

Miscellany36: The Demise of Israel?

© 2006 Joseph George Caldwell. All rights reserved. Posted at Internet web sites <http://www.foundation.bw> and <http://www.foundationwebsite.org> . May be copied or reposted for non-commercial use, with attribution. (16 December 2006)

Commentary on recent news, reading and events of personal interest.

Contents

The Demise of Israel? 1

The Demise of Israel?

President Jimmy Carter's New Book

Recently, former US president Jimmy Carter released a new book, *Palestine: Peace Not Apartheid* (Simon & Schuster, 2006). In it he makes a number of points, including the observation that coverage of the Israel-Palestine conflict is heavily biased in the US toward the Israelis, and the assessment that the Israeli-imposed apartheid in Palestine is more severe than the South African apartheid against the blacks.

Carter is on tour promoting his book. Here is a comment from an article Carter wrote in the December 10 edition of the Los Angeles Times.

“The book describes the abominable oppression and persecution in the occupied Palestinian territories, with a rigid system of required passes and strict segregation between Palestine's citizens and Jewish settlers in the West Bank. An enormous imprisonment wall is now under construction, snaking through what is left of Palestine, to encompass more and more land for Israeli settlers.

“In many ways, this is more oppressive than what blacks lived under in South Africa during apartheid. I have made it clear that the motivation is not racism but the desire of a minority of Israelis to confiscate and colonize choice sites in Palestine, and then to forcefully suppress any objections from the displaced citizens.”

Carter is taking a lot of flack from the Jewish community, because his book casts them in an unfavorable light. Much of the comment is addressed to his use of the word “apartheid” to describe the relationship of Israel to the Palestinians, but the use of this word in this context is not new (see, e.g., p. 121 of *Tales from the Time Loop*, by David Icke (Bridge of Love Publications, 2003)).

A Brief History of the Founding of the Modern State of Israel

Because of the massive amount of international tension that arises because of Israel, it is of interest to review its origins.

The current Jewish state of Israel is a very recent invention. In the early twentieth century, some Ashkenazi Jews (Khazars of Eastern Europe, who did not originate from Biblical Israel /

Palestine) appealed to Britain for support in founding a Jewish homeland in Palestine. In 1917, Lord Balfour, the British Foreign Secretary, wrote a letter to Lord Lionel Walter Rothschild, in which he expressed support for this idea. The letter was drafted by Lord Rothschild and his employee, Alfred Milner. Here is the text of that letter:

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

This letter is now referred to as the "Balfour Declaration." Nothing further was done about this until after the Second World War, when Britain decided to let the newly founded United Nations decide what to do about the issue. In 1947, the UN partitioned Palestine into Jewish, Arab, and international areas (Jerusalem and Bethlehem). Fifty-five percent of Palestine was allocated to the Jews. Why would it take an established country, Palestine, and give part of it to some East-European Jews who had no current presence there, and no historic or genetic link to the land? It appears that for no other reason than succumbing to lobbying by the East-European Khazars, who wanted a country of their own.

The rationale for granting the Khazars (Ashkenazi Jews) a piece of Palestine is really tenuous – their argument was that they were Jews, and some Jews (unrelated to them) had lived in Palestine 2,000 years ago, so they were entitled to have a homeland there. Their ancestors lived in East Europe, however, not in Palestine, so they have no historical claim whatever, based on the concept of a right of "primacy." The granting of a homeland for Ashkenazi Jews in Palestine was really outrageous. An analogous example would be if I were to describe myself as an Aztec and appeal to the UN to partition Mexico into Aztec and other parts, which would then do so and subsequently condone my imprisoning the people in the other parts, as the Israelis are now doing to the Palestinians.

In his book, Carter does not mention that the effort to found a modern Israeli state was an effort of East-European Khazars (also referred to as the "Zionist Movement"), who were not from the Palestine area at all. He does not discuss that there is little relationship of Zionism to Judaism, that Zionism is a recent political movement initiated by the East-European Khazars, and has little to do with Judaism, and nothing to do with Judaism of Biblical times.

In 1948, the British mandate over Palestine, which had been in effect since World War I and the collapse of the Ottoman Empire, was ended. British forces withdrew from Palestine, the Ashkenzim declared their independence as a nation, and the new state of Israel was proclaimed. US President Harry Truman promptly recognized the new state of Israel. The Arab states of Egypt, Lebanon, Syria, Transjordan, and Iraq joined with the Palestinians in attacking Israel. The war ended in 1949 with the defeat of the Arabs. That year, Israel was admitted to the United Nations. In the armistice agreement, Israel was awarded 77 percent of Palestine. In 1967 Israel launched preemptive strikes on Egypt, Syria, Iraq and Jordan, and (after six days) took control of the Golan Heights, Gaza, the West Bank (including Jerusalem) and the Sinai Peninsula. In 1973, Egypt and Syria attack Israel in the Golan Heights and the Sinai, but are defeated after sixteen days. In 1979, Israel and Egypt signed a peace treaty returning control of the Sinai to Egypt. In 2002 Israel began construction of a wall separating Israeli and Palestinian areas of the West Bank.

According to Carter, “it is estimated that in 1880 there were only 30,000 Jews in Palestine, scattered among 600,000 Muslim and Christian Arabs. By 1930 their numbers had grown to more than 150,000.”

Carter continues: “There had been further waves of Jewish and Gentile immigration into Palestine, as indicated by official British data: the Arab population increased from 760,000 in 1931 to 1,237,000 in 1945, mostly attracted by economic opportunity, while the number of Jews during the same period increased to 608,000, primarily because of persecution in Europe.”

“British forces withdrew in May 1948 and Israel declared itself an independent state, recognized almost immediately by President Harry Truman on behalf of the United States. At that point Arab troops from Egypt, Lebanon, Syria, Transjordan, and Iraq joined Palestinians in attacking Israel, but their separate national forces were not well coordinated and there was some doubt about their specific objectives. The Israelis, in contrast, were cohesive, better armed, well led, and highly motivated as they fought for their lives and their new nation. The war ended in 1949 with armistice agreements signed between Israel and the proximate countries, based on Israel's acceptance of a divided Palestine (77 percent Israeli, 23 percent Arab) and the assumption that Jordan would control what is now known as East Jerusalem and the West Bank. No serious consideration was given by Arab leaders or the international community to establishing a separate Palestinian state while these people's ancient homeland was divided among Jordan, Israel, and Egypt.”

Israel's Right to Exist: Fact or Fiction?

