

Christianity's acceptance of Jesus - one man's word - while also denouncing Mohammed, exposes their flawed, inconsistent position. Contrast that to Judaism, which is based on public demonstration: G-d's Revelation to millions at Sinai.



ESTD
1997

JewishTimes

*Dedicated to Scriptural and Rabbinic Verification
of Authentic Jewish Beliefs and Practices*

Volume III, No. 40...Aug. 13, 2004

WWW.MESORA.ORG/JEWISHTIMES

Download and Print Free

IN THIS ISSUE:

PARSHA: RE-EH	1,5,6
REFUTING JESUS	1,7
DIALOGUE W/ A MISSIONARY II	1,2,3
BOOKS: COMPETITION	4
THE REAL KING	8
LETTERS	9,10
HAGUE: JUSTICE FOR JEWS	11

SUGGESTED READING:
SEE THESE AND OTHER ARTICLES AT OUR SITE

Maimonides' 13 PRINCIPLES
THE BASIC FOUNDATIONS WHICH ALL JEWS
MUST KNOW AS TRUE. WE URGE YOU TO READ THEM:
www.mesora.org/13principles.html

**God's Existence:
Belief or Proof?**
www.mesora.org/belieforproof.html

God's Land Without God?
AN OPEN LETTER TO THE JEWISH COMMUNITY:
www.mesora.org/openletter/openletter2.html

Weekly Parsha

Re-eh

RABBI BERNARD FOX

“You shall not do thus to Hashem your G-d.” (Devarim 12:4)

Moshe commands the people that they should uproot all objects of idolatrous worship from the land. He then enjoins the nation not to

(continued on page 5)

BIBLICAL REFUTATIONS OF JESUS AS MESSIAH

JACK E. SAUNDERS

I am once again writing in response to one of the recent articles in the Jewish Times, Dialogue with a Missionary, Volume III, No.39...August 6, 2004.

Having once been a Christian myself and having heard and even been involved in trying to defend Jesus and Christianity, there is one thing that I came to understand that while Christianity is Debatable, it is not Defensible.

Christianity is a system based on belief and not knowledge. In some sense Christianity often prefers ignorance to knowledge, wisdom, and understanding. I realize that such statements for some of your Jewish readers who come from a system that is predicated on knowledge, wisdom, and understanding, this may sound strange. But that is the reality of the system that is based on simple belief.

Now I would like to address some of the issues that the Missionary has stated in his dialogue. Such as: the dependence on the miracles in Jesus' life either performed for him or by him to supply evidence for him being the Messiah; the destruction of the Temple that for him seems to indicate that there is no longer a

(continued on page 7)

Part II

Dialogue with a Missionary

RABBI MOSHE BEN-CHAIM

Reader: Dear Jewish Times:

The Jewish Times does not accept the New Testament as inspired Scripture, of course. But neither does it accept it as a historical record of events. What sort of evidence would Jewish Times accept as valid? An eyewitness still alive from 2004 years ago? Before and after photos of lame men walking, cured lepers? Perhaps we could show a coroner's report showing the cause of Jesus' death. Then we could find a satellite photo showing the Roman guard posted around the tomb of Jesus and then Jesus walking out, alive. Hmm, you see the dilemma? There is no evidence that you would accept; therefore it is pointless to conduct a debate.

Mesora: No dilemma. Ask yourself why we affirm the Revelation at Sinai and deny Jesus. Wouldn't you like to know why - with no satellite photos - we accept Sinai and Moses' Torah?

But before I give you an answer, let me shed some light on your glaring blindness: You say, “What sort of evidence would Jewish Times accept as valid: an eyewitness from 2004 years ago; photos of lame men walking, cured lepers; a coroner's report; a satellite photo?” Such

(continued on next page)

statements are Christian attempts to make us look foolish for asking a religion for "proof" of their beliefs. You are immersed so deep in the murk of blind faith, that it cakes-over your eyes. You cynically mock our demand for rationality and proof. However, you look foolish in this dialogue. With this type of sarcasm you attempt to dismiss the notion that there can be any proof for history. You try to portray our request as impossible, only because this is your vision of religion: one where intelligence and proofs take a back seat. However, you too accept Revelation at Sinai. You too accept world history. So, your words here are either transparent, malicious venom, or you ignorantly contradict your very belief in a provable history.

Accounts like Sinai, histories of Caesar's and Pharaoh's existence, and Alexander's victories are all accepted as 100% proven truths. Now, unless you wish to deny world history, you already know what is accepted as a valid proof for history. So why don't you provide such proof for Christianity, or admit you have none?

Masses attended Sinai, 2.5 million strong. Such numbers are absent in all accounts of Jesus' miracles, and all other religions claiming divinity. We do not accept any historical event that lacks masses. Such stories are contrived.

Reader: Eyewitnesses did write the events in what are now the Gospels - contrary to what you assert. This is not the place to present the evidence for the veracity of the Gospel stories. There are plenty of Christian websites with this information for the man who wished to fully understand the Christian's faith in them.

Mesora: Your Gospels lack any proof, as proof of history exists only with mass witnesses. Anyone can write down, "Masses saw Jesus perform miracles." But that proves nothing other than a healthy imagination.

The most Christianity has are the words, "multitudes followed Jesus." No record of who these people were, where they came from, or their numbers. You either believe or you don't. Your New Testament's claims are vague at the least, and contradictory at the most, as seen in your four Gospel accounts that vary greatly about the same, so-called events.

However, Judaism records with great detail, the Jewish Tribes, their numbers, their princes, and counts them as a whole more than once in the Bible. There is no doubt as to who those people were, where they came from, exactly how many they were, and to where they traveled. No ambiguity. This is why you accept it too.

You should also be concerned about Moses' many addresses to the Jews. He tells the entire nation not to forget "what your eyes saw." (Deut. 4:10) Such a statement is not found in your New

Testament tales about Jesus, and for good reason: Jesus could not make anyone believe they saw, what in fact they did not see. He performed no miracles. Remind yourself what our Bible says:

"For your eyes have seen all the great acts of G-d that he performed." (Deut. 4:7) Moses notes that those events that transpired before the entire nation were clearly perceived. He states, "You are the ones who have been shown, so that you will know that God is the Supreme Being and there is none besides Him. From the heavens, He let you hear His voice admonishing you, and on earth He showed you His great fire, so that you heard His words from the fire". (Deut. 4:9-13,32-36).

