination—commanding, mastering, directing reason, to which man and nature are to be subjected.*⁶³

To the Christian, the domination of base desires is a great virtue and blessing, and this was the consensus of all Western philosophy prior to the disintegration of the modern era. And what greater good could be imagined, than to live in accordance with the instruction of the Logos that has created and governs all existence? The only argument that Marcuse brings against Logos is that it prevents unrestrained carnal indulgence, but for him this is reason enough to destroy the theological and philosophical concept of Logos entirely, and to replace it with his own “Logos”, the “logic of gratification”:

Both [the logic of domination and the will to gratification] assert their

61 *Ibid.* Page 169.

62 *Ibid.* Page 111.

63 *Ibid.* Page 125.

*claims for defining the reality principle...[A]gainst the conception of being in terms of Logos rises the conception of being in a-logical terms: will and joy. This countertrend strives to formulate its own Logos: the logic of gratification.*⁶⁴

*Eros redefines reason in his own terms. Reasonable is what sustains the order of gratification.*⁶⁵

This “a-logical” logic proposed by Marcuse is completely absurd and self-contradictory, but tragically, the “logos of gratification” is the ruling principle in contemporary America. Proponents of abortion, promiscuity, divorce, or homosexuality do not discuss these topics logically with an eye towards wider social ramifications. They are almost exclusively concerned with the increase in carnal pleasure that these evils bring about. In America today, that which is pleasurable is good, and that which is restrictive of Eros is evil. Our culture's embrace of the Logos of gratification has produced a generation that is incapable of understanding economic reality, a generation that thinks perpetual borrowing and perpetual handouts are sustainable. They have subconsciously accepted Marcuse's statement that:

*Man is free only where he is free from constraint, external and internal, physical and moral—when he is constrained neither by law nor by need. But such constraint is the reality. Freedom is thus, in a strict sense, freedom from the established reality.*⁶⁶

The Logos of gratification is the Jewish idol that has come to dominate our society. The worshipers of the true Logos who refuse to bow down to this idol are labeled as heretics—heartless bigots whose days are numbered.

Many conservatives still wonder how such a prosperous and advanced Christian nation like America could have disintegrated almost overnight. In tracing the development of Cultural Marxism, we have found part of the answer, but before we can understand how such nonsensical Jewish theory became so mainstream so quickly, it is necessary to look more closely at the greatest source of Jewish power: Hollywood.

64 *Ibid.* Page 124. Emphasis added.

65 *Ibid.* Page 224.

66 *Ibid.* Page 187.

24. Jewish Hollywood

The Jews control Hollywood. This simple statement is absolutely true and impossible to refute. Although the Jews and their allies will dismiss it as “anti-Semitic paranoia”, it is quite easy to show from Jewish sources that the power of the Jews in Hollywood is nearly absolute. Even though the Jews are terrified of organized gentile resistance against Jewish power and therefore try to keep their influence a secret, the Jews are also incredibly arrogant. They love to brag about their own achievements, including their control of mass media, especially when talking amongst themselves.

The *Times of Israel* recently published an article entitled *Jews DO control the media*, which openly states what “anti-Semites” have known for years:

We Jews are a funny breed. We love to brag about every Jewish actor. Sometimes we even pretend an actor is Jewish just because we like him enough that we think he deserves to be on our team. We brag about Jewish authors, Jewish politicians, Jewish directors. Every time someone mentions any movie or book or piece of art, we inevitably say something like, “Did you know that he was Jewish?” That’s just how we roll.

We’re a driven group, and not just in regards to the art world. We have, for example, AIPAC, which was essentially constructed just to drive agenda in Washington DC. And it succeeds admirably. And we brag about it. Again, it’s just what we do.

But the funny part is when any anti-Semite or anti-Israel person starts to spout stuff like, “The Jews control the media!” and “The Jews control Washington!”

Suddenly we’re up in arms. We create huge campaigns to take these people down. We do what we can to put them out of work. We publish articles. We’ve created entire organizations that exist just to tell everyone that the Jews don’t control nothin’. No, we don’t control the media, we don’t have any more sway in DC than anyone else. No, no, no, we swear:

*We're just like everybody else!
Does anyone else (who's not a bigot) see the irony of this?
Let's be honest with ourselves, here, fellow Jews. We do control the media.
We've got so many dudes up in the executive offices in all the big movie
production companies it's almost obscene. Just about every movie or TV
show, whether it be "Tropic Thunder" or "Curb Your Enthusiasm," is rife
with actors, directors, and writers who are Jewish. Did you know that all
eight major film studios are run by Jews?⁶⁷*

Another example of Jewish bragging comes from Jewish writer Joel Stein, whose article *Who runs Hollywood? C'mon* appeared in the LA Times:

*How deeply Jewish is Hollywood? When the studio chiefs took out a
full-page ad in the Los Angeles Times a few weeks ago to demand that the
Screen Actors Guild settle its contract, the open letter was signed by:
News Corp. President Peter Chernin (Jewish), Paramount Pictures
Chairman Brad Grey (Jewish), Walt Disney Co. Chief Executive Robert
Iger (Jewish), Sony Pictures Chairman Michael Lynton (surprise, Dutch
Jew), Warner Bros. Chairman Barry Meyer (Jewish), CBS Corp. Chief
Executive Leslie Moonves (so Jewish his great uncle was the first prime
minister of Israel), MGM Chairman Harry Sloan (Jewish) and NBC
Universal Chief Executive Jeff Zucker (mega-Jewish)...
The person they were yelling at in that ad was SAG President Alan
Rosenberg (take a guess). The scathing rebuttal to the ad was written by
entertainment super-agent Ari Emanuel (Jew with Israeli parents) on the
Huffington Post, which is owned by Arianna Huffington (not Jewish and
has never worked in Hollywood.)
The Jews are so dominant, I had to scour the trades to come up with six
Gentiles in high positions at entertainment companies. When I called them
to talk about their incredible advancement, five of them refused to talk to
me, apparently out of fear of insulting Jews. The sixth, AMC President
Charlie Collier, turned out to be Jewish.
As a proud Jew, I want America to know about our accomplishment. Yes,
we control Hollywood. Without us, you'd be flipping between "The 700
Club" and "Davey and Goliath" on TV all day.⁶⁸*

Joel Stein not only brags about Jewish control of Hollywood, but he also insults wholesome, Christian media as being boring and worthless. He expects Americans to thank the Jews for the

67 Friedman, Manny. *Jews DO control the media*. Times of Israel. July 1, 2012.
<https://web.archive.org/web/20140813183744/http://blogs.timesofisrael.com/jews-do-control-the-media/>
(accessed 11/17/14)

68 Stein, Joel. *Who runs Hollywood? C'mon*. LA Times. December 19, 2008.
<http://articles.latimes.com/2008/dec/19/opinion/oe-stein19> (accessed 11/17/14)

smut that they have poured into our culture.

Jewish control of Hollywood is not a recent development. From the very beginning of the film industry Jews have played a central role, something which Neil Gabler shows in his book *An Empire of Their Own: How the Jews Invented Hollywood*. This book has been widely praised by the Jews. *An Empire of their Own* was a 1989 Los Angeles Times Book Prize winner. A film adaptation of the book was screened at the 1998 Jerusalem Film Festival, where it won the Best Jewish Experience Documentary award. The thesis of Gabler's book is accepted by the Jews, and the facts contained in his book are uncontroversial (that is, until the facts are repeated by a concerned Christian, at which point they become “anti-Semitic”). Gabler examines in detail the Jewish men who founded and ran the major studios. Universal Studios, Columbia Pictures, 20th Century Fox, MGM, Warner Bros, Paramount Pictures—these studios were all controlled by Jewish movie moguls. Gabler also admits that the Jewish control of Hollywood fundamentally shaped the ideological tone of the movies. These Jewish moguls were not just greedy businessmen trying to make a profit; they used their influence to re-shape our culture and Judaize America. According to Gabler, the Jewish control of Hollywood goes back to the early days of the industry:

The much-vaunted “studio system,” which provided a prodigious supply of films during the movies' heyday, was supervised by a second generation of Jews, many of whom also regarded themselves as marginal men trying to punch into the American mainstream. The storefront theaters of the late teens were transformed into the movie palaces of the twenties by Jewish exhibitors. And when sound movies commandeered the industry, Hollywood was invaded by a battalion of Jewish writers, mostly from the East. The most powerful talent agencies were run by Jews. Jewish lawyers transacted most of the industry's business and Jewish doctors ministered to the industry's sick. Above all, Jews produced the movies. “Of 85 names engaged in production,” a 1936 study noted, “53 are Jews. And the Jewish advantage holds in prestige as well as numbers.”⁶⁹