In his book, Carter hammers on the right of Israel to exist. But let's take a look at this. First, what is the meaning of the word, “right”? According to *Merriam Webster's Collegiate Dictionary*, Tenth Edition (1996), “right” (in this context) is defined as “the power or privilege to which one is justly entitled.” The *American Heritage Dictionary* defines it as “Conforming with or conformable to justice, law, or morality.” There are basically two kinds of rights. On the one hand are what are referred to as “inalienable human rights,” which are basic privileges that many people believe should be available to all people, such as “life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness,” or “basic human rights,” or “children's rights.” On the other hand, there are rights that are granted to people by a government or other organization. These are specific rights, such as legal rights, to which a person subject to the jurisdiction of the government or organization is entitled. They are privileges, and they exist only to the extent that the government or organization is willing to and is capable of providing them.

Without the existence of a power that is willing and able to defend a right, it does not exist. In an absolute practical sense, there are no “basic rights” – you don't have a right to air in a jug, unless some part of society ensures it. There is no “invisible hand” that ensures that “inalienable human rights” will be upheld. You may have a “moral” right to something, but that is of no practical value unless the society in which you live chooses to recognize and defend that right. For example, people often claim that they have a “right to privacy,” but there is in fact no right to privacy granted to US citizens under the US Constitution. So, it is very important to be clear in a discussion whether we are talking about “moral rights” or “legal rights” or “substantive rights” that are upheld by some entity.

Also, rights are always relative to the entity that recognizes and defends them. My wife, as a US citizen, has a right, under US law, to walk in public with her head uncovered. If she is in Saudi Arabia, she still has that right, but the US is unwilling to defend it, and so, for all practical purposes, it does not exist. My wife has a right to have her head uncovered with respect to US

law, but not with respect to Saudi law. Saudi law does not recognize that right. There are countless other examples of this sort of thing. Rights are defined by groups or organizations, and members of those groups or organizations may enjoy those rights only to the extent that those groups or organizations are willing and able to defend them.

In the case of Israel's so-called "right to exist," we are clearly in the context of a right granted by an organization or group, in this case the United Nations or specific countries such as the United States that may formally recognize – and uphold / defend / protect – this "right." Depending on your point of view, no country, existing or conceptual, has any "moral right" to exist, or every country, existing or conceptual, has a moral right to exist – all nations are simply creations of mankind. Carthage may have had a moral "right" to exist as a nation, but no one was willing or able to defend that right, and so the Romans destroyed it. Prior to the UN's partitioning of Palestine, Israel did not exist at all. Although some may have held that it had a "moral right" to exist, there was no legal, or substantive, right to exist (since it did not yet exist!). One could assert that Palestine had a moral right to exist, but no one was willing or able to defend that right, and so Palestine was transformed into Israel. After the Ashkenazim declared Israel's establishment as a sovereign nation, it still had no "right" to exist, any more than the Confederate States of America had after seceding from the Union. Even after its defeat of the Arab states who opposed its unilateral declaration of independence, it still had no "right" to exist – it may have had the "power" to exist, but not the right. It was only when it was recognized by outside entities, such as the US or the UN, that it acquired a "right" to exist. And that right remains only so long as those outside entities recognize it and uphold it.

Now here's the interesting part. Jimmy Carter states time and again the Israel has a right to exist, and that the Palestinians and other Arab nations must recognize that right. But that right was acquired only in 1948 and 1949, after Israel appropriated Palestinian land for its use, declared their independence, and the US and the UN formally recognized it. That right exists only relative to the United States and the UN, and any other countries that recognize it. In the eyes of the Arab states, and certainly in the eyes of the Palestinians who were conquered by Israel and whose land was confiscated by Israel, Israel has no right to exist. The action of the UN in partitioning Palestine, and the action of the US and UN to recognize Israel have absolutely no effect on their view. Israel has a right to exist relative to the US and the UN, but not relative to Palestine, Syria, Iraq, or Iran.

Several times in his book, Carter urges that all nations recognize the *reality* of the modern state of Israel. He is on much firmer ground here, than in urging other nations to recognize Israel's "right" to exist. As discussed, it is very much up to each nation to decide for itself whether it wishes to recognize another nation – e.g., should the US recognize Taiwan, or not? China does not, and that is their perfect right. Many nations do not recognize Israel's right to exist at all, and that is their perfect "right." But Israel is now a powerful, nuclear-armed state, and that reality cannot be ignored or denied.

Since rights are relative (to whatever group recognizes them or does not recognize them), and since the decision to recognize a nation's right to exist is totally discretionary, the issue of whether Israel has a "right to exist" is unlikely ever to be resolved, and so, for practical purposes, it is not worth arguing over. Israel has a right to exist only if a nation says so, and the status of that right (recognized or not recognized) varies relative to each nation or people in the world. It is a waste of time to keep harping on this issue. The important issue is whether the world is better off in having Israel as an independent nation, or better off without it.

The Concept of A Partitioned Palestine Did Not Work Out As Planned

In the original concept proposed by Lord Balfour and the UN in its partitioning of Palestine, it was stated that “nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine.” The Ashkenazim have totally disregarded this concept, first in their unilateral establishment of the state of Israel after it “got its foot in the door” in Palestine, and now in their severe repression of the Palestinians, whose country they took over. In partitioning Palestine, the concept was that the world might be a better place, since the Jews and Palestinians were quarrelling incessantly.

But things are now much worse than they were in 1947, when the partitioning was done. The partitioning has led to a fascist, repressive state that is causing no end of turmoil, both in the lives of the Palestinians who are imprisoned in parts of their former homeland, and in the lives of the rest of the planet, who have to hear every day how the Palestinian/Israeli conflict may bring the world to global war. Things were much better before, when the Ashkenazim, stuck in Eastern Europe, were constantly lobbying for a homeland in the Middle East, than they are now that they have one.

The Jewish homeland – a part of Palestine – was created with the stroke of a pen, but, regrettably, it cannot be disestablished quite so easily, now that Israel has been established – the physical reality of the modern state of Israel has much more substance than the original intangible concept of a Jewish homeland in Palestine had. It is an idea that may have seemed good at the time (to reduce squabbling between Arabs and Jews), but has worked out very poorly. Unfortunately, as things have turned out, the squabbling between Arabs and Jews is far worse than before, and the world is much less stable because of this arrangement. Just as the UN established a Jewish homeland in an attempt to improve global stability, it could now consider disestablishing it for the same reason, and returning the region to the Palestinians, in recognition of their right of primacy. (The Palestinians *do* have a right of primacy, because, unlike the Ashkenazim who never occupied the area, and even unlike the Jews who occupied it several thousand years ago, they occupied it in 1947, when the UN decided to partition it.) Will it? Not very likely, in view of the power of “the Jewish lobby.”