"And G-d spoke to you from amidst the flames, a sound of words did you hear, and a form you did not see, only a voice." (Deut. 4:12)

"And all the people saw the voices and the flames and the sound of the horn, and the mountain burning, and the people saw, and they stood from a distance." (Exod. 20:15)

You must realize the world of difference between your New Testament and our authentic Bible. Moses does not tell the people years later what happened, as is the case with your Gospel writers. Your approach is bereft of any proof, as it expects belief in a story recounted to those not at the "event". Your Gospels were written decades after the assumed miracles of Jesus. Therefore the stories were not told over to anyone of Jesus' era, so they could not attest to having witnessed anything. It's all blind faith. In contrast, Moses addresses the people as a nation, more than once, reminding them of what "their eyes saw." The fact we have these stories about the Jews' acceptance of what they saw, is only possible if they did in fact accept Moses words, and their own eyes. Judaism is set apart from every other religion by the attendance and testimony of millions of people, whose names we know, and whose numbers are verified.

Reader: There were plenty of folks around who could have refuted the Gospels as frauds. Funny, we don't find any.

Mesora: Are you completely ignorant of the Jewish view that denies Jesus? Are you completely blind to your own view that bases itself, not on proof, but on "blind faith?" Your own religion stands behind the doctrine of belief, as opposed to proof! But I won't disappoint you. I will soon offer a few refutations of your positions.

Reader: And what would the early Christians have to gain from perpetrating the fraud? Let's see, being thrown out of the Jewish community. Being fed to lions, beaten and imprisoned by Romans. Laughed at by the Greek pagans. Where is the incentive for the Apostles and other Jewish converts to perpetuate the new faith?

Mesora: This is what they gain: the easy-way-out doctrine of forgiveness without remorse and reflection; the idolatrous man-god, the satisfying emotion of pity for a victimized Jesus nailed on a cross, normal human aggression now can be targeted at the Jewish scapegoat, and no more 613 weighty commands...you need not look far to understand the weakness of those people who desire Christianity over Judaism. They gain an easier life that caters to base instincts and emotions. Instead of a system like Judaism where man must conquer his emotions, they can outlet their drives guilt-free.

Reader: Why not try to refute the evidence, as it exists? Find the errors in interpretation. The Epistles of Paul and the Gospel of Matthew offer many references to Hebrew Scriptures as evidence. Why not work to show that their interpretations are erroneous? I would love to see this, and if it already exists please tell me where I can find it. I am only interested in knowing the truth, whatever it is. So far, the only religion that I have found with the ring of truth is Catholicism.

Mesora: I will comply, showing fully how your interpretations are erroneous. Your Epistles err gravely when attempting to teach the Jews how to interpret our "Divine Book".

Rabbi Reuven Mann poignantly allegorized Christianity: the Epistles are akin to travelers, journeying to a far-off, unknown island. After reading the islanders' history and books, the travelers told these islanders their OWN version of what these islanders are to believe about their history, insisting that the islanders have their OWN facts wrong. This would be absurd, for anyone to approach another people, and tell them what to believe. Perhaps I will approach Einstein and tell him what he really means by his theories! The entire foundation of Christianity is built on lies and foolishness. I feel truly sad for Christian children who are never trained to think, and become duped into accepting notions based on blind faith, and not reason.

The Jews never accepted Christianity's distortion of our Bible. The New Testament is a foolish attempt to hijack the Bible authority possessed by the Jewish nation alone. Even according to you, the Jews were the sole recipients of the Torah at Sinai. During that great miracle of G-d's selection of the Jews, G-d appoints the Rabbis as the sole body of Biblical authority. (Deut. 17:11) Therefore, Christianity

(continued on next page)

claiming possession of the correct Bible interpretation denies G-d's words.

Judaism rejects the New Testament's interpretations of G-d's Bible. The Jews are the authority of their own book. Christians, who arrive later on, are in no position to tell us how to understand our heritage, what audacity! This reasoning alone is airtight. But I will go one further: the Talmud states that prophecy ended. Therefore, all of these stories of Jesus receiving prophecy from G-d are contradicting G-d's appointed Bible leaders, who said prophecy had ended.

Reader: When Christians speak of a "new" covenant, they do not mean that G-d changed His mind and made up a different covenant whole cloth. Christians interpret the events recorded in the New Testament in light of the covenant found in the "old" Testament (if I may use that phrase to distinguish the two).

Mesora: This is another lie: Christianity does in fact view G-d as having changed His mind, as Christianity contradicts G-d:

G-d said: "Fathers are not killed for their sons (sins), and sons are not killed for their fathers (sins), each man in his own sin will be killed." (Deut. 24:16)

Christianity says: Jesus although bearing no sin, died for other people's sins - a direct violation of G-d's word, what we call blasphemy.

G-d said: "...for man cannot know me while alive." (Exod. 33:20)

Christianity says: G-d became man. Not only does this claim knowledge of G-d when G-d said this is impossible, but it imputes humanity onto G-d.

G-d said: "Listen Israel, G-d is your G-d, G-d is One." (Deut. 6:4)

Christianity says G-d is a Trinity. The most fundamental principle is denied. Christianity has no regard for honesty or for G-d's word, but follows its own agenda to glorify a man-god.

G-d never says that atonement is achieved other than through repentance.

Christianity says atonement is achieved by the death of a man. Christianity concocts baseless notions and calls it "G-d's Words."

Reader: The events of Jesus' life is a fulfillment of a covenant of signs or symbols to a covenant of reality. What we see in the Mosaic liturgy of Passover, for example, is the sacrifice of an animal to preserve the Israelites from the



Sculptures depicting Jesus saved by angels and cherubs attempt to evoke pity from adherents. Judaism differs, focusing exclusively on G-d.

Angel of Death. The lamb's blood on the doorpost was a sign to the angel and a mark that these people were G-d's people. How can an animal's blood absolve us of sin? G-d chose the death and sprinkled blood of an innocent, unblemished lamb as a sign of the innocent, unstained-by-sin Redeemer crucified on a cross. The old covenant was fulfilled (not discarded) and only with the old covenant can the new one be understood.

Mesora: You make leaps that make no sense: Where in G-d's name do you see in His Torah any mention of a cross? Even more alarming is your principle that "G-d lies": G-d mentions no further requirement other than the Paschal Lamb, yet you claim Jesus' crucifixion was necessary! You thereby claim that G-d's words are lies. You suggest He doesn't tell the truth when He says to offer the Passover Lamb as complete atonement. Listen to yourself talk; you deny G-d's very words.

The sacrificial lamb during our Egyptian Passover, you now tie to Jesus? You unite two completely unrelated matters. You take a proven story of the Jews being atoned by killing the Egyptian god, and suggest a stupid idea that a man's death affords atonement. Do you hear your own words? Your words have no meaning, no semblance of rationality, and you expect me to applaud?

The Jews were commanded by G-d to kill the

lamb. And this fact has reason: for G-d to offer the Jews His Bible and for them to accept Him exclusively as G-d on Sinai, the Jews must deny all other assumed deities. Thus, G-d reasonably commanded them to make a display that they denied the Lamb to be god - by its slaughter, although their Egyptian oppressors did believe this foolishness.