Even up until the early 20th century, wise Christian prejudice prevented the Jews from dominating American business and academia. Christians understood that the Jews always work for their own ethnic self-interest regardless of their citizenship, and that they always seek to undermine the religion founded by Jesus. However, the impediments to Jewish power were not

69 Gabler, Neal. *An Empire of Their Own*. Doubleday, 1989. Pages 1-2.

strong enough. The movie industry, and all forms of entertainment, were looked down upon by mainstream society, and in large part this is why the Jews were allowed to flourish there. Unfortunately, many Christians failed to foresee the enormous influence that this new medium was to have. The Jew has an overpowering grasp on our hearts and minds because he controls our media. Films and television present a false reality that blocks out the reality of our own thoughts and experience, and this false reality causes us to continue to support policies that are obviously bringing about our spiritual and national destruction. Every film that comes out of Hollywood has the Jewish stamp of approval, and therefore every Hollywood film is Jewish propaganda. The Jewish perception of reality is presented as truth, and the psychological and emotional power of big budget films causes us to accept this reality:

If the Jews were proscribed from entering the real corridors of gentility and status in America, the movies offered an ingenious option. Within the studios and on the screen, the Jews could simply create a new country—an empire of their own, so to speak—one where they would not only be admitted, but would govern as well...They would create its values and myths, its traditions and archetypes.⁷⁰

*What is amazing is the extent to which they succeeded in promulgating the fiction throughout the world. By making a “shadow” America...the Hollywood Jews created a powerful cluster of images and ideas—so powerful that, in a sense, they colonized the American imagination. No one could think about this country without thinking about the movies...Ultimately, American values came to be defined largely by the movies the Jews made. Ultimately, **by creating their idealized America on the screen, the Jews reinvented the country in the image of their fiction.**⁷¹*

In the preceding chapters, we have seen what the Jewish imagination is capable of. If Gabler is correct about the Jewish colonization of American culture, then it is not at all surprising that American morality completely collapsed shortly after Jewish power in Hollywood was established.

Like the Jews of the Frankfurt School, the Jews in Hollywood were very aware of their Jewishness. They commonly practiced nepotism, which, according to Gabler, “*was a defense*

⁷⁰ *Ibid.* Pages 5-6.

⁷¹ *Ibid.* Pages 6-7. Emphasis added.

mechanism for the Hollywood Jews to surround themselves with their own kin".⁷² By the late 1940s the Hollywood Jews were making films that sought to combat "anti-Semitism"; in other words, films that demonized the traditional Christian opinion regarding those who crucified Christ and who to this day try to stamp out the message of the Gospel. For the Christian, anti-Semitism is a moral requirement. The Jews are the Pharisees of today, and if we are truly to imitate Christ, we must follow his anti-Pharisaic example. But rather than examining the theological issues that have shaped Christian-Jewish relations, the Hollywood Jews made movies where anti-Semites are presented as cruel, irrational, or psychopathic. The good-looking, heroic leading men and women were shown to be "tolerant" towards the tribe of antichrists, while the "anti-Semite" took on the characteristics of the classic movie villain. Rather than attempting rational argument, the Jew employed emotional manipulation and deception.

One of the most prominent attempts at "fighting prejudice" to come out of Hollywood was the 1947 film *Crossfire*, which featured a maniacal Jew-hating killer played by Robert Ryan. According to Gabler:

*Crossfire...had a profound effect on the leaders of the Jewish community, especially in the East, by sensitizing them to a new issue: since Hollywood promulgated the image of the Jew to most Americans and since Jews controlled Hollywood, why couldn't they be coaxed into presenting a more positive image of their own people?*⁷³

In attempting to alter public opinion, the Jews did not act in a random or haphazard fashion. They were highly organized and deliberate:

*"Jewish organizations have a clear and rightful interest in making sure that Hollywood films do not present Jews in such a way as to arouse prejudice," declared a memo from an umbrella group of Jewish organizations called the National Community Relations Advisory Council (NDRAC), early in 1947. "In some cases, such pictures should be edited carefully to eliminate questionable passages. Everything should be done to eliminate unfortunate stereotypes of the Jews".*⁷⁴

These Jewish efforts resulted in the creation of a new organization, the Motion Picture Project. According to Gabler,

⁷² *Ibid.* Page 208.

⁷³ *Ibid.* Pages 299-300.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.* Page 303.

The project's chairman was a former English teacher from New York who had come to Hollywood as a writer in 1919 and later moved into production. John Stone, formerly John Strumwasser, was to be a watchdog on the industry—reviewing scripts, cajoling producers, keeping the big Jewish organizations informed of any movie that might help or hurt the Jews. One member of the Motion Picture Committee described the project's operation this way: “They'd give us the scripts. We'd tell them what was right and what was wrong. They would do it.”⁷⁵

Gabler points out that prominent Jewish Hollywood lawyer Mendel Silberberg and his associates “suggested that none of Stone's activities be publicized fearing that it could draw ‘the charge that [a] Jewish group is trying to censor the industry,’ **which, in fact, was exactly what it was trying to do**”.⁷⁶

Above it was noted that Christian opposition to Jewish power in Hollywood was insufficient, but that does not mean that Christians were completely oblivious to the problem posed by the film industry. Christian opposition to morally corrupt films goes all the way back to the very beginning of the industry. In the early 20th century, various Christian organizations and local governments sought to censor films that posed a threat to public morality. Pressured by the National Legion of Decency and the threat of boycotts against the industry, in 1934 the Hollywood movie studios voluntarily accepted the Motion Picture Production Code. The Code required Hollywood films to follow strict guidelines, and banned the following from appearing on screen:

- Profanity and blasphemy
- licentious nudity
- the illegal traffic in drugs
- sexual perversion
- ridicule of the clergy

Though it is often scoffed at today, the Code was responsible for decades of relatively wholesome motion pictures. Some Christians began to recognize the profound influence that mass media can have on opinion and behavior, especially that of the young, and they saw adherence to the Code as absolutely necessary for maintaining the moral health of the nation.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*

⁷⁶ *Ibid.* Page 304. Emphasis added.

While the creation and enforcement of the Code was a great triumph, the Code turned out to be short-lived, and it often failed to prevent more subtle degenerate material from being released. Starting in the 1950s, the studios produced more and more provocative films in defiance of the Code. In the 1960s the Code was finally abandoned, and within a few short years, major Hollywood studios were releasing essentially pornographic material. The proponents of the Code had noble motives and a clear understanding of a number of important points, but the Code was ultimately an unsuccessful half-measure that failed to effectively attack the root of the problem: Jewish control of Hollywood.

This failure is especially sad because many of the Christians who supported the Code were aware of the Jewish problem. For example, in an article from the *Jewish Daily Forward*, film historian Thomas Doherty discusses Joseph Breen's attitude towards the Jews.⁷⁷ Breen, an Irish Catholic, was Hollywood's chief censor and the man responsible for the enforcement of the production Code up until 1954. It was of great interest, therefore, when in recent years personal letters from the early 1930s were uncovered in which Breen expressed distaste for Hollywood Jews. Breen, in describing the people who ran the movie industry, wrote: “*People whose daily morals would not be tolerated in the toilet of a pest house hold the good jobs out here and wax fat on it...Ninety-five percent of these folks are Jews of an Eastern European lineage. They are, probably, the scum of the scum of the earth*” and “*These Jews seem to think of nothing but money making and sexual indulgence*”. Given that Breen held these views, one would assume that when trying to clean up the movie industry, Breen would have denounced the Jewish dominance of Hollywood and attempted to increase the number of Christian studio executives. Regrettably, this was not the case, and Breen never made any public statements critical of the Jews.