To resolve this issue, perhaps the Ashkenazim could cajole some other country, such as Sudan, into selling them some land so that they may establish a legitimate homeland in a less contentious, undisputed area. They have profoundly violated the premises that motivated Britain and the UN to give them living space in Palestine – that they would not prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine. As soon as they were given permission to live in Palestine, they unilaterally declared themselves an independent state, conquered the Palestinians and turned them into prisoners in their own land. They have profoundly violated the terms of the partition agreement, and have therefore abrogated it.

The Ashkenazim, from Eastern Europe, have no moral right, or right of primacy, to control Palestine, or to remain in Palestine. There was never any historical basis for granting the Ashkenazim, from Eastern Europe and with no ties to the Holy Land, access to part of Palestine. They got there solely by persistence in lobbying Britain, the US and the UN. They were graciously accommodated and granted access to Palestine for zero cost, at what has turned out to be great cost to the Palestinians whose land they were given access to and which they quickly appropriated. They have been ungrateful guests, they are no longer welcome, their presence is a thorn in everyone’s side, and, from the viewpoint of many, it is time for them to leave. Will they? Of course not. That is the reality, and it has nothing to do with whether you accept their right to exist. Israel has taken control of Palestine, and the fact is it is not going to relinquish it. The Palestinians and the neighboring Arab countries should stop bellyaching

about Israel's takeover of Palestine and accept that it is never going to leave of its own accord, no matter how unjustified its takeover of Palestine may have been, or how objectionable its system of apartheid may be.

Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad (an Aryan, mind you, not an Arab) has declared that Israel should be "wiped away." Partitioning Palestine to give living space to East European Jews may have seemed like a good idea at the time, but it has turned out very badly – mainly because of the actions of the Israelis themselves. The present situation is indeed a mess, and it should be rectified. Israel's presence in the Palestinian land that it appropriated is simply causing too much trouble. The current arrangement has been tried for 60 years, and it has failed to stop the bickering between the Arabs and the Jews – the original rationale for partitioning Palestine. The situation is, in fact, far worse than it was in 1946, before Palestine was partitioned. It is time to throw in the towel on the current arrangement – it just is not working.

There is no justification for the US' continuing support for the modern state of Israel, since that arrangement has not reduced squabbling between Arabs and Jews, it is not conducive to world stability, it is not going to last, and it is a waste of effort and money. If Israel can make it on its own, fine, but it is high time for us to stop funding this troublesome venture, perhaps conceived with good intentions but gone terribly awry in its implementation. Perhaps if Israel sees that it is on its own, it will take steps to resolve the situation – or perhaps the Arabs or Iranians will do so. In any event, Britain, the UN, and the US botched the problem really badly, and they should step out of the way. Israel took charge of its own destiny when it proclaimed its independence. The Arabs took charge of theirs when they attacked this new state and failed to destroy it. The issue is not yet resolved, but let them work it out by themselves. Israel is now a powerful state, and its neighbors are also powerful. It is time for the US to extricate itself from Arab/Israeli politics. These nations have "grown up," and can sort out their own problems. It is time for the US to stop propping up and encouraging this ridiculous mess, and let the Arabs, Jews, and Iranians work it out by themselves.

By the way, I should point out that my remarks in this matter of Israel are based on my logical analysis of the situation, and is little influenced by bias, pro or con, relative to Israelis, Palestinians, Jews, Arabs, Christians, Iranians, or Americans. I have no great respect for the Arabs, since they have demonstrated such utter incompetence in developing their nations. I have a great deal of respect for Jews, who have contributed tremendously to science. They are highly intelligent and industrious, and have demonstrated great ability in constructing the modern, powerful state of Israel. But the modern state of Israel was founded on deception, and this deception is causing much turmoil. Israel is in the wrong place at the wrong time. It is simply causing too much trouble. If the Israelis can hold on to this synthesized "homeland," fine. Since they are a well-armed nuclear power, they may well be able to. But that should be on their own account, not on ours. They abrogated the partition plan that we originally agreed to, and we have no responsibility to defend or support their wild adventure, once they departed from the original concept and terms. They have caused and are causing too much trouble, and it is time for the US to stop supporting their venture – it has little to do with us.

It is noted that Israel has read Machiavelli's book. Machiavelli stated that there are three ways to administer a conquered people ("win the peace"): (1) Kill all of them (as the Romans did with the Carthaginians, and the Jews did in the Promised Land); (2) Move in with them and overwhelm them with your numbers (as the Americans did with the Indians, and the Chinese are now doing in Tibet); and (3) Set up a puppet government – some strong local families, who are beholden to you for their position, to administer the place. To some extent, Israel has employed

option 2 in the West Bank – sending in settlers in large numbers. But it has not employed any of the three options for in Gaza. Because the Palestinians are breeding much faster than the Israelis, it would appear that option 2 is not workable in the Gaza Strip. It may appear that it has employed option 3 in Gaza – viz., putting a local puppet government in charge – but no family has been able to take control, and suicide bombers are still targeted against Israel. Perhaps this option is no longer feasible because the Palestinians’ population has exploded and there are now far too many people in far too small a place, to make it a viable country / subcountry. It would appear that the only option available to Israel to resolve the Gaza Strip situation is to annihilate it. If I lived in Gaza, I would be saying my prayers each night.

America has been Pro-Israeli and Pro-Jewish, but Jews Have Not Been Pro-American

By promoting the passage of the Immigration Act of 1965, the Jews have done much to damage US culture and US environment. As a people and as a nation, they do not deserve the continued support or consideration of the United States, which they have betrayed. The Arabs don’t either – they have no love for us, as Christians. If in charge, I would immediately cease all assistance (domestic and military) to all countries in the Middle East – Israel and Egypt, who receive the largest amounts, and all of the others as well. Let these children of Abraham sort things out by themselves, with the help of their common God.

Jimmy Carter’s book may seem on the surface to be pro-Palestinian, but it is actually profoundly pro-Israeli. It cites, time and time again, Israel’s right to exist, and urges that everyone, including the Arabs whose land the Israelis confiscated and ravage, must recognize this fact. Carter never for a moment considers the fact that Palestine was originally partitioned by the stroke of a pen, that the UN, Britain, and the US may withdraw support for the concept of a Jewish homeland as easily as we established it. We would be morally justified in doing so, since the Ashkenazim profoundly violated the terms of the partition agreement. But moral justification is not very relevant here. More relevant is that we would be practically justified in doing so in the interests of promoting stability in the Middle East, which Israel has profoundly distressed.