In stark contrast, Christianity has no reason or proof for its claims. Your ideas contradict G-d as the Bible clearly shows, and your positions enunciated herein contain ridiculous notions, no rhyme or reason, and have no facts as support, as I mentioned.

You completely ignore the greatest minds like Maimonides, Nachmonides, Ibn Ezra, Saadia Gaon; the list goes on. These great thinkers - great by anyone's standards - unanimously admitted that Revelation at Sinai is a proven event. They simultaneously deny Jesus, Christianity's claims, and all of your words. Now, if great thinkers were unanimous in an opinion, why don't you wonder why? Perhaps there is "reason" for their agreement. I urge you to educate yourself on their words.

But offering you a drink of your own poison...if you do accept the word of a Jesus - a single man - that G-d spoke to him and selected him as a Messiah, then you must also accept Mohammed, as he bases himself on the same argument as Christianity; "one man's words are enough." You cannot answer this contradiction! But Judaism does not have this problem, as we base ourselves on reason, and proof: the masses who attended Revelation at Sinai. We do not rely on the word of one man, for who is to say whether he is truthful about his assumed prophecy? But we rely on what was seen and heard by millions. There can be no mistake: the only proven religion is Torah given at Mount Sinai.

I will end citing the Bible's words on a false prophet (Deuteronomy 13:2-6): "If there arise among you a prophet or a dreamer of dreams and he gives you a sign or a wonder, and the sign or the wonder of which he spoke to you comes to pass, and he says, 'Let us go after other gods which you have not known and let us serve them. Do not listen to the words of that prophet or dreamer. God your lord is testing you to see if you are truly able to love God your Lord with all your heart and all your soul.'"

With the Trinity, Jesus denied that G-d is one. Christianity denies G-d's words that people are killed for "their own sins." Hence you have a man named Jesus who led the people astray from the One G-d, and His words.

Jesus was a false prophet. ■

Taken from "Getting It Straight" Practical Ideas for a Life of Clarity

Competition

DOUG TAYLOR & RABBI MORTON MOSKOWITZ

I was cold, I was tired, and above all, I didn't want to be here.

A snow-covered branch, strategically positioned directly overhead, succumbed to its extra winter weight and gave way, causing a cascade of the cold white stuff to make a direct hit down the back of my neck. I controlled the urge to smash my snow shovel into the ground.

"Looks like you're having fun," said a familiar voice.

I looked up from the driveway to see my friend, the King of Rational Thought, standing on the nearby sidewalk.

"Many descriptive words are possible at this particular moment," I said, walking toward him. "Fun isn't one of them."

"So why are you doing it?" he asked, after explaining that he was out for a morning walk. "It's the weekend, and your driveway is flat enough that you could get your car out if you had to. Why bother shoveling the snow off? It'll probably melt in a day or two anyway."

"Because of the neighbors," I snapped.

He lifted an eyebrow. "What about the neighbors?"

"Well look around," I said. "Every one of them has already been up and shoveled his driveway clean. Mine's the only one on the block looking unkempt."

He pondered that for a moment but didn't even glance at the neighbors. Instead he looked right at me and asked, "How does a great baseball player evaluate himself?"

Now it was my turn to stare. "What?" I said.

"How does a great baseball player determine that he's great? What yardstick does he use?"

It seemed crazy to be discussing this in the driveway with the mercury below 30, but I replied anyway. "Well, based on batting averages, home runs, number of errors, stuff like that."

"I understand," he said, "but what is the basis

for determining that a given number is the yardstick for greatness?"

What was he driving at? "You look at another great player," I replied. "You measure your results against his."

"So the other player becomes the yardstick?"

"Sure," I said. "That's the way it works in almost anything."

"Interesting," he said. "Has it ever occurred to you that, once you set up another person as the yardstick in evaluating yourself, you have made yourself subordinate to that person? You're subservient to him. That's the basis for competition. Whenever you go into competition with another person, you've automatically set him or her up as the standard. Notice that you haven't worked out an objective standard. You've just arbitrarily set up another person as the standard and are measuring your worth against that person."

He scooped up a handful of snow, began molding a snowball, and continued. "The problem is, of course, that the other person may not be a realistic standard for you at all. The standard for your behavior should be set objectively and rationally. Not on the basis of what someone else is doing."

"So?" I asked.

"So give me one rational reason why you should shovel your driveway when there's no practical reason to do so and you're clearly not enjoying it," he challenged.

I opened my mouth to answer. Then, like a dud missile that finally connects with the fuse,



I got it.

He didn't even give me time to respond. "Let me show you something fun to do with this snow," he went on. "See that tree over there?" He pointed to a giant cedar near the middle of my yard, some 30 feet away. "How about this? You're looking a little chilled and probably need a break. We'll each throw a snowball at the trunk of the tree. Whoever hits closest to the middle of the trunk wins. Loser buys lattes."

"You're on," I said, dropping my shovel and grabbing a handful of snow. I hastily packed a tight one with my wool mittens and sent it flying... almost through the front window. I missed the tree by at least six feet.

Without a word, the King of Rational Thought drilled his snowball dead center into the tree.

I stared. "How did you...?"

He grinned. "I played baseball in college." ■

treat Hashem in this manner. The simple meaning of the pasuk is explained by Rashi. It is prohibited to destroy any stone of the holy altar of the Temple. This prohibition also includes erasing the written name of the Almighty.

Rashi then quotes the opinion of Rebbe Yishmael. Rebbe Yishmael explains that the pasuk has a deeper meaning. Moshe is commanding Bnai Yisrael not to adopt the idolatrous practices of the nations they are soon to conquer. Ignoring this warning will result in retribution from Hashem. This punishment can result in the destruction of the Bait HaMikdash. In other words, Moshe is not merely prohibiting the direct destruction of the altar and Temple. He is urging the nation to guard its behavior and not indirectly destroy the Temple through idol worship.[1]

Nachmanides comments on Rashi. He explains that Rebbe Yishmael is not disputing the simple meaning of the passage. He agrees that this pasuk prohibits the direct destruction of the altar or the erasure of the name of Hashem. However, he maintains that the pasuk has a second intention. Rebbe Yishmael identifies this second message. We should not conduct ourselves in a manner that can lead to the destruction of the Temple.[2] However, this raises a question. According to Rebbe Yishmael, the pasuk has two messages. How are these two messages related? Why are they included in a single passage?