It is difficult to say whether Breen was simply a fool who thought Jews could be gently encouraged to do the right thing, or a cynical sell-out who did not want to risk his position by attacking Jewish power. We can say, however, that he was a failure. It seems that Breen wrongly thought that Hollywood could produce decent, Christian entertainment while still allowing Jews, who are anti-Christian by definition, to control the industry. The behavior of the

⁷⁷ Doherty, Thomas. *Was Hollywood's Famed Censor an Antisemite?* The Jewish Daily Forward. December 11, 2007. <http://forward.com/articles/12234/was-hollywood-s-famed-censor-an-antisemite/> (accessed 11/18/14)

Hollywood Jews making movies under the Code shows how misguided Breen's attitude was. While largely staying true to the letter, the Jews constantly violated the spirit of the Code. For example, the Jews produced movies that glamorized the gangster throughout the bulk of the film, and then tacked on his punishment at the very end. Lustful, murderous criminals, played by actors like James Cagney and Edward G. Robinson, were the charismatic stars of many of these films, and these characters were idolized by the youth of the era as heroic “tough guys”. Movie producers also violated the spirit of the Code in many other ways, such as hinting at drug use and sexual deviance without explicitly presenting them on-screen. The Hollywood Jews demonstrated that they would fill their films with as much degeneracy as they could get away with, a clear indication that stronger measures than the Code were needed. The problem in Hollywood was not simply a general, vague lack of morality—the problem was that Jews controlled the industry. The Code was able to curb the immorality of Hollywood films for a few decades, but as long as the studios were left in Jewish hands, the Jews simply bided their time, and once the Code grew weak, they opened the floodgates of degeneracy.

While the Christian might at first feel sympathy towards a man who spent his life keeping the movies relatively clean, Doherty's article shows that Breen took no steps to counter Jewish influence directly, and actually attacked those noble Christians who did. The “incriminating” letters were written in the early 1930s, but by the end of the decade, Breen was actively participating in spreading pro-Jewish propaganda. Doherty relates a striking example of Breen's newfound love for the Jews:

On October 1, 1938, “Box Office,” a glossy trade weekly, reprinted a crude antisemitic leaflet circulating around theaters in the Midwest and, closer to home, along the streets of downtown Los Angeles. “Hollywood is the Sodom and Gomorrah where International Jewry controls Vice-Dope-Gambling,” the leaflets read. “Where Young Gentile Girls are raped by Jewish producers, directors and casting directors who go unpunished.” A caricature depicted a hook-nosed Jew despoiling a vessel of lily-white Aryan womanhood.

Two weeks later, “Box Office” printed a sampling of the outraged letters that poured into its editorial offices. The sentiments from one writer were highlighted in a boldfaced, boxed-off column. “I have myself received copies of this vicious and salacious leaflet,” Breen declared. “The whole business is so revolting, and so thoroughly un-American, that I want to be the first, if possible, to lodge my protest against it. I stand ready to go the

*limit to help out in any way possible and I am hastening to tell you that you may count on me to do anything I can to run this vicious thing into the ground.”*⁷⁸

The “vicious and salacious” leaflet expressed sentiments nearly identical to those found in Breen's letters from just a few years prior: Jews dominate Hollywood, and they are greedy and sexually depraved. Breen, who had an intimate knowledge of Hollywood, was undoubtedly aware that the claims of the leaflet were true. The fact that he condemned those Christians who were spreading the truth betrays a spineless and treacherous character. Breen may have protested lascivious sex scenes, but he was unwilling to risk being called a bigot, and eagerly slandered his fellow Christians as “un-American” to gain the favor of the Jews. His spinelessness and the complete failure of his life's work go hand in hand. Siding with the Jews against ones fellow Christians can have only one result: Jewish victory and Christian defeat.

The role of Hollywood in subverting traditional Christian and patriotic values cannot be overstated, and the Jewish control of Hollywood from the very earliest days of the industry cannot be denied. The initial success but ultimate failure of the decency leagues of the 1930s teaches us an important lesson: when dealing with the Jews, half measures are ineffective. Jewish power is not something that can safely be guided or directed for the long-term benefit of gentiles. The Jews must be rendered powerless within a Christian society in order for that society to flourish.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*

25. Living In The Jewish Madhouse

The founders of our nation viewed America as a city on a hill, a model of Christian, Western civilization for all the world to admire and follow. Despite all the turmoil of our history, from the very beginning up until the early 1960s, America maintained a remarkably high standard of public morality. Faith, patriotism, family loyalty, decency, modesty—these virtues were widely admired, and adherence to them was expected. But in the 1960s, all of these traditional virtues were inverted. Our society was turned completely upside down. There certainly has been Christian resistance to these changes, but this resistance has lost the battle on every front, and the wildest fancies of the 60s radicals have now become completely mainstream. This cultural revolution was not spontaneous or accidental. It was the specific, desired outcome planned by Jewish intellectuals like Horkheimer, Adorno and Marcuse, whose research projects were funded by major Jewish organizations, and whose ideas were enthusiastically promoted by Jew-controlled Hollywood.

One of the most important events in the Jewish war against decency was the publication in 1950 of *The Authoritarian Personality*, the culmination of years of clinical research that began in the mid 1940s. The book was co-written by Theodor Adorno, Else Frenkel-Brunswick, Daniel J. Levinson and R. Nevitt Sanford (of the four authors, Sanford is the only gentile). The authors claimed to present evidence proving that anti-Semitism and “prejudice” are caused by psychological flaws in gentiles, not by Jewish behavior.

Before examining the content of *The Authoritarian Personality*, we must note that the creation of the book was heavily financed by the American Jewish Committee (AJC). The AJC

provided funds to carry out the psychological research on which the book was based, and the AJC also published the book. This generous support from the AJC is noted in both the Preface and the Acknowledgments of the book.

From the Preface by Max Horkheimer:

*The project could not have been realized without the generous and intelligent support of the American Jewish Committee...[T]he Committee...decided to create a Department of Scientific Research. From the first the Department was conceived as a scientific center to stimulate and co-ordinate the work of leading scientists in the sociology and psychology of prejudice and, at the same time, as a laboratory for evaluating action programs.*⁷⁹

From the Acknowledgments by the authors of the study:

*The authors wish to express their indebtedness to the American Jewish Committee for the grants which sustained their research during a period of two and one-half years. They owe a special debt of gratitude to Dr. Max Horkheimer, Director of the the Department of Scientific Research of the American Jewish Committee at the time the present study was undertaken. Dr. Horkheimer played the crucial role in the initiation of the study, and he remained closely identified with it until the end; he contributed ideas, guidance encouragement and untiring activity in support of our aims.*⁸⁰

It is important to point out that the AJC is not a fringe, openly Marxist organization. It is in fact the most prominent, most mainstream Jewish organization in the country. The AJC was founded in 1906 by a group of influential Jews, including Jacob Schiff, an extremely wealthy banker and businessman. In 1950, when *The Authoritarian Personality* was published, the AJC was still being run by men who, to all appearances, should be strong proponents of capitalism. At this time, the president of the AJC was Jacob Blaustein. Jacob and his father Louis Blaustein were the founders of the oil giant Amoco. The younger Blaustein continued in private industry throughout his life, and his grandson still runs the family business.⁸¹

The authors of *The Authoritarian Personality* did not disguise their Marxist leanings. In the book we find the exact same Freudian-Marxist theory that the Frankfurt School was known

79 Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, and Sanford. *The Authoritarian Personality*. The American Jewish Committee, 1950. Page xii.

80 *Ibid.* Page xiii.

81 From the website of Atapco Properties, the company representing Blaustein family interests. <http://www.atapcoproperties.com/about/> (accessed 11/18/14)

for, and the authors even cite capitalist production and division of labor as factors that contribute to “prejudice”.⁸² The AJC is still proud of the book today, and the publication of the *Studies in Prejudice* series, of which *The Authoritarian Personality* is a part, is listed on the organization's time line as one of its great achievements.⁸³ This is despite the fact that the AJC even today employs both secular and religious Jews. Once again, we see that the division between secular and religious Jews, or even between capitalist and communist Jews, is completely meaningless. Jews of all religious and political opinions work together when the goal is undermining Christian society.

In the Forward to *The Authoritarian Personality*, these Jews openly state that they aim at “re-educating” America's Christian majority.