Carter’s book is a smokescreen. It may appear to be a work decrying Israel’s mistreatment of Palestinians, but it is in fact a work dedicated to promoting the legitimacy of the very illegitimate nation of Israel. It decries the apartheid system that Israel has imposed on Palestine, while never for a moment addressing the issue of why Israel should continue to be supported as a nation/state. It is in fact a work dedicated to justification of continuation of the state of Israel. The real problem with respect to the Israeli/Palestinian issue is not Israel’s repression of the Palestinians – if the Palestinians, who outnumber the Israelis, continue to submit to their domination, that is their problem. The real problem is that the Israeli/Palestinian conflict is “in-your-face” every day, and is contributing to great instability in the Middle East and in the world, and this is not helpful. Partitioning Palestine turned out to be a very bad idea, and it would appear that rescinding the privilege granted to the Ashkenazim to live there would be quite justified (even if it would at this point, given the reality of a powerful, even if illegitimate, Israel, be a feckless action). After 60 years in control of Palestine, the Ashkenazim are now quite wealthy, and they can now purchase land somewhere else where they will not cause so much trouble (rather than cajoling the UN into confiscating someone else’s land for them).

From the case of Israel, Britain, the US and the UN should have learned that it is not a good idea to give some lobbyists a country simply by carving a part out of another country. The East-European Ashkenazim never had any moral or legitimate or historical basis for a claim to any part of Palestine, and were granted access simply because of their persistent lobbying. The

whole idea (of partitioning the quarrelsome Arabs and Jews in Palestine), while perhaps well-intentioned, was poorly implemented (when it granted Palestinian land to East Europeans who had no justification for being in Palestine). The Palestinians will never forgive the granting of their land to the Ashkenazim, and this festering crisis will never go away until Israel is disestablished – or all of its enemies are! Carter never addresses this fundamental issue. By writing an entire book about Israeli apartheid in Palestine, he seems to be criticizing the Israelis, when in fact he is hammering over and over again their right to exist as a state and remain in Palestine.

The Israelis are well aware of Carter's ploy. They don't mind someone telling them that they are misbehaving, while emphasizing their legitimacy. Through his book, he is doing them a big favor, and they know it. Carter is right that US news is tremendously biased in favor of the Israeli point of view, and he is pretending to "set the record straight" by chastising the Jews for their sorry treatment of the Palestinians. In fact, what he has done is to have drawn a lot of attention to a book that pounds the message over and over again that Israel has a right to exist, and that everyone should recognize it. Israel in fact has no moral right to exist at all. If anyone has a moral right to Palestine, it is the Palestinians who occupied the country in 1946, a year before part of it was given by the UN to some East European Khazars. The Ashkenazim have no moral right to Palestine at all. They proceeded to found Israel in their partition and imprison the host Palestinians, in direct violation of the terms of partition. Their actions will never be forgiven, and peace will not come until they leave the region, or they are destroyed, or their enemies are destroyed.

Ben Gurion: The Arabs Will Never Accept Israel

My previous article, Miscellany29, contained an article entitled, "Ben Gurion Understood." It is worth repeating here:

One of the newspaper articles I read while visiting Tracy and Clair was a letter to the editor in the Friday, July 21 edition of the (Toronto) Globe and Mail. Entitled, "Ben-Gurion Understood," it was submitted by Mariam Sheibani of Ottawa. It read as follows:

Norman Rosencwaig (Israel's Success – letter, July 19) is not the first to claim that the goal of the Arab community is to "destroy" Israel. I fail to understand why Israel and its proponents are so shocked that it has not been welcomed in the Arab and Muslim world with open arms.

I am certain that if someone has been unjustly occupying your property, killing and kidnapping your children and threatening your very existence for six decades – regardless of who supported this person – your reaction wouldn't be very different from that of the Palestinians and those honest enough to sympathize with their plight.

This truth was well understood by Israel's early leaders. David Ben-Gurion, one of Israel's founders and its first prime minister, once told Nahum Goldmann, president of the World Jewish Congress: "If I were an Arab leader I would never make terms with Israel. That is natural: We have taken their country.... We come from Israel, but 2,000 years ago, and what is that to them? There has been anti-Semitism, the Nazis, Hitler, Auschwitz, but was that their fault? They only see one thing: We have come here and stolen their country. Why should they accept that?"

At least Israel's founders didn't feign innocence. That's more than can be said for its current leaders and for those who support them.

Mariam Sheibani, Ottawa

[End of Sheibani letter.]

Prior to 1948, the modern state of Israel did not exist. Its existence owes to promotion of the idea by European Jews and sponsorship of the British Empire following the breakup of the Ottoman Empire in the Middle East. Support for this state is not at all universal, and, in view of all of the trouble its existence has caused and is causing, it is time to reconsider whether its establishment was a good idea. At the very least, establishing it in the midst of a region occupied at the time entirely by Arabs seems to have been a very big mistake. Perhaps it should be abolished, as it has been for thousands of years. Or perhaps it should be moved somewhere else, e.g., to somewhere in Africa, where it would fit more harmoniously. Based on six decades of experience, the evidence seems overwhelming that it is a state in the wrong place at the wrong time. Its time was several millennia ago. Its time is not now.

[End of "Ben Gurion Understood".]

The only additional comment that I would add is that the people who lobbied Britain and the UN for partition of Palestine were not Jews from 2,000 years ago. They were East-European Khazars (Ashkenazim).

By bringing about the partitioning of Palestine, which led directly to the establishment of Israel and the suppression of the Palestinians whose land the Ashkenazim were given access to, Britain, the US, and the UN all share responsibility for the current Israeli/Palestinian debacle. Although these players may have been well intentioned, they have stood by while Israel has taken over Palestine and imprisoned its previous inhabitants. If they have any sense of justice, they should now work for the disestablishment of Israel, and the return of the land to the Palestinians. This would be a true Roadmap to Peace in the Middle East.

Continuing to support the Ashkenazim/Israel, which has no moral or historical claim to Palestine, will never work. Machiavelli would be very proud of the Israelis, in that they have acquired a stranglehold on Palestine by one of his three dictums (administer a conquered land by flooding it with your own people). If the Israeli/Palestinian conflict were not so much trouble, nobody would care. But it is causing considerable instability in the Middle East, and this instability is not going to go away as long as Israel retains the conquered Palestinian land. In the interest of regional stability, it would be a good idea for the long-running experiment of the modern state of Israel to be discontinued. It is not too late for the US, Britain, and the UN to resolve this problem, which they caused. Israel is a thorn in a nest of Arab states, and one placed there by the US, Britain, and the UN. It is incumbent on them to remove this thorn. They are in a position to do so now, peacefully, or they can wait until a neighboring state, with nuclear weapons, simply blows it away – or until Israel does the same to all of its neighbors. The choice is theirs.