Maimonides provides an insight into this issue. Maimonides considers the prohibition against destruction of a stone of the altar or the erasure of Hashem's name to be a negative command. It is interesting that he discusses this command in the very first section of his code – the Mishne Torah. He places this command directly after the prohibition against defiling Hashem's name through inappropriate action – chillul Hashem. This juxtaposition indicates that Maimonides considers the destruction of the altar or the erasure of Hashem's name to be an act of disrespect towards the Creator.

We can now answer our questions. Rebbe Yishmael is teaching us that the commission of a sin is a violation of one's personal relationship with the Almighty. However, there is an additional harm caused by violation of the Torah. Hashem declared the Jewish people to be His chosen. This relationship is best demonstrated through the prosperity and success of Bnai Yisrael. When the Jewish people are punished, they are still the children of the omnipotent Almighty. However, this reality becomes less obvious. As a result there

is room for a terrible chillul Hashem. Skeptics will ask, "Where is the omnipotent Jewish G-d, now?"

This is the second message of the pasuk according to Rebbe Yishmael. We must recognize the significance of our actions. Our obedience to the Torah results in success and prosperity. The name of Hashem is sanctified. Our disregard of the mitzvot results in our exile and oppression. This is a desecration of the Almighty's name.

"This you should do only at the place that Hashem your G-d will choose from among all of you tribes to place His name there. His presence you should seek and you should come there." (Devarim 12:5)

Moshe explains that once Bnai Yisrael occupies the land of Israel the Bait HaMikdash will be established. The worship of the nation will be centered on the Holy Temple. Moshe explains that the people will offer their sacrifices at the Bait HaMikdash.

Our passage tells us that we should seek Hashem at the Bait HaMikdash. The simple meaning of this statement is that the Temple should be a center of worship. Nachmanides understands this phrase in a more literal sense. Jews from distant communities will travel to Bait HaMikdash. As they travel, they will need directions. They will ask, "Where is the road to the Holy Temple?" They will invite others to join in their pilgrimage. This asking for guidance is the "seeking" to which the pasuk refers.[3]

If we understand the comments of Nachmanides in a literal sense an implication can be made. Apparently, no elaborate measures are taken to mark the road to the Bait HaMikdash. Instead, travelers are forced to rely on the directions provided through encounters along the route. This seems odd. It would seem appropriate to carefully mark the roads leading to the Temple.

This contrasts with the requirement for Arei Miklat – cities of refuge. These cities are provided as safe havens for a person who accidentally takes a life. In the case of such a tragedy, the killer is required to take refuge in one of a group of specially designated cities.



He must remain in one of these cities for an indefinite period of time. The relatives of the victim have the court's authority to execute the murderer if he or she is found outside of the city. Therefore, the murderer must quickly travel to one of the Arei Miklat. In order to facilitate the killer's escape, the roads to the Arei Miklat are carefully marked.[4] Why are the roads to the Arei Miklat carefully indicated but the route to the Temple neglected?

The comments of Nachmanides seem to provide a hint. As explained above, the simple meaning of our passage is that the Bait HaMikdash should be the center of worship. It is there that the Divine presence should be sought. Nachmanides is not rejecting this interpretation of the passage. He is suggesting that the pasuk has an additional meaning. It is reasonable to assume that Nachmanides' interpretation is somehow related to the simple meaning of the pasuk. What is this connection?

Perhaps, Nachmanides' interpretation is an elaboration of the simple meaning of the pasuk. The pasuk tells us that the Bait HaMikdash must be established as the center for worship. Nachmanides suggests that the pasuk also provides a means for accomplishing this objective. No signs are to be posted marking the way. Travelers are forced to rely on those they encounter on their pilgrimage.

(continued on next page)

Through asking directions, they publicize the purpose of their trip. They emphasize the importance of the Mikdash. Others are encouraged to accompany these pilgrims. This process accomplishes the objective outlined in the simple message of the pasuk. The centrality of the Temple is firmly established.

The Midrash supports this interpretation. The Navi explains, in Shemuel I, that Elkanah – the father of Shemuel – traveled to the Mishcan in Shiloh at regular times. Before the construction of the Bait HaMikdash the Mishcan in Shiloh was the central location for worship. The Midrash explains that Elkanah would take his entire family with him. He was careful to make himself and his family conspicuous. He invited questions regarding his destination. The questions would come. Elkanah would respond with a short discourse on the importance of the Mishcan as a central institution of Bnai Yisrael. He would invite these inquirers to accompany him. The Midrash further comments that each year Elkanah would travel by a different road. His purpose was to encourage a new group to join his pilgrimage.[5]

According to our interpretation of Nachmanides' comments we can readily understand Elkanah's behavior. He was fulfilling the directions of our pasuk. The passage essentially instructs us to use the journey to the Bait HaMikdash or Mishcan as an opportunity to promote the importance of these institutions. Our pasuk suggests that this be accomplished through requiring the pilgrims to seek directions. Elkanah devised additional means to effectively use his journey to emphasize the importance of the Mishcan.

This answers our question. There would be a practical benefit in marking the road to the Bait HaMikdash. However, an overriding consideration dictated that this not be done. The Torah wants the person traveling to the Bait HaMikdash to share with others the purpose of the journey. Through leaving the road unmarked the circumstances are created for interaction between the pilgrim and others. As a result the importance of the Bait HaMikdash is emphasized.[6]

“And you shall eat there before Hashem your G-d. And you shall rejoice for all efforts – you and your households with which Hashem will bless you.” (Devarim 12:7)

Moshe tells the people that they will rejoice in the service of Hashem. Sforno comments that Moshe is referring to a person who serves Hashem out of love. Such a person will feel a

sense of joy. In other words, one who loves the Almighty experiences a sense of inner happiness.[7]

Why does the love of Hashem result in this inner joy? This seems to contradict a basic assumption of the Torah. Hashem punished Adam and Chava for eating from the Tree of Life. One aspect of this punishment was that humanity would toil for its sustenance.[8] It seems that a certain level of pain and discomfort is a fundamental aspect of human existence. Is a person who loves Hashem exempt from this curse?

Maimonides discusses the mitzvah of loving Hashem in his Mishne Torah. In that discussion he describes the intensity of this adoration. He comments that the love of Hashem should be all-consuming. He compares the intensity of this love to the infatuation of romance. Envision a person who is deeply involved in romantic relationship. This person's thoughts and feelings are fixated upon the romantic partner. All consideration for one's self becomes secondary. The needs and desires of the loved one become primary.[9]

This explanation of loving Hashem underlies Maimonides' analysis of another mitzvah. The Torah prohibits us from seeking revenge. What is the basis for this mitzvah? Maimonides explains that the desire for revenge is an expression of inappropriate priorities. If a person insults us or causes us some material harm, we should not feel the need to seek revenge. No major harm has been caused. Our desire for revenge is merely the result of an overestimation of the damage caused to us. If we recognize the insignificance of the material world, we will not feel compelled to seek vengeance.[10] We should not place too high a value on the material world.