From the forward by Max Horkheimer and Samuel H. Flowerman:

*Our aim is not merely to describe prejudice but to explain it in order to help in its eradication. That is the challenge we would meet. Eradication means re-education, scientifically planned on the basis of understanding scientifically arrived at.*⁸⁴

Note the repeated insistence on “scientific” understanding made by the very same Jews who elsewhere attack Western science as being inherently oppressive. As we shall shortly see, this “re-education” means the destruction of all traditional Christian values. Thus, it is no exaggeration to say that organized Jewry (the AJC) funded a multi-year research project run by Freudian-Marxist Jews who sought to undermine Christian culture. And yet, the very Jews who carried out this project dare to say that resentment against Jewish meddling is completely unfounded, and that anti-Semites are simply irrational:

*The authors...hold the view that anti-Semitism is based more largely upon factors in the subject and in his total situation than upon actual characteristics of the Jews.*⁸⁵

The objective situation of the individual seems an unlikely source of such irrationality; rather we should seek where psychology has already found

82 Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, and Sanford. *The Authoritarian Personality*. The American Jewish Committee, 1950. Page 389.

83 <http://www.ajcarchives.org/main.php?GroupingId=150> (accessed 11/18/14)

84 Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, and Sanford. *The Authoritarian Personality*. The American Jewish Committee, 1950. Page vii.

85 *Ibid.* Page 2.

*the sources of dreams, fantasies, and misinterpretations of the world—that is, in the deep-lying needs of the personality.*⁸⁶

Having assumed that anti-Semitism is due to emotional flaws, the authors of *The Authoritarian Personality* sought to discover the precise psychological traits that lead to “prejudice” and how individuals develop these traits in the first place. They gathered data by means of numerous questionnaires and interviews. First, they put together a questionnaire that had several “anti-Semitic” statements. Subjects were asked to express their degree of agreement or disagreement with each statement, which allowed the researchers to assign them an anti-Semitism score.

If we look at the following “anti-Semitic” statements from the questionnaire,⁸⁷ we will at once see that Bible-believing Christians are required to agree with some of these statements, and that many others are also obviously true:

The Jews should give up their un-Christian religion with all its strange customs (kosher diet, special holidays, etc.) and participate actively and sincerely in the Christian religion.

Christians are required to believe that all men should believe in Jesus. Apparently, the authors of *The Authoritarian Personality* believe that evangelism itself is “anti-Semitic”.

It is wrong for Jews and Gentiles to intermarry.

Christians are forbidden from marrying those who are outside the Church: “*Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers: for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? and what communion hath light with darkness?*” (2 Corinthians 6:14)

A major fault of the Jews is their conceit, overbearing pride, and their idea that they are a chosen race.

In a previous chapter we quoted the former chief Rabbi of Israel who said that gentiles were created to serve Jews.

Jewish power and control in money matters is far out of proportion to the number of Jews in the total population.

By most estimates, Jews make up less than 3% of the American population. Despite their tiny

⁸⁶ *Ibid.* Page 9.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.* Pages 68-70.

numbers, since the founding of the Federal Reserve Bank in 1913, over 35% of the chairmen of the bank have been Jews. According to *Forbes Israel*, in 2013 24% of American billionaires were Jewish.⁸⁸

It would be in the best interests of all if the Jews would form their own nation and keep more to themselves.

The dream of Jewish Zionists becomes “anti-Semitic” when gentiles support the very same idea.

One of the first steps to be taken in cleaning up the movies and generally improving the situation in Hollywood is to put an end to Jewish domination there.

As we saw in the previous chapter, Jewish domination in Hollywood is undeniable, and Jewish commentators admit that the Jewishness of those who control Hollywood shapes the movies they make.

The Jews must be considered a bad influence on Christian culture and civilization.

The Jews are antichrists, they do not believe the writings of Moses, and they do not belong to the Father. How could such a group possibly be a good influence on Christian culture and civilization?

There seems to be some revolutionary streak in the Jewish make-up as shown by the fact that there are so many Jewish Communists and agitators.

Earlier in this very chapter we saw that the AJC funded and published the research of Marxist Jews. Jews were also over-represented amongst the Bolsheviks in Russia, and they have been the most influential leftist demographic in America. They have consistently supported liberal and radical policies, and have always been far to the left of American Christians. Jews have voted by overwhelming margins in favor of Democratic presidential candidates, and the Israeli newspaper *Haaretz* reports that, “Jewish support for Democratic candidates is higher and more stable in Congressional elections than in Presidential elections, running consistently close to 80%”, and that Jews “are the most consistently liberal group in American politics”.⁸⁹

88 Sailer, Steve. *Jewish Wealth by the Numbers*. Takimag. May 1, 2013. http://takimag.com/article/jewish_wealth_by_the_numbers_steve_sailer/print#ixzz2S0xS2H22 (accessed 11/18/14)

89 Shalev, Chemi. *American Jewish voting patterns are major obstacle for hopeful Republicans in 2012*. *Haaretz*. July 10, 2012.

No matter how Americanized a Jew may seem to be, there is always something basically Jewish underneath, a loyalty to Jewry and a manner that is never totally changed.

As long as a Jew identifies with his Jewish background, his loyalty will be split. He will be incapable of being completely, 100% devoted to American interests. Jews have always acted this way, and although they denounce this charge as “anti-Semitic” when talking to gentiles, when talking amongst themselves they admit and celebrate it. In 2013, the *Jewish Daily Forward* stated that it is:

*time to stop pretending that the loyalties of some American Jews aren't divided between Israel and America. Of course they are. There's just nothing wrong with it...The truth is that any American Jew who doesn't care as much about a Jewish state as he or she does about the United States can't be very identified with the Jewish people. Suppose vital American and Israeli interests were to clash. What would it mean for a Jew to say: "I don't give a damn what's best for Israel. All that matters to me is what's best for America"? What kind of Jew would that be? How deep could his or her Jewishness be said to go?*⁹⁰

Recall that the authors of *The Authoritarian Personality* decided that anti-Semitism has nothing to do with Jewish behavior or with objective fact of any kind. In their view, having some sort of psychological defect is the only reason someone would agree with the (objectively true) statement that Jews are disproportionately influential in money matters.

After distributing this survey measuring anti-Semitism, the authors selected individuals who had achieved high scores and subjected them to further analysis. Having isolated a group of anti-Semites, the authors hoped to discover the psychological traits and defects this group might have. Once these psychological traits were identified, they could be directly attacked, thereby curing the subjects of anti-Semitism. To discover these psychological traits, the authors created more questionnaires. These questionnaires did not mention the Jews at all, and instead featured statements on politics, interpersonal relationships, public morality, and other subjects. Adorno and company put together statements that they felt were typical of “authoritarian” and “fascist”

<http://www.haaretz.com/news/u-s-elections-2012/american-jewish-voting-patterns-are-major-obstacle-for-hope-ful-republicans-in-2012-1.450269> (accessed 11/18/14)

90 Halkin, Hillel. *Why American Jews Shouldn't Be Afraid To Put Israel First*. The Jewish Daily Forward. November 1, 2013. <http://forward.com/articles/186631/why-american-jews-shouldnt-be-afraid-to-put-israel/> (accessed 11/18/14)

individuals, statements that they believed the anti-Semitic subjects would agree with more strongly than the general public.

As we survey these “authoritarian”⁹¹ and “fascist”⁹² statements, it is obvious that once again fundamental Christian and American beliefs are being demonized:

Every person should have a deep faith in some supernatural force higher than himself to which he gives total allegiance and whose decisions he does not question.

Christians believe that it is right to obey God in all things: “*thou shalt love the Lord thy God, and keep his charge, and his statutes, and his judgments, and his commandments, alway*” (Deuteronomy 11:1)

He is, indeed, contemptible who does not feel an undying love, gratitude, and respect for his parents.

The Bible commands us to “Honour thy father and thy mother” (Exodus 20:12).

Sciences like chemistry, physics, and medicine have carried men very far, but there are many important things that can never possibly be understood by the human mind.

Christians believe that “*the things of God knoweth no man*” (1 Corinthians 2:11). According to these Jews, denying that human reason can explain everything is an “authoritarian” trait.

Although leisure is a fine thing, it is good hard work that makes life interesting and worthwhile.

The Bible teaches that “*In all labour there is profit: but the talk of the lips tendeth only to penury*” (Proverbs 14:23). Finding greater satisfaction in professional accomplishment than in leisure shows a rejection of the “logic of gratification”.

Human nature being what it is, there will always be war and conflict.

Our fallen nature prevents us from achieving a world without war. As the Bible teaches, “*there is not a just man upon earth, that doeth good, and sinneth not*” (Ecclesiastes 7:20). Only in the world to come can the causes of war (envy, greed, hatred, etc.) be done away with forever.