The Arabs States Don't Care about the Palestinians

It is interesting how Israel and pro-Israeli factors are constantly arguing that it is necessary to resolve the Israeli/Palestinian conflict, before resolving other issues in the Middle East. But the Arab states do not care a whit about Palestine (or else they would offer Palestinians a home in their states). All they care about is the elimination of Israel. Here follows an article on this topic, written by Lisa Beyer and published in the December 18, 2006, issue of *Time* magazine.

The Big Lie About the Middle East, by Lisa Beyer

No sensible person is against peacemaking in the Holy Land. Applause and hopefulness would seem the reasonable reaction to the Iraq Study Group's recommendation that the Bush Administration "act boldly" and "as soon as possible" to resolve the conflict between the Israelis and Palestinians. But as a front-row observer of similar efforts over the past 15 years, I could muster neither response. In lumping the Iraq mess in with the Palestinian problem-and suggesting the first could not be fixed unless the second was too-the Baker-Hamilton commission lent credibility to a corrosive myth: that the fundamental problem in the Arab world is the plight of the Palestinians.

It is a falsehood perpetuated not just by the likes of Saddam Hussein and Osama bin Laden, who came late to the slogan after their actual beefs – Saddam with his neighbors; bin Laden with the Saudi royals gained insufficient traction in the Arab world. The mantra is also repeated like an axiom in the U.S. in parts of the State Department, in various think tanks, by editorial writers and Sunday talk-show hosts.

Yes, it was a great disturbance in the Arab world in the 1940s when a Jewish state was born through a U.N. vote and a war that made refugees of many Palestinians. Then the 1967 war left Israel in control of the West Bank and Gaza Strip, and thus the Palestinians who lived there. But the pan-Arabism that once made the Palestinian cause the region's cause is long dead, and the Arab countries have their own worries aplenty. In a decade of reporting in the region, I found it rarely took more than the arching of an eyebrow to get the most candid of Arab thinkers to acknowledge that the tears shed for the Palestinians today outside the West Bank and Gaza are of the crocodile variety. Palestinians know this best of all.

To promote the canard that the troubles of the Arab world are rooted in the Palestinians' misfortune does great harm. It encourages the Arabs to continue to avoid addressing their colossal societal and political ills by hiding behind their Great Excuse: it's all Israel's fault. Certainly, Israel has at times been an obnoxious neighbor, but God help the Arab leaders, propagandists and apologists if a day ever comes when the Arab-Israeli mess is unraveled. One wonders how they would then explain why in Egypt 4 of every 10 people are illiterate; Saudi Arabian Shi'ites (not to mention women) are second-class citizens; 11% of Syrians live below subsistence level; and Jordan's King can unilaterally dissolve Parliament, as he did in 2001. Or why no Middle Eastern government but Israel's and to some extent Lebanon's tolerates freedom of assembly or speech, or democratic institutions like a robust press or civic organizations with independence and clout-let alone unfettered competitive elections.

One might argue that if the Arab dictators were deprived of the Great Excuse, they might begin to rule with greater concern for their constituents' needs. But why should they be allowed to wait-in the meantime cynically selling their people the Israel Myth-especially since the wait is apt to be long? The Baker commission is quite right in wanting to see sooner rather than later a viable Palestinian state. But the report's airy prescription for frog-marching Israelis and Palestinians into new peace talks perpetuates another persistent fiction: that U. S. involvement is the key to a breakthrough. That contradicts the real-life story of all three of the major peace agreements Israel has signed, with the Egyptians, Palestinians and Jordanians. Each was the result of bold initiative not by Washington but by local leaders, when conditions were ripe. In all three cases, the accords were the product of negotiation begun in secret behind the backs of the Americans. The Oslo accords with the Palestinians ultimately fell apart, but not because of a collapse of U.S. diplomacy; rather, because of a failure of leadership by Yasser Arafat.

The Israelis and Palestinians aren't going to make peace until they have brave, inspiring leaders, which they don't, and when they are sick of fighting, which they aren't. When that time comes, the U. S. can facilitate negotiations, as it has before, but only if it re-establishes its reputation as a reasonably honest broker. In the past, Washington tilted to the Israelis' side but not so much that the Palestinians couldn't live with it. President Bush has turned the tilt into a

slap-down. He says he supports Palestinian statehood, but the Palestinians don't hear the words; they grasp the lack of feeling he evinces for them. They take in the unprecedented silences in Washington when Israeli forces overreact; they wince at White House endorsements of what the U. S. used to call illegal Jewish settlements in the West Bank. If James Baker had wanted to improve U.S. policy toward the Palestinians, he might have whispered these things into Bush's ear instead of sucking up to the Arab states with his inappropriate and quixotic peace plan.

US Support of Israel Will Soon Disappear

The modern state of Israel has had a great deal of support from the United States, since its inception, when US President Harry Truman recognized it. Today, Israel receives much financial support from the United States. Most people believe that this is because Jews have considerable influence in the US economy, in the US news and entertainment industry, and in the US government. It is of interest to consider how the strength of the "Jewish lobby" will be affected by the decline in the economic strength of the United States, caused by the loss of its manufacturing capacity and the financial strength of its currency, the US dollar.

Here follows a copy of an interesting e-mail that I received last Sunday (December 10) and today (December 16).

U.S. dollar facing imminent collapse?

Fed in bind as Paulsen, Bernanke head to China

Posted: December 10, 2006

5:38 p.m. Eastern

Jerome R. Corsi

Even as the stock market is hitting new record highs almost every day, the Federal Reserve and Treasury Department are quietly coordinating a devaluation of the dollar that the Bush administration hopes will be a slow decline rather than a dollar collapse.

This week, in an unusual move, the Bush administration is sending virtually the entire economic "A-team" to visit China for a "strategic economic dialogue" in Beijing Dec. 14 and 15.

Treasury Secretary Henry Paulson and Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke are leading the delegation, along with five other cabinet-level officials, including Secretary of Commerce Carlos Gutierrez. Also in the delegation will be Labor Secretary Elaine Chao, Health and Human Services Secretary Mike Leavitt, Energy Secretary Sam Bodman, and U.S. Trade Representative Susan Schwab.

The Bush administration wants to get China's cooperation in preventing a dollar collapse. That's the conclusion of John Williams, an experienced professional econometrician, who writes the "Shadow Government Statistics" blog.

Williams has re-created M3, a money-supply measure whose data the Federal Reserve simply stopped publishing after issuing a technically worded March 2006 announcement.

Williams reports M3 is currently growing at close to a 9.6 percent rate and trending higher, compared with an 8 percent rate early this year, when the Fed quit reporting the measure.

"The Fed is pumping liquidity into the U.S. economy," Williams told WND, "and the Fed evidently did not want the markets to follow too closely what the Fed was doing with the money supply."