This interpretation of the prohibition against seeking vengeance is consistent with Maimonides' comments on love of Hashem. We are commanded to love the Almighty. This love should be the center of our attention. We should not be overly fixated upon material concerns. A person who achieves this elevated spiritual plane will not seek revenge. The material world becomes a petty consideration. It does not deserve our attention.

It is important to note that the prohibition against vengeance recognizes that we may not be on this spiritual level. We may be deeply angered by personal attacks or material harm. Nonetheless, the Torah requires that we forsake the desire to avenge ourselves. In

observing this command, we recognize the innate insignificance of the material world. We may feel anger but we acknowledge that this is a subjective personal reaction. It is not a reflection of the true reality.

We are now prepared to understand Sforno's comments. Hashem cursed the material world. As a result of this curse, we must struggle to sustain ourselves. In addition, as we attempt to indulge our material desires we experience frustrations. We decide to go on a vacation. Our car breaks down. We buy a new car, and a week later someone accidentally scratches it. These mishaps are programmed into the material world. They are the consequence of the curse. Involvement in the material world is fraught with disappointment and frustration.

Sforno is explaining that the one who loves Hashem can avoid many of consequences of this curse. This person is not concerned with the material world and self-indulgence. This is the reason that one who loves Hashem does not seek vengeance. Instead, this individual is absorbed in an intense love. One's attention is directed towards the Almighty. These material frustrations are of minor concern. There is not reason to become disproportionately upset over the petty issues of our material existence. Therefore, Sforno concludes that one who loves Hashem will experience ongoing happiness. ■

[1] Rabbaynu Shlomo ben Yitzchak (Rashi), Commentary on Sefer Devarim 12:4.

[2] Rabbaynu Moshe ben Nachman (Ramban / Nachmanides), Commentary on Sefer Devarim 12:4.

[3] Rabbaynu Moshe ben Nachman (Ramban / Nachmanides), Commentary on Sefer Devarim 12:5.

[4] Mesechet Makkot 10a.

[5] Rabbaynu Shimon HaDarshan of Frankfort, Yalkut Shimoni, Sefer Shemuel I, chapter 1.

[6] Thank you to Rav Binyamin Nadoff for providing most of this material. Rav Nadoff attributed the basic insight to the Chafetz Chayim.

[7] Rabbaynu Ovadia Sforno, Commentary on Sefer Devarim 12:7.

[8] Sefer Beresheit 3:17-19.

[9] Rabbaynu Moshe ben Maimon (Rambam / Maimonides) Mishne Torah, Hilchot Teshuva 10:3.

[10] Rabbaynu Moshe ben Maimon (Rambam / Maimonides) Mishne Torah, Hilchot Dayot 7:7.

BIBLICAL REFUTATIONS OF JESUS AS MESSIAH

JACK E. SAUNDERS

place for the atonement for sin; the Christian belief that the New Covenant replaces the previous Covenant; and finally the Trinitarian doctrine, and Jesus being G-d in the flesh, G-d forbid.

From a Christian standpoint the whole idea of Christianity is based on the idea of Jesus' life that begins with a miraculous event, his birth. Then the miracles that he performs provide more evidence of him being the Messiah. Finally, his resurrection provides proof that he is indeed the Divine Messiah.

Jesus' birth is proclaimed as a miraculous birth.([1]) Whereby, G-d in some miraculous way impregnates a man's wife who is a virgin and then must send angels to assure him that her pregnancy was not only all right, but that this was G-d's will and plan. Of course this is predicated from a passage found in the writings of the prophet Isaiah ([2]) that Christianity finds support for such a miraculous birth of the Messiah.

Also, all the miracles that he performs during his years on the earth such as, healing the blind, walking on water, changing water into wine, raising the dead all provide the Christian evidence that Jesus is the Messiah and even the possibility of being G-d in the flesh, G-d forbid.

His miraculous resurrection following his death is intended to provide more evidence and lend more validity to their claim of him being a divine Messiah. Although there have been other miraculous resurrections recorded in the Tanach and no one made any such claim to them being the Messiah.([3])

This is the one of the basic flaws of Christian theology, i.e., a complete dependency on miracles and miraculous

occurrences to substantiate and solidify Jesus as the Messiah. According to Christian doctrine all of these miraculous events either performed on Jesus or by him can only point to one thing and that is; He is the Messiah and divine.

G-d knows the pull that the miraculous has on individuals and has stated so in the Torah.([4]) Since there would be from time to time miracle workers who would be able to perform seemingly miraculous events to try and lead Israel astray. He would use these to test Israel so that they could strengthen themselves and never be lead astray by those who just perform miracles.

Christianity fails to take into account the real evidence that is presented throughout the Tanach to validate the real Messiah, when he shows up and falls into the trap of falling for the miraculous that eventually leads one away from G-d and Torah.

The Sages of Israel have, over the ages, agreed upon certain criterion for establishing who the Messiah is, and performing miracles is not among them.([5])

The criterion ([6]) given by the Sages of Israel concerning the Messiah falls basically into two categories: 1) His Person; 2) His Performance.

First, let us address the category of His Person.

1) He is to come from the House of David i.e., a direct descendant of King David.

2) He is to be learned in the Torah and observance of the commandments as established by both the Written and Oral Law in the same way of his father David. This of course implies that his birth is

through natural means and grows up and matures as a Torah Scholar careful to observe the commandments.

3) He is to be an influential person. His influence will be so great that he will be able to unite all of Israel in the service of G-d.

Now let us look at the second category, His Performance.

4) He is to fight and be victorious in the wars of G-d such as the war of Gog and Magog.

5) He is to rebuild the Temple.

6) He is to gather the dispersed of Israel.

All of these criterion can be clearly substantiated in the writings of the Torah, Prophets, and Writings. Which one of these standards does Jesus measure up to? According to Christian dogma concerning Jesus he does not measure up to any of this criterion that has been established by the Sages of Israel based on the information presented in the Tanach.

Remember: having a miraculous birth, performing miracles, and raising from the dead are not to be found in this criterion established by the Torah and the Torah Scholars of Israel. ■

[1] Gospel according to Matthew 2:18-20.

[2] Isaiah 7:24

[3] I Kings 17:17-24; II Kings 13:20-21.