Sex crimes, such as rape and attacks on children, deserve more than mere

91 Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, and Sanford. *The Authoritarian Personality*. The American Jewish Committee, 1950. Page 226-227.

92 *Ibid.* Page 248-250.

imprisonment; such criminals ought to be publicly whipped.

In ancient Israel, sex crimes were punished by public execution. Recall that acceptance of sexual perversion is a key feature of Cultural Marxism.

Books and movies ought not to deal so much with the sordid and seamy side of life; they ought to concentrate on themes that are entertaining or uplifting.

Christians are to seek edification in both work and leisure. Films that focus on sordid subjects tempt the viewer into lust and other uncleanness.

Any red-blooded American will fight to defend his property.

According to our Declaration of Independence, property is certainly something worth fighting for.

America is getting so far from the true American way of life that force may be necessary to restore it.

Our nation was founded on active rebellion against tyranny. There is no reason to think that such action will not be necessary in the future.

What this country needs is fewer laws and agencies, and more courageous, tireless, devoted leaders whom the people can put their faith in.

Failure to believe in the power of socialist bureaucracy is deemed “authoritarian”.

What the youth needs most is strict discipline, rugged determination, and the will to work and fight for family and country.

This has been the default opinion of Americans from the very beginning of our nation.

No sane, normal, decent person could ever think of hurting a close friend or relative.

It is hard to imagine why the authors considered this to be a “fascist” or “authoritarian” opinion. Agreeing with this statement is a basic requirement for a decent human being.

The results from these further questionnaires showed that those who had scored high on the “anti-Semitism scale” also scored high on the “authoritarian scale” and the “fascist scale”. This confirmed the Jewish opinion that in order to combat anti-Semitism, the Jews must destroy everything that Christians hold dear. In formulating their attack against these “authoritarian”

opinions, the Jews hoped to undermine religious faith, patriotism, respect for parents, and sexual morality.

The authors of the study focus in particular on sexual repression and parental authority as causes of anti-Semitism. Through their research they discovered that “unprejudiced” individuals “*show more acceptance of sex*” and of “*instinctual tendencies*”.⁹³ Prejudiced individuals expressed a strong belief in traditional gender roles, the women wanting a strong man who can support her financially and emotionally,⁹⁴ and the men wanting women who go to church and can take care of the home (that is, women who are able to care for their children spiritually and physically). “Unprejudiced” individuals were found to disregard traditional gender roles and be more interested in finding a mate with whom they can share hobbies and have a good time (thereby neglecting their responsibility towards their children and focusing on their own selfish desires).⁹⁵

In what are perhaps the most disturbing sections of the entire book, the authors include quotes from interview subjects speaking about their parents. The “prejudiced” individuals generally express great admiration for their parents, while the “unprejudiced” speak ill of their parents in front of total strangers.

An example of a “prejudiced” subject speaking about his mother:

*(What sort of person was your mother?) Well, the best in the world...She's good, in fact, the best. In other words, she's just tops with me. She's friendly with everybody. Never has no trouble. Does anything for me she can. Writes me all the time. (What do you admire most about her?) Just about everything. When father went away, mother took care of me all her life, where she could have put me in a home some place if she had wanted to. She always stayed with me in trouble.*⁹⁶

An example of an “unprejudiced” subject speaking about his mother:

*I don't particularly respect my mother. She is intellectually shallow, wishy-washy—vacillating is the word. That's a hell of a thing to say about mother, but...*⁹⁷

93 *Ibid.* Page 396.

94 *Ibid.* Page 401.

95 *Ibid.* Page 403.

96 *Ibid.* Page 343.

97 *Ibid.* Page 345.

The authors actually praise the insulting attitude of the “unprejudiced”, while finding fault with the respect shown by the “prejudiced” subjects. In a fantastic display of illogical logic, the authors explain that the subjects who insult and rebel against their parents are the ones who actually have genuine respect for them:

*expression of rebelliousness seems to go with increased ability to give as well as to receive genuine affection while repression of resentment is associated with a more stereotypical glorification of parents that seem devoid of real feeling.*⁹⁸

Only the openly rebellious and disrespectful children are capable of genuine feeling and affection, while those who speak respectfully of their parents do so only because they secretly fear and resent them. Excessively strict parents prevent the free development of a child's Eros, causing resentment against the parents. But because these repressed children fear their parents so much, they cannot allow themselves to blame their parents for their unhappiness. So instead they direct their resentment towards completely innocent outside groups, like the Jews:

hostility against ingroup authorities, originally the parents, has had to be repressed; the “bad” aspects of these figures—that they are unfair, self-seeking, dominating—are then seen as existing in outgroups, who are charged with dictatorship, plutocracy, desire to control, and so forth. And this displacement of negative imagery is not the only way in which the repressed hostility is handled; it seems often to find expression in authoritarian aggression...

The individual who has been forced to give up basic pleasures and to live under a system of rigid restraints, and who therefore feels put upon, is likely not only to seek an object upon which he can “take it out” but also to be particularly annoyed at the idea that another person is “getting away with something”...

It is to be expected, therefore, that the conventionalist who cannot bring himself to utter any real criticism of accepted authority will have a desire to condemn, reject, and punish those who violate these values. As the emotional life which this person regards as proper and a part of himself is likely to be very limited, so the impulses, especially sexual and aggressive ones, which remain unconscious and ego-alien are likely to be strong and turbulent. Since in this circumstance a wide variety of stimuli can tempt the individual and so arouse his anxiety (fear of punishment), the list of traits, behavior patterns, individuals, and groups that he must condemn

98 Ibid. Page 346.

*grows very long indeed.*⁹⁹

If we read between all the psycho-babble, the message is obvious: strict, Christian parents raise their children in an environment of unjust domination and sexual repression. In order to destroy anti-Semitism, it is necessary to undermine the traditional family and everything that is connected with it. This would include the destruction of limits on sexual gratification, gender roles, the Christian faith, and patriotism.

In 1950, when *The Authoritarian Personality* was published, it would have seemed crazy to think that these Jews could actually carry out their plan of subversion. But within a few short decades of the book's publication, they did succeed. The poison developed by the Jews of the Frankfurt School spread throughout American academia and, even more significantly, Hollywood. The Frankfurt School shaped the “liberal” worldview that came to dominate the mainstream in the 1960s, and the propaganda spread through films and television was the most important weapon in the Jewish arsenal. Every degenerate practice was presented as normal in Hollywood films long before it was accepted as normal by the general public. Cataloging all of the subversive films produced by Jewish Hollywood would fill an entire series of books. In the interest of space, I include a few short examples showing how the ideology of the Frankfurt School has been spread.

The Graduate (1967) was directed by the Jew Mike Nichols and featured the Jew Dustin Hoffman as a disaffected college graduate who shows no interest in living the bourgeois lifestyle of his parents. Hoffman's character spends the film sexually pursuing an older married woman and then her daughter. *Bonnie and Clyde* (1967) was directed by the Jew Arthur Penn and presented the murderous outlaws as romantic rebels against the uptight establishment. *Bob & Carol & Ted & Alice* (1969) was written and directed by the Jew Paul Mazursky and starred the Jewish actors Elliot Gould and Dyan Cannon. This film normalized adultery and wife-swapping. *The Boys in the Band* (1970) was directed by the Jew William Friedkin, and was one of the first Hollywood films to normalize homosexuality. Hollywood films made in more recent years have also relentlessly pushed Cultural Marxism. Some of the more obvious examples of this include the films *Whatever Works* and *American Beauty*. *Whatever Works*

99 *Ibid.* Page 232-233.

(2009) was written and directed by the notorious Jew pervert Woody Allen. In the film, a young southern girl runs away to New York City and is pursued by her conservative parents. Her parents are shown to be largely unhappy and neurotic individuals. After their arrival in New York, the girl's mother begins sleeping with multiple men, while the father discovers that he has been repressing his homosexuality his entire life. By the film's end, the girl's parents are shown to be happy and well adjusted because they have abandoned their conservative values and embraced sexual perversion. *American Beauty* (1999), directed by the Jew Sam Mendes and produced by the homosexual Jew Bruce Cohen, is another textbook example of Cultural Marxist propaganda. The “hero” of the film, played by Kevin Spacey, is a middle-aged man who quits his job, begins using drugs, and has sexual fantasies about his teenage daughter's friend. His behavior is portrayed positively as a rebellion against stuffy bourgeois values. Spacey's neighbor in the film is an uptight former marine played by Chris Cooper. Cooper's character is presented as a typical hyper-masculine authoritarian military father, whose harsh exterior merely masks his repressed homosexual desires. We are made to think that if only he had been able to express his sexuality freely, then he could have had a happy, loving relationship with his family. In the film, his refusal to accept his homosexuality ultimately leads to tragedy and murder.