China today now is holding a historically unprecedented \$1 trillion in foreign exchange reserves. During the Thanksgiving holiday, an announcement by China that their central bank planned to diversify foreign-exchange holding away from the dollar caused the dollar to drop in value on international currency markets. Since then, the dollar has hit a 20-month low against the euro.

"This was almost an orchestrated announcement," Williams claimed. "Around Thanksgiving the markets were thinly traded. I'm not sure who was playing games there, but the signal was clearly heard."

"You're dealing with mass psychology here," Williams argued. "The central bankers around the world know they are going to take a hit on their dollar holdings. None of the central bankers want to start a dollar panic, but none of the central bankers want to be the last out of the dollar, either."

Williams explained that the Federal Reserve is in a bind.

"Raising rates would kill any chance of avoiding a recession, but in terms of the dollar, we can't raise the rates fast enough when the dollar starts to slip quickly."

Are we experiencing a dollar collapse?

"Not yet," Williams answered. "I believe we're going to have a dollar collapse, but the Fed is going to do its best to slow play the dollar's decline in value, so that it takes a year or two for the dollar value to reach its low point."

Williams explained the risk of collapse the dollar faces:

"There will be a central bank, most probably in Asia, who will start the move away from the dollar and when it happens, you're going to see other central bankers covertly trying to follow. The move will magnify very quickly and it could become a full-fledged panic and a dollar collapse."

The Fed is struggling right now to contain inflation and stimulate economic growth. All the Fed is doing right now with all their grand policy shifts is using a lot of propaganda and market massaging to try to prevent a financial panic."

Recent reports have shown that U.S. gross domestic product growth slowed to 1.6% in the third quarter, the lowest in more than 3 years.

Will a declining dollar help narrow the U.S. trade deficit with China?

"You could take a 30 percent decline in the value of the dollar," Williams argued, "and it wouldn't make much of a dent in our trade deficit with China, not as long as Bush administration trade policy continues to be one-sided in favor of China."

"The Fed is faced with an impossible circumstance with the trade and budget deficits being run by the Bush administration," Williams told WND, "and they are just playing games with the markets and the public by not publishing M3, the broadest measure of money supply and the best indicator we have of long-term activity."

M3 is the broadest measure of the total money in the economy, including checking and savings accounts, cash, time deposits, and money-market funds. Economist Milton Friedman, one of the key economists contributing to the conservative theories that led to the development of "Reaganomics," argued that money supply is a key measure correlated both with economic growth and inflation.

http://www.worldnetdaily.com/news/article.asp?ARTICLE_ID=53311

[End of first e-mail.]

BREAKING: CHINA TO DUMP ONE TRILLION IN U.S. RESERVES!!!!

December 15

BEIJING, CHINA. -- Sources with a U.S. Delegation in Beijing have told The Hal Turner Show the Chinese government has informed visiting Bush Administration officials they intend to dump One TRILLION U.S. Dollars from China's Currency Reserves and convert those funds into Euros!

China was allegedly asked to withhold the announcement until Bullion Markets closed for the weekend to prevent an instant spike in gold and silver prices. This delay will give the world the weekend to consider appropriate actions rather than have a knee-jerk reaction which could see the U.S. Dollar totally collapse in value Monday.

According to this Senior source, China told the U.S. delegation they no longer have faith in U.S. Currency for several reasons:

- 1) The Federal Reserve Bank ceased publishing "M3" data in March, making it nearly impossible for anyone to know how much cash is being printed. China said this act made it impossible to tell how much a Dollar is worth.
- 2) The U.S. Dollar has lost upwards of thirty percent (30%) of its value against other foreign currencies in the recent past, meaning China has lost almost \$300 Billion simply by holding U.S. Dollars in its reserves.
- 3) The U.S. has no plans whatsoever to reduce deficit spending or ability pay down any of its existing debt without printing money to pay it off.

For these reasons China has decided to implement an aggressive sell-off of U.S. Dollars before the rest of the world does so. China reportedly told the US delegation; "we are the largest holder of U.S. Currency and if the rest of the world unloads theirs before we unload ours, we will lose our shirts."

Early this week, in an unusual move, the Bush administration sent virtually the entire economic "A-team" to visit China for a "strategic economic dialogue" in Beijing Dec. 14 and 15.

Treasury Secretary Henry Paulson and Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke lead the delegation, along with five other cabinet-level officials, including Secretary of Commerce Carlos Gutierrez. Also in the delegation is Labor Secretary Elaine Chao, Health and Human Services Secretary Mike Leavitt, Energy Secretary Sam Bodman, and U.S. Trade Representative Susan Schwab.

The Bush administration wanted to get China's cooperation in preventing a dollar collapse. The Hal Turner Show has been told the effort failed.

According to the source, Fed Chairman Bernanke left the meeting "pale and in a cold sweat" as the implications of China's decision seemed to sink in.

The implications are enormous: The U.S. Dollar is likely to collapse in value against all other major currencies as early as Monday, December 18.

This would cause a worldwide sell-off of dollars, create almost immediate "hyper-inflation" in the US and also impact world markets at a level "worse than the Great Depression of 1929."

Arabs to the rescue?

In a strange twist of fate, Arabs and OPEC may come to the rescue of the U.S.!

Senior officials in OPEC made clear that they too would be severely harmed if the U.S. Dollar collapsed, and hinted they "would not be inclined to sell oil to any particular nation that intentionally caused such a collapse."

This was a thinly veiled threat to China, which depends heavily on OPEC oil for its rapidly developing energy needs.

The OPEC officials even went so far as to say "Since China lacks the ability to project their military power, OPEC nations need not worry about any Chinese military response to an oil cut-off."

Such brutally candid remarks will not sit well with China; and signal ominous things for the U.S. .

Arabs and OPEC will want something in return for saving the U.S. from economic collapse and it is already widely speculated what they want will be a complete change in U.S. backing of Israel in the Middle East.

If such demands are made by the oil-rich Arabs, the U.S. would be left with little choice but to virtually abandon the Jewish state to preserve itself.

<http://www.haltturnershow.com/ChinaToDumpUSDollars.html>

[End of second e-mail.]

The US is in fact in a terrible position. Because of its long-term policy of massive international free trade, it has suffered substantial erosion of its manufacturing capacity, and has rung up massive international trade deficits. Because of these trade deficits, the dollar has weakened substantially relative to other currencies. Normally, the weakening of the dollar would be greeted with joy, since the price of US manufactured goods would then be substantially lower

relative to the price of manufactured goods produced by other countries. But, because the US has severely damaged its manufacturing capacity and has high labor costs, it cannot sell its manufactured goods to other countries, even with a 30% reduction in the value of the dollar. As I observed in a recent article, the US has lost its manufacturing capacity and competitiveness to such an extent that it now resembles a Third-World country. Last year, China imported 36 billion dollars worth of manufactured goods to the US through the Port of Long Beach, California, and we exported only three billion dollars to China, much of that raw material, such as cotton and other low-value-added commodities (such as cereal grains).