[4] Deuteronomy 13:1-4

[5] Hilchot Melachim, Chapter 11:3, Page 230, Moznaim Publishing Corporation

[6] Hilchot Melachim, Chapter 11:4, page 232, Moznaim Publishing Corporation

THE ONE & ONLY REAL KING

DANIEL GOBER

The Haphtarah to Parashas Korach discusses the inauguration of the first king of Israel, Shaul Hamelech. At the inauguration, Shmuel HaNavi, the prophet of the time, emphasizes to the nation of Israel that they have sinned against G-d by requesting to have a King rule over them. When one inspects the verses in the Navi, (Samuel I, 8:1-5) however, it seems as if the Jews were making a legitimate request. The verses tell that it was a time when Shmuel HaNavi was approaching old age and his successors were not acting in accord with the ways of G-d. Some kind of change in the system was necessary in order to maintain justice among the nation. If so, how was the request for a King a sin against G-d? On the contrary, the Jews were just trying to ensure that G-d's system of justice be kept among the nation!

The Radak, a commentary on Prophets, raises another question. He says that there were three commandments issued upon the nation once they entered the land of Israel. They were, appointing a King, destroying Amalek, and setting up the Beis Hamikdash. Being that appointing a King is a commandment in the Torah, it seems as if this institution is beneficial for the Jews. If the Torah demands that the Jews have a king upon entering the Land Of Israel, what was sinful about asking for one? If anything, they were just trying to fulfill their commandment.

The Radak answers that the sin of the Jews rests in the fact that they did not ask with the intention of fulfilling the commandment of appointing a King, but rather, they had ulterior motives in doing so. It was these ulterior motives which demonstrated a lack of trust in G-d. Furthermore, he adds, they asked for a King, "like all the nations," but they didn't need a King like the other nations. Had they been following G-d's ways, G-d would fight their wars.

At first glance, these explanations raise a few strong questions. First, what were these ulterior motives behind the request and how were they ipso facto a lack of trust in G-d? Second, we never simply assume a lax attitude, that G-d will "fight our wars". The Jews always form an army to fight against their enemies, so why not have a King as well? Furthermore, if the Jews do not look to a king to fight their wars as other nations do, what purpose does this institution serve in Torah? Surely the Torah would not endorse something that detracts from the nation's view of G-d?!

As a prerequisite to approaching these questions, it is necessary to highlight that an integral idea in Torah is that there is only one true King, the King of all Kings, G-d. The idea of a King as an independent authority, who has control of everything and is not subjugated to anything above, can only refer to G-d. G-d's "Kingship" is qualitatively differentiated from man's kingship. For example, a human king's position is solely dependent on whether people are willing to follow him. His status as a ruler, therefore, is inherently limited to the loyalty of his constituents. If the people were to rebel, his kingdom would be overthrown. But such notions are in no way applicable to G-d. Being that G-d is not dependent on anything, His "Kingship" is essentially different. G-d is the only "all powerful" ruler since His Kingdom can never be overthrown.

As such, it must be that the position of a human king in Judaism is a very limited role, whose power as an authority is inherently limited to and dependent upon what G-d legislates. As it is impossible for a human to play any role similar to G-d, the only capacity of a Jewish king is to help direct the people to serve the Real King, G-d. The human king functions in a way to help the nation recognize G-d as the

only true source of security. This is illustrated by the many laws legislated specifically to the human king. For example, at the time the king starts to rule, he must write his own Torah Scroll and carry it with him wherever he goes, whether to battle or to the courts (Maimonides, Hilchot Melachim 3:1). Perhaps this is a constant demonstration that an integral element to his kingdom is the concept that he is only a king - subject to the Torah, G-d's law, not his own. When viewing the king, one immediately encounters the Torah, which he carries, which directs a person's attention to the true Ruler of the world. Even at a time of war, when egos are raging and people are looking to find security in a war hero, the human king and the nation are reminded that such notions are false because their success is only due to their relationship with G-d as followers of the Torah, that the human king always carries. Additionally, there is a law stating that anyone who disregards the human king's decree because he was involved in a commandment of G-d is exempt from punishment (ibid, 3:9). This also reflects the idea that the service of the human king is simply a means to the service of the True King. Therefore, it makes sense that the fulfillment of a commandment of G-d takes priority over the fulfillment of a human king's decree, since the prior is a direct service of G-d.

Other nations of the world, however, relate to a human king in a way contrary to Torah. To the rest of the world, a human king assumes ultimate authority, whose demands cannot be questioned and whose existence maintains the security of the people. All respect and commitment is directed towards him because he is considered responsible for the nation's success and prosperity. In addition to the socio-economic role of the king, there lies a powerful psychological dependency on the king as well. He



is viewed as a "father" who will take care of all of the people's needs, fighting their wars, removing worries from their hearts. It seems as if the other nations foolishly instill their kings with powers that only G-d possesses.

It follows that a false view of a human king, as the other nations maintain, reflects a false view of G-d, and ipso facto hits upon fundamental principles in Judaism. Had the request to Shmuel HaNavi been intended to fulfill G-d's commandment and enable the nation to serve G-d better, there would have been no sin at all. On the contrary, it would have been a step towards true recognition of G-d, just as the commandment is designed. But it was evident from the request of the people that this was not their intention. They were interested in something else. As the verse tells, the Jews requested to be like all the nations, whose king would judge them and fight their wars for them. The Jews' sin was that they failed to realize the true source of their prosperity and success. Unlike other nations, there is a special Providence over the Jews insofar as they are the nation who follows the Torah. The Jews must recognize that this providence plays an essential role in their existence as a nation which no human king can ever replace. Therefore, it must be that the Jews' attempt to find any security elsewhere could only stem from a "lack of trust in G-d", the only Real King. ■

Punishment & Heaven

Reader: I find your articles very encouraging and very uplifting. Thank you so much for your site. My husband and I are both recent converts (only about 3 years), but we have a long history of studying Judaism prior to our actual conversion. While I especially am in the very learning stage..I know 'basics', but desire to know more..I only hope and pray that I am able to go to bible studies or some place where I can learn more of Hashem's ways.

I have a few questions for you. First of all, I read in the book of Jeremiah about how G-d will punish those who practice idolatry, etc. yet, many Christians of which, I was one, bow down to statutes or kiss them or pay money to them. Yet at the same time, I have believed now that all righteous people will inherit a place in the World to Come. Is this correct? That these people who either willingly or unwillingly do these things, plus worship on the wrong day (Sunday instead of Saturday) or do not follow the feasts ordained by G-d, will still have a place in the 'after life'? Then who are the people that Jeremiah talks of that will be destroyed? And what exactly then happens after a Jewish person dies? Do we go to a 'heaven'? A 'peaceful' state...are we as Christianity teaches, reunited with loved ones?

Thanks again. I may have other questions for you at another time. Hope I can write to you again.

Mesora: I have not read or heard of being reunited with loved ones. But idolaters will have no heaven. One cannot enjoy a "heaven" (union with G-d's truth) if he denies G-d in his life.