The Cultural Marxist message is present, in at least some subtle form, in nearly every product of Jewish Hollywood, even when there is not an overt message of sexual perversion. Every film or television show that presents fathers as stupid and bumbling, pastors as crooked and hypocritical, or police and military men as cruel and sadistic, is part of the Jewish propaganda effort. All of the old values identified as “authoritarian” by the Freudian-Marxists have been systematically attacked and undermined by Jewish Hollywood.

Many commentators like to think that the cultural revolutions of the 60s were the result of spontaneous youth energy, but this view is completely false. The road to the 60s was carefully and deliberately laid by Freudian-Marxist Jews in academia and media. Western Civilization was traditionally seen as the triumph of reason and willpower over the chaotic and savage forces of the world, but the Jews tore down this view and in its place substituted the idea that the development of our civilization was the growth of mental illness caused by sexual repression. If we look at the spread of “free love”, drug use, atheism, or rebellion against parental and military

authority, we can see the deliberate implementation of the “logic of gratification” proposed by Marcuse. In the 1960s, the Jews turned the demonic, irrational tendencies of fallen man into virtues. But as vile and sinful as the 60s were, things have only continued to get worse in the years that followed.

26. Total Culture War: The Endgame Of Jewish Control

In earlier chapters we have seen how the Jewish doctrine of total liberation from God's law promoted by the Frankfurt School provided the intellectual foundation for cultural revolution, and how Jew-controlled Hollywood provided the means of spreading this poison to the public. The logic behind this drive towards degeneracy was devised by Jews, and Jews are the ones who spread it. Both messenger and message are thoroughly Jewish. Although many godless gentiles have also taken part in this process, Jewish power and ethnic cohesion are the main driving force. Without speaking the Gospel truth about the Jews and destroying their influence in our nation, no Christian effort to restore public morality will have any success. No light will shine as long as the media and the academic establishment are dominated by antichrists.

The need to remove these Jews from power is very urgent, because the process of subversion started by the Jewish Frankfurt School is *progressive*. That is, it is constantly moving towards ever greater depravity, with no sign of ever slowing down. What was considered shameful and immoral just a few years ago has quickly become accepted as mainstream, and there is no reason to think that this process will not repeat itself again and again.

Conservative Christians have long warned about the “slippery slope” of immorality. They have argued, for example, that allowing homosexuals to marry will eventually lead to the acceptance of other sexual perversions, such as bestiality. The Jew-controlled media deny the validity of this “slippery slope” argument, claiming that comparing homosexuals to “zoophiles” (those who practice bestiality) is bigoted and ignorant. But the slippery slope argument is logically valid. When asked why homosexuals should be allowed to marry, Cultural Marxists respond, “because they are consenting adults who love each other and want to get married”. In

other words, for the cultural Marxist, the only definition of acceptable sexual behavior is “consenting adults who desire to engage in a certain act”. It is obvious how this definition allows for countless perversions, such as bestiality, consensual incest or necrophilia.

The validity of the slippery slope argument is also proved by the fact that there already are proponents of incest and bestiality using the exact same tactics as homosexual activists. Colleges are already holding events that attempt to normalize these sexual perversions. Campus Reform reports on one such event held recently at Yale University:

During the workshop, entitled, “Sex: Am I Normal,” students anonymously asked and answered questions about sex using their cell phones, and viewed the responses in real time in the form of bar charts.

Survey responses revealed that nine percent of attendees had been paid for sex, 3 percent had engaged in bestiality, and 52 percent had participated in “consensual pain” during sex.

Event director Giuliana Berry told Campus Reform in an interview on Monday that the workshop was brought to campus to teach students not to automatically judge people who may have engaged in these sorts of activities, but rather to respond with “understanding” and “compassion.”

“People do engage in some of these activities that we believe only for example perverts engage in,” she said. “What the goal is is to increase compassion for people who may engage in activities that are not what you would personally consider normal.”

McDevitt referred to the range of activities discussed in the workshop as “sexual diversity.”

“It tries to get people to be more sensitive ... to sexual diversity,” McDevitt told Campus Reform in an interview on Monday. “We’re not all heterosexual, able-bodied folks who have standard missionary sex.”

Several students submitted discussion topics about having incestuous sexual fantasies. Attendee Alex Saeedy, told the News that he at first found this surprising, but then “thought it might be more of a psychological thing we all might have.

“I think that’s what the point of the workshop was — to bring up things we thought we [sic] so taboo and desire or urges we criticize are just regular

parts of sexual psychology,” he said.¹⁰⁰

Note how this workshop was not calling for the legalization or open display of incest or bestiality. It was merely trying to normalize the idea of incest and bestiality and to make regular people more tolerant of those who engage in these perversion. But this “tolerance” is always the first step towards full legal protection of sexual perversion.

In Germany “zoophiles” are already organizing politically and comparing their movement to the more mainstream homosexual movement.

From the Globe and Mail:

Michael Kiok knows that people despise him.

He has got into trouble at work over his sexual views and a legal change in his native Germany is about to make him a criminal. His long-term partner could be removed from their home. But he won't stop speaking up over what he sees as a civil-rights issue.

“The actions of society are nearly the same as they were against homosexuals 30 years ago,” he said earlier this week in a phone interview from his home in western Germany, near the Ruhr valley. “We are doing the same things homosexuals did – we go out in public, we show our faces. You have more fear and hatred of things you do not know.”

Mr. Kiok is a zoophile, the group's preferred term for those whose love for animals extends to sexual relations, and the voice of a lobby effort struggling against the tide of public opinion.¹⁰¹

Some German lawmakers do not accept Kiok's argument and are pushing to criminalize bestiality, which is technically legal in Germany. But the best reason they can come up with to oppose bestiality is that it harms the animal. According to German lawmaker and bestiality opponent Hans-Michael Goldmann:

Sexual interaction is problematic because it can lead to harm and

100 Timpf, Katherine. *Yale hosts workshop teaching sensitivity to bestiality*. Campus Reform. March 5, 2013. <http://www.campusreform.org/?ID=4646> (accessed 11/18/14)

101 Moore, Oliver. *'Zoophiles' vow fight after Germany re-bans bestiality*. The Globe and Mail. December 14, 2012. <http://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/world/zoophiles-vow-fight-after-germany-re-bans-bestiality/article6356367/> (accessed 11/18/14)

*emotional disorder of animals..it's not proven that animals would enjoy sexual interaction with humans.*¹⁰²

So what if a new study comes out proving that animals do enjoy sex with humans? It is hard to see what objection to bestiality liberals could come up with at that point. Bestiality appears to be on the rise in Germany. According to the Daily Mail, the country is now home to “‘erotic zoos’ which people can visit to abuse animals ranging from llamas to goats”.¹⁰³ Without much firmer opposition, it is difficult to see how the spread of bestiality can be defeated.

The United States has also had to deal with the legality of bestiality in recent years. Disgusting Jew pornographer Ira Isaacs was charged with violating obscenity laws for producing and distributing films that featured sex acts with animals. Isaacs argued that his work was protected by the 1st Amendment, which was a wise argument for him to make given that our insane courts have already decided that normal pornography is protected by “freedom of expression”. Although Isaacs was eventually convicted,¹⁰⁴ the fact that there was ever any question about the legality of bestiality porn in first place shows how far we have fallen. It is also obvious that in a few years another bestiality related obscenity case will come up, and a more enlightened judge will decide that the 1st Amendment does protect sex with animals performed for “artistic” purposes.

While sexual perverts are given ever greater “freedom” to practice and celebrate their depravity, at the same time Christians are losing their freedom to condemn these perversions and to protect their children from them. The logic of Jewish cultural Marxism demands that anyone who opposes absolute liberation be shunned by society, and ultimately be labeled a criminal. We can see this happening throughout the Western world today.

In May of 2014 the Colorado Civil Rights Commission decided that a Christian baker was guilty of “discrimination” when he refused to sell a wedding cake to a sodomite couple.