In addition to a substantial financial crisis, the US is facing a substantial energy crisis as well. The US economy runs on energy, and much of that energy comes from oil. The US has used up most of its own oil, and is now highly dependent on oil from foreign sources. The major source of foreign oil is the Middle East – the Arab countries, such as Iraq, Kuwait, and Saudi Arabia, and Iran. Global production of oil is now peaking (Hubbert's Curve, Hubbert's Peak, Peak Oil), and the global competition for the ever-decreasing supply will grow in intensity. The dependence of the US on Arab oil will intensify. The Middle Eastern oil-producing countries have oil, and they also, as observed in the above e-mail, have a lot of "petrodollars." The US needs both. Israel does not produce oil, and it does not hold large amounts of US dollars – in fact, it is high on the US list of foreign assistance. The fact is that Israel is dependent on the US for support and defense, but the US does not need Israel at all. On the other hand, the US is very dependent on the Arab countries of the Middle East, who oppose Israel's existence. When push comes to shove, and that time is just about now, the US will be dependent on the Middle Eastern oil-producing countries for support. As that happens, the US will abandon its support of Israel.

A Realistic Scenario for the Middle East

So what will happen then? Well, it is difficult to predict the exact events that will occur, or when they will occur, but it is pretty easy to outline a realistic scenario. First, the US will certainly shift its support from Israel to the Arab states. Jimmy Carter's new book is just one small reflection of that coming shift. Soon, Iran will have nuclear weapons, and be able to destroy Israel. As we know from history, Israel has a policy of preemptive attacks. It preemptively attacked Egypt, Syria, Iraq and Jordan in the so-called Six-Day War. It preemptively attacked a facility in Iraq that it believed to be producing nuclear weapons. At some point, it will likely make a preemptive strike against Iran. There is little doubt about this. Iranian President Ahmadinejad has announced to the world that Israel should be "wiped out." Long before Iran acquires nuclear weapons to make this a reality, Israel will attack Iran.

But Iran is not blind. It knows that Israel will at some point attack it, preemptively. So what is the best strategy to adopt in this case? On the one hand, it could be for Israel and Iran to employ a "John Nash equilibrium (bargaining) solution to a general-sum game," in which both Iran and Israel lay down their arms and embrace each other as friends. But this is unlikely to happen, in a world of exploding populations and decreasing global oil supplies. The strategies that will be employed in the post-Peak-Oil era are those that lead to *decreases*, not *increases*, in human population. Iran's best strategy in that environment is to attack Israel, as soon as it possibly can. If it waits until it clearly has the capacity to build its own nuclear weapons, it will be too late, for Israel will likely attack before that happens. As a result, Iran will likely "borrow" nuclear weapons from Pakistan or some other source to attack Israel first.

Well, that is what Iran is likely to do. But what about the other Middle-Eastern states, the Arab ones? What will they do? Once again, that is hard to predict with precision, but some realistic scenarios can be surmised.

A Realistic Scenario for Moslem Terrorists

Islamic terrorists have two main goals – one is the destruction of the US, and the other is the destruction of Israel. Recently, a leading Islamic terrorist announced that a key objective in reaching this goal would be to attack energy sources. Since the US is so dependent on energy, that is a very rational objective. The problem is that it is difficult to accomplish in the short term. At the present time, the major sources of commercial energy are oil, coal, nuclear power, and hydroelectric power (other sources of solar power are very small, and nuclear fusion is a “pipe dream”). It is difficult to destroy nuclear power stations, since there are very many of them, and they are distributed all over the world, and they are heavily guarded.

What about hydroelectric generating stations? Well, here, from Wikipedia, is a list of the major hydroelectric generating stations, ranked in terms of maximum generating power.

<u>Dam Complex</u>	<u>Generating Power</u>
La Grande Complex, Quebec, Canada:	16,021 MW
Itaipú Brazil/Paraguay 1984/1991/2003	14,000 MW 93.4 TW-hours
Guri Venezuela 1986	10,200 MW 46 TW-hours
Grand Coulee United States 1942/1980	6,809 MW 22.6 TW-hours
Sayano Shushenskaya Russia 1983	6,721 MW 23.6 TW-hours
Robert-Bourassa Canada 1981 (part of La Grande)	5,616 MW
Churchill Falls Canada 1971	5,429 MW 35 TW-hours
Yaciretá Argentina/Paraguay 1998	4,050 MW 19.1 TW-hours
Ertan Dam China 1999	3,300 MW 17.0 TW-hours
Gezhouba Dam China 1988	3,115 MW 17.01 TW-hours
Iron Gates Romania/Serbia 1970	2,280 MW 11.3 TW-hours
Aswan Egypt 1970	2,100 MW

The problem with attacking hydroelectric facilities to hurt the US is that most of them are not located in the US. They could be attacked to hurt the Western world’s energy supply, but at the present time these facilities do not account for much of the total commercial energy supply. This will not change until oil and coal run out (oil within 40 years, coal within 300 years, at current rates of consumption).

For a spectacular effect, such as was accomplished in the attack on the World Trade Center on September 11, 2001, terrorists could blow up a large hydroelectric dam. For example, two tactical nuclear weapons detonated on the Aswan Low Dam and the Aswan High Dam would have a rather spectacular effect, with the instant flooding of the entire Nile Valley, Cairo, and the Nile Delta. Since the Nile is narrow at the dam site, blowing up the dam would not cause a massive tsunami-like wave, but it would still cause a lot of infrastructure destruction. The primary rationale for blowing up the Aswan Dam would be that it would restore fertility to the Nile Valley and Nile Delta, by restoring the annual flooding of the Nile, with its annual deposit of silt over the Nile farmlands.

Arab terrorists have attacked oil pipelines, and they will no doubt continue to do so, but this is a rather pointless enterprise. In fact, from an economic point of view, it simply helps the

industrialized world, since it generates more economic activity (to rebuild the destroyed pipeline link).

What about bigger attacks on oil, such as dirty tactical nuclear weapons placed on oil fields? If this were done on a large scale, it would bring about the demise of the industrialized world, immediately, rather than will happen anyway gradually over the period from now until 2050, as global oil reserves are depleted. But is this feasible?