There are varying views among the Rabbis regarding heaven. Ramban holds that after life here, our soul abides in what he refers to as the World of Souls, until at some point the Messiah comes. Then, one is resurrected into a physical human form again for eternity on Earth. Maimonides is of the opinion that

one's final state is not physical.

According to either view, one who denies G-d and is an idolater will not receive such a reward. As no attachment to truth was forged in his life, he has not prepared his soul for what is eternal, i.e., truth. ▣

Creator and Created I

Rabbi Abraham Stone was recently criticized by Rabbi Marshall Gisser for attributing human needs and emotions to Hashem (Letters, July 30). I was gratified to see Rabbi Stone respond (Letters, Aug. 6) by reaffirming the most fundamental principle of our religion — that Hashem cannot be understood or characterized in physical or psychological terms, and that he has no needs that require fulfillment.

However, the remainder of his letter was decidedly disappointing, and, indeed, self-contradictory in several ways. Amidst the citation of several midrashim, Rabbi Stone suggested that "In all Jewish souls here there is vested the essence of Hashem...Hashem created the world in a way that our service is for the need of Hashem, and He gains pleasure when his will is fulfilled."

This view of Hakadosh Baruch Hu is deeply problematic and not representative of our Holy Torah. Hashem is One and cannot be compared to His creations in any way, shape or form. Chas v'chalila that we should entertain the notion that Hashem is divided into parts that are "distributed" across humanity in the form of souls. When we say human beings have a divine element or spark, or that humans are created in Hashem's "image" we mean — as our sages explain — that human beings have the potential to relate to the Creator of the universe in a unique, spiritual way that differentiates them from all other earthly creatures.

Rabbi Stone establishes a dangerous precedent in his exercise of poetic license and pays insufficient regard to the fact that many

midrashim are not to be interpreted in their literal sense.

In addition, Rabbi Stone's statement that Hashem has no needs cannot be reconciled with the statement that His needs are somehow fulfilled by our mitzvot. Nor can the notion that Hashem has no emotions be reconciled with his assertion that Hashem "takes pleasure" in the fulfillment of His will. As the Ramban explains at length in his comments on Devarim 22:6, the mitzvot are designed purely for the benefit of mankind.

It is simply blasphemous to suggest that the Creator of heaven and earth and all they contain — a being with no weaknesses, defects or dependencies — would turn to His creations for help or fulfillment. ▣

*Rabbi Joshua Maroof
Beth Aharon Sephardic Cong.
(Reprinted from Jewish Press)*

Creator and Created II

Dear Jewish Press,

Had this issue not jeopardized the perception of Judaism's true tenets, I would let it go. However, when Torah fundamentals might be misunderstood, it is crucial that we talk with precision, speaking out on what are, and what are not true Torah ideals.

Two weeks ago I wrote to the Jewish Press, and questioned Rabbi Abraham Stone's unqualified explanation of "Menachem Av" as he put it, "consoling G-d." I quoted Numbers, 23:19, "G-d is not a man that He should lie, nor the son of man that He should be consoled..." I added that we possess no license to suggest new phrases like "consoling G-d", not authored by the Torah or the Rabbis. The Rabbis coined a term, "If the Torah had not written it, it would be impossible to enunciate".

Last week in his response, Rabbi Stone acknowledged that, "Certainly, we cannot attribute any physical features and human emotions to Hashem." He also affirmed, "He (G-

d) needs nothing from us." But a few sentences later Rabbi Stone wrote, "For Hashem created the world in a way that our service is for the need of Hashem." Rabbi Stone contradicts himself in a single article. The Rabbi openly says that G-d has "needs", and thus, posits a human frailty onto the Creator. However, it is the unequivocal teaching of all Torah Sages that G-d has no needs.

Rabbi Stone cites numerous rabbinic statements. However, we must be careful with such statements, not imputing emotions to G-d. The Rabbis taught that these words are not to be taken literally.

Rabbi Stone makes another fundamental error, violating one of Maimonides' 13 Principles - an idea not disputed by any of Judaism's Sages: Rabbi Stone writes, "Every Jewish soul is part of Hashem from Above." In his Second Principle, Maimonides writes, "And (G-d is) not like one man that may be divided into many individual parts..." Maimonides makes it clear: the concept of division or parts cannot be ascribed to G-d. Maimonides also writes, "...the Chachamim (wise men) denied G-d as being composite or subject to division", and, "the prophet said (Isaiah, 40:25), 'To what shall you equate Me that I should be similar, says G-d?'" (ibid; Principle III) There is no analog to G-d — hence, division cannot be ascribed to Him.

Do I belabor this point? If I do it is because of what Rabbi Bachya says in Duties of the Heart, (Gate of Unity, Chap. 3), "Whoever neglects to study [this subject] (unity of G-d) conducts himself disgracefully, and is counted among those who fall short in both knowledge and practice." This yesode (principle) of G-d's unity is of such paramount importance to the authentic, Jewish concept of G-d, the "Shema Yisrael" must be read twice daily where we affirm, "G-d is One". The Torah and the Rabbis share one voice; G-d has no parts.

We must be vigilant against any thought, which erodes Judaism's fundamentals. ▣

Letters

Missionary's Confusion

Shalom Moshe. I have just finished reading your response to the Christian missionary. I can relate to this dialogue because I have been "down that road", having been born and reared as a Baptist. I am only too sorry that it has taken me this long to begin to realize "the truth". There are no Orthodox congregations anywhere near me but, in my heart, I have already converted.

My point in this letter though is to ask the missionary if by chance he takes ALL of G-d's Word to be binding or just select portions? Should he say that it is ALL binding then I must ask him how he reads Devarim 4:2 and Devarim 13:1? The way I see it, if that is binding upon us then how in the world can anyone accept this "New Covenant" and all that goes with it? That is most certainly an addition to His Word. I am sure the missionary is an intelligent person but if he can show me or anyone else, where in G-d's Torah does G-d EVER even allude to there being a "god-man", man-god, a Trinity, a second coming, or a death and resurrection of a man that will atone for my sins, then I might consider his argument as somewhat valid. But other than some convoluted, twisted, out of context verses there is absolutely NO basis for any of what the missionary is espousing. When I read (just to name a few) Devarim 32:39, Isaiah 42:8, Isaiah 43:25, Isaiah 45:3-5, Isaiah 45:21-23, Isaiah 44:6-8, Ezekiel 18, then any and all doubt in my mind is erased. I have found, through my own experience, that if one immerses himself in half-truths and untruths, then he will have a difficult time ever being led to "ha emet". But there is hope.

Keep up the good work and I look forward to your dialogues with this missionary in the future.