¹⁰² *Ibid.*

¹⁰³ Blake, Matt. *Bestiality brothels are 'spreading through Germany' as campaigner claims abusers see sex with animals as a 'lifestyle choice'*. Daily Mail. July 1, 2013.
<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2352779/Bestiality-brothels-spreading-Germany-campaigner-claims-abusers-sex-animals-lifestyle-choice.html> (accessed 11/18/14)

¹⁰⁴ Kim, Victoria and Ahmad, Aida. *Fetish filmmaker convicted of obscenity*. LA Times. April 28, 2012.
<http://articles.latimes.com/2012/apr/28/local/la-me-obscenity-trial-20120428> (accessed 11/18/14)

From CBS Denver:

The owner of a bakery in Lakewood said he will no longer sell wedding cakes after the Colorado Civil Rights Commission ruled he did discriminate against a gay couple when he refused to sell them a cake. Jack Phillips owns Masterpiece Cakeshop. In 2012, David Mullins and Charlie Craig went to the shop to order a cake for their upcoming wedding reception. They planned to marry in Massachusetts and have a reception in Colorado.

Phillips said he doesn't believe in gay marriage and he refused to sell them a cake.

"We would close down the bakery before we would complicate our beliefs," Phillips said after the hearing. Phillips also admitted he had refused service to other same-sex couples.

A judge previously ruled a business owner cannot refuse service to a customer on the basis of sexual orientation. Phillips appealed to the commission, but it upheld the decision.

That prompted Phillips to decide he would no longer make any wedding cakes. He said he would be fine selling cupcakes for a birthday party for someone who is gay but added, "I don't want to participate in a same-sex wedding."¹⁰⁵

Christians should view this development with great dismay. Do not let the seemingly trivial issue of wedding cakes fool you: this is just one battle in a total culture war being waged by the Jews against Christianity. Step by step, the Jews are working to criminalize and/or ban from the public sphere the basic moral teachings of our faith. There is no point at which the sexual deviants and other antichrists will have their fill of moral degeneracy, and decide to give us Christians a safe space to preach the truth. They will never stop until faithful Christians are completely silenced.

The attack on the ability of Christians to conduct business is bad enough, but a far worse development is the attack on the ability of Christians to raise their children as they see fit. This attack on our children can be seen in the recent bans on homosexual conversion therapy for minors. California and New Jersey have already banned this type of therapy, and several other

¹⁰⁵ *Bakery Will Stop Making Wedding Cakes After Losing Discrimination Case*. CBS Denver. May 30, 2014. <http://denver.cbslocal.com/2014/05/30/bakery-will-stop-making-wedding-cakes-after-losing-discrimination-case/> (accessed)

states are moving in the same direction.¹⁰⁶ The rationale behind banning this therapy is that it causes harm to those it attempts to convert. According to the Jewish mainstream culture, homosexuality is completely “natural”, and therefore any attempt to suppress homosexual feelings goes against nature and is deeply unhealthy.

But if it is harmful for a therapist to discourage homosexual desires in a child, then surely it is also harmful for a pastor or a parent to discourage homosexual desires in a child. How could it not be? And the next step is clear: taking children away from Christian parents who refuse to give their children a full range of options when it comes to sexuality and gender.

A recent development from Canada shows how the state-run subversion of traditional parenting will be carried out.

From Life Site News:

Concerned parents have managed to stall for a time what they say is an under-the-radar attempt by the Vancouver School Board's (VSB) LGBTQ+ committee to have the board adopt radical revisions to its existing “Sexual Orientation and Gender Identities” policy. They believe the policy revisions, which are now expected to be put to a vote on June 11, would usurp parental authority and potentially harm children.

The new policy grants students confidentiality in how they identify their gender at school, bars staff from referring students for counseling that would “change [their] sexual orientation or gender identity,” and allows students to choose which bathroom they use.

The concerned parents, led by lawyer Cheryl Chang, who chairs the Parent Advisory Council at a local high school in the VSB, are being labeled as “homophobes” for raising concerns over the proposed revisions.

“I’m representing parents who actually love their children, want to be involved in parenting them, and what we’re being told is: ‘No, the school knows better. You’re all dangerous, especially if you have religious beliefs that gender is associated with genitals, then you are wrong,’” Chang said in an interview with Sun News’ Brian Lilley, host of Byline.¹⁰⁷

106 Erbentraut, Joseph. *Gay Conversion Therapy Ban Advances In Illinois*. The Huffington Post. March 26, 2014. http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2014/03/26/gay-conversion-therapy-illinois_n_5036918.html (accessed 11/18/14)

107 Vancouver School Board's new 'gender identity' policy ignores parents: critics. Life Site News. June 6, 2014. <https://www.lifesitenews.com/news/vancouver-school-boards-new-gender-identity-policy-ignores-parents-critics> (accessed 11/18/14)

The public schools throughout the Western world teach our children that sexual perversion is completely normal and completely healthy. Now they are moving towards actively accommodating and encouraging this perverted behavior when it arises, and even keeping it secret from concerned parents.

The goal of the current Jewish regime is exactly the same as that of the Jewish Bolshevism of one hundred years ago: the complete destruction of the Christian faith and the nations that used this faith as a moral foundation. Under Communism, the Jewish commissars attempted an immediate, all out attack on Christianity, and while they did succeed in murdering many of the faithful, their clumsy and brutish methods largely failed to remove Christ from the hearts of his people. But under the current system, the Jews are waging a war of attrition. Year by year, the integrity of the Christian faith is damaged. The Church makes more and more compromises, and declares itself impotent to carry on the righteous struggle against sin. Our pastors make tame objections to homosexual “marriage” while refusing to affirm that we should follow the Bible and simply execute all homosexuals, as our Christian forebears did. These pastors would rather defend the liberal position of thirty years ago than the teaching of the Bible. They want to make it clear that they can peacefully co-exist with sodomites, as long as those sodomites respect marriage as a heterosexual institution. But our opponents are not interested in any such compromise. Our opponents are working for the total destruction of everything we hold dear, for a day when no one who thinks like we do will be allowed to speak his mind or instruct his own children.

If you value your freedom to raise your children as God-fearing Christians, now is the time to stand up and halt the advance of degeneracy. Either Jewish power and the sexual perversion it promotes will be destroyed, or the Church will enter one of its greatest periods of persecution. Our slide towards absolute degeneracy seems to be accelerating, and things will get much worse. What is at stake in these questions of sexual morality is the ability to perceive the natural boundaries of reality, such as the boundaries between male and female, child and adult, human and animal. While these boundaries might be recognized scientifically, Jewish cultural Marxism does not think that our sexual gratification should be limited by these boundaries in any way. When the boundaries established by the Creator are ignored, satanic chaos can be the

only result. The growing acceptance of bestiality and other perversions is an indication of just how dark this road of Jewish destruction will be.

27. The Second Great Apostasy

God and his truth are eternal and unchanging. God has revealed this truth to us through the Bible, but our fallen, carnal minds often fail to heed this Word. Thus while God is perfect and immutable, in this current life his Church is frail and prone to error. The faithlessness of man is plainly taught throughout Scripture.

In the Old Testament, the Israelites constantly turned away from their Lord, following after the Golden Calf, Baal, Molech, and Asherah. This idolatry and immorality were taken to such a degree that God punished the Israelites by destroying Solomon's Temple and sending them into exile in Babylon. God had given the sons of Jacob special favor, granting them an incomparably just law and a land of great prosperity. But all this was undone by their stubborn refusal to follow God's word.

After the return from the Babylonian exile and the work of Ezra, the Jews adopted a stricter outer adherence to the Law of Moses, and largely did away with their brazen idolatry. But Satan refused to acknowledge defeat, and tempted many of the Jews into a new, more subtle form of disobedience. This new form of disobedience was the Pharisaic approach to God's law, where adherence to the outer fulfillment of God's commandments was counted as righteousness, leaving the heart free to indulge in pride and hatred. When Jesus came to earth, he targeted this Pharisaic doctrine as being the greatest evil, specifically because of its seeming righteousness. The obvious immorality of Pagan idolatry is much easier to avoid than Satan's subtler tricks. With the institution of the New Covenant, Christ created a spiritual ark in which the faithful could escape from the carnal cults and philosophies of men.