Here is a list of the known top producing oil fields in 2001, taken from *The World's Giant Oilfields*, by Matthew R. Simmons (website <http://www.simmonsco-intl.com/files/giantoilfields.pdf>)

Table 7. 2001 Known Top Producing Fields ('000 Bbl/Day)

<u>Country</u>	<u>Field</u>	<u>2000 Daily Production</u>
Saudi Arabia	Ghawar	4,500
Kuwait	Burgan	1,500
Mexico	Cantarell	1,211
China	Daqing	1,108
Iraq	Kirkuk	900
Iraq	Rumailia North	700
Saudi Arabia	Abqaiq	600
Saudi Arabia	Shayba	600
U.S.A.	Prudhoe Bay	550
China	Shengli	547
Brazil	Marlim	530
Saudi Arabia	Safaniyah	500
Saudi Arabia	Zuluf	500
Iraq	Rumailia South	500
Abu Dhabi	Bu Hasa	450
Saudi Arabia	Ben'i	400
Abu Dhabi	Zakum - Lower	400
Abu Dhabi	Zakum - Upper	400
Russia	Samotlar	320
Norway	Ekofisk	310
Total Production		16,526 Estimate

According to the Simmons report, there are over 4,000 actively producing oilfields in the world, and they produce 68 million barrels of crude oil daily, from almost one million individual wells. Most oilfields are small, with the average producing less than 20,000 barrels per day. From the above table, we see that the top twenty oil fields produce 16.5 million barrels per day, or about 24 percent of the total. From these data, it is clear that a small number of nuclear weapons, say 20, could significantly reduce global production (i.e., by 24 percent), but it would take a very large number of weapons to destroy a significant portion of global oil production. Moreover, since the oil fields are located in many different countries, attacking them all at once would be very difficult. The conclusion here is that if Islamic terrorists wish to destroy the US by destroying global oil production, it would be very difficult. The small attacks that they make on pipelines have no significant effect, and simply produce a positive stimulus to the oil industry (in creating demand for parts and labor to repair the damaged pipeline). Since none of the oilfields are in Israel, attacking oilfields has no effect on Israel.

Although there is a considerable amount of coal on the planet, it is distributed very unevenly. The following table shows the reserves for the sixteen countries having the largest recoverable, according to the World Energy Council (WEC) and British Petroleum (BP) (source: The Wiley Encyclopedia of Energy and the Environment, vol. 1, p. 379 (1997); WEC figure shown unless otherwise indicated):

<u>Country</u>	<u>Total Recoverable Coal (million metric tons)</u>
China	730,505 (WEC) – 166,125 (BP)
United States	240,920
USSR	239,020(BP) - 40,936(WEC)
Australia	90,916
Germany	80,047
India	62,531
South Africa	55,318
Poland	40,390
Yugoslavia (former)	16,565
Colombia	9,663
Turkey	6,102
Czechoslovakia (former)	5,369
Hungary	4,460
Bulgaria	3,729
Botswana	3,499
Indonesia	2,999
World	1,662,930

The top three countries possess almost 70% of the recoverable coal reserves (using the WEC figures).

As with oil, coal fields are very numerous. Since the US has very substantial coal reserves, its future energy supply could be significantly impaired if dirty tactical weapons were detonated on each field, but since there is much coal in other countries, this would have little long-term impact. (I could not find a list of US coal fields on the Internet, and so cannot estimate the amount of production that would be destroyed by a small number of weapons.) Israel has no coal, and so it is not a target with respect to destruction of coal fields.

From the above, it may be concluded that Islamic terrorists cannot destroy the US or Israel by targeting energy facilities, such as nuclear power plants, oil fields, or coal fields. They could cause significant damage by targeting the larger facilities, but since all oil will be gone within 40 years and all coal within 300 years, doing so would not make any difference in the long run.

Since destroying energy sources would have little impact on the US or Israel, what other options are available? The terrorists have no doubt learned that attacking buildings with conventional weapons is useless – all that does is stimulate additional economic activity to replace the buildings. So, if the terrorists are going to attack infrastructure, or population, they are going to have to do it on a much grander scale. If terrorists attacked the 20 largest US cities with small tactical nuclear weapons (“suitcase” bombs), they would cripple these cities, but they would not destroy the country (since small nuclear bombs do not destroy entire large cities, and much of the country would remain undamaged). To the extent that specific industries are concentrated or located in specific locations, however, it could well be that the destruction of the heart of the 20 largest cities would destroy critical system components, so that the country could not easily

be repaired. If 20 tactical nuclear weapons were targeted on the 20 largest Israeli cities, that country would be destroyed.

In conclusion, Islamic terrorists can easily realize their goal of destroying Israel with a small number of nuclear bombs, but it does not appear that they would be able to destroy the US with such a limited number, whether they attacked energy sources or population centers. With respect to defeat of the US, Moslem terrorists should simply wait until global petroleum supplies exhaust, by which time the US, along with the rest of the industrialized world, will collapse. At that time, with high-tech weaponry gone, human numbers will play a large part in determining military outcomes, and the Moslems, because of their higher birth rates, will have an advantage.

Since all of Israel's neighbors, both the Arab countries and Iran, wish to see it destroyed, and they will soon have the capability to do so, it would appear that they will soon attack it. The only real issue remaining is whether Israel, which already has advanced nuclear capability, will wait until its enemies attack and destroy it, or whether it will annihilate them first in a preemptive attack. Given Israel's history of preemptive attacks, and the long history of Judaism in totally annihilating its enemies, it seems likely that this will occur.

So, will Israel be destroyed? Are we about to see the demise of Israel? It does not appear so. Israel seems very familiar with Machiavellian principles. It will not wait to be destroyed. Instead, we will likely see the destruction of all of its neighbors – all of the Arab countries in the Middle East, and Iran as well, and possibly Pakistan. And this will likely happen before Iran has an established nuclear weapon capability.

Israel has demonstrated throughout its history that it knows very well how to apply Machiavellian principles in politics and war, and does not hesitate to apply them. It has applied these principles to some extent in its ruthless suppression of the Palestinians, but, because of the exploding Palestinian population, the options that it chose to implement have not worked well. It seems highly unlikely that Israel will wait until the Iran attacks, and that it will launch a preemptive attack against Iran to destroy it first. There is an old saying that if you are going to swallow a frog, let it be a large one. When Israel attacks and destroys Iran, it will also attack and destroy all of its Arab neighbors. What about Gaza? Well, the world would react so badly to Israeli annihilation of Gaza that it will probably not do anything to Gaza until it attacks Iran. At that time, Gaza will be annihilated also.

As it becomes more and more evident to Israel that America is abandoning it in favor of the Arabs, Iran, and anyone else who has oil or petrodollars, the motivation to act will increase dramatically, since it knows that no matter what it does it will lose US support anyway. The shift of US support to the Arabs will occur soon and quickly, and Israel therefore will likely act soon as well (before Iran has nuclear weapons). The long-awaited Armageddon in the Middle East is about to occur.