Shalom,

Wes Poarch

Gentiles Learning Torah

Reader: Over the last few months one of the members of the Young Israel I go to has been having a gentle over for Shabbos, every Shabbos. He is most definitely not Jewish. He sits in on Torah classes, so I have been saying something to the Rabbis that are there. They have told me it is ok if he sits in on a class that is already going. Personally I'm against this idea. Can you offer any words on this subject?

Mesora: Based on Talmud Sanhedrin 59a (top of page) and Maimonides' Laws of Kings (Chap. 10, Law 9) a Gentile may not learn Torah except for his 7 Noachide laws, punishable by death. It follows that a Jew may not teach him other than these laws. I don't see how attending a class was permitted for this Gentile, although the teacher need not stop if the Gentile attends after it starts. I would tell the Gentile he may no longer attend, unless the classes are specifically on the 7 Noachide Laws.

It should be understood why the punishment is so severe, if a gentile learns Torah other than what applies to his seven Noachide Laws. By doing so, the Gentile then blurs the lines of who is a "Torah Authority", and this done en masse, will destroy Torah, as other Gentiles not fit to teach, will proliferate ignorant rulings. Only by the Rabbi/student system discussed in the JewishTimes these past two week, is the Torah insured from falling into the hands of those without proper training.

It may be very possible that a Gentile has the same intelligence as a Rabbi. Judaism does not make stupid claims such as "we are more intelligent than others", as I have unfortunately heard from ignorant

fellow Jews. There is no difference between a Jewish mind and a Gentile mind. However, a Gentile is not bound to fulfill the 613 Commands. As such, the level of meticulous Torah study and adherence will probably not be found among Gentiles who study Torah for its theoretic beauty alone.

Perhaps it is the Jews' obligation, which engenders the proper attitude essential for the highest level of Torah study, and thus, Torah leadership. This secures for Jews alone the right to study and disseminate Torah. I would note that many converts became some of Judaism's greatest teachers. However, to teach Judaism, one must be one of those people who inherited Torah, through "obligatory" Torah study – and this is only the Jew or the convert.

I will suggest this solution, which I hope your Rabbi agrees with and puts into action: suggest to your Rabbi that he teach Torah and Talmudic portions that apply to the 7 Noachide laws. This alone can keep someone busy in Torah study for many years. In this manner, the Gentile may continue to learn of G-d's Torah with you. You will both be studying matters that apply equally to Jew and Gentile. ■



Have a topic you would like to learn about?

Use Mesora's "Search" tool, or write in with your questions:

info@mesora.org

The only poor question is the one not asked.



USAIsrael.org

A MESORA.ORG INITIATIVE

Grow Israel's economy:
Redirect your monthly
business spending on
Israeli vendors.

Free ads and webpages
for Israeli firms.

**Mesora Classifieds are
FREE.**

**Advertise or search for
employment, listings
announcements...
anything! Click the
"Classifieds" link on
Mesora.org**

THE HAGUE

JUSTICE FOR
JEWS

WINTER

This news item recently appeared:

“THE HAGUE, Netherlands (Reuters) - The World Court strongly condemned Israel's West Bank barrier Friday, saying it had illegally imposed hardship on thousands of Palestinians and should be torn down.”

“Hardship” versus heartache, and horror! The moral question that emerges from this ruling: what is more terrible, being inconvenienced on your way to murder, or burying your loved ones?

It seems that according to the world court it is not right to prevent the murder of a few hundreds, if it interferes with the pleasures of the many. There is the rub... according to Jewish moral precepts if you save the life of one it is as saving a universe...and so us Jews have a problem.

What the world court demands from Israel that it should give up their rights of self-defense, and surrender their responsibility for the lives of its citizens. The ruling is also an edict that instructs the Jews to forgo its religious moral principles so not to hamper or inconvenience the lives of the Arab population of Judea and Samaria.

The Court rules against Israeli wall and argues, “Israel’s separation barrier in the occupied West Bank is illegal... and should be torn down.” This court of “justice” urging international action against the Jewish state if it fails to comply with the decision.

It is interesting to note that the court designates the west bank as occupied land, and suggests sanctions against Israel. It is true that Judea and Samaria are occupied lands, and so they were for nearly two millenniums since the destruction of the second Temple. From that time on, the land became pray to a long list of occupiers; the Romans, later the Seleucids, (Persians) the various Islamic Caliphates, the Egyptian Mamelukes, the Ottoman Turks, plus the British Empire, and lastly the Kingdom of Jordan. Finally in 1967 after the coordinated attack by a coalition of Arab states against Israel; that aimed to destroy the Jewish state and failed to drive its populace into the sea. Instead the territory was reoccupied by its original owners the Jews; who by the way were the only people in history that had a clear title accompanied by a distinct national identity and a singular historical tie to that land.

It wasn’t enough for this court who never complained about the Iron curtain, the bamboo curtain, or any of the Berlin or other walls that were erected by countless numbers of countries, to keep their populations imprisoned, and not to protect them from harm threatening them from the outside. The court did not call upon the Palestinian authority to pay reparations to Israeli families for the loss of lives and property that they suffer from the wanton acts of suicide bombers and to maybe call for sanctions against those who finance and reward the murder of the Jews. Instead, they stipulate that Israel pay damages to large number of Arabs harmed by building of the barrier. They instruct Israel to pay reparation to the Arab population for the reason that the wall cuts Arab farmers off from their fields, schools and clinics, turning towns and villages into surrounded enclaves. In other words the Jews should pay for inconveniencing the Arabs in their declared attempt to kill the Jews and eradicate the State of Israel.

The court’s message is as follows: How dare are these Jews inconvenience the indigenous Arab population in their daily lives? Where do these Jews come to have the chutzpah to force the hard working indigenous suicide bombers to look for another route to deliver their enlightening communiqué of deaths! Imagine: our poor Arab neighbors now fail to go through these Jew-erected obstacles. Think of the horrid trauma facing them when they realize that they may have to look for another profession. What other occupation can they qualify for you may ask, when blowing up Jews is all that they were trained to do for generations? What could an unemployed suicide bomber to do when his or her career comes to a sudden end? Think about it, ...even in a best-case scenario, these poor Arabs be forced to keep on collecting comprehensive care benefits from the UN.

Is that a dignified way of life for a proud Arab?

Why should we be surprised by the irrational decision of this court, or any other international forum that claims to have justice as its governing charter, when in every instance these organizations turn out to be nothing else but the mouthpieces of the in-fashion political agenda? Unfortunately for us bearing an anti-Jewish bias is always in fashion. These are the type of justice-bending institutions that put out the charge “Terrorist” against the legally elected Prime minister of Israel, and award a Nobel peace prize to a soiled-hearted murderer who by the grace of the UN and other World court type of institution, imposed himself as a dictator over the Arab people of living in Judea and Samaria. ▣