But even this ark was soon infiltrated by pagan ideas and practices, which were given a Christian veneer. The stark Biblical warnings against venerating mere men and objects were ignored, which led to Marian idolatry, saint-worship, Popery, and a Pharisaic legalism concerning salvation. This fall of the medieval Church came to be known as the great apostasy. Against this error God gave us the men who carried out the Blessed Reformation, returning us to a strict adherence to the Bible. The remarkable and rapid success of the Reformation led some enthusiastic Christians to suspect that they were living in the last days, and that they were experiencing the final triumph of good over evil. However, these Christians were mistaken, as the Church militant still had many wounds to endure before our Lord's glorious return.

If any nation was ever based on Reformation principles, America was. But even here, the Biblical foundations of our culture and government have not prevented our slide into total moral degeneracy. The Bible is a complete guide to righteous living, and it must contain the answer to where we have failed morally. A nation that faithfully followed the Scriptures in every detail would not be facing our current situation, where fornication, sodomy, Marxism and countless other evils are rampant not just in the secular culture, but even within the Church. All of these problems can be traced to our unwillingness to fight against Pharisaism as the Bible demands. This includes both our refusal to directly name and challenge the Jew as an enemy of the Church, and also our tendency to accept Pharisaic attitudes within the Church. This slow acceptance of Pharisaism has grown into a second great apostasy, and unless we confront the problem of Pharisaism with the truth of Scripture, the Church will continue to suffer defeat and degradation.

The fruits born by our refusal to challenge the Jew are obvious. We live in the most savagely anti-Christian stage of Western history since the great persecutions of pagan Rome, and those whom the Bible calls antichrists and murderers of the Messiah are in complete control of our media and culture. How could there not be a connection? Before the Jews took over our mass media and our universities, America was a thoroughly Christian nation. After nearly a century of Jewish control, traditional Christian convictions are laughed at and Christians are losing their businesses because of their faith. How could it be that Jewish dominance has not played a direct role in this change? There is no way that we can take our culture back and secure

a nation where the full truth of the Gospel can be loudly preached unless we demand an end to Jewish influence.

Within the Church, the Pharisaic attitude is seen in our focus on external welfare and prosperity, and in our willingness to be satisfied with doing just enough to be saved. We are quick to thank God for material blessings, but slow to take up the trials of spreading the Word of God beyond the confines of our homes and churches. The true fruit of faith is not doing just enough to save ourselves. It is bringing the fight against evil into the public sphere. It is refusing to accept the lie that there is a separate secular realm where God's Word is not relevant. As soon as Satan lulls us into believing that we can live in a religiously pluralistic society, antichrists find their way into positions of power. God granted us a Christian nation, and in return we allow Christ-denying Jews to destroy this gift, all in the name of "religious toleration". The Christian's battle against evil is never over. As long as some aspect of society is in darkness, it is our duty to continue our efforts to shine forth the light of truth. As it is written, "*Be sober, be vigilant; because your adversary the devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour*" (1 Peter 5:8). Our duty towards our brother is to warn him of this stalking beast, and fearlessly reveal the identity of the beast's servants in the world.

The beginnings of this second great apostasy can be seen amongst certain misguided Christians of the Reformation era who believed that once Catholic superstition was done away with, the Jews would recognize the truth of the Gospel and accept Jesus as the Messiah. These Christians wished to greet these potential converts with love and kindness, as they should. But the fatal mistake comes in thinking that the Jew is our friend *before* he has repented and accepted Christ. In their eagerness for this expected conversion, Christians often invite Jews into their countries and communities. This brings about the tragic situation that we see today, where rather than winning the Jews over to the truth, we allow the Jews to gain power and influence, and then drive our people *away* from the truth. The Church always suffers when the Jews are allowed to control society. In our relationship with the Jews, we must keep in mind that as long as they deny that Jesus is the Christ, they are wicked enemies who cannot be trusted.

This apostasy from the Biblical teaching on Pharisaism prevents us from protecting our brothers and sisters from sin. Zeal for the salvation of our neighbor should be at the center of all

Christian activism, including our anti-Jewish activism. When we preach against the Jews and their corrupting influence, it should not be with a haughty, derisive attitude. Mocking non-Christians is like making fun of somebody trapped inside a burning building, and saying “ha, you fool, I have been rescued from the burning building, but you have not”. This attitude of pride and scorn is the last thing that I wish to promote with this book. I am not mocking the Jews. I am merely pointing out that the Jews not only refuse to be rescued from the burning building, but also try to prevent others from being rescued. As Jesus says,

*woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! **for ye shut up the kingdom of heaven against men: for ye neither go in yourselves, neither suffer ye them that are entering to go in.***

-Matthew 23:13

The devotion of modern Christians to the false gods of “tolerance” and “diversity” shuts up the kingdom of heaven against men. While it is certainly true that we must act with Christian love, true Christian love does not prevent us from speaking the whole truth. Our refusal to speak the harsh truth about the Jews has greatly hindered the spread of the Gospel. We must recognize the deep error that the Church has fallen into with its blind embrace of Pharisaism, and trust that with diligent obedience to God's Word, the Church and our nation can be restored.

28. Cleansing The Temple

And Jesus went into the temple of God, and cast out all them that sold and bought in the temple, and overthrew the tables of the moneychangers, and the seats of them that sold doves, And said unto them, It is written, My house shall be called the house of prayer; but ye have made it a den of thieves.

-Matthew 21:12-13

The episode of Jesus cleansing the temple of the moneychangers has often been used to exhort Christians to combat the corrupting power of mammon, especially when this power is wielded by the Jews. This is an important message for Christians today, when Jewish financiers and vice-peddlers increasingly dominate the political and moral life of our people. But in our efforts to imitate Christ and drive out the moneychangers, we must not mistakenly think that a purely external purging of society is our only goal. In the previous chapter I called for a new Reformation, for a Christian revolt against Jewish control. As we spread this revolt, we must remember that the Gospel is above all concerned with transforming the heart of man. Inner regeneration must precede social change. The need for this inner regeneration becomes evident when one considers how “the temple” is understood in the New Testament.

In John 4, Jesus speaks with a Samaritan woman on the question of whether it is proper to worship God at Jerusalem or mount Gezirim, the holy site of the Samaritans. While affirming that Jerusalem is the historically correct location for worship, Jesus adds that:

the hour cometh, when ye shall neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem, worship the Father...the hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshipers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth: for the Father seeketh such to worship him. God is a Spirit: and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth.

-John 4:21,23-24

With Christ's Passion and the institution of the New Covenant, services at the temple were no longer necessary, and the old external worship was transferred to the new spiritual worship. When the Jerusalem temple was destroyed by the Romans, it was seen by Christians not as a cause of mourning, but as a providential sign that the old era had passed away.

But despite this lack of concern for the old physical worship, the concept and imagery of the temple remained important. In the writings of the Apostle Paul, we see the Christian's body referred to as a temple, because this spiritual worship of which Jesus spoke in John 4 takes place within each individual believer:

Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?

-1 Corinthians 3:16

Know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Spirit which is in you, which ye have of God, and ye are not your own? For ye are bought with a price: therefore glorify God in your body, and in your spirit, which are God's.

-1 Corinthians 6:19-20

Christian's have received the Holy Spirit, and thus our bodies are temples of that Spirit. But that does not guarantee that the temple will remain pure. The Spirit of God was present in the Jerusalem temple, but the Jews polluted this temple through the carnal business they conducted within it. In the same way we pollute the inner temple when we give in to wicked desires, making our bodies participate in gluttony, sloth, greed, vanity and fornication. Each one of us must become “a house of prayer” rather than “a den of thieves” by waging war against the worldly lusts in our own souls.

These two different levels of understanding Christ's example of “cleansing the temple” perfectly complement each other, for the very sins which pollute our inner temple are also the principal means by which the Jews control us. The Jews exploit our lust through pornographic films and the promise of sexual “liberation”, destroying our mental health and our ability to have stable families. Our greed allows us to be pacified by empty consumerism, while our concern for worldly approval prevents many of us from speaking out lest we be labeled as “bigots”. After the West abandoned Christ—the only physician who can free us from

enslavement to the world—it was easy for the Jews to gain dominion. If we were to repent and allow ourselves to be cleansed by Christ, the Jewish means of control would simply melt away. The Jews are lacking in numerical and physical strength. Their power is thus largely an illusion, an illusion that gains reality only because of the depraved inner life of our people. Once the Christian virtues are embraced, the Satanic tempters and deceivers are shut out and can no longer bribe us with carnal gratification or bewitch us with false doctrines.

That Christ will aid us in cleansing the temple, we pray to the Lord.